



Pearson

INTERNATIONAL ADVANCED LEVEL HISTORY

Unit 1 WHI01

Depth Study with Interpretations

Exemplars with examiner commentaries

Introduction

WHI01 Depth Study with Interpretations

The exemplification that follows is designed to show the key features of the generic mark schemes and what distinguishes the qualities of one level from another. These examples are from different options. Additionally, the Paper-specific [principal examiner reports](#) contain more examples.

Unit 1, WHI01, assesses both AO1 (20 marks) and AO3 (5 marks).

The level of response mark schemes identify progression in three separate elements or traits:
Strand 1 - analysis and exploration of key issues raised by the view presented in the question
Strand 2 - selection and deployment of knowledge
Strand 3 - substantiated evaluation and judgement.

The first three responses show progression from Level 3 to the top of Level 4 in answering the same **WHI01 option 1A question**.

Q2. Historians have different explanations for France becoming a Republic in 1792. 'The impact of the King's flight to Varennes was the main reason why France became a Republic in 1792.'
Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

In addressing this question, the Level 3 response demonstrates an understanding of the demands of the question but does not clearly address the given factor. The mid-high Level 4 response clearly demonstrates an understanding of the demands of the question and addresses the viewpoint with regard to the main reason. The high Level 4 response directly addresses the demands of the question and the relative importance of the main reason ('given factor') suggested in the statement.

Option 1a Question 2

Q2 - Historians have different explanations for France becoming a Republic in 1792. 'The impact of the King's flight to Varennes was the main reason why France became a Republic in 1792.' Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

Example Level 3 response

This page is for your second answer) The statement that the main reason for France becoming a republic was the King's flight to Varennes is controversial. I partially disagree with the statement, since there were many other factors contributing to the dismantling of the Ancien Regime and adopting the structure of a Republic, like religious divisions, overall radicalization and the ongoing participation in the War with Austria.

Firstly, one of the bigger reasons to becoming a republic in 1792, was the King's own actions and behaviour. One of the first mistakes made was the pretence carried out by the royalty, ~~to~~ ⁱⁿ acceptance of the new constitution and the constitutional monarchy. Once Louis XVI claimed to have accepted the new constitution, he made a huge mistake of calling a banquet

This page is for your second answer)

for the aristocracy and ridiculing the ideas and demands of the revolution by disrespecting the tricolor flag. When his actions spread to the public and then backfired, since the Women's March and most Parisians forcefully dragged him and Marie Antoinette to Paris, he was forced to be subject to the new law and during the October Days Ancien Regime was fully dismantled and Louis was no longer in control or trusted by the French. Moreover, his decision to flee to Varennes was the pivotal mistake he had made and a vital point in the journey to a Republic for France. Before the flight Louis XVI had left a letter stating his true opinions on the revolution. This was what had caused the major discontent and caused the French to accuse Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette of treason. When he was brought back to Versailles, Louis' actions caused the French public to demand for ~~the~~ ~~the~~ a trial and

an execution as of a traitor.

However, this was not the only reason, since the armoire de Ferme affair had been revealed and Marie-Antoinette's letters to her Austrian Emperor brother and the royal alliance have been revealed. Louis XVI's desperate had lead to their ~~secret~~ secret alliance with Austria - he had believed that if the Austrians took over France, they would be able to restore him and royalty back to power. However, not only did this not happen, but allowed people proof to King's treason and accelerated the fight for a Republic, since the demand for the execution of the royal family rapidly increased.

Furthermore, the division within the church also sped up the gaining of a Republic. As the clergy was divided into juring and non-juring priests,

Due to the controversy with the Oath of Loyalty to the new government, Louis XVI and most people were in a religious division. Not only did this cause violence, controversy, unrest and unstable status, it also indirectly affected the political clubs of France. Religion possessed large power over the population of France, therefore its reforms were not welcomed or approved of, even by Louis himself.

Next, one of the more prominent reasons for the ~~radicalization~~ obtaining of a status of a Republic for France was the radicalization of political clubs, what Marxist historians believe to be the most important reason, due to the working masses being the driving force in their opinion. The radicalization of political clubs of France and mostly Jacobins and Cordeliers was what ~~had~~ had ultimately finalized France.

as a Republic in 1792. Jacobins had widespread effect on the masses due to their popular beliefs. Though they quickly radicalised and mobilised themselves to urge for the execution of the Royal family and an adopting of the Republic their thought Cordeliers could be seen as more moderate during the execution attempting to save Louis' life. They still were in favour of a Republic, which was the main factor of importance.

Finally, the war and fear of treason psychologically played a big part in the population's paranoia and urge to be "freed" and reformed. In the short term the war did have the effects of losses, worsening living standards and more debt, however in the long term it was even more traumatic. It was used by numerous potential governments throughout to manipulate people's

support, and also manifested the fear of treason due to émigrés who were simply higher class citizens running away from the war. People like Lafayette, as respected and praised war general deserting to the Austrian side and Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette themselves, this helped the new government manoeuvre their way to power, arguing the incompetence of the regime and ~~the~~ its leaders.

To conclude, I believe that Louis XVI's actions overall were the most important reason for the rapid gain of a Republic in 1792, since it ultimately caused all other reasons like fear of treason and radicalisation of the political clubs. However, aligning with a post revisionist and the contemporary view all factors were important in the transfer to a Republic in 1792.

