



# Examiners' Report June 2022

GCE History 9HI0 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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0\_2C\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this the first post-Covid A Level paper 2C which deals with France in revolution, 1774-99 (2C.1) and Russia in revolution, 1894-1924 (2C.2). The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. 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 and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners did note that more scripts than has been usual posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out reasoned inferences developed from the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the question on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important that candidates appreciate that weight is not necessarily established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, comments on all the things that the sources might have contained, but failed to do so, is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. The question requires candidates to use the sources ‘together’ and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were aware of this instruction and achieved it using a variety of different approaches.

Candidates are more familiar with the essay section of Paper 2 and in section B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates often wanted to engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates do need to formulate a plan so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; many candidates lacked any counter argument at all. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels.

Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

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

## Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses clearly considered the sources together (eg both sources suggest that Robespierre played a central role in the Terror and was a leading member of the CPS), although treatment of the sources may have been uneven. Such responses also analysed the source material in relation to the enquiry with a sense of interrogation which went beyond selecting key points and made reasoned inferences (eg Robespierre attempted to strengthen his dominant role by creating the cult of the Supreme Being, an alternative civic religion to the Catholic faith). Knowledge of the historical context was used to discuss limitations/what can be gained from the content of the source material (eg Robespierre's failure to consult over the Law of 22 Prairial alienated the CGS and persuaded other CPS members that he was a dictator; Robespierre played a central role in the purge of the Hébertists and Indulgents, which enabled the CPS to pursue a policy of increasing terror and centralisation) and revealed an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which it was drawn (eg the fear engendered by Robespierre's actions during the Terror). Furthermore, high-scoring candidates evaluated the source material relevantly in line with the specified enquiry and considered matters of provenance confidently (eg de Staël was well educated and connected and so would potentially be in a good position to offer an informed assessment of Robespierre's role). The weight of the evidence was taken into consideration when coming to a judgement (eg Barère's informed but self-interestedly critical assessment of Robespierre's role in Source 1).

Weaker responses began to consider the sources together (eg both state that Robespierre played a leading role in the Terror). In addition, such responses showed some limited understanding and analysis of the source material through the selection of key points relevant to the question (eg Robespierre inspired fear among other political figures) and valid inferences (eg Robespierre's role led to divisions within the revolutionary government). However, these valid inferences had only limited support or remained undeveloped. Knowledge of the historical context was mainly used to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail with some attempt to support inferences (eg Robespierre railroaded the Law of 22 Prairial through the Convention and this paved the way for the Great Terror of June-July 1794). Lower-scoring candidates tended to evaluate the source material with some relevance regarding the specified enquiry and noted some aspects of source provenance to draw conclusions about reliability or utility. At this level, judgments often lacked support and could be based on questionable assumptions (eg Barère, author of Source 1, was writing over forty years later and so would have little knowledge of Robespierre's role).

Rosaspierre's role in the Terror is critical, with most viewing him as its main perpetrator, and both sources are highly revealing in helping a historian to understand Rosaspierre's role in the Terror, with him being at its heart and feared by opposition and all.

Source one is written by Barrere, which is highly valuable, due to him being a member of the CPS and thus very close to Rosaspierre during the Terror, giving an insight into the Convention that many others may not give. However, it does need to be noted that Barrere was a Thermidorian and aided in the overthrowing of Rosaspierre and his supporters during the Thermidorian Reaction, thus making his view of Rosaspierre more critical. The source reveals how there was a split within the CPS caused by Rosaspierre, with Barrere having "demanded a delus" to what he called a "dreadful" law. This source reveals how Rosaspierre was at the heart of the Terror, pushing through reform, despite it causing the division between him and his allies. However, Barrere may of said this in his memoirs in order to cover his own side and not to be seen as being associated with the shortcomings of the Terror. Moreover, the source reveals how Rosaspierre was not wholeheartedly

supported by those in the National Convention, with the law passing "Due to the just silence of the deputies". This reveals alot about Robespierre and how much of a role he played in the fear caused by the Terror. As this can be seen historically too with the execution of both the Hébertists and the Dantonists in March and April, which removed any opposition in the Convention. His ruthlessness can be seen through the execution of Desmoulins, his once childhood friend who was an indulgent. With the silence being "forced" it also reveals that the Convention was not willing to stand up to Robespierre during the Terror due to the power over the Convention that he had, with his "support among the Jacobins". Moreover, Barrere gives an insight into how Robespierre's law played out with "its consequences deplorable", as seen with the 1,375 deaths between the law passing and the Thermidorian Reaction, with the amount of executions per day increasing 10x. However, it is important for the historian to question Barrere's motives, with Robespierre being voted as head of the Convention on June 4<sup>th</sup> with ~~the~~ veto receiving support from 216/220 deputies.

Source 2 is also highly revealing for a historian due to ~~the~~ de Stael giving a ~~contemporary~~ view of the events far closer to the Terror's occurrence than the memoirs moreover, with her being a "intellectual" it is likely that she would give a balanced view on the role of

Robespierre during the Terror. When the source reveals how it was not purely Robespierre acting alone during the Terror, with him being "neither more able nor more eloquent than the rest", thus putting more responsibility on the CPS as a whole rather than singling Robespierre out. Although this view point is balanced, with all twelve having a role to play in the Terror, not all twelve were equal in responsibility, with the law of Prarial not being discussed by the CPS and the Vendémiaire Decree not being supported by Carnot, however, she claims it was not his ability that gave him power, but rather him being "loved by all his colleagues", which is to some extent true due to his support by the sans-culottes and the communes, some of which turn out in his support during the Thermidorian Reaction. De Staël also claims that after the Festival of the Supreme Being Robespierre was "vulnerable", which can be examined to be true, with him causing his own downfall in the Terror, with people such as Fouché and d'Holbach de disengaging with Robespierre after this festival, due to them both being avid dechristianisers. The prairial, an insight for the historian into the downfall of Robespierre and the Terror, and due to de Staël being an advocate of "moderate reform" she would have little reason to single out this moment above any others for Robespierre's downfall.

