

A-LEVEL

# History

Paper 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version: 1.0

---

---

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 impact of Stalinism on people's lives in Russia by 1941. | <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 respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. 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 Barber and Harrison’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the claim that Stalin’s role in government was crucially important, because power was concentrated in his hands and he intervened in events decisively
- the qualifying argument that the power of the Soviet leadership was at the same time limited, because there were differences of view amongst its members
- the argument that the party and administrative organs were not efficient, were corrupt and not responsive to what the leadership demanded
- the argument that the population was very effective at avoiding those orders that people disliked, which is why the regime resorted to coercion. However, the regime also enjoyed broad support.

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

- there is a debate to be had about Stalin’s leadership. There were times, for example at the start of the war, when it was very shaky. However, there are also examples of him intervening directly in events like the Terror (e.g. signing death warrants) and being decisive when it suited him, e.g. when stopping the Terror in 1939
- traditionally, Stalin’s leadership has been presented as very authoritarian and he tended to bypass organs like the Politburo and deal directly with individuals. But we do know that subordinates did sometimes question his decisions. Close allies like Molotov were not mere ciphers. We cannot be certain that Stalin was well informed about everything that was happening outside Moscow
- there are many examples of people ignoring Moscow’s orders. Local party organs and even the NKVD in the provinces disobeyed orders; for example sparing particular individuals who were supposed to be purged. There were certainly examples of corruption. There are also examples of Party members and the NKVD taking the initiative, for example in ramping up the Terror, either to meet arbitrary quotas or because they had some local or personal agenda
- it is true that amongst the general population, many people did manage to get on with their lives. Many complained to the authorities. There is also a lot of evidence that many people, not just in the party, supported the regime and believed all its propaganda.

**Extract B: In their identification of Thurston’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the claim is made that Stalin was not a mass murderer, partly on the grounds that his power was limited and he reacted to events rather than plan things. When Stalin did act, he tended to lash out
- people avoided doing what the regime wanted in all sorts of ways. They were on the whole not intimidated by the state and could speak out about things that concerned them
- the regime was well supported, by certain groups in particular, young people and urban inhabitants
- most people were not cowed. They saw Stalin’s USSR as a place where they could advance themselves and decide what they wanted to do, not being directed by the state.

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

- the claim that Stalin was not a mass murderer is debateable. Of course he was not responsible for every death in the USSR, but his policies were directly responsible for millions of deaths, whether those involved were kulaks, Ukrainian peasants, ‘old Bolsheviks’ or other victims of the purges. Stalin frequently gave the orders and signed the warrants
- students may confirm the research of the last 20 years or so that not all people were cowed into silence, e.g. the thousands of letters that the government received each day from people making criticisms and complaints
- many young people did support the regime, they wanted to believe in the propaganda about the march to Socialism and the need to deal ruthlessly with its enemies. There are many instances of people being arrested and then their families, whilst devastated, were often prepared to accept their loved one’s ‘guilt’ and that Stalin must be right
- the picture painted of an optimistic, enthusiastic population may be questionable. There were particular groups such as the peasantry who suffered badly. But it is also true that there were opportunities for advancement in the towns; e.g. there was a need for more specialists, people to replace those who were arrested and people to service the growing economy.

**Extract C: In their identification of Fitzpatrick’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the view that the regime acted arbitrarily towards its citizens, for example when singling out scapegoats for failures
- the view that people suffered, because they were afraid to act and show initiative, and because they felt helpless under an unpredictable government and bureaucracy
- the view that despite all this, at least in the cities, people generally ‘accepted’ the government because it brought in progress and even elements of welfare provision
- the view that where there was criticism of the regime, it was mostly because living conditions were still poor for many people.

