



---

# A-level HISTORY

Paper 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

#### Section A

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the political situation in Russia by 1914. | <b>[30 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>25-30</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>19-24</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic 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.   | <b>13-18</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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.   | <b>7-12</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | <b>Either</b> shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only <b>or</b> 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. | <b>1-6</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## 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.**

**Note:** in responding to this question, students may choose to analyse and evaluate each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. For example, they may look separately at what is said about Nicholas II or the Dumas etc. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

### Extract A

In their identification of Acton's argument students should refer to the following:

- the claim that by 1914 there was a 'rapid' increase' in the power of those social groups in favour of liberal reform
- the references to groups such as a new class of farmers, the 'third section' and groups of workers all in favour of liberal reform
- references to the intelligentsia and to the state itself, the Duma and the 'wide range of political parties'
- the qualification given to a positive interpretation of the likelihood of liberal reform by the reference to the Tsar, his ministers and his wife.

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

- whether the situation in the countryside was as presented. The 'new class' referred to caused divisions in the countryside and the mass of peasants remained backwards and impoverished
- their own knowledge of the workers. Whilst there may have been groups of workers who embraced liberal change, most workers lived in utterly squalid conditions and were more likely, after the demonstration at the Winter Palace, to support radical groups. No reference is made to the increasing number of strikes before 1914
- the experiment of the Dumas. This was mixed: the first two were unsuccessful, after which the franchise was changed to eliminate opposition and for groups which supported Tsarism to dominate
- there may be some challenge to the view of the Tsar's ministers; Stolypin was an able minister, but his fate tends to support the proposition.

### Extract B

In their identification of Hayes' arguments students should refer to the following:

- the overall claim that 'violent overthrow' was seen as the only answer to autocracy
- references to the impact of the 'failure' of the Dumas on moderate and extremist parties support the overall view
- references to political strikes and Western influences and to the regime's failure to control these also offered in support of the view
- the assessment that whilst Russia may not have been on the brink of revolution in 1914, there was very little support for the regime.

---

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

- the Dumas were not without success and the Octobrists, at least, attempted to make them work. They represented a significant change from what had existed before 1905. Whether extremists were strengthened is questionable. Most of the leaders of the SDs were in exile and Lenin was pessimistic about change as late as 1914
- the success of the regime in dealing with opposition may be questioned. The Ochrana was reasonably successful and the evidence that extremist political parties were widely supported is questionable at least
- the major weakness in the interpretation is that it fails to refer to the strengths of the regime. The army was generally loyal to the Tsar and the Church was an influential support for the regime. The tercentenary of the Romanovs seemed to indicate support for the regime.

### **Extract C**

In their identification of Grenville's arguments students should refer to the following:

- the overall interpretation that the Dumas were a missed opportunity for the development of constitutional monarch in Russia
- his claim that the October Manifesto introduced a genuinely parliamentary body with which the Tsar would share power
- his reference to the emergence of the Kadets and Nicholas' negative attitude to them
- the reference to the strengthening of revolutionary socialists after the failed second Duma
- the fact that the Tsar 'spurned the opportunity' to collaborate with moderate liberal opinion and the claim that the Tsar was the stumbling block to reform.

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

- the view that the October Manifesto introduced a genuinely parliamentary body may be questioned. The Manifesto may be seen as a pragmatic concession undermined by the Fundamental Laws
- the Kadets may have had more influence than is suggested
- it is questionable whether the dissolution of the second Duma did strengthen revolutionary parties. They remained relatively weak in this period
- students may well confirm that this view of the Tsar is valid.

In summary, students may conclude that all three interpretations are in some ways limited and partial and that it was the war which was the turning point for Russia and the Tsar.

**Section B**

<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	'The Russian economy was transformed in the years 1894 to 1914.'
----------	----------	--

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**

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

## 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 suggesting the Russian economy was transformed:

- from time of Witte (to 1903) there was a huge government-led drive for economic growth, primarily concentrating on heavy industry – interest rates raised; new rouble; encouragement to foreign experts; expansion of railways including trans-Siberian; expansion of large factory units particularly promoting heavy industry
- grain exports were increased to provide capital for industrialisation so forcing development of grain agriculture
- huge expansion of coal/iron in Donbas and in oil fields of Baku
- effect was to make Russia fifth largest industrialised economy and had second largest railway network by 1914
- light and newer industries also expanded in 20th century – chemicals, rubber, electrical; service industries; stock market; monopolies and cartels
- under Stolypin, there were major agrarian reforms leading to more individual land-owning.

### Arguments suggesting the Russian economy was not transformed:

- poor showing in 1904–5 Russo-Japanese War and subsequently in 1914 showed limitations of industrial growth and infrastructure
- Russia never became fully self-reliant (used foreign investment and foreign ships – although proportionately less reliance from c1905)
- some industries, e.g. consumer goods were neglected and even newer industries had less spectacular growth
- machinery/technology was less developed than in the West and more reliance on sheer manpower
- by 1914 the pace of growth had slowed – only 30% production was industrial compared with 75% in GB or 70% in Germany
- agriculture was subordinated to industry and was vastly under-modernised. Stolypin's reforms never took full effect and only approximately 10% land consolidated into private farms.

**0 3** 'The Bolshevik state under Lenin, between 1918 and 1924, was just as ruthless as the Communist state under Stalin, between 1928 and 1941.'

