



Examiners' Report June 2024

GCE History 9HI0 35

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_35_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

Candidates were able to engage effectively with 9HI0 35 dealing with Losing and Gaining an Empire (35.1) and The British Experience of Warfare (35.2). The paper consists of three sections. Section A is based on a primary source which forms the basis for consideration of two enquiries. Section B requires an essay on a depth topic with a question based on a second order concept, eg change, which promotes informed debate. Section C is a breadth question which covers a 100 year period.

Most candidates managed their time effectively although there were cases where the section C response was not completed.

In section A the strongest answers were rooted in the source with a range of points identified relevant to the two enquiries. Candidates then deployed their contextual knowledge to develop these points. It was disappointing that in a small number of cases one of the enquiries was not addressed. There will always be material relevant to both enquiries in the source.

In section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that were shaped to meet the demands of the question. There were responses that only looked at one side of the question. Candidates must be aware of the need to develop a counter argument. It is also vital that candidates respect the chronological parameters of the question.

Section C requires candidates to answer a breadth question which covers at least a 100 years. Bullet point 2 of the mark schemes makes clear that to attain level 5 on that bullet point it is necessary to cover at least 75% of the timeframe. To reach level 4 on that bullet point 60% is required. It is crucial on this question to focus on the exact question that has been set.

Question 1

Candidates were required to identify from the source points relating to the problems faced by the Lieutenant-Governor and the attitude he showed to his role. The majority of candidates were able to highlight points relevant to both enquiries with specific references from the source being cited. In most responses inferences were drawn and, in many cases, contextual knowledge was deployed to create reasoned inferences. This was particularly the case when discussing Head's attitude, notably to the more radical political elements and the dismissive tone he took towards the central issue of responsible government with Canadians playing a greater role. Stronger candidates commented on the tone of the source and what it revealed about the personality of the writer. Evaluation of the source was disappointing in many answers and some clearly expected to rely on the attribution to provide material for that assessment. Stronger candidates, however, showed knowledge and understanding of Head's reaction to his political superiors and the news that he was to be replaced by Durham.

While the source is of ^{Partial} ~~limited~~ value to revealing the problems faced by the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada in the years 1857-8: it ~~is~~ holds incredible value when displaying the attitude he took to his role. In order for a source to be of value when discussing the aforementioned topics, the ~~evidence~~ content of the source must be able to be corroborated with knowledge of the time, considerable amounts of knowledge equally about the two subjects ~~and~~ ~~with discussing the problems to be discussed~~ ~~and~~ and discuss both political and social issues. While Source one corroborates the evidence of the era well, giving a clear view of Head's attitudes of Canada's situation, it only briefly acknowledges the ^{problems} ~~issues~~, never truly expanding on them and only ever mentioning political issues never social. Therefore while it is useful when revealing Head's attitudes, it only holds partial value when revealing the problems in Upper Canada.

Significantly source one's outlook on the situation (rather Head's attitudes) is that of 'conflicting interests' which if handled poorly, 'would have ended in disaster'. These issues are evident from the growing

tensions within upper Canada, both from a failure of corrupt government and also social problems such as the influx of Irish immigrants in the 1830s and subsequent cholera outbreaks. While the source clearly acknowledges the tense situation corroborated with knowledge from the era, ('I fear the government is underestimating the problems it will encounter') it fails to expand adequately on the problems of themselves, limiting the source value. The problems Head mentions are 'French influence' and the 1837 rebellion. Due to the French Canadian majority within Lower Canada there were high social tensions between upper and lower Canada, showing the evident external social tensions. This is ~~not~~ complemented by the source ~~and~~ adding value to it yet this was not one of the main social issues. Prejudices towards the Irish during the influx of immigration can be argued to have created far larger instances of tension due to the fact that this was an internal issue. Further the cholera epidemics (for instance of 1832) can also be argued to be a larger social issue as it affected the very quality of living. The fact that Head barely mentions social issues in the first place and not even the most detrimental, weakens the source significantly. While the 1837 rebellion was a hugely integral issue particularly within upper Canada as it represented a want for independence, although only lasting a month

~~not~~ with 1000 men and only exchanging a few shots, this is not the source of political problems. So while bringing attention to ~~even~~ perhaps the most significant political problems of 1837-38, it does not address where this stemmed from (external influence of papineau's rebellions in Lower Canada or the lack of popularity for the family compact) and does not go into detail ~~of~~ of the problem, only the solution of the problem: 'two death sentences'. While highlighting the value of the source, ~~therefore~~ the fact that Head did draw attention to the 1837 rebellion is why the source does have partial value as it was such a significant problem.

The source holds far more value, becoming incredibly useful when describing Head's attitudes that he took to his role. He is evidently set in his attitudes, that he was 'concerned' of Lord Dorham being High Commissioner, and ~~is~~ was he was 'firm in my belief that the British Constitution is the best guide'. The whole speech is riddled in his beliefs and approach, first establishing the problems and then exclaiming his attitudes such as his views of Mackenzie where he was 'appalled' by his aggressive attitude. The source does neglect to mention the corrupt government that Head ran, when it became evident that

he was stealing government money. This ~~source~~ neglects however corroborates Head's attitude, as his lack of mentioning shows that his attitude he took to his role was rather of unpersonal, going as far as to not consider the economical impact his corruption would have brought. Head's ~~superior~~ attitude once again linking to the 'British constitution', further also exemplifies Head's ideological attitude, presenting him as an imperialist. This adds much value to the source as it adds further evidence to why Head made such decisions (wanting Upper Canada to stay in the British empire). His disapproval of the appointment of Lord Dornham in 1838, also displays Head's view of superiority and his belief that he did not need support, showing perhaps the fact that Head believed he was capable of solving the issues. The source therefore is ultimately incredibly valuable when discussing Head's attitude, as for the source manages to draw attention to Head's lack of belief of financial equality (or financial corruption), as well as his view on the rebels themselves ('aggressive attitude') as well as his own imperialistic attitude of superiority. The fact that the source allows for so many interpretations due to the corroborating knowledge from the 1830s, and evidently focuses on his attitudes makes the source incredibly valuable for showing his

attitudes.

This is further evident in the provenance. The fact that this was a farewell speech by Head to the executive council of Upper Canada, clearly emphasises Head's attitudes. The nature of a speaker's persuasion so his attitudes are shown to be clearly emphasised.

This perhaps also explains a lack of evidence of social protest as when addressing the council, Head is more likely to focus on the politics AKA, the political problems. However, although the ~~nature~~ nature of the speech exemplifies his attitudes, it simultaneously removes a lot of validity from his descriptions of the problems Upper Canada faced 1832-38 as perhaps it takes on a more prejudiced approach in order to present the workings of Upper Canada in Head's favour. The fact that it was spoken in 1838 however does add considerable value to the source as it shows Head's specific attitudes of the time as there is no gap in his memory of it, and exemplifies the problems as they have happened so recently.