When the two sources are used together, they are highly useful for a historian with no coming from a radical playing a role within the Terror and the other providing a moderate view from outside the Terror. This helps to ~~minimise~~ minimise any bias that either source may have towards certain policies. There is some agreement among the sources to help a historian investigate the role of Robespierre in the Terror, such as how he was feared by his colleagues, which is stated in both, with the law passing due to "forced silence" and de Staël claiming that he was "feared by all his colleagues". Moreover, they both claim Robespierre as being somewhat paranoid, as seen in Barrere with Robespierre needing passing the law without informing either committee adequate concerning them, and with source two where he would send both "counter-revolutionaries and revolutionaries" to the guillotine. However, there are some areas in which the sources disagree, such as the role of other members of the CPS, this is due to Barrere being a member of the CPS and thus is highly unlikely to criticize his own actions. Nevertheless, they both determine that Robespierre was the pinnacle of the Terror with him being able to "distinguish himself from others".

Overall, both the sources are very useful for a historian to use to investigate the role of Robespierre in the Terror, due to both of them having opposite



providence making the laws in which they agree even more valuable to a historian. Although Barere will have a clear aim of distancing himself from Robespierre, this influences what he says with words such as "horrible" and "dreadful" to describe the law, he provides an important insight into the mood of the Convention and the GPs towards Robespierre. Source two on the other hand distinguishes Robespierre from other members of the GPs, not purely because of de Staël's ideology, but also due to the individual actions that Robespierre took during the Terror.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Question 1 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths:

- (1) it interrogates the evidence of both sources making reasoned inferences (eg the Convention was unwilling to stand up to Robespierre because of his power)
- (2) it deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source (eg the increasing number of executions following the law of 22 Prairial)
- (3) it evaluates the source material taking into account its weight as part of coming to a judgement (eg Barere's account may have been influenced by a desire to limit or evade his own personal responsibility for the Terror).



The two main ways to establish the weight of a source are (1) to use contextual knowledge to confirm or challenge claims or statements made in the source and (2) to consider the nature and purpose of the source (for eg the status and motivation of the author). Simply stating that a source fails to cover a particular event or development does NOT establish weight.

## Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses clearly considered the sources together (eg both sources indicate that War Communism had alienated rural society to such an extent that the Bolshevik regime/prospects for socialism were under threat), although treatment of the sources may have been uneven. Such responses also analysed the source material in relation to the enquiry with a sense of interrogation which went beyond selecting key points and made reasoned inferences (eg very few influential Bolshevik figures were prepared to acknowledge that War Communism was having a disastrous impact in the countryside). Knowledge of the historical context was used to discuss limitations/what can be gained from the content of the source material (eg by 1920-21 the negative impact of War Communism could be gauged from the fact that the Bolshevik regime had no effective control over rural areas in many southern and eastern provinces) and revealed an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which it was drawn (eg Bolshevik/socialist concerns that War Communism would provoke a civil war in the countryside). Furthermore, high-scoring candidates evaluated the source material relevantly in line with the specified enquiry and considered matters of provenance confidently (eg Dan's speech was designed to persuade the Eighth All-Russian Congress that War Communism should be abandoned). The weight of the evidence was taken into consideration when coming to a judgement (eg although written by a Bolshevik at the time, the credibility of Source 4 is enhanced by the fact that it considers the negative impact of War Communism in the countryside).

Weaker responses began to consider the sources together (eg both indicate that War Communism led to grain requisitioning and peasant resistance). In addition, such responses showed some limited understanding and analysis of the source material through the selection of key points relevant to the question (eg War Communism had a negative impact on agricultural output) and valid inferences (eg War Communism threatened to alienate the peasantry completely). However, these valid inferences had only limited support or remained undeveloped. Knowledge of the historical context was mainly used to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail with some attempt to support inferences (eg by 1920 agricultural production had declined to just 60 per cent of its 1913 level). Lower-scoring candidates tended to evaluate the source material with some relevance regarding the specified enquiry and noted some aspects of source provenance to draw conclusions about reliability or utility. At this level, judgements often lacked support and could be based on questionable assumptions (eg Serge (author of Source 4), as a Bolshevik at the time, had a favourable view of War Communism).

War Communism was triggered by Bolshevik grain requisitioning in May 1918 and was continued until the introduction of the New Economic Policy in March 1921. Together, these sources are useful to show how War Communism had a negative decline on agricultural production in the countryside, but also triggered peasant revolt against the Bolsheviks. With sources coming from what were opposing parties by 1919, the evidence is useful in showing how a range of ideologies saw these impacts of War Communism. All together, this makes sources 3 and 4 very useful to investigate countryside impact of War Communism.

Firstly, these sources are useful together in showing how War Communism profoundly affected agricultural decline. Source 3 describes how there was a "decrease in the sown area everywhere of almost 30%" and "agricultural decline". This explicit criticism is affirmed by the fact that harvests in 1914 until 1920 produced less than half of the produce produced in 1913. With grain requisitioning troops seizing all supplies, particularly after the introduction of the Food Law in January 1914, the set amount of grain must be seized regardless of local necessity, many peasants resorted to grow the bare minimum for their livelihood. As a result across the country, there was simply less food produced and indeed "agricultural decline". Source

4 describes how how communism left villagers "desperate" and that it was not 'unreasonable' for them to demand "the abolition of requisitioning". This results into the effect of agricultural decline in that many villagers in the countryside were so "desperate" as they didn't have enough food, which was either not being grown or requisitioned - "300 million pood" according to source 3. During the civil war period - 1918-21 - an estimated 5 million died from starvation. The situation was so dire that anti-capitalist Lenin even allowed the American Medical Association to assist 20 million Russians. This affirms source 4 in showing how agricultural decline led to desperation in the countryside. Taken together, these sources are useful in not only showing the sheer scale of agricultural decline, but also speaking to its effect on the countryside.

