



# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2025**

**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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



## 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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0\_2C\_2506\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

# Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates across the ability range engage effectively with A Level Paper 2C, which covers *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 based on two linked sources, assessing AO2 (analysis and evaluation of source material). Section B offers a choice of essay questions that assess AO1 (understanding of the period in depth), targeting second-order concepts such as cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance.

Most candidates managed their time effectively, and there was little evidence of unfinished scripts. However, examiners noted an increase in problems caused by illegible handwriting. It is important to reiterate that credit can only be awarded for what can be read. Some candidates attempted to use the language of the mark scheme in their responses, but this was not always accurate or helpful, especially when unsupported by appropriate analysis. Additionally, there was some unwelcome evidence of informal abbreviations such as "gov" instead of "government" in formal responses.

In Section A, the strongest responses developed sustained and supported inferences based on the sources, evaluated their nature, origin, and purpose, and used contextual knowledge effectively to explore the enquiry. Most candidates were able to discuss the sources 'together', although the way this was achieved varied. A number of candidates, however, still approached the task in overly general terms or failed to focus explicitly on the demands of the enquiry. Others used contextual knowledge to describe events in too much detail, rather than applying it to explore the source material. Some strong responses showed excellent evaluation of provenance and argument, but lacked contextual knowledge, limiting the marks that could be awarded for bullet point 2 of the mark scheme.

In Section B, most candidates demonstrated a solid knowledge base, although this was not always applied with precision. The most successful answers identified and addressed the second-order concept targeted by the question, used relevant evidence across the timeframe of the question, and made supported, analytical arguments. Weaker responses often took a narrative approach or analysed one side of an argument in detail without engaging with a counterview. Candidates are encouraged to structure their responses thematically, show links between issues, and avoid listing factors in isolation. It remains important to remain within the chronological parameters set by the question and to ensure that supporting material is relevant to that timeframe.

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

## Question 1

Most candidates found this question accessible, and responses across the ability range showed engagement with both sources—a British diplomatic report and an account by the writer Nicolas Edme-Restif. Many were able to identify and explain relevant inferences about the nature of the September Massacres, often selecting material to support arguments about the brutality of events.

A number of candidates also brought contextual knowledge to bear in their analysis, including statistics relating to the number of deaths and those involved in the massacres. In stronger responses, this knowledge was integrated with sophistication to test or expand upon the information provided. However, in some cases, contextual knowledge was underdeveloped or missing, especially when it came to substantiating inferences or deepening discussion of the sources' limitations and value. Some candidates drew effectively on knowledge of the victims and the wider political tensions—for example, fear of a counter-revolutionary plot involving imprisoned clergy and nobles. However, fewer developed broader discussion of the political context in September 1792 or linked the issue of refractory priests to deeper revolutionary anxieties.

Most responses made at least some attempt to evaluate the provenance of the sources, with stronger answers addressing this clearly. Many candidates recognised the diplomatic status of Source 1 and the first-hand nature of Restif's account in Source 2. Better responses explored how British interest in revolutionary events might shape Source 1's depiction, or considered Restif's intention to publish his account. In some cases, though, comments on provenance remained superficial or disconnected from the line of enquiry.

Overall, the question produced a range of responses. Many candidates met the demands of AO2 with varying degrees of confidence and precision. The strongest answers offered contextualised readings, evaluated the sources with insight, and maintained a clear focus on the enquiry throughout.

Source 1 suggests that external threats were a driving factor in the violence of the September massacres, as "the Prussian army was advancing on Paris". This suggests that the fear of the capital falling to foreign, counter-revolutionary forces fuelled unrest. Indeed, news of the French defeat at Verdun on the 2nd of September reached Paris. This meant that the path to Paris was clear. Furthermore, the Duke of Brunswick had issued a manifesto promising to burn Paris to the ground in July 1792, serving to frenzy the urban sans-culottes further. Source 2 also references the impact of the ongoing war on sentiment in Paris, as it describes how "military volunteers leaving" would not leave counterrevolutionaries in Paris. Hence it is suggested that the war exposed internal divisions and led to paranoia of the 'enemies within'. It is true that, at this time, France was deeply divided by the decision to go to war, with political factions crystallising as a result, and regional resentment of those in the provinces to fight for the revolution,

who were seen as part of the same plotting sector of society as those priests refusing to swear the oath of allegiance, who are highlighted as targets of the violence in both sources. The author of source 1 is a diplomat, stationed in Paris, so was undoubtedly well informed of the events on the ground, in addition to the overarching political and military situation. Likewise, Restif was himself a Parisian and an eyewitness to the massacres at their height so can provide a high level of detail of events and an understanding of the atmosphere seizing his fellow citizens. Thus the degree of certainty of this key driver of the massacres is enhanced, and the sources' connection of internal and external events is very useful.

¶ Source 2 is useful to an historian as it emphasises the unchecked brutality of events. The actions of the so-called "mob" are described as "pointless cruelty". Evidence would back this up, as the massacres were anarchic in nature, with loud, disorganised sans-culottes killing in particularly inhumane fashions, with reports of fellow Parisians

being hacked to death with axes<sup>\*</sup>. There is further agreement with source 1, which with the author being struck by the "fury of the enraged crowd". This anger was unsurprising, given not only anxiety of the war, but also a dire economic situation, particularly in Paris. Bread supplies were critically low, and sans-culottes discontent was also evident in mob violence against supposed grain hoarders.

\* It is also notable that Restif <sup>remarks that</sup> ~~condemns the~~ majority of Parisians, ~~to who~~ "looked on in fear or approval", implicitly condemning the latter. It is true that the Jacobins failed to condemn the violence, and thus the massacres can be seen as a ~~mob~~ precedent being set for Terror.

