



A-level HISTORY 7042/1H

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855-1964

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



2 0 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 1 H / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the extent of cultural change in the USSR in the years 1941 to 1964.

[30 marks]*Target: AO3*

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- the overall argument is that there was considerable cultural change from the later Stalinist years through Khrushchev's time in power
- the Stalinist approach to culture was through low-level purges and 'controlled persuasion' to prevent public criticism and hide conflict
- under Khrushchev, there was an increase in intellectual and artistic freedom and greater freedom even in 'sensitive' areas, such as sociology and economics
- Khrushchev personally encouraged criticism through his secret speech, de-Stalinisation campaigns and personal attitude (even considering abolishing censorship).

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- post-war Stalinism demanded all-embracing cultural conformity in the Zhdanovshchina; when censorship was again tightened, after a little more latitude (to encourage patriotism) in the war years
- the 1956 Secret Speech and de-Stalinisation encouraged a 'thaw'; greater contact with western culture was permitted; there was some rehabilitation of those (e.g. Shostakovich and Akhmatova) persecuted under the Zhdanovshchina
- examples of greater liberalisation might include Dudinstev, author of 'Not by Bread Alone' and Solzhenitsyn, who was released from labour camp and allowed to publish 'A day in the life of Ivan Denisovich', critical of the Stalinist gulags; Stalin's own economic theory (published) 1952 was challenged
- the 'optimistic' interpretation of change can be challenged by the example of Pasternak, who was not allowed to publish Dr Zhivago, nor to travel to the West to receive his Nobel prize. Works that went beyond criticism of the Stalinist system were still outlawed and Khrushchev's personal tastes were conservative; his desire for cultural freedom, limited.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- the overall argument is that there was considerable cultural continuity from the later Stalinist years through Khrushchev's time in power
- the Stalinist regime was a total dictatorship in which all culture had to meet the demands of 'Socialist Realism' and keeping the regime in existence was the major concern
- under Khrushchev, the dictatorship grew even stronger with censorship and enforced membership of the party's cultural groups was maintained; great works had to be published abroad (and some never appeared in the USSR) and there was extensive religious persecution
- there was initially a little deviation from the overwhelming demands of Socialist Realism but this was followed by a rapid 'refreeze'.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- under both leaders, cultural activities were only considered legitimate if they supported socialist ideology (the inevitable ‘march to communism’) known as Socialist Realism; messages had to be uplifting and positive and ‘real’ subject matter directed to ordinary people
- the Zhdanovshchina saw the purge or persecution of Leningrad literary journalists, Akhmatova (poet), Pasternak (writer), Shostakovich and Prokofiev (musicians) and Eisenstein (film-maker); persecutions, (e.g. of writers Pasternak and Brodsky) continued under Khrushchev
- membership of Party-controlled bodies for all writers and cultural figures had been demanded since 1932 (with principles laid down by Zhdanov in 1934 and extended 1946). Throughout the 1941–1964 period, these unions controlled what was produced and who could produce it; a questioning of socialist interpretations, e.g. of the October Revolution, was seen as politically suspect; the text of Dr Zhivago had to be illegally smuggled out of USSR and published in Italy in 1957
- Khrushchev revived a socialist campaign against the Churches (Orthodox, Islamic and of other sects) and made the school curriculum atheistic. This furthered the Stalinist campaigns of the 1930s, despite some brief respite during the war years when the Church was used to lift morale. Throughout, there was continuity in the regarding of religious culture as a branch of government
- both regimes were too afraid of challenge to allow freedom of culture; fears of the result of exposure to the West in the war years produced a cultural clampdown 1945–53, and concerns at the possible repercussions of the 1956 Secret Speech and spread of cultural dissidence 1953–1964, made censors constantly vigilant.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:

- the overall argument is that there was some cultural change from the later Stalinist years through Khrushchev’s time in power, but that changes were hesitant and erratic
- under both Stalin and Khrushchev, cultural products were defined by their ‘social responsibility’; Khrushchev had the same personal tastes as accepted under Stalinism; writers continued to be attacked and some were even sent to lunatic asylums
- the boundaries of what constituted acceptable culture were fixed under Stalin, with authorities defending these and preventing intellectual questioning; under Khrushchev, the boundaries were challenged and extended, but only gradually and in a ‘zig-zag’ pattern
- policies were erratic under Khrushchev and what was acceptable was not clear; some cultural figures were able to criticise freely, others were persecuted.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- whilst Khrushchev appeared to favour greater cultural liberalisation than allowed in Stalin’s later years – removing restrictions on foreign literature and radio, permitting more foreign travel and tourism and rehabilitating some writers and artists – he was wary of greater freedom and always erred on the side of caution
- Khrushchev’s own conservative tastes made him more like Stalin in cultural attitudes; he was outspokenly critical of the modern art in a Moscow gallery visited in 1962 and could be scathing about modernism; his views were published in Pravda
- Party officials (rarely intellectuals themselves) were unsure and unpredictable in attitudes; they felt on safer ground setting economic targets – culture was a difficult area to understand and regulate; they sometimes persecuted for little reason and sometimes allowed works of less obvious ‘social responsibility’
- examples of writers and critics more erratically persecuted under Khrushchev might include: Vladimir Bukovsky and Joseph Brodsky – confined to mental institutions in 1963, although the previously persecuted Shostakovich, Akhmatova, Bebel, Pilnyak and Zoshchenko were all

