

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level**

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series**

### **9697 HISTORY**

**9697/11**

Paper 11, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	11

## GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument.</i>
2	18–20	<i>Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.</i>
3	16–17	<i>Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.</i>
4	14–15	<i>Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.</i>
5	11–13	<i>Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.</i>
6	8–10	<i>Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.</i>
7	0–7	<i>Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	11

Section A

Source-Based Question

**‘Germany’s policies before World War I were defensive.’ Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.**

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER [e.g. Contextual knowledge]
<b>A</b>	Report by a French diplomat to his government.	Germany feels itself superior to France. It has a militaristic outlook.	N–There were strong militaristic tendencies in Germany. N–There were also more moderate groups in Germany. Y–The source is not objective.	N–Germany sought domination of Europe and was responsible for war. Y–B–Germany was forced to go to war. Y–C–Austria should be free to fight a justified, but localised war. The implication is that Germany did not want to go to war. Y–D–Germany was on the defensive against superior enemies.	Candidates can discuss the background of Franco-German relations.
<b>B</b>	Public speeches by William II.	War is justified and will unite Germans.	Y–There were divisions in Germany. N–The source is very subjective (but it is a normal expression of opinion at the beginning of a war).	Y–C agrees that Germany did not wish to be dragged into a war over the Balkans. Its defence of Austria was justified. Y–D sees Russia as a major threat to a peaceful Germany. N–E contradicts the Kaiser’s claims that Germany sought peace.	Germany’s role in the 1914 Balkans crisis can be examined. They can assess how accurate is the accusation that Russian and French military preparations were to blame.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

<b>C</b>	Announcement by the German Foreign Ministry.	Germany tried to localise the Balkans crisis but Russia and France prevented this.	Y–German policy was threatened by the combination of France and Germany. N–Germany did interfere in the Balkans crisis and did not leave negotiations to Austria.	Y–B states strongly that Germany sought peace. Y–D claims that Russia was a serious and growing threat to Germany. N–A sees Germany as aggressive. N–E is a strong condemnation of the basis of C.	Germany’s role in the Sarajevo crisis can be examined.
<b>D</b>	British historian’s view of German policy.	Germany had departed from its policy of Weltpolitik and sought power in Europe. Russia was a major threat.	Y–There is an informed view of the improvement in Russia’s economic and military situation. Y–There is a clear description of changes in German foreign policy aims. Y–Moltke states the accepted German strategy which depended on a first strike. Y–The source seems objective.	Y/N–C agrees that Germany was badly affected by Russian (and French) military preparations. But disagrees about its attitude to war. N–A disagrees about the relative strengths of Germany and France. N–B–disagrees about Germany’s pre-war policies.	The claim about the localisation of a Balkans war and Germany’s relations with Austria can be assessed.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

<b>E</b>	Account of the views of a German historian.	Germany had aggressive policies and sought the domination of Europe.	Assessment can be at two levels. N–The account of the historian’s views is probably accurate. (Fischer but candidates are not expected to identify the historian.) N–The claim about Bethmann-Hollweg’s memo is strong evidence. N–The source was written by a UK historian but is it objective?	N–A agrees that Germany was aggressive - towards France. N–B claims that Germany sought peace. Y–C states that Germany did not want a general war and wished war would involve only Austria and Serbia. D–Germany was on the defensive, especially against Russia.	The claim about a change of policy can be examined. German war aims in 1914 can be analysed.
----------	---	--	--	---	---

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	11

## 1 Source-Based Question

### L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1–5]

These answers write generally about the causes of the 1914 war but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'Germany's policies before World War I were defensive' but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis. Alternatively, the sources might be ignored in a general essay answer.

### L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation / interpretation in context.

For example; *'The hypothesis that Germany's policies before World War I were defensive is inaccurate. Source A shows that Germany believed that it was superior to France and would use force to maintain that superiority. German claims that the country was peaceful were unconvincing. This feeling was widely shared in Germany, enjoying popular support. Source E claims that Germany sought world power. It was responsible for the outbreak of World War I and its policies were supported by the most important people in Germany.'*

### L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example; *'The claim that Germany's policies before World War I were defensive is justified in several sources. William II's speeches in Source B shows that Germany was reacting to the threats made by other countries. He had sought a peaceful outcome to the crisis. Source C blames Russia and France, not Germany which preferred to localise the Balkans crisis so that a general war would not break out. Source D explains German defensive policies at length. It shows how decisive was Germany's fear of being encircled by the Triple Entente and growing Russian power in particular.'*

