

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9697 HISTORY

9697/13

Paper 1, maximum raw mark 100

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870–1914

SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

'Germany was not to blame for the war.' Use Sources A-E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
A	Report by the French Ambassador to his ministry.	A depressing picture of a likely war. The Kaiser and German opinion favour war. The writer's opinion was apparently shared by other diplomats in Russia.	Y – The writer's opinion is shared by most of his diplomatic colleagues. This is unlikely to be completely true but might be mostly valid. N – Is the report of a French official who would see the Kaiser as his country's most dangerous enemy.	Y – E agrees about Germany's war-guilt. N – B, C and D disagree that Germany wanted war.	Y – William II was determined to back Austria after Sarajevo. Y – Austria had backed down in previous Balkans crises but seemed firmer in 1914. Y/N – Candidates might be able to discuss general public opinion.
B	Declaration of war on Russia by Germany.	Germany tried unsuccessfully to mediate in the quarrel between Austria and Serbia. Russian mobilisation threatened German security. Germany was forced to declare war.	Y – Russia's mobilisation was a tipping point for Germany's decision to go to war. N – Germany's willingness to lead negotiations is over-stated. N – Germany had not made every effort to secure peace.	Y – C agrees that Germany was not responsible and D largely acquits Germany. N – A and E have very different views of German intentions before the war.	Y – Russian mobilisation was a major step towards war. Germany assumed that Russia would be slow to mobilise, giving it the opportunity to gain a military advantage. N – Germany had not been enthusiastic about mediation. It did try to keep the Entente countries from being involved.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

C	Memoirs by a leading German admiral.	The German Chancellor and the Kaiser did not want war. France, Russia and especially Britain were responsible for the war.	Y – Germany feared before 1914 that it was being encircled by the countries of the Triple Entente. Y – There is evidence that the Kaiser's confidence was shattered when war broke out. N – The source exaggerates German innocence and the Entente's guilt.	Y – B and D agree that Germany did not want war. N – A and E disagree about Germany's role in beginning war. N – C is the only source to widen criticisms of the Entente countries, especially Britain.	Y – Germany was probably hoping for a long war between Austria and Serbia that would bolster Austria. Y/N – Candidates can discuss the 'encirclement' of Germany by the Entente countries. Y/N – Candidates can expand briefly on some of the causes of tension mentioned in the source, e.g. trade and the Naval Race, but are not expected to discuss all of the stated issues. Y/N – The references to the Kaiser and Bethmann-Hollweg can be expanded.
D	Memoir by a leading British politician.	Nobody, except possibly Berchtold, wanted war. The Kaiser was surprised by developments but was too weak to hold back.	Y – the role of Berchtold was decisive. Y – The writer was a British politician. Writing after the war, he is very unlikely to have wished to acquit Germany. Y – The description of the Kaiser's character might be exaggerated but is not without validity. Y/N – Nobody wanted war? But Y – not on the scale that it happened.	Y – C agrees generally that Germany was not responsible. Y – To a different extent than C, D is aware of the personal shortcomings of the Kaiser. N – A and E disagree about German war-guilt. Y/N – B disagrees about German war guilt but shows a more determined Germany and Kaiser.	Y/N – Candidates are not expected to discuss all European rulers but can expand on their general attitudes to war. Y/N – The personality of William II can be explored further.

E	View of a modern German historian.	Germany deliberately embarked on war to gain world power.	Y – The reference to the diary can be accepted but 'ready for war' is not necessarily an aggressive phrase. Y – Deliberate political decisions were made. Y/N – Candidates can discuss the merits and demerits of a modern German historian's view.	Y – A agrees. N – B, C and D disagree but with some different justifications for their views.	Y – Germany push Austria to take firm action against Serbia after Sarajevo. Y/N – Candidates can explore the alternatives of accident or deliberate choice in the outbreak of war.
---	------------------------------------	---	---	--	---

NB: These responses indicate only one way to analyse and evaluate the passages. Alternative arguments can be proposed as long as they are soundly based.
Key: Y & N, i.e. The source supports or challenges the hypothesis.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES

These answers write generally about the causes of the 1914 war but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information / evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'Germany was not to blame for the war' but will describe events very generally. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis. Alternatively, the sources might be ignored in a general essay answer.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation / interpretation in context.

