

---

**HISTORY****9769/58**

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

**May/June 2019****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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**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><b>To what extent does Document B corroborate the evidence in Document A about the censorship imposed by the Bolshevik regime?</b></p> <p><i>Similarities</i> Both documents agree there was suppression; both agree that capitalists/reactionaries should not control the press; both are concerned about the people – Document A that their minds should not be poisoned by the press and Document B that the press should express the will of the people. Both documents agree that the press was encouraging ‘counter-revolutionary action’ (Document A), and Document B says the press was encouraging panic and rioting.</p> <p><i>Differences</i> Document A refers to the ‘suppression of the bourgeois press’ but not to the freedom of other forms of newspapers. However, Document B refers to ‘ a temporary suppression of the press’ only, and only of ‘certain papers’. Document B also puts the suppression into the context of more liberal attitudes to theatre and public speaking which Document A does not.</p> <p><i>Provenance</i> Lenin is writing soon after the Revolution when it was essential that an unrepresentative group with a belief in the dictatorship of the proletariat should be able to control opinion. Bourgeois freedom of expression is seen as meaningless in line with Lenin’s ideology. The American visitor is writing to give her impressions, clearly favourable, to American opinion and is not issuing orders to save a precarious revolution. Whatever her impressions, the onset of civil war meant that the tolerance she saw became less common and the restrictions on the press certainly not temporary.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that violence and repression were the main features of the consolidation of Bolshevik power in the period 1918–19? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>Document A: The Decree is certainly repressive. The reference to ‘military needs’ in the Revolution is to the takeover by the Red Guards and the maintenance of authority of a group which had no electoral majority, or even substantial following, and in many areas depended on a dictatorship of the proletariat. The document reflects Lenin’s contempt for bourgeois liberty and freedom – the dominance by capitalists of the means of production was the key to political domination and the press was part of that. It signalled the onset of censorship and control of communication that characterised the regime. This is played down by Document B who sees not repression but tolerance of opinions in the street, the restriction only of certain newspapers and freedom of theatrical performance which seemed to belie conservative fears. This roseate view is not born out by developments of War Communism or the nature of the coup and the philosophy of the Bolsheviks.</p> <p>Document C also takes a positive view of the new regime. Instead of violence and repression, some of which at least is acknowledged by Document B, this is a view of liberating women by progressive and communal supporting measures. Kollontai was deeply involved with these measures and this document reflects some of the ardent hopes for equality that is shown in the initial Bolshevik decrees.</p> <p>Women were drawn into Soviet work, but the context of these developments needs to be considered. Measures were taken to demonstrate the Bolsheviks’ concerns for social equality such as the peasant land decree, the ending of titles and social distinctions, the confiscations and redistribution of property and nationalisation programmes; but they were side by side with the development of the Cheka, the banning of other political parties, censorship and the dominance of the one party state. Some of this alienated even left-wing supporters as Document D shows. Kropotkin sees war as merely as an excuse for the centralising philosophy inherent in Marxism-Leninism in the creation of a dictatorship prior to the golden age here the state withers away. Instead of local initiatives, the regime had imposed certain restrictions that made both workers and peasants suffer.</p> <p>By 1919, with war in full swing, heavy taxation, confiscations, conscription and violence towards enemies certainly justified the view. Lenin allowed little deviation from his interpretation of the revolution, and groups to the left found little toleration. However, the criticism is from an anarchist perspective and Lenin might well have countered that the revolution needed to be saved from bitter enemies such as the Whites. In Document E, a traditional Russian spectre is given a Bolshevik cap and over piles of corpses brings death and destruction to the peasants. The spectre advances on a peaceful countryside with a mill, a church and some neat houses. The Revolution while giving the peasants land quickly brought civil war and requisitioning as well as social conflict to the villages. The Cheka suppressed opposition, including the SRs the main peasant party. However, the cartoon ignores the considerable forces that the Bolsheviks were able to muster and the peasant support from the November land decree and it is obviously a work of propaganda.</p>	20

