

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE**

**GCE HISTORY B**

Unit F982: *Historical Explanation - Non-British History*

**Specimen Paper**

**F982 QP**

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet (8 pages)



### INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your name, Centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the answer book. Write your answers on the separate answer book provided.

This paper contains questions on the following 4 Study Topics:

- Charlemagne
- Luther and the German Reformation 1517-1547
- Robespierre and the French Revolution 1774-1795
- Russia in Turmoil 1900-1921

There are 2 questions for each topic. Answer **one question** from your chosen study topic. Each question is in two parts. Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

### INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- Each question is marked out of **50**.
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.

### ADVICE TO CANDIDATES

- Read each question carefully and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.

**Charlemagne**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

Answer **either**

**1 Wars and Warfare**

- (a) How important a part did religious beliefs play in Charlemagne's wars? [25]

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) How are Charlemagne's military successes best explained? [25]

[Explaining actions]

**Or**

**2 The Imperial Coronation**

- (a) Why was Charlemagne crowned as Emperor in 800? [25]

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) How importantly did the imperial coronation in 800 affect the rest of Charlemagne's reign? [25]

[Explaining actions]

**Luther and the German Reformation 1517-1547**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question

Answer **either**

**3 The Beginnings of the German Reformation**

- (a) Explain the similarities and differences between the beliefs and attitudes of Luther and Erasmus. **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) Why did Luther find himself in dispute with the Church by the end of 1517? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Or**

**4 Radical Social and Religious Movements**

- (a) Why was Anabaptism so widely condemned? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) How is the successful suppression of the Peasants' War best explained? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**[Turn Over**

**Robespierre and the French Revolution 1774-95**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

Answer **either**

**5 The Revolution of 1789**

**(a)** Why was the Third Estate successful in establishing the National Assembly? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

**(b)** Why was Paris in revolutionary turmoil in 1789? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Or**

**6 Revolutionary Government, 1792-95**

**(a)** How far were the policies of revolutionary government driven by revolutionary ideas? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

**(b)** Why did Robespierre seek to destroy his fellow revolutionary leaders? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Russia in Turmoil 1900-1921**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

Answer **either**

**7 Russia 1905-14: an Enlightened Despotism?**

- (a) To what extent did the October Manifesto (1905) and the Fundamental Laws (1906) mark a real change in the beliefs and attitudes of Nicholas II? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) How significant was the assassination of Stolypin in 1911 as a factor explaining the limited success, by 1914, of his agricultural policies? **[25]**

[Explaining events and circumstances]

**Or**

**8 1917: The Provisional Government and the October Revolution**

- (a) Why did the ideas of Lenin and the Bolsheviks hold more appeal for the ordinary Russians than those of the Provisional Government? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) Why did the Provisional Government fail to survive the crisis of March to October 1917? **[25]**

[Explaining events and circumstances]

**Paper Total [50]**

SPECIMEN

***Copyright Acknowledgements:***

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (OCR) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest opportunity.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.

**BLANK PAGE**

SPECIMEN

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN



The maximum mark for this paper is **50**.

SPECIMEN

**Generic Mark Scheme for Unit 2**Maximum mark: **50**Each question is marked out of **25**.

Allocation of marks within the Unit:

	<b>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</b>
Level 5	41-50 marks
Level 4	31-40 marks
Level 3	21-30 marks
Level 2	11-20 marks
Level 1	1-10 marks
Level 0	0 marks

The same generic mark scheme is used for both questions:

	<b>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</b>
Level 5	Proposes complex explanations by analysing the interactions between component ideas, actions and events. Uses relevant and accurate knowledge to support the explanation. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling. Structure of explanation is clear and coherent. <b>[21-25]</b>
Level 4	Proposes valid explanations of ideas, actions and/or events that assess the relative importance of elements within the explanation. Uses relevant and accurate knowledge to support the explanation. Uses historical terminology accurately. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling. Structure of explanation is mainly clear. <b>[16-20]</b>
Level 3	Proposes valid explanations that differ according to what is being explained: ideas, actions or events. Provides an explanation that is unevenly structured. Uses knowledge that is mainly relevant and/or accurate. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of explanation lacks some clarity. <b>[11-15]</b>
Level 2	Proposes valid explanations by establishing causal connections between patterns of ideas, actions and/or events. Uses knowledge, some of which lacks relevance and/or accuracy. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level. Structure of explanation may lack clarity in significant areas. <b>[6-10]</b>
Level 1	Proposes simple but valid explanations of why ideas were held in the past, why actions were taken or why events occurred. Uses knowledge that mainly lacks relevance to the question. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. <b>[1-5]</b>
Level 0	Shows no understanding of how to order information in an historical explanation. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. <b>[0]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p><b>Charlemagne Wars and Warfare</b></p> <p><b>How important a part did religious beliefs play in Charlemagne's wars?</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on empathetic explanation explaining how far religious beliefs inspired and furthered Charlemagne's military campaigns and conquests. Whilst a substantial proportion of the answer will need to be concerned with the importance of religious beliefs, candidates will recognise that the causes of wars and motives for pursuing them were varied and include strategic, dynastic and personal imperatives. Meanwhile, candidates will recognise the greater difficulty in separating religious from secular beliefs and motives in earlier periods of history. A starting point might be to point out that most of the reign was taken up with fighting and that, for the most part, Charlemagne's opponents were pagan, Muslim or in dispute with the papacy. There are few signs of a sense of Christian mission in the wars in Italy, Germany and Spain in the first ten years of the reign. The motives seem to be entirely political. There followed a period lasting into the 790s and even into the last years of the reign when, ostensibly at least, religious beliefs played an important role with war being accompanied by such policies as missionary activity, forcible conversions and baptisms and the foundation of monasteries in conquered territories. It is for candidates to separate religious from secular motives (where possible) and to evaluate their relative importance. Intervention in Italy against the Lombards and in defence of the papacy and its lands was in part an inherited policy and Charlemagne was certainly concerned to extend his influence. Such intervention was also part of the process towards the Imperial coronation. Charlemagne's concern to stabilise his south-western frontier and to establish a Spanish (or Pyrenean) March brought him to intervene in the Visigothic lands of Aquitaine (where new abbeys and bishoprics as well as countships were established were established, in part as a means of influence and control) and in conflict with the Muslim rulers of Spain. These latter expeditions have been represented as an early form of Crusade. Charlemagne's eastern frontier was not easy to maintain and his solutions included the encouragement of buffer states, diplomacy, the sending of Christian missionaries as a civilising influence and, ultimately, war. The first war against the Saxons was in 772 and major campaigns continued well into the 780s. The expedition of 779-80 included mass baptisms and the rebel Widukind was baptised in 785. Further rebellion and breaking of oaths could be, and was, represented as a form of heresy and it might be argued that baptism was as much a political as a religious undertaking. Meanwhile, the foundation of monasteries, encouragement of missionaries and baptism must be set alongside savage massacres (4500 prisoners at Verdun in 782), repression and deportation. Meanwhile, the successful wars against the Avars (788-96) resulted in their apparent conversion to Christianity. Candidates should appreciate that policies such as missions and the foundation of monasteries should be seen as a 'civilising' process (with administrative and economic implications) as well as an evangelising movement.