

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE History 6HI03 B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2016

Publications Code 6HI03_B_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the seventh session of the 6HI03 B examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher grade categories. The paper was divided into two sections: Section (A) was an In-Depth Study question, and Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question. Unfortunately, some candidates continue to write too much generalised comment. As a consequence, their responses lacked precise analytical focus and detailed supporting evidence. Examiners want to see candidates who can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than enough for full marks.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was diverse but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. As expected, there were far more entrants for

B1 – France, 1786-1830: Revolution, Empire and Restoration

than for

B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760-1830.

One pleasing trend is that very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis. The paper provided candidates with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source material as and when necessary.

There appears to be an increasing tendency for candidates to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions. Candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means and this approach does not, in itself, prevent access to the highest levels. However, in some cases, judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were either only partially stated or implicit. Consequently, candidates should be aware that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a solid framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they lacked the detailed knowledge base required to tackle Questions 1 and 2 and produced a catch-all commentary on the stipulated topic (rather than the specific issue), with obvious repercussions. The best answers to these questions – and indeed those on the c1760-1830 British option – showed some impressive study of late 18th and early 19th French and British history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

When attempting the Section (B) questions, a small number of candidates engaged more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Question 5, although it was still a small minority. The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses had a sharp focus on the reasons for the fall of Robespierre in 1794 and the extent to which this was caused by his desire to establish a personal dictatorship (including his prominent role on the Committee of Public Safety, attempts to establish his own police bureau, and the launching of the Cult of the Supreme Being). Candidates offered balance in their answers and considered the role of other factors such as the growing fear and revulsion created by the Terror, the opposition of the sans-culottes following the Law of 14 Frimaire and the impact of economic problems. Weaker answers offered little development on the reasons for the fall of Robespierre, or struggled to focus on the stated factor of his desire to establish a personal dictatorship. Low scoring candidates also offered narratives with weak links to some aspects of Robespierre's fall but no real consideration of the role played by his desire for personal dictatorship.

'Robespierre fell from power in 1794 mainly because of his desire to establish a personal dictatorship in France.' How far do you agree with this view?

Personal dictatorship - his desired style of rule was similar to that of the Bourbons

- crowned himself emperor
- appointed advisors and ministers

Jacobins lacked support compared to the Girondin
Girondin had the support of the military
Jacobins were radicals - the general feeling was for a constitutional monarchy, not a full blown revolution
The Great Terror

Robespierre's style of rule was similar to that of Louis xvii's. Consequently, his rule was seen as a step back from the revolution; his rule was oppr
repressive and gave him majority of control. However, Robespierre fell from power due to a variety of reasons.

Robespierre demonstrated his desire to establish a personal dictatorship when he crowned himself emperor. By crowning himself, Robespierre ~~took on~~ demonstrated an attitude similar to ~~the~~ divine right: he assumed the power was rightfully his. It may be argued that there was a vote which placed Robespierre in his position of power. However, Robespierre used fear to force people to vote yes, and so although ~~the~~ he was granted power by the vote, he had done so unfairly.

Furthermore, it can be argued that Robespierre desired to establish a personal dictatorship because he appointed ministers and advisors, rather than them being voted democratically. By appointing advisors and ministers, Robespierre was guaranteed their support, ~~which~~ ^{which} was essential if he wished to remain ~~as~~ a leader. The style of Robespierre's rule ~~also~~ ~~draws~~ draws more ~~similarities~~ similarities to the rule of the Bourbon monarch. His style of rule was repressive because it didn't give the poor peasants or lower clergy much power or influence as to how the country was run.

During the rule of Robespierre, ~~was~~ the Great Terror occurred which is a prime example of how he was repressive as he executed thousands of suspected unsupporters, without trial. This was similar to the abolished ~~lettres de~~

(Section A continued) ~~catcher~~. Through military violence, Robespierre ~~instated~~ created a wave of fear, which ~~constituted~~ he used to remain in power. However, this created a mass of hatred towards the emperor and actually weakened his position.

On the other hand, there were other ~~contributed~~ factors which contributed to Robespierre's fall from power.

The economic situation in France was still insecure. ~~There were even more suffered as the demand for their work decreased, seeing high unemployment.~~ Furthermore, ~~inflation~~ poor harvests led to ~~inflation~~. Poor harvests in the rural areas led to low output of grain, which caused inflation and meant peasants had less grain to sell for a profit. Furthermore, the urban workers were affected as the price of bread increased and the demand for their output decreased. As a result, there were revolts and uprisings to protest.

In conclusion, although other factors, such as the economic instability in France, contributed to the downfall of Robespierre, it cannot be denied that he presented a desire for personal dictatorship. The similarities ~~in his~~ between his style of rule and that of the Bourbon monarchs is overwhelming. Although the Great Terror shows

(Section A continued) Robespierre's ~~more~~ repressive style of rule, it alone was a major contributing factor to his downfall because he demonstrated a ruthless attempt to gain absolute power.

