

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2009 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9697 HISTORY

9697/12

Paper 12, 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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2009 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

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. In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the 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 making at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

Section A: The Origins of World War I, 1870 – 1914

Source-based question: Analysis and Evaluation

- 1 *'The Serbian government was to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I.'* 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	Message from Serbian Prime Minister and Foreign Minister to Serbian embassies.	Serbia is not to blame for the crisis. Serbia has condemned the Sarajevo assassination. Serbia has tried to control terrorist groups. The assassins were not Serbians but Austrian subjects.	Y – The reliability of the source is suspect. The writer would wish to defend Serbian interests and persuades his foreign diplomats to defend Serbia. Y – The assassins were not Serbians. N – There was considerable sympathy in Serbia for pro-Serbian groups, often violent.	Y – B states that Serbians are astonished by the assassination. A semi-official newspaper denied Serbian responsibility for the assassination. N – C, D and E see Serbia as the cause of the problem, including the encouragement of terrorist attacks on Austria.	Y – The assassins of Sarajevo were not Serbians but Bosnians, technically Austrian subjects. Y – The Serbian government had taken steps to control anti-Austrian terrorism. N – Some groups in Serbia, including the military and government, gave tacit or open support to anti-Austrian violence.
B	Report from a British diplomat to his Foreign Minister.	Opinion in Serbia is shocked by the assassination. There is concern about Austria's reactions.	N – Serbians are concerned rather than exulted by the assassination. N – A semi-official newspaper regretted the assassination. N – Whilst not objective, the report has some reliability.	Y – ? A agrees about Serbia's lack of responsibility. N – ? The source does not mention terrorist groups explicitly. N – C, D, E contradict the claim about Serbian concerns after the assassination.	Y – The immediate reaction of most people in Belgrade showed concern. N – The source ignores opinion in other parts of Serbia.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

C	Message from the Austrian Foreign Minister to Austrian ambassadors.	Serbian of all classes and groups have engaged in anti-Austrian provocation.	Y – Anti-Austrian feeling is widespread in Serbia, unchecked by the government. N – The writer is an important Austrian official who would not be objective.	Y – D and E confirm the claims about Serbian support for extreme anti-Austrian feeling. Y – D also mentions the background, from 1912–13. N – The writer is a high-ranking Austrian politician who would not be objective. N – Contradicted by A and B.	Y – There was support in Serbia for greater Serbia which was not necessarily anti-Austrian. Y – The trouble did not begin in 1914. It was apparent in the 1912–13 Balkan crisis and started before that. N – The moderates in the Serbian government had tried to restrain extremism.
D	Summary by French acting Foreign Minister of note from German Ambassador.	Serbia is responsible for the crisis. It is the culmination of many years of Serbian provocation.	Y – Serbia is responsible for anti-Austrian sentiments. Y – Austrian moderation has not worked. Y – Serbia was responsible for the assassination. Y – The summary is probably an accurate version of the German note. N – The writer of the note is from a country that gave Austria enthusiastic support.	Y – C and E confirm the claims about Serbian support for extreme anti-Austrian feeling. Y – C also mentions the background, from 1912–13. N – The writer is a high-ranking German diplomat. Germany was the enthusiastic ally of Austria and anti-Serbian. N – Contradicted by A and B.	Y – see the reference to the previous history in C. Y – Other countries had tried to intervene to secure peace in the Balkans. N – Austrian moderation was less apparent than its weakness. Most Austrians, supported by Germany, felt that a stand had to be made in 1914.
E	Official statement by the Austrian government after outbreak of war.	Serbia caused the assassination. The Serbian government did not keep its promises to suppress anti-Austrian feeling.	Y – Serbia has engaged in a consistent anti-Austrian programme, culminating in the assassination. N – The source is a virtual declaration of war which is one-sided.	Y – C and D support. Y – There were terrorist groups in Serbia. N – The timing and purpose of the statement weakens its reliability. N – Contradicted by A and B.	Y – Other Austrian officials had been attacked before the archduke and his wife. Y/N – The Serbian government had taken measures against terrorist groups but they were not fully implemented or support in Serbia. N – The statement generalises about opinion in Serbia.