In Conclusion while the source is incredibly useful at ~~and~~ revealing Head's attitudes towards his role of Lieutenant governor Leven as his imperialistic approach) it is only of partial value

when revealing the problems upper Canada faced due to its lack of explanation, and lack of mentioning key issues such as economic and social issues, meaning that while it corroborates evidence of the time, it does not expand enough.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Q1. Merits a sound level 4 mark.

Engages with the source and deploys some effective contextual knowledge to illustrate points. Argues that the treatment of one of the enquiries is not strong but is very thorough in dealing with the other enquiry.

Question 2

Candidates were required to examine the tactics employed by Wellington at Waterloo and to identify the value of the source for assessing Wellington's qualities as a commander. The majority of candidates rooted their response to both enquiries in the source and a range of key points were identified and illustrated by specific deployment of contextual knowledge. There was evidence of reasoned inference in the vast majority of responses, eg Wellington's attention to detail shown by his choice of the site for the decisive encounter and his development of strong points in the farm buildings. Many candidates also commented on his strategic ability, eg his co-operation with the Prussians who played such a key role. The majority of candidates produced some sound evaluation and some commented on the significance of his relations with his political superiors and the way he kept them informed of developments.

The source is written in the summer of 1815, just after the defeat of Napoleon. This is useful for revealing the usefulness of the source, as we can conclude that the information is fresh from the mind of someone who saw the entire battle. As commander of the coalition army, the Duke of Wellington (referred to as Wellington throughout) is a highly useful author as he saw the entire ~~side~~ battle from the top of the ridge at Mount St Jean. He can also better assess success and failure due to his wealth of military knowledge, seen through the peninsular wars. The source is a highly professional letter, written to inform the secretary of state for war about a huge British victory. This is useful to reveal the nature of the source as all information is handled professionally, with pride having less involvement in overstating the victory. Finally the tone is that of both pride and joy. Wellington has won a great battle. This makes

The source is useful to assess Wellington's personal characteristics because we will see his personal characteristics.

When revealing the tactics used by Wellington at the Battle of Waterloo, the source has many useful aspects. The first, and arguably principal, of these is the idea that Wellington was leading a "coalition army", and was aided by the Russian leader "Prince Blücher". We know this to be true as nearly all of the £250 million spent on the war went into the 7 European coalitions. This is useful for assessing Wellington's lack of complacency in tactics, and his keenness to rely on support from allies. Another tactic used by Wellington is the division of his forces to separate the French into pockets that he could take out one at a time. "I established two outposts... La Haye Sainte... and... Houyoumont." The latter of these farms was a valiant holdout from the 93rd Highland Regiment, and both played crucial roles in delaying the French attack until Blücher

arrived. This is useful because it can be assessed that Wellington is adept at using defensive strategy to win decisive victories. This is evidenced as Wellington's tactical genius rendered "the French vulnerable to crossfire". Wellington also makes use of all ~~part~~ three branches of his army, allowing control of the entire battlefield. His excellent use of artillery to counter "the enemy's repeated charges", also proved that he could use the cannons to great effect. By placing them at range, on the high ground, they were hard to hit with musket fire, but easy to ~~be~~ fire down into infantry formation. "Squares" also proved effective, where Wellington placed his men in 2-line squares (one bayonet line, one firing line) preventing cavalry from getting close. Despite this Wellington's crowning military tactic was "reverse slope" where he would protect and conceal vast quantities of troops until they were needed. It is this tactic that repelled the Neigh's cavalry charge, after Wellington feigned a retreat. The source is useful in revealing that

any general could have used these tactics but only Wellington could use them so effectively. Overall the source clearly details every bit of strategy used by Wellington at Waterloo, making the source extremely useful for revealing the tactics used.

When evaluating Wellington's qualities as a leader the source is equally as useful. Proven at Talavera (1806), ~~th~~ a lesser general would see small victory and push forwards yet Wellington pushed back. "We held off the French offensive at the Battle of Quatre Bras and I took the decision to pull back". This shows Wellington to be intelligent and reserved as a leader, thinking about the further Battle ahead. This proved to be a good choice as it delayed Napoleon, who had to pull guns through deep Belgian mud, due to heavy rain. He is also sure in his own ability: "I was confident that his Prussian forces would continue to play an important role". This faith in his allies reveals that Wellington was

a steadfast leader who both gave and commanded respect. His vision was true when the green-coat Russians out flanked the French and won the war, at around 4 PM. Wellington was also extremely paternal. "They were less vulnerable to the massive bombardment". By placing his men behind the ridge like on the reverse slope he shows great care and protection over his men and sees each soldier as valuable. He also demonstrated this at the Siege of the Bada^{joz}, where he cried over the loss of 5000 men. The source is cynical here in revealing the caring nature that Wellington's men came to respect him for. This is demonstrated again: "We have lost many who have served their country with distinction. 20,000 died at Waterloo, and the source shows Wellington's respect for his subordinates. Overall, the source effectively displays all of Wellington's characteristics, whilst slightly overlooking his more ruthless side such as at the Battle of Victoria in which he referred to his men as the "Scum of the Earth".

To conclude, the source is highly valuable for revealing both the tactics used by Wellington at the Battle of Waterloo and for the qualities he showed as a commander. It gives first hand accounts of specific military tactics, and is spoken with the tone of intelligence and experience. Wellington also writes with great respect for the men he has lost, warning in comparison to the likes of Baglan and Buller. Overall it can be said that Wellington was one of the greatest military leaders of our time.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Q2. Merits a clear level 5. Response is rooted in the source and identifies points central to both enquiries. Cites specific references from the source and deploys contextual knowledge to develop points.

Question 3

The most popular of the questions in this section of the paper. Candidates were required to discuss the reasons for the British loss of the American Colonies with an assessment of the contention that the superior military skills of the rebel Americans was the most significant factor. The topic was generally well known and the majority of candidates identified a range of points and at least began to weigh them up. Consideration of the nominated factor tended to focus on the role of Washington and the Americans' knowledge and use of the landscape but there was also some effective discussion of the development of the Continental Congress and role of individuals such as Sam Adams. Most candidates were aware of the role of the French, eg at Yorktown, and linked it to their development of American military superiority.

Other factors were also identified to promote informed debate. Most candidates discussed British military failings with some impressively clear accounts of the Saratoga campaign. Strong candidates also discussed other weaknesses on the British side including political divisions at home, commitments to other parts of the Empire and the failure to deploy the potentially decisive Royal Navy effectively.