It is of utmost importance that both authors portray the gory, frenzied nature of events, rather than glorifying them as many radical journalists, such as Marat, did. This shows that their partisan nature <sup>shown by</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>critical language</sup> appropriate given the bloodiness. Despite the author of source 1 being a British diplomat and therefore more likely to look at events

in France as having become too radical, when Britain had a <sup>stable</sup> model of constitutional monarchy, the ~~set~~ <sup>clear</sup> shock of the author is matched by that of a Frenchman, who ~~as a~~ <sup>as a</sup> ~~likely~~ <sup>likely</sup> as a ~~member~~ <sup>non-titled man and</sup> of the Third Estate supported reform to an extent. However, it could also be the case that as a writer, the sensationalism of the situation is exaggerated in order to satisfy the intrigued public. Overall, the correlation of the wild brutality of the events described, despite the different nationalities of the authors, makes the sources very useful together.

Another aspect of the massacres raised by source 2 is the aim of those who had taken action: "to get rid of refractory priests". This suggests to an historian that the sans-culottes were driven by a purpose ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> implementing de-Christianisation. This is certainly the case, as popular figures such as Collot d'Herbois and Jacques Hebert called for violence against non-juring priests, and vandalism of churches, which represented a challenge to the ~~reason~~ <sup>enlightenment</sup> ideas of reason and secularism. Similarly, source 1 reports how "vengeance was principally directed

against the refractory priests<sup>ii</sup>. This implies that sentiment against the Catholic Church ~~was~~ had been brewing amongst the sans-culottes for some time. Resentment at this time was likely, given opposition to the Constituent Assembly had been clearly demonstrated, with only 7 of 83 bishops swearing their allegiance. This, alongside the fact that Louis had sought to protect refractory priests with a veto of a law calling for their deportation, meant that this group was associated with counter-revolution and the September massacres sought to rid the capital of such traitors. Although it is also true that a majority of those killed in the prisons were minor criminals from a common background, the agreement of the sources show that it can be confidently concluded that the opposition of the clergy was at least a pretext for the massacres.

In conclusion, the sources offer a particularly valuable view of the nature of the September Massacres when taken together. They elucidate key ~~in~~ factors which drove the violence, as well as the manner and targets of the sans-culottes' anger. These points of consistent

agreement are rendered more useful by the contrasting positions from which they are written; from a likely disgusted Englishman writing officially to their Government, which likely would be made anxious by radicalism in France, and from a French writer, both willing to ~~condemn~~ <sup>clearly portray the brutality</sup> these actions to the public. It is thus clear that a historian would certainly be able to make great use of these sources together.



This response demonstrates secure L5 qualities. The candidate interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the sources can be used. The response uses both sources together, assessing a range of themes to investigate the nature of the September Massacres: the role of external threats, the brutal nature of events, the targets of the massacres. There is also reasoned inference, as the candidate moves beyond perfunctory source reading: "Hence it is suggested that the war exposed internal divisions and led to paranoia of the 'enemies within'". The candidate deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate what can be gained from the contents of the sources, displaying secure understanding of the need to evaluate source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. Here there is recognition of heightened fear in Paris following the declaration of the Brunswick Manifesto and strong awareness of how the September Massacres were portrayed elsewhere with reference to Marat. Knowledge is used to illuminate what can be gleaned from the sources and is clearly directed throughout this response. Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. The candidate considers that the agreement between the sources, despite the differing viewpoints of the author, makes them useful to the enquiry into the nature of the September massacres. At L5 candidates also offer evaluation that takes into account the weight of the evidence when coming to a judgement. Both sources are considered in terms of benefits, proximity to the event, and limitations, British anxieties about revolution and the writer's sensationalism.

## Question 2

Candidates across the ability range demonstrated a sound understanding of the sources, with most highlighting the poor treatment of workers at the Lena Goldfields depicted in both documents. Many responses effectively identified key details, such as the appalling working conditions, drawing inferences and contextualising these with own knowledge—for example, referencing workers being forced to eat rotten horsemeat. Stronger answers went further, noting details like the impact of illiteracy on workers signing contracts to add context to Source 3.

The best responses demonstrated strong contextual awareness, situating the sources accurately within the timeline leading to the Lena Goldfields Massacre and linking them to broader industrial unrest, including the 1905 protests following Bloody Sunday. These candidates drew clear connections between the workers' demands in Source 4 and the contractual terms in Source 3, using this interplay to explore the relationship between workplace conditions and protest. Their analysis was supported by well-chosen factual knowledge, with stronger responses avoiding generalisations about Stolypin's reforms or Duma legislation in favour of more directly relevant context.

Many candidates showed awareness of the provenance of the sources, with higher-level responses offering insightful evaluations about how differing perspectives and purposes shaped their usefulness. These answers recognised that, despite their distinct origins, both sources could be used to criticise the treatment of workers at the time.

Some candidates accepted the legalistic tone of Source 3 or the protests in Source 4 at face value, without fully exploring their limitations or potential bias. For instance, some responses argued that Source 3 showed workers willingly accepted their conditions without question. Only a few ignored provenance entirely or misread it, though some did mistakenly suggest that both sources reflected the same or similar viewpoints. Very few responses ignored the sources altogether in favour of a general narrative about the Lena Goldfields Massacre or simply re-wrote source content.