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 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

1 Source-Based Question

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss *'The Serbian government was to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I.'* but might make only general points about the causes of the war. 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.

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, 'Source C states that Serbian diplomats, government officials and others who were important in Serbia fully supported revolutionary groups in Serbia against Austria. The Serbian government had not tried to curb the activities of violent anti-Austrian groups. Source D agrees. It also agrees that the Serbian government had supported anti-Austrian agitation before 1914. The view in Source E is that the Serbian government was responsible because it had not suppressed violent groups and had encouraged the hatred of Austria. Serbian attitudes led directly to the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife at Sarajevo.'

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, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that 'The Serbian government was to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I'. Source A disagrees with the claim and dismisses Austrian claims as unjustified. The assassination was the act of one fanatic "young and ill-balanced". Serbia could not be held responsible because the perpetrators were not Serbs but Austrian citizens. The assassination would not benefit Serbia. Source B broadly agrees with this view, stating that people in Serbia did not celebrate the assassination but were astonished by it, expressing more than mild regret. A government newspaper had expressed regret for the murder and described it as the act of a solitary maniac.'

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, demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis and by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, 'The claim that 'The Serbian government was to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I' can be supported from an evaluation and comparison of the evidence. In Source A, the Serbian Prime Minister (also the Foreign Minister) denies Serbian responsibility. However, this cannot be accepted at face value because he would want to absolve Serbia from involvement in terrorist activity. There is evidence that in 1914 and before, terrorist groups received arms and other support from some officials in Serbia. Source B might be reliable as far as it goes but it is a partial view and the writer might not have had knowledge of terrorist groups based in Serbia. In Source C, Berchtold is correct to claim that Serbia saw itself

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

as the centre of anti-Austrian feeling, which had resulted in crises in 1909 and 1912-13. Source D is written by an enemy of Germany and thus indirectly of Austria, it is probably an accurate account of German policy. This agrees with Source D about the role of Serbia before the assassination crisis of 1914. Serbia indeed saw itself as the centre of a larger Pan-Slav movement. Source E agrees with Source C very closely about the continuation of Serbian involvement in terrorism from 1909 and in its description of views that were widely held in Serbia.'

- L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17–21]

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

For example, (L4 plus) '...However, the sources can also be interpreted to show that the Serbian government was not to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I. Although Source A is not an objective view, some of its claims are justified. It is correct in its claim that the assassins were not Serbian citizens and that Serbia was a smaller country than the vast Austrian empire. In the aftermath of the assassination, most people in Europe probably assumed without proof that Serbia was responsible. Source B can be relied on as an accurate view of the immediate impact of the assassination on Belgrade; it is the most reliable of all of the extracts. Whilst Sources C, D and E ignore Austria's responsibility, their reliability is very suspect because they express strongly either Austrian or German attitudes and ignore any responsibility other than Serbia's.'

- 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, not simply 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 'The Serbian government was to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I', the more convincing case supports the claim. Whilst Source A is correct that the Sarajevo assassins were not Serbian citizens, Serbia was at the heart of anti-Austrian propaganda and violence. The writer is wrong to claim that Serbia had done everything in its power to suppress terrorism. Whilst Source B says that people in Belgrade were astonished at the assassination, it was probably because the Serbs had miscalculated the extent to which violence would be used against Austria. Sources C, D and E agree about Serbia's role before 1914 when the tensions with Austria were increasing. Although these sources are not objective because they represent the views of Austria and Germany, its ally, they are correct to point out the connection between Serbia and terrorism. There is other evidence not referred to in the sources that Serbia promoted the Pan-Slav movement and had ambitions of becoming the major Slav nation, which could only be achieved by violence.'