While the American rebels had superior military skills, I do not believe that this played the biggest part in Britain's loss of their American colonies. Other factors such as the new wave of enlightenment and the strong unity built between the 13 colonies to rebel against the imposing taxes brought on by the Crown. Military skills are important but if forces do not have a cause to fight for that is ~~of~~ ^{important} ~~crucial~~ for them, morale is low and ~~so~~ troops will not give the same effort. American troops were fighting for their freedom, whereas British troops were fighting based on orders all the way from London. This difference is ultimately why the 13 colonies won against the British in the American war of independence.

~~#~~ Even though I do not believe

the superior military skills to be the main reason for the British losing the American colonies, they still had a massive influence. At the battles of Lexington and Concord, which are considered the first shots of war, the American ~~the~~ soldiers forced the British to retreat further east, the British were only saved when relief ships arrived with supplies and more ~~so~~ men. However, this display of dominance from American soldiers had enthused the rebels with a sense of confidence and, on the other hand thoroughly embarrassed the British, as they had thousands ~~to~~ more men than America but had still been forced to retreat.

Another example is Washington seizing the gunpowder from factories in the colonies, making British forces believe an attack was imminent. This act distracted British forces and caused them to be ready for an attack that never happened. The British forces travelled south, searching for more loyalists for support, however Washington met

one British force with over 16,000 rebels, immediately preventing the British from moving further South. While these superior military skills allowed for major progress towards independence in the 13 states I still don't believe that it played the biggest part in it.

A factor I believe to be the biggest part in Britain's loss of their American colonies was instead, the mindsets ~~and~~ and the movements spreading across America. The main movement being enlightenment. With the ~~to~~ meaning 'dare to know' enlightenment was the ~~to~~ desire for new ways of life with independence, further education and new policies in healthcare, advances in science and ~~to~~ a new perspective on traditional gender roles. The idea of enlightenment spread fast throughout the colonies, mainly due to Thomas Paine's pamphlet 'Common Sense'. Enlightenment brought the colonies together as many people believed this new way of living and thinking was

the future. It further drove the idea of independence in a way not seen before. This new political awareness meant that a majority of people (non-loyalists) could agree on topics and present as a more united front to protest against British imperial rule. Enlightenment leaders such as ~~Thomas Jefferson~~ ^{Benjamin Franklin}, Paul Revere and Thomas Paine became leaders of the revolution and later became very involved with the American declaration of independence. Intelligence and new ideologies ~~it~~ ^{were} vital for America to be victorious in the war of independence as it allowed for more organisation and less of a need for military violence.

Another factor that caused the British to lose the American colonies was the anger that the British had caused by continuously imposing taxes on the colonies and the criticised ~~them~~ ^{actions} of giving orders from London to the colonies instead

of allowing the colonists to have involvement in their own governments. With the tea act being the final straw that then led to the Boston tea party, where £10,000 worth of tea (346 chests) ~~there~~ were thrown off boats such as the *Tea* in the Boston ~~port~~ harbor. In retaliation of the Britain allowing the East India Company to trade directly with the American colonies rather than through British ports. This made the tea much cheaper and Americans couldn't compete with the prices, meaning tea business in the colonies suffered. The continued use of taxes on the American colonies eventually bubbled up into absolute anger and resistance from the colonies, with groups such as the Sons of Liberty taking lead of the resistance. The population in the American colonies were also not much more involved in politics than in Britain, 60% of Americans ~~able~~ ^{were able to} ~~to vote~~, ~~not~~ vote compared to 1 in 10 men in Britain. This wide franchise

allowed Americans to feel as if they had more of a sense of control. This helped to further inspire the idea of unity and further resistance against British control.

In conclusion, while the Americans did possess superior military skills, this factor did not play the biggest part in Britain's loss of their American colonies. Instead, I believe it was the numerous new ideas and movements spreading throughout the colonies, that inspired resistance and encouraged political involvement and education that ultimately led to the British loss. Enlightenment showed Americans that a better America was possible and they could choose to what it was like. This hope and encouragement gave the American rebels a cause to fight for. The strong determination ~~ultimately~~ led to America gaining its independence.



Q3. Merits clear level 4.

A focused response which develops an argument and deploys a range of specific evidence to illustrate it. The response is an interesting example of a candidate who focuses on strong development of American perspectives and not other factors, eg French and Spanish interventions.

Question 4

This was the less popular question in this section. The question aimed to promote an informed discussion of the reasons for the decision to establish settlements in Western Australia and to weigh the economic and commercial points against other factors, notably the determination to prevent France establishing bases in this area and the need to develop and safeguard British interests in Asia. The majority of candidates were able to develop points regarding the availability of potentially rich agricultural land, notably for sheep farming and the opportunity to start a new life. The stronger responses developed these points and were able to introduce evidence specifically related to Western Australia, eg the contribution of James Stirling and the development of the Swan River Company.

1823 - Swan River colony

- new trade - new resources

1765 Australia Agricultural economy

- private new business

- close to Britain - Strategic

Stop French -

Napoleonic Wars

- new grant royal grant

- Socially - expand colony - NSW Act

- Aborigines?

- less economic; land grants

- exchange more population in territories

Many ~~people~~ historical debate on Britain's decision to establish a settlement in Western Australia in 1823, such as the economic factors, the political factors, and also the social factors of such a decision. However, with sufficient evidence, it is clear that the statement ~~is~~ ^{is} accurate.

Some might consider the economic and commercial decisions of ~~a~~ a settlement in Western Australia. This is clearly accurate through the British government's financial aid from the City of London to Australia, for example in 1823 when £10M was given to the Australia government in a royal grant, clearly showing the British government's economic desires.

in Western Australia. Additionally in 1823, The Swan River Company was set up to purchase land in the West Australian to set land grants for people who were willing to go to Australia and economically contribute in the area, by giving 4000 acres for every pound spent on land. Furthermore, the Australian Agricultural Company was founded, in response to the growing economic importance, to set out administration by the Australia Legislative Assembly. Some might also suggest the ~~introduction~~ increase of trade being a big commercial factor in the decision. As the majority of the population lived in the New South Wales in Eastern Australia, Australia found itself in a difficult position in regards to international trade. By having a ~~population~~ ^{proportion} of the population to the work coast, it increased the amount of trade fairly by 15% with other international ports. Ultimately, the government and the Crown's interference with the decision clearly shows the economic decision behind it. Therefore, economic and commercial motivations were a significant motivation behind the decision.