For example, 'Germany was not to blame for the war. Source B states that Germany was forced to go to war when Russia mobilised and that the Kaiser had been in favour of mediation to solve the crisis after Sarajevo. Source C defends Germany saying that the Kaiser and Bethmann-Hollweg had sought peace, not war. Britain, France and Russia, not Germany, were responsible. Source D was against going to war and that the Kaiser was dragged into it. Berchtold, the Austrian Prime Minister, was mostly responsible.'

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, 'On the other hand, some sources show that Germany was to blame for the war. Source A indicates that the Kaiser did not favour a moderate policy and that German public opinion favoured war. Source E refers to Germany's war aims. Bethmann-Hollweg was in favour of war and the outbreak of World War I was not an accident, but was deliberately caused by Germany.'

L4 BY INTERPRETING / EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'The claim that Germany was not to blame for the war can be challenged by evaluating the sources. Although at first sight Source A might be thought unreliable because it was written by the French ambassador, he refers to diplomats from other countries. He was not alone in his fears about the likelihood of war. He is also correct in assessing the reaction of William II to the assassination at Sarajevo. Source B is a declaration of war in which Germany tried to justify its actions. It is not true that the Kaiser had many strenuous efforts to mediate in the crisis. Tirpitz in Source C was writing in hindsight after Germany's complete defeat in World War I when the victorious allies found that Germany was responsible for war-guilt. It is therefore not objective and he represents Germany as innocent in all the developments that led to war. The Entente countries were not 'solely' to blame for the war. His claim about the archives is not true. Source E gives strong support to the claim that Germany was to blame, especially as it was written by a German historian.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS.

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and to disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that the claim that Germany was not to blame for the war is justified. The strongest evidence is in Source D. Lloyd George, a British minister at the time when the war broke out and later the wartime Prime Minister, might be expected to be very harsh in his criticism of Germany. However, he did not see the conflict as resulting from German war policies. The problem was not that the Kaiser wanted war but that he was too weak to stop it. Berchtold of Austria was the guilty party. Source A shows that Germany was very nervous about the policies of the Triple Entente countries and especially resented British policies. It was on the defensive rather than being the aggressor.'

L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE / SUPPORT IS BETTER / PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES / EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22–25]

For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, 'Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that Germany was to blame for the war, the more convincing view supports the judgement that Germany was responsible. Although Sources A and E are in a minority in the group, they outweigh the others in value. Source A shows that a number of countries were suspicious of Germany's intentions. Source E is a considered verdict that makes convincing points about the decisions made by Germany. The limitation of Source B is that it is very subjective, rather than objective, as a declaration of war. Source C is wide-ranging but it obviously intended to acquit Germany of a charge of war-guilt. It is too extreme in its criticisms of other countries. Source D, although surprising because it was written by a British politician, largely evades the issue of responsibility, except for a brief reference to Berchtold.'

OR

'Although there is evidence in the Sources to support the claim that Germany was to blame for the war, it must not be forgotten that the Sources offer more valid reasons to conclude that it was not to blame. Source D is powerful evidence from a British Prime Minister who was in power during World War I and had every reason to point out Germany's guilt. The Kaiser was muddled when war broke out and did not seek it intentionally. This can be supported by evidence outside the sources, such as the exchange of telegrams between him and Tsar Nicholas II. Germany had genuine fears that it was being overtaken. France had strengthened its army, as had Russia. Britain was the key to the Triple Entente and did not make its intentions known during the Balkans crisis. Germany gambled wrongly that it would not risk involvement in a world war.'

