

A-level
HISTORY
7042/1H

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855-1964

Mark scheme

June 2021

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 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 © 2021 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, ie 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 changes brought about by industrialisation in Russia in the years c1890 to 1914.

[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 industrialisation had mixed, and not entirely favourable, economic results
- agriculture remained dominant and agrarian issues held development back; there were few large towns and only an 18% urban population by 1914
- the pattern of industrial growth was variable, with periods of depression; this produced monopolising corporations and high prices c1900–1907
- overall, industrialisation brought a favourable balance of trade and Russia experienced some impressive industrial growth rates – but these need to be kept in perspective.

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

- massive growth took place in heavy industry, railways and mines, for example, the oil industry in Baku
- a healthy balance of trade was achieved by Witte but only through the export of grain which squeezed the peasants (and made the economy dependent on agriculture)
- the slump of c1900–1907 was aggravated by the limited scope of development, industrially and geographically, poor labour productivity, lack of internal demand, the under-development of infrastructure (eg of banking system) and competition from more advanced western economies
- in challenging the argument, it could be noted that by 1914 Russia was the world's 5th largest industrial power and the economy had become more self-sustaining; Stolypin's reforms looked set to change the agricultural base suggesting positive development.

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

- the overall argument is that industrialisation brought profound social change including greater social mobility. Russia's old social hierarchy was replaced by a new and more upwardly mobile society
- education and literacy spread, providing new opportunities for those of peasant origin
- millions of peasants moved to work in factories and mines and some bettered themselves; the middle classes emerged and some merchants became noblemen
- industrialisation also brought discontent, partly because of the poor factory conditions, which led to a growth in strikes.

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

- the breakdown of the social hierarchy saw the rise of the middle classes, which had an impact on the position of the nobility. Although some nobles became involved in industrial enterprise or financial speculation; management and professional positions increased and middle classes became more dominant (helped by the zemstva and dumas)
- education, aided by government reforms, stimulated the desire for advancement, increased literacy and provided new opportunities at all levels but particularly for the poorer classes
- strike activity escalated, particularly from 1905, and the discontent of the working class might be reflected in incidents such as the Lena goldfields massacre

- in challenging the argument, the limits of social change might be emphasised, eg the continuing dominance of nobility in government, the small size of the middle class and the division of rich and poor; also, limitations to geographical movement – most of the peasant population remained in villages.

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

- the overall argument is that industrialisation produced new political tensions
- the population doubled and the structure of the countryside and towns was changed by industrialisation; this created conflict as changes clashed with the state's need to maintain control
- industrialisation helped the Russian Empire to prosper and supported its Great Power status, but its outdated political structure survived and the two were irreconcilable
- industrialisation created new aspirations which the tsarist regime found hard to meet.

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

- the land issue and movement from villages to towns increased a sense of alienation and bred political discontent; industrialisation helped awaken peasantry from earlier conservatism and inertia
- the state did little to address the effects of social change, eg limited welfare reform, and halted political demands with repression; changes of 1905/6 were very limited; Lena goldfields, 1912 showed limitations of tsarist response
- new aspirations were linked to development of education, work of political agitators and, among the middle ranks, the opportunities afforded by zemstva and dumas; the importance of industrial development strengthened the critical voices
- in challenging the argument, it could be alleged that the regime responded to change in the establishment of a State Duma from 1906 and that some welfare measures were passed; all industrialising societies need a period of readjustment and this was well underway by 1914; there was no reason for industrialisation to topple tsarism.

Section B

- 0 2** How effective were tsarist policies towards ethnic minorities and Jews in strengthening the Russian Empire 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 tsarist policies towards ethnic minorities and Jews were effective in strengthening the Russian Empire in the years 1855 to 1894 might include:

- by encouraging the use of the Russian language and spreading Russian culture throughout a diverse empire (of over 100 different ethnic groups), both Alexander II and (even more so) Alexander III helped develop a shared identity (while curbing other divisive cultural allegiances)
- Russification policies reinforced a strong central administration (eg weakening of Finnish diet), which was necessary for modernisation and economic unity – strengthening Russia
- curbing separatism helped unify the country in the face of powerful neighbours (esp. Germany); this accounts for suppression of minorities and Jews in border and more vulnerable areas, eg suppression of Polish independence movement and attacks on Jews in Pale of Settlement; Russification of education provided for stronger unity in future
- pogroms channelled discontents at a time of economic dislocation; relieved frustrations through, eg belief in Jewish involvement in Alexander II's assassination; a propagandist move which appealed to conservative peasants/right wing.