Sources 3 and 4 are useful to be used together to investigate the way the the workforce was treated at the Lena Goldfields in 1912 as both sources agree that the workers were placed under high demands from the Lenzoloto Mining Company. Source 3 highlights how the workers were subject to unusually extreme working conditions evidenced in the information illustrated: "working day must consist of 11.5 ~~to~~ working hours" ~~and~~ and "lunch breaks --- are not included in the hours of the working day". The point raised here is strong as it is evidenced that the Lena Goldfields Workers felt high demands from such long working days and demanded an 8 hour working day. The working conditions were worsened in the impact on families from such an extensive working day as the workers also demanded education for their children, which was inaccessible in the extreme working conditions. Source 3 is ~~an~~ ~~a~~ from the work contract created ~~in~~ and controlled by the Lenzoloto Mining Company. This adds weight to the

value of the source as it is factual and informative and is an official report of the working conditions for Lena Goldfields workers meaning it is more likely to convey a true reality for the ~~the~~ conditions experienced in their jobs.

Source 4 agrees that the Lena Goldfields workers were under high demands from the Lenzoloto Mining Company. Source 4 suggests that the treatment for workers was poor as they experienced a ~~poor~~ ~~qualit~~ reduced quality of life as Lena Goldfields workers. This is highlighted in one of their demands: "workers living quarters should be expanded and improved". The point author's point here is strong as ~~it is~~ ~~on~~ the workers were subject to ~~to~~ arguably inhumane working conditions. The Source 4's claim can be evidenced in how the workers worked 11 hour days in the mines where temperatures could fall to -60°C illustrating the uncomfortable circumstances they were forced into. Additionally, the workers were often served food that was ~~is~~ in actuality rotten horse meat emphasising the inhumane treatment. Source 4 is a document

written by the Lena Goldfields miners in 1912. This adds weight to the value of the source as it is contemporary to the investigation of 1912 and it is likely to provide an informed viewpoint. This is due to the fact that the ~~was~~ miners themselves arguably are in the best possible position to inform upon how they were treated working at the Lena Goldfields. Therefore, sources 3 and 4 are valuable to an investigation on the way the workforce was treated as they both agree that workers were placed under high demands.

Furthermore, sources 3 and 4 present further value towards this investigation through their agreement that the workforce of Lena Goldfields felt their treatment was unfair and consequentially opposed it. Source 3 communicates that the managers of the Lena Goldfields experienced opposition ~~to~~ from the workers as the contract rules against: "gathering together a crowd that poses a threat to peace and order". This The point made here is strong as it enforces a claim that the managers were used to or were actively experiencing

opposition. Although there was a sense of prolonged discontent from the workers this is namely illustrated through the 1912 protest where 3,000 unarmed protestors struck and marched in the Lena Goldfields which evidently disrupted peace and order. The gathering of this many people illustrates how the workers felt their treatment was unfair. Source 3 is from the work contract signed by the miners who worked at the Lena Goldfields which adds weight to the value of the source as evidently the Lenzoloto Mining Company who controlled the Lena Goldfields workers would be aware of any miners potential disruption and wish to eradicate the possibility of it. Yet, the source is slightly limited in being written by the company, it may not wish to present a true extent of unfair treatment towards the workers as it is written from a position of power and authority.

Yet, source 4 does agree that the treatment of the Lena Goldfields workers was unfair which led to opposition. Source

4 suggests that the workers felt ~~unjustly~~ that the Lena Goldfields was an unjust environment meaning they wanted change, ~~and~~ reform and support: "all food should be handed out in the presence of a worker representative". This claim suggests the author's point to be strong as it calls on the workers feeling a need to be represented and protected to prevent unjust treatment, for example in food quality. ~~The fact that~~ The fact that workers may have felt unjustly treated and wanting support is evidenced through the protest ~~in~~ in 1912 yet the injustice is highlighted by the massacre that ~~comments: 90 soldiers fired~~ commenced where 90 soldiers fired and killed ~~100~~ 100 leaving 200 wounded. This supports and enforces the tone conveyed in source 4 of fear of the unjust treatment upon workers as their opposition resulted in violence. Source 4 is a document written by the miners called 'Our Demands' which could add weight to the source as it is written with the purpose of conveying any issues felt in regards to how the workforce of Lena Goldfields was being

treated. Yet, the tone of being filled 'Our Demands' and the tone in commands such as "managers must address workers politely" could limit the value of the source as it could be argued that the miners were exaggerating as they aimed to improve conditions. However, Sources 3 and 4 remain valuable for the investigation as they both present strong points of agreement that the workers of Lena Goldfields felt they received unfair treatment and thus opposed it.

Overall, Sources 3 and 4 are useful for investigating the way the workforce was treated at the Lena Goldfields in 1912 as they both agree that the workers were placed under high demands and that the workers felt treatment was unfair, therefore opposed it. Crucially, Sources 3 and 4 approach this investigation from opposing viewpoints, one being the powerful authority of ~~those~~ the company who controlled the miners (the Lenzeloto Mining Company) and the other being

those employed by them, the miners themselves. Therefore, this adds weight to the points which they agree upon increasing the usefulness of the sources.



This response includes L5 qualities. The candidate interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways in which the sources can be used. The response uses both sources together, assessing a range of themes to investigate the treatment of workers at the Lena goldfields: working days, demand, and worker's perception of treatment. There is some slight confusion around whether Source 3 was pre-emptive or responding to provocation, but otherwise the material here is secure. The candidate deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate what can be gained from the contents of the sources, displaying secure understanding of the need to evaluate source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. There is discussion of working conditions that goes beyond the sources, including the famous servings of horse meat and some information on the Lena goldfields massacre. Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. The candidate demonstrates that both sources suggest that high demands were placed on labourers, though this is subjective. Evaluation takes into account the weight of the evidence, the candidate recognises how the perspectives of management and workers differ through the documents. Candidates may find the provenance of the contract, Source 3, a little more difficult to deal with and that is the case here. But they do deal with the source provenance and contrast it with Source 4 to demonstrate how the extracts can be used as a set.