Examiner commentary

The view in the statement is addressed in the opening paragraph. A statement with regard to the 'given factor' is made and other factors identified but not developed. The response then addresses a key issue suggested as 'one of the bigger reasons' for France becoming a republic – the King's own actions and behaviour.

The response does attempt to analyse the impact of these actions in relation to the desire of the people to get rid of the King, which would then lead to the creation of a republic. The 'impact of the flight to Varennes' is addressed in this paragraph but as one of several actions taken by the King rather than main reason as identified in the question. Although this is a valid line of argument, the way in which this is organised makes it difficult for the candidate to come to a judgement about the viewpoint in the question statement.

This is followed by a brief discussion of the role of religious reform which, although relevant, is limited in development with regard to the creation of a republic. The response then addresses the radicalisation of politics during this period and its relationship to the creation of a republic. The supporting material acknowledges the focus of the question as a matter of interpretation and continues an implied criterion for judgement from the previous paragraphs based on the extent of popular support for getting rid of the monarchy.

A final factor – the war and the environment of fear created by it – is then discussed. The supporting material demonstrates some understanding of the issue but is lacking in depth.

The concluding paragraph returns to the factors identified in the opening paragraph. It states that the King's actions were the most important reason and attempts to substantiate this by stating that these actions caused all the other reasons and mentioning some historiographical approaches. It does not show in the conclusion how these factors are linked nor does the main body of the response. There is a sense of attempting to establish importance. The specific given factor is not addressed in the conclusion but has been linked earlier in the response. There is an awareness of the extent to the role of popular support for the monarchy might be a criterion for judgment but it is implied (as it is in the rest of the response).

Strand 1 – Understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by the question is shown by selection and explaining some key points of view that are relevant. (Level 3)

Strand 2 – Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth. (Level 3)

Strand 3 – Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.
(Weak within Level 3)

There are weaknesses within the Level 3 descriptors in Strand 2 and 3 which put this at mid-Level 3.

Q2 - Historians have different explanations for France becoming a Republic in 1792. 'The impact of the King's flight to Varennes was the main reason why France became a Republic in 1792.' Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

example mid-Level 4 response.

- 1) King's Flight to Varennes = royal couple's actions => letters with codes
 ↓
 Champs de Mars -> Martial law
 ↳ violence & afraid & counter revolution
- 2) ^{Pillnitz Dec.} War = large Austrian army = Marie Antoinette = fear = turned violent
 ↳ people were hungry + not satisfied with going to war.
- 3) Constituent Assembly = Civil Constitution of Clergy
 ↓
 those depended on relief.

To begin with, the King's actions and especially the Flight to Varennes was responsible to a large extent for France becoming a republic in 1792. ~~the cause~~ This was because people felt threatened and they blamed the royal couple of not supporting the revolution. This was also partly because of the ~~the~~ threat of war and consequently people were ~~at~~ alert of counter revolution. It could be said that the threat of war was the factor most responsible for France becoming a republic since people felt threatened and this turned them violent, ^{especially the sons-cultures} ~~additionally~~. ~~the~~ Additionally, the constituent assembly's failure ~~to~~ ^{to} solve the problems of the people and ~~bring~~ ^{load problem} the ~~people~~ ^{with} the ~~food~~ was responsible to a certain extent for the fall of constitutional monarchy in 1792.

Firstly, the Flight to Varennes in 1791 was responsible to a large extent for France becoming a republic in 1792. This was because after the attempt to escape, the population could not trust its royal couple anymore and it was apparent to them that King Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette were not supporting the ~~people~~ revolution. There were also letters of Marie-Antoinette with codes and lemon juice. Consequently, this made the people more suspicious and it created unrest since people were afraid of any counter-revolutionary activity. Hence, this fear of people turned people violent and this resulted in a large crowd meeting at the Champs de Mars demanding for King Louis' abdication. The National Guard was needed in order to restore order and also this resulted in a Martial law which suspended the civil liberties of the Parisians. Hence, it was understood that the Flight to Varennes was firstly seen as a betrayal by the French people since they ~~understood~~ understood that the royal couple did not support the revolution. Moreover, it turned the sans-culottes violent since everyone was afraid and alert of any counter-revolutionary activity. Hence, this meant that the more afraid the people were, the more violent they were. Hence, this enabled them to be more radical and stop at nothing. Hence, it could be said that despite the Flight of Varennes having a political impact as well, the most important impact was left on the people who were not fond of their royal couple anymore. Thus it could be said that this event was important to a large extent for the fall of constitutional monarchy in 1792.

Additionally, the War and the Austrian troops could be said to be responsible to a very large extent for France becoming a republic in 1792. This was because once more the people felt threatened and intimidated. It is known that the revolution had to fight for its survival and having to deal with external threats made the people coartices and it caused a lot of unrest. ~~The Austrian Army~~ Adding to that, the Austrian Army was huge and - this was the reason consequently, the population felt threatened. Both the Flight to Varennes and the Threat of War caused people to be alert of counter revolution and consequently result in the republic. Moreover the Brunswick Manifesto made the people feel even more threatened and that was the reason the Hôtel de Ville (townhall) was stormed. This resulted in the bourgeois deputies to be purged and instead ~~supporters~~ ~~to~~ it was filled with sans-culottes who ended up being more radical and used violence more. Thus, it could be said that ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ people were scared that the revolution would not survive and this is what consequently led to them making radical changes including the one with the Commune which was now more sympathetic to the sans-culottes and more radical. Hence, this influence given to the Sans-Culottes helped a lot to bring about the end of the constitutional monarchy and consequently, ~~to~~ it is understood that the threat of war was responsible to a very large extent for France becoming a republic in 1792 since ~~the~~ the population felt threatened and afraid and thus

turned violent.

