

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_35_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was good to see candidates engaging across the ability range in this series of exams with GCE A level paper 35. Paper 35.1 deals with Britain: losing and gaining an empire, 1763-1914 and Paper 35.2 with The British experience of warfare, c1790-1918.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts- cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1).

Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and few did not complete all 3 sections. There were a small number of scripts where reading the handwriting posed a significant problem.

Question 1

The majority of candidates were able to identify a range of points relevant to both enquiries and a pleasing number developed reasoned inferences deploying their contextual knowledge to illustrate key issues. There was some effective use of the caption to establish the context in which the source was written and many candidates commented on the tone of the source.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Railhouse, Governor General of India from 1848 to 1856, remains one of the most controversial figures of the British India. His critics charge him with fracturing the relationship between India and Britain and setting it on the path to independence, whilst his admirers claim he began the process of ~~turning~~ turning India into a modern state. ~~This area~~ The objectives and methods of that of Railhouse are an important area of study for historians of the Empire, and who must analyse sources with regard in order to come to a conclusion. This essay will analyse the content and provenance of ~~source~~ the source together, in regard to how useful the source is for an investigation into Railhouse's objectives and methods, ultimately concluding that the source is very useful for revealing information about both enquiries, but is slightly more useful with regard to an investigation into his methods, to a large extent.

The source is ~~highly~~ useful for investigating Railhouse's objectives as Governor-General, to a large extent. Indeed, the source ~~reveals~~ suggests that his aim was to 'benefit the company' and 'the people of India', suggesting

that Dalhousie sought to simultaneously improve the ~~Company's grasp of over India and East India Companies~~ to grasp over India, and to improve the lives of Indians in general. This is accurate and therefore useful, as his prioritisation of economic development benefited simultaneously the company - through the greater flow of trade in India because of ~~for~~ the development of rail - ~~and~~ and the general Indian population - through provided greater travel opportunities in the example of rail. Furthermore, ~~the~~ the source cites Dalhousie's 'right principles' as guiding his 'purport or motives', suggesting that Dalhousie's objectives were in line with his moral outlook. Indeed, this is highly insightful, as Dalhousie was a utilitarian and associated himself with John Stuart Mill, which reveals that his objectives ~~where~~ ~~broadly~~ were broadly to ~~to~~ create the greatest happiness ~~so~~ for the greatest number, ~~so~~ in line with utilitarian philosophy. The source also cites 'the development of modern [Indian] state' as one of Dalhousie's objectives. This is useful, as it is in line with his utilitarian outlook, and ~~th~~ his wide-ranging infrastructure projects, which not only served the general Indian, but also reveal ~~f~~ his objective in creating a modern state, to further enrich the ~~the~~ Company by making it easier to trade with India. However, the source doesn't have much to say about his objective of ~~the~~ territorial

expansion. Indeed, the source does suggest that territorial expansion may have been a method, but it implies that ~~the~~ territorial expansion wasn't a major objective of Dalhousie, which is ~~rather~~ untrue, as many letters from the Indian office to Dalhousie inform him that his objective was to ~~fully~~ 'expand the territories of India'. The fact that the source doesn't imply that territorial expansion was a major objective of Dalhousie. Somewhat weakens the source's usefulness for this enquiry.

The source is highly useful to a large extent for ~~can~~ revealing the methods that Dalhousie used to carry out his policies to a large extent. Indeed, the source states that 'Punjab has been pacified', a reference to the Anglo-Sikh war (1848-1849), that Dalhousie deliberately engaged in, in order to fulfill his policy of expansion. Furthermore, the ~~source~~ source cites Dalhousie's method of removing 'crumbling native dynasties', ~~as~~ suggesting that this was a method of ~~the~~ securing trade in areas still ~~was~~ ruled by princely states, and therefore outside of ~~a~~ de jure British control. Indeed, this is useful, as this was a key method used by ~~a~~ Dalhousie, as seen with ~~the~~ his annexation of Awadh in 1856 and in 4 other provinces during his tenure. Furthermore, the source mentions the 'irrigation projects' established by

Dalhousie. Indeed, this was a method that Dalhousie used to improve the economy of India, as seen by his the diversion of approximately 100,000 m³ of water in the northern territories of India, in order to improve crop yields in the region. The source also suggests that Dalhousie's introduction of a 'telegraph system' and 'penny post' were important methods he used to achieve his goal of economic improvement. This is true, as he set up the a British style post in 1854, and had built thousands of miles of telegraph wire by the end of ~~the~~ 18 of 1856. However, ~~source~~ the source falls short in that it doesn't mention in Dalhousie's employment of the doctrine of paramountcy as a method. This is an important omission, as it was actually the main method he used to achieve his goal of weakening the princes in all ~~the~~ princely states except for Awadh, somewhat weakening the usefulness of the source to a small extent.