Secondly, together these sources are useful in showing how how communism led to opposition from the countryside towards the Bolshevik government. Source 3 describes how there was a basis for a bourgeois counter-revolution in Russia, where Bolshevik enemies - lumped under the term "bourgeoisie" - must fight back using the peasants due to how communism. This was indeed the case with Nestor Makhno leading a 10,000-strong "Green" army during the civil war simply demanding the rights of peasants, this army alternated between supporting the Whites and Reds, but clearly shows how when the peasantry felt threatened, they could be led and utilised as mass opposition!

the "basis" for a revolt. Source 4 goes one step further and actually speaks about peasant uprisings due to war communism: "requisitioning by the USSR" were "sometimes even massacred". This idea of countries like Russia is affirmed by the fact that there were 120 peasant uprisings in 1920. In particular, the Tambov uprising saw an army lead a force of 20,000 guerrilla fighters who used tactics such as summary execution to 'massacre' Bolsheviks. This affirms source 4 in showing the war communism forced actual peasant revolt. Taken together, these sources are useful as source 3 shows the potential for peasants to be organised against the Bolsheviks and source 4 shows how war communism was a triggering factor that harnessed this potential to cause peasant rebellion.

#### Sources

Finally, the providence of these sources is useful. Source 3 comes from Emma Dan, a leading Menshevik in <sup>December</sup> 1920. From as early as spring 1918, the Bolsheviks had rooted out the Mensheviks and soon outlawed the party outright. As such, this source is useful in showing how the Bolshevik's socialist opponents viewed war communism. On the other hand, source 4 derives from a Bolshevik, Viktor Serge. This is useful in showing how some of the Bolsheviks viewed their own policy. Taken together, the similar accounts of negative impacts of war communism from political enemies really underlines ~~underlines~~ the usefulness in affirming war communism's role

impact on the countryside. The full text source <sup>3</sup>, which describes <sup>the basis of the</sup> ~~the~~ rebellion in 1914, but source 4 certainly confirms makes the sources useful together to show how peasant <sup>countryside</sup> opposition may have been forced. However, source 4 is limited by the fact that it was published in 1951. As such, it is likely to be revisionist and argue that the Bolsheviks were perhaps less responsible for the negative <sup>effects</sup> ~~effects~~; "it was all the economic interventionist plans". Similar source 3, coming from a Bolshevik opponent has the potential to exaggerate the negative effects in order to discredit the Bolsheviks. Nevertheless, the full text source parallels well with both other sources and overwhelmingly useful in showing the effect on the countryside. The limitations speak mainly to the origins of war communism, which is not relevant to this investigation. This reaffirms how overall, these two sources are very useful together.

To conclude, together these sources are useful in showing the extent and effect of agricultural <sup>decline</sup> ~~decline~~ in the countryside caused by war communism, but also the threat and reality of <sup>peasant</sup> ~~peasant~~ revolt in the countryside due to war communism. ~~Coming from political opponents~~, these sources are useful as any <sup>parallels</sup> ~~parallels~~ must be <sup>accurate</sup> ~~accurate~~. While there are some limitations, these mainly refer to a separate investigation, but also reaffirm that any similar impacts of war communism seen must be sources which are absolutely useful in portraying an accurate image of countryside impact. Overall, these two sources

could make significant use of ~~sources~~ <sup>Sources</sup> 3 & 4 to investigate the impact of War Communism on the country side.



This Question 2 Level 4 response possesses several strong features:

(1) it analyses the source material to make some reasoned inferences (eg War Communism generated serious rural opposition to Bolshevik rule)

(2) it deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source (eg Makhno's green army to defend peasant interests)

(3) it evaluates the source material taking into account its weight as part of coming to a judgement (eg although a Bolshevik at the time of War Communism, Serge is critical of the policy).



Candidates should aim to develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the sources, not merely paraphrase the content of the sources. Inferences can be supported by reference to contextual knowledge surrounding the issues raised by the sources.



### Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the significance of the challenge to the ancien régime posed by rural poverty and urban food prices in France in the 1780s. Such responses explored the significance of the challenge posed by rural poverty and urban food prices (eg poor harvests in the years 1781-87 increased rural poverty and urban food prices and led to rising tensions, as peasants and urban workers suspected tithe-owners and nobles of hoarding and speculating; a disastrous harvest in 1788, due to extreme weather, increased bread prices by 50 per cent in Paris; this caused severe hardship among the capital's workers and hardened anti-government feeling) and the significance of other factors/developments (eg Enlightenment ideas posed a fundamental challenge to the foundations of the ancien régime, radicalised informed Third Estate opinion and mobilised members of the younger nobility who were critical of the old system; Louis XVI's determination to preserve absolutist rule and his ill-judged decisions played a significant role in undermining the ancien régime, eg he exiled the Paris Parlement (1788) and dismissed Necker (1789); Louis XVI's Finance Ministers, notably Turgot, Necker and Calonne, failed to address France's serious financial problems and, by 1788, France was facing bankruptcy, which sharpened divisions within French society). High-scoring candidates also demonstrated an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question (significance), deployed sufficient knowledge and established criteria to make a judgement (eg the extent/depth of the social, economic and political challenge posed). Such responses were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of the significance of the challenge to the ancien régime posed by rural poverty and urban food prices in France in the 1780s. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of the period under scrutiny. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (eg limited comments on the harvest failures of the 1780s). 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

Taxes <sup>could've</sup> <sup>reigning</sup> <sub>1/20</sub>

Plan 10a1:

- Grand Fear was - pressures
- Revoltion Riots
- cashed food shortage
- Enabled the spread of ideas - Diderot
- led to change
- Bastille second the revolution

But happened what why not

- Demand for bread
- Unable to reform
- Louis
- Overall no want to reform.