Lastly, the Constituent Assembly is also responsible to a certain extent for the fall of constitutional monarchy in 1792. This was because it didn't provide people with what they wished and it did nothing to solve the problem of food and poverty. Hence, since the people had to blame someone for the fact that nothing was changing in the economy and with poverty, they ended up blaming the King and this what brought the fall of constitutional monarchy. To begin with, ~~the~~ all the church land was confiscated and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy ~~made~~ caused the church to be under state control. All these reforms ~~of~~ passed by the Constituent Assembly affected the church negatively. ~~The~~ ~~measures~~ ~~these~~ ~~measures~~ ~~the~~ Also, this meant that the church ~~was~~ ~~unable~~ could not run anymore education and health care. Consequently, the Church relief that people once relied upon did not exist anymore. This resulted in the people who depended on the church to lose that little support they were given. Hence, this meant that the standards of the people were to decrease after the Assembly ~~decide~~ decided to get rid of the church land and bring the church under state control. This caused the people to suffer and to be disatisfied with the Constituent Assembly and this is ~~what~~ ~~consequently~~ why this factor can be said to be responsible to a certain extent for the fall of constitutional monarchy in 1792 since the people were not helped and in the end the blame went to the political system and the monarch.

To conclude ~~as~~ the Flight to Varennes was responsible to a large extent since ~~it~~ after the event the people felt betrayed by the royal couple and their action was seen as counter-revolutionary activity. This caused fear amongst the people ~~and~~ consequently resulted to them being violent and being about the end of constitutional monarchy. However, the ~~the~~ threat of war and the huge Austrian army was the most responsible factor since one more the people felt alert and also the revolution had to fight internal but also external enemies. ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~1792~~ Both events above caused distress and tension amongst the population. Lastly, the Constituent Assembly was ~~a~~ responsible to a certain extent for the fall of constitutional monarchy since it didn't provide enough and people remained unsatisfied. In their attempt to blame someone, the political system and the monarch were ~~1792~~ blamed and hence this made France a republic in 1792.

Examiner commentary

This response includes a brief plan. The time allocated to each response is one hour which should provide sufficient time for candidates to plan a response. A well-produced plan can aid candidates in identifying the conceptual demand of the question and creating a well-structured, organised and coherent response.

Key issues relating to the view presented in the question are addressed and explored from the opening paragraph of the response. The response refers to the given factor – the impact of the King's flight to Varennes – and begins to discuss its importance in relation to two other key issues – the impact of France being at war and failure of the Constituent Assembly to solve the problems of the people. There is a general agreement with the view stated in the question and there is a suggestion that the key issues are inter-linked with each factor seen as being contributory.

This opening section shows an understanding that the question requires a discussion of the reasons why France became a republic (causation) but there is

also a reference to responsibility for the fall of the constitutional monarchy that might suggest a slightly different focus.

The response then addresses the given factor suggesting that the 'flight to Varennes' was responsible to a 'large extent' for France becoming a republic. It is clearly focused on the 'impact' and does not give an unnecessary description of the 'flight to Varennes' itself (as might be seen at low Level 3 or Level 2). It links the impact of the 'flight to Varennes' to the subsequent political situation and social unrest but in terms of the fall of the constitutional monarchy rather than the creation of a republic.

In the following paragraph the war is identified as also being 'responsible to a very large extent' for France becoming a republic. It continues to develop the criteria used in the previous paragraph of the extent to which it posed a threat to the constitution and stirred up the people. The extent of threat to the constitutional monarchy is compared with that of the impact of the 'flight' and developed with reference to radical politics and the creation of a republic. This paragraph is most clearly related to the creation of a republic.

The final issue explored is the Constituent Assembly which is identified as being 'responsible to a certain extent' for the fall of the constitutional monarchy. It provides supporting evidence – mainly connected to church reform - to show the reasons why the people were dissatisfied with the Assembly and consequently blamed the monarch for the situation. Again, the extent to which the people were affected by the actions (criterion) of the Assembly is used to come to the judgement of 'certain extent'.

In the concluding paragraph, the response returns to the three factors identified as making causal contributions to the creation of a republic. The extent to which both the monarchy was undermined and the people were affected are used to established criteria for judgement. The focus is on the fall of the constitutional monarchy rather than the creation of the republic but the two are clearly inter-linked. The relative importance is not clearly established but a hierarchy of importance is made clear and the inter-relationship between the causal factors is established.

Strand 1 – Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and exploring issues of interpretation raised by the claim. (Level 4)

Strand 2 – Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate issues raised by the question and to meet most its demands. (Level 4)

Strand 3 - Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluation may only be partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.

(Weak within Level 4)

Q2 - Historians have different explanations for France becoming a Republic in 1792. 'The impact of the King's flight to Varennes was the main reason why France became a Republic in 1792.' Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

Example top of Level 4 response

(This page is for your second answer) To begin with, it can be agreed that the 'Flight to Varennes' in 1791 was not the main reason why France became a republic in 1792. If it had not been for the war the ^{pull of the} constitutional monarchy would not have taken place since it was the war that proved that ~~the~~ the King's opinion mattered no more. However both the 'Flight to Varennes' and the 'war' increased fear of counter-revolution and therefore paranoia that resulted in the juree of 20 August 1792 ~~that~~ were the sans-culottes demanded a new constitution, leading to the reaction of the National Assembly. If it had not been of the sans-culottes the National Assembly that ~~was~~ recognised France as a Republic in 1792 would not have taken place, there making the sans-culottes the most important reason.

