

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/71

Paper 5j (Special Subject: Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

Nominated topic: Economic and Social Changes, 1917–1924

- 1 (a) How far is the view of the impact of Bolshevik rule on the working class in Document A corroborated by the view expressed in Document C? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. A and C agree on enslavement – A refers to the ‘greater enslavement’ of the Bolsheviks, while C speaks of ‘arbitrary rule and exploitation’ which life confirms is their fate. A is more explicit about the role of the police, with the Cheka inheriting the Tsarist police’s role. A refers also to the hangman’s noose and C refers to arbitrary rule. A is more hopeful in that despite the repression, the working class can still have its elected soviets and smash the Bolshevik policeman’s truncheon. This in contrast to C, which sees no possible role for the proletariat. The thrust of C is more towards the political impact rather than merely maltreatment of the workers. There is reference to dominance by a new bourgeoisie and resentment at NEP-men and the emergence of a Kulak class. Its main complaint is that the change in direction has weakened the working class, whereas A is more about the impact of War Communism, forced labour and dictatorship. In contrast to C it complains about state capitalism, not the return to a bourgeois capitalism. The circumstances have changed between the two documents – A is a fighting appeal by the men of Kronstadt in open revolt against the War Communism and dictatorship of Bolshevik rule. The very premise of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is criticised. C on the other hand is from a pure Marxist viewpoint after the suppression of the Kronstadt rising and the concession made by Lenin in introducing NEP which some in the party thought an unacceptable ideological retreat. A is in the thick of revolt in Russia; C is from exile and is not offering a revolution but a protest against ideological impurity.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Lenin was forced into ideological retreat when he introduced NEP in 1921?

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. The debate is on whether Lenin merely reacted to the pressure of widespread peasant revolts, a resistance movement in the factories and the Kronstadt revolt to retreat, or whether in terms of strict Marxist theory, a period of capitalist development was necessary to create the preconditions for a socialism which he had already imposed. Lenin was careful not to offer any political concessions and kept the ban on factions and a high level of repression and control in place. His own justification given in D, is that Russia needs to catch up with its own revolution and therefore NEP is not really a retreat from socialism but a way to achieve it. Despite agreeing with Napoleon that a certain pragmatism is necessary – a sort of wait and see - he is clear in his goal: the 'quest for Socialism'. C disagrees and sees the growth of a new bourgeoisie which has merely confused the proletariat in whose name Lenin has taken power. The party and now the economic elite has formed a new middle class. The Kulaks have arisen in the villages and the revolution has been compromised, by implication, by a pragmatic policy which has sacrificed ideology. A sees the failure to meet working class needs as predating NEP and it is this opposition which some have seen as the key to Lenin's policy. If the working class did feel exploited and betrayed and he was facing the sort of opposition seen in A, then Lenin had to do something. Candidates may know the vital importance of Kronstadt in the Revolution (though the sailors of 1921 were not the same people as the revolutionaries of October). The reliance on revolutionary terror mentioned in A had not achieved its aims and so Lenin was forced to modify his policies. Lenin supports this in B, in contrast to D, by offering a purely pragmatic defence – it is necessary for a measure of limited capitalism to help the great mass of peasants and to boost trade and the economy. Even to the party, Lenin does not attempt to hide the fact that he has been forced to concede – he says we 'must accept' - a measure of capitalism. This document is before he has had time to justify the policy ideologically – it is very close to the Kronstadt rising and to the massive disturbances at Tambov. It reflects a real fear that the Bolsheviks will follow the Tsars if they, too, fail to make concessions. E, on the other hand, shows that Lenin was aware of the type of criticisms made in C from the safety of exile. Candidates may know that in Marxist theory political and economic change are linked. Once bourgeois capitalism emerges so will bourgeois democracy in classic Marxism. In order to forestall that, repression and political control are necessary. So in one way Lenin was subverting Marxism and in another way showing his knowledge of and belief in it. There is plenty of evidence for the continuation of terror and every reason to suggest that NEP was only going to be a temporary measure. Stalin had the repressive wherewithal to overturn it after 1928 and, as C shows, the potential support of 'pure' Marxists.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

2 Assess the view that the Tsarist reforms between 1905 and 1911 were ‘too little, too late’. **[30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. There is a well-established debate here. There are those who see the October Manifesto, the creation of the Dumas, the attempts to create a stable conservative landowning class and to instate military and administrative reforms as too limited and too late to preserve Tsarism. Others point to the high level of economic change; the greater military organisation and power; the attempt of the Tsar to have a national parliament and the limitation of opposition as signs that reforms might well have given stability to the regime had not war intervened. There was certainly very rapid industrial growth and some take up of Stolypin’s opportunities for peasant proprietorship. Against this, urban conditions for workers were bad and Russian peasants remained committed to older methods, desiring a large scale repartition rather than capitalist farming reforms. The history of the Dumas was not very encouraging and Stolypin depended heavily on repression. Much depends on the long-term potential for development that these changes offered and whether, under a more progressive or intelligent Tsar, they might well have led to the regime being strengthened. The war showed the limitations of change, but Russia sustained very large scale campaigns, showed that the regime could survive war and engender support, at least for the first part of the war, if not in the long term, and that industry could cope with huge demands- if not as smoothly as that of Germany and Britain.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There is not a completely clear cut case here for all the reforms failing, though candidates may conclude that they could not arrest the long-term decline of the monarchy, especially when the Tsar failed to see the need for change and when the reforms had a lot of limitations. Better answers will show a balanced judgement and be supported by knowledge of the achievements and limitations of changes after 1905. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

