



## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE History (9HI0/2C)  
Advanced 2019

Paper 2: Depth study

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

Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894–  
1924

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2019

Publications Code 9HI0\_2C\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## 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

Target: A02: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## Section B

Target: A01: 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	<p><b>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material</b> 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.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the challenge posed to the Republic by the Vendée revolt in 1793.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a senior Republican army officer with orders to regain control of the Vendée, Turreau could potentially offer an informed view on the challenge posed by the revolt</li> <li>• <b>The status of the source (a memoir) may seek to inflate Turreau's role, e.g. praising the rebels' military capabilities in order to make his eventual victory seem more impressive</b></li> <li>• The partisan nature of the source is evident from the use of language to <b>reinforce points</b> ('Their skill ... fires so many shots.', 'a fire which is ... deadly as ours.', 'Any educated army officer ... successfully here.')</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the challenge posed to the Republic by the Vendée revolt in 1793:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that the Republican forces struggled to quell the insurgency <b>because the rebels could exploit their knowledge of the local terrain</b> ('Their attack is sudden', 'never allows ...cavalry.')</li> <li>• It suggests that the rebels used effective military tactics against the Republican forces ('The rebels never allow ... where they want.', 'Their battle formation ... distance.')</li> <li>• It implies that the rebels were uncompromising in the pursuit of their aims ('crushed under a mass of fire.', 'In victory, they encircle you ... with a fury.').</li> </ul> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>Vendée rebels were able to overcome the Republic's forces at Pont-Charrault and Chalonnes</b> in March 1793; between April and June some 20,000 rebels controlled the region</li> <li>• The Vendée revolt contributed to the formation of the Committee of Public Safety (CPS) by the National Convention; the CPS viewed the defeat of the rebels as crucial to the survival of the Republic</li> <li>• The Vendée rebels were not a real challenge since they were poorly disciplined, not used to set-piece battles, reluctant to move very far from their homes, and failed to coordinate with the federalist revolts.</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 2</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a government official working in a department affected by the revolt, de Benaben could potentially offer an informed view on the challenge posed to the Republic by the Vendée revolt in 1793</li> <li>• The status of the source (commissioner reports) offers an official view on the challenge posed to the Republic by the Vendée revolt in 1793</li> <li>• The source is confined to specific events (e.g. at Le Mans and Savenay) and thus covers only part of the Vendée revolt.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the challenge posed to the Republic by the Vendée revolt in 1793:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that the Republic was able to deal with the challenge posed by <b>the Vendée revolt ('The whole route ... the rebels.', 'an entirely...the rebels.'</b>)</li> <li>• It implies that, given the intensity of the military force used by the government at Le Mans, the Republic viewed the Vendée revolt as a <b>serious challenge ('town taken by storm', 'the fury of the soldiers.'</b>)</li> <li>• It implies that the Vendée revolt attracted significant support and was thus a serious challenge <b>to the Republic ('More than 2,000 were shot.', 'we made about 1,200 rebels 'drink'.')</b></li> <li>• It implies that influential groups were involved in leading the insurgents, thereby making the <b>revolt a greater challenge to the Republic ('nobles, priests and all those ... great influence over the population.')</b></li> </ul> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The Vendée revolt posed a significant challenge because it united <b>elements from all three estates in an 'anti-Paris' coalition</b> that was determined to preserve their traditional way of life</li> <li>• The Republic was able to muster both the determination and the military <b>resources to crush the revolt convincingly, e.g. the government's victory at Le Mans (December 1793) which left 15,000 rebels dead.</b></li> </ul> <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources either state or imply that the Vendée rebels posed a serious challenge to the Republic</li> <li>• Both sources state that the Republic had to intervene directly to pacify the Vendée</li> <li>• These points of agreement are reinforced due to the fact that both authors acted for the Republic during the Vendée revolt.</li> </ul>

## Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894–1924

Question	Indicative content
2	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in March 1917.</p> <p>Source 3</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The status of the source (an imperial Act) offers <b>Nicholas II's</b> official position on the reasons for the abdication</li> <li>• As a document intended for public consumption, the Act is clearly designed to persuade the Russian people that the Tsar is acting in the national interest</li> <li>• The tone of the language used in the source emphasises that the abdication is the proper response to the great crisis facing Russia ('voice of my <b>conscience</b>', '<b>new and formidable trial</b>', 'my <b>duty to abdicate</b>').</li> </ul> <p>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 abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in March 1917:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that <b>the Tsar's abdication was due to the pressures of war</b> ('terrible struggle against the foreign <b>enemy</b>', '<b>cruel</b> foreign enemy ... <b>supreme effort</b>')</li> <li>• It implies that the abdication was prompted by the need to improve the efficiency of the Russian war effort ('enabling <b>the closest</b> ... achievement <b>of victory</b>')</li> <li>• It implies that <b>the abdication was a voluntary decision on Nicholas II's part</b> ('I think it my <b>duty</b> ... <b>the supreme power</b>').</li> </ul> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By late 1916, <b>military defeat and the regime's mismanagement of the war effort</b> had alienated the Progressive Bloc and prominent moderates such as Guchkov and Lvov were considering the overthrow of the Tsar</li> <li>• By early 1917, the army high command and the bureaucracy concluded that a government of Duma politicians had a better chance of winning the war and preventing domestic disintegration than the Tsar</li> <li>• <b>Nicholas II's abdication was not voluntary: the army high command</b> overrode his instructions to regain control of Petrograd and pressed (along with senior Duma politicians) for his abdication.</li> </ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 4</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a prominent politician in 1917, Kerensky was potentially in a good position to offer an informed view about the reasons for the abdication of Nicholas II in March 1917</li> <li>• <b>The purpose of Kerensky's account</b> was to portray Nicholas II as an <b>inadequate ruler, thereby reflecting the author's anti-tsarist political stance</b></li> <li>• The partisan nature of the source is evident from the use of language to <b>reinforce points</b> ('this living mask of a ruler', 'consequently humdrum ... no longer thrilled').</li> </ul> <p>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 abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in March 1917:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that Nicholas II viewed the exercise of power as a great <b>weight</b> ('He bore 'the burden of power' until the end.', 'former Emperor ... calm and even happy mood.')</li> <li>• It claims that Nicholas II abdicated because he had no wish to hold on to <b>power</b> ('he would not fight for it: he had no wish to rule', 'free of all duties and obligations')</li> <li>• It indicates that Nicholas viewed his abdication as a form of <b>divine intervention</b> ('It was God's will', he said).</li> </ul> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nicholas II became increasingly fatalistic in the period immediately before his abdication, suggesting he had lost faith in his ability to protect the <b>autocracy, e.g. his dismissal of Rodzianko's warning in late February 1917</b></li> <li>• For Nicholas, abdication came as a relief since he was a reluctant Tsar and felt he lacked the attributes to take on such a role</li> <li>• <b>Given Nicholas II's longstanding affection for the army, the withdrawal of the leading generals' support was critical; without their backing, the Tsar lacked the will to attempt to hold on to power.</b></li> </ul> <p>Sources 3 and 4</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources suggest that Nicholas II was unable to deal with the pressures and demands associated with the <b>Tsar's role</b></li> <li>• Both sources suggest that the abdication occurred, in part, because Nicholas II was not prepared to cling to power regardless of the circumstances</li> <li>• These points of agreement are reinforced due to the contrasting positions of the authors (the Tsar and a prominent political opponent).</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the reforms of the National Assembly (1789–91) transformed France.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the reforms of the National Assembly (1789–91) transformed France should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feudal rights (1789–90) and the nobility (1790) were abolished, and the principle of democracy was introduced at all levels by the extension of the <b>voting rights to 'active citizens'</b>, creating the widest franchise in Europe</li> <li>• The tax system was overhauled, via the abolition of most indirect taxation, the removal of exemptions and the introduction of three new direct taxes, making it, in overall terms, more just</li> <li>• A single, more enlightened legal system was created, available to all with a jury system, which abolished torture, hanging and branding, and reduced the number of crimes punishable by death</li> <li>• Some of the abuses in, and privileges of, the church were removed, e.g. tithes were abolished, pluralism forbidden and Protestants/Jews were granted civil rights; the church was also made subservient to the state.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the reforms of the National Assembly (1789–91) did not transform France should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The three-tier indirect electoral system was designed to ensure that politics remained the preserve of wealthy men, e.g. only about 50,000 qualified as electors and under 10 per cent could stand as deputies</li> <li>• Some measures perpetuated social divisions, e.g. the Chapelier Law of June 1791 banned trade unions, collective bargaining, picketing and strikes, which only benefited the affluent bourgeoisie</li> <li>• The attempt to establish a constitutional monarchy was undermined by the unreliability of Louis XVI, e.g. the flight to Varennes (1791)</li> <li>• The National Assembly viewed poor relief as a state responsibility since almost two million people were reduced to begging, but the Assembly lacked the financial resources to introduce any meaningful reform in this area.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p><b>Answers will be credited according to candidates'</b> 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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the Directory restored financial, but not political, stability.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Directory restored financial, but not political, stability should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-thirds of the national debt was written off in September 1797 through the issue of bonds to government creditors, which reduced interest payments and stabilised French finances at least for a time</li> <li>• Finance Minister Vincent Ramel reformed the taxation system in 1798 (by introducing four new direct taxes and making tax collection more efficient), which enabled the government to balance its books</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The constitution of Year III, which established annual elections and provided no mechanism to resolve executive-legislature disputes or alter the constitution, failed to give the Directory political stability</li> <li>• In an attempt to preserve a non-Jacobin/Royalist majority, the directors interfered with elections, which undermined respect for the political system, e.g. Law of 22 Floreal.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that challenge the statement that the Directory restored financial, but not political, stability should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Directory's constitutional arrangements (based on the Directory of five, the Council of Five Hundred and the Council of Ancients) prevented the concentration of power and avoided the extremism of 1793–94</b></li> <li>• <b>Until Fructidor (1797) the Directory provided a moderate 'representative' government steering a middle course between the restoration of the monarchy and the introduction of popular democracy</b></li> <li>• <b>Attempts to restore 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</b></li> <li>• The monetary crisis of 1795–97 reduced purchasing power, which undermined economic stability; the bonds issued to write off government debt quickly slumped in value, which alienated government creditors.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894–1924

