



Examiners' Report **June 2024**

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 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_2C_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with 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 that 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 very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. There continues to be an increase this year in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting, some of which were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There did seem this summer to be evidence of a greater number of candidates using the language of the mark scheme in their responses. However, many of these responses were not doing what they claimed to be doing and it was felt that generally this was not a very helpful approach. There was also some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, eg the use of gov instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It continues to be disappointing to have to note that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discuss issues arising from the sources in general terms. This question requires candidates to use the sources ‘together’ and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches to integrating the sources do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as they are discussed together. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or, on occasion, no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

In section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that have a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates continue to need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

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

Question 1

Responses to this question came from across the ability range. Most candidates noted aspects of source provenance, such as the position of the authors, and the stronger answers explained how this impacted the utility of the two sources, evaluating the weight the evidence would bear when coming to the judgement. Responses were generally stronger when addressing the Mercier source, as a moderate member of the Third Estate. Fewer students demonstrated knowledge of the *cahiers* of the nobility and their purpose. Stronger responses demonstrated an understanding that the relationship between the different estates of French society on the eve of the 1789 revolution was very tense; these responses showed understanding of the nature of challenges within French society at this time. A number of good candidates who were able to make excellent developed inferences from the sources did not consider them together but focused on writing about each source separately. This is, of course, a legitimate way of dealing with the sources but places additional emphasis on the need for comparison in the evaluation.

Weaker responses offered a lack of supporting context, taking the sources very much at face value. However, most responses were able to develop some degree of inference from the source content. Weaker responses dismissed sources, particularly Source 2, as biased and/or made very general/stereotypical comments about provenance. There were candidates that failed to deal with source utility at all.

Both sources 1 and 2 provide a valuable insight into the rights of the French nobility before the 1789 revolution. Source 1 highlights the disproportionate taxes and lack of equality in promotion in a negative light whilst source 2 views these excessive rights of the nobility as fundamental to the French society and a constitutional right that should not be challenged. They are highly valuable as a pair as ~~the~~ positions of the author are from highly different backgrounds so can highlight the range of perspectives to the rights of the nobility before the 1789 revolution.

Source 1 is written in the form of a book that is designed to be mass consumed highlighting the clear desire of Mercier to share this view and his work across France to increase the awareness of the oppressive rights the nobility have in France. Mercier is a member of the Third Estate meaning he can provide a well informed view on the impacts of the rights of the nobility has on this class and despite this class he is well educated so can convey this view

effectively increasing the awareness of the fundamental issues associated with the rights of the nobility. The position of the author therefore provides a valuable insight into the attitudes of towards the rights of the nobility from below. Although he may be perhaps an in an attempt to gain sympathy for his position in an attempt to reform the political system but as he has observed the rights of all social classes and is both well educated and well informed this limitation does lack some strength. Overall, the provenance of source 2 makes it highly valuable into the rights of the nobility before 1789. Source 1 explores the rights of the nobility in a largely negative light emphasising the oppressive nature that these rights tended to have on those in the Third Estate. From source 1 we can infer that one of the main rights of the nobility was tax exemptions and special tax privileges. It states 'oppress the poor... by imposing their own taxes'. Here, it highlights that the nobility were able to re-inforce the privileged position in society through an unfair tax system. Despite the nobility making up just 120,000 of 28 million they held over 70% of wealth in France which was largely accumulated through this tax system. They were exempt from all direct taxation meaning the non were getting richer whilst those in the Third Estate even

as Mercier and paid the brunt of tax and were getting poorer. Perhaps it is this agitation that gives the negative tone of source 7 and what triggers the largely negative viewpoint surrounding the rights of the nobility as the author himself had experienced this oppression making it a highly emotive first hand account. Similarly, source 7 emulates a clear tone of frustration towards the system of venality which was another right of the nobility before 1789. We can infer this through the statement 'nobility will not allow the common people to have promotions or honours'. This is a clear reference to venality in which those who wanted to move to the 2nd Estate could purchase a venal title meaning they would be exempt from all direct taxation such as the taille and the gabelle. 30,000 bought titles and blocked the advancement based on merit. This once again demonstrated the ability of the nobility to reinforce their position of dominance within France as they manipulated promotions to favour themselves, creating a clear schism within society. This clearly highlights the rights of the nobility were strong and unyielding as they were further re-inforced through the people of the third estate members who bought titles to gain these rights. This clearly demonstrates the agitation of the third estate that is reflected throughout source 1.

