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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.

- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.

- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.

- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.

- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.

- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.

- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.

- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
**Generic Level Descriptors: Section A**

**Target:** AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–3  | • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.  
      |       | • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.  
      |       | • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2     | 4–7  | • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.  
      |       | • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.  
      |       | • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3     | 8–12 | • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.  
      |       | • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.  
      |       | • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification. |
| 4     | 13–16| • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.  
      |       | • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.  
<pre><code>  |       | • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | 17–20| • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.  
• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.  
• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims. |
### Section B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.
2. Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.
3. The overall judgement is missing or asserted.
4. There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>4–7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>8–12</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>13–16</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>17–20</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 1

Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.

Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the seriousness of the financial problems facing the French monarchy in the years before 1789.

#### Source 1

1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:
   - Having travelled widely across France in the late 1780s, the author could potentially offer an informed view on the seriousness of the financial problems facing the French monarchy
   - His interest in economics would potentially give his observations about the seriousness of the financial problems greater credibility
   - The partisan nature of the source is evident from the use of language to reinforce points (‘King who lacks the mental resources to govern’, ‘royal court ... devoted to pleasure and indulgence’).

2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the seriousness of the financial problems facing the French monarchy in the years before 1789:
   - It suggests that French people were concerned about the state of the monarchy’s finances (‘The whole group agreed ... confused state of the nation’s finances’)
   - It suggests that the French monarchy on its own is incapable of solving these financial problems (‘with a deficit .... of the kingdom assembling’)
   - It suggests that French people were more concerned with the country’s financial problems than the political difficulties that might follow (‘no conversation... bankruptcy was a much discussed topic’).

3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:
   - The French monarchy’s financial situation steadily worsened (e.g. in the years 1774 to 1788 royal debt had increased over threefold from 40 million livres to 126 million livres) largely due to war expenditure
   - Louis XVI’s ministers – Turgot, Necker, Calonne and Brienne – all failed to solve the financial crisis
   - The chaotic and inefficient tax system, with its exemptions for the privileged, contributed to the financial crisis and generated resentment and criticism among the Third Estate which shouldered the tax burden.

#### Source 2

1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:
   - The status of the source (a Royal Edict) offers the French monarchy’s official position on the financial problems
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | • As a document intended for public consumption, the Edict is clearly designed to reassure the French people about the future of the government’s finances  
|          | • The optimistic tone of the language used in the source is probably designed to disguise the extent of the financial disaster (‘its resources are even greater’, ‘followed by a complete recovery’). |

2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the seriousness of the financial problems facing the French monarchy in the years before 1789:

|          | • It indicates that the financial crisis has placed the French monarchy in a serious position (‘if its distress is great’, ‘payments made ... not in paper money’, ‘when circumstances ... raise a loan’)  
|          | • It suggests that the government expects the meeting of the Estates-General to improve the financial situation (‘the crisis should become less serious ... Estates General approaches’, ‘until the meeting of the Estates General’)  
|          | • It indicates that a negative public reaction will only make things worse (‘except by anxiety and fear’, ‘safeguarded from all alarm and disquiet’). |

3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:

|          | • The declaration of bankruptcy in August 1788 compelled Louis XVI to agree to call the Estates-General which amounted to an admission that the royal government had failed to address the problems of national debt and state finance  
|          | • The Edict led to panic on the French stock market as government funds plummeted and there was a run on the main bank  
|          | • The suspension of treasury payments meant that lenders were no longer prepared to offer loans to the state; this had serious implications because the government would be unable to pay its army or fund the royal court. |

**Sources 1 and 2**

The following points could be made about the sources in combination:

|          | • Both sources indicate that the financial problems facing the French monarchy were serious in the years before 1789  
|          | • Both sources suggest that the calling of the Estates-General offered a solution to these serious financial difficulties  
|          | • These points of agreement are reinforced due to the contrasting positions of the authors (an informed English traveller and the French government). |
Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894-1924

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the reasons for the introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source 3**

1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:
   - As a contemporary academic specialist in Russian history, the author was potentially in a position to offer an informed assessment of the reasons for the introduction of the NEP
   - The author’s visit to Russia during the civil war may have exposed him to the conditions which gave rise to the change in policy
   - The account was written several years after the event and the passage of time may have influenced the author’s discussion of the reasons for the NEP.

