

AS

History

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

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

Mark scheme

7041

June 2017

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

June 2017

Tsarist and Communist Russia, 1855–1964

AS History 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 the development of Russia in the years c1890 to 1914? **[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 Bromley’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- the extract refers to developments in Russia’s industry and agriculture which were beginning to modernise Russia’s economy during this period
- the Russian economy was subject to ups and downs, but from about 1905 was on an upward path
- accompanying the economic developments the regime carried out some social reforms to benefit workers and peasants.

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

- it is true that Russia ‘was on the threshold of becoming a major industrial power’ because there were major advances in the late nineteenth century, for example in railway building and the oil industry in Baku. Large industries were developing in some cities
- Witte was successful in some respects. He helped to attract vast sums of foreign investment into Russia, which funded developments in industry in particular. The industrial base was strong enough to enable Russia to recover from periodic slumps such as that of the early twentieth century
- where the extract is perhaps less convincing is suggesting that social policies were forward looking: initiatives in areas such as worker insurance and unionisation were limited in impact
- many peasants were still poor and debt-ridden by the twentieth century; and most workers lived in very difficult conditions.

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

- the extract refers to primitive conditions which still prevailed throughout most of Russia at this time
- the economy still faced precarious challenges, because of foreign competition from more advanced economies
- the backwardness was evident in the poverty of most workers and peasants.

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

- although industrial expansion was significant in Russia, Russia actually fell lower in the world industrial rankings among Great Powers by 1914 compared to 20 or so years before, so that although the Russian economy was expanding, it was falling further behind other powers
- rural society did not modernise in most areas of Russia. For example, relatively few peasants out of the total took advantage of the Stolypin reforms designed to allow peasants to consolidate or increase their landholdings
- developments were 'patchy'. For example, most Russian industries remained small scale, and industrial advance was hampered by factors such as lack of an efficient banking system. Labour productivity was low in many Russian factories. Industries without contracts from the government were prone to recession.

Students may conclude that both extracts have some validity in discussing the strengths and weaknesses of Russian development at the time. Extract A puts more emphasis on the positives in both agriculture and industry; while recognising some changes.

Extract B highlights the negative factors which inhibited economic growth. Neither source is 'incorrect' because economic growth had both successes and failures. The Russian economy was in some ways very different in 1914 compared to 1861, but the more successful developments were not yet fully embedded, and the Russian state remained dependent overall on a backward rural economy with patchy examples of modernisation.

Section B

- 02** 'Alexander II's reforms were motivated by his determination to preserve his autocracy in the years 1855 to 1881.'

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 Alexander’s reforms were motivated by his determination to preserve his autocracy in the years 1855 to 1881 might include:

- the Tsar knew that the long-term future of his regime might well depend on reforms to strengthen the state and repair the weaknesses exposed by Russia’s defeat in the Crimean War
- the abolition of serfdom was recognised as a pre-condition for other reforms, such as of the military, in order to strengthen Russia
- reforms to taxation, local government, education, the judiciary etc were heavily influenced by the desire to create a stronger and more efficient state
- Alexander was committed to the autocracy and made it clear that reform was partly designed to reduce the likelihood of ‘revolution from below’.

Arguments challenging the view that Alexander’s reforms were motivated by his determination to preserve his autocracy in the years 1855 to 1881 might include:

- there is some evidence that Alexander’s ‘liberal’ education made him enthusiastic for a certain amount of reform based on ‘enlightened’ principles
- the Tsar retained some reforming enthusiasm until about 1865, and measures such as the zemstva were as much about improving the quality of local government as about strengthening his own position
- economic and financial initiatives were as much about stimulating economic progress as ensuring political stability
- despite evidence of reaction in the 1860s, there is evidence of Alexander considering a measure of political reform shortly before his death.

Overall, students may consider that maintaining the autocracy was the most important factor influencing Alexander II’s policies, but they may also concede that to a greater or lesser extent he was also influenced by other considerations; and it may be that political, economic, humanitarian, military and social motives were all closely intertwined.

- 03** ‘The policies of Alexander III, in the years 1881 to 1894, greatly weakened the Russian Empire.’

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 Alexander III's policies, in the years 1881 to 1894, greatly weakened the Russian Empire might include:

- by the late 19th century the Russian Empire already comprised over 100 ethnic groups with their own religions, cultures and so on – and so the Tsarist policy of seeking administrative and legal uniformity over the whole empire was almost bound to create tensions – particularly as the Russians found themselves in an overall minority
- the policy of Russification intensified the tensions, since groups or nationalities such as the Ukrainians, who had previously been treated leniently, in response to Alexander's policies formed their own nationalist and even revolutionary organisations. Several Jews were driven into opposition and revolutionary groups
- Russification also caused resentment amongst Finns, Latvians, Lithuanians, Armenians, Georgians and others, and such resentment contributed to nationalist risings during the 1905 Revolution
- Alexander's repressive policies and reliance on hard-line ministers like Pobedonostsev, meant that his father's reforms were not completed (e.g. some of the legal and educational reforms were reversed), local initiative was stifled and opposition to the regime developed inside Russia as well as throughout the Empire.

Arguments challenging the view that Alexander III's policies, in the years 1881 to 1894, greatly weakened the Russian Empire might include:

- despite the potential for disruption, many of the nationalist or ethnic groups lacked the leadership or resources to cause too much trouble to the Empire, and the various groups rarely attracted a mass following
- periodically the regime did make concessions to some groups, e.g. Galicians were given a measure of home rule – which averted more threats. Some minorities gained economic benefits from being in the Empire, and even many Poles accepted the regime
- Alexander III kept the peace through his foreign policy and economic development, especially in industry and the railways, was promoted – the beginnings of modernisation?
- opposition to Alexander's regime inside Russia was not abolished, but it was contained and the regime appeared to be strong.

Overall, students may conclude that Alexander III's policies brought mixed blessings to the Empire. On the surface his regime brought stability at home, a largely peaceful foreign policy, some economic progress and a series of measures which benefited many nobles, peasants and workers. However, some of the benefits were short-term, and other policies might be regarded as promoting longer-term weaknesses and even helping to lay the foundations of revolution, as early as 1905. The regime's attempts to enforce Orthodoxy, autocracy and other aspects of Russian culture on minorities, the continued backwardness of many aspects of Russia, and the treatment of political dissent, all helped to weaken Russia and its Empire in the longer-term.