

Online network event – GCE summer 2018 exemplar answers

Paper 2C Section B exemplar answer

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

EITHER

- 5** How far do you agree that the survival of the Tsarist system, in the years 1894-1906, owed more to the weaknesses of its opponents than to government policies?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

Tsarism had survived the 1905 revolution due to a number of factors the weaknesses of its opponents had been important than this but government policy it could be argued had been more significant. It is also the case that government policies had only been ^{more} significant after the 1905 revolution and before this it had been the weaknesses of opposition.

The main ~~also~~ organised political opposition ~~to~~ to Tsarism in the period came from reformist groups. These groups had been weak due to their small nature and lack of support and given the fact that at the time Russia was virtually completely unpoliticised with a population consisting of 90% illiterate peasants it is no surprise that these groups had been ineffective in gaining support around the country and organising a revolution. Not only this but the groups had been deeply split in their aims and methods - some such as the ~~Revolutionary~~ Populists/and Peoples will and the social revolutionaries had wanted a complete overthrow of Tsarism and used violent methods such as the assassination of Alexander II and the assassination of the minister of the interior - Plehve for the social revolutionaries. Others such as the Liberals had wanted civil rights and self determination while Marxists looked for a communist Utopia. This had meant that Tsarism had been able to survive

in the 1900s as there had been no unity between revolutionary groups allowing no ~~mass~~ revolution to occur. This lack of consensus had meant that the Tsarist regime had been able to repress such groups. This shows that the weaknesses of the opposition had been significant and ensuring the stability of Tsarism before 1905.

It could be argued that the government ~~policy~~ ^{policy implementation} had instead actually caused this weakness between the opposition. ~~He~~ ^{Nicholas} had used the Okhrana ~~to~~ to arrest key figures of opposition groups such as the leaders of the Social revolutionaries and the arrests of leading Marxists - this had been the cause for the weaknesses in the opposition as it had meant the groups became disorganised and ~~more~~ uncoordinated. Not only this but after the revolution the Tsar ~~had~~ had implemented the October Manifesto allowing for freedom of speech, association and giving rights - this had further divided opposition and allowed the Tsar to take advantage of opposition disarray and implement a crackdown upon leaders of such groups as the October Manifesto had satisfied the liberals and ~~ended~~ ended the General Strike and so the Tsar was able to retain control. This shows that government policy had been ~~more~~ significant in the survival of the Tsarist system as it had further created divisions between such groups allowing the Tsar to retain control.

The government policies shortly following the 1905 revolution had been significant in ensuring Tsarism survived ~~and~~ ^{more so} ~~so~~ than the weaknesses of the opposition. The Tsar had implemented

the October manifesto which had not only divided opposition but gave concessions to the army, this had allowed the Tsar to bring the army back on side by increasing their pay and giving them greater rations, subsequently the Tsar was able to put down any unrest as seen in the Moscow uprising in which the Tsar used the army to fire upon the protesters and used artillery on working class districts killing 1000. Not only this but the October manifesto had created a Duma - which was viewed as a Russian parliament allowing groups in society to gain political representation and which many such as the liberals viewed as a fair balance of democracy and monarchy as the Tsar was unable to pass laws without the approval of the Duma. This had thus deescalated revolutionary tensions and guaranteed a constitutional Russia. This clearly highlights the effectiveness that legislation had in ensuring that Tsarism survived post 1905 as the army had let him remain in control.

Government policy had also meant that once Nicholas had brought the army back on side he was able to implement the Fundamental Laws of 1906 which had reversed much of the change and pains made by the 1905 October manifesto and had meant that the Tsar could dissolve the Duma as he wished and limited the power of the Duma so much so that he was able to pick its members, his own ministers and meant that issues of defence and foreign policy could only be controlled by him. This was crucial in the survival of Tsarism as it allowed him to not only end the revolution with the implementation of the October manifesto but to retain all the power he had had before the revolution.

overall it seems clear that ~~that~~ it is not accurate to say that the stability of Tsarism had been owed more to the weaknesses of the opposition than to government policy. Government policy had been more important than the weaknesses of ~~the~~ opposition as it ~~had~~ allowed the Tsar to remain control politically through the fundamental laws and allowed the Tsar to issue harsh repression through the army concessions and put down any threat to his Autocracy. However it must be noted that pre 1905 ~~the~~ the weaknesses of opposition had been responsible for the survival of the Tsarist System as they were unable to co-ordinate an effective revolution but significantly the post revolution policies had allowed Nicholas to preserve his autocracy and cause further divisions of the opposition.

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"> Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. The overall judgement is missing or asserted. There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. 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. 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.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. 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. The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

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 whether the survival of the Tsarist system, in the years 1894–1906, owed more to the weaknesses of its opponents than to government policies.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the survival of the Tsarist system, in the years 1894–1906, owed more to the weaknesses of its opponents should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Liberal opposition to the Tsarist system had little influence in this period due to the relatively small size of the Russian middle class and liberal fears of inciting an all-engulfing mass revolt against autocracy• Marxist opposition had little impact because it attracted few adherents (40,000 by 1904), partly due to limited industrialisation; the Bolshevik-Menshevik split of 1903 also reduced the Social Democrat threat• The loosely organised Populists and Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs) were unable to mobilise the scattered peasant population into a viable opposition force; moderate-extremist divisions also weakened the SRs• Fundamental divisions between these groups prevented cooperation, e.g. liberals and Marxists disagreed over capitalism and political violence, and the SRs and Marxists had different conceptions of socialism. <p>Arguments and evidence that the survival of the Tsarist system, in the years 1894–1906, owed more to government policies should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Before 1905, the government ensured that opposition parties faced an inhospitable legal climate – they were illegal organisations, further hampered by laws restricting freedom of speech and assembly• The Tsarist secret police, the Okhrana, successfully infiltrated and destroyed revolutionary networks; the army was also used to break up strikes and demonstrations in this period• The October Manifesto, issued in 1905, offered a range of concessions, including a Duma, basic freedoms and voting rights, that placated moderate opponents of the Tsarist system• The Tsarist regime pursued repressive policies to maintain control in the wake of the 1905 Revolution, e.g. Stolypin's 'pacification' of the countryside, beginning in 1906. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

The answer provides a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features (Govt policy / opposition weakness) to explore the issues relating to the continuation of Tsarist control, deploying sufficient knowledge to respond to the demands of the question and communicating the argument with precision. Criteria are applied throughout the answer to show the significance of opposition /policy. Note the use of for example, 'as it meant...' 'it allowed...' 'so the Tsar was able...'

Shows significance of weakness of opposition pre-1905 and the interrelationship of that with government policy 'actually more significant as it further created divisions, allowing...'. Shows significance of government policy post 1905, using criteria for judgment such as 'created divisions' 'de-escalated revolutionary tensions. Shows relative significance of government policy in relation to the army 'this was crucial' to reach an overall judgment that government policy was more significant.

The answer achieved a high level five mark. It could have been further improved with greater clarity of organisation and argument in the first part of the essay (where direction is not completely clear).

SECTION A

Choose EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2 for which you have been prepared.

You must start your answer on page 3.

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

Study Sources 1 and 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1** How far could the historian make use of Sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the extent of the Directory's success?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 1 = 20 marks)

Sources for use with Section A.

Answer the question in Section A on the option for which you have been prepared.

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

Sources for use with Question 1.

Source 1: From Germaine de Staël, *Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution*, published 1818. The daughter of former French Finance Minister, Jacques Necker, de Staël was a prominent writer and intellectual in France during the 1790s. Here she reflects on the record of the Directory.

We have to give credit to the Directory. The first twenty months constitute a particularly remarkable period of administration. The Directory came to power in the most unfavourable circumstances. Paper money had fallen to almost a thousandth of its normal value and there was not as much as 100,000 francs in cash in the treasury. Food supplies were so scarce that popular discontent was barely contained and the revolt in the Vendée was still going on. Civil unrest had produced bands of outlaws, who committed horrible atrocities in the countryside. Finally, almost all the French armies were disorganised. 5

In six months, the Directory raised France from this deplorable situation. Coins smoothly replaced paper money; old and new property owners lived peacefully side-by-side; country roads had become perfectly safe; the army was very successful; the liberty of the press made a come-back; elections followed their legal course. 10

France would have been free if the nobles and priests had enjoyed the same treatment under the law as other citizens. But liberty cannot be compromised. If you persecute one individual in the State, justice will never be established for all, particularly when 100,000 individuals are placed outside the protective circle of the law. However, when the Directory was established, revolutionary measures spoiled the Constitution. The last four years of the Directory were so poor, from every perspective, that people easily attributed the disorder to the institutions themselves. 15 20

Source 2: From a confidential Paris police report written in late 1797. Here the report considers the state of the country at that time.

A great amount of public anxiety has been caused by the financial situation. Investors are profoundly and painfully affected by the subject. Violent grumblings can be commonly heard against public poverty, and critics of 18 Fructidor* say that the cause of poverty is due to that event. The number of jobless workers has increased in Paris, and there are rumours that unemployment is just as great in the regions. This great distress, with winter coming, raises the fear of unfortunate consequences. 25

Rumours are rife that another 18 Fructidor is going to take place any time and that the Directory is going to purge the two Councils once again. Some people, speaking of the present Constitution, say that it is not at all popular and that it is an aristocratic government. The only difference, it is said, between the Constitution of 1791 and that of 1795 is that the implementation of the laws, instead of being carried out by one king, is carried out by five Directors. Fears about the future in political terms, complaints and even grumblings about financial matters, and the desire for peace: such was the mood and the character of public opinion yesterday and again today. An exterior calm nevertheless continues to exist. 30 35

* 18 Fructidor (4 September 1797) - a coup carried out by the Directors to remove elected monarchist deputies from the Councils

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

~~The Dir~~ Both sources can be used to investigate the extent of the Directory's success. Where source 1 focuses on how a change in the Directory's way of dealing with situations limited its success, source 2 focuses on how financial problems are a running theme throughout the course. The sources used together show that, although there were some successes, the Directory had many drawbacks.

Source 1 credits the 'first twenty months' of the Directory - up until the year 1797. It shows how ~~the~~ financial reforms were successful, 'paper money' refers to the inflation of the assignat and the lack of 'cash in the treasury' was an unfortunate circumstance the Directory ~~was~~ were left with. This is supported by their dealings with ~~the~~ debt by issuing state bonds where debt was paid off successfully but still angered ~~on~~ those who were given the bonds due to their later decrease in value - ~~as~~ a limitation to the success of this reform.

The source further highlights how civil unrest had produced 'bands of outlaws' - referring to

the jeunesse dorée and the Chouhauists. The source ~~highlights~~ illustrates the Directory's success in ~~make~~ dealing with this unrest, it is known that the army successfully quashed much of civil unrest. This adds value to the use of this source in the enquiry - alongside the author who would seemingly appear to be knowledgeable on financial issues. ~~How~~ The source does not appear to have any intentions of motivating particular groups nor does it use a persuasive tone, all of notions which strengthen the authenticity of the claims made.

~~The~~ However, ~~the~~ the source becomes highly critical when it describes the coup of Fructidor, ~~as~~ illustrating how this ~~limited~~ limited the Directory's success by 'compromising liberty'. ~~It may also be~~ Source 2 ~~acknowledges~~ acknowledges ~~the~~ Fructidor as a key event which limited its success, it however highlights how this caused economic issues in Paris. Using both sources together, they both highlight how Fructidor was a downfall but explain different implications it had.

Source 2 details a private police report, further strengthening its validity in ~~showing~~ showing the success of the Directory - as it appears to have

no ulterior motives which would question its authenticity. It ~~shows~~ highlights how ~~the~~ the financial situation affected investors - referring to the decline in value of state bonds. This opposes source 1's details of success in economic reform. Source 1 ~~also~~ also appears to overlook financial failures in other aspects, & stating coins 'suddenly' replaced the currency. However, it is known that following the failure of the mandate, there were a lack of coins in circulation; causing deflation. This shows how the sources differ but also when used together shows the difference in opinions on the extent of the Directory's financial success.

Both sources further highlight how the Directory carried with it ~~parts~~ revolutionary ideals which, in the opinion of the sources, limited its success. Source 1 states that this 'spoiled' the Constitution - perhaps referring to way it was set up to make sure no one could become a dictator. This weakness, which failed to provide strong leadership, as one Council could only accept or refuse laws, there was no opportunity to amend any, & is illustrated to be a limitation to its success. Used alongside source 2, & the

Constitution has been described to be no different than that of 1791. Instead of implying a notion of great leadership, it compares the 5 Directors to the king, ~~as~~ illustrating how the Directory was unsuccessful as it was an 'aristocratic government'. This impacted its success due to the removal of the Councils being purged, especially after the events of Fructidor. In light Overall, it is evident that both sources agree that the success was limited due to aspects of the constitution and that the Coup of Fructidor was the turning point in the lead up to the Directory's downfall.

In light of all this, ~~the~~ both sources could be used to investigate the extent of the Directory's success. ~~Where source 1~~ Both sources have strong validity and authenticity due to their authors and motives. ~~But where source 1 highlights~~ Source 1 is useful in learning about the ~~effective reforms & successful reforms~~ successful reforms of the Directory whereas source 2 ~~is~~ illustrates the unsuccessful reforms. Used together, they are both useful in explaining how the Coup of Fructidor ~~was~~ was the biggest factor limiting its success and ultimately made the Directory

unsuccessful.

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
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of 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.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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.

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 extent of the Directory's success.</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">• As a well-educated and socially and politically well-connected French woman, de Stael could potentially offer an informed view on the extent of the Directory's success• The account was published almost twenty years after the event and the passage of time may have influenced the author's discussion of the extent of the Directory's success• The nature of the source is essentially non-partisan, suggesting that the author is attempting to provide a balanced assessment of the Directory's record. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent of the Directory's success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It suggests that, over the first 20 months, the Directory was able to achieve a number of successes to improve the general situation ('Coins smoothly replaced ... their legal course.')• It suggests that the Directory failed to establish real liberty and legal equality because of its treatment of nobles and priests ('But liberty cannot ... circle of the law.')• It implies that, after the initial period of success, the Directory was a failure ('The last four years ... from every perspective'). <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">• The Directory's constitutional arrangements (based on the Directory of five, the Council of Five Hundred and the Council of Ancients) prevented the concentration of power and avoided the extremism of 1793–94• Two-thirds of the national debt was written off in September 1797 through the issue of bonds to government creditors which reduced interest payments and stabilised French finances, at least for a time• 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.

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"> • The status of the source (a police report) offers an official view of the extent of the Directory's success • As a confidential document intended for government officials only, the author's assessment of the Directory's performance may be more candid • The police report is confined to developments under the Directory in late 1797 and thus covers only part of the 1795–99 time frame. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent of the Directory's success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It implies that the Directory had failed to deal with the financial and economic problems facing France ('public anxiety ... financial situation', 'Investors ... by the subject', 'jobless workers ... increased in Paris') • It implies that the Directory had failed to create political stability ('Rumours are rife ... two Councils once again.') • It implies that the Directory in late 1797 had failed to mobilise popular support ('Violent grumblings ...', 'Some people, speaking ... aristocratic government.', 'such was the mood ... today.'). <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"> • The Directory failed to restore the government's finances (e.g. the assignat and government bonds both collapsed) and this alienated government creditors and the bourgeoisie • In an attempt to preserve a non-Jacobin/Royalist majority, the Directors interfered with elections which undermined support and respect for the political system, e.g. Law of 22 Floréal • The Directory failed to deliver political stability, e.g. Babeuf's Conspiracy of Equals (1796), the Coup of Fructidor (1797), the Coup of Floréal (1798) and the Coup of Brumaire (1799). <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"> • Both sources suggest that the Directory's policies were not successful in the late 1790s • Both sources suggest that the Directory's constitutional/political arrangements were flawed and the government was losing popular support • These points of agreement are reinforced due to the contrasting positions of the authors (an informed French writer and a French police officer).

The strength of this script is the integrated and judicious use of contextual knowledge to discuss what can be gained from source content. The sources are used together to show what they each contribute to the overall enquiry. Knowledge illuminates the references in the source and displays a secure understanding of the contemporary situation and contemporary concerns. Knowledge is also used to identify an element where source 1 is lacking. Although it is not necessary to identify limitations (content omission), here it has been done in order to test a claim in the source. Hence knowledge is used to illuminate, test, affirm and challenge, showing that the evidence of the sources has been used with confidence and discrimination. Consideration of the weight the evidence will bear infuses the treatment throughout as considerations of accuracy purpose and origin are also brought to bear in the process of considering what can be gained. The answer is able to distinguish the degree of certainty with which aspects of the sources can be used.

The evaluation applies the criterion of accuracy (using contextual knowledge) fully to consider the weight the evidence will bear. Other criteria (origin, purpose for example) are introduced, but not fully applied.

The answer achieved a mid-level five mark.