OR

'Although there is evidence in the sources both to challenge and support the claim that 'The Serbian government was to blame for the increasing tension with Austria before World War I', the more convincing case supports the claim. However, it must be remembered that Austrian policies had contributed to the growth of terrorism because it directly opposed any concessions to Serbia and Slav opinion. Furthermore, although some Serbs might have promoted terrorism, Source A can be believed as the view of a responsible Serbian politician who saw the danger of

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

extremism. This is supported by Source B. Therefore the claim that the Serbian government encouraged terrorism is an exaggeration although other Serbian groups did so.'

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 Serbian extremism and terrorism from the early years of the twentieth century to 1914 were caused both by forces within Serbia and by Austria's reactionary policies. Austria was afraid of the effects of its empire in the Balkans and elsewhere if the Slavs were given further concessions. It was also apparent that Austria was a declining power. Therefore the terrorists in Serbia were encouraged.'

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

2 How far, and why, did the aims of the revolutionaries in France change during the period from 1789 to the execution of Louis XVI in 1793?

The key issue is the changing aims of the French revolutionaries. Good answers will consider 'How far' and 'why'. However, some candidates might not differentiate explicitly between 'How far' and 'why' and these answers will have to be considered particularly carefully. The question begins in 1789 but the aims of the revolutionaries in that year can only be explained by referring to the background. However, candidates need to keep this in check to avoid rambling surveys. The major aims of the revolutionaries were financial, especially fiscal. Once the Estates General met, there were political demands, not against the King, but against the entrenched position of the clergy and nobility that was represented in the system of voting by orders. The struggle soon widened because the financial demands were not satisfied. Louis XVI's concessions were reluctant. Widespread disorder and violence in Paris and other cities, with disorder against feudal authorities in the countryside, encouraged the revolutionaries and hardened the resistance of the conservatives. Although Louis compromised, he did so reluctantly and had ambitions of regaining his former powers. He continued to correspond with foreign princes. The Flight to Varennes was to prove very significant. Attitudes to the Church changed. Its fiscal privileges were unpopular in 1789 but France was not irreligious. Its special position in the *ancien régime* led to the imposition of the Civil Constitution. By 1793, the radicals introduced more extreme changes to religion, seeking to introduce an anti-Christian system and the worship of reason. The combined threat of foreign princes (e.g. the Brunswick Manifesto) and the émigrés was important. Revolutionaries began to outbid each other for support. A struggle between the Jacobins and the Girondins developed leading to the victory of the Jacobins and the establishment of a republic.

3 'The most important cause of the Industrial Revolution was changes in technology.' How far do you agree with this judgement? (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the assessment of the claim that technological change was the most important cause of the Industrial Revolution. Candidates can explain the impact of new machinery, for example in textile production that allowed goods to be produced in larger quantities, more quickly and to better standards. Steam machines, particularly on railways, were important. Although the canal age was comparatively short-lived, canals provided an important boost to industrialisation for a time. A weakness of some answers might be that they include descriptions of technological innovations without explaining why they contributed to a wider Industrial Revolution. Investment was important. Britain followed by France and parts of Germany, had financiers who were willing to invest in industry and trade. A growing population led to a larger work force and bigger markets. Whatever the reasons, the link with industrialisation is clear. Some might point to the availability of raw materials useful to industry. This can be given credit because many books used by candidates make this point. However, very high credit should be given to those who take a critical view of this factor. France was rich in natural resources, as were parts of Russia. More important was the ability to take advantage of these resources. Britain was not dominated by industrial owners until the late nineteenth century, probably later, but the most important groups pursued generally favourable policies from the beginning of the century. French and German governing groups gave such support but later. Towns provided a favourable environment. Factories were larger scale and had to be built in towns because of the concentration of labour. This increased the wealth of the industrial middle classes. Candidates are asked to refer to developments in at least two specified countries. However, examiners will use their judgement about the degree of detail and balance in these references.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

4 How far was Bismarck a champion of Prussia's interests rather than a German nationalist during the period from 1862 to 1871?

