
A-LEVEL

History

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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 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

June 2017

A-level

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the impact of Soviet industrial policy between 1921 and 1941. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

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

- the overall argument is that the industrialisation was a great success, with socialist industry replacing the capitalist industry of the NEP period
- the process of industrialisation was demanding, required sacrifices and led to shortages and other problems, but the majority of workers rallied heroically to the call
- as a result of the stupendous efforts, the first stage of industrialisation was completed ahead of schedule.

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 the success of the First Five-Year Plan in particular. It was officially completed ahead of schedule, but there were different versions and modifications of the plans
- there were several significant achievements, but many of them, like work on the transport infrastructure and building giant industrial and power complexes, only bore fruit later
- there were certainly hardships for most people, including the shortages referred to and rationing. But not all suffered equally. It might be argued that displaced and persecuted peasants suffered more than most workers
- the emphasis on the impact of propaganda about heroic feats of labour, commitment and selflessness is partly true. But not everyone cooperated, and there was also a lot of repression, volatility amongst the workforce and some disillusionment, which was ignored or downplayed in Soviet propaganda.

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

- the overall argument is that the industrialisation of the 1930s did achieve some success compared to the NEP era, and helped prepare the USSR for war, but it was also characterised by failures and problems which sometimes reached crisis proportions
- the industrialisation required major readjustments to old practices, but both managers and workers often found it difficult to adjust to these
- the problems included destitution, insufficient training for new equipment and falling productivity per worker, which was only partially compensated for by a vast increase in the labour force
- the regime's propaganda about socialist progress and class consciousness had some impact but was ultimately ineffectual.

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

- the claim that there were impressive achievements during the 1930s is accurate in terms of some of the big increases in capital goods outputs and achievements in fields such as hep, coal and steel, compared to the NEP period, but it is also true that not all targets were met
- it is true that the idea of single management was favoured over the previous practice of management by committees and political interference, but management of the Plans at all levels did not run smoothly
- it is true that some of the achievements did help Russia during the following crisis of War – especially the emphasis in the later 1930s on rearmament
- the debate about productivity is ongoing and there are various interpretations of it. It is true that the economy was very labour intensive, and large groups, particularly women and peasants, were incorporated into industry, but they took time to become skilled and efficient workers.

Extract C

In their identification of Barber and Harrison’s argument, students should refer to the following:

- the overall argument is that essentially the whole 1930s industrial drive was too ambitious and flawed to fulfil many of its aims
- the extract suggests that political demands superseded more realistic economic requirements, and that this led to desperate tactics such as purges to fulfil the regime’s objectives
- it is claimed that the economy was inefficient, and hampered by the crisis in agriculture, waste, inefficiency and other problems, and so was not really an improvement on the NEP period
- overall, whilst there were achievements, there were also significant industrial crises, especially in the early 1930s and from 1937.

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

- the view that the industrial programme was over-ambitious and dominated by political objectives is probably true, although sometimes the emphasis did change to meet perceived needs, such as when rearmament was the focus in the later 1930s because of the threat of war. In some aspects it was not an improvement on the NEP period
- the cyclical nature of industrialisation is true. The First Plan laid some of the foundations for later achievements but then ran into difficulties. Some of the foundations bore fruit by the mid-1930s when the targets also became more realistic. There was stagnation after 1937, which was only reversed in the last period of peace 1940–1
- it is true that major events, such as the purges and collectivisation, had a major impact on industry, often negative – although there were some benefits, such as the availability of more labour absorbed into industry from the countryside
- it is true that some areas of the economy, such as steel production, developed rapidly, while other existing resources, such as small-scale industries, suffered badly. It is possible to argue in different ways about the overall balance-sheet.

In summary, students may conclude that there were benefits and failures in the Stalinist industrialisation drive, and the very terms ‘success’ and ‘failure’ depend partly upon what they are

measured against: ideological, political, economic or military objectives. What is clear is that the overall industrial drive was massively disruptive in its alteration of the NEP economy, at least in the short-term, while its longer-term impact and implications are possibly harder to assess.

Section B

02 ‘The main aim of Alexander III was to reverse his father’s policies.’

Assess the validity of this view with reference to 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 suggesting that the main aim of Alexander III in the years 1855 to 1894 was to reverse his father's policies might include:

- before 1881 Alexander had already opposed his father's reforms such as concessions to the Poles and announced on his accession that he would accept no limitations on his autocratic rule. His upbringing had been authoritarian
- he appointed very conservative ministers and advisers such as Pobedonostsev. He committed himself to the Orthodox Church and full Russification of the Empire
- he introduced new security laws which extended censorship and the power of the police to search and arrest suspected or real opponents of the regime
- land captains and city judges were appointed to increase central authority at the expense of local initiative. There were further restrictions such as state control over universities and giving the Church power over primary education.

