



Pearson

Examiners' Report

June 2017

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 or 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.



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. 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.

June 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_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 with the new 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 hand writing. 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 (e.g. both sources suggest that the calling of the Estates-General offered a solution to these serious financial difficulties), 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 (e.g. the monarchy is attempting to play down the seriousness of the financial problems). Knowledge of the historical context was used to discuss limitations/what can be gained from the content of the source material (e.g. the Edict (Source 2) amounted to an admission that the royal government had failed to address the problems of national debt and state finance for many years) and revealed an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which it was drawn (e.g. official concern to preserve the reputation and authority of the monarchy). Furthermore, high-scoring candidates evaluated the source material relevantly in line with the specified enquiry and considered matters of provenance confidently (e.g. Young was a writer on economic matters and had travelled widely in France so would be an informed observer). The weight of the evidence was taken into consideration when coming to a judgement (e.g. the overly optimistic tone and omissions/evasions apparent in Source 2).

Weaker responses began to consider the sources together (e.g. both state that France is facing financial problems in the 1780s). In addition, such responses showed some limited understanding and analysis of the source material through the selection of key points relevant to the question (e.g. French people were concerned about the state of the government's finances) and valid inferences (e.g. the French monarchy was incapable of solving these financial problems). 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 (e.g. Louis XVI's finance ministers all failed to solve the problem). 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 (e.g. Arthur Young, author of Source 1, was foreign and so would have little knowledge of French financial problems).

Source 1 is an extract written by Arthur Young - an English writer on economics and agriculture - and it details the confused state of the nation's finances and the problem of an unsustainable deficit. Source 2, a Royal Edict, asserts on the contrary that 'nothing is threatened except by anxiety' but ultimately ~~announces~~ declares a suspension of royal payments - ~~thus~~ implying the crown's inability to service its immediate debts. ~~As both~~ As both sources ~~refer~~ refer to the problems of state debt they provide valuable insight to a historian in this area, but both however neglect other key ~~problems~~ financial problems such as an inefficient taxation system which threatened France.

Source 1 and 2 are valuable primarily as they both detail the unsustainable problem of state debt.

Source 1 states that the monarchy had built up a 'deficit that was impossible to tackle without the estates general' for example. Following the 7 year war France had lost both valuable colonies and immense amounts of state revenue and so had to increase borrowing to 90%. Louis XVI compounded such debt with his involvement in the American Revolution.

(also mentioned in Scene 1) ensuring that by 1768 state debt had ~~been~~ ~~reduced~~ to 50% of state spending, as debt had ~~been~~ ~~reduced~~ to 50% of annual revenue. Scene 2, despite asserting the greatness of the nation's resources, ultimately declares that payments made by the royal cashier would not be made in 'paper money' suspending immediately payments made by the royal treasury. Considered collectively then, scene 1 alludes to how the deficit payments ^{were} ~~was~~ beginning to consume unsustainably high quantities of state revenue, and scene 2 confirms the monarch's inability to service such payments in 'paper money'.

The ~~seriousness~~ seriousness of the situation ~~is also clearly~~ can also be clearly inferred from both sources as they both make reference to the Estates-General. Scene 1 states that the deficit would ~~only be tackled~~ was 'impossible to tackle without the Estates-General' and likewise scene 2 also asserts desperately that the meeting of the Estates-General causes the crisis to become 'less serious'. The fact that no solution to the problem of state finance could be ~~found~~ ~~achieved~~ achieved without the calling of the Estates-General is testament to the severity of the situation. The body had not sat since the 17th century and the fact it was called indicates a failure of the traditional structures of the ancien régime to provide

an adequate solution to the issue. Source 1 specifically mentions the potentially destabilising effects of such a meeting stating that it is 'remarkable that no conversation about the consequence of such a meeting' occurred highlighting the gravity of the situation and its ~~potential~~ the potential ~~and~~ political implications of the situation.

Both sources then criticise the failure of the traditional systems of the ancien regime to solve the issue by reference to the calling of the Estates General. The financial crisis forced Louis to pursue serious structural reforms to the ancien regime and the prevailing inaptitude of such systems although implied, is not fully expanded by either source. The system of taxation under the ancien regime was highly inefficient and corrupt and arguably this was the principle cause of the nations financial troubles.