Some might also suggest that a political ~~attitude~~ motivation was also applicable behind this decision. As this decision was made in the early 1820s, it is clear as an international 2nd Britain had many opponents, not to mention the French who had consistently been the trouble with in this era, the biggest being the Napoleonic

was in 1815. As the French were also seizing land where the British were, which also happened in the US, Canada, and in the Suez Canal colonies, the British were destined to stop the French acquiring Western Australia. Britain also had a similar attitude towards the Chinese and the Japanese, who had sealing and whaling posts around Australia, a clear threat to British rule. Ultimately, ~~the geo-political strategy~~ ~~drive~~ behind it is significant, the geo-political stance that Britain took ~~clearly shows~~ is clearly significant as it was a ~~first contact~~ ~~purpose~~ throughout Britain's imperial history.

Finally, one can consider the societal reasons or motivations behind ~~this~~ the decision to create a settlement in Western Australia. This it could be argued with the New South Wales Act of 1825, which gave some self-governance to the Australian assembly. Throughout Australia's history, especially under Macquarie, it became clear that the Australians wanted to transform the colony from a prison colony to a fully-functioning society of individuals. Therefore, it is plausible that a settlement of in Western Australia was to keep the already-expanding colony of new free-born settlers the autonomy and independence to work for themselves. Additionally, it became

clear that the government advisors paper from Britain to work in western Australia, through economic and political incentives such as a better standard of live and a higher wage. Nevertheless, may suggest that the settlement of western Australia was not a one caused by societal change as much of New South Wales was already 'free' by the late 1820s. Over 60% of the population were 'free-sons' and already had been given land grants in areas such as Parramatta for personal incentives. Therefore, the societal motivations were of little significance of behind the decision to create a settlement in western Australia.

To conclude, with sufficient evidence this judgement of the decision to move a western Australian settlement as an economic and commercial one to be fairly accurate. Whilst it is clear that the societal impacts had little to no significance behind the decision as much of New South Wales was already a fully-functioning society, the economic and political factors were together both significant. By going emigrating to western Australia, the British government could grow their colony and increase international trade, whilst also politically protecting the west side of their colony from other powers such as the French. Therefore, the judgement is fairly accurate.



Q4. Merits level 4.

The response identifies commercial and financial reasons for settlement and cites the intention of safeguarding British interests, especially against the French.

There is a lack of specific reference to Western Australia but the general points are valid and the response is clearly structured.

Question 5

This was the most popular of the questions in this section. Candidates were expected to examine the reasons for Boer success in the conflict up to the relief of Ladysmith and weigh the significance of Boer strengths against other factors. The nominated factor was illustrated and explained in the majority of responses with reference to the quality of their commanders and the effectiveness of their 'commando' tactics. There was also much reference to their knowledge of the terrain with stronger candidates citing specific examples, eg Colenso. Many candidates were also aware of the significance of the use of more advanced German military equipment, eg Mauser rifles. Candidates then measured these points against British failings with much focus on Buller and the lack of manpower in the early stages of the conflict.

I agree with the judgement that the strengths of the Boer forces account for their consistent success against the British military up to the relief of Ladysmith, ^{to a good extent} as they had had quite a large advantage with their knowledge of terrain, ~~and organisation~~ ^{training and weapons} however the lack of organisation by the British and the ~~change of poor~~ leadership, ~~or~~ changes and command of the British side, also played a significant part in their consistent success, ~~however it can be argued~~ ^{however it can be argued were it} ~~was not as important as the Boer's~~ ^{strength}

Further, the Boer forces, although they were very small in size in comparison to the British force, were very strong and were very good for fighters and can clearly

be seen through the sieges of Mafeking, Kimberley and Ladysmith. The Boers had expert knowledge of the terrain which significantly hindered the British as they had trouble ~~not~~ navigating South Africa, ~~so~~ which led to mistakes running up to the relief of Ladysmith due to confusion. This factor helped the Boers to be stronger and gain a large advantage over the British. Furthermore, the Boers were very well trained and were all skilled horseback riders, as opposed to the British who mainly had very few training or experience before being sent to the Boer War. The Boers were a lot more coordinated than the British and as a result of their strong upbringing and training, were a lot better equipped to fight than the British, which led to their success of besieging Ladysmith, Mafeking and Kimberley. The Boers also used their own weapons, which were more effective than the British British's, even though in some cases they were not as technologically advanced. Due to this and their trained skill with their individual weapons, they were able to ~~take down~~ succeed against the British and ~~was a~~ this combination of factors ~~are~~ were a significant reason why they got consistent success against the British military.

However in contrast to this, poor military leadership was also another significant reason for the Boers' consistent success against the British. The relay began with Buller

and in charge, however he communicated very badly and made ~~poor~~ ~~decisions~~ ~~poor~~ considerably poor decisions which led to the Boers besieging Ladysmith, Mafeking and Kimberley. As a result ~~there~~ ^{there} had to be changes in leadership and Roberts was replaced by Buller. He was ~~able~~ eventually able to relieve Ladysmith however, the ~~time~~ ~~wasted~~ ~~poor~~ ~~decisions~~ made by Buller led to ~~an~~ an early defeat of the British by the Boers up to 1900. ^{as they had next time to prepare.} This would suggest that this factor has a significant part to play in the consistent success of the Boers, and hinders the argument that it was the ~~Boers'~~ ^{Boers'} of the Boer forces that were the overriding factor.

On the other hand, another important factor to consider when evaluating whether the strength of the Boer forces account for their consistent success against the military is the ~~poor~~ ~~resources~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Bo~~ lack of resources the British had. The British, unlike the Boers did not have expert knowledge of the terrain, which they found to be quite difficult and employed some ~~poor~~ local ~~experts~~, however these local experts were not frequent enough in the force to successfully direct all of the troops and could not ~~be~~ ~~relied~~ ~~on~~ always be reliable. This led to a number of mistakes or decisions warbling time, ~~making~~ ~~the~~ ~~giving~~ the Boers more time to prepare their attack, ~~making~~ ~~the~~ the British more ~~easy~~ susceptible to attack and ~~giving~~ the Boers a higher chance of success. Furthermore, supplies

were also difficult to get to the British due to this difficult terrain, as a result they did not have the sufficient equipment to fight off and defend against the Boers, ~~which was~~ for example they did not have enough weapons. Although it can be argued that this would not have made much of a difference due to the skill of the Boer forces. They were also malnourished due to the difficulty of getting the food to them and for it is prepared and was often dehydrated. ~~Therefore~~ ~~also~~ due to a lack of water and long marches through Africa to get to the ~~right~~ sites. This ~~consequently~~ ~~consequently~~ affected their performance and ~~made the Boer~~ helped the Boer's to win consistent successes ~~against~~ against the British.

