



A-LEVEL History

7042/1H – Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855-1964
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

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 tsarist political authority in Russia before 1917. **[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 Service's argument, students may refer to the following:

- tsarist political authority relied on repression, but tsarist power waned after 1905 and the war sealed the fate of the autocracy
- extensive tsarist oppression and reactionary rule over a society dominated by the 'dark masses' of peasants and workers, for whom life was extremely grim, was an accepted fact by both critics and admirers of tsardom
- tsarist governments in the late 19th century were very fearful lest discontent was channelled into political opposition
- tsarist autocracy was undermined by events in 1905 which left the government with such a narrow support base that tsarist authority could not withstand the impact of the First World War.

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

- tsarist governments relied on repression (use of Okhrana; Siberian exile; role of nobility/land captains under Alexander III/Nicholas II); there were, however, reforms, particularly under Alexander II and economic reforms 1890s–1914
- industrialisation worsened working conditions for workers in towns and cities; peasants saw limited amelioration of living standards because of redemption payments, population growth and lack of land; however, some thrived and the work of Stolypin was improving lot of peasants
- political opposition grew in last quarter of 19th and early 20th centuries (socialism; populism; Marxism; land and liberty; Black partition; SRs and SDs) and thrived on social discontent; but apart from 1905, opposition was contained and the peasantry was remarkably loyal
- events in 1905 spelt an end to autocracy through the creation of the State Duma (although this was 'managed' so its challenge was less than might have been expected; the war brought economic and social as well as political discontent which forced the Tsar's abdication in March 1917.

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

- tsarist political authority was undermined by Nicholas' government's failure to win over the growing intelligentsia and merchantry (entrepreneurial class)
- the fault largely lay with Nicholas whose lack of political skill led to the dramatic revolution of 1917
- the nobility – the traditional power base of the autocracy – was undermined by social and economic change in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but tsarist authority survived the events of 1905
- had Nicholas II granted concessions in the years 1907–1917, he could have created a stable bourgeois government – permitting the survival of tsarist authority; instead, in 1917, tsarist authority disappeared along with the authority of the traditional ruling nobility.

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

- the growth of the intelligentsia accompanied a growth in education and an opening up to the West in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; this was associated with Vyshnegradsky and Witte's economic drive which expanded the merchant class; both groups were excluded from the political elites; however, there was state support for economic change and Alexander III had established zemstva which were active
- Nicholas II lacked political drive and judgement; he had limited awareness of the impact of economic change (as seen in surprise at events of 1905); but the Tsar was not alone in this and any concessions would have weakened his authority which was needed to drive change
- Nobles' status had been undermined by emancipation, declining land values, the growth of industry and the increasing complexity of government which demanded skilled professionals; but the nobility still retained wealth and influence in government (e.g. serving as ministers)
- Nicholas survived in 1905 by splitting the opposition and timely concessions which he subsequently manipulated to his advantage, although his authority could never be as strong after 1905; the revolution of 1917 saw the abdication of the Tsar and a new government based on the formerly-excluded intelligentsia, professional middle classes and workers'/soldiers' representatives in the soviets; however, noble influence was still present, e.g. Prince Lvov.

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

- a constitutional monarchy emerged in Russia in 1905/6 and tsarist political authority was not in danger before 1914; it was only the Great War which destroyed it
- tsarist authority stabilised from 1907 as it took more account of social change, acknowledged civic freedoms and worked with a state Duma
- it was the war that destroyed tsarist authority/constitutional monarchy largely because of economic disruption, particularly to food supplies; this brought mass discontent.

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

- the outcome of the 1905 revolution brought an elected assembly with some legislative powers; there were 4 dumas to 1914, working with the Tsar's government however, this was hardly a constitutional monarchy as Nicholas retained the upper hand, as confirmed by the fundamental laws
- there were social welfare reforms, 1907–1914, but these were outweighed by high-handed repression, e.g. at the Lena Goldfields in 1912; civic freedoms were not widely observed and the State Duma was muzzled by dissolutions and changes to the franchise
- the war brought severe disruption to the economy which were the result of organisational failings, e.g. in the use of railways as well as inadequate planning, e.g. in ensuring food supplies were maintained alongside conscription
- mass discontent was apparent in Bread riots in Petrograd in February 1917; however, the Tsar's forced abdication was also the result of his own inaction and soldiers' and officers' mutinies.

Section B

- 02** How significant was the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 to Russia's economic growth in the years up 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 the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was significant to Russia's economic growth in the years up to 1894 might include:

- emancipation freed peasants (who 'sold out') to go to live and work in cities, provided a labour force; some peasants were able to combine work in cities with return to the mir at key times of year
- emancipation promoted the emergence of wealthier kulaks, so increasing consumer demand
- emancipation enabled the development of agriculture; kulaks' larger farms increased output which provided sufficient surplus to feed the labour-force in towns and cities and boost an export-drive
- some landowners used the compensation they received to make profits through investment in industry.

Arguments challenging the view that the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was significant to Russia's economic growth in the years up to 1894 might include:

- the imposition of reparations payments and communal tax collection within the mir prevented a high degree of labour mobility
- high taxes, grain requisitions and traditional farming practices perpetuated by the mir hampered agricultural change and there was insufficient internal demand to promote economic growth, e.g. famine 1891–2
- state-promotion of industry was the key factor behind economic growth – particularly the attraction of foreign investment and the grain export-drive
- the improvement of infrastructure, particularly the railway network and state-imposed tariffs on imports were also key.

