

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 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 2014 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 2014	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 met.

Question 1 (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 2014	9769	71

Question 1 (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 a 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 2014	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 met.

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 2014	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 2014	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 2014	9769	71

Nominated topic: The Revolutions of 1917

- 1 (a) To what extent does Document B challenge the views of Document A about the nature and aims of a possible Bolshevik revolution? [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. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities: Both share a view that there should be revolutionary change and Kamenev says that Lenin was right to submit his ideas – implying a shared way of moving forward. He praises Lenin for submitting a ‘very concise’ understanding of current events and there is no challenge in **B** to the demands for confiscation, nationalisation or Soviets of poor peasants.

Differences: The two differences are about the war – **B** rejects Lenin’s criticisms of the policy of the Bolsheviks to the war – the ‘revolutionary defencism’ referred to in **A** and for Lenin, but not for Kamenev, the war is bourgeois and capitalist and should not be supported. The other disagreement is about the nature of the revolutionary situation. For **B** the bourgeois revolution has not been completed, so the aim of an immediate socialist revolution is invalid. For Lenin there has been a transition to the classic Marxist stage of the bourgeois revolution, and the conditions justify moving to the proletarian and (conveniently poor) peasant revolution.

Provenance: The April theses are a statement by Lenin soon after his return to Russia from Swiss exile. He had not been in Russia to witness and understand the nature of the events from February, whereas Kamenev was writing from a different perspective – not the great ideologue but a revolutionary leader working in the reality of the political changes after February. **A** is a declaration and **B** a response in the official newspaper

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	71

1 (b) How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents for the view that, in 1917, Lenin was an effective and visionary revolutionary leader? [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each, although, depending on 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 and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in 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 different historical interpretations is to be expected.

A and **C** take the view of Lenin offering a vision of ideologically justified and immediate action which wins over the party and the workers and holds the socialist banner aloft. **B** and **E** suggest much less effective persuasion of the party and much less clear vision. **D** suggests a personal failure to take responsibility and lead from the front.

A could be seen as visionary, having the confidence to unite proletarian and poor peasant as a justification for socialist revolution in terms of Marxist theory; having a vision of peace and socialism. Was it effective? Some may see the policy of ‘peace, bread and land’ effectively marking out the differences between the Bolsheviks and the other groups and playing on fears and discontents about the war. Others may see **B** as perhaps less visionary but more effective. Many did not want an immediate end to the war at any cost, and it was more realistic to see Russia in a stage of transition than in a state where a minority could take power in the name of the ‘proletariat’, however defined. **C** sees the results of effective leadership in the growth of the Bolsheviks in terms of membership and influence. The ideological stance of **A** is seen in the banner being held aloft by socialism. Kamenev is seen as maintaining his opposition but the majority of the party and of the workers being swayed by Lenin – signs of an effective leadership with a vision of revolution. However, this is hardly an objective source and by 1930 Lenin’s reputation was very high.

A more jaundiced view is taken by one of Lenin’s political enemies – an SR. Lenin has not here been an effective leader, leaving ‘the sheep’ and earning the contempt of many. Lenin is seen as ‘the real culprit’ of the July Days and lacking in real vision by misjudgement and subsequent flight. A Soviet view might be that Lenin needed to prevent himself being arrested and to keep himself free to rally his forces by effective and visionary leadership later. The suppression of enemies to the left by 1922 may explain the bitter tone of this.

In contrast to **C**, **E** suggests the party was not so enamoured of Lenin’s plans and the ideology which underpinned them. Here the skill lies more with Trotsky and the view is that Lenin lacked insight into what would be acceptable. Pipes is well known for his hostile view of Lenin, and this could be challenged by the growth of popular support and the low esteem in which the Provisional government was held after the Kamenev incident and the losses in the war.