~~as the author~~ As Mercier questions the system that has been created in which the only solution was to buy into it yourself and further oppress the Third Estate. The position of the author clearly typifies my feeling of anger and frustration as despite his moderate political views he himself indicates he is eager for change. Throughout source 7 it is clearly demonstrated that the rights of the nobility were both strong and unavoidable as they created a system that only furthered schisms in society creating fragmentation that was evident in the 1789 revolution.

Source 2 is similarly useful in providing an insight into the rights of the nobility in the years before 1789. The source is written by members of the nobility making it highly informed as they can provide a first hand account of the many rights they receive in the political system. Despite the chances of being an opportunity to suggest reform source 2 instead largely consists of desires to maintain the rights of the nobility which clearly indicates that they must be favourable to the nobility as there is no desire from this group to have much political change. The position of the author is highly useful as it can provide a direct and well educated view into the

rights of the nobility in the years leading up to 1789. Source 7 explores the rights of the nobility in a much more positive light, viewing them as fundamental to the system in France preferred through constitutional rights. We can infer that the voting system was favourable to the nobility as they lack any incentive to reform it and instead desire to preserve it. It states 'voting should only be done by Estate and not by head'. This highlights that one of the main rights of the nobility was enabling the oppression of the Third Estate through this unfair voting system. Voting prior to 1789 was done by Estate and not by head meaning that the First and Second Estate could vote together as had similar views and was always able to outvote the Third Estate despite the Third Estate representing the largest proportion of the French people. Despite this voting not being a right directly, it facilitated the nobility with the position to both reject any legislation unfavourable to their position and pass legislation that would further ensure their dominance and extend their rights further. This was compounded by the right to property of the nobility, they 'wished to preserve the sacred right of property'. This was a clear right of the nobility as it enabled them to ensure their dominance over the

Third estate. France existed under a system of feudalism and the nobility had the right to property meaning that large proportions of the Third Estate worked under the First Estate which further ensured their dominance over the French people. Despite the more positive tone of source 2 and the attempt it makes to illustrate the rights as a positive system it once again demonstrates the underlying oppression associated with the rights of the nobility. Therefore, it is clear the rights were oppressive in France.

Both sources 1 and 2 provide a valuable insight into the rights of the nobility as they reinforce the view that the rights were fundamentally oppressive in nature. Despite the attempt to spin the source positively in source 2 it is impossible to ignore the HAW associated with the rights of the nobility. Source 1 could have been influenced by the enlightenment leading to the emergence of the alternative view of oppression created by the rights of the nobility. In conclusion, whilst source 2 does provide a valuable insight into the rights of the nobility, source 1 is ultimately more valuable as it provides a more well rounded viewpoint and the impact the rights had on the

Third Estate demonstrating their oppressive nature
more clearly in source 2 -



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response was able to access L5. Though the sources are largely treated in isolation, the candidate does demonstrate how they can be used as a set at the end of the answer. There is a real sense of period resonance in this response. The candidate is clearly able to interpret the source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society at the time; they are clearly aware of the social structures and tensions in France in the period the sources are taken from.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to identify hunger as being a reason to explain the February 1917 Revolution in Russia, which was included in both sources. More candidates than in previous years seemed able to demonstrate how the sources could be used together to show the causes of revolution, building inferences and using valid material from the sources to support their arguments. Candidates were able to add contextual knowledge to their analysis of source provenance, with stronger answers demonstrating the impact that the position of the authors had on utility due to their political beliefs and stances. Stronger responses were able to explain the impact these aspects had on source utility and evaluated the weight the evidence would bear as part of coming to their overall judgement. The best responses included excellent evaluation of Source 4, considering how the use of language might reflect Marxist philosophy. More candidates than in previous years seemed able to demonstrate how the sources could be used together to show the causes of revolution, building inferences and using valid material from the sources to support their arguments.

Some candidates failed to note that Trotsky was writing in the USA, although they did note the disparity in timing between the two sources. Few commented on the tone of the sources. Some candidates did confuse the February and October revolutions. While there is some transferable material between the two, considering the impact of World War I, it is vital that candidates have a firm grasp of the chronology and are able to differentiate between events.

Both sources 3 and 4 can be used together to investigate the reasons for the February 1917 revolution. Source 3 comes from the perspective of Chernov, a social revolutionary, and he places emphasis on the revolution originating from hunger. Source 4 suggests the same idea but includes further information of events, which can be inferred from Chernov's writing. This could be perhaps due to it being a newspaper. Sources 3 and 4 can be used together to investigate the reasons for the February 1917 revolution.