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>What best explains why the Tsarist regime survived the 1905 revolution?</b></p> <p>AO1/2 – the revolution of 1905 was on a considerable scale and offered the largest threat to the regime before 1917. Explanations could focus on the widespread but essentially divided nature of the opposition. The constitutional demands of the middle-class radicals were not the foremost concerns of the nationalities who rose in opposition, or the peasants or workers. The Tsar had endured military reverses, but not on the scale of the First World War and the army remained essentially loyal. The mutiny of the Potemkin was not typical of the Tsar's forces as a whole. The unrest in the cities was considerable, but the middle classes were concerned at the level of radical revolution and, possibly, bought off by some timely concessions with the October Manifesto. The Tsar was not as isolated as he was in 1917, either physically or in terms of being unsupported by the ruling elite. Witte was there to offer the October concessions and his military commanders stood by him. In the aftermath, French loans bolstered the regime, the Dumas were able to be controlled, and a string of intelligent conservative, Stolypin offered a mixture of agrarian reforms and concessions with repression of opposition. The workers' opposition groups were not strong enough to sustain the revolution, while the peasants lacked enough political ends as opposed to economic grievances and demands to make them effective regime changers. The nationalities were isolated from each other and from the mainstream of revolution. The real answer may lay in the nature of the revolution itself. In comparison with 1917, the various groups were not able to paralyse the regime or undermine the loyalty of the Tsar's troops and the support he got from the secular and religious establishment. In 1905, it was not too late to make some concessions to end the immediate threats. After that, economic growth, reforms, a divided opposition and residual loyalty to the dynasty, and propertied people's concerns at the scale and violence of revolution which they had observed in 1905, served to make the regime more stable.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>How far were the key developments in Lenin's thinking by 1917 brought about by the First World War?</b></p> <p>AO1/2 – One view is that the key element of Lenin's thought is found in the 'Development of Capitalism in Russia' (1899), which argued that the capitalist class was too weak to bring about a bourgeois revolution as in France in 1789, and as a forerunner of a proletarian revolution – the Menshevik position – and to wait for this would be to end any chance of revolution in Russia. Lenin saw the future before 1914 as being linked to the urban working class in cooperation with land hungry peasants bringing about revolution; this would bring about a democratic revolution in which bourgeois economic growth would bring about the expansion of the proletariat, which would in due course bring about the revolution which Marx envisaged, and which would establish their dictatorship prior to the state withering away. Key elements were developed before 1914 with the split from the Mensheviks, and Lenin's development of his ideas about the Bolsheviks being the key vanguard of revolution rather than a mass party. The war shocked Lenin as the working classes did not rise but rather supported a bourgeois internecine struggle. Lenin contemplated this in 'Imperialism, the Latest Stage of Capitalism' (1916) (sometimes translated as the 'Higher' stage). This study brought him to argue that the contradictions of capitalism had reached such a stage as to make socialism, rather than a worker-and-peasant-led bourgeois revolution, an imminent reality. Therefore, the lack of a developed Russian bourgeoisie, the overwhelming rural masses and the relatively under-developed class of industrial workers took second place to an analysis of the development of capitalism which made it ripe for revolution. In this view, the war brought about the key and fundamental development of Lenin's thought, which enabled him to portray the revolution as vital to achieve regardless of strict Marxist theory of the preconditions necessary, and accusations of adventurism by his opponents who condemned actions, which seemed to go against the whole Marxist analysis of revolution occurring when social development had reached such a 'nodal point' as to make the historical process inevitable. The most developed view of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Lenin's theory comes in the 'State and Revolution' (1917). An alternative view is that by his adaptations of Marxist thought to fit Russian conditions and by his establishment of the Bolshevik party as a vanguard, set out 'What is to be Done?' (1902), the key developments of Lenin's thought had already been established by 1914. The very acknowledgement that the peasantry, instead of being a counter revolutionary irrelevance were going to be a key feature of revolution, meant that the further justifications of power seizing on more pragmatic grounds than Marxist thought allowed had already been established. This is a question on Lenin's thought, not his policies, and revolutionary theory must be at the heart of successful answers.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>How far was the February Revolution a result of Russia's failures in the First World War?</b></p> <p>AO1/AO2 – The key developments in the events of the revolution were the initial strikes of steelworkers and the rapid growth of demonstrations. The turning point was the refusal of troops to fire on demonstrators any longer. Without effective military backing, the Tsar could not prevent the Duma refusing his order to dissolve or the establishment of the Soviets. The establishment of a provisional government revealed that he had lost the support of the elites, as did the expressions of no confidence by leading military commanders. The failure of Nicholas to get to the capital and the scale of the demonstrations together with the lack of confidence, led to his abdication in a remarkably short time. The war can explain these events up to a point through the heavy losses, disruption of transport and food supplies which made the cities cold, hungry and discontented, rising prices, and the suffering from a severe winter. The decision of Nicholas to take command associated the monarchy with the failures of government. The expressions of discontent arising from the war had eroded the Tsar's confidence and he abdicated quickly. The Tsar's failures were seen in terms of his inability to: organise the war effort, maintain supplies and keep a balance between military needs and the need to maintain men, and transport and horses for food production. Russian troops had been well-equipped and well-led enough to fight an effective campaign in 1916, and the extent to which the population of Russia supported peace at any time despite the heavy losses can be debated. The war had brought more cooperation between businessmen and industrialists but had revealed the inadequacies of the Tsarist system, for instance, the presence of Rasputin at the heart of government. Other countries suffered from heavy losses and shortages but had generally managed to establish stronger governments and leaders. There was no Russian Clemenceau or Lloyd George, and the Kaiser had given the war effort over to the army leaders. However, it could be argued that the reasons for these failures lay deeper than the war. The failure to develop a sound parliamentary system meant that there was nothing between the Tsar and popular discontent, therefore, responsibility was not shared, and vital cooperation not established because of an underlying fear of consultation which predated the war. The lack of modern infrastructure and good communications made Russia vulnerable to food shortages. Urban unrest was likely because of a pre-war failure to establish better conditions. Peasant unrest was always a possibility because of the limitations of the land reforms of Stolypin and an unassuaged land hunger only dealt with by Lenin after the Revolution. The limitations of the Tsar as a national leader had been shown before 1914 and continued during the war. Also, the experiences of 1905 meant that once authority had broken down, revolutionary and radical leaders quickly reconstituted the Soviets.</p> <p>Explanations focusing on the war and might also stress on longer term factors.</p>	30