The providence of the source makes it the source particularly useful ~~to enquire~~ for an enquiry into his objectives, as it is taken from Dalhousie's own diary, and this is likely to closely resemble his genuine objectives. Indeed, this can be seen in his admission that he ~~has~~ feels he has 'been treated badly', which ~~is~~ ~~says~~ suggests that the context in his diary is true to his real feelings.

as if he did intend his diary to be published, it is unlikely that he would have included his ~~to~~ resentment of the British establishment, as this would have been highly detrimental to his ~~career~~ career. Furthermore, the source was written on his last day in office, meaning that it is likely that Dalhousie reflected on his objectives accurately, and without the ~~be~~ ability to only remember the glorious objectives, had the source been written later. With regard to one-sidedly ~~into~~ Dalhousie's methods, the source's ~~provenance~~ ~~a~~ slightly reduces the value of the source, as it is written ~~to~~ from Dalhousie's highly subjective point of view. Indeed, it is therefore unlikely that Dalhousie would mention some of the more controversial methods, such as the Hindu Marriage Act of 1856, which caused social chaos. ~~This~~ This can be seen in his citation of only ~~the~~ the methods that ~~are~~ 'the essential elements', rather than methods that resulted in a negative outcome that he would rather not mention.

In conclusion, the source is highly ^{valuable} ~~useful~~ ~~for an enquiry~~ revealing what Dalhousie's objectives and methods were as Governor-General, to a large extent. Indeed, the source reveals his objectives of ~~a~~ achieving ~~a~~ large improvements for the general Indian population and the hold of the company over India, as well as his methods of infrastructure

development^{and} territorial expansion ~~and economic de~~
~~to~~ The provenance of the source makes the source
more valid for ~~an~~ enquiry into his objectives -
something only Palhousie could truly know. On the other
hand, ~~that~~ the source fails to mention territorial expansion
~~as~~ as an objective, instead suggesting it was a method,
and also fails to cite the doctrine of Paramountcy as
a method. Nonetheless, overall ~~the value~~ so the
source ~~is~~ is highly valuable for ~~re~~ revealing
Palhousie's objectives and methods to a large extent.



This response merits a sound level 5. It works with the source to identify a range of points relevant to both enquiries. It makes clear that Dalhousie was aware of a dual loyalty to 'the Indian people' and to 'the Company'. It deploys contextual knowledge very effectively, notably re Dalhousie's utilitarian philosophy and is strong on his 'moral outlook'. The candidate also shows awareness of the provenance and of Dalhousie's desire to express his feelings at the end of his term of office.



This response illustrates clearly the value of working closely with the source and identifying and citing specific extracts.

Question 2

The majority of candidates were able to identify key issues relevant to both enquiries from both extracts. The first enquiry was competently dealt with and there was much deployment of contextual knowledge, notably regarding Black Week and Buller's conduct of that campaign. Stronger candidates commented on the tone of the source and the clear evidence of frustration from both Buller and Roberts. This manifested itself in the identification and illustration of effective reasoned inferences. Overall, the address to the second enquiry was not as strong with many candidates not identifying the nuance in the relationship between Buller and Roberts. The majority of responses were structured and clearly expressed.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

This source is likely to be useful as it is an exchange of letters between Buller and Roberts. This is significant in revealing the relations between them as they are likely to be more personal due to the confidentiality of writing letters. Additionally, these exchange of letters were in 1900 which may also be useful in revealing the military situation of the Boer War. This is because Buller was following the loss of several men including Ladysmith and Kimberley and Spion Kop (all very crucial), thus may show insight into the issues faced throughout this detrimental time of the war. The source is also likely to be useful as it is following Buller's replacement by Roberts. This is significant because it may display their relations regarding the change in leadership, along with Buller's findings to lead to his 'limited responsibilities', thus also possibly highlighting the military situation throughout the Boer war.

Source 2 states that "Wherever I go, the Boers can predict my arrival and confront me with superior forces". From this I can infer that the Boers are highly skilled and knowledgeable on the battlefield and have a powerful army due to the having 'superior forces'. This is concerning because the Boers were far stronger than the British had initially anticipated, being a large

Advantage over the British. The Boers had significant knowledge of terrain, in comparison to the British, this contributing towards the 'Surprise Attacks' and tactics. Evidently, this can be seen through the Boer use of dummy tracks as they were aware the British had little local knowledge, having to use poor ~~poor~~ guides, therefore alerting the Boers of their presence so they could attack. The Boers also had access to Mauser rifles which were highly beneficial as they were snipers, this allowing the Boers to remain undetected, contributing towards their tactics and advances. This is being supported by the source again as it states that "They are able to act more quickly and effectively than I have seen able to". Therefore this highlights the Boers advanced tactics through effective planning (i.e. surprise attacks) as opposed to full blown out artillery bombardments. This therefore demonstrates the military situation in the Boer War in 1900 as ~~a result of~~ the unanticipated warfare skills and technological advancements (Mauser Rifle) as a contributing factor towards the ~~disaster~~ catastrophic events.