The 'Flight to Varennes' was a result of King Louis' objections to the Civil Constitution of Clergy (created in 1790), and the death of his fellow monarchist Mirabeau. The flight was seen ~~as~~ by the people as an act that proved that King Louis' himself ^{opposed} ~~was~~ ^{therefore} ~~created a lot of~~ the idea of constitutional monarchy, and ^{this he} ~~therefore~~ seen as an enemy of the revolution.

* by the cordeliers

(This page is for your second answer) This resulted in calls for abdication that therefore threatened the existence of constitutional monarchy and foreshadowed the creation of the new republic. To add on this, the cordeliers ~~also~~ advocated the crowds into ~~an~~ ^{The} uprising, and ~~as a result the~~ Flight to Varennes that created fear for counter-revolution resulted in the Champs de Mars in 1791 that ~~became~~ ^{escalated} violent ~~over~~ into violence very quickly. ~~The Flight~~ As a result the Champs de Mars destroyed the reputation of Lafayette - a popular supporter of the constitutional monarchy - which caused people to turn to ^{the} more radical factions that encouraged them eventually to call for the new Republic in 1792. One could argue, that ^{because after the Champs de Mars} the Flight resulted ~~at~~ ^{there were} ~~the~~ restrictions of the press and many radicals such as Marat, Desmoulins and Danton went into hiding, the moderates had in fact won. To add to this even after the Flight to Varennes ^{in the} the Legislative Assembly, ~~and~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ Feuillants won the majority of seats, highlighting that there was still hope for ~~the~~ constitutional monarchy, making the 'Flight to Varennes' not the main reason for France becoming a republic in 1792.

Furthermore, the war was more important than the flight because when the war was declared in 1792 the Legislative Assembly proposed some laws such as the arrest of any remaining refractory priests - that were considered counter-revolutionaries - and the

(This page is for your second answer) creation of the fédérés. King Louis responded by using his royal veto, which increased suspicion of the wing not protecting ~~from~~ the revolution against the refractory priests but also not ^{willing} protecting to protect France by the ~~much~~ external threat. This, in the eyes of the people looked like the King was a counter revolutionary himself, causing opposition against him and constitutional monarchy, leading to the ~~the~~ ^{population's} need of ~~and~~ ^{the} thus the creation of ~~the~~ New Republic in 1792 that would protect ^{them} ~~them~~ ^{revolution against} the enemies. To add insult to injury, ^{the} King's using ~~fe~~ his veto resulted in the ~~same~~ Legislative Assembly going forward with the ~~new~~ creation of the fédérés without the King's approval. By doing this the Legislative Assembly proved that the King's opinion mattered no more, and it is believed that this action marked the end of constitutional monarchy. The war was therefore more important than the Flight to Varennes since it resulted in the declaration of the Republic, since after the Flight to Varennes there was still hope of ~~the~~ survival of the constitutional monarchy, ~~but~~ ^{but} ^{however} after the war there wasn't any hope left.

In addition, it can be agreed that the Sans-culottes were ~~the~~ the most important factor for the creation of the Republic in 1792, since they

(This page is for your second answer) were the ones that asked for the new constitution, ^{which led to the creation of the} ~~the~~ National ~~Assembly~~ ^{Convention} that eventually ~~called~~ for declared France a Republic. The Sans-culottes, driven by the cordeliers, as a result of the Legislative Assembly not agreeing with the calls ~~of~~ ~~for~~ the removal of the king, ~~forced~~ invaded the Tuilleries Palace, killing the Swiss Guard and eventually managing to imprison the king. The Journee of the 10th of August 1792, proved the dissatisfaction of the common people of France as well as the fear after the Brunswick Manifesto in 1792. This is linked to the war since the Brunswick threatened ~~those~~ ~~th~~ anyone that opposed him, his army and king Louis, which ~~caused~~ resulted in fear and anger leading to the journee. Further, the sans-culottes created the new commune, taking more power in their own hands and they ~~we~~ also underestimated the legislative assemblies power by going against them. This led to the creation of the National Convention, since the sans-culottes ~~had~~ asked for it, that ~~sent~~ declared France ~~to~~ a Republic. It can be agreed that if it had not been for the Sans-culottes the journee would not have happened and the Republic would not ~~have~~ been created making the sans-culottes more important than both the flight to Varennes and the War.

Overall, ~~the~~ it can be agreed that the Flight to Varennes was not the ^{main} most important ~~for~~ reason

(This page is for your second answer) for the ~~fall of~~ France declaring the Republic, since even though it increased fear for counter revolution and made ^{damaged the} the King's reputation it had not threatened the constitutional monarchy as the war had done, by causing the Legislative Assembly to take actions ^{against} ~~not taking in~~ the will of the King. However, the most important factor were the sans-culottes. Since without their intervention the Republic in 1792 would not have been formed but ^{instead it} would have taken more years for France to ~~take~~ ^{take} ~~that~~ ^{to act} ~~const~~ actions against the Assembly. ^{Their decision} ~~which~~ eventually led to the ~~acts~~ ^{to act} of creation of the National Convention and therefore ~~the~~ France becoming a Republic, at the right time, ^{before further unrest} ~~the more when it was~~ and fear could occur.