Question	Indicative content
5	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far Tsarist government in the years 1894–1905 was fundamentally similar to Tsarist government in the years 1906–14.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Tsarist government in the years 1894–1905 was fundamentally similar to Tsarist government in the years 1906–14 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout both periods, the Tsarist government relied on repression to maintain control, e.g. in 1901 the army was used 300 times to deal with strikers and <b>Stolypin's 'pacification' of the countryside in 1906–09</b></li> <li>• The autocratic government structure in the years 1906–14 was similar to that in the years 1894–1905, e.g. <b>Nicholas rejected the 'senseless dream' of political reform (1895)</b> and the impact of the 1907 electoral law</li> <li>• Before and after 1905 Nicholas II was temperamentally unsuited to leadership in the modern age, e.g. his enduring belief in divine right and autocracy, and his dislike of the Duma and reforming ministers</li> <li>• Before and after 1905, the government attempted to modernise Russia in <b>order to strengthen the Tsarist regime, e.g. Witte's industrialisation programme (1893–1903) and Stolypin's agrarian reforms after 1905.</b></li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Tsarist government in the years 1894–1905 was not fundamentally similar to Tsarist government in the years 1906–14 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of the Duma in 1906 introduced an elected national legislative body that had not existed before and which was prepared to <b>criticise the Tsar's government</b></li> <li>• Nicholas adopted a different attitude and coexisted with the Duma; he resisted calls from some of his ministers to strip the Duma of its powers and turn it into a purely consultative body</li> <li>• The October Manifesto (1905) granted the legal right to form political parties and these were, within limits, free to criticise the tsarist government; such a system did not exist before 1906</li> <li>• From 1906 the tsarist regime had a constitution of sorts in the form of the Fundamental Laws and a freer press, which helped to encourage public political debate.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the survival of the Bolshevik regime, in the years 1917–21, owed more to the weaknesses of its opponents than to the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the survival of the Bolshevik regime, in the years 1917–21, owed more to the weaknesses of its opponents than to the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mensheviks and SRs did not seriously oppose the Bolsheviks after the seizure <b>of power in 1917, mistakenly believing that Lenin's government</b> would quickly collapse and the Constituent Assembly would triumph</li> <li>• The White forces in the civil war were made up of different groups with different aims and beliefs, which made cooperation difficult and the formulation of an agreed political strategy impossible</li> <li>• Foreign intervention against the Bolsheviks during the civil war lacked real unity of purpose, was driven by national self-interest, and was also undermined by war-weariness</li> <li>• Major revolts against Bolshevik rule, such as Kronstadt and Tambov (involving 15,000 and 40,000 rebels respectively), failed to coordinate with other opponents of the regime.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the survival of the Bolshevik regime, in the years 1917–21, owed more to the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky than to the weaknesses of its opponents should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lenin was the driving force behind the forcible closure of the Constituent Assembly and acceptance of the Treat of Brest-Litovsk; both decisions helped the fledgling Bolshevik regime to survive</li> <li>• Lenin used his personal authority to gain Bolshevik acceptance of the NEP <b>in order to create a vital 'breathing space' for the regime in early 1921;</b> this policy change led to improved economic conditions</li> <li>• <b>Trotsky's organisation, and leadership, of the Red Army was a critical</b> factor in the Bolshevik victory in the civil war of 1918–20</li> <li>• Trotsky led the Red forces against the rebels based at Kronstadt in March 1921; in crushing the mutiny he removed a serious threat to Bolshevik power.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>