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support / contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, 'An alternative explanation is that although there is evidence in the Sources to support the claim that Germany was to blame for the war, it must not be forgotten that other countries shared the blame. Germany was not solely responsible. The Balkans crisis that led to the outbreak of war initially involved Austria and Serbia, not Germany or the other major powers. All of the leading politicians miscalculated, believing that the crisis could be defused like previous crises. However, Germany was mostly to blame. It encouraged Austria to go to war, knowing that this risked Russian intervention. Germany's attack on Belgium brought in Britain as an ally of France and Russia. A Balkans crisis turned into a world war and Germany was mostly, but not completely, to blame'.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

SECTION B

2 Did Robespierre and the Jacobins do more to save or to endanger the French Revolution?

The key issue is the role of Robespierre and the Jacobins in the French Revolution. Examiners will not look for an equal balance between positive and negative features. Any mark can be awarded for answers that are heavily weighted either way but answers in Bands 1 (21–25) and 2 (18–20) will consider alternatives, even if they are rejected. On the positive side, it can be argued that Robespierre and the Jacobins did much to save the Revolution. They executed Louis XVI and abolished the monarchy, removing one of the most important threats to the revolution. They acted against comparative moderates such as the Girondins who might not have defended the revolution in such a determined manner. Although initially against war with foreign countries, they came to lead the national resistance. Carnot's *levée en masse* transformed the fortunes of the revolutionaries and changed warfare. Their success in bringing severe economic problems under control has sometimes been underestimated. On the other hand, they were very divisive. As long as they were in power, obedience was enforced and there was no conciliation. Suspected as well as real enemies were persecuted. Whilst claiming to defend democracy and the will of the people, Robespierre and his associates became a dictatorship. Terror was a hallmark of the regime. Perhaps 40,000 died. Not only royalists but other prominent figures and supporters of the Revolution were executed. The number of émigrés increased, to include not only overt royalists and clergy but ordinary people who sought to escape the violence. In domestic terms, Robespierre's attack on Christianity itself rather than the Church led to DeChristianisation. This backfired. Robespierre and his colleagues became more isolated. It might be argued that the success of Robespierre and his associates ultimately led to their fall. By 1794, the Revolution was comparatively safe from its foreign enemies. The domestic economy, whilst still problematic, was improving. The Jacobins' manner of government was resented and Robespierre became dispensable.

3 Why did Britain become industrialised before France and Germany?

The key issue is the difference in timing of the Industrial Revolutions in Britain, France and Germany. In terms of balance, the emphasis can be expected to be on Britain but France and Germany can be taken together in terms of weight. 60:40 might merit any mark. Answers that are extremely vague about France and Germany, but where the vagueness is relevant, might be worth up to Band 4 (14–15). Britain had more capital available for investment and people who were willing to make such investments. In France, there was little investment in trade and associated industries. Most money was invested in offices or government loans. Germany lacked money for investment. The position of the vital middle classes was better in Britain. The taxation system enabled profits to be made which could be invested as working capital. The role of inventors was important, not because the British were more intelligent but because there was encouragement for their new devices. For example, steam power was applied earlier in Britain and the railways were at the heart of the Industrial Revolution. Agricultural improvements made for more efficiency and higher production but at the cost of unemployment, forcing people to move to towns. Urbanisation was a telling factor. An increasing population provided labour and markets for produce. Britain did not have more natural resources than parts of France and Germany but they were used more effectively. Easy access to ports and plentiful shipping opened up overseas markets and sources. Britain was affected by war, especially the conflicts with revolutionary France and Napoleon, but the impact was less than in France and Germany. The economy of France was slow to change in the eighteenth century although there were some advances, for example in foreign trade. Revolution and then war impeded industrialisation. After Napoleon, industry struggled to advance, partly because governments and the governing classes were unenthusiastic. Germany was disunited. Some states, such as Prussia, saw significant changes but most remained rooted in traditional economies. The establishment of the Zollverein in 1834 was a turning point. It not only broke down customs barriers but also provided other conditions necessary for industrialisation, for example a common commercial law and currency.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

