



## Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0/2C)  
Advanced 2020

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)

Autumn 2020

Publications Code 9HI0\_2C\_2010\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1-3</b>	<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>
<b>2</b>	<b>4-7</b>	<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>
<b>3</b>	<b>8-12</b>	<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>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<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>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="384 210 1382 353">• 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 data-bbox="384 371 1406 562">• 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 data-bbox="384 580 1390 754">• 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:** 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.

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</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p>of the relationships between key features of the period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="384 210 1390 322">• 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 data-bbox="384 338 1374 450">• 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 data-bbox="384 465 1337 530">• 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>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.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the power of the French monarchy in the years immediately before 1789.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Minister of Justice, Chrétien-François de Lamoignon could potentially offer an informed view on the power of the French monarchy in the years immediately before 1789</li> <li>• As the source was a speech before the <i>Parlement</i> of Paris, it appears to have been designed to remind the audience listening that the monarch's power is absolute and cannot be challenged</li> <li>• The partisan nature of the source is evident from the use of language to reinforce points ('universally accepted by the nation', 'the unchanging principles of the French monarchy.').</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the power of the French monarchy in the years immediately before 1789: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that sovereign power over the nation and population belongs exclusively to the French monarch ('Sovereign power ... king alone', 'The king ... embodies the nation', 'Legislative power ... sharing with no-one.')</li> <li>• It indicates that only the monarch has the power to convene the Estates-General ('The right to convene ... useful or necessary.')</li> <li>• It implies that the authority of the French absolute monarchy was being challenged by the <i>Parlement</i> ('When our kings ... rival royal authority.').</li> </ul> </li> <li>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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Louis XVI's role as an absolute monarch rested on the widely accepted belief that the king's power was total and bestowed by God, according to the concept of divine right</li> <li>• In reality, there were practical limits to the king's 'absolute' power, e.g. he</li> </ul> </li> </ol>



Question	Indicative content
	<p>relied on advisers and ministers for guidance, he was bound by French law and customs, and needed the co-operation of the noble elite</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In July 1787, the Paris <i>parlement</i> challenged Louis XVI's power by refusing to sanction new taxes; the king's response (exiling the <i>parlement</i>) provoked the 'revolt of the aristocracy'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source 2</b></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 relatives of the King and prominent members of the French nobility, the authors could potentially offer an informed view on the power of the French monarchy in the years immediately before 1789</li> <li>• The status of the source (a petition) suggests that the princes wanted to persuade the king to take action to preserve the system of French absolutism</li> <li>• The partisan nature of the source is evident from the use of language to reinforce points ('the State is in danger', 'stirring up opinion', 'deliberate insubordination and contempt').</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 power of the French monarchy in the years immediately before 1789:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that although the king is personally respected, the governing system based on the French absolute monarchy is being challenged ('Sire, the State ... principles of government')</li> <li>• It implies that the current climate of criticism regarding the system of French absolutism will only get worse ('Everything reveals ... opinions will stop?')</li> <li>• It indicates that the key features of the power structure based on the French absolute monarchy (royal, estate and feudal rights) are being questioned ('The rights of the throne ... a left-over from a barbaric past.').</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>• Enlightenment thinkers challenged the power of the French absolute monarchy by criticising the structure and inequality of the <i>ancien régime</i></li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Criticism of the power of the French absolute monarchy was fuelled by other factors, e.g. the impact of the American Revolution and the American War of Independence, and royal expenditure</li><li>• The second Assembly of Notables was concerned at mounting pressure to double Third Estate representation at the Estates-General; this would increase criticism of the French absolute monarchy and the feudal order.</li></ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></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 French absolute monarchy had considerable power</li><li>• Both sources either state or imply that the powers of the French absolute monarchy are being called into question</li><li>• These points of agreement are reinforced due to the different positions of the authors (a government minister and close relatives of the king).</li></ul>

**Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894-1924**

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the problems associated with foreign intervention in Russia after the Bolshevik takeover.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></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 (a diplomat's report) offers an official British assessment of the problems associated with foreign intervention in Russia after the Bolshevik takeover</li> <li>• As a confidential document, the report is likely to be candid in its assessment of the problems surrounding foreign intervention</li> <li>• The status of the author and date of the document are likely to make this government report an informed contemporary source.</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 problems associated with foreign intervention in Russia after the Bolshevik takeover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that open foreign intervention would provide the Bolsheviks with a pretext to abandon the wartime alliance and hand over military resources to the Germans ('give Lenin's party ... German prisoners.')</li> <li>• It suggests that the benefits of foreign intervention are speculative rather than guaranteed ('Cossacks might also come in', 'It might secure ... Fleet')</li> <li>• It indicates that secret British funding (of anti-Bolshevik groups) might not be used by the recipients as intended ('we have no guarantee ... pure gamble.').</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>• Foreign intervention was made more likely by Bolshevik-German peace negotiations, since the latter raised the prospect of German territorial and military gains, placing the Allies in a weaker position</li> <li>• Once the First World War was over, the rationale for foreign intervention was considerably weakened, since there was now no incentive to install a new government that was willing to fight Germany</li> <li>• Britain sent around £100 million of supplies to the White forces but, due to incompetence and corruption, some of these resources ended up in</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="400 163 635 197">Bolshevik hands.</p> <p data-bbox="304 645 432 678"><b>Source 4</b></p> <p data-bbox="352 723 1353 835">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 data-bbox="352 880 1412 1272" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="352 880 1412 1037">• As a British agent in Moscow in 1917-18, Bruce Lockhart was potentially in a good position to offer an informed view about the problems associated with foreign intervention in Russia after the Bolshevik takeover</li> <li data-bbox="352 1037 1412 1149">• The purpose of Bruce Lockhart's account was to illustrate that small-scale foreign intervention in 1918 was a mistake, thereby endorsing the author's own critical stance</li> <li data-bbox="352 1149 1412 1272">• The partisan nature of the source is evident from the use of language to reinforce points ('unbelievable error', 'absence of a strong lead', 'remained completely apathetic.').</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1361 1377 1473">2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the problems associated with foreign intervention in Russia after the Bolshevik takeover:</p> <ul data-bbox="352 1518 1412 1832" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="352 1518 1412 1630">• It implies that large-scale foreign intervention would have galvanised anti-communist opposition in Russia and demoralised the Bolsheviks ('On 4 August ... excitement', 'In despair ... ready for departure.')</li> <li data-bbox="352 1630 1412 1709">• It claims that the small-scale nature of foreign intervention did not pose a real threat to the Bolsheviks ('He now said ... few hundred men.')</li> <li data-bbox="352 1709 1412 1832">• It claims that the lack of large scale committed foreign intervention led to divisions among anti-Bolshevik groups in Russia and encouraged apathy among the Russian people ('In the absence ... completely apathetic.').</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1955 1377 2067">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>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Only 200,000 foreign troops were sent to Russia and since these were deployed defensively across three main areas, the intervention did little to strengthen anti-communism in Russia</li><li>• Allied intervention did not pose a major threat to the Bolsheviks since most foreign troops defended ports and arms depots and rarely engaged communist forces in battle</li><li>• The temporary, limited and dispersed presence of foreign troops did little to hold the disparate White forces together or mobilise popular support, e.g. most British, French and US soldiers left in 1919.</li></ul> <p><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></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 open foreign intervention in Russia (either in the abstract or in reality) had a negative impact on Russia</li><li>• Both sources suggest that open foreign intervention (either in the abstract or in reality) benefited the Bolsheviks</li><li>• These points of agreement are reinforced due to the contrasting positions of the authors (a British secret agent in Moscow and a British diplomat).</li></ul>

## Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the significance of external threats in sharpening divisions within France in the years 1791-94.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that external threats were significant in sharpening divisions within France in the years 1791-94 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Pillnitz Declaration (1791) and the presence of <i>émigré</i> troops under the Comte d'Artois on France's north-eastern border hardened attitudes against Louis XVI</li> <li>• The Brunswick Manifesto (1792) and poor French performance in the war strengthened public opposition in Paris to the king and divided France more sharply between republicans and moderates</li> <li>• The war led to domestic violence, as Parisians were encouraged by radical orators to deal with the 'enemy within' in the face of foreign invasion, e.g. the September Massacres of 1792</li> <li>• Economic hardship caused by the war and conscription measures sharpened social and Paris-provincial divisions, e.g. the government levy of February 1793 triggered the Vendée rebellion.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that external threats were not significant/other factors were more significant in sharpening divisions within France in the years 1791-94. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External threats helped unite France in support of the revolution, as many Frenchmen enthusiastically joined the revolutionary army and during 1794 the French military position improved markedly</li> <li>• Religious issues had a divisive impact during these years, e.g. Louis XVI's use of royal vetoes (1791-92), the unofficial policy of dechristianisation (1793-94) and Robespierre's Cult of the Supreme Being (1794)</li> <li>• Louis XVI's reluctance to assume the role of constitutional monarch created deeper divisions by encouraging the growth of republicanism, e.g. the flight to Varennes and his proclamation to the French people in 1791</li> <li>• The role of Robespierre and the sans-culottes in radicalising the revolution through the Terror (1793-94) led to resistance, e.g. the federalist revolts and opposition from other revolutionaries.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

4

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 about whether economic and financial problems were the primary reason for the collapse of the Directory in 1799.