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	11

L4 BY INTERPRETING / EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example; *‘Germany’s policies before World War I were defensive. This hypothesis cannot be justified by using directly one of the primary sources, Source A, and one of the secondary sources, Source E. Source A’s claims that Germany felt itself superior to France are supported by contextual knowledge. William II departed from Bismarck’s policy of combining the isolation of France with a desire to build a series of peaceful alliances. The source correctly points to the importance of the military and militaristic opinion in Germany. Source E makes a well-argued case about the direction of German foreign policy. It rightly states that Germany did not make a serious effort to localise the Sarajevo crisis. It presents new and important evidence about Bethmann-Hollweg’s memorandum.’*

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example; (L4 plus); *‘On the other hand, some sources suggest a contrary argument. Source B might be dismissed as self-serving propaganda by the Kaiser but contextual knowledge shows that he did not believe that a general war would break out in 1914. His speeches in this source are similar those delivered by politicians in every country that went to war. Source D is quite objective and concludes that Germany believed that it was in danger from its enemies. Moltke supported war as a form of self-defence because the balance of military power would swing increasingly towards France and Russia. The Triple Entente was believed to be much stronger than the Triple Alliance. Of Germany’s partners, Italy was unreliable and Austria was not a strong power.’*

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE / SUPPORT IS BETTER / PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES / EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22–25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example; *‘Overall, the hypothesis that Germany’s policies before World War I were defensive is more convincing. Source D is the most valuable source because it shows changes in German policy and explains why Germany might seem to be aggressive. Germany, with its Schlieffen Plan, depended on a first-strike strategy because this was only way to deal with a war on two fronts against France and Russia, and possibly Britain. Source A is very anti-German as it stands but it ignores the strong anti-German feeling of the French. Sources B and C might be dismissed as propaganda but all countries produced similar documents to justify themselves. Source E is a total condemnation of Germany but the extract omits any reference to alternative explanations.’*

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

**OR**

*'The simple claim that Germany's policies in before World War I were defensive is incomplete. Germany did alarm other countries, especially Britain, by its policies, for example in waging the naval war. Germany did nothing to improve its relations with France and handled Russia badly. Its relations with Austria, as shown in Source C, were poorly directed and increased the danger of a general war. In Source E, Bethmann-Hollweg's memorandum seems clear evidence of German aggression but it supposes that the Chancellor had most influence over German policy. Source B might be dismissed as propaganda by William II but there also evidence that he was alarmed when a general war broke out.'*

For **(b)** include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support / contradict) in order to improve it.

*For example; 'A better hypothesis would be that all countries were defensive in 1914. That is, they were defensive against other individual countries or groups of countries in alliances. Politicians misunderstood the scale and outcomes of the resulting wars. They were also aggressive, except Britain, because they believed that attack was the best defence. They believed that the war would be won by a quick mobilisation. This mobilisation did not work for any country.'*

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	11

## Section B

### Essay Questions

#### 2 Assess the problems facing the French Revolutionaries from 1789 to the execution of Louis XVI in 1793.

The question lends itself to a chronological structure because the problems facing the French Revolutionaries changed. In 1789, it can be argued that the immediate problem was representation in the Estates-General. The traditional system represented the hierarchies in the ancien régime but, backed by the King, the nobility and Church, would have obstructed demands for reform. The declaration of the National Assembly and the Tennis Court Oath followed. The next problem was the attack on privileges in the August decrees and Louis XVI's initial refusal to accept both these and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The problems it indicated were liberty, security, an end to oppression and the guarantee of property rights which then meant a reformed fiscal system. It was not a demand for democracy. The Church was seen as a problem, not only because of its fiscal privileges. The Civil Constitution (1790) was the outcome. The King continued to be obstructive, even when he seemingly promised to accept the reforms. The Flight to Varennes (1791) epitomised his desire to regain his lost powers. Internally, there were problems with growing disorder, showing the extent of counter-revolutionary opinion. Many provinces were involved, especially the Vendée. Inflation worsened the situation. The Revolution was in danger from the war against foreign monarchies. The battle of Valmy was an important victory for France but did not end the danger. These events brought to a head the rivalries between increasingly radical parties and the moderates. The Committee of Public Safety gained power as an emergency body, with the Jacobins winning out over the Girondins. Revolutionaries were in danger from their former colleagues. Mention might be made of Hebert and Danton. The execution of Louis XVI showed starkly the change in the balance of power. In 1789, the major problem seemed to be the reform of existing systems. In 1793, the major problem for governors was how to destroy the system.