Examiner commentary

Key issues relating to the view presented in the question are identified and directly explored from the opening paragraph of the response. The response refers to the given factor – the impact of the King's flight to Varennes – and begins to discuss its importance in relation to two other key issues – the impact of France being at war and the impact of the actions of the sans-culottes.

Disagreement with the view is asserted but an inter-relationship between the key issues is established and a hierarchy of importance indicated. The response suggests that the most important reason will be that which creates an environment which necessitates the replacement of the constitutional monarchy with a republic. This opening section there is clear understanding that the question requires a discussion of the reasons why France became a republic (causation) and the need to come to a judgement as to the main reason.

The response then addresses the given factor in the view presented. It is clearly focused on the 'impact' and does not give an unnecessary description of the flight to Varennes itself (as might be seen at low Level 3 or Level 2). It provides evidence that, although the 'flight' did question the King's commitment to constitutional monarchy and create fear of counter-revolution, the eventual outcome was that the moderates maintained control and the constitutional monarchy remained (criterion for judgement).

In the following paragraph, another potential cause is introduced – the war. This is not stated as 'another main reason' (as might be seen at lower Level 4 or Level 3) but as being 'more important' – so exploring the relationship between the key issues raised. It is suggested that the direct action of the King in using his royal veto is more inflammatory in causing opposition (criterion for judgement) than the impact of the 'flight to Varennes'. The response indicates this through phrases such as 'To add insult to injury...' and 'proved that the king's opinion mattered no more...'. It also establishes the relative importance of the given factor to the war – the war was 'more important than the flight to Varennes...since after the flight...there was still hope...however, after there wasn't any hope left.'

Having established that war was more important than 'the flight' the response then determines that [the actions and impact of] the sans-culottes was the most important reason. This fourth paragraph argues that it was the physical response of the sans-culottes and their call for a republic – although clearly linked to the war – which led to a republic being established. Sufficient knowledge of the events of 1792 is used in support.

In the conclusion, the view presented is directly addressed in coming to an overall judgement. The key issues identified in the opening paragraph, and which have been explored in the main body of the response, are revisited with their relative importance established. The relative importance is not just stated but substantiated using criteria related to the extent to which the constitutional monarchy was undermined by each factor – e.g. '...even though it increased fear for counter revolution and damaged the reputation it had not threatened constitutional monarchy as the war had done...'.

Strand 1 – Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and explaining issues of interpretation raised by the claim.

Strand 2 – Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate issues raised by the question to meet most of its demands.

Strand 3 – Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluation may only be partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.

Some of the supporting evidence is not always clearly explained and the evaluation might be better substantiated at times but these limitations are clearly built into the Level 4 descriptor, hence the answer demonstrated the qualities needed for the award of full marks.

Option 1B – Question 2

Q2. Historians have different explanations for why there was a revolution in Russia in 1905. 'The impact of Russia's defeat in the Russo-Japanese war was the main reason why there was a revolution in Russia in 1905.'

Example weak Level 3 response

This page is for your first answer) This essay will argue that Russo-Japanese war was an event that made revolutionaries believed it with that revolution will be successful, not that it was the main reason.

There were other factors that sparked the Revolution of 1905, such as: starting with Russo-Japanese war, ^{living conditions} not satisfied peasants and workers which led to a major factor: The Bloody Sunday and finally the Political reforms.

Russia wanted to expand its power to North-Korea and China. However, Japanese swooped in the war and swooped Russians out. They humiliated Russian's on the battlefield. Russia lost 25 warships out of 35. Many ~~soldi~~ families in Russia lost their father, son or husband.

To top it all off, people of Russia questioned Tsar's competence. The Revolutionaries saw a moment of weakness of Nicholas II's power and believed that the Revolution was going to be successful. Russo-Japanese war started 1904 and it ended 1905.

Another factor that contributed to the Revolution were the peasants and workers. They were the majority of Russia but always put aside. They had rubles with high taxations which were increased in order

This page is for your first answer) to support Russo-Japanese war, lack of harvesting, poor living conditions and they were experience violence in the capital cities. Besides all of their problems and struggles they still had the traditional respect for their Tsar.

~~In~~ ~~or~~ ~~P~~ Everyone knew that Nicholas II believed in only two things: autocracy and religion. Therefore Father Gapon gathered a group of 50,000 peasants and workers to seek for help from their powerful Tsar. They were unarmed, singing slogans & songs about Tsar, carrying church sign boards. As they reached Winter Palace a group of soldiers awaited them. With no orders from Nicholas II they opened fire on the crowd. Soldiers thought the group of peasants were going to attack them. Eventhough they were unarmed with not carrying any weapons or any sharp object.

~~In~~ ~~f~~ This tragic event was named the Bloody Sunday were 200 people died. Eventhough Nicholas II did not order any violence on the crowd, ~~he~~ ~~he~~ was blamed the blood of his people were on his hands. This event painted a bad picture for Nicholas. People did not believe that their Tsar will come to rescue them from the crises,

(This page is for your first answer) they believed that he was the causation of the crisis.

This was a turning-point for Revolution 1905. The Bloody Sunday occurred on the 9th of January 1905, yet 40,000 workers were on strike by the end of January. Furthermore by the end of the year 1905, 2.7 million workers went on strike and caused massive demonstrations. Nicholas failed to tackle these problems by any political reform.

Which leads to the final factor that was involved in the causation of Revolution 1905. Zemstva was banned since 1890s, and it was illegal to form any political party. However this law did not stop ideas flowing in and ~~at~~ the organisations of groups. There were two groups. Social Revolutionaries and Social Democrats.