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 suggesting that the Bolshevik state under Lenin, between 1918 and 1924, was just as ruthless as the Communist state under Stalin:**

- Lenin ensured that he established a Bolshevik (single-party) state. Rapidly abandoned coalition government. Removed and persecuted SRs and Mensheviks (dismissal of Constituent Assembly, January 1918); this ruthless eradication of opposition could be compared with Stalin's rise to power and elimination of rivals – which reached its apogee in the purges and his government through a one-party state
- coercion was regarded by both as more important than 'democracy' – both ran a centralised system based on the party. Lenin's ban on factions 1921 meant any decision of Central Committee had to be accepted. This was used by Stalin, under whom no criticism was possible
- Lenin set up and used the Cheka (from December 1917) to root out enemies. This became the NKVD in 1934 under Stalin and under both there was 'ruthless' vigilance/spy network
- Red Terror during the Civil War helped eliminate political enemies and made Terror (as later used by Stalin) a legitimate policy of state
- Lenin began the onslaught against class-enemies – those of aristocratic or middle-class backgrounds depriving them of rations – which Stalin continued, particularly in his persecution of Kulaks and bourgeois industrialists
- Lenin's harsh Cheka grain requisitions in countryside pre-1921 (and some even after NEP) with execution of suspected black marketeers, hoarders and speculators and destruction of whole villages (which produced Tambov revolt) foreshadowed Stalin's treatment of the Kulaks
- Lenin instituted the Communist censorship of the press – the closure of non-Bolshevik newspapers, purge of bureaucracy, propaganda campaign against class enemies – again as ruthless as Stalin's campaigns
- Lenin was equally hostile to campaigns for 'national self-determination' for ethnic groups from 1921 (demands from Georgia brutally crushed 1922)
- both persecuted the Church. Lenin's union of Militant Godless established 1921 – part of systematic campaign to weaken power of Church. It could even be argued that in this he was even more ruthless than Stalin who allowed some rehabilitation in the war years.

#### **Arguments suggesting that the Bolshevik state under Lenin, between 1918 and 1924, was not as ruthless as the Communist state under Stalin:**

- Lenin's 'Red Terror' was a response to exceptional wartime circumstances. It has been suggested that the terror was simply a way of saving the country from collapse at a time of famine, strikes and breakdown in law and order and was designed to protect the revolution and the working class; this can be contrasted with Stalinist terror and the purges, which served no practical purpose and could be argued to have weakened the state
- the extreme Cheka activities were more the result of local zeal than government policy under Lenin whereas Stalin was far more committed to ruthless eradication
- Stalin was responsible for crushing the Georgian revolt of 1922 and acted against Lenin's wishes; this gives some indication of his greater ruthlessness

- Lenin was pragmatic and ready to change policies when he saw they were not working – hence the NEP and its slightly greater 'liberalisation'; Stalin was dogmatic and fixed in his policies – as seen in his continuation of 'Terror' even after victory in the Second World War
- Lenin never sought personal glory – a marked comparison with Stalin whose actions seemed determined by this.

**0 4** 'The lives of the Russian peasants were transformed in the years 1928 to 1964.'

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 suggesting the lives of Russian peasants were transformed in the years 1928 to 1964 might include:**

- Stalin's collectivisation programme changed the countryside; peasants found themselves working in large units which constantly increased in size – reaching their maximum extent under Khrushchev
- mechanisation increased – at first through state tractor stations, under Khrushchev by the individual ownership of machinery by the collectives
- wages were paid by the state and peasants' produce was bought at fixed prices; their farming and their lives were centrally controlled from 1928+
- quasi-scientific farming methods endorsed by the party were encouraged, e.g. 'biological yields' and Lysenkoism
- many (especially young men) uprooted and moved to the towns and cities with profound results for the disruption of families
- kulaks were dispossessed and often suffered brutal treatment, particularly under Stalin – creating a very different rural society by the end of the period
- national ethnic groups were deported in war years and post-war – accused of collaboration in areas overrun by Nazis. Khrushchev did not rehabilitate all and grievances continued to fester
- reliance on wages kept peasants poor while the wages of industrial workers rose. Even post-war, wages on collective farms were only 20% of industrial wages
- some peasants faced further radical change under Khrushchev's reappraisal of situation of peasants – and in particular his virgin lands scheme.

**Arguments suggesting the lives of Russian peasants were not transformed might include:**

- Stalin had to legalise private plots (from 1935) and these continued as the most productive areas of peasant farming throughout the period allowing peasants to work on these using traditional methods
- despite attempts to curb the power of the church in the villages, the majority of peasants remained believers and traditional religious festivals continued
- women and children continued to work on the land (alongside the men) as they had always done
- farming methods remained behind those in the West; income and productivity were low and peasants were constantly subject to poor harvests and famines – in 1963 as much as in 1930s
- state put main emphasis on industrial growth and town workers (although Khrushchev had slightly more interest in peasants); for the most part the peasants were 'squeezed' by high taxes to support the industrialising economy, as they had been from the time of the Tsars
- central government proved unable to plan agriculture; prices/quotas changed at random; lack of incentive; ill-conceived government initiatives (e.g. Khrushchev's drive for maize grown on unsuitable land)
- despite increase in schooling in 1930s, peasants remained the least educated class of society.