Both sources 3 and 4 portray the idea of hunger ^{as} ~~not~~ a key catalyst to the February revolution of 1917. Source 3 states "poor riots broke out because the bakery shops lacked bread". This quote details the events which were going on in cities such as Petrograd and Moscow. From it we can infer that this was the beginning of discontent, there has already been issues with inflation and long term social issues in the city such as working ^{and living} conditions and economic issues such as wages. This may have been the catalyst to the revolution. We know this to be true as peasants were withholding grain supply from

the cities as they had no incentive to sell. The war communism was put in place to try and prevent this with grain requisitioning. Squads sent to get the food. The origin of this source, Chernov, makes it reliable. Chernov would have lived through this period in a position of influence so will have had first hand experience of events. Source 4 backs up the idea of hunger causing the revolution alongside source 3. Trotsky wrote "this workers' protest movement has been mobilised by a lack of bread". From this we can infer that there were underlying issues which led to the revolution but it was the hunger problem which 'mobilised' the revolution which source 3 similarly suggests. The purpose of this article makes it useful for the enquiry because it is a newspaper it will detail key events to spread the news what was going on, if it lied it would have lost credibility. Sources 3 and 4 can be used together to investigate ~~the~~ the cause of the revolution with both clearly outlining hunger.

Both sources 3 and 4 highlight the incompetence of the Russian regime but pick out different points. Source 3 highlights the struggle to restore order from the hunger strikes and the incompetence of the people to control it. Chernov does highlight how 'the police restored order' however they did not put

down with it continuing "people demanded bread but then began to shout down with the police". From this we can infer that there was a degree of incompetence to the regime. They were not effectively able to control opposition or issues put forward to them such as protesters. This can also be seen with the inability to fight the war, troops were becoming demoralised with the constant military defeats such as Kornilov's Summer offensive. This therefore made controlling opposition harder adding to the incompetence. Source 4 also portrays the incompetence of leadership by directly outlining the problem. Trotsky wrote "incompetence of Tsarism under the influence of Rasputin". Rasputin a peasant holy man was greatly influencing the Tsarina who was currently in charge due to him saying he could heal her sick son. Rasputin was disliked across the political nation. From the quote we can infer that the Tsarist system was so incompetent due to a lack of leadership, it let in a peasant man into a position of power to influence decisions. However, the origin of the source can be questioned, Trotsky was a Bolshevik opposed to Tsarism, he may have over-exaggerated or over-exaggerated to push his own agenda. Sources 3 and 4 both show incompetence as a cause for the 1917 February revolution.

Both sources 3 and 4 both highlight the war as a key cause of the February Revolution. Source 3 highlights chants such as "Down with the war". From this we can infer that the ~~proletariat~~ workers in the city were now tired of the impact of the war and the issues it was causing and as the Tsar would not leave the war a revolution was necessary to overthrow him. The war led to discontent in the cities we know as it caused food shortages, grain was being diverted from the cities to the front causing social unrest. The origin of this source can be questioned, clearly a social revolutionary would see a revolution so may be just presenting his beliefs not true facts across. Source 4 also portrays idea of war as well as source 3. Source 4 expands from source 3 to discuss the issues with the army. Trotsky wrote "The social system was unable to cope with mass human military". From this we can infer Russia was losing the war and it was resulting in social and economic issues. 45% of government spend was on the army so being unable to cope was a huge problem. Both sources can be used together to expand upon the idea of the war causing revolution.

In conclusion, sources 3 and 4 can be used together to investigate reasons for the 1917 February

revolution with both sources portraying similar ideas and expanding off of each other. The provenance of both has its weaknesses but is ^{still} also strong so can be trusted. Overall, sources 3 and 4 are useful together in investigating reasons for the February Revolution in 1917.



The response uses the sources together, with a really tight focus on how far the historian could make use of the sources to investigate reasons for the February 1917 Revolution in Russia throughout this response, if material could be developed further. Page three clearly demonstrates a candidate making inferences from the source material and expanding on those inferences through use of own knowledge. This was judged to be a secure L4 response.