~~Robespierre~~ Robespierre was the leader of the Jacobins, a much more radical group in comparison to the Girondin. After the abolition of the constitutional ~~monarchy~~ monarchy, the Girondin had most support, but because Robespierre encouraged ~~through~~ people, through pressure and fear, to vote for him, he actually ~~had~~ had support. Therefore, he was in a weak position. ~~Q~~



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response illustrates two typical weaknesses of low-scoring essays (1) it relies heavily on general statements about the fall of Robespierre which lack detail and depth (2) the range of factors considered is rather limited.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

To gain high marks on the Depth Study question you must have sound subject knowledge. Check the specification for the key topics.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses had a sharp focus on how far Napoleon's domestic reforms were primarily designed to consolidate changes introduced during the Revolution. More able candidates offered balance in their answers and considered other motives such as Napoleon's determination to consolidate his own power. This included consideration of the motives behind relevant developments or issues such as links with the Papacy, return of émigré aristocrats, the Civil Code, reforms in education, secularisation of Church lands, and legal and administrative reforms. Weaker responses tended to offer narratives about Napoleon's major domestic measures between 1799 and 1807 with few or no links to the issue of consolidating 'the changes introduced during the French Revolution'. At the lower levels, descriptive responses were likely to focus overwhelmingly on one or two measures such as reforms in education or restoration of links with the Papacy. A few low scoring candidates produced responses with weak or no development of other motives for the reforms.

Napoleon's rule in the years 1799⁹ to 1807 were riddled with changes to the country yet most of these seem to be for his personal benefit and in aid of a dictatorship. The revolution called for democratic governance and he was certainly not creating one.

The level of control that Napoleon took over the education of France proves how he doesn't consolidate changes but create his own military dictatorship. In 1802 he establishes lycées which are military academies ~~and by 18~~ that are also highly selective as the majority of students are sons of notables. This was so

(Section A continued) If there was a revolt against him it was less likely to be a success as a poorer revolt wouldn't have had the level of resources they'd need. ~~By 1805~~ He had created the imperial university that would control all of the specification of what every single school will teach and only 3 years before converted the polytechnique into a military school. This level of educational control was so Napoleon would govern the successes of the future military, creating his own power rather than accommodating the people's needs. By 1807 he was developing a highly skilful military dictatorship with himself at the forefront.

Another factor which aids his own dictatorship is the control he had over the majority of France, therefore showing he didn't ~~create~~ do the 'necessary order'

(Section A continued) but ^{Another} ~~one~~ way his megalomaniac personality is presented is through the ~~degree of~~ ~~control~~ grasp he seems to have at the beginning of his control. In 1802 he is given the hereditary principle, which shows absolute power as he can elect a successor. Even though this is given to him because he measures the people ~~empires~~ will not be allowed their land back it proves that he has sole control and it is not a democracy which would be giving all a voice (what the revolutionaries wanted). Additionally, the personality cult is the way in which he presents himself, as a God-like figure. In fact the extent of this is seen when he says 'we wanted a leader to direct us, now you behold him'. In 1804 he ~~is~~ becomes a self-proclaimed Emperor with an ~~excuse~~ ~~excuse~~ of the assassination attempt. He tells the people that his own position must

(Section A continued) He secure in order for the revolution to continue, or at least for them to think they are benefiting. This level of control that he is showing doesn't reflect the initial concept of the revolution yet Napoleon makes people think his dictatorship is for them.

The law of Brumaire at the very start of his control shows how he dismisses the wants of Sieyès, and other people, in order to gain sole control. This law states he is to be a first consul and the second, third and legislature and Tribunate with for the most part be 'advisors'. He sets himself up in a position where others views are of little to no importance. This is proved in the 1802 purging of the Tribunate as he wants to rid it of those who opposed his first consul position.

(Section A continued)

Napoleon also provides reason to believe he wasn't just consolidating changes that were made as he shows a strong unwillingness to allow others a say. The opposition he faces comes from ~~Jacobin~~^{left-wing}, Royalists as well as moderates. This much opposition must prove he wasn't the leader France needed as he wouldn't allow a democracy or for the people to have a say. In 1800 he used the excuse of another assassination scare to allow himself to deport 126 Jacobin leaders and ~~by the~~ he squashed royalist uprisings with force. ~~He~~ He is showing a willingness to view the needs of others yet does it in a way that allows himself support by making the public feel it is best for the revolution. The moderates he easily removes threat of by the use of censorship. The propaganda and censorship he uses provide

(Section A continued) evidence for ~~they~~ ^{how} he was controlling France from 1800 to 1801 73 Parisian journals were written down to only 4 and the police controlled what could be revealed or presented to the public. This again is a way he aids his own rule and strengthens support as he portrayed it as a 'duty' for them to obey him. The domestic reforms are used to benefit his own power alone, not the ideas the revolution created of equality and liberty.