Arguments challenging the view that tsarist policies towards ethnic minorities and Jews were effective in strengthening the Russian Empire in the years 1855 to 1894 might include:

- rather than suppressing separatist feelings, persecution – particularly under Alexander III, boosted nationalist/separatist feelings among non-Russian population; Alexander II's action in Poland left long-lasting resentments
- policies created insecurity; brought popular disturbances in ethnic areas and pogroms caused disruption to local economies
- policies antagonised educated and wealthy in minority groups (particularly among Finns, Poles, Baltic Germans and Jews) who were thus attracted to opposition movements; disproportionate numbers of Jews were led to join revolutionary groups, especially Marxist groups
- policies entangled the Church in politics, breeding religious resentments especially among Muslims; removed educated Jews from professions where they could serve the community and drove some wealthier citizens to emigrate.

It could be argued that, in 1894, the Russian Empire appeared strong and that repressive measures against ethnic minorities and Jews appeared to have worked. However, whether these groups posed any real threat is questionable and it might be suggested that Alexander II's more tolerant policies (except in Poland) served better in strengthening the Empire, by reducing resentments, than the intense Russification practised under Alexander III. Overall, evidence would suggest that aggressive policies did more harm than good, both politically and economically, but their full effect was not felt until after 1894. As always, reward any argument that offers a considered and well-substantiated judgement.

0 3 'Personal ambition outweighed all other considerations in Stalin's rise to, and consolidation of, power in the years 1921 to 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 supporting the view that personal ambition outweighed all other considerations in Stalin's rise to, and consolidation of, power in the years 1921 to 1941 might include:

- even before Lenin's death, Stalin was jostling for power, eg acting independently in Georgia, remaining close to Lenin during his illness; developing his position as General Secretary; plotting and playing on fears of Trotsky as a military leader
- Stalin entrenched his position at Lenin's funeral (Trotsky absent); outmanoeuvred and marginalised rivals; used ban on factionalism to advantage; changed his views according to personal advantage in 1920s debate on NEP; built up a personal following which ensured his predominance from c1928
- in the 1930s, Stalin showed personal ambition in dominance over government: called Party congresses infrequently; worked with personally-selected committees rather than whole Politburo; built a loyal party membership and bureaucracy; used atmosphere of 'crisis' during collectivisation and industrialisation to enhance personal image and power; by the end of 1930s had personal power independent of the Party
- developed cult of personality as Lenin's true heir and father to the nation. Old Bolsheviks, enemies and potential enemies were removed in the Terror which became increasingly personal in the late 1930s, fulfilling Stalin's ambition to be unchallengeable.

Arguments challenging the view that personal ambition outweighed all other considerations in Stalin's rise to, and consolidation of, power in the years 1921 to 1941 might include:

- Stalin had genuine convictions: his support for 'Socialism in one Country' was a constant and ideological issues were of importance to him. NEP was contrary to Marxist thinking and Stalin was motivated by what he genuinely felt were Russia's best interests in the years 1921 to 1927
- Stalin was driven by practical considerations and the necessity of catching up with the West; personal control of party and government was only a means of fulfilling his deeply-held concern for the future of Russia and Communism
- Stalin was prepared to risk personal unpopularity in his desire to do what was best for his country – he was flexible, eg ready to 'pull-back', eg in first stage of collectivisation or from Great Terror when circumstances demanded; his government was little different from Lenin's – the centralised command system had already been put in place (not part of his personal ambition)
- Stalin was driven by the need to protect USSR from the menace of enemies, especially, Germany 1933–39; despite his miscalculations 1939–41, he pushed rearmament in the 3rd Five-Year Plan and his industrial drive, ultimately, enabled the country to drive the enemy back; this was quite separate from personal ambition.