Candidates are encouraged to move beyond surface-level evaluation by linking provenance directly to the enquiry. To access higher levels, they should consider how and why the origin, purpose and audience of a source might shape our interpretation of it, rather than simply stating these features.

## Question 3

This was the more popular essay question for 2C.1. Most candidates engaged well with the demands of the question and demonstrated sound understanding of causation. Responses typically examined how the failings of both Louis XVI and his ministers were the main reason for the onset of the French Revolution in 1789, with stronger answers making clear distinctions between the roles of the king and ministers such as Necker, Calonne and Brienne. These responses evaluated the significance of their actions within the unfolding crisis of the 1780s, particularly in relation to fiscal breakdown and political mismanagement.

Many candidates drew on a wide range of supporting factual detail. Most were able to consider additional causes of the revolution, including Enlightenment ideas, the impact of war debt, and public unrest, though breadth sometimes came at the expense of depth. The Enlightenment was often mentioned, but only some responses developed its influence on revolutionary activity with precision.

Judgements were generally well supported, though in some cases the lack of clearly established criteria made conclusions less convincing. Better responses explained why the stated factor was most or least significant, often framing this in terms of government credibility, public trust, or the inability to enact reform. A common pitfall was to treat ministers' failings as interchangeable with Louis's, or to focus on one at the expense of the other.

Some responses included Turgot, but his relevance was limited due to the set timeframe. Consideration of Turgot was only effective when used briefly to contextualise later attempts at reform. A few candidates drifted into narrative, but most answers showed a secure grasp of the topic and were generally well-organised and coherent.

## Question 4

Although this was a less popular choice, it encouraged a number of strong responses. Candidates recognised the dual focus on both financial and political aspects of the Directory, and most structured their responses accordingly.

Many responses demonstrated secure knowledge of the Directory's successes and failures from 1795 to 1799. Most established clear criteria for success and failure, often in the introduction, which helped sustain a focused and evaluative approach throughout. Judgements were usually well supported, and second-order thinking was evident in the way candidates analysed the relationship between political and financial factors.

Some responses strayed slightly from the precise focus of the question, veering into a broader assessment of how far the Directory was a success. However, this did not significantly undermine the analysis in most cases. The strongest answers made effective use of specific knowledge, showed clear awareness of the complexities of the Directory's position in a period of instability, and avoided generalisations.

Fewer responses focused on either the political or financial dimension to the detriment of the other. Some argued one-sidedly, emphasising either the Directory's political or financial successes or failures without offering a counterbalance, which limited the extent to which their judgements were substantiated.

In the years ~~1795~~ 1795 - ~~to~~ 1799 the Directory attempted to (at least at the start) establish a stable, <sup>or Jacobin</sup> democratic government that did not fall into the domination from the radical left or radical right. ~~It was successful~~ It was successful in some regards during its period of rule, as it did prevent royalist <sup>or Jacobin</sup> uprising. ~~This essay will~~ However, the question ~~remains~~ remains as to whether the political and financial successes of the Directory ~~are~~ outweigh the its failures. This essay ~~will~~ analyse this claim by discussing: the <sup>political</sup> success of the Directory from preventing a radical dominance. The failure of the Directory to solve financial problems and finally, the Director's failure to provide a ~~more stable~~ stable, democratic government. ~~It will then~~ ~~discuss~~ ~~the criteria for whether~~ the overall, the successes did not outweigh the failures, as from the very start the 1795 constitution limited the Director's effectiveness by ~~not~~ ~~allowing~~ by not allowing it to make financial reforms and ~~at~~ limiting its stability in an attempt to prevent dominance.

The Dir

The Directory was ~~success~~ for largely successful in ~~to~~ preventing a one political group from ~~dominating~~ dominating the government and a dictatorship occurring as seen during the Terror. The 1795 constitution was specifically set up for this. It established a five man Directory, who would serve for 5 five years, with one being <sup>changed</sup> appointed every year. ~~in order to~~ This was successful in ~~the~~ preventing anyone from ~~to~~ becoming too politically dominant such as Robespierre had. ~~then~~ The Directors were responsible for foreign affairs and finances and passed and vetoed laws presented by Councils of 500 and Council of Ancients. These were also successfully set up to prevent dominance, ~~and in a Jacobin or~~ ~~it~~ with this a third of the deputies being switched every year. This did mean that no political significant ~~of~~ political force emerged in the beginnings of the Directory. ~~then~~ <sup>the system</sup> However, while the Directory was successful in its political aim of ~~creating~~ creating a government in which no ~~dict~~ dictator could emerge or any ~~governing~~ governing body become overly dominant, this created an unstable, ineffective

government. This is ~~because~~ because with  $\frac{1}{3}$  of its Council members being changed each year, it meant no meaningful legislation could be passed or any significant ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~directors~~ <sup>directors</sup> emerge. The 1795 Constitution constrained the ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~Directors~~ <sup>Directors</sup> effectiveness as ~~by~~ in an attempt to prevent radical dominance (which it was successful in) it couldn't pass meaningful actions or ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~laws~~ <sup>laws</sup>. Further, the way in which the 3 bodies interact further limited its success at political and financial success. The ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~Director~~ <sup>Director</sup> was in charge of the Directory was supposed to pass financial changes but it had no part in creating ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> with ~~so~~ <sup>so</sup> ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> this is after as the Council <sup>because</sup> ~~so~~ created the laws. Therefore, ~~this meant~~ the 1795 Constitution ~~or~~ was so focused on succeeding in preventing radical domination they created an ineffective form of government. ~~In addition to this,~~ A large reason as to why domination didn't occur is from the Law of 2/3 which stated that all members of the Councils and Directory had to have ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> served on the Convention (eliminating 3 royalists). This was successful and ~~was~~ there was no meaningful royalist threat other than the ~~Conventions~~ <sup>Conventions</sup> in Brissot's in 1795/6.

