



---

# AS HISTORY 7041/1H

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2019

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

---

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. <b>Always</b> provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

## 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, i.e. 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.

## Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

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

#### Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of Russification in the reigns of Alexander II and 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.**

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

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

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

- Alexander III’s reign (from 1881 – i.e. the 1880s) brought about a new state policy – that of administrative and cultural Russification
- Alexander II had not engaged in systematic Russification and had even granted concessions to national minorities
- Alexander III’s reign, by contrast, brought the persecution of those previously protected or given concessions, such as the Baltic Germans, Jews and Finns.

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

- Alexander III’s intensive Russification of the Baltic Germans, 1885–89 (in administration, schools, university, police force, judicial system) and elsewhere – Belorussia, Georgia, Ukraine, Siberia and the east and forced conversions to Orthodoxy provides support
- Alexander II’s concessions – decrees permitting Latvian/Estonian conversions to Lutheranism; attitude to Finns, whose Diet was encouraged by Alexander II – then systematically weakened under Alexander III; concessions to Jews to live outside the Pale – provide support
- Alexander’s swift and severe repression of Polish Revolt would challenge the interpretation.

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

- changes in attitudes towards National minorities began in 1855 and continued through the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III
- Russification was determined by the need for control. This developed from 1855 and more particularly in Alexander II’s ‘later years’ and beyond
- manifestations of non-Russian nationality were prohibited by decrees – of which there are examples from 1863 onwards.

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

- Alexander II’s aggressive behaviour towards Poland in 1863 and the attempts at assimilation after the rebellion – which also extended to schools being forced to teach in Russian, together with the increased intolerance of the regime in the 1870 provides support
- the greater influence (under Alexander III) of cultural Russification (curbing ethnic folk customs, literature and heritage) together with expressions of racial superiority – as taught by Pobedonostsev – provides challenge
- the Jewish pogroms of 1881–84 and May Laws of 1882 launching new anti-Semitic persecution would challenge the interpretation.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might conclude that Extract A offers the more convincing interpretation, since there is plenty of evidence to support a strengthening of Russification under Alexander III. However, an argument can certainly be made for some continuity of policy and a suitably substantiated case could be made in favour of the interpretation given in Extract B.

**Section B**

- 02** 'In the years 1890 to 1905, liberal opposition was more challenging to the autocracy than the opposition of radical groups.'

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 suggesting that in the years 1890 to 1905, liberal opposition was more challenging to the autocracy than the opposition of radical groups, might include:**

- liberal opposition thrived in the zemstva; influence increased in wake of government incompetence during the Great Famine (1891–2), Alexander III's attempts to reduce zemstvo powers and Nicholas II's dismissal of the 1895 petition for a national advisory body as 'senseless dreams'
- liberal opposition grew in the wake of industrialisation and was strengthened by the levels of education, wealth and status of its supporters, e.g. town leaders, lawyers, teachers, industrialists and students. By 1900 it had a broad support base
- united behind a definite/realistic programme for a constitutional monarchy (appealing to influential supporters) and nationally organised, e.g. the Beseda Symposium (1900), 1903 Union of Liberation, 1904 society banquets. Nicholas' promise of a consultative assembly in 1905 shows the extent of their influence
- radical groups were more disparate (with splits between and within the major groupings), lacking in funds, leaders in powerful positions and without a single unifying programme.

**Arguments challenging the view that, in the years 1890 to 1905, liberal opposition was more challenging to the autocracy than the opposition of radical groups might include:**

- radical groups presented a greater challenge because of their Marxist-inspired ideas; they wanted the complete transfer of political authority from autocracy to the people with political revolution leading to social reorganisation
- Radicalism grew enormously with the emergence of the Social Democrats (SD Party 1898) and Social revolutionaries (SR Party, 1901); the former had a power base among the working classes of the major cities, the latter, potentially more worrying, had large peasant membership as well as urban working class. The activities of the Tsarist secret police in countering radical groups suggests the extent of challenge they posed
- radical SRs organised 2000 political assassinations 1901–05 including: Minister of Education, Bogolepov, 1901, Ministers of internal affairs, Spiyagin, 1902 and Plehve, 1904, Grand Duke Sergei, 1905. Both stirred discontent in cities and played an active part in the 1905 Revolution (SR – combat division; SD – St Petersburg Soviet 1905 which directed a General Strike and helped force concessions from Tsarist government.)
- Liberals had little political influence before 1905 (ignored by Tsarist autocracy) and were easily won over in that year. Radicals offered a stronger challenge, maintained the pressure and refused to be reconciled by half-hearted promises.

Students could provide a case for or against this proposition, but whichever way they choose to argue, they should show some awareness of the differences between these two opposition groups and their strengths/weaknesses and successes/failures. Some analysis of the meaning of 'autocracy', and what 'challenge' meant, might also be seen in good answers.

**03** 'In the years 1894 to 1914, the Russian nobility lost most of its power and influence.'

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 suggesting that in the years 1894 to 1914, the Russian nobility lost most of its power and influence might include:**

- continued erosion of nobles' wealth – particularly as many estates were mortgaged (following emancipation losses); debt and bankruptcy continued to increase; failure of many nobles to make profitable investments (shunning industry and modern agricultural practices) worsened the situation
- growth of middle class (businessmen and professionals) challenged traditional leadership status of nobility; middle class had increasing economic power and became a prominent voice in the zemstva, town dumas and (from 1906) the State Duma
- non-nobles increasingly involved in government, e.g. Sergei Witte who had made a career in business and railway administration; the establishment of elected Duma government after 1905 and the emergence of political parties further challenged the traditional role of nobility as political leaders
- economic change in favour of industry at the expense of agriculture weakened the economic status of the nobility and created a more complex society in which the nobility lost out comparatively.

**Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1894 to 1914, the Russian nobility lost most of its power and influence might include:**

- much of the nobles' former wealth was retained: there was no redistributive taxation or measures taken against landed wealth; nobles' land bank provided cheap loans to nobility
- until and beyond 1914, Russia had an agriculturally based economy (and industry represented only 20% national income). This kept economic power in the hand of the land-owning nobility
- nobles wielded a good deal of power in the zemstvo – encouraged by Nicholas II who, for the most part, continued to appoint nobles as advisers and ministers – e.g. Pyotr Stolypin
- nobles acted as Provincial governors and vice-governors in each province; each district had a noble assembly meeting annually; 1906 Meeting of 'united nobility' showed solidarity in resistance to change.

Students should be able to link their knowledge of developments in Russia – economic and political as well as social – to the status of the nobility and thus provide a judgement on the degree of change and continuity experienced by this class. The focus should be on the nobility, rather than the increased importance of other groups, although this information can also be made relevant, as indicated above.