

AS
HISTORY
7041/1H

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

Component 1H Autocracy, Reform and Revolution: Russia, 1855–1917

Mark scheme

June 2022

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 © 2022 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** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the reign of Alexander III?

[25 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:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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:

- overall, this extract suggests that Alexander III's reign was a time of extreme repression, with no redeeming features
- it suggests that Tsar Alexander III was fully behind the intolerance and heavy-handed rule, giving widespread powers to the police and stifling his country's development
- the view is that Alexander III created an oppressive police state. He also had no hesitation in persecuting the non-Orthodox or encouraging economic policies which promoted famine.

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

- in support of the interpretation: From the abandonment of the Loris-Melikov scheme which would have allowed limited constitutional concessions, Alexander III steadily reduced the powers of the zemstva and constitutional courts, re-established harsh censorship and created the Land Captains (1889); he pursued systematic discrimination against the non-Orthodox and non-Russian nationalities, particular Jews (May Laws); Vyshnegradsky's grain export drive produced the great famine of 1891–2
- police powers (including the okhrana) were increased under Plehve and Dornovo, with new criminal investigation branches and more spies; 1882 Statute on Police Surveillance permitted (arbitrary) police activity in 'areas of subversion' and those arrested were tried in closed court sessions
- to challenge the interpretation: despite counter-reforms the reign was not exclusively backward-looking: there was no return of serfdom, education spread and the enterprising were able to advance socially with new economic opportunities; it was not a fully oppressive police state – there was an underlying loyalty to the Tsar; vigilance was variable and workers' organisations, illegal trade unions and Marxist discussion circles survived.

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

- this extract puts forward the overall interpretation that Alexander III's reign was, in at least some ways, progressive
- it suggests that Alexander III favoured some reform and it was Pobedonostsev more than he that was responsible for counter-reform and repression – but that even these policies were in the interests of maintaining 'public calm'
- the interpretation suggests that, with Alexander III's support, thought was given to the position of the peasants and much was done to advance the country which was 'moving forwards' economically.

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

- in support of interpretation: evidence of Alexander's devotion to duty (reading/signing papers) and his consideration of a form of consultative assembly can be contrasted with the authoritarian ideas pushed by Pobedonostsev – and his overwhelming influence – as tutor and government-adviser – on the rather intellectually limited Tsar

- evidence of agricultural development (land banks facilitating purchase and emergence of kulaks facilitating export drive) and state-promoted industrial growth (under Vyshnegradsky and Witte, using foreign expertise and investment, eg for railways) would support the progressive aspect of the reign
- to challenge the interpretation: repression was not solely undertaken for motives of calm; the reign was underpinned by a defence of autocracy that involved highly repressive measures; the economy and society remained backward in comparison with the West.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might point out that, while both passages adopt extreme stances, Extract A presents the more commonly held view that Alexander III's reign was a time of stagnation and repression. Whilst there was economic advance, this was not accompanied by political change, making Alexander III guilty of storing up problems for the future. Students who argue in favour of Extract B may suggest that economic change was more important for the future than the illiberal political system or that Pobedonostsev should take the blame for the negative aspects of the reign, whilst Alexander III should be viewed more favourably. Reward any sensible comparison offering a supported judgement in favour of one or other interpretation.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The 1905 revolution in Russia was due to the growth of liberal opposition to the Tsarist autocracy in the years 1894 to 1905.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 1905 revolution in Russia was due to the growth of liberal opposition to the Tsarist autocracy in the years 1894 to 1905 might include:

- Liberals provided leadership in 1905: from 1894, the zemstva, a stronghold of liberalism, became increasingly politicised; already more confident after action in Great Famine; incensed when Nicholas dismissed suggestion of consultative assembly as a 'senseless dream', 1895 and banned an 'All-Zemstvo Organisation', 1896
- Liberals had a widespread following: strong in universities, among students (with constant clashes, eg 1901 St Petersburg troubles); appeal among growing 'middle classes': town leaders, lawyers, teachers, industrialists; strong leadership from nobility (Prince Lvov) and lawyer/intellectual (Pyotr Struve) – Tsarist government could not afford to ignore them when faced with wider unrest, 1905
- educated, 'westernised' and relatively well-off, the liberals were organised through the Beseda Symposium (1899), Union of Liberation, 1903 which arranged society banquets 1904–5 and in 1905 the liberals formed the Kadet Party; were in a strong position to exert pressure on Tsar, 1904/5
- Liberals had strong reason for taking a lead: appalled by Russia's poor showing in war against Japan and events of Bloody Sunday; wanted to control popular discontent which threatened them; gained control of the illegal unions in formation of 'Union of Unions', May 1905; in meetings in 1905 (March and Sept.) rejected any compromise save a Duma with universal suffrage and civil liberties; Liberals thus directly responsible for October Manifesto and revolutionary change.