However, one factor which is linked to the revolution changes is the Concordat. This is a way to control the church yet it links it to the revolution by bringing the church under the thumb of the rulers. The civil constitution of the clergy by the constitutional monarchy may be viewed as similar so Napoleon is

(Section A continued) reversing the Terror's change of dechristianisation as he accepts that Catholicism is the 'majority religion' and to have them support him is going to benefit himself. Therefore, although this is linked to the revolution it is actually him still trying to aid his ~~to~~ own dictatorship by gaining the 'majority' support. The Pope was forced to accept this as the French troops effectively occupied Italy, which shows it was rather more his own gain in wanting support than for religious reasons. It also allows for ~~the~~ priests to be deported if 6 people report them. ~~the~~ Napoleon heightens his power by calling for a 'St. Napoleon day' on the 16th of August which is portrayed to be a Christians duty to obey through censorship. He shows here the extent of his ~~assess~~ selfishness and greed.

Overall, while claiming he is

(Section A continued) 'Sowing the revolution' as he does in the Coup of Brumaire it is obvious he is in fact using this facade to hide his own dictatorship. The domestic reforms also have economic benefits, i.e. the new currency of the gold standard in 1803 makes circulation better, yet they are on the whole to aid his own control. He does not just 'consolidate changes' the revolution made but creates his own, eg education/military control and a personality cult, to show himself as a 'hero' and 'God'.

* The Legion of Honour is also in support of this idea as Napoleon doesn't not just 'reward loyalty' but he is creating a position where no one will question him. Opponents now fear both him and the Legion that are loyal as eg. Senators are paid 25,000 francs to support him.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate has produced a Level 4 answer by offering detailed knowledge within a focused analytical structure. Care has been taken to (1) focus on the key issue of consolidating changes introduced during the revolution and (2) develop the argument across several areas (e.g. education, dictatorial power, actions against opponents and policy on religion). Consequently the response has good range and depth.

Question 3

On Question 3 the strongest responses assessed in depth how far the reform movement before 1785 possessed support or influence. These answers tended to focus on Wilkes, Wyvil, Burke, the Association Movement and the Rockingham Whigs, and also considered the impact of other broader issues in the 'neither influence nor support' debate (e.g. relations with America, resentment of George III and the growing importance of commercial and industrial centres). Weaker responses offered little in the way of real knowledge or development concerning the support given to, and the influence of, the pre-1785 reform movement in Britain. Other low scoring answers drifted quickly from the time frame of the question and offered accounts of the reform movement in the 1790s. A few possessed a very narrow range, focusing merely, for example, on the career of Wilkes.

How far do you agree with the view that, before 1785, the reform movement in Britain possessed neither support nor influence?

Man Many of the factors, an individuals, and groups who helped ~~bring~~ bring about permanent, major reform appeared ~~after~~ or only became significant after 1785. ~~In that respect, the reform movement had~~ ~~power and influence and ability to see~~ ~~power~~ ~~in comparison~~ ~~pre-1785~~ ~~with~~ ~~power~~ ~~and influence does~~ ~~pale~~ ~~in comparison to~~ Given that, the power and influence of the pre-1785 reform movement does pale in comparison with that of later years. However, to state that the reform movement had no support whatsoever, or even that it had no support of any significance, would be a gross misunderstanding. John Wilkes, "Wilkes the reformer", existed. A comparatively radical (when compared to his peers) member of the ~~country~~ ~~great~~ parliament, his work was crucial in exposing the corruption

Of the landed Gentry, ~~the~~ unfair who, as
(Section A continued) as a quirk of England's archaic
mish mash of a political system, could control
large influential boroughs by buying out or otherwise
bribing tiny villages. ~~meanwhile~~ meanwhile, many
regions were tragically ~~and~~ underrepresented, the
entirety of Wales and Scotland having so few
boroughs as to be irrelevant.

Wilkes often put these weaknesses to
great effect in his campaigning and criticism of
the government. His newspaper ~~and~~ did this to
great effect, and before long, the phrase "Wilkes
and Liberty" became somewhat infamous. The St
George's massacre, after which Wilkes was forced
to flee the country or risk arrest (along with
charges of libel against the king), was attributed
to Wilkes by the government at the time.
We can at least see he is ~~the~~ an indirect cause,
is not directly involved.

After this, however, his actions lost a great
deal of influence over the political battleground.
His newspaper was ~~so~~ finally shut down, and
Wilkes could do little while staying in self-imposed
exile. Even after his return, little of what he
did was of any note.

With Wilkes neutered, who was very much
an anomalous personality amongst his

(Section A continued)

Contemporaries, the reform movement received little support. The king's friends and loyalists in parliament were unlikely to support the manifesto of a traitor to his country, especially not one that would reduce their powers and those of the royalty. The landed gentry, whose position was dependent on the current system stagnating, were similarly disinclined. ~~to~~ Even support among the aristocratic factions was low, more palatable to moderates such as Rockingham drawing their attention.

Despite all of his failures, Wilkes, the champion of the reform movement, made a major contribution. ~~to~~ Being the first to put forward an organised manifesto his actions would inspire and guide many future campaigns, such as the chartist movement, who exist even in the present day. His contribution was indeed helpful towards the reform movement, and eventual realisation of universal suffrage.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 1 response illustrates two typical weaknesses of the lowest scoring essays (1) it relies heavily on general and largely descriptive statements about John Wilkes rather than developing a range of different detailed points for analysis (2) it is rather short



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.