yet Jacobinism began to re-emerge in 1798.  
 Therefore, overall, while the Directory was  
 successful in ~~also~~ <sup>estab</sup> creating a government  
 that did not fall into radical domination, <sup>this does</sup>  
 not outweigh the failure as it did <sup>this</sup> by creating an ineffective  
 government that fell in 1799 with little  
 protest ~~due to its~~ <sup>due to its</sup> ~~own~~ <sup>own</sup> ineffectiveness. Because  
 of this.

The financial successes of the Directory do not outweigh the financial failures. A key factor leading to the downfall of the Directory and for a large amount of ~~cost~~ investment was because of the dire financial situation that the Directory faced. While it did inherit a failing system, it only had one success financially ~~or~~ (yet even that is controversial.) The only success of the Directory financially was the re-introduction of individual taxes. These are taxes on the purchase/possession / purchase of certain items. The ~~first~~ Directory ~~to~~ introduced taxes on ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~chi~~. These as a way of solving their shortfall, and they did succeed in making money. ~~It~~ This included poll taxes and chimney taxes. They even tried to pass the

imposed a gabelle (salt tax) but was blocked by the Council of Ancients. This was only partially successful as it was hated by many, and the Directory faced the accusation of trying to return to the ancien regime. Therefore, the Directory only partially had one partially successful financial reform. They ~~also~~ <sup>scrapped</sup> the assignat (which had lost 96% of its value) in 1796. They created a paper currency called the mandate, but this was based on the value of the assignat so its value also crashed. Within the period of the Directory, the poor got much poorer and people could not afford to eat. The Vendémiaire uprising in which 25000 gathered to overthrow the convention was largely financially fueled by the economic situation. The fact that it took place in the Section Lepelletier which was where many bankers and merchants lived supports this. Therefore, alongside essentially robbing their creditors the of money with the sale of emigres and the financial successes of the Directory do not outweigh its failures. The 1795 Constructed Action they could take as

previously discussed and was a primary reason for unrest in Paris and why no-one protested the Coup of Brumaire.

Lastly, the Directory failed to provide a government that could & keep its power democratically and so which is its ultimate political failure. The Directory when created was ~~sup.~~ thought to be incredibly democratic with 3 bodies frequently being elected new members. However, by 1799 it was relying on the military and an unconstitutional ~~actions~~ to keep its power. It had no political success in this regard. For example, in the Coup 1798 the Jacobins made large gains in the elections winning 83 / 433 seats. This worried the Directory leading them to annul the elections in 53 departments and filling them with their own choices and 133 Councillors lost their seats. This is highly unconstitutional and makes a mockery of the democracy it promised. Further, in the Coup of Fructidor and the terror that ensued its failure to provide a fair democracy.

made clear. It firstly used the military ~~order~~ general to surround the Council and arrest my father royalist or members. In the terror that ensued the they blamed the clergy with 10,000 being arrested and in Nov 400 churches closing. The fact that only 250 were actually punished (sent to Guyana) shows a major political failure and misjudging of the mood in France. Overall, the Directory had no political success in establishing a democratic government as and soon began to rely on the military for rule.

In conclusion it is clear that the Directory's financial and political successes don't outweigh its failures. If it failed in all regards to provide a politically stable and democratic system of government and only exacerbated existing financial problems. Sieyès was wise to judge that the Directory would soon collapse, and the people of France supported the <sup>Constitution</sup> that was created in the center 1799.



This is a well-developed response with Level 5 qualities. It clearly weighs the political and financial successes and failures of the Directory. There is initial consideration of political success, followed by a very strong section that explores limited financial success in the context of overall failure, and a further section that examines political limitations. The depth of knowledge is substantial and supports the overall judgement effectively.



In questions where candidates are asked to weigh the relative successes and failures of policies in a historical context, it is important that they consider both sides of the argument. Discussions that merely argue for either success or failure are unlikely to reach the top levels of the mark scheme.

## Question 5

This was the slightly less popular question on 2C.2, but those who attempted it often showed a good understanding of both revolutions. Most candidates recognised the comparative focus and structured their responses around factors such as cause, course, and consequence. While knowledge was generally secure, coverage could sometimes be unbalanced, with more detailed treatment of either 1905 or 1917. In a few instances, candidates compared 1905 with the October Revolution, rather than February.

Many candidates were able to identify relevant points of comparison, particularly the impact of war as a catalyst. However, some answers would have benefited from more clearly defined criteria for evaluating whether similarities or differences carried greater weight. There were instances where judgements were asserted rather than developed through analysis. A small number of responses included excellent detail but lacked an explicit comparative framework, which limited the credit that could be awarded.

Some responses tended towards descriptive or narrative writing, particularly when outlining causes. Where analysis was stronger, candidates successfully explored both revolutions as responses to military defeat, and contrasted the outcomes—recognising, for instance, that 1905 resulted in limited change, while 1917 marked a profound shift. More developed answers also explored differences in leadership, organisation, and popular support, and considered the role of political repression and reform across the period.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☐

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☐

It is entirely accurate to argue that the differences between the revolutions of 1905 and February 1917 outweigh their similarities. This can be argued as while the causes and nature of both revolutions have distinct parallels, the revolution of 1905 ~~led to~~ failed, thus the consequences were the ~~restoration~~ continued presence of autocratic power whilst the Revolution of February 1917 led to an unprecedented dual-power government after over 300 years of Romanov <sup>autocratic</sup> rule, and the key pillars of <sup>Russian society</sup> ~~autocracy~~ had been destroyed.