Social Revolutionaries wanted power sharing with peasants and workers. They were willing to use violence. Therefore they were responsible for 2,000 assassinations within ~~5~~ five years. Nicholas's uncle was one of the victims.

Social Democrats wanted a complete change of society for peasants and workers. They were also

This page is for your first answer) willing to use violence.

However they ~~sp~~ split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Eventhough their power has split, they were still a threat to autocracy and the Tsar.

However with all that was going on in Russia during period leading to 1905, Tsar still managed to refuse any further political reforms or deal with the issues occuring in the country.

Nicholas ~~only knew one wa~~

~~Q~~ During beginning of december ~~1905~~, demonstrations got out of control. Violence started to breakthrough.

Nicholas solved the problems the only way he knew how; using violence. An armed uprising occured.

Troops marched to places of unrest which were manly in St. Petersburg. In nine days, thousands of people were killed and parts of the city were ruined. ~~But the 1905 Revolut~~ After two years, four months, three weeks and four days the Revolution of 1905 was ~~or~~ defeated. ~~in 1907~~.

Therefore, Russo-Japanese war was one of the sparks that drove Russia into Revolution. Russia certainly did economically weaken since it spent lots of its resourced on the war. However,

This page is for your first answer) Other factors that were caused by the war weighted out the revolution. Factors like the poor living conditions of workers, poor harvesting, the violence during Bloody Sunday and after, the lack of Political reforms implemented to restore order and finally the lack of leadership experience by Tsar, Nicholas II.

However, Nicholas managed to maintain his autocracy by implementing October Manifesto, Fundamental Laws and Dumas. These were short-term solutions considering the following revolution occurred only 12 years later. ~~that is~~

Examiner commentary

This is a response which does have an understanding of the issues raised by the question. It also has knowledge of the given factor and events leading to the revolution in Russia in 1905. There is an awareness of the need to make a judgement in relation to the point of view and to attempt to determine the relative importance of the given factor – the impact of Russia's defeat in the Russo-Japanese war. However, the response has limitations in developing these qualities.

Strand 1 – shows an understanding of the issues raised and does select some key point of view. However, the analysis and explanation is limited and there is some description. There is some commentary rather than straight description e.g. reference to 1905 Revolution as a turning-point and that it 'painted a bad picture' for the Tsar. The response has more qualities of Level 3 than Level 2 but is limited within Level 3.

Strand 2 – Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth e.g. a range of factors is covered including the given factor, the events of Bloody Sunday and social and political opposition but, apart from Bloody Sunday, there is a lack of detail to support the analysis provided in Strand 1. The response meets Level 3.

Strand 3 – Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. There is an attempt to judge the view by the extent to which the defeat in the Russo-Japanese war caused the discontent which led to the outbreak of the 1905 revolution and its proximity in time. However, this is not always explicit. The response has more qualities of Level 3 than Level 2 but is limited within Level 3.

Overall there is a sense of understanding the demands of the question and demonstrating this with knowledge but in the form of a narrative commenting on the key issues rather than an analysis of the key issues. This is often indicative of responses within Level 3.

Option 1D

Q2. Historians have different explanations for the Labour Party's electoral victories in 1964 and 1966. 'The leadership of Harold Wilson was the main reason why the Labour Party had electoral victories in 1964 and 1966.' Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

Example high Level 2 response

(This page is for your first answer)

~~Harold Wilson had won many times in election~~

Harold Wilson, the prime minister from Labour party, had won many elections during his lifetime as a politician. He was talented for attracting supporters, and show his leadership. For ~~the~~ 1964 and 1966 election, luck for background also helped him to victory. There was many reasons for him to be a prime minister of United Kingdom.

Firstly, ~~the~~ before government, ^{at 1964,} the conservative party, with prime minister of ~~Macmillan~~ ^{Reginald Hone,} wasn't ~~doing~~ getting good results from what they were doing. One of the good example could be 'Sweet tax'. ~~At the~~ At the point where election was close, Macmillan's government increased tax for sweets. This made Conservative party to look ruthless, as sweets are usually given to kids. It made people to think that Macmillan is trying to make kids to pay tax. This made Macmillan to lose large number of his supporters, and they voted for Wilson, expecting better taxation than Macmillan.

Secondly, ~~Macmillan's~~ ^{Douglas-Home's} cabinet member ~~was~~ had lied in front of House of Common. His name was

This page is for your first answer) John Profumo and he had affair with 19-year-old Model. When he was asked about it, he lied in front of House of Commons. This cause people to think that members of Conservatives are not worthy to be trusted. This also cause many supporters to leave, and the alternative was Harold Wilson.

Also, there was Suez- Canal crisis before 1964 election. + brought big declination of economy during Conservatives, and people wanted change. Harold Wilson ~~was~~ showed himself as young and enthusiastic man who has sense to know ~~to~~ how to do for those problems in UK.

Fourth, there was infighting at Conservative party. It was just before the 1964 election, and Macmillan fired ~~so many~~ ^{a lot of} members of his own ~~the~~ party. This made Conservatives to look very ruthless, and people started to lost their belief on Conservatives.

In contrast, Labor party was showing positive image of their Cabinet Harold Wilson was young and seemed know what to do, and he had cabinet members who was also very young and smart. This positive image given to Labour party became big advantage during election.