Intro: 57  
P1: 12  
P2: 27  
P3: 33

In the 1780's rural poverty and urban food prices were massive issues, there were constant failed harvests which led to riots and instability across France as keeply people fed is the most important political policy, however it was instabilised with the financial crisis and the Ancien Regime as a whole.

Evidently rural poverty and urban food prices were a major issue in the 1780 in both the 1780's and 80's there were constant failed harvests which led to riots over bread and grain such as the flour wars. This unrest forced the majority of France's

poor, whose unrest is a major issue to the Crown as at this point most of the countries' income is paid by the third estate who are the ones most affected by hunger. The 55% of the revenue is made up from indirect taxes which are paid by the third estate. If the crown's biggest revenue stream is hit in a time of financial crisis it is a major challenge, therefore the worst impact effect of the challenge of the issues with party and food shortage is its coincidence with the growth of enlightenment ideas. The failure of the French state to support the third estate led to a growth in ideas blaming the crown for the issues. Abbe Sieyès is key to this with what is the third estate's argument for more representation. This is important as, yes there were ground unrest and riots over food and party law that had been happening for the past 100 years so the reason this was challenged was its coincidence with a political awakening of the third estate. This is clear a previously very uprisings at rights of the third estate both in parts and in the process has been almost brought back as the 1780's advances riots such as the day of tithes in Avignon and then in 1789 the storming of the Bastille, shows a clear political

direction of discontent. It is important  
still to see that the spread of these  
ideas and the growth of political action  
in the poor is still vital in the  
desperate need for bread as seen in the  
crust for as although they were attacking  
these privileged they were attacking  
and destroying records of rent. Bastille is  
the most important example of the challenge the  
rural party and urban food crisis posed as the  
actions of the Sans Culottes in rising up to  
oppose the King's forces could be seen as  
saving the revolution, their intention maybe  
ideological however the drive of their fervor  
is desperation because of lack of food. The  
growth of rural party and urban Sansculottes  
allowed the conditions for the spread of ideas  
and the drive for change that supported the  
political movements at the Estates General.  
However, you cannot see this as a stand alone  
issue, food shortage and poverty had been  
common in France for the past 100 years so  
it is other conditions combined with poverty  
which lead to it being a challenge

The main other issue is the financial

failure of the Ancien Régime. Throughout the period the finances of the state were in a dire position, with 80% of expenditure being on pay of debt in 1780 with this rising to 90% in 1788 showing a clear failure of finances. The system itself is reliant on the Third estate with very property taxes like the venetian being allowed the First and Second estate to pay a don gratuit to get out of it, this system relied on the power to pay for the country, which in a time of financial strife exacerbated the road to revolution, showing this poverty as a symptom of financial failure. This financial problem posed the greatest threat with forces including to reform the system. There was this one done for two reasons the weakness of Louis XVI and the Grand Alliance to change. Louis constantly refused to pass reform he was a divine right monarch yet was weak he rejected the sensible reforms of surgeons instead going for the people war in America which cost an 1 billion livres. He continually failed to support his ministers with both Calonne and Brienne being overruled after he failed to support them. This is most obviously seen in

the parlements where Louis attempted to use the lit de justice to pass through despite needed reform yet he backed down when challenged. This exacerbated the conditions in the out parts of the poor as reform still wasn't occurring. Louis also failed to assert himself in the Estates general especially the Science royal leading to the creation of the national assembly and the fall of the Ancien regime. However, despite Louis' weakness the major challenge to the Ancien regime was the lack of will to reform within the system itself. It was the people who lost the vote if there was reform who decided reform. This is most evident at the assembly of notables with the Notables accepting that Calonne's reforms needed to happen but refused to be the ones to ratify them. This continued at the parlements, by enlightening bourgeoisie to demand reform. The lack of will to reform left a stagnant and outdated system that when combined with unrest and starvation and the growth of Enlightenment ideas, became a serious challenge to the Ancien regime.

In conclusion, it is clear that the reform

food shortages and rural poverty posed a serious threat to the ancien régime. They lead to riots and unrest and when combined with the political awakening of the Third Estate lead to a very decisive role in need of change. Thus they serve as a symptom of the failure of the ancien régime to effectively deal with the financial and political issues of the time and the weakness of Louis



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Question 3, level 5 response possesses several strengths:

- (1) it targets the significance of the challenge to the ancien régime posed by rural poverty and urban food prices in France in the 1780s
- (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of rural poverty/urban food prices and other developments, eg the radicalising effects of rural poverty/urban food prices, the challenge of Enlightenment ideas and the impact of the Crown's financial problems
- (3) 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 4