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p><b>How are Charlemagne's military successes best explained?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on intentional explanation, for example, of the actions of Charlemagne and his military leaders, tactics, organisation and resources as well as the weaknesses and limitations of their opponents. To put Charlemagne's military successes into perspective candidates should recognise that, although the picture is overwhelmingly one of success, there were failures and weaknesses on the part of the Franks. Given the wording of the question candidates should be expected to attempt to place their explanations of success in some order of hierarchy whilst recognising the interconnectedness of some of the relevant factors. Charlemagne's own contribution in terms of planning and personal qualities of leadership, energy and ruthlessness are of major significance. Candidates might well speculate as to the perceived righteousness of his cause, especially against non-Christian opposition.. The strengths of Charlemagne's armies should be seen within the context of the growth of aristocratic power. Landowners were summoned to serve in person, mounted vassals provided the backbone and leadership of armies and they were rewarded with estates and office. Charlemagne's was essentially a cavalry army, well organised and well provided with weapons and defensive armour. As far as the Saxons were concerned, for example, the Franks had great superiority in men, arms and tactics. The Carolignian administration provided the organisation for raising and supplying armies whilst the frequency of campaigns gave great experience. To put the analysis and explanation into perspective, candidates should be aware of the weaknesses of Charlemagne's opponents. Internal divisions and rivalries applied particularly to Saxon, Lombard and Muslim leaders, whilst their political structures were less well developed than those of the Franks and were thus less able to respond to demands for men and supplies. On the whole, too, Charlemagne's enemies failed to combine against him. Alongside the purely military factors, candidates should be aware of other explanations of success including diplomacy, missionary activity, conversion, the foundation of monasteries and the often ruthless policy of devastation. Candidates may be expected to use examples from particular campaigns to illustrate their explanations.</p>	[25]
2(a)	<p><b>The Imperial Coronation</b></p> <p><b>Why was Charlemagne crowned as Emperor in 800?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be an empathetic explanation, explaining the religious and imperial concepts and beliefs surrounding the coronation of Charlemagne by Pope Leo III on Christmas Day 800. At the same time candidates need to be aware of the political and pragmatic motives influencing the Pope and Charlemagne and his advisers as well as the context of events immediately preceding the coronation. Candidates will be aware that there are competing explanations for the coronation, that there is conflicting evidence and considerable controversy. Accounts of what happened in the four principal extant sources differ. (<i>Annales Regni Francorum</i>, Einhard's <i>Vita Karoli</i>, the <i>Liber Pontificalus</i>, the <i>Annals of Lorsch</i>).</p> <p>Between them these sources put forward a variety of ideas and concepts: the revival of the Roman Empire (at least in the West), an Emperor of the Romans with the title of 'Emperor' or 'Augustus'; divine approval in that Charlemagne was 'crowned by God' before the tomb of St. Peter; that the recent accession of the</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a) cont'd	<p>Empress Irene in Constantinople meant that since the throne was under 'the sway of a woman' the title of Emperor 'had ceased to exist among the Greeks' and the Imperial crown should therefore be conferred on Charlemagne; the idea of Charlemagne as protector of the Church; the concept of a Christian and 'universal' Emperor. Alongside this set of religious and imperial theories and concepts candidates should set a range of events and more pragmatic motives. For some time, Charlemagne had been considering himself as the equal of the Byzantine Emperor and the recent and opposed accession of the Empress Irene may well have acted as a trigger. This against the wider background, of course, of the expansion of the Frankish Empire under Charlemagne and the view that, to an extent at least, it represented a 'Western Roman Empire'. Respect for the Roman Empire amongst the Germanic peoples was of long standing and visions of its restoration were current, not least amongst Charlemagne's advisers such as Alcuin and Einhard (here of course, concepts and pragmatism meet). Charlemagne not only had a close relationship with the Church in his own lands but he had also developed a close rapport with the Papacy as a result of his interventions on behalf of Hadrian I and Leo III against the Lombards and the pope's personal enemies, not least as recently as 799.</p>	[25]