In conclusion, I agree ~~to~~ to the statement that the strengths of the Boer forces were the principal reason for the ~~or~~ successes of ~~the~~ against the British up to the relief of Ladysmith, ~~as~~ to a good extent, as although the poor leadership and lack of resources affected ~~the British~~ Britain's performance, it can be argued that regardless of this, the Boer's would have succeeded due to their advantage in terrain, training and weapons.



Q5. Merits level 4.

Addresses the nominated factor and cites specific Boer strengths, eg knowledge of the terrain, strict discipline and use of German Mauser rifles. Weighs this against a range of British failings, notably those of Buller. Some specific engagements are cited.

Question 6

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. The majority of candidates used their knowledge of the campaigns on the Western Front and the developments in military technology to develop an informed argument, eg the developments of machine guns which could be used on both sides of the debate and the advent of tanks.

Many candidates brought in other factors, eg the changing tactical mindset of senior commanders and the impact of events in other theatres of the War. There was also some effective discussion of the significance of more sophisticated communications technology.

The strongest argument is that the judgement that the use of new technology was the principle cause of the war on the Western Front becoming a war of attrition rather than a war of movement in the years 1914-18 is mostly accurate, due to the fact that ~~unlike~~ while other factors such as the use of new tactics and the role of ~~existing~~ ~~technology~~ ~~played~~ ~~a~~ ~~significant~~ ~~role~~ ~~in~~ ~~this~~ ~~development~~, the use of new technology was ultimately the most significant factor.

The most significant factor in the war on the Western Front becoming a war of attrition rather than a war of movement in the years 1914-18 was the development of new technology. This is due to the fact that, particularly in the early stages of the war, killing technologies such as weapons had ~~evolved~~ evolved ~~more~~ more rapidly than communication technologies. A notable

example of this was the development of the machine gun - while this had been adopted by all major powers following its invention in 1884, it had become increasingly lighter and easier to utilise - while earlier forms of machine gun were cumbersome and required four people to operate, this was addressed with innovations such as the Vickers machine gun which could fire up to 500 rounds per minute. This was highly significant in that it enabled defending forces to take advantage of the relatively primitive methods of communication utilised during the war prior to the adoption of the radio during the later stages of the war and this resulted in offensive operations incurring high casualties on a regular basis, as advancing in a closed formation would lead to men being mowed down, ^{largely} necessitating multiple waves of attacks, ^{as occurred with the deaths of 19000 men on the first day of the Battle of the Somme} whereas advancing in open formation would lead to a loss of control by commanders over their men. Overall therefore, the development of new technologies was the most significant factor in the development of the war on the Western Front becoming a

was attention rather than a war of movement during this period.

Another highly significant factor which contributed to the War of the Western Front becoming a war of attrition rather than a war of movement in the period 1914-18 was the development of new defensive tactics. This is due to the fact that the development of tactics such as trench warfare provided defenders with a substantial advantage over offensive operations. A notable example of this was the fact that the 1914 Battle of the Marne saw French forces push back German forces, until the Germans were able to utilise trenches to obstruct any further French advance. Trench warfare was highly significant in that it enabled defenders to evade offensive tactics, such as the German forces' use of underground bunkers to evade the creeping barrage of artillery utilised by British forces at the July 1916 Battle of the Somme, before returning to their positions from which they

Infllicted 19000 British Casualties in a day on 1 July. Moreover, trench warfare enabled the utilisation of barbed wire which effectively obstructed offensive forces as standard grenades were too inaccurate to destroy it; it was not until the invention of Fuzes 106 in the later stages of the war that this advantage could be overcome by shells that detonate on impact with soft land or barbed wire. Overall, therefore, due to its significance in providing defending forces with a substantial advantage over offensive forces, due to its enabling of the use of bunkers to evade artillery, barbed wire to obstruct advancing forces and the more effective utilisation of new technologies such as machine guns to mow down advancing armies, trench warfare and new defensive tactics were a highly significant factor in the Western Front becoming a war of attrition rather than a war of movement during this period.

Another, highly significant factor which contributed to the ~~success~~ development

as the war on the Western Front becomes a war of attrition rather than a war of movement in the years 1914-18 was the role of aircraft. This is due to the fact that ~~more than~~ while almost over 90% of aircraft missions were utilised to conduct aerial reconnaissance, with cameras which evolved from being large and cumbersome to relatively small and attached to the fuselage, and with communications that evolved from inter-~~person~~ reports to radio communication that enabled indirect artillery fire in the later stages of the war - while reconnaissance aided offensive forces by providing them with information such as the ~~number~~ number of enemy trench lines and the position of enemy artillery, it also contributed to a change of the use of movement by enabling descending forces to prepare for impending artillery bombardments. Moreover, as was demonstrated in the ~~1918~~ Battle of Amiens, aircraft, while not specialised for this purpose, and vulnerable to attacks from artillery or anti-aircraft guns, could engage in ground support of an advancing army - while this may have helped to enable a war of movement.

it nonetheless arguably contributed to a war of attrition as aircraft were able to drop munitions on enemy supply networks, thereby delaying advances by counter-attack and further prolonging a war of attrition. Overall, however, the role of aircraft was a highly significant factor in the development of the war on the Western Front into a war of attrition rather than a war of movement during this period.

In conclusion, the strongest argument is that the ~~main~~ judgement 'the use of new technology was the principal cause of the war on the Western Front becoming a war of attrition rather than a war of movement in the years 1914-18' is mostly accurate due to the significance of new technologies in weaponry, such as machine guns, in outpacing developments in communication technology and thereby giving a decisive advantage - notably, however, in other sectors, such as the use of trench warfare to provide the use of barbed wire and the use of aircraft to conduct reconnaissance and ground attacks to undermine

potential enemy offensive operations, we also
highlight significant factors in this development.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Q6. Merits entry point level 5.

Identifies and illustrates a range of factors, notably machine guns and tanks, with some specific engagements cited. Strong on impact of improved communications technology and covers the timeframe effectively.

Question 7

This was the more popular question in this section of the paper. The question required consideration of the proposition that the developing power of the Royal Navy was the most significant stimulus to British commercial development. Many candidates identified and illustrated a sound range of points with some effective specific illustration, eg the change in ship types and the establishing of naval harbours in many key locations to protect trade routes.

Many candidates developed other factors and some of these, eg the expeditions and cartography of James Cook and the work of Barrow in sponsoring expeditions, could be related to developments in the Royal Navy.

There are several stimulants to British Commercial success between the years 1763-1878, all of which played a role in aiding Britain in becoming a global superpower and a trading force to be reckoned with. It can be argued that factors such as the power of the royal Navy, and the purchase of Suez Canal shares by Benjamin Disraeli, were the most significant stimulants to British commercial success. However, it is undoubtable that the industrial revolution was the most significant factor in Britain's increasing success commercially.