On Question 4, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the statement that the role played by Sieyès was the main reason for the success of the coup de Brumaire in 1799. High-scoring answers weighed this stated factor (eg Sieyès' election as a Director (May 1799) gave a notable opponent the opportunity to work from within to replace the Directory since he feared political instability would lead to a monarchist or radical seizure of power; Sieyès realised that many of the government's critics wanted a return to strong leadership and that, with the French armies achieving victories again and the Councils in confusion, a coup was feasible; Sieyès invited Napoleon to participate, since he knew that a successful coup required military support and a capable army officer who inspired loyalty within the ranks and popular support; Sieyès, and others, used the pretext of a Jacobin plot in the Council of the Five Hundred to persuade the Council of Ancients to move to Saint-Cloud, a location where the Ancients were more vulnerable to a coup attempt) against others (eg Napoleon's support for the coup was vital, since he provided the conspirators with a prominent and popular figurehead, making it less likely that the coup would encounter significant resistance in the capital; Napoleon's participation ensured that a large proportion of the military supported the coup (Bonaparte took control of the Paris garrison containing approximately 100,000 men); Lucien Bonaparte saved the coup by demanding the expulsion of 61 deputies from the Council of Five Hundred, which facilitated the passing of laws to replace the Directory with a three-man executive; other individuals made important contributions to the success of the coup such as Director Barras who acted as an 'inside' co-conspirator and Talleyrand who introduced Sieyès to Napoleon and backed the coup; influential groups in French society failed to rally to the Directory's defence in 1799 because of the impact of the government's economic measures, such as the forced loan and the Ramel liquidation). These responses included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (causation) in the question. Judgements made about the relative importance of Sieyès' role were reasoned and based on clear criteria (eg the effectiveness of Sieyès' planning and organization in determining a successful outcome). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to describe key events that took place in the coup de Brumaire in 1799 with limited focus on causation and/or the stated factor (the role played by Sieyès). Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (eg limited comments on Sieyès being able to recruit Napoleon for the coup attempt). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.



Main Reason	Not main reason
- He helped to reconstruct it from within	- Military involvement
- Part of directory	- Napoleon's role
- Invited the army	- <del>Economic</del> overextension
- Knew he needed popular support	- Directory failures - Coup of Fructidor & Floreal
	- Economic situation - Babely plots
	- Inefficient tax

~~The~~ ~~Abbe~~ ~~Sieyès~~ ~~was~~ The Coup of Brumaire saw the collapse of the directory and in 1799, with which Sieyès played an integral in ~~being~~ undergoing these actions. He was the main conductor of the coup and ~~was~~ organised the involvement of the army by inviting Napoleon to help overthrow the directory. However, ~~the involvement of the~~ the coup of Brumaire wouldn't have been ~~a~~ successful without the ~~involve~~ role the army in events <sup>with its</sup> ~~and the~~ popular support and the power it had gained over the course of the Directory's rule. Furthermore, the Directory's own unpopular actions' during its reign that caused a rise in opposition ~~to~~ that would contribute ~~to the~~ ~~but~~ see popular view in favour of overthrowing the Directory, warranting the success of the coup of Brumaire. Therefore Sieyès' role though important ~~would~~ in scheming a coup wouldn't have been successful without ~~the~~ popular support, in the army and the resentment towards the Directory.

Abbe Sieyès ~~played an integral role in the~~ ~~was~~ had an important role in ~~with~~ the ~~coups~~ ~~the~~ success of the coup as he was the one who came up with an effective plan to destroy the Directory from within. ~~It~~ ~~by~~ ~~involve~~ ~~looking~~ ~~towards~~ ~~the~~ ~~popular~~ ~~support~~ ~~and~~ ~~without~~ ~~he~~ ~~had~~ ~~schemed~~ ~~a~~ ~~plan~~ ~~to~~ Sieyès ~~was~~ ~~had~~ ~~schemed~~

up a plan to overthrow the Directory by looking towards the popular support of the army, in particular Napoleon Bonaparte. Sieyès identified that he needed to ~~smoke~~ in order to overthrow the Directory ~~was~~ of which he was a part of, he was going to need a figurehead that would ~~bring up~~ the garner the support of the people ~~as well as provide~~ through Napoleon's many military successes ~~in Europe in Europe~~ in campaigns in ~~plains~~ Italy and against the First Coalition which had ended up with him having a grand reputation in France. ~~The~~ Napoleon's popularity ~~had~~ and power had rose to an extent where he <sup>negotiated signed terms</sup> ~~agreed terms~~ in Treaty of Campo Formio without the Directory's consent, showing the ~~power~~ ~~great~~ threat the military was towards the Directory as well as showing that Sieyès was the significant in convincing Napoleon to ~~leave~~ join the coup which would make it a success.

Furthermore, Sieyès played an important role ~~in~~ in the success of the Coup due to his position within the governing of the nation. Sieyès was a part of the 5 ~~of~~ members of the Directory ~~which allowed him to have an influence~~, which meant ~~that~~ he could destroy the Directory ~~by being within it~~. ~~The power of being a~~ If Sieyès had not been within the Directory you could say that little would have changed as previous coups had failed to gain any success due to the lack of ~~high~~ ~~power~~ people within the governing body as they couldn't match the ~~power~~ undemocratic power of the Directory ~~that~~ that had ~~been~~ been used to suppress them. ~~The~~ For example, ~~the~~ in the Coup of Fructidor the Directory ~~put~~ put down royalists gains in election of 1797 by excluding ~~177~~ 177 deputies with force. This was less likely to occur ~~if~~ with Sieyès involved with the Coup of Brumaire as he ~~could~~ held power within the Directory, which he could use to include the Directory's main source of suppression, the army, which would therefore guarantee the success of the Coup of Brumaire.

However, despite the imitiation from Sieyès ~~to~~ to Napoleon, the ~~actual~~ Directory's previous overreliance on the military as well as the army's participation within the coup, contributed heavily to ~~the~~ its success. The Directory previously had used the army relentlessly to prevent any sort of ~~attempts~~ ~~to~~ oppositions rise in power particularly amongst the far left and from the left and the right wing. For example, ~~the~~ such as in <sup>64</sup> in such uprisings as to events as the coup of Floreal where ~~to~~ the rise of Neo-Jacobinism deputies warranted ~~the~~ the use of the army to exclude them from taking their seats ~~an~~ ~~undemocratic~~ way, showing the use of the army within ~~the~~ politics that would help it. The fall of Martial Law by the Directory would allow further strengthening of the position of the army by ~~allowing~~ ~~down~~ using the army to put down domestic disputes and ~~also~~ would use military courts ~~with~~ to ~~to~~ trial those arrested which would later become a permanent ~~and~~ governing institution for the Directory in 1797. This constant use of the army in internal matters would threaten the Directory as it allowed for an opportunity for the possibility for a military coup and would leave the Directory powerless to resist this, ultimately contributing to the success of the coup of Brumaire.

