
A-level HISTORY 7042/1H

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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 Assessment Writer.

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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.

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to attitudes to autocracy during the reigns of the Tsars Alexander II and Alexander III. **[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.

Extract A: In their identification of Sixsmith's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Alexander II passed reforms to aid the survival of the 'Tsarist system', but undermined autocracy; Alexander III returned to autocratic rule
- Alexander II was liberal and reforming in outlook, Alexander III was conservative and reactionary
- although Alexander II reformed out of necessity and to ensure survival, he took the first step towards constitutional democracy; Alexander III returned to autocratic rule because Pobedonostsev advised that reform had led the country towards ruin (i.e. believed reform had destroyed autocracy)
- landowners were critical of reform as were the 'conservatives'

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

- Alexander II's reforms – emancipation, zemstva and dumas, judicial reform, decline in censorship, education, economic and military reform – would support view of his 'liberal' reforming outlook –and of rousing opposition
- measures, such as the Land Captains, educational control and censorship and increased work for the secret police, would support the autocratic and reactionary outlook of Alexander III
- Alexander II's repressive legislation after the assassination attempt of 1866 would attest to his support for autocracy – challenging the picture given here
- knowledge of Alexander III's 'reforms' – particularly changes to taxation and the Land Banks – as well as his failure to reverse measures, such as emancipation, might suggest he was less reactionary than portrayed here.

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

- both Alexander II and Alexander III believed in autocracy but, in order to preserve this, they adopted different approaches
- Alexander II was not liberal and was never fully committed to reform; he was pushed by practical necessity; Alexander III toyed with a 'liberal' change but was persuaded of the need for repression and never deviated thereafter
- Alexander II's murder was the catalyst for change away from reform. Reaction was not, at first, as much the result of Alexander III's own convictions as of the arguments of Pobedonostsev
- both Tsars are shown as the victims of circumstance.

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

- the support of both Tsars for autocracy could be substantiated with reference to Alexander II's emancipation speech demanding 'reform from above' and Alexander III's 'Manifesto of Unshakable Autocracy'
- Alexander II's lack of commitment to reform might be backed up by his readiness to change his ministers in 1866 and ensure greater central control over education, the police and the prosecution of the law

- Alexander III's change of direction might be linked to his upbringing, the views of his tutor, Pobedonostsev and the Church, and the growth of opposition (culminating in the People's Will) during Alexander II's reign
- evidence from Alexander II's more enlightened background and his choice of early appointments, e.g. the Milyutin brothers, might be used to challenge the interpretation that he was never fully committed to reform.

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

- Alexander II and Alexander III were markedly different: Alexander II was a liberal who weakened the autocracy; Alexander III, a reactionary who restored autocratic power
- Slavophile view - during Alexander II's reign the state had been torn apart and autocracy had been all but destroyed by reform, westernisation and assassination
- Alexander III distanced himself from Alexander II's reforms, refusing to celebrate the anniversary of serf emancipation; he was a strong autocratic ruler – he disliked bureaucracy and avoided advice from the State Council
- the two Tsars had different outlooks and attitudes to autocracy; Alexander II rejected it while Alexander III supported it.

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

- detail of policies in both reigns, e.g. reduction in censorship v. extension of censorship or liberal attitudes to education v. control – could be used to support the difference between the attitude of the two Tsars to rule
- the 'destruction' of Alexander II's reign could be linked to the growth of radical opposition and pressure from westernisers. (Spread of ideas of Herzen, Bakunin, Marx) and activism of Nechaev, the Tchaikovsky circle, the Narodniks, land and liberty and the People's Will
- the 'liberal' view of Alexander II could be challenged with reference to the limitations of reforms (e.g. the continued influence of nobility post-emancipation and the successful repression of opposition) and the continuation of autocracy
- the single-minded 'autocracy' of Alexander III might be contested with reference both to his own limitations and the influence of advisers such as Pobedonostsev and Slavophiles, as well as his more reformist measures – cancelling serf debts, reducing redemption fees, abolishing the Poll tax, introducing the Peasants' Land bank and granting reformist factory legislation.

Section B

- 02** How significant was the growth of towns, in the years 1894 to 1914, in changing Russian society? **[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 the growth of towns, in the years 1894 to 1914, was significant in changing Russian society, might include:

- society was changed as proportionately as increasing numbers left the countryside to live/work in cities – both older centres (e.g. St Petersburg and Moscow) – and newer industrial cities (e.g. around Baku); this became self-perpetuating as a newer generation was born to urban life
- emigration to towns broke-up traditional relationships; urban dwellers lost some of their former identity and (semi-) independence; their lives were more controlled, disciplined, monotonous; greater independence for women; more stratified society
- urban dwellers were subject to new influences and aspirations; opportunities for emergent middle class businessmen and professionals; town dumas and professional societies
- life in close proximity gave more political awareness to the new 'working class' who had shared discontents (living and working conditions, fears of unemployment); development of Trade Unions (semi-legal from 1905) in cities; strikes – particularly from 1912
- in the towns there was greater availability of education, increased literacy, dissemination of books and pamphlets (Sunday schools, worker-education libraries, newspapers reading rooms); all fuelled social change; also some dissemination back to countryside in early years because of family ties.

Arguments challenging the view that the growth of towns, in the years 1894 to 1914, was significant in changing Russian society, might include:

- Russia remained a largely rural nation; urban living was the exception not the norm and the only large cities were St Petersburg and Moscow (of 166 million in 1914, only c25 million lived in cities); much of society untouched
- Russian society still stratified – noble and land-owning elite remained dominant, especially in government (still the major ruling class) and local administration (major voice in zemstva); pace of change was limited
- social change also came through rural development, e.g. Stolypin's schemes and greater division kulaks/landless labourers; rural society experienced some improvements in communications, health care, education; peasantry slowly becoming more politically aware
- it was less the growth of towns than the growing importance of industry, money, capital and wages that was changing society; development of railways and spread of education were also highly significant.