Only 2.6% of state revenue was generated from tax on land (the best indicator of wealth) and 55% was generated from indirect taxation. The taxation system caused serious problems for principally two reasons. Firstly it compounded state debt forcing the monarch to borrow to fill shortfalls in revenue and secondly it forced the King to attempt serious reforms in conflict with the population. Neither source sufficiently details the extent to which all problems were either

cause or compounded by this system and although some
I refer to the 'deficit' and 'the eve of revolt' the
taxation system is not discussed.

Source 1 is of particular value in that it makes
reference to the excesses of the royal court stating
that it was 'devoted to pleasure and indulgence' and
that it added both to the 'Country political and
financial problems'. Court spending amounted to 6%
of annual state revenue ~~and~~ and this
was a serious issue for the monarchy both in policy
debatable regard to revenue, but perhaps more
significantly in generating immense public criticism as
it was deemed unacceptable in time of debt and
poverty. The nobles feared for the stability of the
nation and the bourgeois bourgeoisie also criticised
such excess involving support of the monarchy.
Source 2 also deals the need to assert
that 'His Majesty has not despaired of the rectitude
intended' and the fact this clause is ~~not~~ included
implies contemporary feeling of distrust of the court
and belief that the nation's finances were being
squandered.

Both sources were written contemporary to the time
discussed in this odd, value somewhat. Arthur Young,

As a writer on economics, would likely possess sufficient knowledge on the matter to be able to analyse the impact of debt and excess at least as he wrote frequently on economics. The Royal Edict, as an officially royal document, has a clear purpose of calming ~~debts to the~~ creditors to the crown and so would ~~the~~ likely underestimate the true severity of the states finances.

Despite this Source 2 still makes reference to a 'crisis' and also to the Estates-General implying the extent of the seriousness of the problem. Also, despite its purpose and language used to ensure they (for example ~~assure~~ ~~that~~ ~~public~~ ~~credit~~ ~~is~~ ~~secured~~) and stating that there will be 'complete recovery') it is ultimately a document suspending payments which indicates the crown inability to deal with the situation. Considered alongside Source 2 which more openly discusses the severity of the situation referring to the debt and court spending, it provides valuable confirmation of the severity of the problem. Despite both sources also failing to explicitly mention the inefficient tax system or non-compliance of the parliament to resolve the issue, such problems are implied and these sources are ultimately highly valuable.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it interrogates the evidence of both sources making reasoned inferences (e.g. the crown's inability to service its debts, the financial situation was deemed serious enough to call the Estates General), (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 (e.g. the negative financial consequences of French overseas policies, the inefficiency and corruption inherent in the taxation system) and (3) it evaluates the source material taking into account its weight as part of coming to a judgement (e.g. the nature and purpose of Young's account and the Royal Edict are examined to establish weight).



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

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 e.g. 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 (e.g. both sources indicate that the economic failures of War Communism led to the introduction of the NEP), 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 (e.g. the situation in 1920-21 required a new policy that was not rigidly based on communist principles).

Knowledge of the historical context was used to discuss limitations/what can be gained from the content of the source material (e.g. Lenin had to use his personal authority at the 10th Party Congress to ensure the NEP was adopted) and revealed an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which it was drawn (e.g. Bolshevik concern that they were alienating their core ideological support). Furthermore, high-scoring candidates evaluated the source material relevantly in line with the specified enquiry and considered matters of provenance confidently (e.g. Pares was a specialist in Russia history and had been present during the civil war so he would be an informed observer of Bolshevik actions and policy). The weight of the evidence was taken into consideration when coming to a judgement (e.g. Lenin's candid admission in Source 4 of his government's previous mistakes in economic policy).

Weaker responses began to consider the sources together (e.g. both indicate that Lenin was forced to introduce the NEP). In addition, such responses showed some limited understanding and analysis of the source material through the selection of key points relevant to the question (e.g. War Communism had led to economic breakdown) and valid inferences (e.g. the introduction of the NEP was due to the failure of War Communism). 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 (e.g. peasant revolts and worker protests revealed the harshness of War Communism). 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 (e.g. Bernard Pares, author of Source 3, was foreign and so would have little knowledge of the reasons for the introduction of the NEP).

