



# Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0)

Paper 2: Depth study

2C.1: France in revolution, 1774–99

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)

November 2021

Question Paper Log Number P66274

Publications Code 9HI0\_2C\_rms\_20211216

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## 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>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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 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 <b>for King Louis XVI's flight to Varennes in June 1791.</b></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>• The Marquis de Bouillé's personal connections with the King and the planning for the flight potentially enabled him to provide an informed <b>account of Louis XVI's</b> reasons for embarking on the flight to Varennes</li> <li>• The author clearly intended to portray Louis XVI's motives in a positive light as shown in his choice of <b>language ('told me he felt disgust', 'could not doubt ... his intention')</b></li> <li>• <b>The Marquis de Bouillé's memoirs were published in 1797</b>, which suggests <b>an attempt to rehabilitate Louis XVI's reputation</b> regarding the flight to Varennes in the wake <b>of the King's execution.</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 King Louis XVI's flight to Varennes in June 1791:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that the King embarked on the flight to Varennes because the constitution was so faulty it proved impossible for him to uphold it ('so imperfect ... <b>impossible to uphold</b>')</li> <li>• It implies that the King embarked on the flight to Varennes because, in reality, he refused to accept the political constraints imposed on him since <b>1789 ('once the King had recovered his liberty.')</b></li> <li>• It suggests that the flight to Varennes was motivated by the King's hostility to the Assembly; he was determined to force it to negotiate new terms with him ('<b>employed force</b> ... arrangement with the Assembly.').</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>• <b>The King's flight to Varennes</b> was an attempt to reach the relative protection of the French frontier town of Montmédy, from where he intended to renegotiate the constitution with the National Assembly</li> <li>• <b>Louis XVI's</b> flight to Varennes was partly motivated by his opposition, as a devout Catholic, to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; his anger increased when he could not attend Easter Mass</li> <li>• Louis may have felt that, following Mirabeau's death, his support in the National Assembly was waning; Louis may also have been motivated by rumours of an Austrian invasion to restore his absolute power.</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>• Grégoire, as a radical Jacobin, clergyman and member of the National Assembly, was able to provide a radical perspective on <b>Louis XVI's reasons</b> for embarking on the flight to Varennes in June 1791</li> <li>• The author clearly intended to portray Louis <b>XVI's motives</b> in a negative light, <b>as shown in his choice of language</b> ('abandoned his post.', 'a declaration which, if not criminal', 'conspiracy against liberty')</li> <li>• Grégoire's account, as a public speech, was clearly intended to persuade members of the National Assembly that Louis XVI's motives for the flight to Varennes were dishonourable and threatened the revolution.</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 King Louis <b>XVI's flight to Varennes in June 1791</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that the King embarked on the flight to Varennes because he disagreed with the revolutionary settlement introduced since 1789 ('a written declaration ... contrary to the principles of our liberty.')</li> <li>• It suggests that the view that the King's flight to Varennes was an attempt to facilitate peaceful negotiations with the Assembly is unconvincing ('in that case, it was useless to flee from the capital.')</li> <li>• It implies that the King's real motive was to mobilise military force against the Assembly in particular and the revolution in general ('support his claims with military force, in that case it was a conspiracy against liberty.')</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>• Before leaving, the King drew up a proclamation to the French people in which he made it clear that the flight to Varennes was motivated by his rejection of the revolution</li> <li>• The King's flight was partly driven by his dislike of being 'restricted' by the National Assembly; he hoped that, by putting himself 'out of reach' at Montmédy, he would be in a stronger position</li> <li>• Afterwards, the King stated that the flight was motivated by his concern for the safety of his family if they stayed in Paris; he denied he intended to leave France in collusion with foreign powers, his relatives or émigrés.</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 imply that the flight to Varennes was motivated by the King's rejection of political developments and the apparent revolutionary settlement of 1791</li> <li>• Both sources either state or imply that the flight to Varennes was motivated by the King's desire to strengthen his position in relation to the National Assembly</li> <li>• These points of agreement are reinforced due to the different positions of the authors (a royalist general involved in the flight and a radical Jacobin).</li> </ul>



