

---

A-level  
**HISTORY**  
**7042/1H**

Component 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

---

**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](http://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** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the development of the Soviet economy in the years 1921 to 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.

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

- the overall argument is that Russian economy developed impressively throughout the years 1921 to 1941, growing from an economy 'in need of rescue' to one in a 'strong position'
- there was rapid industrial reconstruction in the 1920s, the targets of the first five-year plan were surpassed by 1932, and there was a great spurt, 1934–6 and armament manufacture expanded 1936–41
- agriculture recovered rapidly in the 1920s; peasants were 'controlled' and the kulaks annihilated in the 1930s and, although lagging behind industry, (and crop failure 1936), agriculture contributed to USSR's overall strength in 1941
- the gap with the West was closed and, thanks to economic growth the USSR was in a strong position to fight the Second World War and achieve victory.

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

- 1921 saw the introduction of the NEP which got the economy moving again after the problems brought by the First World War, the Revolution and the Civil War
- 1928 brought Stalin's 'Great Turn' which introduced the five-year plans for industry. Under central planning and target-setting, there was huge growth in heavy industry, engineering, railways and communications, and power generation. Under the 3rd plan spending on rearmament doubled
- the NEP revived peasant trading and collectivisation from 1928 increased efficiencies; there was 100% collectivisation by 1941 and aims fulfilled – industrial workers were fed and grain exports increased
- in challenging the argument: the limitations of the NEP, the five-year plans and collectivisation can be cited; even the extract suggests agriculture lagged behind industry and the annihilation of the kulaks could be mentioned as having added to farming problems by removing c10 million of the more successful farmers.

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

- the overall argument is that economic development between 1921 and 1941 looked impressive but was, in reality, badly flawed and the so-called 'planning' did not work
- economic growth looked stronger than it was because it began from a low starting point in the 1920s and was achieved in just a few 'chosen' areas
- growth was lop-sided because key areas, including agriculture and consumer industry, were neglected and not all branches of heavy industry were promoted
- development was unsustainable because it failed to provide the goods and services which the workers needed.

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

- detail on the NEP in the 1920s and comments on the achievements/failures of the five-year plans could be used to corroborate or challenge the overall argument
- the neglect of agriculture could be challenged with reference to collectivisation but supported by material on the destruction of grain and livestock in the process, the unrealistic procurement quotas, poor organisation and famine
- poor standards of living with punitive work demands, inadequate housing and limited and poor quality consumer products existing alongside show-piece projects such as the Volga canal and Dnieper dam for HEP would illustrate the lop-sided industrial growth and its unsustainability
- problems of the command economy with its many layers of officialdom and difficulties of coordination would illustrate that the economy ‘was not really planned at all’.

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

- the overall argument is that state-led industrialisation in the 1930s was undertaken for ideological reasons and was only achieved through coercion and a system of penalties, involving ‘extraordinary violence’
- the small-scale capitalism of the NEP in the 1920s was popular, so contrasting favourably with the conditions that followed
- it became necessary to impose ‘harsh penalties’ in an attempt to make central planning work and meet ‘over-optimistic’ targets
- ‘militaristic coercion’ meant inflicting violence on the very workers and peasants on which the state relied to impel the economic growth – a severe indictment of the economic developments after 1928.

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

- examples of coercion and penalties ranging from the trial of managers (eg Shakhty) for industrial sabotage and rigorous work-place rules such as dismissal/loss of housing and benefits for damaging machinery or late arrival, to the annihilation of kulaks and penalties for failure to meet collective quotas; penalties got worse 1939–40
- the popularity of the NEP can be supported with reference to private trading and Nepmen and challenged in terms of the division of wealth, poverty in the countryside and control of labour, eg through internal passports; a contrast with 1930s may be questioned
- examples of impossible targets and the problems of confused planning can be used to explain the need for penalties but it might be noted that incentives were also used, eg wage differentials, bonuses and the Stakhanovite movement
- militaristic coercion most in evidence in rounding up of kulaks by Red Army and Cheka. Purges and persecution of managers, engineers, scientists and ordinary industrial workers and peasants in Yezhovshchina; gulags filled with prisoners put to economic use, eg digging the White Sea canal; oppression can also be challenged with reference to enthusiastic workers, eg Komsomol graduates, who willingly contributed to the five-year plans as ‘shock workers’.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'By 1881, the emancipation of the serfs had brought profound social change in Russia.'