Sources 3 and 4 both recognise that the main reason for the introduction of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in March 1921 was the result of "complete economic breakdown" during the Civil War and the policy of War Communism, introduced in July 1918. Source 3 ~~focuses on~~ however, although this reason is acknowledged, the source could go into more depth regarding ~~the~~ the problems under War Communism and the opposition to the Bolsheviks that grew out of it, especially among the workers and peasants, although source 4 does briefly touch on this. The provenance of the sources must also be considered, in terms of how the motives and position of the authors reflects on their about the economy in ~~the~~ the run-up to 1921.

~~Source~~ In terms of content, source 3 is useful because it signals the NEP as an "economic retreat", namely a "retreat from Communism" as a result of the "complete economic breakdown" during the civil war. Together with Source 4 explores this further as it identified how the Bolshevik party "handled things very, very badly in this economic area". Together the sources recognise how attempts to enforce Communist economic policy under War Communism

(July 1918-March 1921) left the economy in an incredibly dire state, hence it was necessary to introduce ~~the~~ the NEP and form a mixed economy, taking elements of private ~~cap~~ capitalist ownership as well as some state control. The sources are limited in that they ^{could go into more detail regarding these problems, an for example,} the slump in industrial output and the rampant force of inflation ^{caused} in ~~which~~ the purchasing power of workers' wages ^{manifesting itself in the fall of productivity} had ^{to} dropped considerably. ~~A clear reason, therefore, for the introduction of the NEP was the failure of War Communism and the desperation deep~~ ~~desperately~~ failing economy that ~~its policies caused~~ from the discontented urban working class. The introduction of the NEP, therefore, was to solve these problems under War Communism and improve industrial ~~and ag~~ productivity, for example through getting rid of 'one-man management'.

Source A, however, identifies that the NEP ~~also~~ was also introduced to increase agricultural production. Source 4 is useful because it discussed the need for the NEP to form "proper relations between the working class and the peasants". War Communism with its unpopular policies like prodrazvestka (grain requisitioning) increased peasant unrest and the hoarding of grain, which caused worsening food shortages in the towns and cities, contributing to slacking industrial output. Together sources recognise the need for the NEP in increasing both agricultural and industrial as the two go hand in hand. One of the NEP's

main aim was to establish a working relationship "between manufactured goods and the supply of surplus agricultural goods, which it accomplished in its replacement of grain requisitioning with the "tax in kind" in which the peasantry paid a fixed amount of grain to the state and the surplus could be kept and traded privately. Only 1/2 of the grain gained during requisitioning was collected in this way, improving the situation of the peasantry in terms of poverty. The sources are limited, ~~however~~ in this regard still, because they do not identify important motivations behind the NEP such as the famine of 1921, which the NEP was too late to stop, in which 25 million were affected and around 5M million were thought to have died. The sources ~~do not~~ ^{do not} recognise the desperation and resulting opposition ^{among} ~~to~~ the peasantry, who turned to cannibalism and ~~or~~ rebellions such as those in the Tambov Province where poison gas was used ~~to~~ ^{furthermore,} by the Red Army to fight them back. ^{the} February 1921, strikes in both Moscow and Petrograd resulted in ~~totalling~~ ^{because} more than 30 killings. The extent of discontent and rising opposition to War Communism was very serious and limits the usefulness of the sources as they recognise the failure and mistakes of the Bolsheviks in economic policy, but do not explore the urgency behind the need for the NEP.

In terms of provenance, source 3 is useful because it is an

outside perspective in that it is not ~~from~~ from a Bolshevik party member and should give a better view of the effects of communism. However, in this regard, source 4 does a better job of this even though it is a speech made by Lenin; instead of hiding his errors Lenin freely admits his mistakes in the economic section and highlights the class need for NEP. Source # 3 recognises the "failure of War Communism"; however Bernard Pares isn't as conclusive as Lenin is drawing out the reasons for the introduction of the NEP and instead focuses on the ^{Bolshevik} 'victory in the Civil War as the reason for the NEP and the 'retreat from communism', rather than its aim to solve discontent.

Together the sources are useful because they ~~show~~ ^{well-informed} comprise an inside-party view from Lenin, the ^{party} leader who is making ~~this new~~ economic policy, as well as the view of someone outside the Bolshevik party. A limitation to source 3 is that it focused too much on failings and retreats on the Bolshevik's behalf which may indicate bias against the Bolsheviks and exaggeration of the economic problems; Pares did serve the Russian Army as a British Military Observer during the First World War under the regime of the Tsar. However, together with source 4 which ^{Lenin} agrees with the failings of badly conducted economic policy, source 3 is actually accurate ~~and this~~ in the description of economic failings and is therefore still useful.