Sixth, there was general economic decline before 1964. During the time of Conservative ruling, Economy was worse than ~~any~~ Japan and Germany, who lost ~~the~~ at WWII. Britains accepted it as very shameful result, as they won the WWII, and started to blame conservative party. So they lose many supporters, and they elected Harold Wilson instead of Conservatives.

For 1966 election, Harold kept his image of young smart leader. Since ~~the~~ his Cabinet members were ~~by~~ very young, they were inexperienced. However, Wilson was the only one who experienced during last government from Labour. It made him ~~to become easy to~~ to control his Cabinet very easily, and it was ~~showing his~~ the way how Wilson ~~did~~ the things he planned to. It was successful, and people thought Harold is worthy for vote.

Even though he controlled over his cabinet, he showed himself to public as friendly man ~~and~~ who ~~is~~ knows to share and who knows to balance with his cabinet. He usually showed himself as a ~~the~~ kind grandfather and this cause people to think him as close person and have positive idea on him.

In contrast, his rival at 1966 election, Edward Heath was an ^{old} man who doesn't show up ~~in~~ to public. Public saw him as a man who cannot communicate ~~and~~ which was complete opposite of Harold Wilson.

Wilson also likely to go to place where people oppose to him. He tried a lot to bring people to his supporters. This brought big numbers of supporters from moderates and even conservatives.

~~I agree with the opinion, that~~

I think leadership of Harold Wilson is not the only reason for the victory of him. There was numerous reasons, just like I have mentioned. I strongly believe that especially in 1964, there was more reason of external ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~country~~ ^{country} than Wilson's leadership. That was the time and fortunately Wilson just fit to the image ~~of~~ of change. However, I think leadership of Wilson is main reason on 1966 election. He showed his potential on politics during that election, and he built up positive image on ~~to~~ him. He showed good results during 2 years from 1964, and it was mainly due to

the leadership of Harold Wilson. So I believe that the leadership of Wilson ~~was~~ is one of the significant reasons for the 1966 election, and it could also be a noticeable reason for 1964 elections.

Examiner commentary

In addressing this question, the response does show an understanding of the issues raised by the question and some analysis of the issues by selection some key points of view that are relevant. In particular, there is an awareness of the need to address the reasons for the electoral victories in both elections.

The response is aware of the impact of Wilson's leadership and the weakness of the Conservative Party in fighting the elections but the explanation is often limited, repetitive—particularly in relation to Wilson's leadership (the given factor) - and at some points contradictory e.g. 'young' and 'kind grandfather'.

The knowledge deployed to support the key points of view is, however, not always accurate or secure or detailed. Knowledge of Wilson's leadership is mainly generalised and repetitive meaning that some of the key points made are not substantiated in attempting to reach an overall judgement. Knowledge of the 1966 election is also deployed in brief with limited accurate development. In the conclusion, an overall judgement is made and it is stated that Wilson's leadership was more effective in 1966 than 1964 but the criteria used to establish this are not clearly drawn out and only implied in the main body of the response.

Strand 1 – there is some understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by question and some key points have been selected but the explanation is very limited. There are elements of both Level 2 and Level 3. (Borderline L3/2)

Strand 2 – although range has been shown in the deployment of knowledge, the depth of knowledge is limited with a combination of generalised statements alongside relevant but not wholly accurate knowledge. (Level 2 with limitations)

Strand 3 – An overall judgement is given in relation to the question and there is some awareness of possible criteria referred to in the conclusion but substantiation is limited. (Borderline L2/3)

Overall there are some elements of the Level 3 descriptors but the deployment of knowledge does not support or substantiate the judgement sufficiently to reach Level 3 – examiner judgement here is that 'best-fit' is the top of Level 2. A 'best fit' judgment is arrived at when answers display the qualities of more than one level.'

Option 1c: Question 2

Q2. Historians have different explanations for why the Nazis were able to establish a dictatorship in Germany in the years 1933–34.

'The impact of the Reichstag Fire was the main reason why the Nazis were able to establish a dictatorship in Germany in the years 1933–34.' Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

Example Level 2 response

(This page is for your second answer) The Reichstag fire contributed greatly to Nazis in 1933–34 because the person that was responsible for the fire was a communist and many a but, Reichstag fire was not the only reason that Nazis were able to create a dictatorship in Germany, because the strength of SPD, and failure of other chancellors, and propaganda and other sources were also let in favour of Nazis.

After Hitler became chancellor on 30 January 1933, there he needed to make more effort to gain more support. However, Reichstag fire made a huge impact to strengthen his and party's position and although there are some theories that Nazis caused Reichstag fire, a Dutch communist was found there and he became responsible for the fire. As a result, the KPD's and SPD's support was reduced and helped NSDAP. So, they could hold a new election and form a coalition with another nationalist party which is DNVP. Additionally, they can pass the enabling act which will enable Hitler to pass laws without asking Reichstag.

(This page is for your second answer) On the other hand, there are other reasons that helped Nazis and that is SA which is the paramilitary group of the party led by Ernst Röhm. During 1933-34, SA had millions of members and they ~~was~~ ^{were} crushing other parties' meetings and using its power to attack political opponents, especially KPD. However, as it became powerful and was bigger than army, Hitler needed the support of army and also, SA's leaders were mostly holding socialist beliefs in the party and they wanted second revolution which would crush upper classes in Germany. Thus, in order to get the support of conservative elites and army, SS carried out the Night of the Long Knives which ~~led~~ led to the murder of Gregor Strasser, and von Schleicher, ~~and also~~ some SA leaders and Ernst Röhm who was first arrested, then ~~got~~ ~~totted~~ ~~died~~.

