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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.
**Generic Level Descriptors**

**Section A: Questions 1a/2a**

**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>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–2  | - 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 if any substantiation. Concepts of utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2     | 3–5  | - Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis 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 or confirm matters of detail.  
- Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3     | 6–8  | - 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.  
- Knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.  
- Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. |
**Section A: Questions 1b/2b**

**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     | 1–2  | - 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. Concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2     | 3–5  | - Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, 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. Concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3     | 6–9  | - 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 weight 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, with some justification. |
| 4     | 10–12| - 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.  
- 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.  
- Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement. |
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>No rewardable material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11–16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section A: indicative content
Option 2C.1: France in revolution, 1774-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a       | 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 the source to consider its value for an enquiry into Louis XVI’s attitude to the French Revolution in the early 1790s.  
1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:  
   - It implies that the King had tacitly accepted the revolution since he did not want to leave France or use military force against the population (‘felt disgust at the thought … against his own rebellious people’)  
   - It implies that the King had genuinely intended to uphold the Constitution but that the latter was so faulty it proved impossible for him to do this (‘could not doubt his intention … impossible to uphold’)
   - It suggests that the King was hostile to the Assembly and prepared to use force against that body if it would not negotiate new terms with him (‘only have employed force … a suitable arrangement with the Assembly’).
2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:  
   - The Marquis de Bouillé, as a personal associate of the King, was in a good position to provide an informed account of Louis XVI’s attitudes towards the French Revolution in the early 1790s
   - The author clearly intended to portray Louis XVI in a positive light as shown in his choice of language (‘told me he felt disgust’, ‘could not doubt his intention’, ‘he would only have employed force …’)
   - The Marquis de Bouillé’s memoirs were published in 1797, which suggests an attempt to rehabilitate Louis XVI’s reputation (and the monarchy generally) in the wake of the King’s execution.
3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:  
   - Louis XVI sent a circular to foreign courts in April 1791, implying he had recognised the revolution and in September 1791 he accepted the Constitution, albeit reluctantly
   - The King’s flight to Varennes (June 1791) was an attempt to reach Montmédy from where he intended to negotiate with the Constituent Assembly about the parts of the Constitution he disliked
   - In August 1792, incriminating correspondence between the French King and the Austrian royal family was discovered, which revealed that Louis was seeking to undermine the revolution. |
### Option 2C.1: France in revolution, 1774-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b</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 source in relation to an enquiry into Robespierre’s role in the Great Terror.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:
   - As a former member of the Committee of Public Safety, Billaud-Varenne was in a good position to provide an informed account of Robespierre’s role in the Great Terror
   - The defensive nature of the source is reflected in the description of a seemingly all-powerful Robespierre (‘enjoyed an immense popularity’, ‘the dominant figure’, ‘so much ascendancy over public opinion’)
   - Billaud-Varenne’s recollections of Robespierre’s role may have been influenced by a desire to limit or evade his own personal responsibility for the Great Terror.

2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:
   - It implies Robespierre acted independently in the Great Terror since he was not reliant on the Committee of Public Safety (‘Not one single fact ... was our work’, ‘by the time ... most important man in France’)
   - It suggests that Robespierre’s role in the Great Terror was based on the power and influence he had accumulated before joining the CPS (‘in the National Convention ... the dominant figure?’)
   - It suggests that public support for Robespierre during this period was due to his temperament and outlook (‘the strictest virtues, the most absolute devotion and the purest principles’).