In conclusion, together sources 3 and 4 do create a useful picture of the reasons for the introduction of the NEP in 1921. They focus on the failure of War Communism, the ^{Bolshevik} victory in the Civil War and class discontent as reasons for the NEP. Both sources could go into more depth in regards to class discontent and the extent of opposition, but together, despite their respective limitations, they create a well-rounded scope of the need and desperation for the NEP.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response achieved Level 4 because it (1) analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences (e.g. attempts to enforce communist economic policy had left the country in ruins), (2) deploys some knowledge of the historical context to illuminate the source content and/or reveal its limitations (e.g. the key features of War Communism that built up the pressure for change) and (3) evaluates the source material taking into account weight (e.g. government leader Lenin's candid admission of previous economic mistakes adds weight).



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Simply stating that a source fails to cover a particular event or development does NOT establish weight. See Examiner Tip for Question 1 for advice about how to establish the weight of a source.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the extent to which the Terror had successfully strengthened the Republic by 1795. Such responses explored key issues and developments relevant to the question (e.g. the Terror enabled the Republic to avoid economic breakdown and fight the war successfully) although the treatment of key issues was sometimes uneven (e.g. an extensive focus on the serious divisions and resentment created by the Terror). 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 (e.g. the extent of political stability, economic strength and foreign threat by 1795). 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 extent to which the Terror had successfully strengthened the Republic by 1795. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of the Terror during 1793-94. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the violent excesses of the Terror). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

From 1793-94 the Terror had established a government by fear that killed more or less anyone who posed the slightest threat to it. However in 1794 the Coup of Thermidor ended the Terror by killing Robespierre, and so the resulting Republic government, The Directory, were left in the aftermath of an event that I believe weakened the Republic by the start of 1795.

One way that it could be argued that the Republic was strengthened by Terror is that rebellious groups may have been deterred by the events in the Vendee in 1794. Starting in 1793 against the ~~mass~~ levee en masse (conscription) for the War of the First Coalition, the Vendee rebels were defeated in 1794. However, in order to root out any remaining rebels and to place a penance on the

region for the insurrection, the officers in charge ordered crops to be destroyed, homes to be burnt down, and people to be shot on sight. Overall, 250,000 people died, and the government essentially ignored it. The memory of this event may have prevented people from participating in anti-Directory marches that they otherwise might have.

Another argument that could be made for the idea that the Terror did strengthen the Republic by the beginning of 1795 is that the Directory was no longer willing to be controlled by mob rule. Previously in events such as the Girondin Purge (1793) and the Attack on the Tuileries (1792), the government had given in to the will of the sans-culotte. However the ~~1795~~ 1795 Rising of the Prairial proved that due to the Terror the government had learnt from its mistakes and was free of Jacobin influence (which promoted giving in to the sans-culotte). When thousands upon thousands of protestors surrounded the Directory, they did not give in but instead used the army to disperse the crowd.

However, one reason why the Terror had not strengthened the Republic by 1795 is that the government was now faced with immense resentment from those who suffered under the Terror, which, due to aspects such as the Law of Suspects in 1793, was a

large amount of the population. This resentment would become a problem in 1797 when royalists won 180 of the Council seats that election. In an act known as the Coup of Fructidor, the Directory completely undermined the principles of democracy by having 52 council members arrested and 171 removed by making the elections in several departments void.

Therefore, because of the Terror, citizens began to lean towards royalism as they could no longer trust the Republic which forced the Directory to make a mockery on the concept on which their government depended on, democracy.

Another way in which it could be argued that the Terror did not strengthen the Republic by 1795 is that the legacy of the Terror would act as a constant criticism towards any restrictive measures that the Directory introduced. This was an issue as it used a somewhat universally hated period to undermine radical measures that the Directory thought were necessary. In 1798-99, measures brought in to help the National Guard take back control from the riots that had resulted from the conscription and forced loan of the War of the Second Coalition, were likened to those implemented during the Terror, despite their necessity.