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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited <b>according to candidates' deployment of material in</b> 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 <b>Lenin's influence over the Central Committee in October 1917.</b></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>• As a member of the Central Committee, Trotsky was potentially in a good position to offer an informed view on Lenin's influence over the Central Committee</li> <li>• The author clearly intended to portray Lenin's influence over the Central Committee in October 1917 as crucial for success, as shown in his choice <b>of language ('Lenin's leadership ... such arguments', 'Lenin was right')</b></li> <li>• The account was published about seven years after October 1917 and the passage of time may have influenced Trotsky's recollections of Lenin's influence over the Central Committee just before the revolution.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about <b>Lenin's</b> influence over the Central Committee in October 1917:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that Lenin's influence was not automatic because he had to work hard to overcome resistance within the Central Committee to a policy of immediate revolution ('persistent ... relentless pressure')</li> <li>• It indicates that Lenin's influence was instrumental in securing a Central Committee decision on 10 October for an armed rising ('The pressure exerted by Lenin secured ... Central Committee.')</li> <li>• It indicates that, even after 10 October, Lenin did not exert complete influence over the Central Committee ('Central Committee members, Zinoviev and Kamenev ... against an immediate armed insurrection.').</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>• Before 10 October, the Central Committee largely <b>ignored Lenin's letters</b> calling for an immediate uprising; up to this point Lenin was in hiding in Finland</li> <li>• At the Central Committee meeting of 10 October, most of those attending were initially opposed to an uprising but were eventually won round by Lenin's arguments; only Zinoviev and Kamenev voted against</li> <li>• At the Central Committee meeting on 16 October, Zinoviev and Kamenev opposed Lenin's position and four others abstained, thus revealing that the Bolshevik leader did not exert total influence over that body.</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>• This letter is a confidential document and so would be likely to contain Lenin's candid views about the actions of the Central Committee and its members</li> <li>• <b>The purpose of Lenin's letter was</b> to strengthen his influence over the Central Committee by seeking to expel his chief critics, Zinoviev and Kamenev, from that body</li> <li>• The date of the letter (19 October 1917) makes it a relevant contemporary source concerning Lenin's influence over the Central Committee immediately before the Bolshevik takeover.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about <b>Lenin's influence</b> over the Central Committee in October 1917:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that Zinoviev and Kamenev attempted to mobilise opposition in the Central Committee to Lenin's pro-insurrection stance but they failed to attract support ('Zinoviev attempted to defeat ... not a single vote')</li> <li>• It indicates that Zinoviev and Kamenev continued to challenge Lenin's influence after the Central Committee had passed a resolution in favour of armed insurrection ('began to dispute ... been taken.')</li> <li>• It suggests that Zinoviev's and Kamenev's decision to air their objections in the non-Bolshevik press was a sign that Lenin had effectively marginalised opposition within the Central Committee.</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>• Lenin travelled secretly to Petrograd on 10 October and secured a 10-2 majority in the Central Committee for an armed uprising; on 16 October another Central Committee meeting endorsed a seizure of power by 19-2</li> <li>• Lenin faced opposition not only from Zinoviev and Kamenev but also from another important Central Committee member, Trotsky, but the Bolshevik leader was able to overcome his objections, too</li> <li>• Zinoviev and Kamenev published their objections to <b>Lenin's policy in Gorky's newspaper <i>New Life</i></b> (18 October) and resigned from the Central Committee, actions that strengthened Lenin's <b>influence</b> over that body.</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 Lenin's influence over the Central Committee in October 1917 was not total</li> <li>• Both sources indicate that opposition to Lenin's influence over the Central Committee came from senior members Zinoviev and Kamenev, but they were not successful</li> <li>• Both sources suggest that Lenin exerted considerable influence over the Central Committee in October 1917.</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' <b>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the lack of effective financial reform was primarily responsible for undermining the <i>ancien régime</i> in France.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the lack of effective financial reform was primarily responsible for undermining the <i>ancien régime</i> in France should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turgot failed to ban the <i>corvée</i> and introduce a property tax payable by all in 1776 due to resistance from the First and Second Estates and the <i>parlements</i>; consequently, fundamental causes of discontent remained</li> <li>• Necker's policies increased the state's debt and the <i>Compte rendu</i> (1781) concealed the massive deficit from the public, which intensified the shock to the regime when France's real financial condition was later revealed</li> <li>• <b>Calonne's attempt to extend taxes to the nobility</b> and clergy led to protests in the <i>parlements</i> and provoked the 'revolt of the aristocracy', which helped to trigger the 1789 revolution</li> <li>• Turgot, Necker and Calonne all failed to secure consistent support from Louis XVI for their financial reforms in the face of resistance from the First and Second Estates; this helped to undermine the <i>ancien régime</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors or developments were primarily responsible for undermining the <i>ancien régime</i> in France should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Louis XVI's ill-judged decisions contributed to the onset of revolution by undermining the <i>ancien régime</i>, e.g. he exiled the Paris <i>Parlement</i> in 1788 and called up the troops</li> <li>• The Enlightenment promoted the spread of new ideas based on reason, logic and evidence, which challenged the structure, inequalities and rationale of the <i>ancien régime</i></li> <li>• French involvement in the American War of Independence also <b>encouraged the spread of more liberal ideas (following the colonists' victory)</b>, which encouraged demands for reform in France</li> <li>• Office-holding in the royal bureaucracy was based on venality, which led to waste, corruption and incompetence, and also fed the resentment of those bourgeois professionals who were excluded from the system.