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 the content. Relevant points may include:
   - Robespierre was the most prominent figure on the CPS and played a major role in imposing key aspects of the Great Terror, e.g. the Law of 22 Prairial
   - Robespierre was only one of 12 CPS members, all Committee decisions were collective, and he personally signed only a relatively small number of the Committee’s decrees
   - There were limits to Robespierre’s influence and authority during the Great Terror, e.g. he disagreed with the policy of de-Christianisation and the excesses of some representatives on mission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2a | 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 the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons for the February Revolution in 1917.  
1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:  
   - It implies that the onset of the February 1917 Revolution was not politically motivated (‘Neither the Bolsheviks ... led the workers of Petrograd on to the streets’)  
   - It suggests that the February Revolution was triggered by food shortages and then popular protest also targeted other discontents (‘The people demanded ‘Bread!’’, ‘there appeared the old slogans’)  
   - It suggests that anti-tsarist groups tried to channel this popular discontent in order to gain support and give the protests political direction (‘every revolutionary ... militant political slogans’).  
2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:  
   - As a prominent participant in Russian politics at the time, Chernov was in a good position to provide an informed account of the reasons for the February Revolution  
   - Although a senior SR, Chernov makes no partisan claims about the role of the Social Revolutionaries in triggering the February Revolution, which enhances the credibility of the account  
   - Chernov’s account was published almost 20 years after the event, which suggests he has had time to reflect on the reasons for the February Revolution.  
3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:  
   - On 23 February 1917 thousands of women demonstrated in Petrograd against food shortages and the war; within two days, strikes involving 250,000-300,000 workers paralysed the city  
   - The revolutionary parties played little part in the February Revolution, e.g. the Bolsheviks numbered no more than 10,000 at this time and virtually all their leaders were in exile  
   - The amnesty that followed Nicholas II’s abdication (2 March) encouraged anti-tsarist groups to attempt to fill the power vacuum created by the collapse of the autocracy. |
## Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894-1924

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b</strong></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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into Bolshevik views on making peace at Brest-Litovsk in 1918.

1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:
   - As Bolshevik leader and a key figure in the peace debate, Lenin was in a good position to provide an informed account of Bolshevik views on making peace in 1918
   - The main purpose of the speech was to win over the Bolshevik Central Committee to Lenin’s strategy of accepting German peace terms immediately (‘if we embark on a war … be swept away’)
   - The partisan nature of the source is reflected in the negative description of Trotsky’s policy on peace (‘international political showmanship’, ‘handing … to the Germans’).

2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:
   - It suggests that Lenin’s policy of immediate peace was the only realistic option for the Bolshevik government in early 1918 (‘the German military position is so good … bare hands’)
   - It implies that Trotsky’s preferred strategy was naïve and ignored the realities of power politics (‘international political showmanship’, ‘handing Estonia to the Germans’)
   - It suggests that large concessions would have to be made to safeguard the socialist regime (‘a shameful peace … forced to conclude’, ‘handing over independent Poland’, ‘reparations of three billion roubles’).

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 the content. Relevant points may include:
   - Trotsky’s ‘neither peace nor war’ approach to negotiations was completely undermined when the German army began advancing unopposed into Russian territory in February 1918
   - Lenin’s ‘realist’ position was then adopted and the regime accepted the draconian terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; Lenin also reasoned that a future German military collapse would render the treaty void
   - A third Bolshevik faction, the Left Communists (led by Bukharin), rejected the German peace terms and called for a revolutionary war against Germany to trigger a German working-class uprising.
### Section B: indicative content

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3**    | 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.  

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the failings of Louis XVI and his ministers in the 1780s were the main reason for the onset of the French Revolution in 1789.  

Arguments and evidence that the failings of Louis XVI and his ministers in the 1780s were the main reason for the onset of the French Revolution in 1789 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  

- As a monarch Louis XVI was perceived as indecisive, weak and dominated by his wife  
- Finance Minister Calonne’s attempt to extend taxes to the nobility and clergy, who resented it, led to protests in the parlements, which triggered the 1789 revolution  
- Louis XVI’s ill-judged decisions contributed to the onset of revolution by undermining the *ancien regime*, e.g. he exiled the Paris Parlement in 1788, called up the troops and abruptly dismissed Necker in 1789  
- Louis XVI’s Finance Ministers (Necker, Calonne and Brienne) all failed to address France’s financial problems effectively and by 1788 the state was facing bankruptcy, which sharpened divisions within French society.  