Source 2 also states that "If it is thought anyone else can do better, ~~then~~ I am prepared to be sacrificed rather than see Ladysmith lost". This is part of the extract from the letter written to Roberts from Buller. ~~This is convincing~~

From this I can infer that

~~Because it highlights~~ Buller concerned that it is rather not the leadership, but instead is the extremity of the war at this time as to why there have been failings. Additionally, it also suggests that Buller ~~is~~ believes that he has been given little aid and resource towards the success of the Boer war which has played a role ~~that~~ in the failures in 1900. This can be seen through his tone of doubt and passive aggression when he says 'If it is thought anyone else can do better'. Buller was provided This is concerning as Buller was called up on to lead the Boer war with little past experience (never led anything before the a South African). Additionally, he was provided with little help in regard to leading the troops and was provided with a very small army of just 10,000 men, this being very little to work with. Therefore, this ultimately led to the great success of failures, losing Mafeking, Kimberley and Ladysmith along with losing 4500 troops and 5000 during 'Black week'. Consequently, this led to his replacement of Roberts but rather seemed to cause annoyance on Buller's side as the failures were largely a part of the little aid he was provided with. The source also states that "At no time since I have taken over command, until your recent message, have you given any indication that you might need additional forces". From this I can infer that Buller and Roberts have quite a uneasy relationship as Roberts is being shown to be

getting frustrated with Buller, presenting the idea that he is 'fabricating' lies. This is convincing as Roberts is likely to be frustrated with Buller due to Roberts' son dying at the Battle of Colenso (under Buller's leadership). Therefore, Roberts is likely to view Buller as a peer leader due to the death of his son, along with the failures of Mafeking, Ladysmith, Kimberley and Spion Kop. Consequently, this resulted in Roberts immediately trying to raise morale after he was put in leadership. This ~~may~~ demonstrates their peer relations between Roberts and Buller, for the most part due to Buller feeling that he has taken full responsibility for failures that were not all at the fault of him, along with Roberts' frustration as he believes it is all at the fault of Buller that his son died in Colenso and the failures of the Boer war.

* Overall, whilst the source is useful the source is, ~~so~~ useful for revealing the military situation in the Boer war in 1900, as well as the relations between Buller and Roberts. However, it is more useful in ~~also~~ highlighting the military situation. This is because it presents the issues faced by the Boers (highly unexpected) as well as the overall replacement of Buller which was a result of the devastating events for the British that took place in 1900 (i.e. Black Week). Therefore, whilst

it remains to be significant in displaying the peer relations, it is mostly useful for revealing the military situation.

* Additionally, the source also states that "I assumed I would be sent more troops". From this I can infer that Butler has little troops/resources and he is not getting much help from the government as it is perceived as he is confused. This is concerning because Butler was provided with only 10,000 troops, unskilled and ill equipped for the Boer army who obtained local knowledge of terrain and advanced weaponry. Therefore, this shows the military situation as being poor due to the fact the Boers were of extreme superiority.



This response merits entry point level 5. It works with the source to identify points relevant to both enquiries and deploys contextual knowledge to support reasoned inferences. This is especially true of the relationship between Buller and Roberts which it characterises as an 'uneasy relationship'. It cites some effective contextual knowledge to illustrate the military situation and the different perspective of the two commanders. Thus, showing effectively how the two enquiries are interlinked.



This response illustrates very clearly the importance of close analysis of the source to identify key points and the way in which contextual knowledge can be used to support inferences.

Question 3

This was the most popular of the two questions in this section. The majority of candidates were able to identify some key issues relevant to the scale of the threat posed by the revolt in Lower Canada but, in a significant proportion of responses there was a lack of specific evidence to substantiate the points being made. Stronger candidates were able to link points together to develop a substantial debate. There were some interesting comparisons made with the situations in other parts of the empire, notably in the East, which led to assessment of the relative significance of the threat.

In ~~1837-38~~ 1837-38, Lower Canada revolted against the British after being inspired by the American Revolution. This was very significant as British were on the verge of losing control. However, some may disagree and believed the revolt of ~~the~~ Upper Canada ~~was more~~ posed a more significant threat to British control. Therefore, I agree that the revolt in Lower ~~of~~ Canada posed a significant threat to significant control due to Mackenzie speaking ~~det~~ detest and hatred to the British ~~&~~ for raising taxes and attempting to control them.

