



Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY

9769/58

Paper 5h Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924

May/June 2018

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

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

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

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

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)**Band 3: 8–10 marks**

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 1: 1–3 marks

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

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

Introduction

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

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18 marks

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>To what extent does Document B corroborate the views of Document A about the reasons for Kornilov’s actions in August 1917?</p> <p>Similarities – In general terms, both think that Kornilov was concerned with the progress of the war. The government was acting in accord with the plans of the Germans, killing troops and threatening the foundation of the country (Document A), while in Document B there is also concern about the malicious attitude of the Bolsheviks against the war and the disintegration of the army, again showing a concern about the war.</p> <p>Differences – Document A stresses saving the country and defeating enemies, but Document B refers to maintaining ‘order’ in the capital, which is not specifically referred to in Document A. In Document B, there is talk of an alliance against Kerensky to suppress disturbances. While, Document A does not refer to these political aims but speaks in terms of hoping for ‘the greatest miracle of saving our native land’, so much more dramatic and hyperbolic. There is specific reference in Document B to the suppression of the Soviet, which does not appear in Document A. Document A’s political aims of allowing popular choice and a Constituent Assembly do not appear in Document B.</p> <p>Provenance: Document A is a public appeal phrased in the highly emotional and extreme language of preventing ‘inevitable ruin’ and needing God’s help. There is limited political reference other than the conditional promise to the Russian people of greater democracy in exchange for their support. Document B is an investigation after the failure of the coup and the rhetoric is absent. Instead, there are claims that the aim was to help the existing government destroy the Soviet and the threat from the Bolsheviks. This would not have been possible to say, even if it were true, in a popular and stirring appeal for a national resurgence.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents that Kerensky was responsible for his own downfall in October 1917? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Document A suggests that Kerensky had let himself be dominated by the Soviet with its Bolshevik majority to act in accord with the plans of Germany to weaken the war effort. This would indicate that Kerensky was to blame for discrediting the government and bringing about the circumstances of a military coup. The efforts to maintain the war made in June belie this and many in the Soviet did not approve a peace policy, though Lenin of course did – something that did not always mean greater popularity. What is interesting is the reference to the Constituent Assembly and candidates may pick up on that as an indication of some weakness in Kerensky in not expediting this.</p> <p>Document B: Kerensky here is seen as approving the coup and having an agreement with Kornilov. Either this can be seen as a decisive action which might have prevented the October revolution or, more likely, an unwise encouragement of a military coup which in the end gave the Bolsheviks the key opportunity to get popular support, arm its supporters and take power to save the February revolution. Kornilov claimed to be acting on Kerensky's instructions; Kerensky painted Kornilov as a counter-revolutionary who wanted to install himself as a military dictator. No conclusive evidence has emerged to support either claim. Candidates may know that Kerensky had increased military disciplinary measures in June 1917 and had agreed to martial law in principle, possibly leading Kornilov to think that the new coalition government would accept a military regime. But Kerensky quickly condemned Kornilov's dispatch of troops to the capital. It would be natural for Kornilov to claim that he was not acting independently, but in the support of the government. The tape has not survived.</p> <p>Document C gives the impression of the affair being crucial to Kerensky's failure, leading to agitation by the Bolsheviks who had been 'impotent' before. This suggests that he had been able to control them, but the coup made a 'fatal link' to the revolution. Written in exile this might seem to be exonerating himself too much. It is true that the July days had been suppressed and Lenin exiled, but the support for Bolshevism had been growing and Lenin had produced powerful propaganda which revealed Kerensky's failures to deliver 'peace, bread and land'. The sudden upsurge of anarchy and revolt following the coup should be seen in a wider context of some failures by Kerensky and the Provisional Government, and the limited willingness of people to support it in October.</p> <p>Lenin in Document D points to Kerensky's failure to prevent peasant rebellion, and there could be knowledge of the inability of the Provisional Government to make the all-important concessions to the peasants that Lenin made in November. The continuation of the 'imperialist' war is seen as a reason for Kerensky's fall by implication. This might be challenged but the failures of the Summer offensive were damaging. It might be argued that the Revolutionary Socialists by 'suffering Kerensky in their midst' was a sign of his ability to work with the largest revolutionary group. Given that this stresses the favourable situation partly created by Kerensky in bringing about 'the final ... crisis', the document might be seen as a credible source.