It may be argued that the power of the royal Navy provided a significant stimulus to British commercial successes in the years 1763-1878, as it gave Britain both a powerful source to trade from, and allowed them to both defend old interests, and gain new ones. For example, the power of the royal Navy was significant in the suppression of piracy, which was a growing problem for the British throughout the period. Britain's

Commercial interests could not be protected if they prosper if they were unable to trade securely without intervention from outside forces, such as pirates - it was a key issue that had to be solved to protect the commercial interests of Britain. Significant threats came from French privateers (pirates who were working on behalf of their crown) and the Beys, who were especially motivated by the fact that they were able to keep 10% of the profits made from their pirated goods. The might of the royal navy meant that Britain's commercial interests could be protected from the threat of piracy, as they were able to deploy tactics such as blockades, as seen in the Algiers, and bombardments. As well as this, it allowed Britain to acquire and defend territories that were essential stimulants to trade, such as those in the Far East. ~~France~~ Shanghai was a particularly important place commercially for Britain as they were able to trade along the Yangtze river, which was 1,000 miles long, and gave access to a booming opium trade - valued at 6.5 thousand by 1880. As well as this, the acquisition of Hong Kong was significant as Britain were able to establish merchant houses (there were a total of 20 in the 1860s), which allowed them to trade directly with other countries in a system resembling

free trade, a policy which later became significant and important for British interests. The far East also offered goods that were important for British commerce such as China, and access to these was only ^{possible} significant if Britain had the military and naval might to defend them. However, these acquisitions, whilst significant, cannot be considered the most important for several reasons. Firstly, the British fight against piracy was not entirely effective - for example, French privateers could evade British blockades due to the compact and speedy ship types used. As well as this, it can easily be argued that, without industrialisation, the change in ship types cannot be as effective as previously it could be, as it was the refined ship types and weaponry that gave Britain their naval might, and ensuring their commercial success.

Conclusion

It is undoubted that the most significant stimulus to Britain's economic success in the years 1763 - 1878 was the Industrial Revolution, which began in Britain around the year 1760, and continued into the late 18th century. One way

in which the industrial revolution aided Britain was the growth of domestic industries, and the impacts that it had on trade - the availability of machinery to produce goods, such as the mechanical loom, helped Britain prosper significantly - more goods could be produced in a shorter time frame, meaning that Britain had more goods to trade. This is evident by the fact that by 1880, half of the world's cotton was produced by the British textile industry, ~~and~~ which had bases in places such as Liverpool. As well as this, the shift from sail to steam ships was a significant stimulus to trade for Britain for many reasons - what began in 1794 with the creation of 'the Kent', soon became a booming industry, with individuals such as Isambard Kingdom Brunell taking advantage of the shift to steam and sparking what would be a gradual progress from sail ships to steam ships - This aided British commercial interests as they were able to trade with places further away, such as the far East - the wind was not always reliable around those areas, and it was a long and arduous journey to arrive in those far flung places - Without the British industrialisation, we would not be able to trade

with those places, and not be able to produce the large quantities of goods which aided British success. While it can be argued that Industrialisation did end Britain's supremacy, as it put everyone on an equal playing field in terms of technology, and it led to a sense of distrust between nations due to increasing weaponry, such as the Paikhan rifle, created in 1875, which was used on British gunboats, the commercial success of Britain was highly reliant on the industrial revolution, both in terms of producing, buying, and trading goods.

It may also be argued that the Suez Canal, and the purchase of shares by Benjamin Disraeli in ^{the 1800s} 1833-1837, allowed for the most significant stimulus to British trade. The Suez canal alone was significant because it allowed Britain an easier passage to places such as the Far East, from which they traded opium (a booming trade in the 1800s) and porcelain, as well as India, which was characterised in its spice trades. Benjamin Disraeli's purchase of Khedive Arabi Pasha's shares of Egypt was on the brink of bankruptcy after his vanity project

to make Cairo closely resemble Paris, totalling 44% of total shares, was significant for many reasons. Firstly, it guaranteed commercial access to the canal, which ensured well protected and easy access to places in the far East, as previously mentioned. However, these shares were also profitable to Britain - by 1822, ~~shares~~^{dividends} in the canal were at 33%, meaning that Britain profitted from those who used the canal - it was a viable source of income, which allowed Britain to prosper as a nation, and

invest those shares back into things such as naval supremacy. However, it cannot be considered the most important for a number of reasons - first, it provided a distraction from focus on commerce - the prospect of the Suez canal being used as a bargaining chip by Egyptian nationalists was a very real prospect for Britain, which led to them having to defend ~~commercial access~~

their place in Egypt, drawing them ^{1870s} further into the Sudan in the ~~1870s~~. As well as this, access to the canal was only possible due to the development of steam ships, meaning that without the industrial revolution and the move to steam, the shares would not really be a significant help to Britain commercially, as it would not be able to be used

for trade - in fact, the need to industrialise was what prevented Britain from buying shares in the canal in the first place.

In conclusion, the ~~purchase of Suez~~ Industrial revolution was undoubtedly the most significant stimulus to trade, as it made all other options stimuli possible, and allowed Britain to branch out commercially and trade further, as well as promoted naval supremacy, through changing weapons and ship types.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Q7. Merits level 5. Identifies a range of points with some effective specific illustration. Relative significance of factors is weighed up to facilitate a balanced overall judgement. Does not achieve a clear level 5 because of a lack of full chronological coverage.

Question 8

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. The question required consideration of the proposition that developments in the Americas, rather than in the Far East, had the most significant impact on the pattern of trade.

The majority of candidates had at least sound analysis of the pattern of trade with the American Colonies and later with the USA. However, only a minority of candidates provided evidence regarding Canada, the Caribbean or South America.

However, most candidates provided at least a fair range of points regarding the developing trade with the Far East.

disagree somewhat
I ~~agree~~ ~~not~~ with statement that the development
in the Americas had a far more than east ~~but~~ ^{however}
I think that developments in ~~east~~ ^{America} were still very
ingrained especially the mercantilism in America and establishment
of eastern entrepreneurs.