~~If~~ Between 1837-38, Lower Canada revolted ~~&~~ against the British government after being inspired by ~~that~~ the American

War of Independence, many joined the revolt led by Mackenzie for trying to implement the policies in American in Lower Canada as well as being upset of Land Ownership by Siegneurs. This posed a significant threat to British Control as they had already lost 13 Colonies from the American War of Independence and did not want to lose another Colony, fearing it would be detrimental to their Colonial Empire. This shows how the revolt of Lower Canada was a significant threat to British Control as ~~the~~ being inspired by the American War of Independence, this led many revolting after being treated unfairly as peasants towards ~~land~~ the ~~land system~~ Feudal Land Systems which made wealthy landowners have all control in contrast to Upper Canada and being taxed heavily; ~~which~~ feared by the ~~loss~~ loss of another Colony the British had aimed to not less this be successful and worked on establishing more control in ~~Canada~~ Lower Canada to end the revolt. ~~Therefore~~ Therefore, this is why I agree that the revolt in Lower Canada in 1837-38 posed a

Significant threat to British control as the threat by Mackenzie to remove British control led to the British working as soon as possible to eliminate the threat and establish a much stronger position and power to ensure the revolt would not succeed.

However, it can be counter-argued by me that the revolt in Upper Canada posed a significant threat to British control. Inspired by the revolt of Lower Canada, there were many who also decided to revolt in Upper Canada however for different reasons as they had a different land system which did not affect Upper Canadian. Upper Canadians revolted against the British to be removed from power. ~~however~~ Although, many may believed it imposed a significant threat to British control due to another revolt ~~also~~ occurring in both Canadas, suggesting a lack of control by the British, this was incorrect. In the 1839 revolt, ~~the~~ the British were quick to shut it down compared to Lower Canada which took longer as they did not see ~~the~~ the revolt of Upper Canada

as a significant threat to British control. This was because the revolts were not as organised and the British already had a plan to shut it down being more prepared after their mistakes in the American war of Independence. Therefore, this is why some may ~~agree~~ disagree that the revolt in Lower Canada posed a significant threat to ~~the~~ British control as they believed the ~~a~~ revolt in Upper Canada may have caused the British to fear of losing both Canadas with another revolt in Upper Canada causing ~~sign~~ chaos for the British, although this time the British ~~were not~~ did not feel threatened as they had already ~~created~~ planned to quickly shut it down.

Another reason why Lower Canada posed as a significant threat to British control was due to the number of people that protested against the British. Feeling motivated by Mackenzie's speech and propaganda against the British, ~~as~~ around ~~5,000~~ 3000 - 5,000 people joined which caused the British to use violence as an act of rebellion, causing

many to be ~~injured~~ wounded, and buildings be destroyed and Mackenzie fleeing from the revolt. In comparison to Upper Canada, not many people joined the revolt with as few as a couple hundred or less, making the revolt seem insignificant to the British compared to the violence people in Lower Canada faced by police brutality. This shows how significant the revolt of Lower Canada affected ~~British~~ the British who used violence to end the revolt, resulting in many injured but effectively establishing their control and position over time. In comparison to Upper Canada who didn't last long by the British as they had already planned to end as soon as possible without making an impact on British control. Therefore, this is why I agree that the revolt in Lower ~~Canada~~ Canada (1837-38) did pose a significant threat to British control as the British had to resort to violence to end the revolt which was seen as a threat towards British power in comparison to Upper Canada which did

not need the same measures, thereby showing a very low significance of their revolt.

In conclusion, I agree that the revolt in Lower Canada (1837-38) posed a significant threat to British control as there was significant damage made by both sides of the British and Lower Canada through the use of violence causing thousands to be injured from the attacks and showing the fear from losing another colony after the loss of 13 colonies from the American War of Independence. Although, some may disagree and believe that the revolt in Upper Canada posed a significant threat due to the interpretation some may have of 2 revolts occurring in both Canadas may display a weakness in British control, this was not the case as the revolt in Upper Canada did not have a proper cause against the British and the British had been more prepared to shut down the revolt after learning from their previous

mistakes. Therefore, ~~if~~ this is why I agree that the revolt in Lower Canada (1837-38) posed a significant threat to British Control due to several factors including ~~British~~ Britain's fear of losing another colony after the loss from the American War of Independence, many protesting against the land reform and feudal system imposed in Lower Canada ~~for~~ showing inequality and the number of ~~protesters~~ ^{rebels} who came to the revolt led by Mackenzie after being inspired by the rebels in the American Revolution, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ posing a significant threat of ~~the~~ weakness of British control.



This response is on the cusp of level 3 and level 4 and was awarded entry point level 4. It identifies some key points, notably the character of the leader of the lower Canada campaign group and the fears of a repetition of the earlier revolt in the American colonies. It also compares the threat with other challenges to provide a sense of both scale and context.



The response refers to the leader of the Lower Canada movement and would have made a stronger case if the qualities of leaders had been developed with some specific illustration.

Question 4

This was the less popular question in this section, but the majority of responses identified a range of points related to social, economic and political issues. Stronger responses discussed the mindset of Baring and his concern to safeguard and promote British commercial interests. Answers were generally structured and clearly expressed.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

It is clear that Sir Evelyn Baring's policies lacked understanding of the needs of Egypt as he ultimately was still an imperialist and therefore didn't understand Egyptian cultural needs. To ~~demonstrate~~ determine if he showed a lack of understanding is to ignore economic, ^{Political/Social} ~~social~~ and cultural needs of the Egyptian population causing discontent. This lack of understanding by Baring can most accurately be seen through his ^{Cultural} ~~economic~~ policies. Whereas his economic reforms can demonstrate his most understanding needs of the needs of Egyptian people.