Question 3

Question 3 was by far the more popular question in 2C.2 Section B, and there was a wide range of responses. Most were able to analyse a range of features that contributed to the downfall of the monarchy. The majority of candidates demonstrated at least a basic understanding of the progress of war in Austria and Prussia, and the different factors at play in the collapse of constitutional monarchy. The very best candidates established criteria to properly explore comparative factors and were able to explain the influence of each factor in further radicalising the *sans culottes*.

There were some pre-planned essays where candidates found it difficult to manipulate to answer the focus of this question. In weaker responses it was with Austria and Prussia, which was not tackled as well as other issues. There were some responses that fell into chronological narrative, rather than offering a range of factors and weighing them. A minority of candidates confused the chronology of 1791-1792.

Historians would agree to some extent that the war of the first coalition was a major reason for the collapse of the monarchy in France as France was successful in this war and many citizens saw this as the new found strength France had gained since forming a constitutional monarchy and this only led to further calls for an establishment of a French Republic. France's war with Austria and Russia was equal with both sides winning battles but France had managed to steadfastly protect its borders from invasion and settlement from enemy forces and when Austria did manage to seize some parts of France in the north these areas were quickly recaptured. The fact that two powerful monarchies in Europe could not defeat France led many French citizens to believe in their own self-determination leading to more calls for a Republic from radical politicians and although many moderates were apathetic to, or opposed the war the circulation of the idea of a French Republic can be said to be a main reason for the breakdown of constitutional monarchy in France.

An argument against the war ~~being~~ being the main reason is Louis's flight to Varennes. In the July of 1792 Louis and his family attempted to flee

to Austria to seek ~~protection~~ protection there from the revolutionary forces calling for his abdication or execution, but he was unsuccessful and was captured by the National guard and was exiled to Tuileries place and forced to wear a red beret, a symbol of the revolution. Louis' flight led to uproar within the populace and many people now saw him as counter-revolutionary leading to greater calls for his removal and for the founding of the French Republic. This is way it can be argued that Louis trying to flee from France is the main reason for the collapse of constitutional monarchy ultimately leading to his execution on the 21st of January 1793.

A reason for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France can be said to be caused by the coalition between the European monarchies not directly by the war. This coalition starting between the Holy Roman Empire and ~~Austria~~ Prussia outlined in the Declaration of Pillnitz made the people of France see how the other monarchies in Europe perceived the ongoing revolution as a threat leading to the declaration due to this power France had gained it led to increased calls for revolts in other countries to form their own republics or constitutional monarchies and furthermore the Brunswick Manifesto which said to follow Louis XVI or face severe punishment further caused more unrest within France's

Much of the population did not want to return to an ~~Constitutional~~ ^{or Solute} Monarchy. This is why it can be said that the war with Austria and Prussia played a smaller role in the breakdown of Constitutional Monarchy. ~~and the~~

The public's view of the Monarch can also be argued to have an effect on why Constitutional Monarchy failed in France. ~~Again~~ Much of the French population had great disdain towards the Crown which was only furthered by the aforementioned flight to Varennes, Marie Antoinette's 'Let them eat cake' quote and also by Louis' repeated use of his power of veto to try and stop his powers being stripped away. These factors culminated together leading to much of the population supporting the abdication or execution of Louis and the Royal Family. This helps to show us how the war was not the main reason why Constitutionally Monarchy ~~failed~~ collapsed in France as it was instead a culmination of many factors mixing leading civil unrest and calls for a French Republic.

In conclusion it can be said that France's war with Austria and Prussia played a role in the failure of Constitutional Monarchy in France, it is my belief that it was ~~the~~ the additive effect of years of

dissatisfaction with the monarchy and the factors previously mentioned that caused the breakdown of constitutional monarchy and the formation of a French Republic.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a L3 response that offers a limited explanation of the impact of war with Austria and Prussia on the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in the years 1791-92. There are a range of other factors, but depth and development of each is limited. There is some analysis and attempt to explain links between the relevant key features of the period and the question.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Candidates must ensure that they suitably develop the question premise, in the case of war with Austria and Prussia, before moving on to consider other factors or themes. To reach a substantiated judgement, it is vital that knowledge of the factor in question is developed, even if the intention is to suggest that the issue was of less importance than other matters.

Question 4

Far fewer candidates chose this question than question 3, due to the unnatural nature of the comparison. Those who did answer the question were able to identify differences between the two periods, coming to a judgement about whether it was 'markedly' different. Strong responses could either distinguish between differences and similarities or focus on 'markedly' to test the extent of the similarity. Most candidates were able to identify the differences in targets of the terrors, and the levels of brutality.

