
HISTORY**9769/58**

Paper 5h Special Subject: Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

May/June 2016**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 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

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.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

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.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

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.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

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.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

Section A

- 1 (a) **How far is the policy of Tsar Nicholas II as stated in Document A undermined by his policy outlined in Document B?** [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 come as declarations from the Tsar. There is the similarity that both say that laws need the approval of the Duma; A refers to civil freedoms and B confirms this to an extent by reference to the right to organise societies and unions and also religious freedom.

Differences

A says that the Tsar will be bound by laws and will not act in an arbitrary way, but B suggests an autocrat answerable only to God. B is about the powers of the Tsar and A, while not specifically reducing these, puts emphasis on the rights of the subjects. The freedom of conscience, speech and assembly in A is limited in B by societies and unions not being for purposes contrary to law – and the law is what the Tsar decides. The tone of the two documents is very different.

Provenance

As A says, the motivation for this declaration is concern about disturbances, and the need to divide the revolutionaries by making concessions which will appeal to the middle classes is clear. By 1906, the immediate danger of revolution is over and the tone and intention are different. Now it is to reassert the power of the Tsar at a time when royal authority under Stolypin was making a comeback.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the changes made by the Tsar's regime from 1905 to 1911 reduced the threat of revolution? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to the documents in this set (A–E).** [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.

The debate is whether the measures taken as a result of 1905 offered enough concessions and change to stabilise the regime or whether they merely increased the chances of revolution by their insufficiency or unintended consequences. A might be seen to support the former. The demands of the moderate liberals of the Zemstva for constitutional freedoms and a new state Duma and the declaration that Russia would be a state in which government was bound by its own laws seemed likely to divided the Liberals from more radical groups and nationalists which did threaten a unity which both Tsar and Liberal opinion believed in.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

However, by 1906 the tone had changed as Document B shows and the history of the Dumas did not fulfil the hopes of Document A with changes to franchise and limited powers.

However, the counter view is that B did not actually remove the Dumas or negate all rights. There was a lot of legislation passed in the period 1906–1911 even if Russia did not achieve a government responsible to parliament. If A does not indicate the true state of liberalism from 1906 to 1911, B does not entirely represent a retreat from the idea of state with more freedom and more consultation. From an English perspective, the Duma did not progress – the message of the cartoon is that it was only going backward. However, despite the disappointing start in 1906, the Duma did continue, did pass reforming legislation and had some potential for development. In 1906, however, with the clear statement of autocracy and the short lived and manipulated meetings of the Duma, the cartoon has some justification.

D reflects the other strand of Tsarist reform, the agrarian changes of Stolypin. The repression mentioned by Lenin could be said either to have built up resentment and undermined stability or to have restored Tsarist order to the countryside. As there was limited political awareness among the peasants, it could be said that a brutal reinstatement of authority together with Stolypin's reforms, increasing freedom, loans and a class of peasant proprietors offered more chance of stability than Lenin suggests. Discussion may hinge on the extent to which the peasantry took advantage of the ability to create larger independent farms and the continuing demands for land in the face of rising population and rising market opportunities. Lenin was concerned about Stolypin as both saw economic factors as key to revolution.

E presents the alternative view, but may be somewhat optimistic. The Stolypin era did little for the industrial workers and in the end the regime fell because of the agitation in the cities. However, the rural masses were slow to offer much support to the Bolsheviks and in the long run the Soviet regime had to go to war with them in a more brutal way than Stolypin's Black Hundreds.

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

Section B

2 Why was there so little effective resistance in Russia to both the revolutions of 1917? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – 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.

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 discriminating element is likely to be the explanation of ‘so little’ resistance and effective comparison between the revolutions. The Tsar, by 1917, had lost the support of his forces in big urban centres and the regime had lost credibility with the Russian elites because of wartime losses, the influence of Rasputin and the Empress and the Tsar’s ineffectual presence with his forces instead of running the government. The rising prices, shortages and hardships of war had left limited desire to defend the regime. By October, the wartime grievances had meant that the Provisional Government had limited support. The new element was a sense of disappointment in the nature and pace of change. If relatively few were enthusiastic Bolsheviks, there was little desire to defend Kerensky and resistance did not build up until later when the consequences of revolution were more apparent.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

3 Was the Civil War won mainly because of the ruthlessness of the Bolsheviks? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – 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.

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 here is weighing the determination of the Bolshevik leadership against the weaknesses of its opponents. Trotsky's armies were tightly controlled; there was requisitioning of supplies for the armies at the expense of rural needs; discipline in factories was harsh and took precedence over more idealistic ideas of worker democracy; brutal repression of enemies was the order of the day, including the murder of the royal family. Yet ruthlessness alone was not the only explanation. Bolshevik propaganda and persuasion were effective: there were concessions to the peasants; the hopes of building a new world offered genuine inspiration; and Lenin's leadership was more than just that of a brutal dictator. Trotsky, too, was inspirational. In addition, the Whites were divided and did not offer clear policies which would have benefited workers and peasants. Foreign intervention was often unpopular and the geographical location of the Red areas in central Russia with its industrial areas and better farmland was more beneficial than the scattered locations of the Whites.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	58

4 What best explains the introduction of the New Economic Policy?

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – 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.

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 justification by Lenin of the policy was in ideological terms. Marxism demanded a certain degree of social and economic development which the 1917 Revolution had had to 'jump'. Now a degree of capitalism was necessary, but the Bolshevik state would continue to hold the key areas of the economy and there would be no political change which would betray the workers in whose name the revolution had taken place. This did not seem convincing to many in the party who saw simply an ideological retreat in the face of rising unrest now that the worst of the war was over. The requisitioning had undermined the promises made to the peasants in November 1917 and the ideals of worker democracy in the factories had been sacrificed to the need for maximum production to fight the war. The grievances of workers and some elements of the armed forces had produced the so-called Kronstadt mutiny and there was a distinct opposition within the party to the sacrifice of all ideals to maintaining power. The discussion will be between expediency based on the idea of maintaining power at all costs; adapting a severe wartime policy which had had to be introduced but was contrary to Bolshevik ideas; the implementation of a considered ideologically-based policy.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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