* While undermining what the Egyptian people ultimately are foundationally calling for.

The most accurate way that illustrates Baring's lack of understanding of Egypt's needs is his ~~political~~ ^{reforms} cultural reforms. This is because Baring believed the Egyptian people to be of a lower priority due to his imperialist attitudes, this can be illustrated through his lack of

investment in education while also increasing tuition fees for primary education making it less accessible. This is because he didn't want Egyptians to gain social ^{mobility} ~~movement~~ as this would undermine his ability to control them. This can also be highlighted through Baring and British Gov declaring they would leave Egypt on 66 separate occasions but this never happened and Baring only left in 1907. Additionally, it is clear that Baring lacked understanding of Egyptian needs through his role in the Scramble for Africa as for Britain this wasn't based on value but purely on territory to counter Russia and France therefore illustrating Baring's imperialist attitudes and demonstrating that their role in Egypt wasn't to help the Egyptians or meet their needs but instead to benefit the expansion of the British Empire. Therefore it is clear that Baring undermined the cultural needs that Egyptian people were foundationally calling for in order to benefit themselves.

Another way that Baring can be seen to lack understanding of Egyptian needs is

through undermining their ~~political and social~~ economic needs. This is because Egyptian debt had increased from £5 million to £100 million causing the result of Dual control by France and England. This led to Baring once becoming Governor-general to implement economic reforms that he believed would benefit the Egyptians; this was through the London Convention 1884 which gave 9 million to Egypt 8 of which were to pay back debt. Although this benefitted the Egyptians as they did have a high national debt, therefore making this less accurate than cultural policy in revealing Barings lack of understanding, this still didn't meet what the Egyptians were foundationally calling for which was to improve the state. This is because only 1 million was spent on irrigation of agriculture which helped drainage of the Nile. Much more could have been done by Baring to ensure the Egyptian needs of having an economically modern state therefore still illustrating some lack of understanding of Egyptian needs. Although Baring was able to make Egypt solvent this again ~~didn't~~ undermined the foundational needs that Egyptians

were calling for. Therefore it is clear that Baring Economic reforms lacked understanding of Egyptian needs as it undermined what they are foundationally calling for and could lead to revolts as the coup by Arabi pasha happened due to army pay cuts and 2500 army members being dismissed therefore clearly suggesting that Egyptian economic needs not being met could lead to a revolt.

The last accurate way that illustrates Baring lack of understanding is his political and social policies. Although they still highlight that Baring lacked understanding of their needs. This is illustrated by his attitudes towards jihadist forces, who were trying to stand up for the Egyptian population, but his harsh repression of them and sending Gordon and Kitchener to further crush the jihadists in Sudan.

This illustrates Barings lack of understanding of Egyptian needs as it reveals that there was discontent in Egypt enough that large nationalist groups were forming. Despite this discontent, Baring doesn't try

resolve the issues but instead further suppress it by trying to dismantle the nationalist forces, therefore highlighting his misunderstanding. Although ~~the~~ Baring's political and social policies still reveal that Baring had a significant lack of understanding of the needs of Egyptians, this is less of an accurate illustration than his cultural policy. This is because a lot of people turning to nationalism and the Jihadist forces was a result of his cultural policy.

This is evident through his raising of primary education tuition fees being raised causing a lot of outrage and people to turn to jihadism. Therefore, it is clear that Baring's social and political policies were less accurate in depicting his lack of understanding. As despite his policies undermining the foundational calls of the Egyptian people, the catalyst for ~~7~~ his policies on politics and social aspects were influenced by his cultural policy.

Overall, ~~the~~ it is accurate to state that Sir Evelyn Baring's policies lacked understanding of the needs of the Egyptians. This

is because Baring's policy would continuously undermine the ~~needs~~ foundational calls of the Egyptian people and had the possibility to lead to revolt. Although this lack of understanding can more accurately be seen through his cultural and economic policies. Almost all policies ~~was~~ demonstrated his lack of understanding and therefore it is very accurate to state that Sir Evelyn Baring's policy showed a lack of understanding of the needs of Egypt.



This response merits entry point for level 5. It engages with the question and develops a clear line of argument, and in the introductory paragraph indicates a clear overall judgement which is sustained, '... an Imperialist did not understand Egyptian cultural needs.' The response does not ignore Baring's positive contributions citing his stabilising the economy, investing in irrigation projects and encouraging basic education for the children of the fellahin but it is clear that Baring's mindset restricted his reforms even in education and he had no understanding of the Nationalist movement. The answer is structured and clearly expressed.