The key issue is the assessment of Bismarck's policies. Was he more a champion of Prussia's interests or a German nationalist from 1862 to 1871? Some candidates might see the issues as complete alternatives and discuss only one but the most successful answers in Band I should consider both alternatives and come to a clear conclusion. However, answers do not have to be equally balanced. On the one hand, a strong case can be made for Bismarck as a champion of Prussia. His priority in 1862 as Minister-President was to push through the army reforms that would strengthen the monarchy and weaken the Liberals. He was involved in successive crises but depended on the co-operation and weakness of others to achieve his aims. Unification went through at least three stages: the alliance with Austria over the Schleswig-Holstein question, the ousting of Austria and the formation of the North German Confederation and the final defeat of France. It is difficult to see that anybody could have envisaged this as a coherent aim in 1862. Each of these stages essentially strengthened Prussia. Candidates can refer to the constitution of the new Germany in 1871. This embedded Prussian power in the Bundesrat; the monarchy was safeguarded and Bismarck's authority was unquestioned. On the other hand, it was reported (e.g. by Disraeli) that he did indeed have such a long-term plan. He certainly used German sentiment to win support for his policies in the three major stages. There is an argument that Bismarck was pushed further than he originally intended and that he would have been satisfied with the largely Protestant North German Confederation. He could not have predicted the issue of the Spanish throne emerging or the reaction of France, although he probably envisaged a future struggle with France.

5 Assess the problems that faced European countries in establishing colonies in either (a) Africa or (b) Asia in the later nineteenth century.

The key issue is the problems facing European countries in establishing colonies. The question asks candidates to consider one of two regions: Africa or Asia which are given as alternatives that should be discussed. Some candidates might discuss both. Examiners might be sympathetic even if this is strictly outside the rubric. A reduction of one band might be appropriate. The requirement is included to encourage candidates not to write vaguely but even the best answers, characterised by relevant and varied arguments, might include only adequate examples. A continuing feature of answers on this general topic of Imperialism is that candidates rehearse the causes without shaping their material to fit the precise questions that are asked. On the other hand, examiners will not dismiss out of hand surveys of causes that link them to problems. Candidates might argue that dealing with international tension was a problem that was a consequence of imperial expansion. For example, the British empire came under pressure from French and German expansion. There were similar rivalries in parts of Asia. Imperial expansion brought military problems as armies had to be strengthened against native resistance and against possible competition from other European countries. Britain fought wars in South Africa in which the Boers were supported by Germany. Fashoda almost became a military action. There were reactions in China as European countries sought to gain control. Communications could be problematic and secure bases were needed. Military forces had to be enlarged and soldiers provided. Investment was vital and some historians argue that the costs of establishing colonies were greater than the benefits they brought. Popular pressures sometimes drove governments to intervene further than they would have wished. There were physical problems. Disease killed or weakened many Europeans even after a partial remedy was found for malaria.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

6 Why did the reforms that Nicholas II introduced after the 1905 Revolution not prevent the revolution in Russia in February 1917?

The key issue is the relationship between the policies of Nicholas II after the 1905 Revolution and the outbreak of Revolution in 1917. The question ends in February 1917. Discussion of later developments will not be relevant unless it appears briefly as part of a conclusion. The focus should be on developments after the 1905 Revolution. There is no need to explain its causes. The October Manifesto was issued by Nicholas II on the advice of Witte. It promised a Duma with a wide franchise. The concessions were not extensive enough (including a limited franchise) to gain widespread approval. Socialist parties did not take part in the election. The Tsar issued a Fundamental Law confirming his supreme power. Meetings of the Duma failed to bring stability, because of the Tsar's attitude and internal divisions. Reforming ministers such as Witte were distrusted. Stolypin might be regarded as a reformer but his reforms were intended to uphold the existing political system. His encouragement of a prosperous peasantry had some success. He attempted to extend education, allow religious toleration and treat the Jews better. These reforms failed to have much effect because of widespread opposition from established reactionary groups. Some candidates might refer to radical opponents such as the Bolsheviks but there is little evidence that they were a serious threat before 1914. There were violent strikes but these were usually unorganised. World War I was a major factor. The military, political and economic weakness of the tsarist government was exposed. Military setbacks reflected the weakness of the army. Nicholas II was undermined and his incompetence exposed by his decision to take personal control of the army whilst the Tsarina was under the influence of Rasputin. The economy was ruined. The February Revolution was mounted by a disparate force that showed the complete ineffectiveness of the post-1905 reforms.

