



HISTORY

9769/58

Paper 5H Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **13** printed pages.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 3: 8–10 marks**

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 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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 1: 1–3 marks

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.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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 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.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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 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.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 5: 25–30 marks

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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.

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 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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 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.

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>To what extent does Document A corroborate the view of the Russian peasants' attitudes towards Communism in Document E?</p> <p>Similarities: Document E mentions the peasants' resentment of taxes. Document A shows resentment against 'the exploiters' and shortage of bread. Document E mentions the rebellious peasants. Document A confirms that there were fears of them 'breaking away from the authority of the Bolsheviks' and their behaviour, even if the writer sees the outbursts of the 'Kulaks' as indicative of a hostile attitude. Nobody listened and stones were thrown.</p> <p>Differences: Document E suggests initial support, even among the more prosperous, for the overthrow of the Provisional Government and support for the Red Armies because of the fear that the landlords would be reinstated. This support is not in evidence in Document A where: the Communists are seen as ungodly; a communist speaker was heckled; stones were thrown; and, 'everything was sabotaged'. There was little support among the students in the village. As this was during the war in March 1919, this casts some doubt about the generalisations made in Document E.</p> <p>Provenance / explanation: Document A is only one village and may not be typical and also this is a report from a Bolshevik outsider on a meeting in a winter evening, who may not have found a receptive audience for a speech which is full of jargon. The opposing peasants are labelled 'Kulaks' to avoid the conclusion that the peasantry as a whole were hostile. Document E too is written by those not part of the rural community who saw the peasants as backward and unsympathetic to the 'New Civilization' they saw in Russia. The visit was some years after the Civil War and there is some doubt about what access they would have had to peasants. Somewhat stereotyped views of the 'greed' and 'cunning' of the drunken peasants echo the disdain Marx and Lenin, and the urban intellectuals, had for Russian rural life.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the Bolsheviks proceeded cautiously to bring about social and economic change from 1917 to 1924? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E)</p> <p>The background is that the main peasant party was the Socialist Revolutionary Party, but Lenin’s land decree had given the peasants the long-desired ownership of land. However, the needs of civil war had resulted in requisitioning and many in the Party were concerned about the creation of peasant proprietorship as an essentially reactionary policy. But the Bolsheviks needed peasant support.</p> <p>Document A is a meeting in which a commissar attempts to persuade the peasants, using the argument that it is the richer peasants that should be squeezed out and the Bolsheviks stand for the poor. Within this framework there are threats – the proletariat must ‘chase out wolves’. However, at this point the village feels confident enough to treat this Bolshevik outsider quite roughly, so generally the document suggests a certain caution on the part of the Party. This local example is somewhat at variance with the Secret Orders given by the Central Committee, also in 1919, when ‘wholesale terror against wealthy Cossacks and peasants’ was urged in Cossack areas, and there was to be grain confiscation and the importation of settlers protected by army detachments. Though this is directed at areas with particular animosity to Bolshevism and aims at preventing separatism, the policy of confiscation of surpluses was more general. The problem was the ruthlessness towards opposition shown here was not always practicable and Document C was written later in 1920 when civil war was more advanced. The small commodity producers cannot be driven out immediately and Lenin urges the party to live in harmony. This document urges ‘slow, cautious organisational work’ (something that was to be confirmed by the New Economic Policy in 1921). There is no doubt about the long-term strategies and the dangers, but this document is clearly for cautious progress.</p> <p>The same caution is seen in Document D where Stalin looks back on four years during which the Party was ‘obliged to be very tolerant’ in relation to the republics. Typically Stalin was urging a harder line and less tolerance. He himself had been harsh during the Civil War and this was in contradiction to some of the compromises made by Lenin in announcing NEP. It reflected a split in the Party, with Lenin finding Stalin ‘too rude’ by 1923.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p>Document E refers to the compromise of NEP and the inability to deal with the problem caused by peasant individualism, suggesting that the Party had not been allowed to become rebellious. The initial decrees issued by the Bolsheviks regarding nationalism and social equality had suggested more radical change than circumstances had allowed and there was more centralisation of political power than fundamental Marxist change. The key was the mass of peasants who were not forced to lose their surpluses for industrialisation until later.</p> <p>The Revolution had been in the name of the proletariat; but these were still a minority in 1924. The war had reduced large scale industrialisation and though peasants had been forced to hand over food for the Red armies, they had maintained their lands (both Documents A and B refer to wealthy peasants and Lenin accepts the need for compromise with them). Much change remained on the surface, like the renaming of the village in Document A or campaigns against specific groups like the Cossacks in Document B.</p> <p>The sources have to be read with some caution. Document A is an account by a Bolshevik of one area and may be trying to show how difficult matters were. Though Document B indicates a hard line and there is evidence of severe measures being taken in the war; it is a proposal rather than evidence of actions taken. In Document C, Lenin is eager to ensure that concession is ideologically justified by attacking radical policies as 'An Infantile Disorder'. Document D's view that the Bolsheviks were 'very tolerant' may be challenged, as there was quite severe repression of nationalism and Stalin may have been exaggerating to justify harsher actions which would increase his power. Document E is not based on first-hand experience of the period and is from socialists who wanted to see change and were distrustful of rural life.</p>	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Why did Lenin’s ideas about Bolshevism excite so much debate among revolutionaries before 1914?