One of the strengths of this response is the use of specific evidence to support a balanced argument.

Question 5

This was the more popular question in this section. The majority of responses were aware of the achievements and reputation of the nominated factor and generally her contribution was effectively illustrated. Most candidates also discussed the contribution of Mary Seacole but the contextual knowledge here was generally less assured. Stronger candidates cited the impact of the Government inquiry leading to the McNeill-Tulloch report. This meant that responses were often rather narrow in range. It also meant that many responses lacked consideration of the relative significance of factors.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

Florence Nightingale was a revolutionary woman of her time. She severely improved the medical situation in Crimea, alongside this Mary Seacole independently ran her own medical department, and the Palmerston reforms paved the way for the improvement of the medical issues. Overall, this essay will agree to a significant extent that the work of Florence Nightingale was the most positive contribution in improving healthcare of wounded soldiers.

Florence Nightingale grew up educated which was not typical for women in this time period, and as she grew older she researched healthcare. Due to the reports coming out in The Times from Thomas Chenowry and the positive feedback from those running scutari; Sidney Herbert, the Secretary of State, for sent

Nightingale and a team of nurses to the hospital as a spy. She arrived shortly after the Battle of Inkerman and immediately reported back on the state of the hospital being dismal. Due to her education, she knew sanitation was not efficient and ordered for the beds to be raised off the floor and cleaned the hospital with her nurses. Despite being a woman, she demanded all men, including the soldiers, to follow her orders. Nightingale revolutionised healthcare as they knew it. She created wards based off illness and ensured clean clothes and sponges for the men, as opposed to how it was with one sponge per room and men remaining in uniform. Due to her relationship with Sidney Herbert, she had the Nightingale fund to ensure the resources and made it easier to obtain what was needed. Due to ~~her~~ Nightingale's ideas, ^{of wards} infections of wounded men by those with diseases decreased by 47%. and sanitation of hospitals permitted more men to recover and deaths dropped significantly. Overall, Florence Nightingale made the most

positive contribution in improving healthcare of wounded soldiers in the Crimean War.

Mary Seacole came from a military background in Jamaica, with her father being a Scottish Soldier and her husband being Horatio Nelson's grandson. She was extremely patriotic for Britain and convinced herself to go through the reports of Russell, as she knew many soldiers fighting. She grew up assisting her mother who cared for the sick, so she had a background in caring for people. She financed her own way to Crimea after rejection to join Nightingale's team, and she set up the 'British Hotel', close to the frontlines. The primary purpose of it was a business venture as she sold alcohol, food and other goods for high prices to soldiers, and gave them 'home away from home' due to her personality. However, during the day, she went ~~very~~ in close proximity of

the frontlines to provide medical attention to injured soldiers. As many men were scared to attend Scotland due to the previously high death rate, Seacole ensured medical attention to everyone who needed it, and the money made at the hotel permitted free healthcare to the wounded soldiers who could not afford it. Overall, Mary Seacole made significant contributions to improving healthcare of wounded soldiers by ensuring many would not die prior to going to Scotland, but her contribution was short term for Crimea and it did not assist those who needed long-term attention.

In 1855 after the removal of Aberdeen as Prime Minister, Palmerston replaced him and brought about reforms to ensure the efficiency of the army, including healthcare. The commissariat were the ones to supply the army for the first year in Crimea, despite their lack of knowledge on what was needed. There were also only

inexperienced doctors sent to Crimea due to the dismissal of the medical branch after Waterloo in 1815.

The continuation of suffering and outrage of the public who read the Times meant that Palmerston immediately reformed many aspects once appointed. He abolished the commissariat and gave supply control to the War Office, which enabled extra uniforms to be sent and prevent certain diseases and infections on the battlefield. He also created a medical department for the army, which allowed ^{qualified} ~~proper~~ medical ~~at~~ professionals to be an official part of the army, as well as a transport department. This made it easier and less risky to move sick and wounded soldiers and decreased the risk of infection, as well as ensuring proper medical treatment received. Overall, the Palmerston reforms did ~~so marginally~~ ^{make} ~~positively~~ make a marginal positive contribution to ~~the~~ improving healthcare of wounded soldiers in Crimea, but it

can be seen as too late due to the war ending a few months later.

Overall, I agree significantly that Florence Nightingale made the most positive contribution in improving the healthcare of wounded soldiers in the Crimean War. Whilst Mary Seacole assisted largely on the frontlines with wounded soldiers, and the Palmerston reforms permitted experienced doctors into the army, Nightingale made revolutionary changes to the medical scene and avoided soldiers who were wounded catching diseases through wounds and extreme improvements to sanitation at Scutari.



The response merits a sound level 3. It identifies three key points and describes some of the work in each case. Relevant knowledge is deployed but the impact of the measures is not clearly expressed and there is a lack of explicit weighing of the relative significance of each factor.