2(b)	<p><b>How importantly did the Imperial coronation in 800 affect the rest of Charlemagne's reign?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on intentional explanation, particularly of the policies and actions of Charlemagne after 800 and the extent to which any changes in direction came as a direct result of the Imperial coronation. There are ways, of course, in which beliefs, concepts and theory on the one hand interact with motives and policy on the other. Important questions present themselves to candidates. For example, how far would any changes of direction and emphasis have occurred in any case as a result, for example, of Charlemagne's advancing years and the extent of his empire by 800 regardless of the Imperial title. A possible starting point for candidates is that there are clear signs after 800 of an 'Imperial' style of ruling, for example, new coins were issued which bore the legend 'Restoration of the Empire' and documents were dated by the year of Charlemagne's reign. Along the same sort of lines, candidates may be expected to trace and comment upon the development of relations with the other imperial Christian power, Byzantium. Charlemagne's initial move was to propose marriage to the Empress Irene (a move which helped to precipitate her overthrow and replacement by Nicephorus) and then to demand Byzantium's recognition of his title. Relationships with Byzantium certainly became more strained after 800 with frequent warfare for control of, for example, Venice and the Adriatic. The Imperial coronation affected dispositions for the succession to the Frankish empire.</p> <p>Although the custom of the Franks was to divide the patrimony between the legitimate sons' the concept of an Empire was that it should be indivisible. Thus, although in 806 Charlemagne provided for division of territories between his three sons he probably had it in mind to confer the imperial title on his eldest son. In the event only the youngest son survived him and he was crowned as Emperor in 811 (in his father's lifetime) and probably by Charlemagne's own hand rather than the Pope's. An immediate outcome of the coronation of 800 was that Charlemagne took steps to rule the papal territory directly and took an oath of allegiance as Emperor from the Pope and the people of Rome. Candidates should be aware of the Ganshof thesis of a period of 'decay' after 800. This has been challenged by</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b) cont'd	<p>P.D.King who has upheld the view of a vigorous approach to policy and government in these last years. Allowance has to be made for Charlemagne's ageing process and, certainly, he was less active in war, leaving more and more to his sons and generals. On the other hand there were new laws, a stream of capitularies and missi were used more and more as a way of disseminating the Emperor's influence. A programme of reform sought to define the relationship between kingship and emperorship. Meanwhile, there was fresh encouragement, as well as warnings, to the clergy as to their obligations and duties. Above all perhaps, there is evidence of a tone of government and pronouncements which emphasised the theocratic nature of Charlemagne's rule. The big question remains, of course, as to the extent to which at least some of the developments of the period 800-814 would have happened anyway, without the Imperial coronation.</p>	[25]
3(a)	<p><b>The German Reformation</b>  <b>The beginning of the German Reformation</b>  <b>Explain the similarities and differences between the beliefs and attitudes of Luther and Erasmus</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, explaining the extent to which Luther and Erasmus agreed and differed in respect of religious beliefs and attitudes, for example, theology, the Church and the Papacy. Candidates should be expected to make distinctions between beliefs and attitudes as well as being aware that the differences between the two men were not fully recognised until the mid 1520s. It will be relevant for candidates to take into account the differences in temperament between the two. Both were clearly reformers. The expressed reservations by Erasmus about the state of Christianity in his time predate those of Luther, although their widely published views more or less coincide. Erasmus attacked scholastic theology and was concerned by the extent of popular superstition. He, like Luther, stressed the importance of prayer and the Bible and mounted an attack on outward shows of religious practice such as the cult of saints. Comparisons might be made here with Luther's assault on the doctrine and practice of indulgences. Like Luther, Erasmus was more than willing to arouse controversy, although, in the last resort, and unlike Luther, was prepared to draw back. In the early stages of Luther's stand, however, Erasmus was reluctant to condemn Luther which provoked Aleander's comment that Erasmus had 'laid the egg which Luther hatched'.