



A-level HISTORY

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Paper 1H

ADDITIONAL SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER

2 hours 30 minutes

Materials

For this paper you must have:

- an AQA 12-page answer book.

Instructions

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book. The **Paper Reference** is **1H**.
- Answer **three** questions.
In **Section A** answer Question 01.
In **Section B** answer **two** questions.

Information

- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- The maximum mark for this paper is 80.
- You will be marked on your ability to:
 - use good English
 - organise information clearly
 - use specialist vocabulary where appropriate.

Advice

- You are advised to spend about:
 - 60 minutes on Question 01
 - 45 minutes on each of the other questions answered.
-

Section AAnswer Question 01

Extract A

Stalin increasingly concentrated power in his hands. His views were decisive in policy-making. He was able to intervene in any debate and when he did the effect could be devastating. His 'cult of personality' was a true reflection of his enormous authority. At the same time, the power of the Soviet leadership was limited. The ruling group was less monolithic than it appeared. Behind the scenes there were continued differences over economic, political and diplomatic issues. The party and state apparatus was often disorganised, understaffed, overworked, corrupt and unresponsive to Moscow's demands. The population displayed remarkable inventiveness in evading and undermining directives from above in order to lessen the effects of unworkable or unpopular policies. The response of Soviet leaders was often to resort to coercion. Stalin unleashed the NKVD in an orgy of repression. No part of the population was immune. For all this, Stalin and his colleagues enjoyed considerable support from the population. The Stalinist political system rested on a combination of coercion and mass support.

Adapted from J. Barber and M. Harrison, **The Soviet Home Front**, 1991

Extract B

Stalin was not guilty of mass murder from 1934 to 1941 and did not plan or carry out a systematic campaign to crush the nation. This fear-ridden man reacted and overreacted to events. His power was constrained, which contributed to his anxiety and tendency to govern by hit-and-run methods. This vision of Stalinism is more disturbing than the view which depicts the loathsome state as a machine operated by a handful of men and as the only real actor. People thwarted central policy in a multitude of small and large ways. People had the opportunity to speak out about local problems and conditions. The state never crushed society. The Soviet regime was hardly democratic. Nevertheless, it appears to have been reasonably well-grounded, at least in the cities and among young people. In any case, terror touched a minority of the citizens. For most urban citizens, Stalinism provided important means of upward social mobility, participation and criticism. Soviet people determined their own fate more than it was determined for them.

Adapted from R. Thurston, **Life and Terror in Stalin's Russia**, 1934–1941, 1996

Extract C

The bureaucracy acted in an arbitrary manner. Political leaders made abrupt switches in state policy and every time this happened, some arbitrarily chosen scapegoats were punished for overzealousness in carrying out the old policy. This encouraged fatalism and passivity in the population, instilling a sense that the individual was not in control of his own fate. It was an abnormal life because of the privations and hardships. People were frightened, given the regime's proven willingness to punish and the unpredictability of its outbursts. This did not mean, however, that Soviet citizens necessarily had a high respect for authority. Lack of personal security, suppression of religion, the emergence of a new privileged class and police surveillance and terror no doubt contributed to broadly-based popular criticism of the regime. But the primary cause was economic: people were living badly. The Russian urban population probably accepted its government, which had apparently associated itself with progress in the minds of many. The Soviet state was also becoming a welfare state.

Adapted from S. Fitzpatrick, **Everyday Stalinism**, 1999

0	1
---	---

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.

[30 marks]

Section BAnswer **two** questions

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]**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]**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]**END OF QUESTIONS**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-HOLDERS AND PUBLISHERS

Question 1 Extract A: J Barber and M Harrison, *The Soviet Home Front 1941–1945*, Longman 1991, Pearson Education Limited
Question 1 Extract B: R Thurston, *Life and Terror in Stalin’s Russia 1934–1941*, copyright © 1996 by Yale University, Yale University Press
Question 1 Extract C: S Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism*, OUP 2000 (www.oup.com), 167w from pp218–225. By permission of Oxford University Press, USA

Permission to reproduce all copyright has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright-holders have been unsuccessful and AQA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgements in future papers if notified.

Copyright © 2015 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.