Trade at the beginning of the 1760s were primarily
focused on taxing the American colonies in
the west. Post seven years war British national
debt had doubled ~~to~~ and a lot of money in
that war ~~had~~ was used protecting colonies so
the British government heavily taxed them through
Policies of Stamp act 1767 which put
a tax on ~~all~~ ^{most} documents, sugar act 1765 which
put 30% of duties on every gallon of molasses, this
was done also in West Indies and America. These
taxes were economically successful ~~but~~ ~~had~~ ~~been~~ ~~repealed~~
but Stamp act was repealed in the colonies due
to discontent. The Tea act of 1773 was another
example of Britain protecting trade in the
~~the~~ Americas as how East India Company tea
was exclusively shipped to the Americas. These
Policies in late 1700s the empire was crucial

and when it's why the developments in the war of independence caused such a shift in trade pattern as trade with Americas post war and during war wasn't great and did actually force british trade patterns towards the far east more. equally with the free trade movement beginning in the early 1800s with Peel's conservatism ~~to~~ remarkably over 100 tariffs, hitting the West Indies and am. developments in the ~~far~~ west Indies and Americas ~~which~~ which helped Britain's trade move from mercantilist to free trade. This was shown in the repeal of the last navigation acts, which were acts that cemented the british mercantilist system. the sugar act was the last to go and this act had terrible consequences in Americas and West Indies economy and Peel (who had repealed it) was forced to resign. This made whigs come into power in 1840s and they were crucial in moving Britain into free trade, this may not have happened if the conservatives set this as the mercantilist system by benefiting the high elite. This shows that the developments in Americas were crucial for the change in trade pattern from the mercantilist to free trade which dominated the empire on lands.

However, however developments in the east were also crucial in changing the pattern of trade for British Empire. The acquisition of Singapore in 1819 was a key example. Singapore was established by ~~the~~ James Raffles in order to undermine Dutch in the area, avoid pirates in Malacca Strait and improve trade with China. The reason ~~the~~ Singapore was so crucial for changing the patterns of trade is the fact Singapore was made a entrepot which had a free port without tariffs. This wasn't revolutionary in world trade as Amsterdam was a large entrepot, but Singapore was the first for the British Empire. This entourage in Singapore was massively successful for the empire as Singapore saw massive growth and this also solidified to the British Government that free trade was the way as entrepots were free traded hot spots. ~~This~~ Singapore was crucial as it led to another key entrepot in Hong Kong which was very crucial for China trade and allowed large ships to dock ~~there~~ and unload as well. ~~Another~~ Developments in Singapore in the east was key example of the British Empire changing trade patterns by introduction, entrepots.

~~The~~ Finally, the developments in the lease of Weihai in 1898 ~~was also~~ and Zanzibar emphasized a key shift in trade patterns ~~and~~ for the empire. The lease of Weihai was given to Britain from China in response to Russia getting ~~the~~ ^{key} Port Arthur. Russian expansion in the east could have disrupted ~~foreign~~ British interest in China and Shanghai are potentially long ways ~~from~~ Weihai is geographically close to Port Arthur so the British could monitor Russian ~~Port~~ plans. The reason for this development changed trade patterns as it showed the British's priorities had shifted to ~~the~~ protection of their interests rather than economic gain as Britain didn't generate any money from Weihai. It ~~was~~ was solely here to look over and protect British interests which was their development for the change of trade patterns in the British empire.

Over I mostly disagree that developments in the Americas had a more significant development on the trade pattern than in the east. Although the loss of American colonies ~~and~~ ~~led to~~ repeal of ~~Navigation acts~~ and ~~the~~ ~~abolition~~ of repeal of navigation acts did help push to grow trade for British ^{empire} ~~empire~~.

also it could have noted ~~on~~ the british eastern trade to develop due to newor, its ~~the~~ developments in the east that were crucial. The establishment of entrepots in Singapore and ~~Kang Kong~~ Hong Kong ~~were~~ subsidised british free trade and changed the way the empire ~~was done~~ trade was conducted overall and the ~~the~~ lease over ~~the~~ ~~signified~~ the change of british trade to be more of protecting interests rather than economic. Therefor I think developments in the east were more important and therefore disagree with the statement.



Q8. Merits sound level 4. The response deals effectively with Far East factors with some good citing of specific evidence. However, it has a relatively narrow consideration of the Americas with its focus being on the American Colonies and the USA.

Question 9

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. Candidates were required to consider the proposition that the Haldane Army Reforms were the most significant in identifying the issues that the British Army faced and advancing solutions.

The nominated factor was addressed effectively by the vast majority of candidates and it was pleasing to note that most candidates attempted to comment on the 'issues' as well as the 'solutions'. Most candidates also addressed the McNeill-Tulloch report and the Cardwell reforms but a significant number neglected the earlier part of the timeframe, eg reduced military budgets after the end of the French Wars in 1815 and the conservative mindset regarding potential reform of influential figures such as Wellington. This had implications for the level awarded for bullet point 2 of the mark scheme.

Throughout 1790-1918 it was undeniable that the army was in need of significant reforms. The Haldane reforms were highly significant in identifying the issues faced by the British army and in advancing solutions as Haldane significantly improved the quality of the army as a whole. However, early reforms such as the Duke of York and Palmerston reforms were also highly significant as they kick started army improvements and began the creation of the army as an appealing career. Furthermore, the Cardwell reforms could be identified as the most significant reform in identifying the issues that the British faced ~~as~~ ^{and} in advancing solutions as Cardwell solved recruitment issues, leading to significant victories later in the war.

Following the Boer War, 4 key issues were identified within the British army: doctrine, supply, training and overall quality of the soldiers. The ~~liberal~~ newly elected liberal government sought to solve these issues and in turn granted Haldane £28 million to

"Fix the army". Haldane implemented huge changes in order to solve these problems including the creation of the British Expeditionary Force (150,000 elite full time soldiers) and Territorial Army (248,000 reserves) improving the overall quality of men significantly and created a strong reserve that did not need to be paid during peacetime, solving wartime recruitment and decreasing the costs of a sustainable army. Furthermore, Haldane created the officer training corps, significantly improving the quality of leadership in the army. Overall, the significance and success of the Haldane reforms is highly evident during the First World War, especially during the Battle of Marne 1914 as the BEF exceptionally held off German troops despite being outnumbered (known as the miracle of the Marne) and stopped the Schlieffen Plan as the Territorial Army sustained high losses before homefront recruitment began and the key issues were successfully solved.