</p> <p>Luther was certainly encouraged by the support of Erasmus and other humanists. However, whilst Luther saw the Bible as the sole authority Erasmus regarded it as only one source. There were also clear differences between the two men with regard to the Church Fathers. Later, in 1524, Erasmus attacked Luther's teachings regarding justification and grace. Luther's reply was devastating. In the end Erasmus grew more and more doubtful about Luther because he saw him as a revolutionary rather than a reformer whose influence was destructive. Erasmus died a Catholic, although his work was later listed in the Index; Luther died an excommunicated heretic.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(b)	<p><b>Why did Luther find himself in dispute with the Church by the end of 1517?</b>  <i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on intentional explanation, chiefly of the motives and concerns which influenced and developed Luther's thinking and produced a course of actions by Luther culminating in the drawing up and later defence of his 95 theses. Actions cannot be separated, of course, from the set of beliefs and attitudes held and developed by Luther. Candidates will need to distinguish between the longer term development of Luther's thought and the shorter term and dramatic action in response to indulgences. They should also show an awareness of the local but important nature of the disputes within the university of Wittenberg between c1515 and 1517, and the direction in which Luther's theology had developed before 1517 on matters other than indulgences. Luther had voiced objections to indulgences as early as 1514 on the grounds of misuse, and he was concerned that the popular view was that indulgences could be bought. Matters came to a head over the issue of plenary indulgences as promulgated by Leo X in 1515 for the rebuilding of St. Peter's, Rome. Candidates should be aware of the complication raised by Albrecht, Archbishop of Magdeburg's arrangement with the Pope, by which indulgences were to be sold in the provinces which he controlled as a way of paying off his own debts to the banking house of Fugger. Although indulgences were not sold in Wittenberg they could be obtained across the border in Brandenburg where their efficacy was preached by Tetzel. Luther voiced his objections to indulgences to Albert, Archbishop of Mainz' before drawing up his 95 theses. Among Luther's objections were the cash based nature of the indulgence and the view that the Pope was in danger of exceeding his authority. Without Luther's knowledge the theses were translated into German and published and open conflict ensued.</p>	[25]
4(a)	<p><b>Radical Social and Religious movements</b>  <b>Why was Anabaptism so widely condemned?</b>  <i>Explaining idea, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, explaining the widespread condemnation of Anabaptists, by both Catholics and Protestants, on religious, social and 'political' grounds.</p> <p>Candidates should be aware of the wide dissemination of Anabaptism in, for example, Zurich (where the original Anabaptists split with Zwingli) and other parts of Switzerland, Austria, Moravia, various parts of Germany and the Netherlands. This was part of its perceived threat as well as it being properly regarded as the most radical of any of the reform movements. The fundamental tenet of Anabaptism was 'rebaptism' whereby adults opted into a gathered congregation. This practice had been condemned by the Church for more than a thousand years. Moreover, the Church taught that unbaptised children went to Hell. Anabaptists questioned the practice. Opting into a congregation or Church implied also the right to opt into society (or not). This raised very serious questions about the Anabaptists' willingness to accept or obey secular authority. Candidates will recognise the objections of the upper and propertied ranks of society. An early example of non-conformism was their refusal (in Zurich) to pay tithes. The notorious Thomas Muntzer of Zwickau actually took part in the Peasants' War seeing it as an apocalyptic event. Some Anabaptists rejected the world and lived with goods in common (a form of primitive communism). It will be readily appreciated by candidates that this was perceived as an attack on property, and</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(a) cont'd	further anxieties were raised by Anabaptists who refused to take oaths to secular authorities. Candidates should recognise that Anabaptism was not one single movement but is something of an umbrella term for a whole range of unorthodox and radical beliefs and attitudes.	[25]