7 How far did Hitler's popularity in Germany from 1933 to 1939 depend on his foreign policies?

The key issue is the reason for Hitler's popularity to 1939. Candidates should note that 1939 is the end of the question. Discussion of developments later than 1939 will not be relevant and cannot be given credit unless it appears briefly as part of a conclusion. However, the syllabus ends in 1939 and few are likely to make such peripheral points. Hitler promised to reverse the humiliation of Versailles, ignoring the fact that the Weimar Republic had done much to secure acceptance as a trusted diplomatic power by 1929. He rearmd Germany, in opposition to the terms imposed at Versailles, and withdrew from the League of Nations (1933). The army was sent into the Rhineland, another challenge to foreign powers. The Anschluss/union with Austria (1938) followed and then the moves against Czechoslovakia. These were popular in Germany as many saw them as steps towards a unification of Germans. It is not clear how popular intervention in the Spanish Civil War and the attack on Poland were. 'How far?' invites candidates to compare foreign policies with domestic factors that made Hitler popular. These might include economic reforms and anti-communist policies that pleased business (although the communists had significant support among some urban groups). Answers can consider the extent of Hitler's appeal to anti-Semitism. Propaganda was important. Populist policies such as the 'People's Car – Volkswagen' and slight, but welcome, rewards for some groups might be examined. The Germans were impressed by the scale and effectiveness of Nazi meetings, the influence of the pro-government media and Hitler's speeches. Popularity is a key issue. However, it would not be irrelevant to examine alternatives that show the limitations of his popularity, although this is not a requirement to gain a high mark. Candidates can consider the other aspects of Hitler's regime such as the use of terror. There were some underground opposition groups.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9697

8 'Neither Lenin nor Stalin was a Marxist ruler.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

The key issue is the relationship between Lenin and Stalin on the one hand and Marxism on the other. It is reasonable to expect a fair but not equal balance in the discussions of Lenin and Stalin. Some candidates might embark on straightforward and successive accounts of Lenin and Stalin without any comparison and without any discussion of Marxism, apart from brief and bald assertions. This might take answers to Band 4. Further comparison with bald assertions about Marxism might be worth up to Band 3. However, examiners will not expect sophisticated discussions of Marxism. The question begins in 1917 and candidates are not expected to consider how far Lenin's earlier career showed him as a Marxist. In 1917, his programme of 'Peace, Land and Bread' showed many Marxist traits but went beyond it. He made an alliance with the Soviets and claimed the October Revolution to be a victory for Marxism but it was not a victory for the proletariat. Lenin changed to advocating the influence of the minority party of Bolsheviks. War Communism was adopted for practical reasons but was partly justified by its Marxist tendencies. The NEP was different, a step back to a former pattern. Lenin's political system can be examined. The triumph and monopoly of the Bolsheviks gave little power to the proletariat. The one-party state was far from the rule of the proletariat. Yet Lenin always claimed that he was a follower of Marx. Stalin embarked on widespread economic changes; he certainly crushed capitalists but this was not because of his Marxist views. He crushed all other forms of real and imagined opposition, including purges of Bolsheviks. The class system was transformed. His personal dominance was different from the political system envisaged by Marx although he also claimed to be the successor of Marx.