
HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/05H

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

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

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

This document consists of **10** printed pages.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

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

Introduction

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

Question (a)

Band 3: 8–10 marks

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

Band 2: 4–7 marks

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

Band 1: 1–3 marks

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

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Band 5: 25–30 marks

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

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

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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

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

Band 3: 13–18 marks

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

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

1 (a) How far do Documents A and B differ in their approaches to the prospects for reform? [10]

Candidates might comment on the proximity of dates in 1906 and the authorship, with due attention given to the place of Stolypin. Document A is negative, even pessimistic, almost rejecting the idea of reform and downplaying any meaningful role for the Duma, where groups did have reform plans and hopes. Document B offers contrasts, there is hope and the prospect of some significant reforms leading to important changes; there is a positive tone. While A rejects ideas of changes to land tenure and upholds the Tsarist dominance and prerogatives in making laws as well as the sense of arbitrariness linked to controls and the powers of the regime, B points to considerations of a range of freedoms, changes in land tenure and in provisions for workers.

None of this would seem possible given the tenor of A. Candidates may consider whether a shift was occurring or had occurred, or whether Stolypin's proposals were less regime-based, more personal. They might argue that A reflects the imprint of the Tsar and loyalty to his word, while B reflects a more personalised agenda. B seems to suggest a freedom of manoeuvre denied to ministers in A. While A seems to rule out political-constitutional changes, candidates might suggest that B offers some suggestion of future changes if the proposals were to be enacted. The prospects for reform, apparently bleak in A, seem better in B.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Tsarist regime's disagreements with the Dumas were the main reason that Russia became destabilised in the period 1906–14? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in the set (A–E). [20]**

Document E provides a useful overview and links well with the other documents. It raises issues of disagreements and conflicts but also other destabilising factors. Candidates might refer to prevailing political, economic and social conditions, in the aftermath of the 1905 Revolution. The Fundamental Laws of 1906 had effectively limited, if not emasculated, the roles of the Dumas, though that did not stop challenges and criticisms; Documents A and C and some of Document D can be linked in here. Document B relates to the spirit of reform pursued after the Revolution but D and E suggest various limits to those reforms. Documents A to D all suggest tensions between the Tsar, his ministers and the Dumas, in turn related to some parts of E.

Candidates should show their knowledge of the scope and character of Stolypin's reforms within the context of agrarian and especially industrial developments (downturn, upturn) in the period. They should also examine the political issues and tensions: the rejection of any form of constitutional monarchy; the severe limits placed on the Dumas; the changes to electoral laws (C, E); and the growth of a range of opposition parties, inside and outside the Dumas (D, E; topic knowledge of the Left especially). Candidates may comment on the language and tone of A to D; they indicate attitudes, stances, even a sense of temperament.

Apart from B and D and their contrasts, A and C can offer further contrasts in places and can be linked to D in terms of Duma claims and requests for action, and outcomes in terms of limited changes. There were certainly tensions between the Tsar, never an easy character and determined to uphold his autocratic status, and the Dumas, even more muted after the changes to the electoral laws. But there were other issues involved in the destabilisation of Russia in the period. Document A recognises the need for rural reforms, thereby linking with areas of B, but rejects Duma demands, setting out clear areas of demarcation; B proposes a reform programme, linked to A, while D comments on some outcomes; and C highlights the Tsar's statement of intent, control, power and a rejection of Duma claims to any meaningful role. Document E has links to all, also advancing a sense of other factors – unrest, violence, militancy (especially 1912–16) – and points to the Duma's role in encouraging a different political atmosphere. Stolypin's death is seen as significant in E, as is noble opposition to reforms and change. Candidates can show their contextual knowledge by referring to issues related to the state of Tsardom, its strengths and weaknesses – much debated – and the ties of economic and political problems. The consequences of the 1905 Revolution were felt in the years ahead, at different levels, creating further tensions and leading to challenges to stability, law and order and Tsarist autocracy (this is well-demonstrated in C).