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 by 1881, the emancipation of the serfs had brought profound social change in Russia might include:**

- emancipation had freed 51 million people from varying forms of bondage and provided them with their own land allotment allowing for individual enterprise and the development of peasant agriculture
- social change ranged from kulaks who bought up extra land and became prosperous petty capitalists (sometimes 'middle-class' traders) to landless labourers, who sold out and were left with no support
- a more socially mobile population turned some former serfs into members of railway gangs, or made them part-time (or full) urban workers dependent on wages and factory, rather than landowners
- changed the status of landowners; some used government compensation to invest in industry, moved to cities and became entrepreneurs; some abandoned farming as sons entered professions or sought state service; some languished in the countryside amidst bankruptcies and the mortgaging of estates; the more resentful voiced their opposition through the zemstva from 1864
- emancipation was directly linked to further reforms (including local government, judicial, educational, military) which in turn promoted a fairer and more westernised/'modern' society.

**Arguments challenging the view that by 1881, the emancipation of the serfs had brought profound social change in Russia might include:**

- 49 years of redemption payments, collected within the mir kept peasants poor and tied to the land; this curbed mobility and limited social change
- the new peasant land holdings were too small and allocations unfair; little incentive to adopt new farming methods on dispersed strips; size of holdings fell over time as land was divided between sons
- there was insufficient industrial growth to bring much social change and peasants were kept poor by heavy indirect taxation; the mirs were highly traditional and volost courts replaced landowner control
- society remained strongly divided; former serf-owners retained much of their previous wealth and status; the urban working class remained very small – under 2% of the population; most peasants remained very poor – some worse off than before 1861
- the results were slow to materialise and social change not 'profound' by 1881. 15% of peasants were still 'temporarily obligated' to landlords, although redemption was made compulsory that year; 50% of peasantry was incapable of producing a surplus to move beyond subsistence farming.

The social impact of emancipation was slow to take effect and students are likely to question the extent of change before 1881. There is no denying that this 'freedom' was an essential and long overdue first step in moves towards a 'modern' society based on capital and wages, but a lot more had to change before this could occur. As always, reward any argument that offers a considered and well-substantiated judgement.



- |          |          |  |
|----------|----------|--|
| <b>0</b> | <b>3</b> | How effective was the opposition of radical and liberal groups in challenging the authority of the Tsar in the years 1894 to 1914? |
|----------|----------|--|

**[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 opposition of radical and liberal groups was effective in challenging the authority of the Tsar in the years 1894 to 1914 might include:**

- liberals and radicals had growing numbers of followers in all sections of society from 1894; they were effective in maintaining pressure on the Tsardom, bringing unrest and forcing the government to resort to extreme vigilance and reliance on the Okhrana
- liberalism was strong in the zemstva; constant pressure for a National Assembly was maintained pre-1905 (Beseda symposium, Union of Liberation) and rewarded with concessions, 1905; liberals were effective in establishing Duma government and became an independent political force, maintaining pressure for reform
- Marxist influence made radicals an increasing threat; Social Revolutionaries (1901) carried out 2 000 political assassinations 1901–5 (including ministers) destabilising government; behind arsons in countryside and strikes in towns; active in 1905 disruption; assassinated Stolypin 1911 – effective undermining of authority
- Social Democrats (1898) spread message of political revolution; influenced Trade Unions pre-1905 and force for disruption 1912–1914; effective in disrupting Dumas
- liberals and radicals – effective in forcing concessions, 1905; won a representative Duma and legalisation of trade unions – so undermined Tsarist authority.