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should present a response to the question which displays an 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 revolutionaries before 1914 were divided and disputatious. With little prospect of power, energies often went into internecine conflict and wars of words about theory.</p> <p>Disputes between the so-called Mensheviks and Bolsheviks in the 1903 Conference in London centred round the nature of the Party – smaller and conspiratorial or mass party. The failure of the 1905 Revolution increased debates about whether Russia was ready for revolution and whether it should be Marxist policy to cooperate with the bourgeois parties in opposition, and in the Duma to create the bourgeois revolution which should be the forerunner of the Socialist Revolution. Peasant policy in this context became the source of contention. Were the peasants a revolutionary proletarian class or should revolution wait until a genuinely industrial proletariat had developed? Trotsky and the Bolsheviks argued with Martov and his supporters about whether revolutionaries had a duty to seize power and about whether the conditions for socialism in Russia were absent in Russia. Lenin opposed traditional Marxists like Plekhanov by arguing that revolution would be in the context of Europe as a whole. Of course, Russia was not developed enough to meet Marx’s requirements, but western Europe was. Lenin saw the Russian revolution in the context of a Socialist revolution in the West. The 1906 Stockholm Conference, though, disagreed about: policy towards peasants; the relationship with the bourgeois parties; participation in the new Dumas; and, whether the Party should support a Red insurrection. The Mensheviks argued that Lenin was veering from Marxism towards ‘Leninism’. He urged keeping the Party away from alliances with the bourgeoisie and ‘parliamentary cretinism’, and despised abandoning the ideal of armed struggle. Lenin rejected reformism and ‘trade unionism’ as distractions from the central ideal of a proletarian revolution. Further disputes occurred in London in 1907. Trotsky aimed to unite the Left. Lenin had no time for ‘conciliationism’ and regarded the Mensheviks as ‘liquidators’. From 1912, the splits became institutionalised.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p>AO2 – Candidates should 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. Lenin's ideas caused so much debate because of their divergence from strict Marxism and the fears that he was developing his own philosophy which could not be underpinned by Marxist theory that revolution was an inevitable process, once the society and the economy had reached a certain stage in development. Lenin's reluctance to concede that a bourgeois revolution was a necessary precursor to socialism, his adherence to armed insurrection and his evasion of issues around the apparent lack of preconditions for socialism in Russia by reference instead to 'world revolution', seemed dangerously unorthodox to many socialists. There were also practical considerations in that 1905 had seen the suppression of a revolution and the power of the Tsarist State seemed overwhelming. More moderate radicals wanted to work with other opposition groups to avoid a repeat. Lenin saw this as pernicious, but offered little prospect of success for his armed revolution. The underground organisation was seen by many as simply dangerous and lawless. Lenin's lack of interest in actual reform conditions, of trade unionism and better conditions set him aside from many on the Left, as did his disputatious manner and his failure to remain in Russia.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Assess the importance of the First World War in bringing about the end of the Tsarist regime in Russia.</p> <p>AO1 – The heavy losses on the Eastern front and the disruption of food and fuel supplies to urban centres as the transport infrastructure was weakened played a major role in discontent. The disappointments of the Brusilov offensive after high initial hopes and the accusations of corruption and inefficiency in government could be analysed. The War took away the Tsar from the capital to the front with a dangerous vacuum being created. The War created the opportunity for potential opposition in the Duma and also led to a loss of confidence about the Tsar's ability at the very top of the Russian leadership.</p> <p>AO2 – The counter view would be that the War merely exposed existing weaknesses and that the failures to sustain a reform programme after 1905 had already doomed the regime. Discontent was rising again prior to the War and the programme of agrarian change was insufficient. Candidates might also consider a view that the supposed inadequacy of Russia to fight the War has been exaggerated and that anti-war groups were not necessarily popular.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Was the October Revolution a popular revolution or a takeover by a minority extremist group?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should present a response to the question which displays an 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 support for the Bolsheviks grew and they did increase membership. The ideas of the April Theses were appealing to many and spread by effective propaganda. However, in Russia as a whole they were a minority and it could be argued that what allowed the Revolution to occur was not mass popular support but the weaknesses of the Provisional Government, especially after the Kornilov Revolt and the failures of the war against Germany. The nature of the takeover and the failure of the Bolsheviks to win a majority in the elections for the Constituent Assembly are indications that the Party launched a minority coup; but there is a debate about the growth in popularity of Lenin and the Bolsheviks.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates should 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 debate: arguments for the Bolsheviks launching a revolution rather than a coup have centred round the following: 1. the Bolsheviks were supported by a majority of the workers. 2. The Bolshevik support among the peasants was growing. 3. The Provisional Government did not have mass support. However, industrial workers were untypical of the whole population, and even in the capital, support was not constant. In the elections in November, the Bolsheviks won 175 seats and the Socialist Revolutionary Party won 370 seats. The promises made of land redistribution and an end to the war did not automatically create support. The SRs had a long tradition as the peasant party and not all Bolsheviks supported the land policy. Also peace was not universally popular. A lack of support for the Provisional Government does not imply a corresponding high level of support for the Bolsheviks. There may have been a vacuum in power between a discredited Provisional Government and a variety of opposition groups. October, unlike February 1917, saw no large scale demonstrations and as Lenin said, he found power lying in the street and picked it up. There is a useful distinction between passive mass acceptance of a change-over in power in the capital and active participation by the masses. No set answer is expected. Responses may discuss factors such as: growing Party membership; the Bolsheviks had gained support for their role in the Kornilov resistance; and, Lenin had a popular policy and was the only major leader not compromised by cooperation with the Provisional Government. On the other hand, it was a coup and evidence of mass enthusiasm seems limited both in October and in the subsequent elections.</p>	30