It could be argued that the nature of the causes of 1905 and the February Revolution were similar. This can be argued as both revolutions follow economic hardship and war. This can be

evidenced through the failed harvests of 1903 and 1904 leading to economic hardship amongst the peasantry and strikes within the workers with 800 strikes between 1901 and 1902. Additionally the failure of the Russo Japanese War fuelled the fire which was the growing discontent in 1905. Similar motives can be found in February 1917 following economic ~~prices~~ motives caused by world war 1. Economic motivations can be evidenced by the real wages of workers being cut in half in 1916 and the price of flour increasing by 600% from 1914 to 1917. Thus it can be argued that both the causes of 1905 and 1917 were similar. However the fundamental intention behind the causes of 1905 and 1917 were distinctively different. In the Bloody Sunday march in January 1905, Father Gapon and his 150,000 protestors only wanted to express their discontent with the current circumstance, there was little talk about the overthrowal of the Tsar previously and many people such as the middle class gave the Tsar's support.

Whereas in February 1917, there had been previous talks on the Tsar's abdication by extremists in the Progressive Bloc and a distinct distaste for the Tsar and his actions as ~~the~~ Commander in Chief of the army <sup>in September</sup> after 1915. Thus while ~~so~~ it could be argued the circumstance around the causes of both revolutions ~~were~~ were similar. It has to be noted that the intention behind the causes of the revolution were fundamentally different. In that 1905 was ~~not~~ aiming to reason with Nicholas II, whilst February 1917 was aiming to remove him.

Additionally, it may be argued the nature of the process of each revolution had similarities. 1905 had the large scale protest of 'Bloody Sunday' and was followed by 400,000 protesters in Feb 1905. 1917 had the protest on International Women's day followed by 200,000 protesters in the days that followed in February. Both revolutions can therefore be described as 'popular revolutions' from below. It must be ~~noted~~ considered that both revolutions were not triggered by political motivations but were 'from below'. Ordinary people initiated

discontent. However the process of both revolutions were extremely different. It could be is convincing to argue that the attempted revolution of 1905 was more like a series of uncoordinated displays of discontent, for example the peasants and workers ~~was~~ unsatisfied with the economy whilst intelligentsia and middle class were dissatisfied with the nature of government. 1905 was different to 1917 ~~but~~ in the way that 1905 was uncoordinated and from below, whereas 1917 February 1917 worked just to politicise the revolution by establishing the Provisional government and Petrograd Soviet only 2 days after the International Women's day march. Additionally all those including army generals were certain on the abdication of ~~Nicholas~~ Nicholas II, all of the country had a united front against the Tsar, ~~who~~ whether that be discontent over the Tsar's commander in chief position, the actions of the Tsarina or the limited autocratic government. Thus whilst both revolutions were ignited from below and ~~showed~~ displayed popular

discontent. They differed in the sense of organisation and politicisation. Additionally, in 1917 the country was united against Nicholas II whereas in 1905, the discontent had different motivations and points of expressing itself with peasant opposition in mostly in the summer and workers and middle class of opposition being in the autumn following the failure of the August manifesto. Thus the differences of the revolutions must outweigh the similarities in terms of the process of each revolution. Lastly it must be argued that the consequences and results of the revolutions were completely different in nature. In 1905 compared to 1917. In 1905 the army remained loyal to the Tsar with 100,000 <sup>soldiers</sup> returning from Russia in November to help Nicholas II restore power. Thus the autocratic nature of government remained, while there were limited concessions such as the Dumas, they were quickly undermined by actions such as the reissuing of the Fundamental laws in April 1906 and Article 4, emphasising the continued autocratic nature of Russia. Fundamental values of Russia

stayed in fact following 1905 like autocracy, nationality and orthodoxy. Whereas in 1917 autocracy was formally ended. The results of the February 1917 Revolution saw an unprecedented dual-power government and the official removal of autocracy after Nicholas II's abdication on the 2nd March 1917. Additionally the army didn't remain loyal, the Cossacks refused to put down the protests during International Women's Day and Army Generals convinced Nicholas II to abdicate. Thus the consequences and nature of Russia had seen fundamental <sup>changes</sup> ~~differences~~ following February 1917 whereas remained relatively unchanged following 1905 ~~then~~. Whilst it could be argued Orthodoxy remained following both revolutions, it can be quickly refuted that following 1917 after the removal of the autocrat, the need for Orthodoxy as a vessel of control was essentially removed, therefore the differences of 1905 and <sup>February</sup> 1917 continue to outweigh the similarities.

On balance, whilst it can be argued

some aspects of the 1905 and 1917 Revolution were similar such as the causes and partially the nature of the process of each revolution. ~~It says~~ ~~any~~ ~~to~~ It is most convincing to argue the differences outweighed the similarities because ~~the~~ despite superficial, surface level similarities, the core, fundamental values of Russia had been completely changed and Russia saw an unprecedented dual-power government after 1917. Additionally 1905 demonstrated a failed revolution, whilst 1917 succeeded in ~~it forcibly~~ removing one system of government and replacing it with a new one. Therefore the differences undoubtedly outweigh the similarities of the two Revolutions.