---

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

- the view that the regime acted arbitrarily is accurate. People were often arrested because quotas had to be met, or because people acted out of spite, or because people were 'guilty by association'
- students may confirm evidence that many people did feel cowed and helpless; but equally some did speak out. Students may confirm evidence that the Terror varied in its impact, e.g. party members, intellectuals and those in positions of responsibility were often more vulnerable than 'ordinary' citizens
- the argument about improving conditions in the cities is questionable. In fact the evidence is not clear because there were examples of improving conditions for some, but also evidence of poor living conditions for others. It is true that many people appear to have believed the propaganda about 'progress'.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Alexander II left the tsarist autocracy in a weaker position at the time of his death than it had been on his accession to the throne.'

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 Alexander II did leave the autocracy in a weaker position than when he ascended to the throne, might include:**

- the Emancipation of the serfs did not fulfil its aim of totally quelling peasant dissatisfaction over land ownership and improving other conditions by the time of his death
- during his reign, the Tsar upset several groups of people, including the nobility. Emancipation hastened the decline of many nobles, who might otherwise have been natural supporters of the Tsar
- the hoped for restructuring of, and boost to, the economy was not significantly achieved by 1881. The lack of investment in agriculture did not release resources for the hoped-for industrialisation
- during this period Russia made slower economic, political and social progress than some of the other great European powers
- Alexander II refused to compromise his autocracy and this might be considered a weakness since it led to political opposition and storing up troubles for the future
- some of the Tsar's other reforms had a limited impact, e.g. the changes to censorship
- there was growing opposition from some of the intelligentsia and groups like the Narodniks/Populists.

**Arguments challenging the view that Alexander II did leave the autocracy in a weaker position than when he ascended to the throne, might include:**

- Russia had some success in recovering from the Crimean War
- some of the reforms had a positive impact, e.g. the zemstva and municipal councils improved local and regional government; legal reforms improved justice; and there were improvements in education
- the army reforms made significant improvements
- there were improvements in some sectors of the economy
- despite the 1881 assassination, most terrorist or other opposition did not appear to pose a serious threat to the regime
- Alexander II could not please everyone with his policies, but he kept the autocracy in control and Russia in a stronger condition than in 1855.

Students may conclude that in many respects Alexander II's reforms, whilst necessary, did, at least in the short term, weaken autocracy. But the fundamentals of autocracy remained in place and strong.



**0 3** 'The Marxist political parties opposing Nicholas II's regime posed more of a threat to its existence by 1914 than they had on his accession in 1894.'

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 Marxist parties were less of a threat in the early years of Nicholas II's regime in 1894 than later, might include:**

- the Marxists were not a threat in 1894 because although there were followers of Marx in 1894, they were mostly isolated intellectuals
- the tsarist police were active in monitoring opponents of the regime
- although Plekhanov founded the 'Group for the Emancipation of Labour' in 1883, the SD Party did not form until 1898, when it began to adopt more revolutionary policies
- the SD Party split in 1903 into Mensheviks and Bolsheviks over organisation and tactics, which probably weakened it at first (although Lenin welcomed the split)
- the party's membership was small in the early years and it had little practical impact
- in the early years of the 1900s, most of the SD leaders were in prison, internal exile or abroad
- Lenin spent much of the early years engaged in disputes with other radicals and developing his own distinctive brand of radicalism/Marxism, rather than focusing on the regime
- the SD had little influence on events in the 1905 Revolution, other than Trotsky's chairmanship of the Petrograd Soviet. Lenin was unable to take advantage of the regime's difficulties, although he defended the 1905 Revolution as a 'dress rehearsal'
- even later the Bolsheviks in particular found things difficult, e.g. in 1914, at the start of the war, the regime briefly benefited from an outburst of national patriotism and support for the government.