4(b)	<p><b>How is the successful suppression of the Peasants' War best explained?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be an intentional explanation, chiefly of the ability of the authorities to crush a whole series of risings which, in totality, represented a formidable challenge to authority both religious and secular. To put the successful suppression of the Peasants' War into context and perspective candidates will need to recognise its scale and widespread nature. A further sense of perspective can be demonstrated by pointing out that many of the grievances of the peasantry were justified, that support was given by some (generally the more radical) religious reformers and that some discontented townsmen joined the peasantry. This, then, was a very considerable challenge to the established order and its suppression will need careful explanation. Candidates will need to offer a range of explanations for the successful repression of the Peasants' War but, given the wording of the question, should offer some evaluation of their relative importance. Although there was effective leadership at some local and, indeed, regional levels, there was little by way of overall direction and military leadership was, for the most part, poor. The influence of radical reformers was a limitation and some groups adopted millenarianism which frightened off the more moderate and certainly alienated property holders. Although many demands were reasonable and just, some were simply unrealisable.</p> <p>The nature and ferocity of Luther's condemnation of the Peasants' War is controversial but it certainly encouraged the princes. Moreover the rebellions were also condemned, although in more moderate terms, by other reformers such as Melancthon. Finally, the princes had overwhelming military power and employed professional soldiers. A good example is provided by the armies of the Swabian League commanded by the able general, George Truchsess.</p>	[25]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(a)	<p><b>Robespierre and the French Revolution, 1774-95</b></p> <p><b>The Revolution of 1789</b></p> <p><b>Why was the Third Estate successful in establishing the National Assembly?</b>  <i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, explaining ideas concerning the rights of man, citizenship, the nation, constitution-making and the nature of the Third Estate. Candidates should be expected to know something of the background of eighteenth-century political thought and the enlightenment more widely, but they should concentrate on the more immediate background of ideas, attitudes and beliefs in 1789. The influence of the <i>cahiers</i> in their wide support for a constitution, reform of the law and a more integrated national economy (physiocratic theory) should be evaluated. Also to be assessed are the ideas and writings of Sieyès particularly on the issue of national sovereignty and the importance of the Third Estate. Candidates should also consider the interaction of events and ideas on the decision that representation in the Estates General should be doubled for the Third Estate and the winning of the argument by the Third for voting by head rather than order. Circumstances and events combined to bring about the creation of the National Assembly: more widely affairs were handled indecisively and unwisely by the King and the Court party whilst events such as the Tennis Court Oath and the Royal Session were key. Meanwhile, candidates should also be aware of the high quality of the deputies of the Third with a large proportion of lawyers, officials and wealthy townsmen. Candidates may be expected also to put into the balance the divisions amongst the two privileged orders which caused some their deputies (especially the lower clergy) to join the Third Estate.</p>	[25]
5(b)	<p><b>Why was Paris in revolutionary turmoil in 1789?</b>  <i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on intentional explanation, for example, the motives and fears of the population of Paris and the actions of individuals. Candidates will recognise that the turbulence, discontent and violence of Paris in 1789 was driven by economic hardship. The crisis was grave in Paris with soaring prices of bread. The demography and living conditions in Paris (for example, slums, tenements and narrow streets) favoured organised as well as spontaneous protest, in addition to being a further cause of distress. Of a population of 600,000, five-sixths were desperately poor. In dealing with factors leading to the fall of the Bastille candidates should be aware of the fears and rumours of a royalist plot to bring armed forces into Paris and the influence of radical orators and agitators such as Desmoulins. More generally, the Bastille was perceived as a symbol of autocracy and, more practically, Parisians were concerned to seize its stores of powder and arms. Alongside the economic discontent, then, candidates should be aware of a sense of insecurity as well as the feeling that events at Versailles (the seat of the Court and the National Assembly) were remote from Paris. In October 1789 the Parisians brought the 'baker King' back to the capital thus demonstrating the close connection between political and economic motives and actions. Throughout the period, the failure of the authorities at Versailles and Paris to deal effectively with the emergency should be noted.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6(a)	<p><b>Revolutionary Government, 1792-95.</b></p> <p><b>How far were the policies of the revolutionary government driven by revolutionary ideas?