

**GCE**

**History A**

**Y219/01: Russia 1894-1941**

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.




All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2021

## 1. Annotations

| Annotation       | Meaning of annotation  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>BP</b>        | Blank Page   |
|                  | Highlight  |
| Off-page comment |  |
| <b>A</b>         | Assertion  |
| <b>AN</b>        | Analysis   |
| <b>EVAL</b>      | Evaluation   |
| <b>EXP</b>       | Explanation  |
| <b>F</b>         | Factor   |
| <b>ILL</b>       | Illustrates/Describes  |
| <b>IRRL</b>      | Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question |
| <b>J</b>         | Judgement  |
| <b>KU</b>        | Knowledge and understanding  |
| <b>P</b>         | Provenance   |

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
|   | Meaning of annotation |
|  | Simple comment        |
|  | Unclear               |
|  | View                  |

| Question |     | Answer  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|------|---|
| 1        | (a) | <p><b>Which of the following had a greater impact on the collapse of the Provisional Government in November 1917?</b></p> <p><b>(i) The actions of Kerensky;</b><br/> <b>(ii) The role of Trotsky.</b></p> <p><b>Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>dealing with the actions of Kerensky</b>, answers might argue that Kerensky's decision to release the Bolsheviks from imprisonment and arm them during the Kornilov Uprising created the very force that would topple the Provisional Government in November 1917;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that Kerensky's 'July Offensive' demonstrated both the Provisional Government's determination to continue with an unpopular war and the army's inability to win that war, weakening the provisional Government's credibility;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that Kerensky's decision to close down Bolshevik newspapers and arrest Bolshevik leaders left Lenin with little alternative but – or the pretext - to launch the action to destroy the Provisional Government;</li> <li>• Answers might refer to Kerensky's relatively limited role in the earlier months of the Provisional Government;</li> <li>• Answers might consider Kerensky's successful suppression of the July Days and Lenin's departure for Finland as successfully prolonging the Provisional Government rather than engineering its collapse.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>dealing with the role of Trotsky</b>, answers might argue that as Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, Trotsky was a leading focus of opposition to the Provisional Government in the weeks leading up to its collapse;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that Trotsky's skills as an orator influenced the garrison of the Peter and Paul Fortress to</li> </ul> | 10   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• Judgement must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, mark as assertion.</li> <li>• Only credit material relevant to the collapse of the Provisional Government.</li> <li>• Answers may deal with each factor in turn, then compare them to reach a judgement, or may take a continually comparative approach. Either approach is acceptable.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul> |

| Question |      | Answer   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|------|--|------|--|
|          |      | <p>side with the Bolsheviks in November 1917, playing a key role in the downfall of the Provisional Government;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers might argue that Trotsky played a leading role in creating the means to topple the Provisional Government given his position leading the MRC and in the planning of the November Revolution itself;</li> <li>• Answers might refer to Trotsky's imprisonment after the July Days and how this limited his influence over events in a crucial month;</li> <li>• Answers might consider that it was Lenin rather than Trotsky who made the final decision to launch the Revolution in November 1917 and without his influence over the Central Committee Trotsky's contribution could not have been realised.</li> </ul>  |      |  |
| 1        | (b)* | <p><b>'The geographical advantages of the Reds were the most important reason for their victory in the Russian Civil War.'</b><br/><b>How far do you agree?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In arguing geographical advantages of the Reds were the most important reason</b>, answers might argue that the Bolsheviks controlled the key central regions of Russia, with the major cities and most of the population under their control and so were in a strong strategic position;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the Bolsheviks also controlled Russia's key railway lines, allowing them to reinforce Petrograd from Yudenich and defeat Kolchak and Denikin's consecutive attacks;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the key centres of military production and storage – such as Tula – were under Bolshevik control and gave the Red Army superior equipment and supplies;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that in comparison the White armies were scattered and in unfavourable areas – such as Kolchak in Siberia and Miller in the far North – giving the Bolsheviks a key advantage;</li> </ul> | 20   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At higher levels candidates will focus on "how far" but at Level 4 may simply list reasons.</li> <li>• At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to the level of extent.</li> <li>• At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to measure relative importance.</li> <li>• To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers might argue that Bolshevik appeals to patriotism were more effective as they controlled most of Great Russia whereas the Whites fought in areas that mostly contained national minorities.</li> <li>• <b>In arguing other factors were more important</b>, answers might argue that Trotsky's Red Army reforms created a more effective and efficient fighting force by reintroducing rank and harsh discipline whereas White forces often melted away;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that White disunity was a major reason for red success; groups like the Komuch refused to accept Kolchak's leadership and Kolchak and Denikin failed to coordinate their attacks;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that Red propaganda and terror – such as agitprop trains and Political Commissars - were crucial tools in ensuring the Red Army was a more effective fighting force;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the intervention of foreign powers worked against the Whites, since it was insufficient to be decisive and allowed the Reds to portray themselves as defending Russia from foreign invasion;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that compared to the differing aims, policies and atrocities of the Whites, the Reds had a simpler and more popular agenda and so suffered less from desertions and poor morale.</li> </ul> |      |          |