permitted to work again; reference could also be made to the dissident movement (writers and musicians) which was forced underground.

Section B

- 0 2** How significant were socialist and Marxist ideas in the growth of opposition to tsarist rule in Russia in the years 1855 to 1894?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 socialist and Marxist ideas were significant in the growth of opposition to tsarist rule in the years 1855 to 1894 might include:

- socialist ideas (egalitarian with freedom from economic/legal/political restraints) were attractive to intellectuals, conscious of the short-comings of the autocracy, particularly after the Crimean War. Such saw Russia's divisive and rigid social structure as inhibiting to progress and general well-being
- ideas circulated as intelligentsia grew from mid-19th century (spread of education, greater university autonomy, less censorship under Alexander II); zemstva/town dumas provided a discussion forum; influential thinkers – Chernyshevsky, Herzen, Bakunin, Nechaev
- socialist ideas inspired 'going to the people' movement. Populism under Lavrov (1874, 1876) demonstrated the strength of socialist feeling, bringing opposition into the open (despite failures); Land and Liberty (1877) won public sympathy; peasant-socialist future furthered in Plekhanov's Black Repartition (1879)
- beginnings of industrialisation produced socialist workers' organisations, illegal trade unions, socialist/Marxist discussion circles; Plekhanov encouraged worker-led socialism/Marxism in 'Emancipation of Labour' (1883) – highly significant in the development of Marxist opposition
- socialist and Marxist ideas inspired the (violent) People's Will (1879) which shook the tsarist government; Lenin's brother was hanged for involvement in its successor organisation (1887); the Great Famine (1891–92) provided further fuel for the Marxist interpretation of capitalist development.

Arguments challenging the view that socialist and Marxist ideas were significant in the growth of opposition to tsarist rule in the years 1855 to 1894 might include:

- opposition did not all come from socialist/Marxist roots; it was disparate in nature, with more division than unanimity among thinkers and activists; some embraced nihilistic and anarchic ideas; others wanted liberal reform within the existing political/social framework
- educated thinkers were a very small proportion of the population; peasants had little understanding of socialist (or any other) ideology – seen in their rejection of populism and preference for rioting/arson to demonstrate discontent; the working class was insufficiently developed to create an influential socialist/Marxist opposition movement
- many educated intellectuals, (particularly from older generation and nobility), were liberal (ie seeking freedom and equality in legal and political ways), rather than socialist or Marxist (ie seeking improvement through economic and thus social change); some (mainly Slavophiles) felt the autocracy should be preserved, although they wanted to reform it
- increased travel and western contact brought a growth in the number of Westernisers who wished to follow the (non-socialist) pattern of development of Western Europe; Chicherin (under Alexander II) and most zemstva reformers were moderate in outlook; here, the hope was more for political reform/greater regional autonomy than for social revolution.

Socialist and Marxist theories certainly took hold in Russia in the years 1855 to 1894, but affected only a minority of people. Whilst they inspired opposition to tsarist rule, they were not the only ideas embraced by its critics. The steady growth in opposition came as much, if not more, from Western liberal thinking, although the most dramatic examples of opposition, particularly the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, were led by those convinced of the need for revolutionary change in Russia, as suggested by socialist/Marxist thinking.

0 3 'Government under Lenin, in the years 1917 to 1924, was little different from government under Tsar Nicholas II in the years 1894 to 1905.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 government under Lenin, in the years 1917 to 1924, was little different from government under Tsar Nicholas II in the years 1894 to 1905 might include:

- government remained in the hands of an authoritative leader; Lenin dominated government so that personality and belief played an important role in decision-making; one ideology had been replaced by another; one man (Tsar) by one party (Bolshevik)
- the government still relied on fear to maintain control; there was a powerful secret police (the Cheka replaced the Okhrana) and both governments maintained the utmost vigilance to prevent and crush opposition, which was harshly dealt with
- both governments ruled by decree with no direct democracy; neither government was elected by the people; neither upheld full civil rights
- there was no freedom of speech nor of the press; the latter was manipulated to support the government of the time
- local government was in the hands of councils (zemstva/soviets) answerable to the central authority; no political initiative at regional level was allowed.