4 Why did the Revolutions of 1848-49 fail to unify Germany and Italy?

The key issue is the failure of unification in the mid-century revolutions in Germany and Italy. Candidates can organise answers sequentially but there should be an attempt to discuss some common factors in Band 1 (21–25). Band 5 (11–13) will require a basic understanding of the failure of unification in one of the specified countries. Common factors might include the prevailing power of Austria, the lack of concerted nationalist movements and limited support for major political changes. In Germany, many princes immediately reacted by granting constitutions which satisfied many who sought change. The aim was not primarily for unification but for more liberal governments. (Give high credit when candidates appreciate the difference between support for unification and liberalism.) Popular uprisings divided opinion or perhaps reinforced support for traditional authorities. None of the leading states supported unification. Frederick William IV rejected the offer of the German crown with contempt. The Frankfurt Parliament reflected the impotence of the middle classes to achieve change. In Italy, there were similar differences between radicals. Rural peasants and the lower orders in towns had economic priorities rather than political ambitions. Mazzini tried to use the Carbonari, then Young Italy, to drum up support but his followers were always in a small minority. The seizure of Rome and subsequent defeat revealed the limitations of his movement. He was not the paramount leader of the unification movement. Others, such as Manin in Venice, had different ideas. The Roman Catholic Church was also conservative in Germany but the role of Pius IX's papacy in Italy was more important. Italian risings were markedly local in their extent and ambitions. Charles Albert of Piedmont proved an ineffective leader for change. In the end, traditional rulers in most states, backed by Austria's military predominance, turned back the tide of unification, at least for a decade.

5 Assess the problems that 'New Imperialism' caused for European countries by the end of the nineteenth century.

The key issue is problems caused by New Imperialism. This involves consequences more than reasons and candidates need to be careful to link origins with the key issue. The question ends in 1900 but examiners might allow some references immediately after this, for example the Boer War and the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. However, it would not be acceptable to examine the role of Imperialism in causing World War I in 1914. Examiners will look for examples to support general claims but, in this question, the examples might be more European than overseas. However answers should provide some overseas material, for instance, the rivalry in Africa and Asia. Political tensions increased at the end of the nineteenth century and 'New Imperialism' played a part. Imperialism was seen as a sign of prestige and power. Countries sought to take over large areas and even small islands, as in the Pacific. One country's gain was seen as another's loss. Britain and France clashed in north Africa, notably at Fashoda in 1898. Britain and Germany were rivals in southern Africa. In Asia, European countries competed for influence in China and elsewhere. Prestige was involved for France after its defeat by Prussia in 1870. Newly-unified Italy sought an overseas empire in north-east Africa. Knock-on effects were that some countries were dissatisfied by their political gains. The acquisitions of Germany and Italy were obviously less politically useful than those of Britain and France. Imperialism resulted in a feeling that Germany was falling behind Britain and even France. There would be political-military problems in dealing with indigenous peoples. Britain was involved in several wars against the Zulus. Gordon's expedition to Sudan in 1885 was a disaster. Even before the Boxer Rebellion, there were difficulties in China. Economic problems lay in the difference between motives and results. Empire was seen as an opportunity for resources and markets. Some countries were luckier than others in gaining resources. There were some significant advantages in parts of Asia and Africa. Other areas, for example Saharan Africa, produced little of value to Europeans. Markets were of variable value. Sometimes, candidates claim that hope of the migration for surplus population was a cause of imperial expansion. In the event, few moved to European empires.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

6 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Nicholas II's regime at the outbreak of war

The key issue is the condition of Russia on the eve of World War I. Answers do not have to be balanced between strengths and weaknesses but answers in Band 1 (21–25) and most in Band 2 (18–20) will consider both. Less commendable essays might focus only on the problems facing Nicholas II. One of the strengths of the regime was there was no obvious alternative to autocracy. The government was backed by the most of the nobility, there was little resistance by the small middle class, and the peasantry largely accepted tsarism. The government could rely on the backing of the powerful Orthodox Church, the army and the police. Radical groups, including the Bolsheviks, were small in number and under control. Many of their leaders, such as Lenin, were in prison or in internal or external exile. Nicholas II's personal position was strong. However, he represented a weakness because of his hostility to change. He gave little support to reformers such as Witte and Stolypin and wasted the opportunity to win wider support after the 1905 Revolution by insisting on autocracy and ignoring the possibilities offered by the Duma. There were political divisions. The policy of Russification was popular in Russia but other racial groups suffered discrimination that caused unrest. Most candidates will see the economy as a weakness. Still largely agricultural, it was more backward than Britain, France, Germany and even Austria. A series of strikes demonstrated the unrest in society, for example the Lena Gold Fields. However, credit should be given when candidates understand some of the economic improvements in pre-war Russia. External trade increased. More railways were built. Nevertheless, there were few entrepreneurs and the most powerful groups were not interested in developing a modern economy. Some candidates might refer to the military. Whilst the failings were revealed in World War I (after the question), and the war with Japan 1904–05 demonstrated weaknesses in the army and navy, there was massive investment and some modernisation from 1906. However, these improvements had not resulted in significant change by 1914 although the other major countries saw Russia as a potentially powerful military force.