Question 4

On question 4, the strongest responses had a confident grasp of why the Tory governments of the 1820s first opposed and then supported Catholic Emancipation. Reasons for early opposition (e.g. perceived threat to the Protestant ascendancy, little pressure to pass such a measure) and later support (e.g. impact of Daniel O'Connell and the Catholic Association, Wellington and Peel's pragmatic conversion) were well developed. Such responses demonstrated good range and depth on 'opposition' and 'support' causes. Weaker responses tended to offer a descriptive account of the Tory government's attitude and actions regarding Catholic Emancipation in the 1820s with few or no links to the question 'why opposition then support'. Other low scoring answers relied heavily on unsubstantiated assertions which lacked range and depth. A few focused solely on the events of 1828-29 which led to the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act.

Question 5

On Question 5, the strongest responses were firmly focused on the issue of foreign threats to the Revolution in accounting for the downfall of the monarchy. The latter was linked to the other factors raised in the sources (e.g. the impact of the flight to Varennes and economic problems) or drawn from candidates' own knowledge. More able candidates also offered some balance in examining the debate and were likely to recognise the interaction of factors or links between the sources. Weaker answers tended to generalise about the reasons for the downfall of the French monarchy in 1792 without offering specific development on 'Foreign threats to the Revolution'. Alternatively, lower scoring responses simply described the evidence for the end of the monarchy presented in the three sources with little or no integration of own knowledge for support.

1 Brunsich
1 Fto V
PIAN Foreign threats Low own mistake
Emigre plotting Economy - Inflation

The argument that foreign threats caused the downfall of the constitutional monarchy in 1792 is put forward by Shennan in source 1. He states the Brunswick Manifesto 'provided the spark for the explosion which finally destroyed the Bourbon monarchy'. Here he states that the interference and threat posed by foreign forces (Austria and Prussia) was an important factor. Furthermore, Shennan explains that this manifested, and foreign threat, helped to strengthen belief that Louis and the queen were trying to 'bring the revolution down'. The 'threat posed by the out break of war' is also mentioned by Sobow. Here this argument shows that foreign threat had a detrimental effect on identifying Louis as an enemy, not creating fear within France.

This argument is supported by numerous pieces of evidence. As stated, Shennan strongly articulates the negative impact

of the Brunswick Manifesto, published in Paris on 1 August

(Section B continued) 1792. This document, issued by the Duke of Brunswick, certainly contributed to the downfall of the constitutional monarchy. This is exhibited by the fact that on the 3 August, 30,000 people marched to the Assembly with a petition by the Cordeliers club calling for the King's dethronement. The Mayor of Paris went to the Assembly on behalf of 47/48 sections calling for the King's dethronement from office. This clearly indicates that foreign threat, such as the Manifesto, helped to lead to Louis's downfall, as it identified him with foreign enemies. The Pillnitz Declaration (27 August 1791) was another declaration by foreign enemies. Again, this appeared as intervention in internal affairs, and ~~created~~ helped to link Louis with over debts, hence helped to lead to the collapse as they no longer thought Louis could be trusted. This being said, foreign threat was not the primary factor in causing the downfall. As whilst they heightened tensions, other events were more important.

Stennan makes a stronger argument than the threat posed by foreign forces, furthermore this same argument is also put forward by Hallsbaum. Stennan references the Flight to Varennes, and the fact that it was in fact Louis's own mistake and actions which caused his own downfall. He slides the

flight, 'heightened the sense of foreign threat' and strongly

(Section B continued) linked him as 'leader of the opposition'. This highlights that Louis's mistake established him as counter-revolutionary. Hobsbawm similarly refers to Louis's flight as 'suicidal', and that it subsequently led to 'republicanism become a mass force'. This like Stenner, Hobsbawm states that mistake and actions of Louis created a negative image of the King, and helped to fuel opposition towards him. He also notes that Louis 'could not accept the new regime', here again implying that due to Louis carrying out actions which made him appear counter-revolutionary, or at the least not fully committed, they led to his downfall as people believed he wasn't for the revolution. Hence this argument is a mere substantial cause for the collapse, as foreign threat wouldn't have had nearly as much impact had Louis not made himself appear to a counter-revolutionary himself.

The flight to Varenne ^(20 June 1791) noted by Stenner and Hobsbawm was detrimental for Louis. The proclamation he left, denouncing the revolution, clearly identified him as counter-revolutionary, and thus caused people to begin carrying out his downfall.

This is shown by events on the 24 June, when 30,000 people marched to the Assembly ~~and~~ in favour of a petition by the Cordeliers Club calling for removal of the King from office. This clearly shows ~~how~~ the extent of anger among people caused by the mistake of Louis's. It highlights the fact that, like Hobsbawm states, Louis's attempt to flee was 'suicidal'.