Overall, while the Terror may have essentially reduced the power of the citizens (somewhat opposite



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers: (1) it offers limited analysis of the extent to which the Terror had successfully strengthened the Republic by the beginning of 1795, (2) it drifts away from the focus of the question by considering developments in the later 1790s (3) the candidate's own knowledge is limited in terms of range and depth and (4) there is some limited judgement but, because of the shortcomings noted above, it lacks proper substantiation.



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 4

On Question 4, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the significance of the domestic impact of war in bringing about the fall of the Directory in 1799 and weighed this factor (e.g. the ongoing deficit during wartime led to the reintroduction of unpopular indirect taxes and the 1799 forced loan to cover war costs) against others (e.g. the constitution provided no mechanism to resolve executive-legislature disputes, the Directory's increasing reliance on the army to cope with political threats). These responses included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. Judgements made about the relative significance of the domestic impact of war were reasoned and based on clear criteria (e.g. political, economic and psychological impact of the war in domestic terms). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to describe aspects or features of the government's domestic/foreign policies in the years 1795-99 with limited focus on significance in bringing about the fall of the Directory in 1799. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on war-weariness and the unpopularity of measures designed to prosecute the war). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Throughout the French Revolution, the economic situation of France had always been one of the most significant causes of instability, as was the case in the fall of the Directory in 1799. It could be said that the economic problems of the Directory were caused by the war that France entered into in 1795. Not only did the war of the second coalition cause economic discontent, it led to popular unrest, and the instability of the Directory itself and with regards to the power struggle between the directors and the army generals. However, there were many factors that resulted in the fall of the Directory for example the instability of the set

up of the 'constitution' itself, and the numerous popular uprisings that occurred throughout.

Firstly, the immediate domestic impact of the war was seen in the economy. Failed harvests led to lack of food, and bread riots particularly from the sans culottes. The most significant of these ~~were~~ ^{were} the risings of Germinal and Prairial in April and May 1796. Though Germinal was more peaceful, the rising of Prairial resulted in the army being called to diffuse the crowd ^{of 30,000} that had gathered around the Directory. In addition to bread riots, the conscription laws enforced by the directory led to the revolt in the Vendée, and it was found that people were cutting off their own thumbs so they didn't have to fight. This shows the extent to which people opposed the rule of the directory, and the lengths they would go to to ultimately rebel. Again the army was called to appease the problem. The fact that the army was relied upon so much shows the weakness of the directory, and that eventually, the generals were given too much power and started acting independently of the directory. This can be seen after France defeated

Austria, and Napoleon organized and negotiated the Treaty of Campo Formio without the consent of the Directory. This therefore led to the weakening of the directors themselves, and it could be argued that as a result, the directory was always doomed to fail because of the war. Furthermore, the economic situation of the war was not helped by the vicious ~~and~~ circle France managed to get into when the more money they needed, the more land they needed to accumulate the money, and therefore the more soldiers they needed to fight, ~~the~~ which was expensive. Again, this displays the instability the war caused.

However, not only did war cause instability, but the layout of the directory itself was much too tight. After the terror, due to the concern regarding dictatorship, an order was created to prevent any kind of one leader in charge. Firstly, there were 5 executives, and one was replaced each year, meaning there was not much chance for long term policy or stability. Secondly, the legislation was created by the Council of 500 proposing new legislation, the Council of Ancients

disputing or approving the proposal, and the directors finally enforcing it. In this way, the directors had to enforce laws they had no part in creating; they had no power of veto, meaning ~~they~~ there was not a lot of room for negotiation. This convoluted method shows the

paranoia the directory was forced with regarding opposition and the possibility of a dictatorship. This is further evident with both the coups of Fructidor and Floreal, in which opposition had gained more support, and the directory turned to immoral methods to prevent this. Firstly, with the coup of Fructidor, there was an insurgence of royalism in response to the dissatisfaction with the directory, causing men to turn to the army to arrest members of the councils, and even the new director François-Maurice to deter the threat of a loyalist uprising. A year later in 1798, there was an emergence of neo-Jacobinism, which the directory countered by annulling the elections and replacing the Jacobins with ministers they chose themselves. While the coups show that the directory was successful in getting rid of opposition, it shows its insecurity regarding opposition, and the undemocratic

methods they turned to when faced with said opposition. Also, it could be argued that just the presence of the opposition, and the fact that it was voted in by the people shows the dissatisfaction with the directory, and leading to its ultimate downfall in the coup of Brumaire in 1799.