Some candidates had difficulty in structuring a comparative answer, resulting in chronological passages with limited analysis. Comparative questions, by their nature, invite analysis, but candidates do need to practice identifying similarities and differences to produce balanced responses.

It is ~~highly~~ inaccurate to say that the Terror of 1793-94 and the White Terror of the mid-1790s were markedly different. For two events to be markedly different, they ~~are~~ must be characterised by ~~similar~~ ^{contrasting} methods and sentiments. Therefore, these two events were not markedly different as they both involved an acceptance by the government of violence, and an involvement of radical groups in ~~pushing~~ driving them forward. Whilst the White Terror was not part of a larger vision, it carried very similar sentiments about the targeted groups.

A key aspect of why these two issues were not markedly different was that they both involved an acceptance by the government of violence. The Terror of 1793-94 saw violence used as the main method of justice, with the Revolutionary Tribunal ~~executing~~ 1,594 people ~~from~~ in June and July of 1794, highlighting the presence of violence. The White Terror saw the Thermidorean government take no action against the killing of Jacobins, even with hundreds being killed in the prisons in Lyon, in the summer of 1795, outlining how this ~~had~~ had

been normalised through a lack of government response. The 1793-94 Terror also saw the acceptance of violence from certain representatives as a mission given free reign, like Calvet d'Herbois, who executed 1,900 people in Lyon after the Federalist Revolt. This resembles the deorganised and random nature of killings by "chasseurs" in the White Terror, with both representative of a more casual attitude to violence across France. Therefore, ~~it is true that it is inaccurate to say~~ these two periods were markedly different as the sentiment of casual bloodshed, and methods of randomised killing were not contrasting, but almost mirroring each other in the two respective periods of Terror.

Furthermore, the two periods were similar in the sense that they were both driven to a certain extent by radical groups. The Jacobin Terror saw the radical mechanisms of Terror created as a result of the pressure from the sans-culottes in the winter of the September 6th 1793 month, when saw the Law of Suspects ^{alongside the arrest revolutionary} introduced. The White Terror also saw the "Jenaise donee" take matters into their own hands, with a bourgeois approach to the sans-culottes' method, and killings of ^{12,000 across the White Terror} Jacobins in winter Paris.

Both of these cases highlight the foundations of killing and oppression being built upon the influence of ideological groups which either created legal mechanisms, or created a particular sentiment against the respective 'victims'. Both the sans-culottes and Japanese donee also ~~were not~~ provided somewhat of an opportunity for the governments to allow some of the less publicly acceptable actions to be carried out by them, but which were normalised eventually by the Committee of Public Safety. Therefore, it is inaccurate to say these events were markedly different from each other as if they both held ignorant influence ~~at~~ from the bottom-up, then the sentiments were being supported by their attitudes, and the methods by their pressure or repetitive approaches.

On the other hand, the White Terror was somewhat different as it was not put of in under vision. For example, Robespierre and Saint-Just had a 'utopian vision' for France as a result of their Terror, which eventually led to the fall of the Cult of the Supreme Being coming into the revolution in 1794. Whereas, on the White Terror, the lack of direct involvement from the National Convention,

who were more outwardly focused on stabilising the economic and political situation ~~of~~ in fighting the Germans, Prussians, and Vendémiaire Risings, meant that they did not project a particular goal for the KPRays. This outlines how the Jacobin Terror was more holistic, and the White Terror was less focused and more disorganised. The Jacobin Terror also had a figurehead, whereas the Thermidorian government was merely an interim government that did not set under the promise of the Jacobins who had 6,000 clubs by June 1794. Nevertheless, the two events were still very similar as, regardless of the government "visions" or aims, the actual events were very similar in sentiment and method, which both ultimately ~~lead~~ would lead to the outcome of the execution of a particular group: counter-revolutionaries and Jacobins.

Overall, the statement in question is inaccurate due to the fact that the two periods had similar sentiments and methods from the bottom-up, in ways which were somewhat disorganised, and were both highly murderous of bloodshed - ~~some~~



This is a similarity/difference response that accesses L5 because of its keen focus on demonstrating the extent to which the Terror of 1793-94 and the White Terror of the mid-1790s were markedly different. Note the candidate develops both similarities and differences talking about the Terror and the White Terror in tandem throughout. Thus, demonstrating sustained analysis of the relationship between key features of the period.