This is a Level 5 response that considers the differences and similarities between the Revolutions of 1905 and February 1917 in Russia through a number of themes. The themes explored are cause, process, and consequences, with the latter proving most decisive in the overall judgement. The response offers a coherent argument to support the idea that the differences between the revolutions outweighed their similarities, particularly due to the outcomes and changes to governmental structures.



When asked to compare events such as revolutions, it is advisable for candidates to take a thematic approach that allows for direct comparison. While there are various valid ways to approach these questions—all of which will gain credit on their merits—responses that examine one event in isolation are less likely to achieve the level of analytical comparison required for the highest levels of the mark scheme.

## Question 6

This was the most popular question on 2C.2. Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the years 1917–24 and could engage with the stated factor—Lenin’s actions and attitudes—as well as other relevant factors contributing to the survival of the Bolshevik regime. Many were able to construct a clear line of argument, often supported by a thesis and conclusion, with high-level responses offering well-substantiated, evaluative judgements.

Many candidates showed a good grasp of the Civil War period and were able to analyse the impact of Lenin’s leadership in shaping and maintaining Bolshevik control. However, some responses relied on pre-prepared material focused on Bolshevik victory in the Civil War, which led to partial relevance. Others interpreted “regime” as “party” and included pre-October material such as the April Theses or the Kornilov Affair. This was only relevant in as far as the material was used to support arguments around the longer-term survival of the Bolshevik regime. The dual focus on *attitudes* and *actions* was occasionally narrowed to just one element—typically actions. These responses could still achieve depending on the security of their supporting arguments.

Although the breadth of the date range (1917–24) was not always fully covered, candidates often engaged with significant developments such as the use of terror, War Communism, the NEP, and opposition from within the Party. Some strong responses also considered whether Lenin’s approach generated further opposition even while consolidating power. There was also a noticeable number of answers referencing geography or the role of Trotsky which, while valid to a degree, could lead to tangents if not firmly linked to Lenin’s leadership. The role of the Cheka was used both to support Lenin’s actions and attitudes as the reason for the survival of the Bolshevik regime and to argue otherwise.

Many candidates produced thoughtful, analytical responses with varying degrees of precision, taking up the challenge posed by the question. There were very few responses that offered narratives on Lenin without reaching the years 1917–24. As ever, candidates should pay careful attention to the date ranges in questions.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

- plan - actions + attitudes - <sup>action</sup> came to power following the Oct revolution. - Decree on Land.
- the peace decree - <sup>appeasement</sup>
  - ~~the role of the ~~proletariat~~ in the third decree and the~~ <sup>the role of the Politburo + the union of</sup>
  - Brest Litovsk - 700+ happened in May - disagreement + pragmatism. but undignified
  - no - Repression - also had a role. <sup>the role of the 1000000</sup>
  - no economic - however had control <sup>748</sup>
  - <sup>utshof</sup> <sup>minimum</sup> <sup>square</sup> <sup>74000 of the</sup>
  - no - the civil war + alternate white etc. <sup>100000 of the</sup>

- essay -

After the Bolshevik insurrection between the 24th to the 26th of October 1917, Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks as a collective undertook a range of steps in order to successfully consolidate, and ensure the survival of the Bolshevik regime from 1917-24. Lenin's actions can be seen

as essential, as they implemented practical responses to divide opposition, appease the masses and direct all policy in the Politburo, reflective of his pragmatic approach and attitudes. However, the role of the civil war and the failure of the Whites, the economic policies of Russia and the use of repression are also important reasons for the survival of the Bolshevik regime. Overall, it seems that it was Lenin's pragmatism which was responsible for the survival of the Bolsheviks because of his economic and political actions which ensured eventual stability.

Finally, it can be argued that Lenin's actions and attitudes were responsible for the survival of the Bolshevik regime 1917-1924. Lenin was an extremely pragmatic character, who effectively balanced ideological intentions with practicality and flexibility. This manifested through a series of decrees which immediately sought to consolidate and establish Bolshevik authority. The Decree on Land which was passed by Lenin was a direct application of his ongoing pledge to ensure "Peace, Bread and Land". Utilising the peasants' ultimate goal as a means of political control, Lenin sought to pragmatically ~~end~~ address land hunger, whilst justifying his ideological

goal which was to end private property. Furthermore, Lenin enacted the decree on Nationalities, effectively appealing ~~to~~ those who sought independent government, such as Finland and Poland. Arguably, most important, Lenin enacted the Peace Decree, and using his effective leadership skills and commitment, convinced his party to sacrifice 1 million square km of land, including ~~the~~ 24% of arable land, and 9,000 industrial centres to ensure peace at Brest Litovsk. Although ~~this~~ this was negotiated by Trotsky, it was Lenin who effectively convinced ~~his~~ his party to accept the terms, and ~~in~~ achieved a 748 majority, with the Left SRs who opposed and were ~~out~~ out of the ~~new~~ Soviet, <sup>being</sup> expelled, dividing the opposition due to the collapse of the Western Front for Germans. This illustrates how Lenin was able to effectively use methods of persuasion to divide his opponents, whilst also ~~the~~ ensuring his own position is stable. Lenin's pragmatism is also evident through his manipulation of the Constituent Assembly ~~in~~ and the ~~fact~~ SRs were successful, and ~~his~~ ~~as~~ ~~the~~ the Bolshevik economic policy. Therefore, it seems reasonable to consider Lenin responsible, because with every union after 1917, Lenin

held authority as the ~~leader~~ head of the executive, or Politburo, and his pragmatic approach was thus applied.