Linking to this, ~~the~~ ~~whole~~ it can be proved that the directory was successful in deterring opposition, another reason ~~for its~~ that brought about its fall in 1799 was the continued popular risings in opposition to the directory. The unrest in Antibes Bay in 1797 is an example of this, involving the Emigrés, particularly Louis' brother Comte de Provence. The fact that the British were brought in displays the severe discontentment to the Constitution, and the desire for change. This is also evident in the Babenaf Plot in October 1796, and the continued unrest in the vendée regarding conscription. ~~The~~ The overwhelming desire for change was a significant factor that led to Abbé Sieyès turning to the army, and Napoleon to take down the directory from within, in the

Coup of Brumaire. It displays the fact that due to a combination of factors, the directory wasn't effective in bringing about significant reform or stability to uphold the country.

PTO.

In conclusion, while there were a number of factors that contributed to the downfall of the Directory in 1799, the most significant trigger was the war. This is because it led to economic discontent, frequent uprisings in the Vendée, and the heavy reliance on the army, which took much of the power away from the Directory itself and onto the generals. The economy was more of a long term cause that France faced throughout, and though the instability of the Directory itself was an important factor in its downfall, overall, the war resulted in the most instability and discontent, and was the catalyst that eventually led to the Coup of Brumaire in 1799.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response secured Level 5 because it (1) attempts to analyse the significance of the domestic impact of war in bringing about the fall of the Directory in 1799 (e.g. in economic terms and resistance to conscription), (2) considers the significance of other factors in the Directory's fall (e.g. the instability created by the Directory's constitutional arrangements) and (3) reaches a 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 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the extent to which the Tsarist government was transformed in the years 1906-14. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Such responses had a solid grasp of relevant issues regarding 'transformed' (e.g. the establishment of the Duma, the legal right to form political parties and the establishment of a relatively free press, the Fundamental Laws (1906) preserved virtually all of the Tsar's autocratic powers, Nicholas II temperamentally unsuited to the role of a modernising leader etc.). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity concerning the Tsarist government were reasoned and based on clear criteria (e.g. extension of popular representation, rights, toleration). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of how far the Tsarist government was transformed in the years 1906-14. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of the Tsarist system in the years up to 1914. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the changes brought about by the establishment of the Duma, or the regime's continued reliance on repression). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

To a large extent it could be said that the Tsarist government was transformed in the years 1906-14. The Tsar, Alexander II, similarly to the kings in England of the 1600's, was a firm believer in the divine right of Kings, or Tsars in this case. The Tsar could be seen as someone who is stubborn and unaccepting of inevitable change.

* Nicholas

Firstly the events leading up to 1906 need to be considered in order to understand the reasons behind the transformation of the tsarist government. In 1904 the Russo-Japanese war occurred, this was a naval conflict between the Russians and the Japanese over the warm water port, port Arthur which was loaned to Russia by the Chinese however Japan had captured it. In a bid to recapture the port and protect Russia's reputation, the Tsar sent most of the Russian navy

out to regain this tactical location. This naval conflict resulted in a crippling defeat of the Russian fleet at the hands of the outnumbered Japanese vessels, although outnumbered, the Japanese fleet was more advanced and the crews were better trained in comparison to Russia's outdated and archaic navy. This defeat sent shockwaves across the Russian people as they heard the news, Russia's reputation was badly hurt and so was the Russian people's opinion of the Tsar.

In 1905, tens of thousands of Russians, led by a man known as Father Gapon, marched to the Tsar's winter palace with the aim of securing better working conditions, however, the Tsar was not in and the panicked soldiers guarding the palace opened fire. This historic event became known as Bloody Sunday with an unknown and number of casualties. Some sources suggest it was 200 dead whereas others claim it was in the thousands. At any rate, blame was placed on the Tsar for this massacre and only worked to create opposition to the Tsar in the form of secretive parties, some of which were the Socialist revolutionaries, the Kadets, the Octobrists, etc.

With opposition mounting the Tsar turned to his advisers for help and so came about the August Manifesto. This allowed for a form of government known as the Duma who could discuss new laws. This was not enough to appease the peasant and worker classes as

it ~~it~~ meant that the Tsar still retained total autocratic rule, with pressure rising, the Tsar turned to his advisor Witte for advice and it was suggested that the Tsar ought to bring about another Duma giving more power to the people and so the October Manifesto was brought about, it meant that the Duma had more power and that people could make political parties without persecution. This marked the start of the Kadet

party led by Paul Milyukov and the Octoberist party.