Arguments and evidence that other factors were the main reason/the failings of Louis XVI and his ministers were not the main reason for the onset of the French Revolution should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  

- The Enlightenment promoted the spread of new ideas based on reason, logic and evidence that challenged the structure, inequalities and rationale of the *ancien regime*  
- French involvement in the American War of Independence also encouraged the spread of more liberal ideas (following the colonists’ victory), which encouraged demands for reform in France  
- A poor harvest in 1788 exacerbated rural poverty, substantially increased urban bread prices (e.g. bread prices increased by 50 per cent in Paris) and contributed to an economic downturn, which led to popular protests  
- Office-holding in the royal bureaucracy was based on venality, which led to waste, corruption and incompetence, and also fed the resentment of bourgeois professionals who were excluded from the system.  

Other relevant material must be credited. |
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.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how significant was the threat posed by the Vendée revolt to the survival of the Republic in 1793.

Arguments and evidence that the threat posed by the Vendée revolt to the survival of the Republic in 1793 was significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Convention was forced to divert 30,000 troops from the revolutionary war front to deal with the Vendée rebels, thus undermining the war effort and increasing the risk of defeat for the Republic
- Pro-royalist and anti-revolutionary sentiment in the Vendée undermined the Republic’s provincial authority, e.g. rebels killed government officials, constitutional priests and National Guard members in the region
- The Vendée rebels opposed key policies of the Republic, such as conscription and the civil constitution, and the authorities felt compelled to combat such defiance by establishing the Committee of Public Safety
- The Vendée revolt posed a significant threat because it united elements from all three estates in an ‘anti-Paris’ coalition that was determined to preserve their traditional way of life.

Arguments and evidence that the threat posed by the Vendée revolt to the survival of the Republic in 1793 was not significant / the threat posed by other factors to the survival of the Republic in 1793 was significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Vendée revolt, as a very localised form of counter-revolution, failed to coordinate with the ‘federalist revolts’ elsewhere in France
- The Vendée rebels were not a real threat to the survival of the Republic since they were poorly disciplined, not used to set-piece battles, and reluctant to move very far from their homes
- The Republic was able to muster both the determination and the military resources to crush the revolt convincingly, e.g. the government’s victory at Le Mans (Dec 1793) which left 15,000 rebels dead
- Other factors could be seen as a more significant threat than the Vendée revolt, notably the foreign military threat to the Republic posed by the First Coalition in 1793.

Other relevant material must be credited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5        | 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.  
Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which government finance was strengthened by the Directory in the years 1795-99.  
Arguments and evidence that government finance was strengthened by the Directory in the years 1795-99 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- In September 1797, two-thirds of the national debt was written off through the issue of bonds to government creditors, which reduced interest payments and strengthened French finances  
- Finance Minister Ramel reformed the taxation system in 1798 (by introducing four new direct taxes and making tax collection more efficient), which helped the government to balance its books  
- Under the Directory, the French economy was boosted by income from the profits of war plunder, e.g. defeated states in Germany paid 16 million *livres* in indemnities and those in Italy paid about 200 million *livres*.  
Arguments and evidence that government finance was not strengthened by the Directory in the years 1795-99 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- The Directory’s attempts to strengthen the Treasury’s finances were not successful, e.g. the value of the *assignat* collapsed, the new currency became worthless, and the introduction of indirect taxes was unpopular  
- The monetary crisis experienced by the Directory in the years 1795-97 reduced purchasing power, which weakened the French economy  
- Ramel’s tax reforms did not cover the cost of running the country during wartime  
- The bonds issued by the Directory to write off government debt quickly slumped in value which alienated government creditors, thereby removing an important source of economic strength from the regime.  
Other relevant material must be credited. |
### Question 6

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.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the most important consequence of the 1905 Revolution in Russia was the creation of the duma.