(Section B continued) In further support of the argument put forward by Shennan and Hobsbawm that Louis own military caused by down is the royal veto used on 27 May 1792. Louis vetoed a law on the deportation of refractory priests, and the establishment of a camp for some 20,000 fédérés. Like his flight, this military again made Louis appear to be actively trying to undermine the revolution, hence identified him as counter-revolutionary. This argument explains the collapse better than simply 'foreign threats'. This is because while threats from abroad caused tension, if Louis had appeared fully committed to the revolution, these threats would have carried much less impact. In further weakening the argument for foreign threats causing the downfall, many of the threats actually carried little weight. For example, the Pillnitz Declaration caused minimal stir, was barely addressed by the Assembly, and in fact Austria was aware they could carry out invasion without the support of Britain. These foreign threats were certainly played a lesser role than Louis's mistakes.

Soboul in source 3 makes reference to the economic situation in causing the downfall of the constitutional monarchy. He claims that the 'renewed economic crisis sharpened the masses' revolutionary fervour'. This point on the economy is also noted by Hobsbawm, who states 'bread prices registered the political temperature of Paris'. This argument is

(Section B continued) well supported in its contribution to causing the collapse of the monarchy. The poor harvest in 1791 not only meant that bread was scarce, but it's price also increased by 50%. This clearly helps to galvanise the sans-culottes and others who were to play a role in King Louis's collapse and driving to storming of the Tuileries on 10 August 1792. Here this highlights that the economy played an important role in causing the downfall. However, this interpretation can still be considered to have a lesser impact in causing the downfall of the constitutional monarchy. This is because it only caused a growth in opposition to Louis, and on its own would not have helped cause his downfall, as previous monarchs had survived economic crisis (Louis had survived the ~~the~~ poor harvest of in the 1780's). However, combined with the Fact Louis was continuously making mistakes, and opposing against the revolution, this allowed factors such as the poor economy, to help galvanise people in causing the downfall.

Thus in conclusion, the argument carrying the most weight as to the cause of the collapse of the constitutional monarchy in 1792 is that put forward by Storr and Halsbaurm. That is, that Louis's own mistakes, and actions identified him as counter-revolutionary, and hence caused people to believe that in order for the Revolution to survive, he not be removed. Actions such as the Flight to Varennes

(Section B continued) and royal veto are key examples of these mistakes. Whilst foreign threat was played on imperial role, as did the poor economic situation, they weren't as detrimental as Louis's mistakes. This is because foreign threat on its own, simply creates fear that enemy abroad are plotting against the nation. However, Louis's mistakes, such as the flight, made it apparent to the citizens enemies were internal, hence had to be removed.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response offers a precisely focused analysis of the reasons for the collapse of the constitutional monarchy in France in 1792. Strong range and depth is evident. The source arguments deployed are reinforced with detailed support throughout and the essay is rounded off with a clear judgement in the conclusion.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

During the planning stage, after you have identified the key issues raised by the sources, add your own knowledge to these points. That way, you will find it easier to integrate the two elements in the essay.

Question 6

On Question 6, stronger responses identified and developed arguments for and against the proposition from the sources, and considered to what extent had Napoleon's 'important lessons' for his enemies consequent on the fall of the French Empire. More able candidates weighed this stated factor against the impact of others covered in the sources (such as the Russian campaign and the Continental System), integrating their own relevant knowledge. Weaker responses tended to adopt a weak 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else included little or no own knowledge in support of their argument. Low scoring answers also uncritically accepted a familiar viewpoint (e.g. the damaging impact of the Russian campaign) and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the sources. Largely narrative accounts of Napoleon's later campaigns figured at this level too.

Napoleon was a great military leader and built a formidable empire that conquered ~~most~~ a large amount of Europe. However, like most great hungry war leaders, he faced an inevitable downfall in 1815 and was exiled to ~~St~~ St Helena. There were several factors that contributed to his downfall: the changing nature of the Grande Armée, the Russian campaign, the allies, military improvement among the allies, Napoleon's ~~at~~ intransigence and that "Napoleon had taught his enemies important lessons." Source 4 agrees with the view that Napoleon's downfall was due to him 'teaching his enemies important lessons' to a great extent, ~~and~~ however, Sources 6, 8 and 6 ~~strongly~~ disagree with this view partly agrees and Source 5 disagrees to a great extent.

Napoleon's form of battlefield warfare ~~was~~, it can be argued, was one of kind. More often than he was the ability to draw the enemy to him and 'play on his feet'. Furthermore, it is stated in Source 4 -

(Section B continued) "They had adopted the advantages of the new military systems encapsulated in the popular concept army, as Prussia, Austria, and, particularly Prussia undertook military reforms in response to Battle of Waterloo." This suggests that Napoleon was responsible for his own downfall in the sense that he helped the allies realize that they needed some sort of military reform to improve their own armies to a ~~similar~~ similar level of ~~the~~ Napoleon's Grande Armée, which was one of the ~~best~~ best of the time.

In addition, it is stated in Source 4 - "he taught his enemies the problems inherent in traditional balance of power politics, not by imitating him but by opposing him."