The focus of this question is on measuring the relative importance of other factors against the nominated factor and a more analytical use of the material is required for a higher-level award.

Question 6

This was the less popular question in this section. The majority of candidates considered the weaknesses in British leadership with the focus of the majority being on Haig. Stronger candidates also considered the opening phases under French. There was also consideration of the German strengths and the reluctance to recognise the importance of tactical flexibility. Some candidates wrote effectively about the failure of many commanders to fully recognise the importance of the role of the RFC. Answers were generally structured.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

~~The heart of~~

By the end of 1916, the British Army had failed to make a decisive breakthrough on the Western Front, and it can be debated whether this was a consequence of poor leadership of senior commanders. The consequences that will be evaluated are poor leadership, technology, and artillery, and ^{some} ~~armies~~ / stalemate. Overall, it will clearly be concluded that poor leadership to a large extent was ~~the~~ ^{not} the (main) consequence of poor leadership, instead technology and artillery.

Poor leadership of senior commanders certainly played a large role in failure to make a decisive breakthrough. For John French who was Commander in Chief from late 1915, under poor leadership, poor line battle at Marne which took place 23rd September 1914, French wanted withdraw the BEF troops back to Britain. There were approximately 120,000 BEF troops and this would have made a large impact as there were 6.5 million Germans at Marne. However, this cannot be used to judge poor leadership as French was overruled by French commanders and the BEF fought but still there was no decisive breakthrough after Marne with failed attack at Ypres twice by ~~they~~ ^{French} once in November 1914 with 6.4 million Allies vs 5.4 million Germans, and once in 1915. ~~with the use of chlorine~~

This clearly highlights poor leadership as there were multiple failed offensives by French that did not lead to a decisive breakthrough nor a replacement clearly motivates poor leadership. However, French's blame could be questioned by the fact that at the 2nd Battle of Ypres, he suffered over 171,000 casualties. Chokone got Gunging mass casualties within 10 minutes and the British did not advance however this can be linked back to French as he was Senior Commander, he had the power to implement his plans, however they were not widely ~~used~~ ^{implemented} unlike the battle in July 1915. Therefore showing that French clearly did not have a decisive breakthrough or no breakthrough to some extent. Haig replaced French and he highlighted a clear convincing argument that poor leadership was the consequence of no decisive breakthrough by 1916. Haig commenced a week long artillery bombardment at the Battle of Somme using over 1.7 million shells. However, this bombardment was unsuccessful leading to 14,000 casualties on the first day alone (31st July 1916) and a total of 420,000 British casualties by November 1916 and only 7 miles were advanced which was not a decisive breakthrough by the end of 1916. This therefore shows to a large extent that poor leadership significantly played a role in failure to make a decisive breakthrough, however the main consequence and was a direct consequence ~~and the consequence~~.

In addition, technology and artillery contributed to the failure to make a decisive breakthrough and was the consequence of no breakthrough. Tanks were a new technology and are a strong argument for future. Only, 40-44 tanks made it to the enemy trenches.

during the Battle of the Somme, and Q5 made it to the front lines as many broke down. This is a convincing argument for artillery to be the ~~consequence~~ ^{cause} of the consequence of why there was no breakthrough as artillery were necessary to allow infantry to advance as they flattened barbed wire and made safe passage sometimes by bombing the enemy. ^{However,} whilst the tanks did have some success at the Somme, by capturing the towns of Flers and Mambrin, this was not enough for a decisive breakthrough by the end of 1916. In addition, shell output was also a issue that limited breakthrough. More shells were being consumed than made in 1915 with shell output approximately 80,000 but usage much more. ~~Lloyd George as PM~~ This is a strong argument for lack of a decisive breakthrough as there was not enough shells for successful bombardment, this was evident at Aubers - Ridge in 1915 when artillery bombardment was ineffective as it only lasted 45 minutes due to a shell shortage. However, Lloyd George as Munitions Minister made loose rules on shell production allowing for output of 1.5 million, however the shells increased in quality as a result, as seen when many shells did not go off at the Battle of the Somme, and the war was unsuccessful in causing the breakthrough. Therefore, it is compellingly clear that technology and artillery to a large extent, were the consequence for failure of the Army to make a decisive breakthrough by the end of 1916 as they had extreme limitations to their success, whilst the leaders were poor, even in their success with advancement, breakthrough is not possible without successful and impactful technology and artillery, especially as artillery was the biggest killer of WWI.