However, the economic policies were another important reason for the survival of the Bolshevik regime between 1917 and 1924. Despite the devastating famine of ~~2020~~ 1920-21, in which an estimated 1 million to 10 million people died due to the decrease in the millions of tons of grain produced, from ~~4 billion~~ ~~in 1913~~ 80 million in 1913, to 46 million in ~~1920~~, due to a range of detrimental factors, the economic policies were in many ways pragmatic and pragmatic as they sacrificed ideological ideals for political ends. For instance, state capitalism, ~~a~~ sought to address the dire economic system which the Bolsheviks had inherited, as the wage of a Russian was on average, 29% of a British person's wage in ~~the~~ 1913. ~~The~~ State capitalism, created a veneer to ~~the~~ address the economy, and ~~a~~ allowed the continuation of petty trade, capitalist engagements, ~~start~~ to act as a transitional stage. However, this pragmatic approach was also evident in War Communism, in which the principle goal was to ensure

that the Red Army were fed, and most armaments were sent. As a result, the Bolshevik introduced labour armies, and Trotsky's 'militarisation of labour' was evident through a decree on the 14th of April in which no man could leave his job. Therefore, they sought to ensure the survival of the regime through debt winning the civil war. Furthermore, forced grain requisitioning was enacted in to ensure the army was fed, and repression was sent out to remove any political responses to the devastation. Finally, the New Economic Policy most clearly ensured the survival of the regime, and illustrated the economic pragmatism of the Bolsheviks as they reinstated private trade, stopped taking grain from peasants to distribute trade, and the peasants, due to the rising prices of industrial goods, increased their efficiency to sell. This most clearly illustrates their pragmatism as the NEP, which many would call capitalist, and others called it the New Exploitation of the Proletariat, and factors like the Democratic Societies, and the works of profit were left. Yet, they continued to survive socialist principles because of its economic efficiency. The NEP meant that wages increased by

50 % from 1921 and that ~~the~~ small industrial output increased by 200%. However, this is really a manifestation of Lenin's attitudes and actions, as his role, as the head of the executive, meant that economic policy was ~~not~~ largely in his control, and Lenin's Ban on Factions, ~~and~~ after the NEP purged the party from 750,000 to 500,000, showing Lenin's ruthlessness, although extreme attitudes. Therefore, Lenin's actions and attitudes are still the most important reason for the survival of the regime 1917-24.

Despite this, the Civil War was also a major reason for the survival of the Bolshevik regime between 1917 and 1924. The Civil War, and with that, the role of Trotsky and the weaknesses of the White forces was also responsible for the survival of the regime. The Civil War, between 1918 and 1921, ~~was not the~~ was ~~a~~ largely a result of opposition to the needs of Britain and France. However, the weaknesses of the Whites <sup>partly</sup> led to the survival of the regime. The Whites were geographically disorganised, with their bases being predominantly around the edge of the Bolshevik ground, and they attracted a much smaller population to use as conscripts.

71 million for the Red Army, compared to 21 million. Furthermore, the White Army were highly divided as they had no clear political goal and were a toxic mixture of anti-semitism and monarchism. This led to less enthusiasm than Trotsky's forces, who were sought to be well socialised as a motivating effect. Additionally, the White Army depended on foreign aid and intervention, which was not only politically a disadvantage, because it only consisted of 200,000 by the end of 1918, but was also a requirement to manipulate the masses by the Reds. The Reds used this fact as a way to shape the White Army as capitalist enemies, on the side of foreign enemies. However, this again shows Lenin's army as responsible for the survival of the regime. Although, it was not only Lenin responsible, but also Trotsky, who was able to get the army to improve his troops, whilst ensuring unique discipline, and utilising old Tsarist officers. This led to a smaller strong army, which was organised and effective, contrary to the disorganised and disorganised Whites, who were shown to be so when Denikin was meant to support Kolchak.

trials in the East in 1918, yet U-nned,  
showing an ineffectual response, which allowed  
for Bolshevik success, and using ~~the~~<sup>the</sup> Red  
Army and Cheka violence, who killed 140,000  
during the war.

Overall, it seems reasonable to consider Lenin's  
attitudes and actions responsible for the survival  
of the Bolshevik regime between 1917-24.  
Despite the one factor being highly significant  
such as the role of Trotsky, the civil war,  
repression and economic policies, Lenin's  
pragmatic and efficient approach is evident  
throughout the period and in each factor.  
Lenin was responsible for the survival of  
ideology for the survival of the regime, the  
centralisation of power through the Council  
People and the manipulation and  
appeasement of the masses, which allowed  
and to create, although tyrannical Bolshevik  
regime in 1924.



This response includes Level 5 qualities. It maintains a clear focus on the role played by Lenin's actions and attitudes in ensuring the survival of the Bolshevik regime in the years 1917–24. The candidate considers economic policy in the counter argument but successfully links this back to Lenin's actions and attitudes through a discussion of the New Economic Policy, using it to support arguments about Lenin's pragmatism. The Civil War is also considered as a separate reason for the survival of the Bolshevik regime, but again is effectively connected back to Lenin's actions.



Rather than simply restating the question after thematic analysis, candidates are encouraged to demonstrate how themes are interconnected, particularly in relation to the given factor in the question.

# 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 discussing the sources in general terms
- Responses should go beyond comprehension and summary by developing reasoned inferences that are fully explored
- 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 narratives about linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure they respond to the demands of all three bullet points assessed in this section of the paper.

## Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses often lacked depth and sometimes range
- Narrative or descriptive approaches should be avoided, as these undermine the analytical focus required for the higher levels
- Candidates should be aware of key dates identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Where appropriate, candidates should explore links between issues rather than presenting a list of discrete factors
- Where questions require it, candidates should ensure they address both sides of an argument.

## 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>

