Title: To what extent were the failings of the provisional

responsible for the success of the Bolshevik government

Revolution?

Criterion A: 4 marks

The question is clearly stated and appropriate. The candidate has selected two

relevant sources; one secondary source – a textbook for advanced history studies

("Communist Russia under Lenin and Stalin") written in 2008 and one primary

contemporary source – a book written by John Reed ("Ten Days that Shook the

World"). The relevance of these sources has been explained and there is an

evaluation of the value and limitations of these sources, but this evaluation could

expand a bit. One odd thing though is the fact that the Reed source is only

mentioned one time in the investigation – maybe one other source should have

been evaluated.

Criterion B: 11 marks

The investigation is well structured. It's focused and the arguments are clear with

appropriate support (evidence). Several comments show a certain analytic

approach, but the candidate could have pointed out more the differences between

historians, emphasized some perspectives (Richard Pipes is a good example of

alternative perspectives of the Russian revolutions). The conclusion could also be

developed more.

Criterion C: 2 marks

A lot of focus on the candidates own investigation without a good example. It

would have been good with more input of the historian methods and the problems

historians face – and then a comparison with some sample from the candidate's

text.

Total: 17 marks