

---

**AS**  
**HISTORY**

Paper 1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1917

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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)

**AS History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme****1H Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1917****Section A**

- |          |          |  |                   |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the reforms of Alexander II between 1855 and 1881? | <b>[25 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> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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.  | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</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.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

### Extract A

Students may assess Radzinsky's argument to be convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate as follows:

- the claim that Alexander was a genuine reformer has some validity, as some validity as he had a 'liberal' upbringing and this could be supported from contextual knowledge, e.g. Emancipation of the serfs; the Zemstva system
- the claim that he carried out extensive reform can be corroborated by contextual knowledge
- it was the case that Alexander did raise expectations that he did not satisfy, e.g. Liberal opposition grew.

Students may see the argument not to be convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to challenge as follows:

- students may argue that the interpretation is weak as it does not acknowledge the limitations of the reforms that were introduced and that a period of reaction undermines claims that Alexander was a great reformer.

### Extract B

Students may assess Wood's argument to be convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate as follows:

- students could corroborate that the Crimean War was important as a motive for reforms, e.g. stressing the impact of military defeat on home soil, and may support the view that Alexander's reactionary period did promote revolutionary activity, by reference to the emergence of revolutionary groups
- Alexander's commitment to autocracy may be supported by reference to the limits of his reforms.

Students may see the argument not to be convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to challenge as follows:

- the cautious and reluctant nature of reform can be challenged. Alexander started with a huge and significant change, the Emancipation and a cautious and reluctant reformer may have not chosen this huge change
- there is an argument to suggest that the reforms were not piecemeal and had an underlying 'liberal' theme.

Students may conclude that whilst each interpretation has some validity, Extract B provides a fuller perspective.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Tsarist authority remained strong in Russia between 1881 and 1904.'

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**

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</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.**

Arguments suggesting that Tsarist authority remained strong in the years 1881 to 1904 might include:

- government autocracy was tightened, forcing opposition into exile (or underground) through the gendarmarie (powers of police extended), Okhrana, use of 'areas of subversion', closed court sessions, land captains. Extensive use of exile to curb revolutionary movements
- 1895 – Zemstva were firmly told that hopes of political participation were a 'senseless dream', when Shopov tried to set up an all-Zemstva organisation, 1896, it was banned, and a reduction of vote in Zemstva and Duma and purge of outspoken members (1900) helped to curb liberal opposition
- use of Cossacks and army to retain control (e.g. 1901, St Petersburg demonstrations crushed)
- Church influence over education increased and used to support Tsarist authority
- Russification effectively carried out with anti-Jewish pogroms.

Arguments suggesting that Tsarist authority did not remain strong might include:

- the Zemstva grew in power and influence. They continued to lobby for greater participation in government and gained in status when they helped alleviate the effects of the 1891 to 1892 famine, leaving Tsarist government looking weak and ineffective. They formed the Beseda (Symposium) 1899 and many (liberal) members supported Struve's 1903 Union of Liberation which held society banquets to campaign for a liberal constitution, 1904, in defiance of the government
- workers' and peasants' unrest in towns and countryside continued, e.g. in the years of the Red Cockerel (1903–4) which authorities found difficulty in controlling
- student demonstrations and strike activity occurred in towns (even though illegal).
- the emergence of more radical opposition groups (SRs and SDs) and their growth, despite Tsarist repression, suggests a government struggling to maintain authority. The SRs successfully carried out political assassinations from 1901, including two government Ministers of the Interior – Sipyagin (1902) and Plehve (1904) and the Minister of Education, Bogolepov, 1901.

Students might conclude that whilst Tsarist authority appeared superficially strong, there was enough opposition within Russia to suggest that it had already been undermined by 1904.

**0 3** 'Bolshevik success in the October/November 1917 revolution was due to successive governments' failure to meet peasant demands following their emancipation in 1861.'

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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</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.**

Arguments suggesting that successive governments' failure to meet peasant demands was responsible for Bolshevik success in the revolution of October/November 1917 might include:

- emancipation had not satisfied the peasant demand for land; many had received limited allocations and, until 1905 had been tied to the mir by redemption dues
- Stolypin's reforms had not gone far enough, and whilst some had bought up land and prospered, many had been reduced to landless labourers and had shown their unrest 1903 to 1904 in the years of the Red Cockerel
- peasants resented conscription and mismanagement of the First World War and many had deserted to seize land; a situation which the Provisional Government proved powerless to control
- Lenin appealed to peasants by his commitment (given in his April Theses) to land redistribution. Peasants were therefore more likely to be accepting of the October/November Revolution.

Arguments suggesting that earlier governments' failure to meet peasant needs was not (or was less) responsible for Bolshevik success in the revolution of October/November 1917 and that and other factors were important might include:

- the October/November Revolution was essentially a city-revolution (in Petrograd) and was led by workers. The peasants did not play an active role in the seizure of power
- the majority of peasants continued to support the SRs rather than the Bolsheviks.

Other factors:

- Lenin's single-mindedness and refusal to cooperate with the Provisional Government won increasing support among workers and army and navy (Kronstadt sailors), whose support in October was crucial
- Trotsky – the military revolutionary committee and Red Guards actually carried out the revolution which is more easily interpreted as the work of a minority party with effective tactics, rather than a national rising (involving the peasants) as subsequent Bolshevik propaganda suggested
- the Provisional Government was weakened less by its failure to satisfy the peasants' demand for land than from its decision to continue the war and by its displays of poor leadership, e.g. over the July Days or Kornilov affair.

Students might conclude that the failure to meet peasant demands was an important element in Bolshevik success but that other factors were also of importance and that it was actually the actions of Lenin, Trotsky, and their urban followers in Petrograd that were really crucial to success in October/November 1917.