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Document E supports the view that Kerensky was responsible for his downfall from a different perspective. Pipes argues that Kerensky did not see the threat of Bolshevism and did not deal with it decisively enough in August, being too worried about the threat of a potential ally, 'he lost a unique opportunity'. Given Pipes's general hostility to Lenin and his Cold War concerns, this may be special pleading. However, candidates do not need to know who Pipes was and their argument should be considered in its own terms. It is true that Kerensky was decisive in July but allowed the Bolsheviks to take advantage of the coup, and contextual knowledge may support this. However, the threat of military dictatorship should not be underplayed given the events of August 1917.</p>	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the view that, in the years 1905 to 1914, the Tsarist state strengthened and stabilised the regime.</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates might discuss: the concessions made as a result of the 1905 Revolution; the October Manifesto and the modifications made by the Fundamental law of 1906; and, the Dumas; and, whether the changes strengthened the regime, or whether the manipulation and limitations weakened belief in the Tsar’s willingness to accept significant change. Consideration on industrial development may be in terms of the extent to which it modernised Russia and strengthened the regime, or whether bad conditions and the growth of unions and socialist ideas, challenged the regime. The increase in unrest before the war may be considered. There could be a discussion of the agrarian changes under Stolypin and the ‘wager on the strong’ and the growth of peasant ownership; however, there is evidence that there was a retreat from this and land hunger and a desire for outright ownership persisted, not met until after the revolution. The repression which followed the revolution might be seen as showing the reliance of the regime on repression, or a sign that the monarchy had recovered from the weakness of 1905 linked to war. Answers might also assess policy towards the nationalities.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates should distinguish between ‘strengthened’ and ‘stabilised’ or offer a balanced analysis of the effects of the changes made in this period. On one hand, they may argue that for all the developments and the advice of an intelligent if ruthless conservative, Stolypin, the fundamental unwillingness of the Tsar to think beyond autocracy prevented any real stability, and that his economic and military strength could not compensate for his underlying failure to come to terms with social and political change. Or, on the other hand, they may think that though there may appear to be a weakening of the state, from the fall of the monarchy after very punishing wartime pressures, in fact, a divided opposition and the making of some progress had increased stability, with the monarchy reasonably stable by 1913–1914; moreover, this was at a time when there was a great deal of social and political unrest in Europe as a whole.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>How important were the military failures suffered by Russia in the First World War in bringing about the fall of the Tsar?</p> <p>AO1 – The war saw over two million deaths and the German advances displaced 500 000 peasant households. It also led to new political developments with the Union and towns, and the Union of Zemstva developing to assist a considerable war effort. The failure of the civilian government, as opposed to the military, to take advantage of this was an indication of the lack of trust between the state and its elites. The Russian state was also less successful than other nations in mobilising public opinion, not helped by the influence of Rasputin and the Empress. The war produced problems of rail shortages, and labour shortages in key war industries. The massive armaments spending led to inflation, and the state printed money. The disruption of agriculture led to high food prices and shortages. The peasants produced enough food, but there were problems in distribution. The government was blamed but the war had concentrated huge forces in the West while civilian populations had been evacuated, disrupting transport and distribution. The demonstrations in February 1917 reflected a failure of the state to keep its urban centres fed. The war also led the Tsar to the fatal decision to abandon the capital. The elites were divided and the need to maintain the war effort may have been just as important in the fall of the Tsar as popular hatred of war.</p> <p>AO2 – Discussion may centre on whether it was the war itself or the inefficient and corrupt nature of the regime which prevented it meeting its demands that was the key. Did the war confirm that the regime was not meeting the needs of its people; or, was the war such an intense experience which presented unprecedented problems not just for Russia but for all its participants, that it must bear responsibility for the fall of the regime?</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Was the establishment of a communist dictatorship the direct result of the Civil War?</p> <p>AO1/2 – Much here depends on the definition of a communist dictatorship. On one hand, the decrees which Lenin issued shortly after the seizure of power indicate the ideological direction of the new regime, while the swift dismissal of the constituent assembly shows the move towards dictatorship. However, the peasant land decree of November indicates compromise. The war accelerated the movement towards communism in one sense with its need for tight controls over resources and for political discipline with War Communism. The dictatorship of the proletariat was already embedded in the ideology of the Bolsheviks, but the war made dictatorship anyway a necessity. Whether this was in the interests of the proletariat was questioned by the so-called Workers Opposition, and the retreat in New Economic Policy (NEP) made it questionable whether what had been established as a result of war was a communist dictatorship, or merely a one-party dictatorship. The development of the Cheka and the widespread violence of the regime may be seen as more dictatorial than ‘communist’, as its purpose went beyond establishing the power of the industrial working class as envisaged in the theories of Marxism and ended with considerable ideological compromise. The broad debate is whether a Communist dictatorship emerged because of ideological preconceptions or as a practical response to maintaining power in the face of considerable opposition.</p>	30