This suggests that Napoleon further sealed his fate by aiding the problems of the allies, thus causing his own downfall.

Furthermore, one of the big factors in causing Napoleon's downfall was the Prussian campaign in 1812. Like most leaders who attempt to create an empire and conquer Prussia in doing so, ~~forget~~ such as Hitler and Napoleon, forget about Prussia's size and other climate and naturally go in with an arrogant, over-confident attitude. For example, for the Prussian campaign in 1812 Napoleon had raised an army of approximately 670,000 men, but under retreat from the campaign the

(Section B continued) Grande Armée had been reduced to approximately 30,000 men, which severely damaged Napoleon's reputation as a competent military leader. In Source 5 it states - "He was an expert in mountain warfare but here the plains stretched to the distant horizon, making ambushes difficult. His line of communication grew ~~longer~~ longer, making it harder to transport food, clothing, ammunition and reinforcements." This suggests that the Russian campaign was this shows how the Russian campaign threw Napoleon out of his comfort ~~zone~~ zone and placed him in a situation that he was not familiar with and ~~caused~~ caused him to be an incompetent leader in the situation, which would have undermined support for him to a great extent. Furthermore, in Source 8 5 it ~~that~~ states - "Napoleon chased Russian forces without ever allowing them to confront him unless they did not want to. When the Russians adopted a strategy of persistent withdrawal, Napoleon had no new plan." This suggests that Napoleon was able to adapt in the situation in which he found himself, but this was short-lived as the Russians drew him in ~~to~~ deeper into Russia and he was unable to develop a new plan, which ~~severely~~ was detrimental to him and his Grande Armée. In ~~add~~ addition, it further states in Source 5 - "In October 1812, with about 100,000

(Section B continued) Troops left (about a quarter of the force he had in June), Napoleon ordered a withdrawal." This greatly highlights the how disastrous the campaign was as ~~estimated~~ ^{Here were} as ~~that~~ 670,000 troops in the Grande Armée at the start of the campaign, but when Napoleon ordered the withdrawal there were 100,000, a loss of ^{more} ~~more~~ than 500,000 men. This would have ^{heavily} ~~severely~~ damaged Napoleon's reputation as it was such an ignominious defeat.

During Napoleon's reign he built an empire in which had a continental blockade, which was designed to close the British ^{and imports} reports^a as the British and the French, at the time, had an extremely hostile relationship. In Source 5 it states - "Napoleon's 'continental system', designed to exclude British trade, sealed like a sieve. It also destroyed any chance that Europe would accept Napoleon's version of empire." This suggests that Napoleon sealed his own fate in the sense that his own creation, the Continental Blockade, had a crack in ~~it~~ ^{it} as many of the countries in the continental system did not want to be a part of it. Furthermore, in Source 6 it states - "Napoleon's despite his magnetic appeal

(Section B continued) ~~for those disinterested~~ ~~discontented~~ with the old European regimes, Napoleon's empire became intolerably burdensome. Russia rejected her commercial obligations and demanded that the Tsar should never regain her kingdom." This suggests that Napoleon had named himself in the same sense that he had created an empire that had become intolerable to all those who were in it, which led to the wanting of an evaluation of the empire. In addition, in Source 6 it states - "In the 'battle of the nations' at Leipzig in 1813, Napoleon's Grand Army, ravaged by its winter retreat from Moscow, was decisively beaten by the Austrians, Prussian Russians and the Prussians." This shows ~~how~~ links in with the Russian campaign, as Napoleon's Grande Armée had been depleted to such a great extent that it was unable to cope with the demands of the death of ~~the~~ nations and led to another great defeat leading to the fall of the Napoleonic era. Furthermore, it can be considered that the ~~the~~ Russian campaign triggered a snowball effect in Napoleon's decline as it resulted in ~~defeat~~ Napoleon suffering from defeat after this point, which caused his downfall and the decline of his empire.

(Section B continued) In conclusion, it can be argued to a great extent that the sources only partly agree with the view that the French Empire collapsed, in the years 1807-1814, because Napoleon had 'taught his enemies important lessons'. However, it can be argued to a great extent that the primary factor in causing the French Empire to collapse was the Russian campaign in 1812, which resulted in a disastrous defeat for Napoleon and ^a triggered a ~~struggle~~ ^{strumball} effect causing the empire to decline ~~at length~~ and cause Napoleon's abdication and exile. It is, however, argued that Napoleon's fall from power was due to a combination of factors, such as the changing nature of the Grande Armée, military improvements amongst the allies etc, with one primary factor, e.g. the Russian campaign in 1812.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 3 response illustrates two common limitations in answers to the Controversy question. Although the candidate cross references the sources, the links are often superficial and only modest own knowledge is added to develop the argument. The extracts need to be more rigorously cross-referenced and more detailed with own knowledge included.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When planning your answer, read through the sources carefully and list all the support and challenge points you can. This will help you to cross-reference effectively in your answer.