Question 5

This question was slightly more popular than Q6. There were a range of answers on this topic, but most were able to discuss the failings of the Russo Japanese war effectively. Most candidates were able to make a judgement as to what was the most significant factor to cause the 1905 revolution was: the Russo Japanese war or domestic problems. Stronger responses analysed the links between factors, including the events of 'Bloody Sunday', and how they interacted in causing the 1905 revolution, using a wide range of evidence to support their conclusions. The best responses evaluated long/short-term causation and triggers.

Weaker responses considered different factors in isolation and did not compare them in their conclusions or evaluations. Some responses did over-generalise; seeing peasants and workers as a homogeneous group. A minority of candidates focused on domestic problems, neglecting to contextualise the Russo-Japanese war. Fewer still focused on the reasons for war without showing how this then caused discontentment/opposition. A minority of candidates did confuse events from 1917 with those of 1905.

The Russo-Japanese war was indeed a significant, contributing factor to the revolution in Russia in 1905. The Russo-Japanese war incited military concern in Russia, but in order for a revolution to occur we must ask ourselves what led to a complete breakdown of the bond between the Tsar and his people in order for this rebellion to occur against him? Indeed, the Russo-Japanese war was a spark for the start of a break-down of relations, but it was domestic problems that affected the day to day lives of Russians and established this complete loss of faith.

The Russo-Japanese war did indeed significantly contribute to deterioration conditions in Russia and therefore aid in the need for revolution. By viewing the Japanese as racially inferior, the Tsar put Russia in ~~an~~ a vulnerable position as he clearly underestimated the threat that Russia was under. Indeed, this led to the military being under-prepared by lacking sufficient weaponry and trained soldiers. Therefore the loss that Russia experienced in the face of those they did not deem worthy of considering as suitable enemies resulted in humiliation and enabled this gradual loss of public

confidence in the Tsar. The Tsar's military loss against the Japanese established him to be in a weak position and acted as an unintentional encouragement for revolution as it showed that the Tsar could not effectively lead Russia to victory. Furthermore, amongst Russians who may have genuinely believed the Japanese to be racially inferior, the defeat would have been especially humiliating as they would have believed that Russia's defeat should have been impossible and therefore heightened the loss of faith in the Tsar and the need for rebellion to occur. Despite this, military defeat purely between Russia and Japan alone would not have been a strong enough incentive for a 1905 revolution to occur. Russians still viewed the Tsar as the 'little father' and many remained loyal to him as a result. Military defeat may have sparked discontent and a gradual loss of faith, but it did not fully deteriorate the bond between the Tsar and his people.

The Tsar's own ^{cultural} political/personal agenda was something that did also contribute to the 1905 revolution. The policy of Russification did indeed anger many civilians as it took away their personal freedoms and imposed the Russian culture forcibly on them. The Russian language was expected to be used in schools, with primary schools needing to teach the Russian language. As a result of this imposed culture, the Orthodox church

was also prominent in the daily lives of Russians. Catholic and Islamic ~~seminar~~ churches and schools were closed down as they did not fit the policy of Russification. This therefore added to the need to rebel against autocracy as it demonstrated that the Tsar was abusing his power in order to enforce his own beliefs and preferred language onto his subjects. If Russian was not a language used amongst some of his subjects, such as Armenians, then Russification would have put people in an impossible situation were they could not effectively communicate or be in a position of comfort. As this affected the daily lives of Russians it proved to be fundamental in contributing to the 1905 revolution. Despite this, the cultural agenda of the Tsar only affected non-Russians the most and due to the continuation of the belief of the Tsar as the 'Little Father,' and the fear associated with the Tsar's secret police force, the Okhrana, it did not fully encourage Russians to revolt.

Domestic problems were a crucial reason for the 1905 revolution as it was a problem that stood in the way of Russian's day-to-day lives and was something that affected each individual. The workers conditions were indeed fundamental for such a stand against Tsarism. The demands of the workers were that they wanted an 8-hour day, better pay and no abuse experienced as a part of typical

working conditions. Bloody-Sunday was a peaceful march by the workers in favour of such demands, but the massacre by Tsarist soldiers in response to this proved that the Tsar had little care for his people or the problems they experienced under his rule. During this massacre, 200 peaceful protesters were killed and 800 wounded (including children) which ultimately marked this move away from the Tsar being ~~and~~ considered as the 'Little Father' as he had no personal or loving feelings towards his subjects. Indeed, demands over hunger and equal working rights were ignored by Russia's ruler and therefore acted as the major reason for the 1905 revolution as there was this feeling of outrage and a desperate need for change. For a revolution to need to occur, there must be this complete breakdown of a bond between the Tsar and his people which domestic problems clearly did due to it directly affecting the Russians. Bloody Sunday clearly allowed for Russians to completely lose faith in their ruler and therefore justified such a revolution to occur.