Furthermore, the Directory's failures ~~with~~ ~~its~~ ~~own~~ in its ~~to~~ attempted economic reform ~~and~~, its inefficient tax system and overreliance of the army to ~~the~~ ~~own~~ bring in revenue ~~would~~ would cause large resentments towards the Directory by French citizens ~~and~~ and allow again for further military power that ~~also~~ would make the coup of Brumaire possible and successful due to overall anger towards the Directory. Directory's introduction of taxes on luxuries ~~and~~ such as chimneys & windows ~~and~~ ~~land~~ were deeply unpopular, along with

In conclusion, Sieyes played an important role in the success of the Coup of Brumaire through his position as a director and his invitation to Napoleon to gain ~~pop~~ popular support so that would ensure a successful takeover. However, the ~~Directo~~ failures ~~and~~ ~~not~~ economically and the overreliance on the military during the ~~military~~ Directory's reign ~~would~~ were the ~~more~~ more significant reasons in stirring up popular resentment towards the Directory and would allow the possibility of a military coup in Brumaire. Therefore, Sieyes is not the main reason for the success of the Coup of Brumaire but instead the military and the Directory's failures.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Question 4 response secured high level 4 because it:

- (1) attempts to focus on the role played by Sieyes in the success of the coup de Brumaire in 1799
- (2) considers the role of other causal factors eg the role of the army and the unpopularity/failures of the Directory
- (3) reaches a judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis.



**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 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were targeted on how accurate it is to say that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule was transformed in the years 1894-1914. Such responses explored key issues and developments relevant to the question regarding 'transformed' (eg The establishment of the duma in 1906 introduced an elected national legislative body, which had not existed before, and which was prepared to criticise the Tsar's government; Nicholas modified his attitude and coexisted (albeit uneasily) with the duma, resisting calls from some of his ministers to strip the duma of its powers and turn it into a purely consultative body; the October Manifesto (1905) granted the legal right to form political parties and these were, within limits, free to criticise the Tsarist government (such a system did not exist before 1906); from 1906, the Tsarist regime had a constitution of sorts in the form of the Fundamental Laws and a freer press that helped to encourage public political debate; from the early 1890s, the government attempted to modernise Russia in order to strengthen Tsarist rule economically and in terms of popular support, notably through Witte's industrial measures and Stolypin's agrarian reforms) and 'not transformed' (eg throughout the period, the Tsarist government continued to rely on repression to maintain control (eg in 1901, the army was used 300 times to deal with strikers and Stolypin's rural 'pacification' in 1906 - 09); the autocratic structure of the government remained largely intact during these years given the lack of reform before 1905, the Fundamental Laws of 1906 and the impact of the 1907 Electoral Law; throughout the period, Nicholas II was temperamentally unsuited to leadership in the modern age with his enduring belief in divine right and autocracy, and his dislike of the duma and reforming ministers; the revolutionary parties (Social Democrats, Populists and Social Revolutionaries) were too weak in the years 1894-1914 to exert significant political pressure to change the regime), although the treatment of key issues was sometimes uneven (eg greater emphasis on 'transformed' rather than 'did not transform'). High-scoring candidates also demonstrated an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question (change-continuity), deployed sufficient knowledge and established criteria to make a judgement (eg the extent and longevity of changes to Tsarist autocratic rule). Such responses were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of how accurate it is to say that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule was transformed in the years 1894-1914. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change-continuity or were essentially a description of some of the main developments under the Tsarist autocratic system during this period. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (eg the changes introduced by the establishment of the duma). The conceptual demand (change-continuity) of the question was generally understood but not developed and attempts to establish criteria (eg the extent/longevity of change) were limited. Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

In the years 1894 - 1914, Tsarist rule had undergone many ~~changes~~ <sup>challenges</sup> that ~~had~~ significantly changed its nature. The main feature of Tsarist rule was autocracy which instated the Tsar as the sole, supreme power in Russia, had very little opposition that was silenced and had no form of democracy or parliament with an influence. ~~or~~ Following the 1905 revolution, it could be argued the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule that was the tradition for over 300 years transformed due to several political concessions such as an elected legislative body - the Duma and also the introduction of civil liberties. However for something to transform, it must be complete, reversible, have a widespread impact and differ ~~over~~ all roundedly from the status quo. Therefore, reactionary political repression after 1905 as well as the continued use of violence and oppression by the Tsarist ~~government~~ government meant that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule ~~had~~ was not transformed by rather slightly diluted.

It could be argued that Tsarist autocratic rule had

significantly changed due to the introduction of civil liberties after 1905. For instance, the October manifesto <sup>introduced</sup> ~~required~~ the freedoms of association which legalised the trade unions and allowed political parties to gather together. ~~Furthermore~~ ~~the~~ ~~introductions~~ This allowed political parties to spread their ideas and strengthen their organisation which posed a threat to autocracy as opposition had the conditions to grow. Furthermore, the introductions of the freedoms of assembly and associations legalised peaceful demonstrations and free press. This further allowed for the easy spread of political or revolutionary ideas which could influence the population more and subsequently increase the threat of opposition. This significantly changed the nature of autocratic rule as a key feature of autocracy was the silencing of opposition and these civil liberties not only allowed for open criticism of the government but also created the conditions for more opposition to grow. However these political concessions did not transform tsarist autocratic rule because they were not complete and ~~were~~ ~~can~~ could easily be reversed. For example, the Fundamental Laws of 1906 ~~state~~ ~~did~~ ~~a~~ meant the tsar was not prohibited from introducing laws that restricted