2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921:
   - It indicates that Lenin’s decision to abandon War Communism was linked to the Reds’ victory in the civil war (‘This retreat came with … and their allies’)
   - It provides evidence that War Communism had brought about a total economic collapse in Russia making a new policy necessary (‘This fact was recognised ... in January 1920’)
   - It suggests that the introduction of the NEP was linked to the ideological problems associated with War Communism (‘pure Communism ... failure was self-evident’).

3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:
   - By 1921 the Soviet economy was in ruins (e.g. the transport system had collapsed and industrial and grain production had slumped) which put the Bolshevik regime under enormous pressure to abandon War Communism
   - Peasant revolts in Tambov and elsewhere (due to grain requisitioning) in 1920-21 and worker protests against the harsh measures of War Communism made Lenin realise that concessions and economic liberalisation were essential for the regime’s survival
   - Lenin became personally convinced that a new policy had to be introduced immediately following the Kronstadt mutiny of March 1921 which indicated that the Soviet regime was alienating its core ideological support.

**Source 4**

1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:
As leader of the Bolshevik regime at the time, Lenin was in a good position to offer an informed view about the reasons for the introduction of the NEP. As a party speech, Lenin’s address was designed to offer the members present an official justification for the leadership’s change of policy. As party leader, Lenin would not have wanted to engage in public criticism of previous Bolshevik economic policy unless he felt he really had to.

The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921:

- It indicates that War Communism was a failure and should be recognised as such (‘So far comrades ... must frankly admit it’, ‘we must recognise ... not try to cover it up’)
- It indicates that an alliance of the workers and peasants underpinned the NEP based on the production of, and need for, manufactured goods and food supplies (‘the foundation of ... the peasantry’, ‘If large scale industry ... coming from the peasants’)
- It claims that, under these new arrangements, the peasants would appreciate the benefits of the NEP and realise that this system was superior to capitalism (‘Then, the peasants ... than the capitalist system’).

Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:

- Red victory in the civil war, which removed popular fears of a White return, led to an explosion of urban and rural discontent in early 1921 against the harsh realities of War Communism
- Lenin focused on incentives for the peasants because he regarded the widespread rural revolt against the regime in the early 1920s as a bigger threat than the White armies during the civil war
- Lenin had to use his personal authority at the 10th Party Congress to ensure the NEP was adopted and the opposition of party members uncomfortable with the partial reintroduction of capitalism was overcome.

Sources 3 and 4
The following points could be made about the sources in combination:

- Both sources indicate that the economic failures of War Communism led to the introduction of the NEP
- Both sources suggest that the situation in 1920-21 required a new policy which was not rigidly based on communist principles
- These points of agreement are reinforced due to the contrasting positions of the authors (an informed academic British visitor and the leader of the Soviet government).
### Section B: indicative content

**Option 2C.1: France in revolution, 1774-99**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the Terror had successfully strengthened the Republic by the beginning of 1795.

Arguments and evidence that the Terror had successfully strengthened the Republic by the beginning of 1795 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Committee of Public Safety and the Committee for General Security employed various bodies to combat the internal threats to France e.g. representatives en mission enforced Paris’s will over the provinces
- By 1795 the army, containing many committed revolutionaries dedicated to upholding the principles of 1789, was a formidable fighting force
- The Terror also ensured that measures were introduced to accelerate the process of dealing with other ‘enemies’ of France e.g. the Girondins and Marie-Antoinette
- The Terror enabled the Republic to avoid economic breakdown e.g. the Maximum fixed prices and made hoarding a capital offence, and central control kept the army and Paris supplied with food
- Measures introduced during the Terror to fight the war contributed to victory which strengthened the Republic e.g. conscription and action against draft-dodgers and deserters.

Arguments and evidence that other factors successfully strengthened/the Terror did not successfully strengthen the Republic by 1795 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The violent excesses of the Terror created serious divisions and resentment which turned many people against the Republic
- The religious Terror directed against the Catholic church alienated many e.g. dechristianisation was deeply resented in the villages
- The later stages of the Terror were primarily focused on removing those Robespierre regarded as threats to his ideal society (e.g. Danton and Desmoulins) rather than strengthening the Republic
- The execution of the Hebertists and the dissolution of the popular societies (1794) weakened the Republic by alienating the sans-culottes.