#### 3 Assess the advantages that Britain enjoyed over France and Germany in developing an Industrial Revolution.

The best responses will explain why the advantages considered promoted industrialisation in Britain. More capital was available for investment in Britain. In France, land and offices were more valued as investments than industrial opportunities. Land was of primary importance in Britain throughout most of the nineteenth century but there were entrepreneurs who were willing to invest. At the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, they were often individuals, such as Matthew Boulton, but groups and banks were attracted later to industrially linked investments. British governments were reluctant to invest their own money, that is taxes, but the general policy of laissez-faire was favourable to industrialisation. French rulers differed in their view of the advantages and disadvantages of industrialisation. Internal customs levies continued throughout much of France. Most German states, even Prussia, found it difficult to promote change until a start was made with the Zollverein. Britain was not free from war at the turn of the nineteenth century. There were continual conflicts with revolutionary and Napoleonic France. However, the nature of these wars did not seriously damage the economy, unlike France and Germany. They increased British overseas trade. It is true that Britain was more free of internal conflicts. Agricultural changes caused hardship to many but benefited landowners, who became investors. They provided a workforce of those who moved to towns. Rural changes were very limited in France and Germany when Britain was advancing industrially. Urbanisation provided an advantage in a number of ways. It allowed for large factories with mass production. These encouraged improved methods of communication, especially railways. They created employment in jobs that served industry. The urban classes were a market for manufactures. The growth of towns and cities in France and Germany lagged behind.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

**4 Explain why nationalists in Germany and Italy failed to achieve their aims in 1848-49.**

The key issue is the failure in 1848-49 of nationalists in Germany and Italy. Answers might be organised sequentially but such answers should normally contain some points of similarity and difference to reach the highest bands. It will be relevant to show the background to the 1848-49 revolutions when reactionary forces were strong in this period, especially with the influence of Metternich. He was the determined and powerful enemy of nationalism and associated liberalism. In Germany, the Carlsbad Decrees (1819) sought to curb critical voices, especially in the middle-class universities. He persuaded a number of German princes who had granted constitutions to withdraw or modify them. Austria had a large but lesser influence in Italy where Piedmont, the Papacy and some small states were more independent. But they also tended to favour conservatism against nationalist influences. His ability to use a network of agents and the strength of the Austrian army were formidable problems for nationalists. Nationalists had to resort to secrecy and were often forced into exile. With a lack of cohesion, they often had different aims. They appealed to different social groups. Mazzini emerged as a leading nationalist in Italy. A republican (from republican Genoa), his aims were untypical of other Italian nationalists. His ideas were drawn from romantic writers rather than political activists. Young Italy emerged as a base for nationalist idealists. France, not for the last time, gave no assistance. Austria was able to restore order. There was a similar story in Germany. The separatism of provinces was marked in Germany and Italy. Germany, unlike Italy, was also subject to religious divisions between Catholic and Protestants regions. The revolutions of 1848 were caused as much by economic grievances as nationalist feelings and the nationalists had diverse programmes. Some in Germany wanted only constitutions in different states. The Frankfurt Parliament can be examined. Some Italians were federalists. Others looked vainly to the Papacy for leadership of a united country. The nationalism of others was regional. Lack of political support and an army proved fatal in Germany and Italy.

**5 ‘The most important reason why continental countries engaged in “New Imperialism” in the late nineteenth century was to compete with Britain.’ How far do you agree with this claim?**

The question suggests the most important reason for involvement in New Imperialism was competition with Britain. Responses can give a higher priority to other motives but will need to consider the stated cause at a basic level. The British Empire was the largest in the world. As well as India, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (not part of New Imperialism because they were developed before the later years of the nineteenth century but they did provoke rivalry), candidates might refer to South Africa, with its rich gold and diamond reserves, West Africa with Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast with raw materials including palm oil, and small but potentially valuable concessions in the Far East. French rivalry with Britain was apparent in Egypt and the Sudan. The Suez Canal was completed in 1869 by French engineers and with French capital but financial problems led to its takeover by Britain. The rivalry led to a confrontation in the Sudan. French interests were promoted by pressure from financial leaders, the military, politicians and the press. The outcome was Fashoda (1898). In Germany, William II adopted the policy of Weltpolitik (world policy) that was largely a reaction to Britain’s world power. Few regions in Africa were available for exploitation (South West Africa and German East Africa) but China and the Far East were more attractive propositions. With this sort of basis, responses can explain and assess other factors. Apart from Britain, France and Germany, other European countries were involved, notably Belgium and Italy. Motives were correspondingly diverse. The possibility of economic gain through raw materials and markets was important. Some answers might refer to the idea of surplus capital (Hobson and Lenin), although this is now largely discredited. Reputation, personal and national, played a part. Social Darwinism and religion were significant to some.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