Question 7

On Question 7, stronger responses demonstrated a firm grasp of the controversy and assessed the source arguments regarding how far firm government action prevented a serious challenge to the British political system (1815–20). Own knowledge was often extensive, although this was not a definite requirement. More importantly, it was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources (e.g. the government acted firmly to preempt a serious challenge, radicals and revolutionaries faced other major obstacles), and key measures and events (such as the Six Acts, Peterloo and the Cato Street conspiracy). Good understanding of the relationship between the sources and exploration of these links using own knowledge was also found at the higher levels. Weaker candidates often produced (1) a largely unsupported commentary on government action in Britain in the period 1815–20 which was inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach (3) a generalised narrative account of government measures in the immediate post-1815 period in Britain which barely addressed the question.

only firm government action prevented a serious challenge
1815-20

- ~~• Peterloo Massacre~~
- ~~• Speen Fields Riot~~
- ~~• Pentrich Rising~~
- ~~• the weavers march~~
- ~~• Cato Street conspiracy~~
- ~~• Attack on King~~
- ~~↳ unhappy with taxes, unemployment~~
- ~~• English Jacobins~~
- ~~• suspension of Habeas Corpus~~
- ~~• Six Acts~~
- ~~• spies, Secret Committee of Secrecy~~
- ~~• corresponding societies widespread~~
- ~~• treason trial - gallows & transportation~~
- ~~• Luddite movement~~
- ~~• Hampden Clubs~~
- ~~• newspapers e.g. Black Owl Political Register~~
~~"circulation of inflammatory lit."~~
- ~~↳ mainly non-violent~~
- ~~↳ no clear leader~~
~~Hunt, Cartwright~~
- ~~↳ 1816 bad grain crop, hunger policy~~
- ~~• no army~~

(Section B continued) The years of 1815-1820 are perhaps the closest England came to a revolution. Numerous societies, riots and conspiracies seriously concerned the government and ministering Pitt's reaction in 1792 introduced several measures against radicals such as the six acts of 1819. It is arguable to what extent firm action of the government under Lord Liverpool was needed ^{or whether} ~~and it was~~ the uprisings would have been no threat to the British political system.

Several ~~years~~ more violent uprisings occurred during 1815 to 1820 including the Luddite movement which destroyed ~~the~~ machines and continued until 1816, the Pentrich Rising and which would have been violent, the Cato Street conspiracy in 1820. According to Thompson in source 9, the uprising may have had 'a greater measure of success' had it not been for ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the spies and this 'offers a shred of justification' according to Thompson to the government's reaction and would support the idea of government intervention being important. The Cato Street Conspiracy was also quickly discovered through the use of spies and may well have been disastrous otherwise. However, as Thompson points out it is questionable as to whether these uprisings actually had 'any chance of success'. Supported by source 8 ~~where~~ in which Morgan says that they may have succeeded if ^{had} 'action been co-ordinated'. Despite ~~these~~ The violent uprisings were few and did not have widespread support meaning the transportation or hanging of those attributed was perhaps too extreme. There were further protests that were peaceful such as the Spa

(Section B continued) Fields Riots in 1916, the weavers march or the Peterloo Massacre. The latter is a very clear point which highlights an unnecessary action taken by magistrates which the government supported which led to 11 deaths. It could be argued that this was mainly the magistrates fault, however, the government condoned it. These harmless protests were certainly over-made too important and would never have presented a serious threat. By the government taking action more agitation was provoked. As the newspapers such as the Black Dwarf or the Political Register described by Gash as 'inflammatory literature' is questionable as to how much important it was. It was certainly very influential but the decision to ban such literature in the 'Six Acts' of 1819 was again too far and perhaps evidence of 'lack of reliable information' as Gash points out. Despite being influential it did not pose a great threat to society.

The 'local political reform societies' such as the Hampden Clubs set up by Cartwright in 1812 ^{are} were further evidence of peaceful means being ~~pushed~~ overestimated and unlikely to be a serious challenge.

The situation in Britain at the time is also an important factor. After the Napoleonic war unemployment was high due to the demobilisation and ~~so~~ less need for a war economy. The returning soldiers needed employment and taxes were extremely high. Bad crops in 1815-16 meant further agitation and hunger of the people led to general discontent. As such there were many displeased with the government and believed in reform.

(Section B continued) a necessity. Evidently the mood of the people would justify the government's fears and subsequent reactions and the situation was at its worst in the 35 years. Nevertheless most wanted it achieved through peaceful means and were content after the economy boom in the 1820s. As such even though ~~it was~~ there was discontent there was never enough to fuel a revolution. Another reason for this was no alliance between working class and middle class as Thompson points out: "an attempt to mount a wholly working class revolution without any middle class support". Only a combination of the two could mean even the chance of a successful uprising even though as Morgan says, even this would have been difficult as there were 'few vital levers of power' and therefore little chance of the same situation as in France.

A further ^{factor} ~~issue~~ as to why there could have been little chance of revolution was the lack of leadership. There was a 'lack of ^{potential} experienced leadership' as Thompson points out and even the ^{potential} leaders for example Hunt or Cartwright did not have a firm stand on how much reform was needed. This was vital to the reform movement and ~~the~~ AS its downfall.