| Question |     | Answer  | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|-----|---|------|--|
| 2        | (a) | <p><b>Which of the following was a greater threat to the Bolsheviks by 1921?</b></p> <p><b>(i) Resentment towards ‘war communism’</b></p> <p><b>(ii) The Kronstadt Rising</b></p> <p><b>Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In <b>dealing with resentment towards War Communism</b>, answers might argue that the harsh discipline and long working hours introduced by War Communism saw Bolshevik support in the cities decline rapidly; a major threat since most Bolshevik popularity lay in urban areas;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that peasants retaliating to the forced requisition of grain by not planting crops had led to widespread famine by 1921 that led to the deaths of millions and caused widespread resent towards the Bolsheviks;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the harsh Bolshevik response to peasant resistance during War Communism led to widespread rural unrest like the Tambov uprising which took months to suppress;</li> <li>• Answers might refer to War Communism having been a necessary measure to ensure the survival of the Bolsheviks by maintaining grain supplies to the army and cities;</li> <li>• Answers might consider that the widespread use of terror by the Cheka and Red Army was able to control much of the resentment to War Communism and so reduce its threat.</li> <li>• In <b>dealing with the Kronstadt Rising</b>, answers might argue that coming as it did from demands issued by workers it was a threat to the Bolsheviks as it showed discontent from their natural supporters;</li> </ul> | 10   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• Judgement must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, mark as assertion.</li> <li>• Only credit material relevant to establishing a threat to the Bolsheviks by 1921.</li> <li>• Answers may deal with each factor in turn, then compare them to reach a judgement, or may take a continually comparative approach. Either approach is acceptable.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with the descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul> |