Arguments challenging the view that government under Lenin, in the years 1917 to 1924, was little different from government under Tsar Nicholas II in the years 1894 to 1905 might include:

- Nicholas II claimed 'divine right'; he ruled by inheritance and had complete power/autocracy in his own person; Lenin had come to power in a coup; he held power in the name of the Congress of Soviets; he had to make compromises to survive and one-man leadership was not fully acknowledged
- Nicholas II's rule was backed by the Orthodox Church which anointed him; Lenin's government challenged and subordinated the Church and nationalised Church land; 'spiritual' authority had been replaced by faith in Marxism
- Nicholas's government was aristocratic; his ministers were mostly of noble stock, augmented by educated (wealthy, landed) bourgeoisie; Lenin's government was largely professional 'middle-class' and also contained men of peasant origin; it was 'proletarian' in outlook
- the machinery of government was very different: councils under royal appointees were replaced by elected soviets and the running of local government moved from the hands of the Provincial Governors/Land Captains and Zemstva to Bolshevik-dominated Soviets
- Nicholas could claim full control over his tsarist Empire with royal officials in all places; Lenin's government had to struggle to establish control through a civil war.

In many ways, Lenin's government looked very like the old tsarist government of Nicholas II before 1905. However, there were important differences – not least in the source of authority of the respective rulers. It could therefore be argued that the similarities were largely superficial, and a good student might point out that, even by 1924, the Bolshevik government was far from the dictatorship it was later to become.

- 0 4** To what extent were purges and terror, in the years 1918 to 1941, a response to real threats to the Leninist and Stalinist regimes?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 purges and terror, in the years 1918 to 1941, were a response to real threats to the Leninist and Stalinist regimes might include:

- there were real threats to the Leninist regime from a variety of political outlooks, ranging from ex-Tsarists and the right-wing, to moderates and radicals in the SRs and Mensheviks; they were thus removed in ‘Red Terror’ which accompanied the Civil War (1918–21)
- Stalin faced some real threats in 1932; this came from both ‘old Bolsheviks’ (ideological opposition) and the ‘Ryutin platform’ which disapproved of Stalin’s leadership. The general Party purge of 1933–1935 was carried out in response to such political challenges
- although it is unclear as to whether Kirov was a ‘real threat’ or not, it is likely Stalin perceived him as such and had him removed. His death also provided an excuse for further purges of those whose political/economic views were seen as a danger to Stalinist policies, e.g. Zinoviev and Kamenev (1936) and Bukharin (1938) (it is also possible there was a genuine Trotsky/Zinoviev alliance to oust Stalin at this time)
- the Yezhovschina removed political dissidents including old Bolsheviks and culminated in the assassination of the genuine political rival, Trotsky, in Mexico in 1940; it was undertaken to remove factionalists/potential plotters and safeguard Stalin’s authority.

Arguments challenging the view that purges and terror, in the years 1918 to 1941, were a response to real threats to the Leninist and Stalinist regimes might include:

- the ‘Red Terror’ which accompanied the Civil War (1918–21) brought attacks on ordinary individuals, deemed ‘class’ enemies, e.g. the burzhui (bourgeois), kulaks and religious figures; these might be categorised as victims of the regime’s ideology rather than real threats
- under Stalin, attacks on industrial managers (as in the Shakhty Trial) and kulaks (during collectivisation campaigns) were similarly directed against those who did not fit the regime’s ideological structure – not because of any direct political opposition
- the Great Purges embraced party workers, military commanders (1937) and intelligence officers; it is unlikely that many of these were genuine opponents of the regime; there is limited evidence that even the major political figures, such as Bukharin, were actively opposing the regime; Yezhov’s own demise (1938) was through ‘excessive zeal’, not opposition to Stalin
- the Yezhovschina brought the ‘Great Terror’ to ordinary citizens. Under the quota system, many were persecuted for no real reason – some merely reported by vindictive neighbours.

Students may point to the difficulty of defining a ‘real threat’ and any valid attempts to see threats as ‘real’ or not should be credited. Since Lenin introduced his ban on factions (1921) and anyone outside the ranks of Party and proletariat was suspected of ‘ideological opposition’, most of the purges and terror could be justified as removing ‘real threats’. However, if threats are seen as attempts to undermine or overthrow the existing regime, then few of the persecuted posed ‘real threats’. Some students may balance their answers by offering alternative reasons for the purges and terror – probably referring to Lenin’s intolerance, Stalin’s paranoia, the zeal of local officials and the difficulty of controlling policy once it got underway. Reward any effective argument.