## **6 Assess Lenin's qualities as a revolutionary leader from 1905 to 1917.**

The key issue is the assessment of Lenin's leadership qualities. The stated end-point of 1917 makes clear that his post-revolutionary government is not relevant unless mentioned briefly in a conclusion. The best answers might well be organised chronologically but they will focus on arguments and will be supported by knowledge, which should then not be dismissed as mere description. Lenin was a determined revolutionary who preferred to split the Social Democrats (1903) rather than accept a broader-based party. He was also an intellectual, driven by ideas. He founded 'Iskra' ('The Spark') and ensured that it was distributed in Russia although he was in exile. 'What is to be Done?' marked a turn towards support for the industrial proletariat rather than the peasantry as the instrument of revolution. Unlike other radical groups such as the Mensheviks, Lenin dismissed the middle class (bourgeoisie). His judgement of events, like almost everybody else at the time, could be faulty. He and his group of Bolsheviks were little involved in the 1905 Revolution and did not believe that a revolution would break out in Russia in 1917. However by 1917, Lenin had built up a disciplined group of Bolsheviks who were able to take advantage of the disorder in Russia. Propaganda and speeches won him wide support. He was able to highlight the key demands of the people: land, peace and bread. He realised the importance of the soviets (workers' councils) as a means of gaining power. They could also be a link to the rank and file in the army. He proclaimed 'All power to the soviets', a revolutionary alternative to the conventional government. His resilience was shown in the contrast between the July Days and the Kornilov affair. The former was a serious setback to Lenin while the latter, a few weeks later, restored his reputation and influence. The events of October 1917 showed that he could take decisive action when many of his colleagues thought the Bolsheviks too weak to seize power. Not a mass rising as the communists later claimed, it was more a coup d'état masterminded by Trotsky.

## **7 How far had Hitler changed society and the economy in Germany by 1939?**

Hitler promised to transform society with a populist programme that included an end to the alleged conditions under the Weimar republic. He preached anti-Semitism and appealed to the self-interest of all groups whom he saw as representing the best features of German nationalism. The consequence was that Germans lost their freedom to disagree. Trade unions were shackled, as were the law courts. Family values were preached but this led to the loss of opportunities by women. Children were controlled by a carefully designed curriculum and teachers were screened for their loyalty. Youth groups were another form of propaganda and control. The worst features of anti-Semitism appeared after 1939 but the 1930s saw strong measures in this direction, including the Nuremberg Laws (1935) and Kristallnacht (1938). Catholic and Protestant churches had a history of co-operation with the state. A Concordat with the Papacy (1933) was an agreement heavily in Hitler's favour. A minority of clergy and lay people resisted on religious grounds. Propaganda and censorship promoted Hitler while excluding alternative opinions. Hitler promised much in economic affairs but was cautious in practice not to alienate industrialists, manufacturers and bankers. Support from such groups was important to Hitler. Schacht worked under the Weimar regime; but he agreed with Hitler's aim to achieve self-sufficiency (autarky). Public works such as the building of autobahns were extended and unemployment declined. This was also made possible by the exclusion from employment of Jews and political 'undesirables' and a larger number of state employees as civil servants. Ambitious four-year plans were introduced. The priority was to make Germany ready for war. Goering's appointment to handle the economy proved unpopular and Schacht resigned. State control was extended but in directions that mollified the major interest groups. The middle classes did not prosper but could be terrorised against open expressions of dissatisfaction.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>11</b>

**8 How effectively did the rulers of Russia deal with the problems of the economy from 1900 to 1939?**

The specified period is from 1900 to 1939 and covers tsarist and communist regimes. Responses might contrast the lack of interest in economic reform displayed by Nicholas II and Lenin's/Stalin's commitment to economic change. The Tsar showed virtually no interest in economic reform, which everyone recognised would probably lead to political and social change. He gave little support to Witte and Stolypin. Lenin and Stalin used the full force of a totalitarian state to reform the economy but still experienced problems. Russia lacked a powerful middle class that could bring about economic change. Nicholas II was not interested in this group while the communists' political views were hostile to the bourgeoisie. Witte realised the importance of investment. The only large source was foreign loans. The price was high foreign debts. There were some gains. The railway system grew, for example the Trans-Siberian railway. Heavy industry increased. The growth rate was impressive but the Russian economy still lagged behind that of advanced western countries. Not all sections of the population gained. Peasants suffered from increased taxes. Famine spread as agricultural production proved inadequate to support the population. Stolypin put more emphasis on peasant reform, aiming to create a new class of rich peasants, the kulaks. They would transform the old, inefficient peasant system. There was an improvement in production and grain exports increased. However, Stolypin was assassinated after only five years in office. War exposed the fundamental economic problems. Lenin, as a result of the instability in Russia, embarked on War Communism, a state-controlled economy. This failed in every respect. Industrial and agricultural production fell and there was widespread disorder. It was dropped in favour of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921. The economy returned to pre-World War I levels. In terms of their practical results, Lenin's policies can probably best be described as a failure. However, he was working in a desperately difficult situation. The problems inherited from the tsarist period were compounded by World War I and the subsequent Civil War. Stalin tolerated the NEP briefly but abandoned it for political and economic reasons. He was driven by a wish to revolutionise the Russian economy. Responses can explain his policies in industry and agriculture but the best will examine the problems that he faced. Some might conclude that Stalin was more successful than the others but the best answers should reflect some awareness of the limits of his success.