Other relevant material must be credited.
Arguments and evidence that the domestic impact of war was significant in bringing about the fall of the Directory in 1799 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- At the 1797 elections, monarchists won 180/260 seats being contested since people were growing weary of the war (and internal religious conflict) and viewed constitutional monarchy as an attractive alternative
- The ongoing deficit during wartime led to the reintroduction of indirect taxes (e.g. the octrois) which made the Directory very unpopular
- The 1799 decree imposing a forced loan of 100 million livres on the rich to cover war costs, together with the Law of Hostages, alienated many who regarded it as signalling a return to the methods of the Terror
- The Directory was in a vulnerable position because war was essential for its survival (e.g. by producing victories, money and prestige) but its very reliance on war led to economic and political problems
- French military defeats in 1798-99 (e.g. Aboukir Bay, Switzerland and Italy) exacerbated the Directory’s domestic problems.

Arguments and evidence that the domestic impact of war was not significant/other factors were significant in bringing about the fall of the Directory in 1799 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The profits of war plunder provided the Directory with much-needed income e.g. defeated states in Germany paid 16 million livres in indemnities and those in Italy paid about 200 million livres
- The constitution contributed to the fall of the regime by providing no mechanism to resolve executive-legislature disputes
- The directors interfered with elections (e.g. Law of 22 Floreal) which eroded respect for the political system
- The Directory relied increasingly on the army to settle political disputes (e.g. the Coup of Fructidor in 1797) and this made a military takeover a real possibility, as happened in the Coup of Brumaire (1799)
- The Directory’s unsuccessful attempts to restore the government’s finances (e.g. the value of the assignat collapsed) alienated important groups notably government creditors and the bourgeoisie.

Other relevant material must be credited.
Arguments and evidence that the Tsarist government was transformed in the years 1906-14 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The establishment of the Duma introduced an elected national legislative body which had not existed before and which was prepared to criticise the Tsar’s government
- Nicholas coexisted (albeit uneasily) with the Duma and resisted calls from some of his ministers to strip it of its powers and turn it into a purely consultative body
- The October Manifesto (1905) had granted the legal right to form political parties and these were, within limits, free to criticise the Tsarist government
- By 1914 a relatively free press had been established in Russia which helped to transform public political debate.

Arguments and evidence that the Tsarist government was not transformed in the years 1906-14 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Fundamental Laws of April 1906 preserved virtually all of the Tsar’s autocratic powers e.g. Articles 4 and 87, creation of an unelected Imperial State Council, the Tsar had the right to ‘hire and fire’ ministers
- The Duma’s functions and composition were altered by the government to preserve the Tsarist regime’s powers and tame the assembly e.g. the new electoral law of 1907 favoured groups most loyal to the regime
- Throughout this period, the Tsarist regime continued to rely on repression to maintain control e.g. Stolypin’s ‘pacification’ of the countryside, 1906–09, and the 1912 Lena goldfields massacre
- Nicholas II remained temperamentally unsuited to the role of a modernising leader after the 1905 Revolution e.g. he held the Duma in disdain and was determined to pass on his autocratic powers to his son.

Other relevant material must be credited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 owed more to its domestic policies than to its decision to stay in the war.

Arguments and evidence that the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 owed more to its domestic policies than to its decision to stay in the war should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Provisional Government’s refusal to legitimise land redistribution undermined its authority because peasants were then less willing to supply the cities with food and engaged in spontaneous land seizures
- The Provisional Government failed to deal effectively with the growing internal threat posed by Lenin and the Bolsheviks from April 1917
- The Provisional Government’s handling of the Kornilov Affair (August 1917) left the administration discredited in the eyes of the workers and boosted support for the Bolsheviks
- The Provisional Government’s status as an interim body weakened the executive by giving the impression it was riven with indecision and delay.

Arguments and evidence that the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 owed more to its decision to stay in the war than its domestic policies should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Provisional Government’s war aims damaged its standing by bringing it into conflict with the Petrograd Soviet e.g. the Milyukov crisis of April 1917
- The failure of the June Offensive undermined the credibility of the Provisional Government and increased the attraction of the Bolshevik pro-peace and pro-soviet platform
- The Provisional Government’s pro-war policy during the period February to October 1917 increasingly ran counter to the growing war-weariness and demoralisation evident in the army and population as a whole
- The Provisional Government’s failure to reverse Russia’s economic decline in 1917, which contributed to the radicalisation and alienation of the workers, was inextricably linked to continued involvement in the war.

Other relevant material must be credited.