Arguments challenging the view that the main aim of Alexander III in the years 1855 to 1894 was to reverse his father's policies might include:

- Alexander III did not actually try to reverse the emancipation of the serfs
- Alexander III promoted and supported Witte in his financial and economic policies to industrialise Russia and strengthen the economy
- Alexander III carried out some reforms, such as creating the Peasants bank, reducing the redemption payments and abolishing the poll tax, passing factory acts and setting up a factory inspectorate – although some of these measures were taken reluctantly and weakly enforced
- Alexander III's reign saw Russia acting peacefully in Europe and he avoided the involvement his father had shown in expansionist policies and war outside Russia.

Students may conclude that reaction was the main feature of Alexander III's policies since he did change some of his father's reforms, although they could to some extent balance this by explaining these aspects about which he was more cautious or which he did not change.

03 'Peasant discontent posed a major threat to the tsarist regime between 1894 and 1917.'

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 peasant discontent between 1894 and 1917 did pose a major threat to the tsarist regime might include:

- the neglect of agricultural reform in the late nineteenth century, the pressure of a growing population on the land and periodic famine increased peasant insecurity which had persisted despite the 1861 emancipation. There were spontaneous local peasant riots during Nicholas II's reign
- a gradual spread of literacy, especially from soldiers returning to villages, made peasants more susceptible to revolutionary propaganda. There was major peasant unrest during the 1904–5 Revolution, because peasant concerns had not been met
- Stolypin's peasant reforms addressed some peasant grievances such as redemption payments, but had a limited impact on the major issue of peasant land ownership. Peasant poverty continued and could be a threat to peace, especially during famine conditions
- during the First World War peasants in the Russian army suffered from the disastrous campaigns, and their concerns were not met. The peasants had proved increasingly reluctant to support either the Tsar or the government which succeeded him.

Arguments challenging the view that peasant discontent between 1894 and 1917 posed a major threat to the tsarist regime might include:

- despite their grievances, many peasants retained traditional loyalty to the 'Little Father' and the establishment
- peasants were difficult to organise. Peasant disturbances were usually localised and, apart from 1905, suppressed by the regime without too much difficulty
- Stolypin's several agricultural reforms after 1906 did benefit many peasants to some extent. Despite the existence of the SR Party, there was little evidence of a revolutionary attitude amongst the peasantry in 1914
- although there is considerable evidence of growing discontent amongst many peasants during the War and revolutions of 1917, and possibly a growing reluctance to support the regime, the key events in 1917 were initiated in the cities and peasants had limited involvement in comparison to urban dwellers.

Students may conclude that peasants faced harsh conditions and could behave in a volatile way, but balance this with the fact that they were largely disorganised and generally loyal to the regime, even when they had local grievances.

- 04** To what extent were the key features of post-Second World War Stalinism still in place at the time of Khrushchev's overthrow in 1964? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that the key features of post-Second World War Stalinism were still in place at the time of Khrushchev's overthrow in 1964 might include:

- the Communist Party still dominated every aspect of government and society and all the key institutions and levers of power under Stalin in 1945 were still functioning in 1964
- the USSR still had a centralised, planned economy in which the State determined the priorities and focused on particular aspects, such as heavy industry and defence, and gave less priority to other aspects such as consumer goods
- the USSR was still a very authoritarian society in which the state controlled all channels of communication, education and culture
- the regime still relied on a mixture of propaganda and authoritarian controls to ensure that a single 'socialist' world view prevailed.

Arguments challenging the view that the key features of post-Second World War Stalinism were still in place at the time of Khrushchev's overthrow in 1964 might include:

- the Party was still dominant but the role of the leader had changed: Khrushchev had less power and authority than Stalin and was removed peacefully from the leadership in a way that would have been impossible under Stalin
- the essentials of the planned economy were still in place but there had been (mostly unsuccessful) attempts to give a stronger focus to consumer goods and agriculture, and decentralise some aspects of economic management
- although the State was still authoritarian, the power of the police had been reduced or regularised and overt, unpredictable terror as an instrument of control had disappeared
- there was less focus on the individual 'leader' despite Khrushchev's cult of personality. There was a very slight relaxation of cultural controls, although there was still extensive use of state propaganda and an insistence on the key role of the Party and its 'orthodox' view.

Students may well conclude that the essentials of Stalinism were still in place by 1964, despite Khrushchev's reforms, particularly because his attempted modifications of the Stalinist economic structure had largely failed and were being abandoned; and, despite tinkering with the Party, the essentials of the one-Party State were still in place, even though the regime relied less on force and more on consensus.