It diluted the principle of autocracy since these liberties had not been seen before but in practice they had little effect.

these freedoms of speech, association and assembly and furthermore he the Tsar could declare emergencies where he could remove these rights altogether. Furthermore these liberties were not widespread since the peasantry at this point

Political repression by the Tsarist government meant that Tsarist autocratic government did not transform because it ~~was~~ reinstated the idea of autocracy after the 1905 revolution. For example the Fundamental Laws of 1906 clawed back any political ground the Tsar had lost. Article 4 stated that the Tsar had ~~sole~~ primary supremacy in Russia by divine right. This resonated ~~to~~ the strong Orthodox religion of the population, particularly ~~of~~ the peasantry which made up ~~over~~ about 80% of the population, which meant that the Tsar supremacy was reinstated for the most part. Moreover Article 87 of the Fundamental Laws ~~stated~~ <sup>meant</sup> that the <sup>legislative powers of the</sup> 1 Duma, a ~~part~~ new elected legislative body introduced by the October Manifesto, were ultimately nullified since any new laws they proposed had to be ratified by the Tsar. The Fundamental Laws also introduced a counterweight to the Duma, the



Imperial State Council which was made up of majority conservative members of the nobility and the Orthodox Church who were very right wing. Therefore they could advise the Tsar and the ideas and values would ~~align~~ align with autocracy strongly. They also had the same legislative powers of the Duma so could veto any laws they passed which essentially meant the Duma had no real, tangible influence or impact. This shows that the nature of ~~the~~ Tsarist autocratic rule did not transform since any political concessions gained by the October Manifesto were all clawed back, making sure they had no physical impact and returned the status quo of autocracy. ~~again~~

However it could be argued that the radicalisation of the Duma's meant that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule was transformed. For instance the first Duma put forward very extreme proposals such as ~~political~~ amnesty for all political prisoners, radical land transfer and a full democracy. They also passed a vote of censure against the Tsarist government which meant they had to be dissolved. This highlights the large extent of their radicalism

which clearly posed a threat to the Tsarist government as their power seemed to be increasing. They also introduced the Vyborg Manifesto, asking the population to stop paying their taxes until the Duma was reappointed, however this failed the population did not follow stop paying their taxes. The second Duma was also dissolved by Stolypin for obstructiveness and it was very polarised between right and left wing members. This highlights that the Duma's ~~members~~ were quite demanding and trying to equal their power with the Tsar which was significantly different from autocracy which meant only the Tsar had sole, absolute power. Furthermore, the fact they were constantly dissolved shows the large oppositional threat they posed to the Tsarist government. However, the ~~B~~ radicalisation of the Duma did not mean that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule transformed since it was constantly dissolved and overpowered by the government who could control it when it was appointed and dissolved. Moreover the Tsar could pass new laws when the Duma was not in session showing its power was not complete. Lastly the failure of the Vyborg Manifesto highlighted that support for the Duma was not

wholly widespread. Therefore it is not accurate to say that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule transformed in the years - 1894 - 1914.

Finally the continued use of violence and oppression to silence opposition demonstrates that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule did not transform. For instance the use of the army to silence worker resistance in the Moscow uprising. In Moscow, the workers organised a general strike to overthrow 'the criminal Tsarist government' and also passed around weapons showing this was going to be an armed demonstration. However the Tsarist government sent the army who cleared the barricades and began shooting in the city to break up the strike. This led to over 1000 deaths in the crushing of the Moscow Uprising and further reprisals included arrests, beatings and executions. This highlights that the nature of Tsarist autocratic government did not transform as violence was still used and successful in ~~the~~ silencing opposition and preventing widespread unrest. The Okhrana was still used up until 1917 who could infiltrate and destroy revolutionary parties from the inside.

and to outside through their black offices which interrupted revolutionary mail and their high technological advanced finger printing system. This meant that revolutionary opposition was still not a huge threat and could not overpower the government. The Black Hundreds also still targeted Jews by keeping them in the Pale of Settlement and through pogroms. This kept the pillar 'Nationalism' of Autocracy strong. This shows that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule was not transformed as oppressive violent techniques to silence opposition still continued. Furthermore this violence was widespread from workers to national minorities to revolutionaries showing autocracy was still present everywhere and influenced everyone.

To conclude, it is clear that the nature of Tsarist autocratic rule was not transformed. Although concessions that were political such as civil liberties and the hint of democracy through the Duma diluted autocracy and its principles, this was not complete or widespread; unlike and was reversed multiple times. Unlike political repression and violence which was widespread

and continued in use to maintain and  
~~not~~ reinstate autocracy to a high level  
which meant the nature of Tsarist  
autocratic government was left relatively  
unchanged.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Question 5 response secured Level 5 because it:

(1) attempts to analyse change and continuity (transformed) in Tsarist autocratic rule in the years 1894-1914 by examining key features such as the Duma, civil liberties, the Fundamental Laws of 1906 and the use of violence and oppression