Most students will take the view that the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was not of key significance to Russia's economic growth in the years up to 1894. They are likely to emphasise the importance of state-promotion of industry and the limited consequences of emancipation, although they should acknowledge the contribution of the kulaks (even if this terminology is not used) and show a balanced assessment. The most perceptive might even point out that emancipation led to a raft of other reforms (e.g. the zemstva) which promoted modernisation and change, so providing a better climate for economic growth. As always, reward any convincing argument, whatever the judgement.

- 03** To what extent were the lives of women and young people changed as a result of Communist rule in the years 1917 to 1941? **[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 lives of women and young people changed as a result of Communist rule in the years 1917 to 1941 might include:

- state directives and enforced ideology/propaganda meant families could no longer live their own lives, but became part of the broader political framework; economic development changed the basis of society as the 'proletariat' grew and the proportion of urban/rural dwellers reversed
- Lenin's government liberated women, e.g. decreed against sex-discrimination, made divorce easier, legalised abortion and drew up 1926 family code; Stalin reversed some of this in the 1930s, emphasising the importance of the 'family', attacking divorce and abortion and banning contraception
- women were expected to work in earlier years and more state nurseries and canteens provided, although from the 1930s women were encouraged to give up paid employment on marriage and to have large families
- young people benefited from free (and more liberal) education at all levels in co-educational schools under Lenin but Stalin was less liberal; quota system encouraging working class children to go to secondary schools, abandoned 1935; more practical work expected, linked to economic policies but much improvement and greater literacy by 1941
- keen youngsters joined Komsomol and Young Pioneers (1926) particularly under Stalin. This taught Communist values, supported party campaigns and provided educational opportunities aiding social mobility.

Arguments challenging the view that the lives of women and young people changed as a result of Communist rule in the years 1917 to 1941 might include:

- Leninist reforms left many women with the double-burden of running a household and bringing up children as well as working (this was similar to the role performed by peasant women before the revolution)
- women continued to earn less than men and to have fewer opportunities for promotion; Stalinist reversals left many women little better off than pre-1917
- the reappearance of selection and more formal teaching in Stalinist times, meant that the educational opportunities afforded working class youth were limited from the 1930s; the emphasis on practical training mirrored pre-1917 days (although it became more formal)
- not all young people joined Komsomol; some preferred Western culture (cinema, fashion, jazz) and opted out despite official disapproval; there were a small number of 'oppositional' youth organisations – suggesting that some would not allow Communism to rule their lives.

Students are likely to see more change than continuity as the Russian economy developed and the basis of society changed. They should, however, be aware of elements of continuity, not least the 'second class' role of women and the educational discrimination which limited earlier Communist aspirations. Reward any balanced argument supporting a judgement.

- 04** 'Opposition from within the Communist Party posed a greater threat to Soviet leaders than that from opponents and cultural dissidents outside it.'

Assess the validity of this view of the years 1941 to 1964.

[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 in the years 1941 to 1964, opposition from within the Communist Party posed a greater threat to Soviet leaders than that from opponents and cultural dissidents outside it might include:

- although there was actually little opposition to Stalin from within the party, he perceived a threat and his behaviour suggests continuous fear, e.g. he removed ex-opponents from history/photographs, e.g. Yezhov
- post-war – perceived opposition from within the Communist Party led to arrest of senior party members/officials in the 1949 Leningrad case; anti-Semitic campaigns; 1951–2 Mingelian case (Georgian purge) and, arising from the 1952 Doctors' plot, a probable purge of Beria, Mikoyan, Molotov and Kaganovich was threatening at time of death; so great was fear of party opposition, Stalin did not even prepare a (party) successor
- opposition outside the party included German collaborationists in ethnic minority areas and some disloyalty in unoccupied USSR in wartime; these were dealt with by harsh terror-tactics which continued post-war under Beria; at no point did outside opposition threaten Stalin's position
- Khrushchev dealt promptly with opposition (or potential opposition) within the party suggesting it was a real threat, e.g. challenge to Malenkov 1953–55; execution of Beria, 1953. Hardline anti-party group removed, 1957 (for opposition to destalinisation) and dismissal/resignations of Zhukov (1957) and Bulganin (1958) removed potential rivals. Threat culminated in Khrushchev's removal from power because of inner party revolt (Brezhnev, Podgorny and Suslov)
- cultural dissidents increased under Khrushchev (underground societies; poetry readings; magazines; music; art, literature) – but a worry rather than an explicit threat and controlled; little opposition from ordinary citizens – exception being rioting in Tbilisi, March 1956 re destalinisation (crushed).

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1941 to 1964, opposition from within the Communist Party posed a greater threat to Soviet leaders than that from opponents and cultural dissidents outside it might include:

- Stalin held complete sway over the party and there was no threat from within; the greater threat was from the repression of artistic/cultural freedom and civil rights which prevented evolution of an effective socialist state and countered state propaganda
- until his demise, Khrushchev dealt effectively with party opposition, but he never fully repressed the cultural dissidents, some of whom defected to the West and whose activities exposed the moral illegitimacy of Communism
- the continuance of repression, the secret police, gulags – despite Khrushchev's attempts at a 'thaw' – showed the potential danger posed by greater freedom within the USSR and the challenge from outside the party
- by 1964, opponents and cultural dissidents had moral backing from the West and were growing in number; despite Khrushchev's 'reforms' – their activities showed the impossibility of achieving a truly 'Communist State'.

Students are likely to take the view that the statement is correct in relation to actual threats at the time. However, those who adopt a broader perspective might argue that it was the 'outside threats' that really challenged Communist domination and threatened leaders in the long-term. Reward any balanced argument that is able to offer a convincing judgement in relation to the quotation in the question.