Evidently there were many factors apart from government action that prevented. The violent outbreaks were not widely supported, ~~the peaceful protests~~ the middle class and working class refused to work together and there was a lack of leadership in the reform movement in general. Despite the peaceful movements being widespread they influenced little and despite the mood of the people

(Section B continued) in the years of an economic slump most were content after in the 1820s. These factors contributed to the prevention of a serious outbreak.

However the government played an important part with its measures of the Habeas Corpus Act and Six Acts. Also the use of hanging and transportation was as Morgan explains 'sharp, savage and effected'. The fear against British Jacobins meant the effective use of spies and the Committee of Secrecy was. As Gash points out the government actions were largely an overreaction as they were worried by 'lack of reliable information' on the exact extent of the situation. This view supports the fact that the combination of other factors were more important although he believes that the government 'could be excused for thinking there was a real danger' and that 'additional powers were necessary'.

It is ^{would be} wrong to conclude that government power was wholly unnecessary despite the other factors as it played an important part in containing the situation. Perhaps some measures for such as transportation or galleys were too strict but as Gash points out "Firmness at the outset would make unnecessary more drastic action later on".



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response integrates source material and the candidate's own knowledge to good effect. The key arguments in the sources are identified, examined and extended (with own knowledge) to develop the argument. The conclusion also makes a clear judgement about the relative importance of 'firm government action'.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Plan your answer around all the key issues raised by the sources and pick out useful quotations from each extract. That way, you won't overlook, or oversimplify, any of the sources when writing your response.

Question 8

On Question 8, stronger responses had a good understanding of the controversy concerning the extent to which the labouring classes benefited from the 'wealth and opportunities' created by the new industries. The source arguments (increased consumption between 1800 and 1850, the economic and social dislocation created by industrialisation and rising living standards for an increasing minority of the working classes) were used with some confidence although there was often uneven development. Candidates' own knowledge at the higher levels was often extensive but this was not a definite requirement. More importantly, it was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources. Good understanding of the relationship between the sources, and exploration of these links, using own knowledge, was also found here. Weaker candidates tended to produce (1) a largely unsupported commentary on the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the British labouring classes between 1780 and 1830 (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach on the 'benefited' issue (3) a generalised narrative account of the Industrial Revolution and/or working class life from 1780 to 1830 which barely addressed the question.

The sources to support as well as refute the idea that the labouring classes in Britain during the period 1780 to 1830, benefitted from the wealth and opportunities created by as a result of industrialisation.

Although the Industrial Revolution did create new opportunities, ~~for some peop~~ it was marked by a loss of livelihood for traditional artisan workers, which led ~~to~~ to a fall in living conditions. The creation of industry also created a clear class divide in society which is supported by Young in source 11 when he ~~states~~ refers to the 'visible spitting ~~of~~ society ^{into} of possessors and proletariat'. This was not the only negative consequence as the other sources demonstrate. Young refers to the 'horror' of their living conditions and ^{the} fall of living standards. Families that depended on traditional handicrafts lost their means of earning a sufficient livelihood as ~~well as~~ ^{did} agricultural labourers. This then led to ^a fall in living ~~standas~~ standards and increased mortality figures. This is supported by Royle in source 12

when refers to he states that the living conditions of 'cotton handloom weavers'... had certainly fallen'. Furthermore, the less than ideal standard of living is also ~~also~~ communicated

(Section B continued) by Young in source 11 when ^{he} describes the lives of the labouring classes as 'ghastly' and the 'honor' of their conditions.

However, the sources also support the idea that the labouring classes benefitted as a result of the consequences of the Industrial Revolution. This ^{is} reflected by a rise in wages and the greater consumption of food a variety of food. The rise in wages is reflected by communicated in source 12 by Royle in the statement that 'real wages were rising' for those 'engaged in the new industrial processes'. However, this rise in wages applied to only a 'minority of the working population' and therefore the view that the labouring classes benefitted from the wealth and opportunities created by industrialisation is significantly limited. The limited significance of industrialisation in ~~improving~~ is highlighted by Hartwell in source 10 when ^{he} attributes the ~~rise~~ failure of living standards to rise previously, not due to a lack of industry but as a result of war.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response has three major weaknesses. First, the candidate simply extracts points from the sources but does not really develop or cross-reference them in a rigorous manner. Second, there is only limited supporting evidence drawn from the candidate's own knowledge. Third, it is very short.

Paper Summary

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

In Depth Study question

- Candidates must provide more factual details. Candidates need to ensure their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth of analysis.
- Stay within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.
- More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.
- In order to address the question more effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis, not provide a descriptive or chronological account. Many candidates produced answers, which were focused and developed appropriately.
- Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.
- Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.

Associated Historical Controversy question

- The students who performed best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question. Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off potential areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question, without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.
- Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.
- Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.
- Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation, not historiography.
- There were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.
- There was a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, the process of carefully studying the sources to ascertain how they relate to the statement in the question, prior to writing the main analysis, allows candidates to clarify and structure their arguments.

Grade Boundaries

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

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.