Arguments challenging the view that the 1905 revolution in Russia was due to the growth of liberal opposition to the Tsarist autocracy in the years 1894 to 1905 might include:

- the 1905 revolution was the product of mass unrest after 1894, fanned by an uncompromising and repressive tsarist government, an incompetent Tsar and a disastrous war
- organised liberal opposition represented a small a minority compared with the opposition of the huge, vital but restless peasant population, (problems of emancipation; years of the red cockerel) and the damaging power of the industrial workforce (strike activity); in the longer term, the revolution was the consequence of economic changes including industrialisation and urbanisation
- radical activity by SRs and SDs more significant, eg assassination of Plehve, 1904 and Grand Duke Sergei, 1905; pressure of organised illegal trade unions; the formation of the St Petersburg Soviet which tried to organise a general strike
- the revolution resulted from multiple pressures including fear of mutiny after that on the battleship Potemkin, June 1905; demands of Poles, Finns, Latvians and minority groups for independence; pressure on the Tsar from his own family and ministers (eg Witte).

It is almost impossible to argue that the 1905 revolution was mono-causal but students might make a strong case for the importance of the liberal opposition as the dominant force pressing for change by 1905 and the group whose demands were acceded to. Alternatively, they may focus on any one or more of the many alternative factors that played a part in the upheavals or they might argue that the revolution can only be understood in terms of a confluence of factors at a critical point in Russian history. Reward any answer that is able to consider the influence of the liberal opposition in context and make a valid judgement on its importance.

0 3 'In the years 1905 to 1914, the problems of the peasantry and Russian agriculture were mostly resolved.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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, in the years 1905 to 1914, the problems of the peasantry and Russian agriculture were mostly resolved might include:

- there was an attempt to address peasant problems (eg small-scale farming, peasants tied to mirs by redemption dues, heavy taxation, low living standards, limited mobility) and agricultural backwardness (result of pressure on resources and traditional practices) in legislation under Stolypin (1906–11): more state land made available for peasants to buy; collective ownership of land by families abolished; development of larger farms promoted by means of funds from a Peasants' Bank to facilitate land transfers
- greater peasant mobility became possible as redemption payments ended, 1907 (as promised 1905); poorer peasants could sell out and leave the over-populated countryside to seek industrial wages/seasonal farming work; communes forced to redistribute land, with commissioners overseeing reorganisation of farms from 1910 – redressing anomalies; improvements in healthcare and education through activity of zemstva
- kulaks thrived and led some prosperous commercial farming (eg using fertilisers), particularly on periphery of heartlands; hereditary ownership of land by peasants more than doubled
- grain production rose substantially; some peasants encouraged to emigrate to Siberia turning it into a major agricultural region; exploitation (eg as experienced under Vyshnegradsky) ceased; the prospect of famine declined (no major famine save in south 1906); excellent harvest, 1913.

Arguments challenging the view that, in the years 1905 to 1914, the problems of the peasantry and Russian agriculture were mostly resolved might include:

- Stolypin's reforms benefited only a minority of the peasant population and were never fully carried out; only c10% land transferred to private ownership by 1914 and many applications were still pending when war broke out and some of the good work was undone as peasants were conscripted into the army
- nobility still owned 50% of land – particularly true in central Russia (heartlands) where mir and traditional farming practices continued to dominate; protracted legal battles to prevent loss of land and claim common land by landowners
- overall 90% peasant holdings still in strips and less than 1% peasants had kulak status by 1914; migrant labourers and those who left the countryside often worse off than before – insufficient industrial growth to absorb surplus labour
- widespread rural poverty persisted; gap rich/poor peasants widened; seasonal labourers often poorly paid and no welfare support; only small fraction (3.5 of 97 million) relocated in Siberia; growing rural population with limited resources, too few schools (60% illiteracy) and doctors; large families, wooden huts, monotonous/limited diet, few possessions; mortality rates remained high.

Students are likely to argue that the problems of the peasantry persisted throughout this period and that whilst some benefited, the lives of a lot more stagnated or even got worse. Better answers may consider the broader issue of 'agriculture' separately from the lives of the peasants and note that the output of grain increased, enabling the growth of industry by feeding town workers and providing for exports. However, it is quite acceptable for students to consider the problems of the peasantry and agriculture jointly, since the two are closely intertwined, and responses should be assessed according to how effectively students evaluate the degree to which problems had been solved overall.