**Arguments that the Marxists were more of a threat to the regime in 1914 than before, might include:**

- by 1914, the Bolsheviks under Lenin had developed a much more tightly knit organisation and also a coherent philosophy (e.g. through Lenin's *What is to be Done?*)
- by 1914 there was a larger industrial base in the big Russian cities and therefore more opportunity for the SD to spread its ideas and recruit members and followers
- a growing wave of strikes and disturbances after 1912, many of them politically inspired, was evidence of a more productive breeding ground for a revolutionary party and there was evidence of increased Bolshevik activity in factories
- the regime's growing alienation of many of its traditional supporters potentially gave any revolutionary group more optimism about its prospects, even though Russia, as a relatively undeveloped state industrially, did not meet the classic Marxist scenario of a society ripe for proletarian revolution.

Students may conclude that Marxist political parties did indeed pose a greater threat by 1914 but that the development and extent of the threat was uneven and inconsistent.

**0 4** 'The Soviet regime's desire to create socialism in the USSR led to a social revolution between 1917 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 supporting the view that Soviet society did undergo a social revolution between 1917 and 1941 might include:**

- on paper there was social levelling after the Revolution, with equality for all those not branded class enemies in the new order. In theory there were now only two classes, workers and peasants, although later the intelligentsia was included. Workers were encouraged to join the new and growing bureaucracy
- as NEP got under way a new class emerged: NEP men. These were enterprising Russians from varied backgrounds who took advantage of the economic opportunities opened up by the NEP, which allowed freedom of trade and small-scale private enterprise. In the countryside, although a kulak class had existed before, it now considerably expanded as many peasants took advantage of opportunities to farm commercially and sell food on the open market. So social divisions re-emerged in the countryside
- the regime introduced radical laws that affected society; easier divorce, abortion, civil marriage, equality for women. The traditional family structure was condemned as a bourgeois relic of the past
- although Lenin and his Government were cautious about launching a frontal attack on religion, activists did attack churchmen and church buildings. The Komsomol carried out anti-religious and other campaigns
- there were some radical changes in education: the church was excluded, a strong propagandist element was brought into schools and there were experiments such as 'child-centred' education and other progressive features. Literacy was greatly extended
- under Stalin there were other radical changes. Widespread female employment was encouraged and this further undermined the 'traditional' family
- the regime in the 1930s promoted the idea of the 'Soviet' citizen, which meant undermining traditional cultures in the non-Russian Republics.

**Arguments challenging the view that Soviet society did undergo a social revolution between 1917 and 1941 might include:**

- a lack of resources and personnel prevented some of the hoped for changes being successful, e.g. the planned revolution in education in the 1920s was only partly implemented for this reason
- the equality which existed on paper was not reflected in reality. Women were now expected to work, but were also expected to run the household, because traditional male expectations were very hard to change. Women did not get equality, except in professions which were not highly regarded
- Stalin did not approve of some of the radicalism of the 1920s. The regime in the 1930s now began to try to strengthen the family, abandoned progressive educational reforms and repudiated egalitarianism. These were seen as destabilising to society and not conducive to having a disciplined workforce which was needed for the industrialisation drive

- 
- there were important changes. The development of an industrial society did open up many opportunities and the need for a large white collar class. There were other social changes: for example the growth of a party elite which effectively became a class apart, with special privileges
  - society as a whole was greatly affected by the regime's cultural and political policies. The use of propaganda, the controls over the media, the emphasis on collectivism and anti-individualism, all had an impact on society and how people interacted with each other
  - some of the regime's policies were simply undermined, e.g. religious practice in the countryside was not abolished, but simply driven underground.

Students may conclude that after the Revolution, Bolsheviks did expect a social revolution to mirror the political revolution taking place. There were certainly some radical intentions and radical developments during the 1930s. However, the radicalism was not sustained in several areas during the 1930s. The emphasis on economic transformation and authoritarian political control under Stalin demanded a drive for discipline and productivity in the work place and ideological conformity. Students may conclude that Russian society was in several ways very different in 1941 from 1917, but the differences were not always what had been intended. Although the population conformed to the regime's policies, it would be hard to claim that a new 'Soviet being' had emerged without any of the old prejudices and other characteristics of the past.