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to <b>candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme</b>. 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 statement that the nature of the Terror in France changed markedly in the years 1793-94.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that nature of the Terror in France changed markedly in the years 1793-94 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parisian <i>sans-culottes</i> were the popular driving force behind the Terror in 1793 (e.g. the General Maximum, the Law of Suspects) but were later marginalised by the Committee of Public Safety (CPS)</li> <li>• The Terror became increasingly centralised during 1794 under Robespierre and the CPS, e.g. Law on General Police, Law of 19 Floréal Year II and Law of 22 Prairial Year II</li> <li>• The Great Terror of June-July 1794 led to a rapid rise in the numbers guillotined, e.g. 244 in April 1794, rising to 659 in June and 935 in July</li> <li>• Under Robespierre, the Terror was justified more on philosophical grounds to preserve the gains of the revolution and achieve a utopian '<b>republic of virtue</b>'.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the nature of the Terror in France did not change markedly in the years 1793-94 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout 1793-94, the Terror was motivated by a desire to remove those perceived to be enemies of the revolution and to secure compliance through coercion and intimidation</li> <li>• Throughout the Terror, the victims were drawn from across the class spectrum, e.g. 25 per cent were bourgeois, 28 per cent were peasants and 31 per cent were workers</li> <li>• Paris remained the main centre of the Terror in 1793-94 as the key power struggles took place there; the CPS and the Committee of General Security remained central to the organisation of the Terror</li> <li>• During 1793-94, dechristianisation remained a persistent, if unofficial, feature of the Terror, resulting in the closure of most churches and up to 20,000 priests giving up their calling.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' <b>deployment of material in</b> 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 opposition to Tsarism had little impact in the years 1894-1914.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that opposition to Tsarism had little impact in the years 1894-1914 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liberal attempts to modernise the Tsarist system through the zemstvo had little impact during this period, e.g. official limits placed on the zemstvo and Nicholas II's resistance to the 'senseless dreams' of liberal reform</li> <li>• Marxist opposition to Tsarism, constrained by limited industrialisation and internal divisions, failed to create a radical mass working class base to challenge the autocracy, e.g. only 40,000 adherents by 1904</li> <li>• The Populists and SRs, hampered by a lack of resources, organisation and unity, were unable to mobilise the scattered and largely illiterate peasant population into a viable agrarian socialist opposition force</li> <li>• Anti-tsarist groups failed to coordinate their opposition in order to increase their impact, e.g. liberals and Marxists disagreed over capitalism and the SRs and Marxists had different conceptions of socialism</li> <li>• Throughout the period, Tsarism used surveillance and repression to limit the impact of the opposition, e.g. the Okhrana's use of infiltration tactics and <b>Stolypin's 'pacification' policy in 1906-09.</b></li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that opposition to Tsarism did have an impact in the years 1894-1914 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the early 1900s, liberalism had strongholds in the universities and zemstva to press for constitutional and economic reform; this was reinforced in 1904 by the League of Liberation's <b>banquet</b> campaign</li> <li>• The SR Combat Organisation, formed in 1902, had some impact on the Tsarist regime through its campaign of political assassination, e.g. killing Interior Minister Plehve, the Tsar's closest adviser, in 1904</li> <li>• Widespread opposition among the middle class, peasantry, workers and nationalities in 1905 destabilised Tsarism, forcing 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> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to <b>candidates' deployment</b> 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 similarities between War Communism and the New Economic Policy far outweigh the differences.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the similarities between War Communism and the New Economic Policy far outweigh the differences, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• War Communism (1918-21) and the New Economic Policy (1921-24) exhibited similar features, e.g. an emphasis on state control of key economic sectors</li> <li>• A central economic objective of the Bolsheviks during War Communism and the NEP was to keep key areas and groups supplied with food, e.g. the main cities and the industrial workers</li> <li>• War Communism and the NEP were both pragmatic (rather than ideological) responses in the face of shifting circumstances, e.g. the threats associated with civil war and the need to increase peasant production of food</li> <li>• War Communism and the NEP were both based on the Bolshevik assumption that raising the productivity of the agricultural sector held the key to long-term economic growth and the stability of the regime.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the differences between War Communism and the New Economic Policy far outweigh the similarities, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under War Communism, the economy was rigidly state controlled but, in contrast, the NEP promoted a mixed economy with a small business private sector</li> <li>• Under War Communism, compulsory requisitioning by food brigades was used to extract grain forcibly from the peasants but, under the NEP, peasants were treated more leniently and offered incentives to produce food</li> <li>• Some Bolsheviks saw War Communism as the correct ideological path to communism, e.g. complete nationalisation and the abolition of money and private trade; many Bolsheviks regarded the NEP as an ideological retreat due to the reintroduction of capitalist features, e.g. private trading</li> <li>• By 1924, the NEP had improved the Russian economy, e.g. factory output increased by 200 per cent from 1920 to 1923; War Communism left the economy in ruins, e.g. industrial output slumped and the urban working class halved in size.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