To conclude, although the Russo-Japanese war was indeed significant in terms of being a contributing cause for the 1905 revolution, but it did not deeply affect the bond between the Tsar and his people in comparison to domestic problems. It was domestic problems that allowed for the Russian

public to fully lose their confidence in the Tsar as it was a response directly to the Tsar's own treatment of his people. The Russo-Japanese war was humiliating but merely for military defeat and did not directly worsen the day-to-day lives of ordinary Russians like domestic problems did.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response offers focus on why the Russo-Japanese War could be seen as the main reason for the revolution in Russia before moving on to discuss domestic factors. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Therefore, this is a fair L4 response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Keep a keen focus on the question where it invites a thematic response. Candidates should demonstrate they are weighing factors throughout their answers to reach a substantiated overall judgement.

Question 6

Most candidates demonstrated a good contextual understanding of the events behind the Bolshevik consolidation of power, supported by precise evidence. Many candidates displayed an understanding of the Bolshevik consolidation of power, stronger answers linking the peace of Brest-Litovsk to the Civil War and the Cheka. The best responses considered both how the peace of Brest-Litovsk could be seen as a help and hindrance in Bolshevik attempts to consolidate power, sometimes considering the interrelationship between the peace and the development of the Civil War. Stronger responses were additionally able to contribute knowledge of how Bolshevik economic policy eventually helped them consolidate power.

Weaker responses focused on the peace of Brest-Litovsk and no other factors, whilst others demonstrated limited knowledge of the terms of the treaty. Some candidates failed to analyse the relationships between the factors they identified, with own knowledge lacking a range or depth. A minority of candidates struggled with the chronology, confusing events between 1918 and 1924. Thus, producing responses that lacked clarity.

peace brought by the
The treaty of Brest Litovsk was partially significant in
the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1918-24.
However despite Brest Litovsk successfully consolidating
some power for the Bolsheviks by reducing public resentment,
other factors such as the crushing of opposition and
economic policies were more significant in consolidating
power for the Bolsheviks as they both prevented revolution
and reduced opponents political power. Therefore the treaty was
only partially significant. //

peace
The ~~treaty~~ of Brest Litovsk was partially significant in
the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1918-
21. Lenin signed the treaty in 1918 to end Russian
involvement in world war one. This did help to consolidate
Bolshevik power as it meant that the public were less
angry with the Bolsheviks. Prior to Bolshevik rule one main
cause of public resentment towards the government was
Russia's involvement in the war as it reduced food
supplies in cities and caused millions of Russian deaths.
By signing the treaty Lenin helped to win back public
opinion of the Bolsheviks which meant that the party had
more public support than it had previously. This increased

the legitimacy of the Bolshevik government as it made the October Revolution seem like more of a revolution and less of a coup-d'état. However, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk also reduced Bolshevik power in some ways. For example when the treaty was signed around 1/3 of Russian land was ceded to Germany, this decreased the economy as many areas were considered significant resources needed for Russia's economy and revenue. Furthermore the signing of the treaty caused foreign support to go against Bolshevik rule by supporting the White Army in the Civil War in the hope that Russia would rejoin the war if the Bolsheviks lost power. This reduced the consolidation of Bolshevik rule as it helped to begin the Russian Civil War and ~~also~~ meant the White Army was not pushed out and difficult for the Bolsheviks to defeat. Therefore while the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was partially significant in the consolidation of Bolshevik power in the years 1918-21 as it meant public resentment towards the Bolsheviks decreased, it also negatively hindered the consolidation of power for the party as it meant lots of Russian land was surrendered and the White Army was stronger due to foreign intervention. Furthermore other factors such as the crushing of opposition and Bolshevik economic policies were more significant as they reduced the chances of revolution and reduced opponents' political power which the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was unable to do.