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be an empathetic explanation of ideas, beliefs and attitudes concerning, for example, the rights of man, the concept of liberty and equality, citizenship and <i>la patrie</i>. Some distinctions should be made between these ideas, which were current in the earlier stages of the Revolution and those which developed as the Revolution became more radical and which are more directly applicable to the period of 'revolutionary government'. These might include '<i>la patrie en danger</i>' de Christianisation, '<i>sans culottism</i>', the concept of the 'general will' as expressed by Rousseau, totalitarian democracy, the Republic of Virtue and the ideological aspects of Terror. At the same time, candidates should appreciate that policies were also driven by events, necessity and personal motivation. In this connection, candidates may be expected to use their knowledge of the effects of the outbreak of war and military defeats, the threats posed by 'enemies of the Republic' such as non-juring priests, emigres and profiteers, the fall of the monarchy, inflationary pressures on the price of food, the need to control Paris and its crowd, resistance and counter-revolution in the provinces. These issues, events and ideas are closely connected, of course, with the motives and aims of the revolutionary leaders. Candidates should be aware of the balance between ideology and pragmatism and that the revolutionaries acted out of mixed motives.</p>	<b>[25]</b>
6(b)	<p><b>Robespierre and the French Revolution, 1774-95</b></p> <p><b>Why did Robespierre seek to destroy his fellow revolutionary leaders?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on intentional explanation, and chiefly on Robespierres's motives in overthrowing his rivals, with particular reference to Brissot, Danton and Hebert. Candidates should appreciate that these principal revolutionary leaders did not act alone and that in each case they had associates who were more or less organised (although the term 'party' might be too strong). Thus answers might use the terms Brissotins, Dantonists, Hebertists and Robespierrists (or Montagnards). It is possible to explain the rivalries and motives behind them in terms of personality and personal ambition, and this is one approach. An extension of this approach is to see the rivalries in terms of a contest for power and influence in, say, the Convention, the Committee of Public Safety and the Paris Commune. At the same time, however, candidates should recognise that there were very substantial issues of principle at stake: Brissot and Robespierre disagreed fundamentally on the whole question of the war; Brissot was perceived to favour the continuation of the monarchy in some form and was also dubbed a 'federalist'.</p> <p>Hebert caused alarm by pursuing what were seen as wildly radical policies and adopting the programme of Roux and the enrages: deChristianisation; stricter economic regulation; a more vigorous prosecution of both the war abroad and Terror at home. Danton, meanwhile, was represented as dangerously moderate (an 'Indulgent') in advocating negotiations for peace and ameliorating the impact of Terror. The actions of the revolutionary leaders were determined in large part by events, such as the outbreak of war and the threat of invasion, the September Massacres, revolutionary <i>journées</i> in Paris and resistance in the provinces.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(a)	<p><b>Russia in Turmoil, 1900-1921</b>  <b>Russia 1905-14: an Enlightened Despotism?</b></p> <p><b>To what extent did the October Manifesto (1905) and the Fundamental Laws (1906) mark a real change in the beliefs and attitudes of Nicholas II?</b>  <i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on an empathetic explanation of the ideas that underpinned the October Manifesto and the Fundamental Laws in comparison with ideas pertaining before 1905. Candidates may assess the extent to which pre-1905 ideas of autocracy and divinely ordained monarchy survived in the light of the constitutional concessions made to liberalism and democracy. They may question whether or not Nicholas II changed his beliefs by contrasting the general terms of the October Manifesto with the limitations imposed by the plans detailed in the April 1906 Fundamental Laws. Candidates may compare the October Manifesto with the more limited concessions proposed in August, based on the instructions given by Nicholas II in early 1905. Candidates may invoke other explanatory modes by setting the October Manifesto and Fundamental Laws in the context of the changing circumstances of the 1905 Revolution and its aftermath, for example the perilous position of the government before the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed and the increased confidence gained once the army had regained control of the capital cities by late 1905. They may use these changing circumstances to explain why Nicholas II appeared to have changed his attitudes but was able to renege on many of the apparent concessions. They may use knowledge of events after the Duma met, such as relations between Nicholas's government and the First and Second Dumas, the Viborg Declaration and changes made to the voting laws, in reaching a judgement on the extent, if any, to which Nicholas had changed his beliefs and attitudes.</p>	[25]
7(b)	<p><b>How significant was the assassination of Stolypin in 1911 as a factor explaining the limited success, by 1914, of his agricultural policies?</b>  <i>Explaining events and circumstances</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on a causal explanation, assessing the role of Stolypin's assassination in limiting the effectiveness of his policies: the '<i>wager on the strong</i>', weakening of the mir, and encouragement to settle eastern Russia. The policies were clearly driven by Stolypin, so his death would have been significant, but other circumstances should be considered. For example, candidates may cite Nicholas II's increasing impatience with the policy, the reluctance of the peasants to take advantage of the opportunities available to them and their poverty and primitive agricultural methods that made it difficult for them to do so.</p> <p>Candidates may broaden the range of causes by considering the wider context of low levels of literacy and traditional thinking prevalent amongst the peasants that contributed to their reluctance to leave the security of the mir and may account for significant numbers returning from Siberia by 1914. Candidates may also take into account that Stolypin himself viewed this as long-term policy, needing decades to take effect, while it only had eight years at most. Candidates may invoke other modes of explanation, for example using the empathetic mode to assess the importance of traditional peasant attitudes in preventing them from leaving the mir, or the intentional mode to explain Nicholas II's failure to support Stolypin adequately.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(a)	<p><b>1917: The Provisional Government and the October Revolution</b></p> <p><b>Why did the ideas of Lenin and the Bolsheviks hold more appeal for the ordinary Russians than those of the Provisional Government?</b>  <i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on explaining the ideas of Lenin and the Bolsheviks and those of the Provisional Government in terms of their appeal to ordinary Russians. Candidates may explain the appeal of the April Theses and the effect of Lenin's refusal to allow the Bolsheviks to co-operate with the Provisional Government. They may also go further back to consider the impact in 1917 of the Bolsheviks' consistent hostility to World War I on the grounds that it was a capitalist conflict that could not benefit the proletariat. The appeal of these ideas should be set against the Provisional Government's longer term commitment to democracy, but short term continuation of the war and refusal to sanction land redistribution. Candidates may invoke other modes of explanation, for example considering the role of the events of 1917 in increasing disillusion with the Provisional Government. The failure of the June offensive, the continuing economic hardships induced by the war and the growing division between the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet may all be used to explain the increasing level of support for the Bolsheviks demonstrated by the growth in party membership and the lack of commitment to the Provisional Government as witnessed in October/November 1917.</p>	[25]
8(b)	<p><b>Why did the Provisional Government fail to survive the crisis of March to October 1917?</b>  <i>Explaining events and circumstances</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on explaining how the circumstances and events of the period caused the overthrow of the Provisional Government. Candidates may show how circumstances and events such as the failure of the June offensive and the debacle of the Kornilov affair reduced the effectiveness and support of the Provisional Government. They may cite the continuing impact of war on living conditions in the cities and the continuing death toll from the war as reasons for the Provisional Government losing support. They may show how these circumstances and events combined to decrease the level of support for the Provisional Government, for example comparing the ability of the government to restore order after the July Days with their inability to withstand the Bolshevik seizure of power in October. Candidates may invoke other explanatory modes, for example explaining the changing attitudes of different groups, such as the workers, peasants and army, to the Provisional Government. They may identify actions taken by members of the Provisional Government, such as the June Offensive or the arming of the Bolsheviks to defend Petrograd from Kornilov to explain why, by October, the Provisional Government could not retain power. They may identify the action taken by the Bolsheviks, for example in gaining a majority in the Petrograd Soviet, and by Bolshevik leaders such as Lenin and Trotsky in September and October as being necessary to an explanation of the failure of the Provisional Government to survive until elections for a Constituent Assembly could take place.</p>	[25]
	<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>[50]</b>