Both parties were mostly opposed to the ideas of tsardom. The Kadets wanted to see a Russia where it was run democratically by the people, the Octoberists were more accepting of a future with the Tsar but with reduced powers and less autocracy.

The first Duma sat in 1906 with a majority of seats taken up by those opposed to tsardom and the tsarist regime.

All of the propositions made by this Duma were declined by the Tsar as they infringed on his power, due to the nature of the Tsar and his firm belief in the divine right of Tsars, it can be seen why he would be reluctant to accept any reduction in his powers, perhaps even seeing it as a personal attack. The Tsar therefore disbanded the Duma and elected a new one. The second Duma however was a similar story and was also disbanded. It was at this stage that opposition to

the Tsar grew, people could see that the Tsar still remained with the full ~~power~~ powers before the August and October manifestos and that he was not prepared to work with the people in order to benefit the people.

~~His~~ Support for the Kadet and Octobrist parties increased as the Tsar was presented as being nothing but a talking shop. From 1908 - 1914 strikes increased for better pay and better working conditions.

One such strike occurred in the Lena Goldfields in 1912, this strike however, resulted in the death of approximately 200 workers with ~~over~~ over 100 being injured. This caused an outbreak of protest and marches occurred in Saint Petersburg with mass worker strikes.

Russia was firmly in a poor position at this stage, with high levels of inflation, food shortages and mass strikes, opposition to the Tsarist government was possibly reaching its highest in history.

In 1914 World War I occurred, the Tsar got Russia involved woefully ill-equipped with an average of one rifle to every 3 ~~most~~ men. Although Russia had been undergoing a weapon improvement scheme, World War I happened before Russia was ready. The war resulted in war economy and meant that all ~~money~~ money needed for government finance was directed to the war effort.

This resulted in increased inflation and greater food shortages. It was also commonly suggested that

the Tsarina was a German spy

To Conclude, The tsarist government saw great change between the years 1906 - 1914 as a result of the tsars actions prior with the Russo-Japanese war and the events of Bloody Sunday. The tsars stubbornness resulted in the dismissal of the first and second Dumas therefore making his October Manifesto irrelevant.

opposition to the Tsarist government grew due to the allowance of political parties such as the Kadets and Octobrists which resulted in mass striking. The tsar essentially put the final nail in the coffin when he entered Russia into world war ~~one~~ in one in 1914 which led to the Tsars abdication later in the war. The tsarist government transformed extensively in the years 1906-14.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers: (1) it offers very limited analysis of the extent to which the Tsarist government was transformed in the years 1906-14, (2) the candidate's own knowledge has some range and depth but much of it is deployed as description or outside the time frame of the question and (3) an overall judgement is given at the end but because of the limitations noted above, it lacks proper substantiation.



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 6

On Question 6, stronger responses targeted how far the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 was due to its domestic policies rather than its decision to stay in the First World War. Such responses included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Higher-scoring candidates offered a sufficient range of domestic and war-related issues for discussion (e.g. the Provisional Government's refusal to legitimise land redistribution, failure to deal with the internal Bolshevik threat, and inept handling of the Kornilov affair; the Provisional Government's war aims brought it into conflict with the Petrograd Soviet, the impact of the failed June offensive, growing war-weariness and demoralisation, the economic consequences of the war etc.). Judgements made about the consequences of the government's domestic and war policies were reasoned and based on clear criteria (e.g. economic, political and psychological impact on public support for/opposition to the Provisional Government). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 and often took the form of a patchy narrative of the main events of February-October 1917 or else drifted into Russia's military campaigns in 1917. Alternatively, lower-scoring candidates provided a limited analysis of the consequences of the government's domestic and war policies that offered little development on the focus of the question. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or only offered one aspect related to the demands of the question (e.g. limited comments how the government's pro-war policy increasingly ran counter to growing civilian and military war-weariness). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The fall of the provisional Government in 1917 owed more to its domestic policies than its decision to stay in the war to a small extent. The decision to stay in the war was the main reason for the fall of the provisional government. This is because it allowed for opposition groups, such as the Bolsheviks, to gain support and power to ^{eventually} overthrow them. It also further angered the workers and peasantry who were tired of conscription and extra work. ^{in addition} ~~created a mistrust~~ ^{shaped them as untrustworthy.} Whether the policies introduced by the provisional government did also contribute towards their fall.