Furthermore, ~~after~~ there was an economic crisis all around the world because of Wall Street crash and as Germany depended on US loans and investments, she got highly influenced too. After that, unsuccessful policies of chancellors ~~like~~ who were Müller, Brüning, von Papen and von Schleicher, ~~most~~ ^{most} ~~most~~ Germans started to support more extreme parties which were KPD, DNVP and NSDAP. During those years, NSDAP ^{became} ~~was~~ the largest.

(This page is for your second answer) party because of successful propaganda methods especially by Joseph Goebbels' and Gregor Strasser's large contribution aids.

Another contribution was the death of President Hindenburg. This is because Hitler no longer had anyone that had ^{bigger} ~~better~~ status than him in the government. As a consequence, with the success of Enabling act, he can declare his dictatorship and get rid of democracy.

To conclude, the Reichstag fire led to several success for Nazis ^{Germany} like banning KPD and replacing their seats with Nazi supporters but other mentioned points had more significant roles for the establishment of Nazi dictatorship in Germany.

Examiner commentary

The introductory statement suggests some understanding of the issue raised in the question with a reference to the Reichstag Fire (given factor) and other factors that might have contributed to the establishment of a dictatorship in Germany.

However, it is not clear from the first line what the specific focus of the question. The candidate refers to 'contributed greatly to the Nazis'.

The given factor is then developed with an attempt at analysis by describing some points relevant to the role of the Reichstag Fire. Some understanding is shown with reference to the need for support, the responsibility of the communists, the holding of elections and the Enabling Act but these are not explained. The knowledge deployed is relevant but insecure and so not wholly accurate. Further paragraphs include other factors which may have contributed to the establishment of a dictatorship.

There is an understanding of the context in which the Night of the Long Knives took place and its role in strengthening Hitler's position but the explanation is limited and analysis is mainly through description. The knowledge deployed is relevant but insecure and so not wholly accurate. This is followed by a paragraph which refers to events before the Reichstag Fire which is descriptive and the links to the key issues in the question are relevant but implicit. Finally, a brief mention of the death of Hindenburg is made showing some understanding but lacking in detail to develop further.

In the conclusion a valid point is made about the role of the Reichstag fire in relation to other factors but with limited support and any criteria for determining why the other factors are more significant has been left implicit (both in the conclusion and the main body of the response).

Strand 1 – Some understanding of the issue raised by the question is shown and analysis is attempted by describing some points that are relevant (Level 2)

Strand 2 – Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth (e.g. in relation to Hindenburg) and has only implicit links to issues relevant to the question e.g. in relation to the economic crisis (Level 2)

Strand 3 – A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and the criteria for judgment are left implicit (Level 2)

There are weaknesses within the Level 2 descriptors, particularly Strand 2 and Strand 3, which put this at mid-Level 2.

Option 1c Question 2

Q2. Historians differ in their judgements about the impact of Nazi policies on women in Germany in the years 1933-39.

'Nazi policies improved the life of women in German in the years 1933-39.' Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

Example Level 1 response

Question 2

The way that Hitler's trial and imprisonment was the main reason for its survival as Hitler had helped raised the Nazi party to what it was and was responsible for people. Becoming fascinated with the party as a result but the public also saw the Nazi party as a viable option for its failing republic.

The first reason for the Nazi's party survival was a result of the failing Weimar republic that had been hurt after the war as people were not happy with government. As they had agreed to the allies terms with not only the unfair demands that they had but also with the treaty of Versailles and also the reoperation and the shrinking of the German army but also losing territory. This had helped the Nazis as they were a main political rival to the Weimar republic.

Another way that it had helped Nazi party was that Hitler was able to create his 25 point plan to help the Nazi party take over the government. But also allowing him the time to write Mein Kampf in which he had stated all his plans for the future of the government. This interred allowed him to plan how he was to carry out his actions with the party as he would be able to how to overtake the government when he was released.

The last thing that had ensured the Nazi parties survival in the time that Hitler was in imprisoned was the strength of the party on its own as Hitler and those that controlled the party had many advantages over the other parties as they had carried out getting rid of

opposition and being with the public and convincing them why they the party that Germany had needed to save the country.

The Nazi Party had survived in the years 1924-28 as they had much influence on the public around them as they had removed opposition. And anyone that may have stood in their way as a result the Nazi party did not need Hitler to be much of an influence in the 8 months that he had been imprisoned for.

Examiner commentary

In addressing this question, the response shows an awareness of a focus on change but there is no consideration of whether the impact of Nazi policies was to improve life for women In Nazi Germany.

The response describes three different areas of Nazi policy in relation to women. The description is developed through the use of simple and generalised statements about the role of women in Nazi Germany some of which is accurate and relevant.

The paragraph on job opportunities, in particular, is limited in relation to the chronology of events and the accuracy of the knowledge deployed.

The paragraphs concerning women's domestic roles and families - include generalised statements which are lacking in the detail expected in a depth study.

There is a judgement on change but not the impact of the policies with regard to improvement. There is no mention of 'improved' in the response itself and so it is not possible to tell from the response the view being discussed.

Strand 1 – Simple or generalised statements are made about the view presented in the question. (Level 1)

Strand 2 – Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks rand and depth and does not directly address the issue in the question. (Level 1)

Strand 3 – Judgement of the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence. (Weak within Level 1)

The weaknesses place this at mid-high Level 1.