(2) reaches a clear judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis



**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 6

On Question 6, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of whether Kerensky's flawed leadership was the main reason for the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917. High-scoring answers weighed this stated factor (eg as Prime Minister, Kerensky was unable to build a strong government and could only establish a fragile liberal-socialist coalition, which failed to provide either stability or dynamism; Kerensky failed to deal effectively with the growing internal threat posed by Lenin and the Bolsheviks from the summer of 1917; Kerensky's authority, and that of the government, was badly damaged by continued Russian involvement in the war, notably through the failure of the June Offensive with its high casualty and desertion rates and loss of territory; Kerensky's suspected collusion with Kornilov's counter-revolutionary plans (August 1917) seriously damaged his government's credibility with the Petrograd working class and boosted Bolshevik membership and support; Kerensky failed to provide solutions to key problems that undermined the credibility of the government, such as rising inflation and the issue of land redistribution) against others (eg Lenin and the Bolsheviks were skilled, resourceful and ruthless opponents of the Provisional Government with effective propaganda on key issues, a concentrated activist base in Petrograd and an organised coup in October; the authority of the Provisional Government was undermined from the outset by the rival Petrograd Soviet via Order No. 1 and Order No. 2; the Provisional Government's status as an interim body (holding power until the Constituent Assembly was elected) weakened the executive by giving the impression it was riven with indecision and delay; Kornilov's attempt to impose a military dictatorship in August 1917 exposed the weakness of the Provisional Government, since the latter had to rely on forces mobilised by the Petrograd Soviet to foil the coup). These responses included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (causation) in the question. Judgements made about the relative importance of Kerensky's flawed leadership were reasoned and based on clear criteria (eg the nature, extent and degree of opposition generated by Kerensky's leadership). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to describe key events that took place in Russia in the period February-October 1917 with limited focus on causation and/or the stated factor (Kerensky's flawed leadership). Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (eg limited comments on Kerensky and the June Offensive and/or the Kornilov affair). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

In order to assess the extent to which Kerensky's flawed leadership was the main reason for the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917, its impact must be evaluated against the significance of other factors that led to ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Provisional Government's fall in 1917; such as, Lenin's April Thesis, the Provisional Government's internal divisions, the Kornilov affair, the Milyukov crisis and its ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~impact~~ <sup>impact</sup> of its ~~acknowledgement~~ <sup>acknowledgement</sup> of its own inferior status compared to the Petrograd Soviet. All these considered suggests that perhaps Kerensky's leadership was not the main reason for the fall of the Provisional Government, <sup>(PG)</sup> this does not mean that it had no impact however.

Kerensky was vain, driven by personal ambition and possessed poor political judgement. This is evident in his enthusiasm regarding the <sup>disastrous</sup> June offensives where he was down on the front line drumming up

enthusiasm among the soldiers, only for the offensives to be entirely counter-productive and for Germany to advance 150 miles deeper into Russian territory as a result of them. This shows the extent to his flawed leadership through its depiction of Kerensky's terrible judgement. However, this alone could not and did not cause the Provisional Government's fall.

As people began to grow tired of the PG's domestic policies, Lenin capitalised upon civilian weariness by producing his April Thesis. It promised peace - an immediate ceasefire in WWI, land reform and all power to the Soviets. It was seen as a far better alternative to the rulings of the PG and increased opposition to it.

In terms of Lenin's influence to the downfall of the PG, he is implicated in not just the April Thesis. He <sup>also</sup> openly mocked the PG's insistence ~~that~~ to wait



to make ~~the~~ decisions on major issues such as land reform until the full establishment of the constituent assembly. This <sup>consistent</sup> insistence gave the impression of indecision and delay on behalf of the PGR and heightened its awareness and the population's awareness of its inferior status compared to the power possessed by the Petrograd Soviet. Lenin's influence, like as well as with the April Thesis, had a bigger influence on the fall of the PGR as he was increasingly getting civilians on side and encouraging the mocking of the PGR thus decreasing ~~its political authority~~ and undermining its political authority.

Additionally, the PGR had major internal divisions which made it a wholly unstable ~~the~~ governmental body. These divisions were due to the existence of coalitions and the gulf between the Social Revolutionaries (SRs) and Mensheviks. The SRs and

Mensheviks had hugely opposing beliefs, attitudes and ideas and therefore the PR was inherently unstable. This is also a more significant reason of the fall of the PR.

Furthermore, the Kornilov affair was very damaging to the PR. Kerensky's association with Kornilov went on for so long despite Kornilov openly demanding martial law and for him to become a military dictator. This association ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> not just Kerensky's fault however as, the lack of power possessed by the PR meant that they had to rely on more powerful institutions ~~and~~<sup>and</sup> individuals, such as the Petrograd Soviet and Kornilov. The Kornilov affair was very damaging to the PR as it made <sup>the</sup> right-wing supporters angry as they said Kerensky should have stuck by Kornilov and put in place what he was demanding.

and the left-wing supporters were angry also as they didn't understand why Kerensky had associated with Kornilov for so long when he was demanding such an extreme of martial law in Petrograd. This split the supporters of the PG massively, leaving the PG even more unstable.

Arguably the final nail in the coffin was the Milyukov crisis, another event more significant to the failings and eventual fall of the PG than Kerensky's flawed leadership. Milyukov stated how ~~that~~ ~~the~~ WWI should be fought until there was a decisive victory for Russia. His statement caused outrage and calls for his resignation. Prince Lvov took the reception of Milyukov's statement as a cue to end the 'dual power' relationship between the Petrograd Soviet

and the Provisional Government.  
Therefore, the Milyukov crisis  
~~was~~ was an irreversible event  
causing the PR's downfall.

To conclude, the evidence leads to  
disagreement with the statement  
that Kerensky's flawed leadership  
was the main reason for the  
fall of the PR as, although it  
certainly had some impact, there  
were other far more significant  
factors that led to the PR's  
downfall. ~~There~~



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Question 6 Level 3 response offers:

(1) some analysis of the role played by Kerensky's flawed leadership and other causal factors in the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 (eg the June Offensive, the Kornilov affair, Lenin's actions, the Milyukov crisis) is offered but there is scope to develop the analysis in terms of depth

(2) although some criteria for judgement are established, the conclusion does not provide an explicit overall judgement.



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

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A

- Candidates should aim to develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the sources, not merely paraphrase the content of the sources.
- Inferences can be supported by reference to contextual knowledge surrounding the issues raised by the sources.
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by, for eg, looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer.
- Candidates should use the sources together at some point in the answer.

### Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified.
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range here.
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels.
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision.
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to facilitate an integrated analysis.

## **Grade boundaries**

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