Personal ambition was clearly important in Stalin's ascent and consolidation, but it would be hard to insist that it was the only motivating factor. The USSR's needs, the practical context and the demands of Marxist/Communist ideology all had their part to play in helping Stalin establish what became an almost personal dictatorship. Some might even argue that the Russians had a psychological need for a strong ruler – hence Stalin's position as 'Red Tsar'. Whatever argument is adopted, students should consider a range of factors and develop links between them. Good answers will provide a well-substantiated judgement on the importance of personal ambition in relation to other factors.

0 4 'Attempts to modernise the Soviet economy and raise living standards, in the years 1945 to 1964, were a complete failure.'

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 attempts to modernise the Soviet economy and raise living standards, in the years 1945 to 1964, were a complete failure might include:

- the war brought economic destruction (particularly in the west) and depressed living standards; Stalin's post-war priority was the re-establishment of heavy industry; modernisation proposals, eg by Malenkov largely ignored
- Khrushchev largely retained Stalin's priorities; some administrative changes attempted modernisation but also added a further layer of bureaucracy and were not widely successful
- 'modernisation' under Khrushchev meant heavy spending on (Cold War) defence and space which limited resources elsewhere; economic growth slowed from 1958 – particularly in consumer industries
- agricultural productivity never really recovered from the war – modernisation (investment in machinery) was limited because Stalin prioritised industry; Khrushchev's virgin lands scheme brought only short-term improvement, campaigns for new crops were not always agriculturally sound and agrocities were never developed
- under Stalin to 1953, living standards scarcely rose: shortages of food, housing, services and consumer goods; women had to replace war dead and the working week remained long; under Khrushchev, despite improvements, standards remained lower than in most industrialised states and quality of consumer goods poor; cars, scarce commodities, health-care and holidays were largely restricted to the top of the political hierarchy and beyond the reach of ordinary citizens.

Arguments challenging the view that attempts to modernise the Soviet economy and raise living standards, in the years 1945 to 1964, were a complete failure might include:

- the war years brought restructuring and greater efficiency to some industries (particularly the new giant heavy industrial complexes in the Urals) and the appropriation of former Nazi industrial machinery helped modernisation. Rebuilding (from scratch) enabled new equipment and processes under the Fourth and Fifth Five-Year plans which mostly focused on heavy industry/capital goods
- Khrushchev partly decentralised planning, establishing economic regions with their own councils and reducing the number of supervising ministries in Moscow; he expanded modern industries, eg chemicals, prefabricated housing, power resources and space (Sputnik 1957; Gagarin 1961) railway lines were electrified, air transport expanded (Aeroflot subsidised); 1959 first civil nuclear-powered ship
- Khrushchev increased investment in rural areas; introduced administrative changes to support agriculture; increased number of farms connected to the electric grid, use of chemical fertiliser and use of farm machinery; undertook several agricultural initiatives
- living standards were necessarily held down by war but Stalin's Fifth Five-Year Plan saw investment in consumer goods, housing and services boosting living standards; under Khrushchev's Plans of 1959 and 1961, living standards received a huge boost; production/availability of consumer goods increased
- taxation changes, reduction of hours of work, better and more widely available education; improvements in medicine and welfare services; better transport; also, some improvement in quality of life with reduction in censorship.

It would be fair to argue that, although Stalin's achievements between 1945 and 1953 were minimal, Khrushchev made some headway in modernising the Soviet economy and raising living standards. Not all of his schemes were successful but a move was made in the redirection of resources away from heavy industry and armaments towards consumer goods, housing and agriculture. This change meant that some of the wealth generated by Soviet industrialisation began to filter down to ordinary citizens,

permitting a rapid rise in living standards in the 1950s. However, it is possible to agree with the quotation by pointing to the limitations of change and the remaining unsolved problems. Reward any well-substantiated, argued response.