| Question |      | Answer   | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|------|--|------|---|
|          |      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers might argue that as the Kronstadt sailors had been previously labelled the 'pride and joy of the Revolution' it demonstrated how much support the Bolsheviks had lost by 1921;</li> <li>Answers might argue that the location and timing of the uprising – close to Petrograd and at the time of the Tenth plenum – was a threat as it embarrassed the Bolsheviks;</li> <li>Answers might refer to the relatively small nature of the uprising and the rejection of all its political demands demonstrates the limited nature of the threat;</li> <li>Answers might consider that the uprising was rapidly crushed by an overwhelming Red Army force, showing that the Bolsheviks were able to suppress the threat.</li> </ul>  |      |   |
| 2        | (b)* | <p><b>'The policy of collectivisation was a success in the 1930s.'</b><br/><b>How far do you agree?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In arguing that collectivisation was a success</b>, answers might argue that the sheer scale of collectivisation – with over 90% of peasants in a collective farm by the end of the 1930s – shows that the policy was successfully implemented;</li> <li>Answers might argue that collectivisation was successful in ensuring improved supplies of grain to Soviet cities, which had been a major objective of the scheme;</li> <li>Answers might argue that in the eyes of Stalin the policy was successful in removing class opposition in the form of dekulakisation;</li> <li>Answers might argue that the network of collective farms allowed for far greater control of the rural population, for example through the surveillance work of the Machine Tractor Stations;</li> <li>Answers might argue that collectivisation permitted the transfer of millions of peasants into the cities to become workers and stimulate Soviet industry, which had been a key reason for introducing the policy.</li> </ul> | 20   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No set answer is expected.</li> <li>At higher levels candidates will focus on "assess" but at Level 4 may simply list reasons.</li> <li>At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to the level of extent.</li> <li>At higher levels candidates might establish different criteria from which to measure relative success.</li> <li>To be valid judgements, claims must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not they are assertions.</li> <li>Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In arguing that collectivisation was not a success,</b> answers might argue that the massive scale of human suffering through famine and the Holodomor means that collectivisation must be seen as a tragic failure ;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that dekulakisation served to remove the most efficient farmers from the USSR and set back agricultural production rather than improved it;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the peasant resistance to collectivisation caused significant damage to Soviet agriculture, with livestock numbers halving in the early 1930s due to peasants slaughtering them rather than handing them to the collective;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that production increases as a result of collectivisation were disappointing compared to the high point of NEP in the 1920s;</li> <li>• Answers might argue that collectivisation was never fully implemented and the toleration of and reliance on peasants' private plots for food production shows that the policy was a compromise rather than a success.</li> </ul> |      |          |

APPENDIX 1 – this contains a generic mark scheme grid

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <i>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.</i>                                    |
|                              | <b>Generic mark scheme for Question 1(a) and Question 2(a): Which of the following? [10]</b>   |
| <b>Level 6</b><br>9–10 marks | Both factors are thoroughly analysed and evaluated using accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, in order to reach a developed and substantiated judgement in relation to the question.   |
| <b>Level 5</b><br>7–8 marks  | Both factors are analysed and evaluated using generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, in order to reach a substantiated judgement in relation to the question.  |
| <b>Level 4</b><br>5–6 marks  | Both factors are analysed and evaluated using relevant knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, however treatment of factors may be un-even with analysis and evaluation of one of the two being only partial. Analysis and evaluation is used to support a reasonable judgement in relation to the question.                    |
| <b>Level 3</b><br>3–4 marks  | Both factors are analysed and evaluated in a partial way, using some relevant knowledge of key features of the period, in order to make a basic judgement in relation to the question.   |
| <b>Level 2</b><br>2 marks    | Limited and generalised knowledge of the period is used to attempt a limited analysis or evaluation of both factors, and this is linked to a very simplistic judgement.  |
| <b>Level 1</b><br>1 mark     | Very limited and generalised knowledge of the period is used to attempt a very limited analysis or evaluation of one of the factors. The other factor is either not considered or there is very limited information or description of the factor with no attempt to use this knowledge. If there is a judgement, this takes the form of assertion. |
| 0 marks                      | Nothing of any relevance to the factors.   |

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
|                                  | <i>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.</i>   |
|                                  | <b>Generic mark scheme for Question 1(b) and Question 2(b): Essay [20]</b>  |
| <b>Level 6</b><br>17–20<br>marks | There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated throughout the answer and is consistently evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated, developed and sustained judgements.<br>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.   |
| <b>Level 5</b><br>13–16<br>marks | There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed.<br>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.   |
| <b>Level 4</b><br>10–12<br>marks | The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made.<br>There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.  |
| <b>Level 3</b><br>7–9<br>marks   | The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit.<br>The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence. |
| <b>Level 2</b><br>4–6<br>marks   | The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made.<br>The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.  |
| <b>Level 1</b><br>1–3<br>marks   | The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis.<br>Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.                                |
| 0 marks                          | No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.  |

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored