



Pearson

Examiners' Report  
June 2017

GCE History 8HI0 2C

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### 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).

June 2017

Publications Code 8HI0\_2C\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the reformed AS Level Paper 2C which covers the options France in revolution, 1774-1799 (2C.1) and Russia in revolution, 1894-1924 (2C.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section A more challenging mainly because some of them were still not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. The detailed knowledge base required in Section A to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1

On Question 1(a), stronger responses demonstrated clear understanding of the source material on the trial of Louis XVI and showed analysis by selecting some key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the Convention stirred up popular hostility to justify Louis's dethronement). Knowledge of the historical context concerning Louis XVI's trial was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm some matters of detail (e.g. divisions within the Convention concerning Louis XVI's fate). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry, and based on valid criteria, such as political motivation, to show the value of the source. Similarly, explanation of utility referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the author was a diplomat and therefore likely to be well informed on such matters). Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on Louis XVI's trial and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making basic/undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. the Convention was hostile to the King). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source material to expand or confirm some points but these were not developed very far. Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often drifted into 'lack of value' arguments. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. the author was an American and so had unbiased views on Louis XVI's trial).

On Question 1(b) stronger responses demonstrated understanding of the source material on the Terror of 1793-94 and showed analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the Terror was indiscriminate and arbitrary). Knowledge of the historical context concerning the Terror was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge some matters of detail (e.g. the Terror was not confined to one particular area or group in France). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry, and explanation of weight referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material, the position of the author (e.g. as a former member of the Committee of Public Safety, the author may have attempted to distance himself from actions taken during the Terror), or knowledge of the historical context to support/challenge the source content. Judgements were also based on valid criteria such as the impact or extent of the Terror. Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the Terror and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. some revolutionaries were executed). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source to expand or confirm points but this was not developed very far (e.g. the fall of the Girondins). Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often lacked focus on either the 'has weight' or 'doesn't have weight' aspect of the question. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. the author can be relied on because he had been a member of the Committee of Public Safety).

(This is for part (a)) Source K is valuable in terms of ~~containing~~ ~~and~~ evaluating the trial of Louis XVI, as it clearly highlights the surrounding feeling among deputies of the Legislative Assembly that Louis was a clear threat to the nation, and providing that he remained alive, the threat of royalism and more importantly counter revolution would still be exist. Significantly, the source states that "the violent sections declared against him," this is a clear reference to the radical section, ~~of the~~ including individuals such as Marat and Robespierre, who were the driving force behind his execution. Furthermore, the source states that even "the pro-monarchy and aristocratic ~~and~~ wish his death." Evidently, this ~~is~~<sup>is</sup> highlighting the significance of the decision made by Marat to enforce the mechanism that ensured that deputies had to publicly announce their decision in terms of the position of Louis and whether he should be ~~to~~ put on trial and then executed. The significance of this ~~is~~ can't be underestimated as it destroyed Louis' monarch, and clearly adds value to the source in terms of an account for the trial of Louis.

(This is for part (a)) Importantly, the source was written by an ~~the~~ American ambassador to France, that he was a man of great importance and more importantly <sup>critically</sup> was intrinsically linked to the political situation at the time in France, thus providing more value. Furthermore, it shows that, as a conservative, he was critical of the French revolution, and he displays the idea that Louis was in placed in a vulnerable ~~and~~ position from the start of his trial and ~~was~~ the outcome was almost inevitable, as he'd become the "common object of hatred to all parties." The purpose of the source is to defend Louis and criticise the actions of the deputies that oversaw his execution, which is helpful in terms of helping to understand the almost undefendable position Louis was in during his trial, as he was considered too great a threat to the revolution.

Overall, the source is ~~not~~ very valuable in terms of helping one to understand Louis' ~~trial~~ trial, as it emphasises the hatred, in particular from radical deputies, towards Louis ~~and~~ ~~also~~ its purpose, to criticise the revolution, helps the reader to understand the undefendable position Louis was placed in from the start of the trial and the lack of justice involved in his trial.

(This is for part (b)) The Terror was an ~~period~~ event driven by a number of key factors, and was ~~so~~ effectively enforced to create a utopian society, free of those who opposed the revolution. Importantly, those responsible for the terror and the reasons behind it are open to much debate. Journe 2 suggests that the Terror was a repressive and bloody period, which "did more harm than good", and yet ~~one~~ one could argue that it was successful in some aspects, as it helped to remove a number of threats posed by opposition groups.

Journe 2 was written by a member of the National Convention and perhaps more importantly, a member of the Committee of Public Safety. The Committee of Public Safety was an important mechanism in terms of enforcing the terror, and was responsible for carrying out revolutionary justice, thus adding value to the Journe. Significantly, ~~Thore~~ Thibaudeau presents a clear opinion that the Terror caused great suffering, stating that "it was a random and swift as death itself." Importantly, ~~the~~ the terror, and the extent terror that followed, was accountable for the loss of many lives due to the revolutionary tribunal, who convicted and sentenced those guilty of crimes against the revolution to death. Furthermore, the Journe states that "people applauded the death of evil executioners and victims." This is clearly a reference

(This is for part (b)) to the work of Marat, who in his newspaper L'ami du peuple he advocated for the lynching of members of the Girouin and ~~encouraged~~ encouraged the sans-culottes to intervene but also to carry out the murder of a number of victim people especially against revolution. ~~For~~

unveiling

The source is also helping to understand that the Terror led to develop an overwhelming hate of paranoia ~~and~~ and fear of counter-revolution among the population, hence "under the Terror no one was able to escape." Significantly, the machinery of the Terror, such as local committees and representatives on a ~~new~~ mission were largely responsible for creating this hate of fear, and ensured that everyone ~~and~~ ~~at~~ received xenophobia became a permanent part of society. Additionally, the source ~~is~~ emphasises the part that "certain classes and individuals, are not affected by the terror they inspire", which is intrinsically linked to the atrocities in Lyon and the Vendee, carried out by representatives on a mission, such as Team-Baptiste Carrier. Evidently, the source highlights the part that these atrocities were not dealt with by Robespierre ~~and~~ and the Committee of Public Safety, who turned a blind eye to these events, thus, the source helps to emphasise the brutal nature



(This is for part (b)) of the Terror.

However, the source is limited in terms of the fact that it doesn't refer to ~~when~~ the source was written after the collapse of the Terror. Following the Terror there was a backlash in terms against the Jacobins and individuals associated with the Terror and by publishing this the Antoinette could perhaps be underplaying his role in events. Furthermore, it ~~seems~~ to refer to ~~the~~ perhaps exaggerate the role of Robespierre, suggesting that he was the "high priest of the Terror." Significantly, Robespierre was responsible for providing the ideological justification for the Terror but actions such as de-Christianisation and the atrocities in the Vendée and Lyon were not of his doing. ~~It~~ In addition, the source emphasises suggests that the Terror was the work of a group of "individuals", and yet the fall of the Girondins and the Law of Suspects was driven by the laws of the Terror.

Overall, I would provide some weight to the source in terms of giving an account for the Terror as it is helpful in terms of suggesting that it caused much harm and claimed the lives of a significant proportion of the population. Furthermore, ~~as~~ the ~~public~~ author, as a member of the National Convention would have

(This is for part (b)) been involved with events at the time. However as a member of the Committee of Public Safety, following the collapse of the Terror, he perhaps wanted to exaggerate the extent to which the Terror caused harm to downplay his role and he also fails to refer to the role of the sans culottes in terms of driving the Terror ~~which~~ ~~as~~ ~~a~~ initial part of the Terror.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This high level response (Level 3 for 1(a) and Level 4 for 1(b)) demonstrates a number of strengths when tackling a Section A question: it understands/interrogates the source material; it deploys historical knowledge to support inferences and confirm/challenge matters of detail; and it evaluates the source material in the light of the specified enquiry and reaches a judgement. Note in part (a) how the analysis is precisely targeted on value.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure your inferences are supported with your own contextual knowledge. Use specific detail about the position the writer is taking and his/her purpose in doing so.

## Question 2

On Question 2(a), stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the source material on Rasputin's relationship with the Tsar and Tsarina and showed analysis by selecting some key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. Rasputin was influential in political and military affairs). Knowledge of the historical context concerning Rasputin's relationship with the Tsar and Tsarina was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm some matters of detail (e.g. Rasputin's relationship was based on his apparent ability to treat the royal couple's haemophiliac son). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry, and based on valid criteria, such as the nature and extent of the relationship, to show the value of the source. Similarly, explanation of utility referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. private letters to her husband, suggesting that the Tsarina is being candid about the relationship). Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on Rasputin's relationship with the Tsar and Tsarina and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making basic/undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. the Tsarina liked Rasputin). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source material to expand or confirm some points but these were not developed very far (e.g. brief comments on Rasputin's influence over official appointments during the First World War). Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often drifted into 'lack of value' arguments. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. private letters 'prove' the imperial couple was dominated by Rasputin).

On Question 2(b) stronger responses demonstrated understanding of the source material on the difficulties facing Kerensky's government in 1917 and showed analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the political and intellectual elites had little control over the revolutionary process in 1917). Knowledge of the historical context concerning opposition to the Bolshevik regime was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge some matters of detail (e.g. the Kerensky government had little choice but to adopt a pro-war policy partly because of treaty obligations to the allies). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material, the position of the author (e.g. the author was a diplomat in Russia and therefore likely to be well informed) or knowledge of the historical context to support/challenge the source content. Judgements were also based on valid criteria such as the impact of war and the quality of leadership. Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the difficulties facing Kerensky's government in 1917 and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. the war was the major problem facing Kerensky's government). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source to expand or confirm points but this was not developed very far (e.g. brief details of the failure of the June 1917 offensive). Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often lacked focus on either the 'has weight' or 'doesn't have weight' aspect of the question. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions

(e.g. as an outsider, the author was likely to have unbiased views on the difficulties facing Kerensky's government in 1917).

Chosen question number: **Question 1**  **Question 2**  1:50

(This is for part (a))

The source is valuable for understanding the extent of relationship between Rasputin, Nicholas II and his wife Alexandra during war time. The fact it was written by Alexandra herself allows the historian to understand the close and intimate relationship that existed between her and her 'holy man' on a personal level.

The source reveals the close relationship between Alexandra and Rasputin, with language choices such as 'friend'. It was known to the public that the Queen had suspiciously close relations to her 'holy man', whom she relied on for political advice, religious knowledge and foreign policy advice. This relationship became closer during wartime as the Tsar assumed overall command at the battlefield to instill patriotism in the Russian army, thus enabling the Tsarina and Rasputin to have control over Petrograd.

The source highlights the trust between the royal family and Rasputin, despite the rumours and suspicions that circled Rasputin. It seems that Nicholas II, as king, took on the advice of Rasputin to name

(This is for part (a))

'Protopopov' as minister of the Interior (an important position in government), thus showing the extent of trust between the two. However, the source, to some extent, suggests that Rasputin himself had power over the King and his actions during wartime, and that their relationship was not balanced. The source makes clear that Nicholas II will do as his friend asks, and thus carries out the suggesting (wise) act in naming a Duma member as 'minister of the interior'.

Rasputin also has a significant influence over the Tsar's military plans and tactics, hinting that the Tsar depended on Rasputin for advice due to his lack of military experience. Rasputin 'begs' him to order his army away from danger to avoid 'endless bloodshed' during the first world war.

The fact the source was written by Alexander in personal letters to his husband heightens the sense of friendship and trust between the King, Queen and Holy man.

Overall, the source is useful for an enquiry into the relationship between Rasputin, the Tsarina and Tsar as it reveals the close, friendly nature of their

(This is for part (a))

relationship. The tsarina refers to Rasputin as 'our friend' and the Tsar takes on his military advice and political knowledge, which thus reveals that their relations were good and friendly in disposition, unlike how <sup>Russia</sup> society perceived their relationship as one of conflict and suspicion.

(This is for part (b))

The source <sup>carries</sup> ~~has~~ weight ~~is~~ mainly due to the fact it was written by an individual who was present in Moscow from 1912 until 1918, and therefore witnessed the problems facing government prior to 1917 and the problems faced specifically by Kerensky's Provisional government in 1917 and how they differed. The source reveals that the <sup>upcoming</sup> Bolshevik revolution was the ~~main~~ one of the main problems the Provisional government faced, and so is used into an enquiry into the problems they faced throughout their short-lived rule. However, the source has a multitude of problems that lowers its credibility and weight.

The source highlights that one of the biggest problems the Provisional government faced was the ~~war~~ <sup>the pressure to make</sup> First World War, ~~against Germany~~ and a 'peace with Germany'. The war divided opinion<sup>n</sup>, while some members <sup>in the Provisional government,</sup>

favoured total and immediate peace, namely the Bolsheviks and left social revolutionaries, ones favoured the policy of 'revolutionary defensism' whereby Russia would not fight to gain territory but would continue to defend its borders and aid its allies, which was supported by Kerensky and his supporters within the government, as set out in the 'Declaration of War aims'. This resulted in heightened conflict and deepened divisions in the provisional government.

(This is for part (b)), which essentially led to the downfall.

The Milyukov crisis, which resulted over divisions over the war, undermined the provisional government's legitimacy to rule over Russia, which was worsened by the June offensive ~~and~~ of summer 1917. Thus, the source has weight because ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> reveals ~~claimed that~~ <sup>conflict over</sup> war and peace the Provisional Government's failure to 'save Russia' by ending the war, led to its failure.

The source also reveals that the problems caused by the Bolsheviks - especially key members such as (Lenin and Trotsky) ~~caused~~ <sup>caused</sup> the downfall of the ineffective Provisional government.

The source reveals that Lenin 'promised to stop the war' thus allowing the alternative ~~p~~ governmental power to come to the 'top' and destroy the Provisional government, which was outlined in his

April Thesis. While this is true, the April Thesis did not gain widespread support in 1917, so cannot therefore be a highly significant problem facing the Provisional Government in 1917, ~~but~~ ~~and~~ ~~enable~~ ~~them~~ ~~to~~ ~~take~~ ~~power~~ ~~later~~ ~~on~~. The source ~~it~~ makes evident that Bolshevik leading figures posed a threat to the temporary government, 'Lenin and Trotsky' whom constantly called the Provisional Government a temporary, undemocratic,

(This is for part (b)) and illegitimate, and thus needed to be 'shot' in order for the Provisional Government to have survived.

It also makes clear that Kerensky himself added to the problems he faced after the revolution, due to the fact he would not 'shoot his opponents' or use repression in order to halt the growing <sup>public</sup> opposition towards the Provisional Government that had been enabled to grow due to the new guaranteed basic freedoms of speech and association.

Furthermore, the source also highlights the fact that the Provisional Government faced problems involving 'land' and 'bread'. After the revolution and ~~the~~ <sup>during</sup> war, inflation ~~was~~ ~~at~~ was high, and the discontent of both urban workers ~~and~~ peasants and middle classes continued into the rule of Kerensky's government. However, Kerensky believed as his the Government was temporary, that these radical reforms were to be carried out by the later democratic constituent assembly. Thus, a major problem the Provisional Government



faced was the lack of reform and the growing discontent  
over the lack of change, which in turn increased the support  
of Bolshevik rule.

However, the source has multiple limitations that  
decrease its weight and effectiveness in an enquiry over  
the Kerensky's Government's problems in 1917. Firstly, it  
was written by a 'British' diplomat over ten years after

(This is for part (b)) the events of 1917. This essentially  
means the evidence outlined could be critically biased  
and misinterpreted by Lockhart - whom it is



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is another upper level response (Level 3 for 2(a) and Level 3 for 2(b)) which demonstrates: understanding of the source material; deployment of some historical knowledge to support inferences and confirm/challenge matters of detail; and some evaluation of the source material in the light of the specified enquiry. Note in part (b) that a final 'rounding off' judgement is missing.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Look at the detail of the provenance of the two sources to see what might give value or weight to the source - e.g. in this case in part (b) the source was written by a Moscow-based British diplomat who was therefore likely to be an informed observer of the Kerensky government's difficulties in 1917.

### Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted the significance of the financial problems of the 1780s in the fall of the ancien regime in France. These answers included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge to assess the significance of the stated factor – financial problems – (e.g. inefficient tax system, series of financially ruinous wars, cost of the French court, the failures of Louis XVI's finance ministers) and a range of other factors (e.g. the challenge of Enlightenment ideas, the impact of a poor harvest in 1788, Louis XVI's own ill-judged actions) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the relative significance of financial problems in the 1780s were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the significance of the financial problems of the 1780s in the fall of the ancien regime in France. Low scoring answers often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of events in France during the 1780s. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. just a focus on the inefficient tax system). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number: **Question 3**  **Question 4**  **Question 5**   
**Question 6**  **Question 7**  **Question 8**

- ① Yes: Financial ministers
- ② No: Food ~~scarcity~~ - Bad Harvests
- ③ No: Bad rule - Versailles & resentment

\* The ancien régime was crumbling as the 1780s progressed, eventually falling totally when Louis XVI was killed at the guillotine. But how significant were the financial problems of the 1780s?

\*

On one hand, the financial problems of the 1780s were less significant to the fall of the ancien régime than a lack of food. During the 1780s, there was a run of bad harvests, culminating in a huge storm in 1788, that wiped out the year's harvest, destroying crops & killing livestock. This led to a massive food shortage, and most importantly, a shortage of bread. Generally,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a worker's diet was bread, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of their income was spent on bread, which shows just how important it was. Initially, the shortage led to rioting, but the search for food can be found as an underlying factor for much of

the civil unrest in the 1780s, ~~which~~ which peaked when attacks on royalty began. In this way, it is not the financial problems of the 1780s that were most significant, and the food shortages were arguably more significant.

On the other hand, there were many financial issues in the 1780s that affected the fall of the ancien régime. Louis XVI had come into power very young, and he inherited from his father the 100 years war, and all the debt that came with it. During his reign, France supported America in winning the American revolution, costing Louis even more money. This financial pressure started to show, as Louis began firing his financial ministers. ~~Henry Atton~~ Three of them tried to introduce new measures, but he were denounced as too radical, then fired, and the ~~fourth~~ fourth, Jacques Necker lied in a statement of finances, and continued to borrow more money. Eventually, France had to declare bankruptcy because no lenders would loan to them anymore. This poor economic state, and ineffective fixes led revolutionaries to believe that Louis was incompetent, and wasting the money he was loaned on an extravagant lifestyle, meaning that they began to deconstruct the ancien régime under constitutional monarchy, and then do away with it when Louis died. For this reason, the financial problems of the 1780s were very significant in the fall of the ancien régime.

However, the ancien régime had a lot of opposition over the hundreds of years that France had been ruled by the Bourbons, under the Ancien régime, it had wronged many people. The estates system meant that

society was unfair, and the poorest people took the brunt of the work & taxes, and the largest amount of people (96% of the population) were not represented/underrepresented in government & rule. The régime was building resentment & frustration, things that were only increased by the circumstances, such as little food, poor pay, unemployment and riots. This level of frustration was ~~both~~ bound to find an unhealthy exit, the King had distanced himself from the people, Versailles was 100 miles away from Paris, and ~~the King~~ Louis no longer understood the wants & needs of the French. In this way, the ancien régime caused its own fall more ~~than~~ significantly than the financial problems.

Overall, I think that ~~the~~ while the financial problems of the 1780s were significant in the fall of the ancien régime, there are other factors that may be considered more significant.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 3 response offers some analysis of the significance of the financial problems of the 1780s in the fall of the ancien régime in France. Mostly accurate own knowledge is brought in to assess the relative significance of these financial problems and some other factors (e.g. the unfair taxation system). The criteria for judgement are mostly implicit and the conclusion at the end needs further development.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When planning your answer to a support / challenge question make sure you have a good balance of key points on either side of the argument, or be prepared to argue support and challenge within each key point.

## Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in 1792 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (Louis XVI's failings) and a range of other factors (e.g. destabilising economic problems in the early 1790s, the growth of republicanism, the impact of war from April 1792). Judgements made about the relative importance of Louis XVI's failings were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a limited analysis of the reasons for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in 1792. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of the stated factor such as Louis XVI's flight to Varennes). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number:

~~Question 1~~

Question 4  Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

~~There is no doubt that the financial problems of the 1780's were the most significant factor for the~~

Q4:

It is clear that Louis XVI's failings acted as a catalyst for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in 1792, yet there is no doubt that the rise in radical minorities played the largest role in its collapse. Other factors, such as the War, and the National (then Legislative)

Assembly, as underlying factors that are not as important.

Louis XVI's failings clearly <sup>acted as a catalyst for his fall.</sup> triggered a rise in Republican ideas. ~~As~~ The Flight to Varennes on the 21st June 1791 triggered 30,000 to march on the

Assembly calling for his abolition. It further triggered the Champ de Mars massacre on the 17th July 1791, whereby ~~the~~ ~~last~~ 20,000 National Guard troops had to be used to suppress it, and 60 died and 200 were arrested. This therefore shows that Louis's mistakes acted as a catalyst for Republican ideas, yet the fact that it was the Cordeliers club that organised it also shows that a radical minority were significant in spreading Republican ideas. Another mistake of Louis' was to veto the *feu* army and the law against the refractory priests on the 25th June 1792, immediately triggering

The journey of the 20th century course-cultures formed the Tuileries. However this further shows that Louis' own actions were only catalysts to the fall in constitutional monarchy, and further that the National Assembly perhaps gave him too much power (as such as the veto)

that allowed ~~to~~ constitutional monarchy to fail. Therefore it is clear to see that Louis' actions do were significant in the collapse of ~~absolute~~ <sup>constitutional</sup> monarchy as he gave the French public a reason to distrust him.

Yet the factor of war plays a larger role in the fall of the monarchy. The Declaration of Pillnitz on the 26th August 1791 sparked debates over war with Austria, and France finally declared war on the 20th April 1792. The Brunswick Manifesto in ~~July~~ ~~June~~ Summer 1792 further caused unrest as ~~it~~ ~~and~~ ~~it~~ and radical ideas. The war

is exposure with Austria is especially significant, as the French public <sup>had already</sup> did not ~~already~~ trust Austrian Prince Arcon Marie Antoinette, and so it sparked rumours that he had an Austrian committee to help fight against the French. Furthermore,

Louis vetoing of the petitioners army provided him with support as it was clear he ~~was~~ did not support the French army, or the French Revolution as his guards stood on the shores of the revolution. For this reason was played a key role in ~~allowing~~ justifying ~~of~~ republican ideas, yet it also shows how Louis' actions acted as a catalyst.

One less important factor in the fall of the constitutional monarchy was the National Assembly, then the Legislative Assembly, because it is often argued that they ~~were~~ ~~had~~ not did not restrict Louis



enough, and for this reason the constitutional monarchy collapsed. On the 5th August 1789 were the August Decrees and shortly after the Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen, which somewhat restricted Louis as he could not create new laws or a taxes ~~without~~ ~~the~~ ~~Assent~~ as this was now the Assembly's responsibility. However he still had the right for a suspensive veto (which caused problems in summer 1792) and the Royal Household were given 25 million livres a year. Not only this, Louis could appoint his own ministers and army generals. Therefore it can be argued that one reason for the collapse of constitutional monarchy was that the National Assembly were not harsh enough in its new legislation. However, <sup>Also</sup> when the new constitution came into effect in October 1791, and the Legislative Assembly was formed ~~whereby~~ <sup>anyone</sup> ~~so~~ ~~one~~ ~~who~~ ~~sat~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~Nation~~, this

agreed to be used to a deterioration ~~of~~ of the constitutional monarchy. Yet it should be agreed that the National Assembly is less important, as the role of radical minorities is much larger, and Louis perhaps could have been perhaps no matter <sup>how much</sup> ~~what~~ the National Assembly restricted his power.

By far the largest cause for the collapse of a constitutional monarchy was the rise of radical minorities. The Cordeliers club was set up on the 20<sup>th</sup> April 1790 by Danton, and during the same time Robespierre became leader of the Girondin Jacobin club. It was the Cordeliers club that organized the Champ de Mars march (that became a massacre), so therefore they hold a key role. Yet the largest group was by far the sans-culottes, responsible for the journée of the 20<sup>th</sup> June, and then for the storming of the Tuileries on the 10<sup>th</sup> August 1792, which ultimately had Louis arrested.

NA only this, but other radical minorities, such as the Great Fear in the 17th July / August 1789, and the October Days in 1789, show that which forced Louis to flee from Versailles to the Palace of the Tuileries, shows that Louis faced backlash even from the part of the Revolution.

Therefore this significantly shows how much of the the sans-culottes, and other minorities, as well as political agitators such as Danton, Robespierre and Marat played in the fall of Constitutional monarchy, as they made it inevitable for constitutional monarchy to wobble and hold great power (seen when Danton and other radicals took over the Paris Commune in the 9th August 1792 or during the September massacres). Yet the fact that it also shows that Louis' actions further gave them a reason to dominate, and the

ongoing economic crisis (caused by the shortfall in the new taxation system of the National Assembly) further aggravated the lower class sans-culottes, the war only further justified their radicalisation.

Overall, there is no doubt that Louis XVI played a major role in his own collapse, but the effects of the war for creating discontent and paranoia, and the National Assembly for not being restrictive enough in its plenary roles. However, the growth of radical groups (primarily the sans-culottes) is the largest factor. Arguably Louis actions continually triggered these radical minorities, until by the end of 1792, the French public were no longer in favor of constitutional monarchy.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths. It targets the role played by Louis XVI's failings in the collapse of the constitutional monarchy in 1792 and it uses decent own knowledge to develop the stated factor (Louis XVI's failings) and other factors (e.g. the impact of war, the role of the National Assembly and the growth of radicalism). Finally, a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Higher level responses are often based on brief plans that offer a logical structure for the analysis. They identify three or four themes and points for and against the proposition. Take a minute or two at the beginning to plan before you start writing your response. That way, you are more likely to produce a relevant, logical and well-structured response.

## Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses targeted the extent to which the Directory was able to restore order in the years 1795-99 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop both sides of the debate (e.g. order restored through constitutional arrangements, writing off two-thirds of the national debt, Ramel's financial reforms and the profits of war plunder but the Directory was unable to restore order due to constitutional 'gridlock', coup threats, and the monetary crisis of 1795-97). Judgements made about the Directory's ability to restore order were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised, often lacked a focus on consequence, and sometimes merely offered a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or only offered one narrow aspect related to the demands of the question (e.g. the consequences of the Directory's constitutional arrangements or Ramel's financial reforms). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number: **Question 3**  **Question 4**  **Question 5**   
**Question 6**  **Question 7**  **Question 8**

After the fall of the Jacobinists and Robespierre in 1795 the Thermidorians attempted to create an air of moderation and tranquillity after the blood lust of the terror. However many factors affected this restoration of order such as the coup of Fructidor ~~in 1798~~, the <sup>Babeuf Plot</sup> ~~Vendemiaire rising~~ and the reliance on the army throughout 1795-99 that jeopardized this stability. However overall it was the economic discontent faced by the people that ~~caused~~ and the failings of the 1795 constitution that did not allow ~~for~~ the restoration of order.

The constitution of 1795 hoped to divide the powers of government between bodies such as the executive, the Council of Ancients and the Council of 500 in order

to prevent the tyranny seen ~~for~~<sup>by</sup> the Committee of public safety. As whilst checks and balances of the constitution prevented governmental tyranny it also prevented a powerful government that was needed to face the external threats of war with the European countries as well as the economic crisis that had left many in famine and starvation. Whilst the Directory (executive) were ultimately in charge of foreign policy and the army, all finances to fund this army ~~require~~<sup>require</sup> that was required to fight in campaigns such as Egypt had to be provided by the legislature. This political gridlock prevented strong government action needed to provide stability in France.

However the Directory did attempt to combat the dire economic conditions that France faced in an attempt to impose stability. By ~~the~~ 1797 the assignat had devalued by 46% as the government printed more and more money for war funds. To make things worse the abolition of the Maximum price had caused inflation, especially for bread and grain. ~~2/3~~<sup>1/3</sup> of the peasant diet was based upon bread and this effected the poorest families the most, which prompted a variety of protests that threatened stability. Notably the 25,000 strong march ~~or~~ called the Vendemiaire rising of 1795. To combat this issue the directory declared bankruptcy and ~~it~~ paid its creditors.

with land bonds that decreased state debt by 2/3. However the bonds soon became worthless ~~and~~ which damaged the prospects of future lending to the government. The government's inability to provide a strong government to impose a degree of stability ~~and~~ in the French economy led to uprisings and protests that undermined the restoration of order from 1795-97.

Another way in which the directory had failed to restore order to France was by its constant reliance upon the army to maintain stability. The Vendémiaire rising serves as an example where Napoleon and the army were called by Director Barras to disperse the crowds demanding a Food Commission, 800 protesters were killed in the dispersal but the army ~~was~~ did enforce ~~so~~ internal social control. Revolts in the Provinces as well as the invasion of Quiberon bay act as further examples for how the Army were relied upon by the Directory to maintain order. However with limited funds to pay for the army, the Directory had to impose an aggressive military policy to invade and plunder foreign lands to pay soldiers and generals with their increasing appetite for money. Whilst this maintained order it led to the politicisation of generals such as Napoleon Bonaparte who oversaw the surrender of Milan from Austria-Hungary without the consent of the Directory. Napoleons public popularity with citizens and his soldiers alike gave him



great political power that undermined the Directory's desire for the restoration of order in France, and undoubtedly led to its down fall during the 1794 coup of Brumaire.

Another way in which order was jeopardized was within the various coups and insurrections that plagued the Directory's desire for progress, one of which was the Coup of Fructidor in 1797. After a resurgence on royalism from a number of royalist clubs and the free censorship of the press that allowed the spread of ideas, an electoral campaign succeeded in winning 180 / 260 council seats within the Directory. Director Barras was responsible for surrounding the ~~council~~ <sup>council</sup> and with the army in an attempt to arrest the deputies that threatened the republic, 177 deputies were arrested as well as Director Barthélemy. However by doing so the Directory had undermined its own constitution of democracy and free elections which sapped its' legitimacy and led to further calls of 'tyranny' and instability. ~~the~~

Another example of an insurrection was the Babeuf plot, led by a far left journalist of 'le tribun du peuple', Gracchus Babeuf. In the first recorded 'communist style revolt', 3 battalions of Parisian police ~~had~~ arranged a mutiny against the Directory. However before the plot could have been ~~acceptable~~ enacted Director Carnot was made aware and all guilty parties were arrested. This serves as a useful example of how the directory were

able to ~~was~~ restore a degree of order despite the attempted insurrection. Overall these coups were successfully suppressed with varying extent of success, however the reasons for the insurrections plagued the Directory which was ultimately beholden to public opinion and was unsuccessful in ~~was~~ restoring order.

Whilst some attempts were made by the Directory to restore order between 1795-99 such as the economic reforms and the forced social control by the army, the solutions created long term problems for the Directory that led to its' collapse on 14 Brumaire 1799. The dire hardship faced by peasants due to economic failures ~~had~~ led to insurrection that prevented order under the Thermidorean government that was ill equipped to deal with the serious issues it encountered.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This response was placed in Level 4 because: it offers strong analysis of the extent to which the Directory was able to restore order in France in the years 1795-99 and has a good focus on consequence; decent depth of knowledge is used to develop the argument (constitutional problems, attempts to establish economic stability, reliance on the military, the impact of various coups); and an overall judgement is reached in the conclusion and the answer shows clear organisation.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.

## Question 6

On Question 6, stronger responses targeted the extent to which the Tsarist system survived the 1905 revolution due to the concessions made by Nicholas II and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (concessions made by Nicholas II) and a range of other factors (e.g. divisions among the disaffected groups, the bulk of the army remained loyal to the Tsarist regime, Stolypin's effective policy of repression). Judgements made about the consequences of Nicholas II's concessions were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised, often lacked a focus on consequence, and sometimes merely offered a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or only offered one narrow aspect related to the demands of the question (e.g. the consequences of the government's decision first to halve and then scrap redemption payments). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number: **Question 3**  **Question 4**  **Question 5**   
**Question 6**  **Question 7**  **Question 8**

It is ~~more~~ as accurate to say that the Tsarist system survived the 1905 revolution due to the concessions made by Nicholas, as he was very stubborn in his personality and whenever was right, Tsar was never the one to follow what the people wanted, which left him on his own in the 1905 revolution to survive.

When the different parties such as social revolutionaries, liberals and social democrats wanted reform, Tsar Nicholas was one who would not give up in his oppositions, which meant that whenever he wanted which was the Tsarist

regime staying in power, it would remain as Nicholas would not ask anyone else for advice.

Indeed moreover, Nicholas chose to go to war himself, although military power was at its minimum. Nicholas still chose to proceed with the war. This goes to show how Nicholas was always banking himself on his options as he thought that he would be able to survive the 1905 revolution, which he did.

Most actions of the Tsar lead to mostly circumstantial events such as bloody Sunday, which meant that the population at the time were not happy with the Tsarist regime. However, because of the actions of the Tsar he still remained in power which meant that his actions and concessions lead to the survival of the Tsarist regime.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 1 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers. It makes generalised statements about the Tsar and 1905 without really engaging with the issue of the regime's survival due to the concessions made. It lacks range and depth and does not offer a clear judgement. There is little attempt to structure the answer appropriately.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

You will be expected to offer detailed knowledge to support your arguments. Check the specification so you know what is required.

## Question 7

On Question 7, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the defeat of the White forces in the Russian civil war and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (lack of White unity) and a range of other factors (e.g. Bolshevik core support and control of the central geographical area, Denikin and Kolchak alienated the peasantry by calling for land to be returned to the nobility). Judgements made about the relative importance of lack of White unity were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a limited analysis of the reasons for the defeat of the White forces in the Russian civil war. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of the stated factor such as the geographical dispersal of the White forces that made a coordinated fighting strategy difficult). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number: **Question 3**  **Question 4**  **Question 5**   
**Question 6**  **Question 7**  **Question 8**

It is accurate to say that the <sup>lack</sup> ~~reason~~ of unity was the main reason for the defeat of the Whites in the <sup>Russian</sup> civil war. However, before coming to a conclusion we must consider all other factors such as the <sup>and their impact</sup> ~~peasants~~ and other groups of civil war.

The Whites were the supporters of the ~~the~~ Tsar's regime. They wanted to defeat the Bolsheviks overthrow their regime and replace it with the Tsar. However during the civil war they faced a few problems such as lack of unity, lack of central co-ordination. The leaders of the Whites

never came to an agreement about what tactics they should use in the war. These internal conflicts gave the Reds an advantage over them as ~~they~~ the Reds were always one step ahead. Due to these disagreements the Whites went through a number of different leaders. These different leaders always had different views and approaches on how to fight the war which

caused instability throughout the army's leadership. Some of the leaders of the Whites were ready to compromise or co-operate with each other therefore they lost a lot of land they were in control of during the civil war. So far the evidence suggests that (the lack of unity) it is accurate to suggest that the lack of unity was the main reason for the defeat of the White forces in the civil war.

Furthermore, the achievement of the Reds is another factor to assess. Unlike the White forces the Reds were very disciplined, unified and had excellent communication and co-operation skills. The Reds owned majority of the land during the civil war which gave them an advantage because they could attack the Whites from

any angles and be fully prepared about it. The Reds also maintained high control of the people in the area which they controlled. This helped them because the Whites would not be able to manipulate people into supporting them. The Reds strong and determined leadership lead them to defeating the Whites because they emphasized the problems the Whites had but then it also allowed the Reds to carry out operations against the Whites. So far the evidence suggests that it is accurate to say that the lack of unity was the main reason for the defeat of the White ~~full~~ forces in the civil war. (The Reds)

In addition to this there were other groups in the civil war. The Greens who were fighting on behalf of the peasants and the national minorities who were a small group of nationalists. Out of these two groups the Greens shown more opposition to the Whites. This is because the peasants didnot want the Tsarist regime to return; the peasants suffered a lot under the Tsar. Therefore the Greens would unite with the Reds at times

otherwise they would fight solely. The national minorities as their title suggests were a minority and did not support any of the groups and would fight anybody who would come across them. These did not have much of an impact on the Whites. The evidence so far suggests that it is still accurate to say that the lack of unity was the main reason for the defeat of the White forces. This is because the Greens and the national minorities did not have a big impact on the White forces.

In conclusion the evidence so far suggest that the lack of unity was the main reason for the defeat of the Whites in the Russian civil war. This is because if the Whites could have agreed to a unanimous decision then they could have used better and ~~a~~ more strategic tactics against the opposition groups in the civil war.





**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This Level 3 response offers some analysis of the reasons for the White defeat in the Russian civil war (e.g. White internal differences, cohesion of the Red forces and Bolshevik control of important territory). Limited contextual knowledge is brought in to support and assess the relative importance of the causal factors selected. The criteria for judgement are mostly implicit but a conclusion on 'main reason' is reached at the end.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Be sure that you are able to make a logical judgement about the relative importance of the stated factor named in the question when set against your other selected factors.

## Question 8

On Question 8, stronger responses targeted the significance of the NEP in the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1921-24. These answers included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge to assess the significance of the stated factor – the NEP – (e.g. NEP offered economic incentives and improved living standards which reduced opposition to the regime) and a range of other factors (e.g. NEP undermined consolidation due to rising urban unemployment in 1921-22, Bolshevik reliance on coercion and repression, the use of propaganda and censorship to win over ‘hearts and minds’) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the relative significance of the NEP were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the significance of the NEP in the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1921-24. Low scoring answers often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of events in Russia in the years 1921-24. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. the NEP offered economic incentives which reduced peasant opposition). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Chosen question number: **Question 3**       **Question 4**       **Question 5**   
**Question 6**       **Question 7**       **Question 8**

The New Economic Policy (NEP) was an important factor in the consolidation of power for the Bolsheviks. However, other significant factors include the use of repression, the removal of opposition, and the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. Overall, while the New Economic Policy was quite significant, the most significant was the removal of opposition.

First, the New Economic Policy was significant in the Bolsheviks' consolidation of power. As it solved many of the problems that the extensive ~~the~~ grain requisitioning and rationing caused - namely widespread starvation, as many resorted to prostitution to feed themselves - during War

Communism, the Bolsheviks had less room for opposition from the public.<sup>It also rejuvenated the economy, making it quite significant.</sup> However, the New Economic Policy came with its fair share of problems, such as the development of the 'scissors Crisis', in which food prices fell dramatically where industrial prices skyrocketed. Another problem with the New Economic Policy was that its introduction of a more mixed economy (with elements of both capitalism and communism) split the Bolshevik party, which fed into the need to remove any opposition. As a result, this means that the New Economic Policy, although very significant in its own right for boosting the economy in post-war Communism Russia, is less significant than the removal of opposition, as the consequences of this was part of the removal process.

However, the removal of opposition was also significant in the consolidation of Bolshevik power. The Civil War, which ended in 1921, removed the majority of the Bolsheviks' external opposition, or at least made them ineffectual. This was significant because it meant that the Bolsheviks' could then focus on running the country, not<sup>on</sup> defending it from separate groups seeking to overthrow them. Furthermore, the removal of opposition also came from the Ban on Factions in 1921, which was very effective in removing ~~external~~ <sup>internal</sup> opposition from the Bolshevik Party. As this was a direct response to opposition against

The nature of the New Economic Policy, it is more significant, as it covers two fundamental aspects of Russian governance - politics and <sup>the</sup> economy.

The Bolsheviks' extensive use of repression also was a significant factor in their consolidation of power. The use of the Cheka was widespread throughout this period, with any 'counter-revolutionaries' executed or imprisoned without any form of trial, <sup>and</sup> was an effective way of

preventing opposition among the ordinary population, with in the period of one month (known as the Red Terror), there were at least 10,000 deaths as a result of the Cheka's brutality, thus making quite significant in the Bolsheviks' consolidation of power through fear tactics. Also, the crushed rebellions of the Tambov revolt, the repression of thousands of peasant revolters, and the Kronstadt Mutiny, in which the Kronstadt sailors (former allies of the Bolsheviks) were brutally put down, with the Bolsheviks themselves losing 10,000 men, and the Kronstadt sailors losing more. It can be argued that the use of repression classifies as part of the Bolshevik removal of opposition, therefore as a consequence, making it less significant than the removal of opposition, but making it more significant than the New Economic Policy, because the repression lasted alot longer than the New Economic Policy had by 1924.

Finally, the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky was significant in the Bolsheviks' consolidation of power. This is because Lenin served as an excellent figurehead for the Bolsheviks, and was an efficient leader of the country, as Prime Minister and head of the Sovnarkom. Although Lenin's policies divided the party, he also was the one who passed the Ban on Factions in 1921 that arguably restrengthened the party, making him quite significant. Furthermore, Trotsky was also a very effective leader, as his command of the army during the Civil War, especially his active involvement on the frontlines and his disciplinary techniques were a big contributing factor in the Reds' victory. Therefore, Trotsky was also significant, also being a huge political figure after the Civil War. Overall, the leadership of Trotsky and Lenin was very significant as they were the ones in charge of all of Russia, and implemented all of the policies and strategies that consolidated the Bolsheviks' power, including the New Economic Policy - making it more significant ~~than~~ <sup>than</sup> the New Economic Policy.

In conclusion, the New Economic Policy was quite significant as it helped to boost Russia's economy after War Communism. It also helped the growth of industry, but overall was not entirely successful, which makes it less significant for the Bolsheviks' consolidation of power. The

removal of opposition, use of repression and leadership of Lenin and Trotsky were all more significant than the New Economic Policy because for the most part they were extremely successful in consolidating the Bolsheviks' power, especially as they were a big part of the Civil War. Overall while the New Economic Policy was quite significant, it was not more so than the other mentioned factors.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely: it targets

the significance of the NEP in the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1921-24 by addressing its advantages and disadvantages; sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of the NEP and other factors (e.g. victory in the civil war, Bolshevik use of repression, leadership of Lenin and Trotsky); and a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Although there are time constraints, try to write at least three or four sides (depending on handwriting size) to give yourself the best chance to explore range and depth in this 'study in depth' paper

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### **Section A**

#### **Value of Source Question (1(a)/2(a))**

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry.

#### **Weight of Source Question (1(b)/2(b))**

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.

In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to use contextual knowledge to support/challenge statements and claims made in the source

- Try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using your contextual knowledge of the period
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, take account of the weight you may be able to give to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source. However, simply stating that a source is limited because it does not cover certain events or developments does not establish weight since no source can be comprehensive.

### **Section B**

#### **Essay questions**

- Candidates must provide more factual details as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Take a few minutes to plan your answer before you begin to write your response
- Pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Pay more careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts

- Try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.



## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