The main reason for the fall of the provisional Government

was due to its decision to stay in the war and ^{only} to a small extent the domestic policies it introduced. The decision to stay part of the war enabled the Bolsheviks to rise in power as more people supported them as they promised to end the war. When Lenin returned to Russia with his April Theses his slogan was 'peace, land, bread'. He was already appealing to the peasantry as they wanted to obtain more land and Lenin actively encouraged land seizures that were occurring. The peasants also wanted for peace as most conscripts for the war were from the peasantry. NOT why did this anger them as people they knew were dying, but they also resented this as it created extra work for them when harvesting as there were less people. On top of this, the army took their best horses for the war which again led to more work being created. As the peasantry made up 80% of the population it was what the provisional government kept them supporting them. The decision to continue the war did NOT do this. This led to the Bolsheviks gradually gaining the support of the peasantry and workers, who were angered due to poor working conditions and long hours. The provisional government lost their support which left them weak and ~~the~~ defenceless men the Bolsheviks seized power in October 1917. Had they ended the war then ~~this would've been~~ they could have prevented losing the support of the peasantry and workers and could have

maintained near power. Therefore, the ~~provisional~~ fall of the provisional government is owed more to its domestic policies than the continuation of war to a small extent.

Another significant reason as to why the decision to continue the war led to the provisional government's fall is due to the mistrust it created. Whilst the provisional government did decide to continue the war, they decided to opt to use revolutionary defensism. This meant they would not attempt to make territorial gains and would just defend their borders. ^{a P.O member,} Milyukov¹ however did not agree with this policy. He sent a secret telegram to the allies stating that Russia would continue to fight until there had been a clear victory. This telegram was leaked so that everyone became aware of his betrayal in March 1917. Not only did this lead to members of the public not trusting the provisional government, it also weakened them. Milyukov was forced to resign in the April and the party, ~~as a~~ which was already weak as it was not an elected group, became weaker. The Milyukov crisis was ~~also~~ a consequence of the continuation of war and could have been avoided had the provisional government ended their participation of the war. It dramatically weakened them and people no longer trusted them to govern the country. ~~As a~~ consequently, the fall of the provisional government is owed more to its domestic policies than the continuation of

war to a small extent.

Moreover, the domestic policies the Provisional government introduced did contribute towards its fall but the continuation of war remained the main reason.

The Provisional Government failed to deal with one of the key issues of 1917 which was land reform. Peasants were participating in land seizures in order to take land they wanted. This caused distress in the countryside.

~~As the Provisional Government wasn't~~ As previously mentioned,

the Provisional Government was not an elected body

and felt unable to address the issue of land

reform. They were also extremely restricted due to the

dual power arrangement they had with the Petrograd

Soviet. In reality the Soviet had all control as they

had order number one so had military support. They

also were a regularly elected and well organised body.

This contrasts to the Provisional Government which weren't

elected or well organised. Their inability to address key

issues such as land reform and their poor leadership

by Kerensky, who was vain and just wanted glory in

winning the war, all led to their downfall. Therefore,

domestic policies are responsible to the downfall of the

Provisional government to a small extent as they did

contribute to the loss of support and their ultimate downfall.

In conclusion, whilst the domestic policies of the Provisional government were responsible for their fall to a small extent, the main reason for their failure was due to the continuation of war. This is because it gave political opposition, such as the Bolsheviks, an advantage as they could gain supporters who were discontent with the war and also use it to highlight the weaknesses of the Provisional Government. On top of this, it also weakened the party and led to them being perceived as untrustworthy due to the Milyukov case. Domestic policies did also contribute towards their fall as they were unpopular or non-existent, but they were not the main reason. Therefore, the fall of the Provisional government in 1917 owed more to its domestic policies than to its decision to stay in war to a very small extent.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response achieved Level 4 because (1) it targets the domestic policies/decision to stay in the war debate concerning the fall of the Provisional Government in 1917 with a decent focus on 'owed more', (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to support the arguments made (e.g. impact of the war on key groups, the issue of land reform etc.) and (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.

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 e.g., 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:

<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