The Bolsheviks crushing of opposition was far more significant in the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1918-21 than the treaty of Brest Litovsk. One way in which the Bolsheviks crushed opposition was through the use of the Cheka and the red guard. These were Bolshevik secret police forces who used violence and terror as a method of crushing any political opponents of the Bolsheviks. By 1924 the Cheka had 150,000 officers and was used all across the country to silence those who disagreed with the government using brutal methods such as being smeared with oil or forcing a rat to eat its way through their bodies. This was a more significant in consolidating Bolshevik power than the treaty of Brest Litovsk as it allowed the Bolsheviks to use using fear and edging prevent any political opponents from gaining support or speaking out against them. Furthermore the Bolsheviks crushed opposition using the red guard. Examples of this include the 1919 and 1920 Tambov and Kronstadt uprisings where the Cheka and red guard were able to crush 1000s who opposed them. This helped to consolidate their power as it meant other opponents were too afraid to revolt against them and made an example of opponents. This both prevented revolution and limited opponents political power as it ~~was~~ demonstrated that the Bolsheviks were more powerful than any opposition groups. Therefore the Bolshevik party's crushing of opposition through the use of the

chekas and the red guard was a far more significant factor in the consolidation of Bolshevik power in the years 1918-21 than the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. As while the treaty had negative effects on Bolshevik power such as the loss of valuable Russian territory, the crushing of opposition was purely effective and beneficial for the party as it reduced the ^{political} power of opposition and prevented revolution through the use of some fear tactics, which on signing of the treaty did not.

The Bolshevik party's economic policies including War Communism and the NEP were also more significant in the Bolshevik party's consolidation of power in the years 1918-1921 than the peace of Brest-Litovsk. The party's first economic policy was war communism which was introduced in 1918. This policy was harshly communist and included changes such as the nationalisation of industries and grain requisitioning. This meant that control of food production and other significant industries was centralised under the Bolshevik government. This helped to consolidate the party's power as it prevented groups such as workers and peasants from having enough power and resources to revolt. However ~~the~~ war communism did somewhat limit Bolshevik power as it caused divisions within the party surrounding whether or not the party policy was too harsh and damaging. This meant the party had less power as disagreements within the party created challenges about how

to rule Russia effectively. Furthermore the policy caused peasants to begin grain hoarding and revenue in 1920 was only 50% of what it had been in 1913. Therefore despite the communists allowing the Bolsheviks to prevent uprisings and weaken opposition groups, it did not entirely help to consolidate their power as it created disagreements within the party and public resentment. Another policy introduced by the Bolshevik party is the New Economic Policy (NEP) which was introduced in 1921. This policy was more capitalist as it relaxed the nationalisation of industries, allowed free markets and created a new middle class known as 'NEP-men'. This policy did help to consolidate Bolshevik power as it decreased public resentment by relaxing the harsh conditions that had caused rebellions abroad during the communist revolution. Furthermore the policy also prevented revolution as the public were happier with the government and were less likely to spread anti-Bolshevik ideas. However the policy also damaged the Bolshevik party as party members or members argued the policy was too capitalist and did not truly reflect Bolshevik ideals. Therefore while the economic and social policies of the Bolshevik party did help to consolidate Bolshevik power in the years 1918-21 by weakening political power of opposition and reducing public resentment ^{they} also somewhat ~~weakened~~ weakened their power as they created disagreements within the party which made it harder to rule. Despite this the factor was still ~~to~~ not

Significant than the peace of Brest-Litovsk as while the treaty only consolidated their power by reducing public resentment, the economic ^{policies} ~~policy~~ both prevented revolution and limited the power of the opposition despite their weaknesses demonstrating that the peace of Brest-Litovsk was only partially significant.

In conclusion, the peace of Brest-Litovsk was only partially significant in the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1918-21. This is because other factors such as the Bolshevik ~~power~~ party's crushing of opposition and economic policies also played a role in the consolidation of power and were far more significant factors. This is because Brest-Litovsk caused several problems for the government and despite managing to reduce public resentment, did little to prevent revolution or limit the political power of opposition groups. Meanwhile the other two factors achieved all of these aims despite the issues associated with the economic policies. Therefore the peace of Brest-Litovsk was only partially significant in the Bolshevik consolidation of power between 1918 and 1921 as other factors did more to decrease the political power of opposition and prevent revolution.



This is a L5 response that considers the significance of the peace of Brest-Litovsk in the Bolshevik consolidation of power in the years 1918-24. However, it also considers how the treaty may have also hindered the Bolsheviks in their attempt to consolidate power, before moving on to offer some range in counter argument. Valid criteria by which judgement can be made are established and applied. Their relative significance is evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating an overall judgement.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- 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 rather than merely presenting a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

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>