Arguments and evidence that the most important consequence of the 1905 Revolution in Russia was the creation of the duma should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The creation of the duma provided Nicholas II with an opportunity to build a broadly-based political system that enjoyed popular support due to the participation of social classes previously unable to vote
- Members of the duma had the right of free speech and parliamentary immunity, and the right to question ministers on government policy, which encouraged greater scrutiny of the autocratic regime
- The creation of the duma led to fundamental civil freedoms being granted to the population, e.g. freedom of conscience, speech, assembly and association
- From 1906 and 1917, the duma provided a forum for multiparty politics and criticism of the regime; in this sense, the duma undermined the autocratic system and came to be seen as a possible alternative to it.

Arguments and evidence that counter or modify the view that the most important consequence of the 1905 Revolution in Russia was the creation of the duma should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The 1905 Revolution led to the implementation of other important reforms, e.g. tax arrears were cancelled, redemption payments were abolished, and Stolypin introduced agrarian reform
- The 1905 Revolution led to a prolonged period of state repression, e.g. government clamp-downs in St. Petersburg and Moscow, and troops were used to crush rural revolts in 1906-07
- Nicholas II limited the duma’s powers, e.g. the Tsar could veto any laws, dissolve the duma and appoint all ministers; the duma also had limited power over the budget and was restricted by the State Council.

Other relevant material must be credited.
7 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.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that opposition from the Petrograd Soviet was the main reason for the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917.

Arguments and evidence that opposition from the Petrograd Soviet was the main reason for the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- From the outset, the Petrograd Soviet was potentially a major opponent of the Provisional Government, e.g. a popularly elected body that was supported by workers and the Petrograd garrison
- The Petrograd Soviet’s Order No.1 (March 1917) illustrated starkly where real power lay in the Dual Power relationship and demonstrated that the Provisional Government did not control the army
- The Petrograd Soviet’s Order No.2 (March 1917), which advocated a defensive military strategy without territorial gains, undermined the government’s war effort and led to the damaging Milyukov or April crisis
- The Bolsheviks’ control of the Petrograd Soviet in September-October 1917 was an important factor in their successful overthrow of the Provisional Government.

Arguments and evidence that opposition from the Petrograd Soviet was not the main reason for the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Provisional Government’s status as an interim body weakened the executive by giving the general impression it was a temporary administration riven with indecision and delay
- Kerensky’s authority as Prime Minister of the Provisional Government was badly damaged by the impact of the Kornilov Affair (August 1917)
- The failure of the June 1917 offensive, with its high casualty and desertion rates and loss of territory, increased the workers’ and soldiers’ disaffection with the Provisional Government
- Initially the Petrograd Soviet did not want to take power from the Provisional Government, preferring a watchdog role instead; members of the Petrograd Soviet joined the Provisional Government to bolster it.

Other relevant material must be credited.
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.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which Bolshevik economic policies changed in the years 1917-24.

Arguments and evidence that Bolshevik economic policies changed in the years 1917-24 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Under War Communism (1918-21), the economy was rigidly state controlled but the NEP (1921-24) promoted a mixed economy with a certain amount of private ownership
- Under War Communism, compulsory requisitioning by food brigades was used to extract grain from the peasants but, under State Capitalism (1917-18) and the NEP, peasants were treated more leniently
- Workers’ control was established under State Capitalism but was abandoned in favour of ‘one man management’ under War Communism and limited private ownership under the NEP.

Arguments and evidence that Bolshevik economic policies did not change in the years 1917-24 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Nationalisation and state control was an important feature of State Capitalism, War Communism and the NEP
- The central objective of Bolshevik economic policy during these years was to keep the cities and the workers supplied with food
- Throughout the period, Bolshevik economic policy remained pragmatic (rather than ideological) in the face of shifting circumstances
- Throughout the period, Bolshevik economic policy was based on the assumption that raising the productivity of the agricultural sector held the key to long-term growth and stability.

Other relevant material must be credited.