Students may argue about the extent of social change and the key factors promoting that change, but they should consider the effects of town growth, either supporting and criticising its impact or balancing urban development against other factors.. In analysing this, students are at liberty to refer to the impact of urbanisation on the countryside, as indicated above, and this broader perception might well be a characteristic of a better response.

- 03** 'The transformation of Russian industry, in the years 1917 to 1941, was achieved through the application of socialist/Marxist principles.'

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 the transformation of Russian industry, in the years 1917 to 1941, was achieved through the application of socialist/Marxist principles, might include:

- developments were planned and controlled by the central party leadership, not left to private individuals; the government exercised control in the name of the people (as advocated by Marx in the transition stage from capitalism to communism); nobility, bourgeois and 'peasant society' were eliminated along with capitalism
- Communist governments took over the key factors of production, decided the allocation of resources and what products and services would be provided under Lenin's 'state capitalism', 'War Communism' and even more so, Stalin's 'Five Year Plans'. The latter, in particular ensured a massive growth of heavy industry backed by improvements to infrastructure
- the transformation of the economy was driven by the workforce (Marx's proletariat) in action campaigns (e.g. shock brigades); Socialist man was created and idealised
- women were treated equally in the drive for industrial growth; managers were socialist employees/not bourgeois specialists; the Marxist emphasis on industry was complemented by (socialist/Marxist) collectivisation in the countryside.

Arguments challenging the view that the transformation of Russian industry, in the years 1917 to 1941, was achieved through the application of socialist/Marxist principles, might include:

- Lenin's early decrees – recognising workers' 'control' over factory management followed socialist/Marxist principles, but were abandoned in favour of central control during the civil war. It was the abandoning of this socialist principle that enabled the economy to revive
- war Communism and the implementation of Stalin's Five Year Plans were only made feasible through the use of repressive measures against the population-contradicting Socialist/Marxist thought
- the successful economic plan – the NEP reintroduced some capitalism; the Five Year Plans only succeeded by allowing capitalist elements, such as wage differentials and bonuses (and private plots to peasants in countryside to support town workers)
- central control proved not to be a passing phase (Marx's view) but a permanent state. Transformation of industry was achieved through a combination of propaganda, ruthless action, tolerance of corruption and planning with little thought for the future.

Students should show an awareness of socialist/Marxist principles in relation to industrial development. The more explicit the connection, the better the answer is likely to be. Students can analyse the importance of principles in relation to other factors affecting economic policy in these years, or provide balance by looking at when such principles were applied as opposed to when they were not. That industry was transformed is a given, and students are not expected to argue the extent of transformation. As always, reward any well-focused and well-substantiated argument.

be

04 'The years 1941 to 1964 were a time of political stagnation in the USSR.'

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 the years 1941 to 1964 were a time of political stagnation in the USSR, might include:

- between 1941 and 1953 there could be no major change to the political system for fear of incurring Stalin's wrath; from July 1941, all authority rested with Stalin as 'supreme war leader'; Stalinist system triumphed in war justifying its perpetuation in post-war 'High Stalinism' when loyalty to Stalin replaced loyalty to Party
- Stalin's death left a vacuum and his legacy was too strong to permit radical change; party system prevented reformers rising to the top and earlier idealists had been purged in 1930s; debates permitting Khrushchev's rise centred on the economy rather than politics; Khrushchev rose through the Party and had no wish to destroy the political structure
- Khrushchev's de-Stalinisation was limited – focused on dismantling the Terror (although secret police accepted) and the Stalinist cult; need to avoid incriminating the beneficiaries of the Stalinist system; need for strong leadership, a single party/ideology and the elimination of factions accepted; USSR needed stability at a time of international pressure
- Khrushchev was continually under pressure from conservatives in the Party and his own need to retain control so any change had to remain within the system; traditional hierarchy of power retained; central government control; command economy; the huge bureaucracy bred conservatism and apathy; dissidence repressed.

Arguments challenging the view that the years 1941 to 1964 were a time of political stagnation in the USSR, might include:

- new ideas were floated after Stalin's death (Malenkov and Beria) keeping political debate alive; under Khrushchev, further change as Party was restored to a Leninist position after Stalin's personal dictatorship
- de-Stalinisation caused a major shake-up of the political system by raising questions about the past and helping restore Leninist principles; many were rehabilitated and there is greater evidence of political debate
- Khrushchev actively pursued greater democratisation – re-enlivening party institutions, permitting greater independence of the judiciary and reducing police influence in state matters
- Khrushchev favoured decentralisation – splitting the Party into urban/rural divisions; establishing local bodies to supervise political and economic matters
- Khrushchev's fall suggested there had been more than political stagnation; opposition of both traditionalists and reformers suggests reforms had an impact; perhaps more 'tinkering' than a complete turnaround; but change had occurred – Khrushchev was allowed to retire – not shot.

Students will need to assess both the Stalinist USSR from 1941 to 1953 and the time of Khrushchev in order to make a judgement about the degree of political stagnation in this period. Students may adopt differing definitions of stagnation and arguments should be assessed on their merits, but they must link to continuity and change 'in the USSR' They may make judgements on each leader's regime or the whole, but whatever the approach, arguments should be backed by a broad range of supporting material.