Contextual knowledge should be used to test both views. Was Lenin realistic in opposing war and proposing the seizure of power by a relatively small and unrepresentative party which was divided and led by a man who had been long out of Russia and was known for his disputatious and rancorous attitudes? Or did Lenin show a considerable insight into the situation – keeping the Bolsheviks apart from other groups, allowing them to be the beneficiaries of government unpopularity, risking a coup and reaping the benefits of daring and vision?

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	71

- 2 'The 1905 Revolution failed mainly because of the disunity of the Tsar's opponents.' [30]
Discuss.

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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. Though a culmination of discontents, the revolution of 1905 could be seen as lacking a single focus other than hostility to autocracy. The demands of peasants, workers, intellectuals, regional and religious groups were possibly too diffuse to be effective against a Tsarist regime which recovered after the low points of defeat against Japan and the effects of Bloody Sunday.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The view that disunity was the major cause of failure might consider the willingness of some revolutionary groups to accept concessions, the concerns of the liberal middle classes about the violent revolutionary activities in the major cities, and the fears of peasant unrest in the countryside. As the Tsar made concessions, social conservatism and the fears of the break-up of the Empire divided those who had united in opposition to a failing and rigid autocracy. The relative importance of the change in context with the end of the war and of the policy of concessions by the Tsar in acceding the October Manifesto and the reassertion of royal authority as revolution receded with the Fundamental laws and increasing repression and control of the Duma must be set against disunity. Better answers will weigh factors and not merely offer a series of reasons for the failure of 1905.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 2014	9769	71

3 'It was the First World War alone that brought about the fall of Tsarism.' How valid is this view? [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The Tsarist regime had long-term problems: the Tsar was not an able ruler; despite economic growth Russia was still backward economically and there were discontents in fast-growing industrial cities and on the land. There was disillusion with the operation of the constitutional concessions and Russification and anti-Semitism had produced resentments. Though a long way from taking power, revolutionary and terrorist groups were widespread.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The issue is whether the long-term problems would have brought down the dynasty by themselves. The war brought very large casualties and revealed inadequacies of military leadership and of supply. However, it did generate some cooperation between industrial leaders and the state; it did give rise to some military innovation; Russia did sustain heavy fighting for an extended period and there was still support for the war in the summer of 1917.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	71

4 How important was Trotsky's contribution to the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War? [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. From March 1918, Trotsky headed the two bodies responsible for the war effort, the Military Soviet and the All-Russian Collegiate. He ensured less in-fighting and he took a pragmatic not a party line, introducing conscription which raised 540 000 troops by August 1918, against the orthodoxy of a worker army he recruited peasants and ex-Tsarists. He ended soldiers committees and restored strict, even draconian, military discipline. His new army groups recovered the Volga region late in 1918. He relied on skilled commanders like Tukachevsky and his visits to the front in a special train raised morale. Punishment for unauthorised retreat was severe. The transfer of 30 000 men to the key Volga front was a crucial decision. There was also a major propaganda campaign to support the troops. Mass execution of enemies displayed a new ruthlessness.

The successful defence of Kazan and counter attacks to take the Volga region were the turning point of the war. He rejected ideas of a people's militia and supported a disciplined Red Army, overcoming internal criticism in 1919. Frunze stemmed White attacks in the East in spring 1919 and Trotsky was astute enough to transfer men to the disintegrating Southern front. He developed a Red cavalry force and rushed to lead the defence of Petrograd in September 1919, inspiring the defence and also ensuring reinforcements came from Moscow. Having rejected his strategy for dealing with the Volga front, the party adopted it and it proved successful. Strict control of resources by the War Commissariat under Trotsky was important throughout – strict discipline met problems of industrial absenteeism, weak transport and unreliable raw material supply. The strength of the Red Army by 1920 was five and a half million. A Revolutionary Labour Army had been created by 1920 and he hoped to apply this militarisation of the economy to later developments.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. In assessing importance, candidates could point to the opposition Trotsky faced through the dislike he engendered but also to advantages – geographical, the control of central Russia and the major cities, the divisions of the Whites, the weaknesses and unpopularity of foreign aid to the Whites, and the geographical divisions of the different White armies.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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.