7 'The most important reason for Hitler's popularity in Germany from 1933 to 1939 was propaganda.' How far do you agree with this view?

The key issue is the evaluation of propaganda as a reason for Hitler's popularity. Hitler probably used propaganda more successfully than any other totalitarian ruler although some would put Stalin as his equal. Goebbels, his most faithful and fanatical follower, was employed as Minister for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda. Through him, Hitler dominated newspapers and other forms of publishing, radio, the cinema and a variety of arts such as architecture. Propaganda served two purposes, to represent Hitler's greatness and the Nazis' achievements and, on the other hand, to discredit enemies and alternative views. It allowed crucial developments such as the Night of the Long Knives (1934) and Kristallnacht (1938) to be represented as victories against enemies of Germany. There were also other forms of propaganda. Hitler as Führer was supreme and the Führer Principle meant that he was unchallenged by any section of the state, including the military. The economy was portrayed as enjoying unlimited success. The truths of under-achievement, continuing unemployment and low wages were concealed. Candidates can discuss foreign policy developments to 1939. Propaganda was used to highlight Hitler's achievements in making Germany great again. The question asks whether propaganda was 'the most important reason' for Hitler's popularity. This invites candidates to discuss other reasons. Many of the Nazis' policies had wide support. The dictatorship of the Enabling Act was popular but perhaps partly because of propaganda that exaggerated the threat from communists. However, there was wide support for right-wing policies and the end to the uncertainty of Weimar governments in Germany. Candidates can discuss whether the anti-Semitic policies in the 1930s were popular. Historians differ in their assessments. Other policies that were pursued were undoubtedly popular. These might include rearmament and withdrawal from the League of Nations after demands for equal military status were refused. A risky series of foreign policy initiatives, such as sending soldiers into the demilitarised Rhineland, increased support. The pro-German Saar plebiscite (1935) was popular, as was the Anschluss with Austria (1938). Most Germans probably realised little of the dangers of expansion into eastern Europe and the takeover of Czechoslovakia. Propaganda represented this as the justified reunion of Germans in that region. The question does not ask candidates to examine the limits of support and the extent of opposition. This can be mentioned but is not a major element of the key issue.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697

8 To what extent did Russia become a Marxist country under Lenin and Stalin, to 1939?

The key issue is the extent to which Russia became Marxist by 1939. Answers in Band 1 (21–25) will demonstrate three qualities but not necessarily with equal success. First, and probably most important for this band, there should be a clear understanding of Marxism. However, this can be conveyed briefly within the available time. Candidates might refer to the creation of a classless state, prefaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, after the fall of bourgeois capitalism. Private property and wealth would give way to the economic division of resources according to need. Some aspects of Marxism developed by 1939. Russia / the USSR became a republic. The class system was transformed with the disappearance of the aristocracy and middle class. Lenin attempted to end capitalism in War Communism, which was as much an ideological policy as a response to the civil war. However, he had to take a step back with the New Economic Policy (NEP) when agricultural and industrial production collapsed. Stalin took a tougher line, using state planning to direct all aspects of the economy and curbing all real or imagined survivals of private enterprise. Yet the proletariat did not gain power. Lenin promoted the Bolshevik party, not the proletariat, as the agency of change and power. This was pushed further by Stalin. The purges were justified as a defence of the party against political and economic opponents. The 'dictatorship' of the many became dictatorship by a small minority. In Bands 1 and 2 (18–20 and 21–25) there should be a reasonable balance between Lenin and Stalin. 60:40 either way will be appropriate. However, as always, there might be compensation for some imbalance in a strong and well-supported argument. Moderate candidates might write descriptions which will be accurate in themselves but where the Marxist element will be more implied than explicit. Band 5 (11–13) will need a basic understanding of broadly relevant aspects of either Lenin or Stalin.