Arguments and evidence that economic and financial problems were the primary reason for the collapse of the Directory in 1799 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Directory launched a new paper currency in 1796 but inflation soon made this virtually worthless, alienating government officials, rentiers and workers
- Metal coins became the only legal currency from 1797 but were in short supply and resulted in deflation which made the Directory unpopular with producers and retailers due to low prices
- By writing off two-thirds of the debt it owed to its creditors, and compensating them with bonds that soon became worthless, the Directory also angered debt holders
- Due to the wartime deficit, the Directory revived indirect taxes (e.g. the *octrois* was reintroduced) which eroded popular support
- The 1799 decree imposing a forced loan of 100 million livres on the rich to cover war costs alienated many and led to non-compliance in some local areas
- Food shortages and supply problems due to poor harvests, the British blockade and the Directory's policy of requisitioning domestic produce for the French military led to widespread economic discontent.

Arguments and evidence that other problems were the primary reason for the collapse of the Directory in 1799 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- 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
- In an attempt to preserve a non-Jacobin majority, the Directors interfered with elections (e.g. Law of 22 Floreal) which undermined respect for the political system
- Challenges to the Directory eroded its political authority, e.g. Babeuf's Conspiracy of Equals (1796), the coup of Fructidor (1797), the coup of Floreal (1798) and the coup of Brumaire (1799)
- The Directory's increasing reliance on the army (e.g. the coup of Fructidor in 1797) made a military takeover more likely, as happened in the coup of Brumaire (1799)
- The Second Coalition posed a significant military threat to the Directory in 1798-99, e.g. French forces were forced to retreat from Italy and Russian troops occupied Switzerland.

Other relevant material must be credited.



**Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894-1924**

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that Tsarism remained a fundamentally stable system of government in the years 1894-1914.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Tsarism remained a fundamentally stable system of government in the years 1894-1914 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout the period, Tsarism was able to rely on repression to maintain control and preserve the stability of the system, e.g. the Okhrana's use of infiltration tactics and Stolypin's 'pacification' policy in 1906-09</li> <li>• The autocratic government structure remained largely intact during these years, e.g. the lack of reform before 1905, the Fundamental Laws of 1906 and the impact of the 1907 electoral law</li> <li>• Revolutionary parties committed to the overthrow of Tsarism, such as the Social Democrats, Populists and Social Revolutionaries, lacked support, were internally divided and failed to cooperate</li> <li>• Liberal opposition to Tsarism in the years 1894-1914 was hampered by the relatively small size of the Russian middle class and liberal fears of inciting an all-engulfing mass revolt against autocracy.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Tsarism did not remain a fundamentally stable system of government in the years 1894-1914 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widespread disturbances among the peasantry, workers and nationalities in 1905 destabilised Tsarism and forced it to make concessions, e.g. the October Manifesto and the scrapping of redemption payments</li> <li>• The reforms that followed the 1905 Revolution meant that Tsarism had to operate in a much more overtly critical political environment, e.g. creation of the duma, the legal right to form political parties and a freer press</li> <li>• Attempts to modernise the Tsarist system did little to alleviate socio-economic tensions and increased popular discontent, e.g. Witte's industrialisation programme and Stolypin's agrarian reforms</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Nicholas II was a source of instability because he was inconsistent and unsuited to the role of a leader, e.g. he held the Duma in disdain and wanted to pass undiluted autocratic power to his son.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the differences between the revolutions of February 1917 and October 1917 far outweigh their similarities.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the differences between the revolutions of February 1917 and October 1917 far outweigh their similarities should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• February 1917 represented a large spontaneous popular protest against the failures of Tsarism, whereas October 1917 amounted to a seizure of power by a small group of organised revolutionaries</li> <li>• February 1917 resulted in the Dual Power arrangement that constrained the authority of the Provisional Government; October 1917 led to the establishment of one-party government</li> <li>• February 1917 produced a 'honeymoon' period of political reform (e.g. an amnesty for political prisoners and freedom of speech and assembly), whereas October 1917 led quickly to political repression</li> <li>• February 1917 produced a cautious interim body that was to hold power only until the election of the Constituent Assembly; October 1917 led to a government determined to hold on to power and implement radical change.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the similarities between the revolutions of February 1917 and October 1917 far outweigh their differences should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both revolutions in 1917 were fuelled by the economic and social consequences of Russia's involvement in the First World War, e.g. rising inflation, deteriorating living conditions and industrial dislocation</li> <li>• Neither the Tsar in February 1917 nor the Provisional Government in October 1917 offered much resistance at the critical point when their authority was being directly challenged</li> <li>• In both revolutions, the army was not prepared to defend the government under threat, making its downfall virtually inevitable, e.g. the military in Petrograd effectively abandoned the Tsar and the Provisional</li> </ul>

	<p>Government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Both revolutions can be seen as popular revolts against authority, reflecting widespread public disillusionment with the government of the day; Petrograd was central to events in both revolutions.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>
--	---