**Arguments challenging the view that the opposition of radical and liberal groups was effective in challenging the authority of the Tsar in the years 1894 to 1914 might include:**

- liberals – wary of pushing too hard; lost momentum after the 1905 October Manifesto; cooperated in the Dumas; almost became establishment figures in the face of the demands of radicals, helping preserve the authority of the Tsar
- radicals – never very effective because of the activities of the okhrana; after 1905 had to operate underground; many leaders exiled; the SR/SD split and Bolshevik/Menshevik division weakened effectiveness further; achieved little
- authority of the Tsar was upheld throughout, thanks to the loyalty of the army and the forces of repression, eg action at the Lena Goldfields, 1912; authority reinforced by the fundamental laws and the way the Dumas were handled
- the differing aims of and different reactions to the ‘concessions’ of 1905 split the liberals and radicals and weakened the effectiveness of opposition; tercentenary celebrations, 1913 and reaction to war, 1914 showed continued loyalty and authority.

There are varying ways of viewing ‘effectiveness’ and the argument put forward will largely depend on the student’s definition of ‘authority’. If it is seen in terms of the Tsar’s overall dominance and hold on his country, it is possible to argue that both were severely damaged by the activities of the liberal and radical opposition. If, on the other hand, authority is equated with actual power and command, very little changed; the autocracy was barely scratched in 1905 and despite their activities, the opposition achieved little. Reward any well-argued and supported case.

**0 4** 'There were more similarities than differences between Stalin and Khrushchev as Soviet leaders.'

Assess the validity of this view of the years 1941 to 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 supporting the view that there were more similarities than differences between Stalin and Khrushchev as Soviet leaders in the years 1941 to 1964 might include:**

- a belief in strong leadership/personal power; both held position as head of government and of the Party; both used top-down Party apparatus – the politburo under Stalin and presidium (established 1952), under Khrushchev; secretariat essential with protégés in crucial posts; both controlled and relied on police and propaganda
- neither would brook any opposition; both played off major figures against one another, eg Zhdanov v Malenkov and executions of ‘potential opposition’ (Stalin) and dealings with Zhukov and Bulganin, the ‘anti-party’ group and execution of Beria (Khrushchev)
- both driven by Marxist belief; maintained a one-ideology, one-party structure; upheld the power of communist elites; supported a command economy and economic controls
- exerted a strong international presence, emphasising USSR’s ‘superpower’ status in opposition to Western capitalism; tight control over satellite states; belief in importance of military
- maintained cultural control; dissidents attacked; little respect for human rights; anti-Church (except as political tool); hostile to ethnic minorities and anti-Semitic outlook.

**Arguments challenging the view that there were more similarities than differences between Stalin and Khrushchev as Soviet leaders in the years 1941 to 1964 might include:**

- Stalin was stiff and remote; relied on a stronger cult of personality, particularly that of war hero; Khrushchev liked to mix with people and use humour; Stalin obsessed with industrial might/Soviet strength at expense of the people; Khrushchev more interested in agriculture; less hectoring; more aware of quality of life
- Stalin was more autocratic; destroyed party autonomy and ruled through force of personality; Khrushchev revived authority of the Party and gestures towards democratisation and decentralisation, especially in economic sphere
- Stalin relied on terror, torture, mass arrests, executions before and after war; under Khrushchev, coercive machinery was dismantled, secret police reduced in size, gulags dismantled, with political amnesties and the judiciary gained more independence
- Stalin more driven by ideology; showed total intolerance-paranoia; Khrushchev more practical approach; permitted some cultural ‘thaw’/freedom
- Stalin listened to no one, was suspicious of change; allowed country to stagnate; Khrushchev sought information, prepared to de-Stalinise and introduce limited reform.

Students will need to evaluate the degree of similarity and difference between these two leaders and may legitimately emphasise either of these as the more important. Although a number of differences are likely to be observed, the more astute may point out that these differences were not absolute, not least because the one-party state and command economy were preserved. While there was really little underlying change in the authoritarian political, economic and cultural climate, Khrushchev’s different style of leadership and attempts at reform, may temper conclusions. A reasonable case could be made that Khrushchev’s attempts to be different – retreating from Stalinism and returning to Party control – were thwarted by his own determination to maintain control and lead from the top. Reward any genuine attempt to argue a case and provide a judgement.