2 'Without the First World War, there would have been no Bolshevik Revolution.' How far do you agree with this view? [30]

AO1 – Answers should cover the timespan (August) 1914 to (October) 1917. Candidates should provide a good analysis and evaluation of the nature of the War and how it destabilised Russia, leading to the fall of the Tsarist dynasty and system and a power vacuum that was filled uneasily by the Provisional Government, which in turn was overthrown by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. They should assess: the military defeats; the economic, financial and social crises, which were blamed on the Tsar and advisers; growing morale problems and domestic unrest and violence; mutinies in the army; and the roles of the Progressive Bloc and the Rightist elites. They should also examine: the takeover by the Provisional Government (in reality, a series of uneasy coalitions); the promises made; the mistakes made (promises unkept, continuation of war, failure to quash the Bolsheviks in and after the 'July Days'); the leadership of Kerensky; the Kornilov Affair; and the weakening and narrowing appeal and support base. This is the context for the position of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the appeal and message, extent of support, vicissitudes, and the chance to seize power in October (Trotsky, MRC, weak Provisional Government forces). The failure of previous regimes (Tsarist, Provisional) may have given Lenin and the Bolsheviks their opportunity.

AO2 – Candidates should debate the strength or weaknesses of the Tsarist regime in 1914 and how far the War destroyed it; they may argue that, contrary to later Soviet historical thinking, there was no inevitability about the Bolshevik accession to power. Candidates may judge the collapse of the Tsarist regime as certain once war started and went badly, but that will not explain the Bolshevik takeover; rather it will set the context of a power vacuum uneasily filled by the Provisional Government; then Lenin and the Bolsheviks had their opportunity.

3 How valid is the judgement that the Reds won the Civil War (1918–21) because their opponents were deeply divided? [30]

AO1 – Candidates should balance the Reds' strengths, advantages and successes against the Whites' weaknesses, disadvantages, errors and mistakes. There should be a focus on the relative strengths and weaknesses of both sides, militarily, economically and politically, especially in 1918. Candidates should be wide-ranging in their assessment of factors such as leadership (political, military), recruitment, logistics, administration, ideology, strategy and tactics, resources, geography and transport. They may also highlight the importance of war communism and propaganda. They may examine the roles of Reds such as Lenin and Trotsky, the Red Army, the Cheka and AGITPROP and set these against the lack of such figures, features, operational forces on the side of the Whites. Ideology, linked to propaganda (e.g. a patriotic war to defend the gains of the Revolution) was important in providing the impetus to the Reds' success. Also, candidates should show awareness of the role of the Greens and the importance of peasant unrest. Candidates may refer to the major conflict between the Reds and the Greens (1920–1) and the extent of divisions within the Greens.

AO2 – Candidates should consider whether it was inevitable that the Reds would win and if so, how and why. They might take into account the following: whether the Reds were successful only because of their opponents' problems and weaknesses; whether they really did possess superior qualities and resources; whether they were lucky; or whether the cause was Lenin's desire for a confrontation, a civil war.

4 How far was a socialist revolution achieved in Russia by 1924?**[30]**

AO1 – The answer should provide an assessment of Bolshevik aims, perceived, conjectured or known. The word ‘revolution’ is crucial. It is acceptable for candidates to blend economy and society provided that recognisable features of each are engaged. The political arena is not at issue and references to this should be brief. War communism and the NEP should be prominent features in the assessment of economic changes, and their context and content should be considered: the aftermath of the seizure of power; the actions of peasants and workers; nationalisation decrees; and changes in economic thinking and strategy either side of the Civil War. Candidates should compare and contrast late 1917 and early 1924. In social policy areas, candidates could refer to: education, youth, women, religion, the class structure, peasants, workers (true proletariat?), leavening of society, extent of changes (attitudinal, structural), the re-alignment of elitism (party-based) and the extent of mobility achieved (was the party the key vehicle?). Links to the economy could include: living and working conditions, prices, wages (low, curbed), food prices (inflation), work hours, housing, health, nutrition (many people died from starvation).

AO2 – Candidates should debate whether the Bolshevik Revolution was a true revolution; how far it was driven by ideology; how far it was tempered by realism and pragmatism; whether Lenin pursued a true revolutionary ideology or whether he actually betrayed the hopes of the October Revolution; and whether there was more social change than economic.