However, ~~the~~^e early reforms were also highly significant in identifying and solving the issues of the British Army. For example, the Duke

of York reforms were implemented due to the poor leadership and awful quality of the army exposed during the Flanders Campaign. These reforms included the increase of pay, decrease of floggings, the restriction of purchasing commissions and the creation of Sandhurst (an army officer training college). However, while Wellington himself credited these reforms with ~~th~~ a noticeably improved army it could be said that these reforms were more ^{necessary} ~~practical~~ tweaks than radical reforms and therefore not the most significant reform in identifying the issues that the British army faced or in advancing the solutions (1800 - 1912). The ~~th~~ Palmerston reforms were another significant early reform as they were implemented due to the abysmal conditions exposed during the Crimean War through the McNeill Tulloch report and reporters such as Russel and Chennery. The Palmerston reforms introduced the creation of the Army Medical Corps, introduction of transport and clothing divisions, increased education requirements and abolished the commissariat overall ^{highly} improving the medical and supply divisions of the army. ~~legend~~

However, while these reforms were highly significant, they were certainly not the most significant at identifying and solving issues of the British army as they were more the bare minimum of what the army deserved since even before 1800.

On the other hand, the Cardwell reforms are a strong contender for the most significant reforms between 1800 and 1912. Implemented due to concerns of poor leadership, poor quality men, insufficient weaponry and recent successes of the Prussians, the Cardwell reforms introduced pivotal changes in order to significantly improve these issues. For example, Cardwell banned flogging during peace time, completely abolished branding, introduced the split of the 12 years service into two 6 year periods and guaranteed home deployment once a year to all men; this highly improved the appeal of the army as a career, especially to family men. Furthermore, Cardwell completely abolished the purchase system, meaning officers now had to earn their rank through merit rather than status. This reform shows clear

Significance and impact as the army size increased tremendously from 30-40,000 to 250,000 during the Boer war and recruitment was so well improved the Army army could afford to turn away men for the first time ever.

In Summary, I partially agree with this judgement as Haldane's reforms were revolutionary in the army divisions (BEF/TA) and his legacy is still withstanding even today through his military orphanage and successes of the BEF, particularly the 393rd Highlanders. However, ~~the~~ The Cardwell Reforms take ~~no~~ definite position as the most significant in identifying the issues that the British ^{Army} ~~were~~ faced and in advancing solutions in the years 1800-1912 as recruitment was permanently improved, possibly ^{even} taking partial credit for success in the Boer wars as Roberts used huge numbers to finally overpower the Boers. It could even be said that the Haldane reforms may have been less efficient without the influence of Cardwell who created the original reserves, becoming the territorial

army and abolished the purchase system
allowing monumental leaders such as
Kitchener and Haig to take Britain into
victory.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Q9 Merits a sound level 5. There is a clear and effective address to the nominated factor with specific illustration and explanation. The response identifies a range of other factors with coverage of the timeframe.

Question 10

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. This question required consideration of the proposition that changes in ship types were the most significant factor in the development of the Royal Navy as a fighting force.

This question was effectively responded to by the majority of candidates with sound coverage from the Middleton reforms through to the policies of Admiral Fisher and the evolution of the submarine at the end of the timeframe. There was a pleasing amount of specific illustration. Other factors, notably more effective professional training at places such as HMS Excellent, were advanced by many candidates.

In the period 1790-1918, there were significant changes to ship-type: Ships changed from being powered ~~to~~ by sail to steam and from being made of wood to iron. This created faster ships and protected against increased weaponry. There were a number of other changes to the Royal Navy at this time, including the broken Reforms which introduced standardised gunnery training, and the Fisher reforms, which launched a dreadnought programme which allowed Britain to compete with the growing threat of Germany. The extent to which one of these factors can be considered the most significant can be judged primarily by whether or not it produced a navy that was capable of challenging taking on Britain's enemies. It can also be judged by whether one factor was a catalyst for other factors, so can be considered more significant.

The change ~~to~~ from ~~to~~ sail to steam was slow but eventually HMS *Dreadnought* was

landed in 1873, which was the first fully steam-powered ship without rigging. This meant that Britain now had warships that could travel ~~at~~ at much faster speeds and were on a the same pedestal of France, who had previously been using steam power on a number of its ships. Therefore, Britain could now take on France if war arose, so the navy was improved as a fighting force. However, ~~but~~ the position of the navy as a fighting force had to be stronger than that of its enemies, as its land forces were usually weaker. Therefore, the development was not that effective in promoting Britain to this higher level. The change to ~~steel~~ iron gun wood had a similar impact. The use of heavy weaponry meant ships were better suited to iron hulls. However, conservatism ~~a~~ surrounding the change meant that once again it was a slow one, so although it did place Britain at a similar position to its rivals, this was not the fighting force the British Navy strived for.

The Graham's reforms played a more important role in producing a ~~for~~ stronger

fighting force. A gunnery school was set up on HMS Excellent to provide training for ~~to~~ ~~was~~ a competent navy force. Captain Hastings also set up a standardised gunnery programme. This meant that seamen could easily be transported between different ships and remained ~~so~~ familiar with the ~~gunnery~~ gunnery on each. Therefore, the navy was a far more streamlined fighting force and a sense of synergy was created. Furthermore, the reforms created a minimum service before officers could move up the ranks. This meant that promotion was not based on influence, so only the ~~best~~ best officers commanded the navy. This allowed Britain to produce a navy that could dominate the sea in a way that changes to ships could not, as the best possible officers commanded men which were well trained and available for any ship.

Fisher's reforms were a highly significant improvement to the British navy as a fighting force. Fisher recalled 90 ships to Britain which ~~meant~~ led to a development in ~~the~~ the improvement of the navy's fleet. This meant that Britain fell behind in the two

~~Power~~ Power Standard, but allowed for a the creation of a new navy which protected Britain's coast. This was very significant as by briefly accepting a fall behind its rivals, Britain was able to effectively develop a fighting force that was much greater than those rivals, rather than simply trying to stay level with them. Fisher also produced his dreadnought programme. This created a new type of ship, developing into the Queen Elizabeth class, which was 21,000 tons with 15 inch guns. This was vital to the development of a fighting force for World War One because Britain was able to out-produce Germany in Dreadnoughts by 1914 by 29 to 17. This forced Germany to focus on its land army, so allowed Britain to control much of the seas.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ the Fisher reforms were most significant in developing a strong fighting force, for it allowed Britain to propel its navy to a position above its rivals through the changes made to its fleet and the successful dreadnought programme. The changes made to the ship design could

only match the fighting force of other
rivals so can't be considered as significant.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Q10. Merits a clear level 4. Identifies a range of points with some effective specific illustration. Develops a clear argument and has generally good coverage of the timeframe apart from the earliest part.

Paper Summary

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

SECTION A

- Read the question carefully and ensure that both enquiries are addressed.
- Do not summarise the source but focus on developing reasoned inferences.
- Read the caption carefully as it may be helpful in your evaluation of the source.
- Make full use of relevant contextual knowledge to support your inferences and evaluation.

SECTIONS B & C

- Planning the response will help to produce an effective analysis
- Make sure that you are clear about the focus of the specific question and its chronological parameters.

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