3 To what extent was the ideology that Lenin had developed by 1917 a betrayal of Marxism? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The key text here may be *What is To be Done* (1902), arguing against the ‘economists’ and for the challenge to state power to be led by a vanguard party of professional revolutionaries to lead the working class, which was instinctively socialist, to a socialist consciousness. Secret organisation was vital to run alongside the mass movement. Lenin had argued in *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* of 1899 that Russia had entered the capitalist phase of Marx’s taxonomy. In 1905 in *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* he took the view that the revolution would be directed by ‘a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry’. This veered from orthodox Marxist theory that a democratic bourgeois phase must precede the dictatorship and that the proletariat not the peasantry was the engine of Marxist revolution. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* of 1916 argued that capitalism had changed from competitive to monopoly capitalism and this would lead to war and revolution and so open the way for immediate socialist revolution. In 1917, in *The State and Revolution*, Lenin appeared to be suggesting a less violent form of revolutionary proletarian dictatorship before the state withered away. He rejected parliamentary representative democracy and hoped for a revolutionary commune. The role of the party would be less important. In practice, Lenin reverted to his earlier ideas of the powerful vanguard and a pragmatic alliance with the peasantry; he did not follow orthodox Marxist theory which argued that true socialism can only come after the bourgeois revolution. He diverged from Marxism on a number of points, but the debate is whether he developed Marxism in the light of the needs of Russia and a belief in the changing nature of capitalism but kept its essential ideas or whether Marxism was merely adapted for the purposes of more easily gaining power, betraying its true historical sense and the theory of development which meant that revolution would only need to be accompanied by the minimum of violence. The discussion might centre on ideas of the role of the Party – which were not developed in Marxism which believed that revolution was inevitable once the ‘nodal point’ of economic and social development had been reached. Without this conspiracies were irrelevant. Also, as Marx did not envisage revolution taking place in largely agricultural and semi-feudal societies like Russia, attempts to offer a form of Marxism which offered hope to the Russian proletariat, limited as it was, were a form of intellectual betrayal but might be defended in emotional or political terms. Much hangs on the view in *Imperialism* of capitalism developing in a way unforeseen by Marx, but anticipated in a way by his view of its contradictory and destructive character. If capitalism had changed, the socialist theory also needed to change. However, as Marxism is predicated on a given view of historical development, then it comes close to betrayal to question that view by the sort of analysis that Lenin offered. Lenin’s views were as opposed by Marxists as they were by conservatives and much depends on how his ideas are interpreted as to what view is to be taken. No set answer is looked for, rather an understanding of the intellectual issues. Ironically, before the Revolution Lenin seemed to be moving towards a view that was less violent and repressive than the limited dictatorship of the proletariat suggested by Marx.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Better answers will go beyond a series of explanations of Lenin’s ideas to a sustained judgement of their relationship with classic Marxism and a discussion of whether they were in the true revolutionary spirit of Marx and merely updated the ideas and adapted them to Russia, bearing in mind that Lenin did not think in terms of Russia being an isolated revolutionary state but of revolution spreading throughout the world. The alternative is to see ideas being manipulated in the pursuit of power by pragmatic means and then justified by specious applications of selective theories of Marxism. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	71

4 How valid is the judgement that Kerensky was more responsible for the October Revolution than Lenin? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The discussion here centres on whether Kerensky failed to initiate vital changes quickly enough – the establishment of a constitution, agrarian reform, changes in urban and factory conditions and the negotiation of a peace with Germany, leaving the Bolsheviks to isolate and play on key grievances (Peace Bread and Land) . There is also his personal ambition which may have undermined confidence in him among potential political supporters and his actions in the Kornilov affair. It could be argued that these key weaknesses, rather than anything special that Lenin brought, were the key. Lenin was not in the capital for long periods from February; he did not advocate revolution at the optimum time; he did not necessarily command complete support in the party; he may have miscalculated in June. However, against this it was Lenin who had adapted Bolshevik ideology in such a way that taking power was not seen as mere ‘putschism’ but in line with a modified Marxism; he isolated key elements that would get support; he saw the importance of the Soviets and of remaining ‘uncontaminated’ by the failures of the Provisional government; he saw the need for rapid action in the aftermath of the Kornilov affair and had important leadership status in the party.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. There are many factors to do with both Kerensky and Lenin, and better answers will try to evaluate the importance rather than merely offering a series of explanations; they will also see that there were links between Kerensky’s supposed failings and the way that Lenin took advantage of them. Balanced answers will look critically at different aspects. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.