Attrition and stalemate ^{made} characterise the beginning of WWI as well as one factor not certainly contributed to failure to make a decisive breakthrough but can be questioned as to whether it was the main consequence. Attrition and the race to sea began after the Battle of Marne in September 1914 and certainly as a credible argument for the consequence of failure to make a decisive breakthrough. One of the reasons for attrition was artillery and weapons. The machine gun could fire 600 bullets a minute, and had the same firepower as 40-50 riflemen. This caused attrition as it rendered the cavalry ineffective and could decimate all its enemies. This shows a strong argument that it was not attrition itself ^{not stalemate} that caused failure to make a breakthrough as there were many other factors, but rather the causes of attrition. The new weapons were technology which led to no decisive breakthrough which therefore reflects technology and artillery as the main consequence of failure of the Army to make a decisive breakthrough. In addition, the allies were not united in 1916 which led to failure to make a decisive breakthrough, as the British fought at Somme, the French were fighting at Verdun with over 400,000 casualties and they asked Italy to move up the offensive and did it without them to relieve Verdun's pressure. This is a credible argument as if the troops were united they would have more manpower, as seen at Arras in August 1918 with over 3 million Allies, leading to more success, however this is not the most convincing argument. Therefore, to a limited extent attrition and other factors were not the consequence but were certainly a factor in failure to make a decisive breakthrough by end of 1916, technology and artillery was more compelling.

To conclude, it is inaccurate to say that the failure of the British Army to make a decisive breakthrough on the Western Front by the end of 1916 was the consequence of the poor leadership of senior commanders. Poor leadership under the future humane the successors of the leaders was limited for example poor shelling and failed artillery, making technology and artillery to a large extent the consequence as artillery is key to every element. Attrition and other factors contributed however one of the causes of attrition was artillery, making back was 'tech' and artillery being the consequence. Therefore, it has been concluded to a large extent that the failure of the British Army to make a decisive breakthrough on the Western Front by the end of 1916 was the consequence of technology and artillery.



A sound level 4 response which identifies a range of points and argues a point of view with some effective specific illustration. There is some address to the nominated factor but this aspect required stronger development to promote the overall debate.



While it is perfectly legitimate to conclude that the nominated factor is not the most significant it is generally good practice to make it a more central focus in the overall argument.

Question 7

This was the less popular question in this section. Many candidates did not explore the role of the Americas as widely as anticipated but it was possible for a wide-ranging response to be developed, covering the timeframe with a narrow definition. On the other hand, some candidates ranged widely and there were interesting points made on the wider development of trade, eg in the Far East. There was pleasing deployment of specific evidence to support some examples but overall, there could have been more explicit discussion of the relative significance of factors.

This question was the less popular in the section. There was a limited interpretation of 'Americas' in many responses although most responses did make points related to the expansion of trade which could be recognised in relation to the generic mark scheme.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☐

Question 9 ☐

Question 10 ☐

The impact of the Americans on the expansion of British trade was limited because after the traditional mercantile economic system was renewed and replaced with one of Free Trade and Slavery was abolished, British trade moved to focus on that of the Second British Empire focused around the East and India, which shows the large significance of the Suez Canal to British trade, ~~as, making it~~ making Free Trade the ~~best~~ greatest cause of the expansion of ~~Britain transitioned from the traditional Mercantile economic~~ ~~the~~ ~~most~~ British trade in the years 1776-1914 because it allowed the British government to focus on smaller, more economical acquisitions.

The renewal of the traditional Mercantile economic system with the popular system of Free Trade was ~~advocated~~ advocated by Adam Smith in his book 'The Wealth of Nations' was the greatest impact on the expansion of British trade as it ~~permitted~~ enabled the British to buy cheaper goods such as sugar from other countries who were more efficient at producing it, which enabled Britain to spend more money on the industrial revolution, which was more profitable than the mercantile trade system the British had been ~~operating~~ operating under the Navigation Acts. ~~Free Trade also enabled~~ By allowing Britain to trade with other ~~and~~ countries, the Free Trade helped increase

the economic importance of the Industrial Revolution as products no longer were restricted to being sold ~~in~~ within the British Empire, which was in decline after the American War of Independence when a newly independent USA became a Free Trade country while Britain was still Mercantile and had lost a large market to sell to. This makes Free Trade extremely important as it allowed Britain to compete against other European countries as the 1800s developed ~~into a free trade system~~, keeping Britain's economic superiority in a period of increasing geopolitics.

The American's had little ~~expansion~~ impact on the expansion of British trade after ~~slavery was abolished~~ the triangular slave trade was abolished in 1807 and slavery ownership was made illegal in 1833. This was due to Britain's sugar cut post no longer being economically viable in the increasingly Free Trade economic system, as although the slaves were effectively still used under Victorian apprenticeship laws, it was more economically viable for Britain to buy it cheaply from other ~~other~~ European nations who still used slaves. This highlights that while the American's ~~were expanded~~ British trade, it was not the most effective form of trade.

~~Benjamin~~ Disraeli's
The British Prime Minister's purchase of around 40% of the Suez Canal Shares in 1875 also had a great expansion on British trade as it secured the quickest route to India, Britain's greatest source of commerce. The purchase of the shares highlights British imperialism, as Britain had the monopoly on steam ships due to

the ~~RN~~ Merchant Navy and increased Royal Navy innovation due to an increase in geopolitics and the Great Game against Russia and only steam ships could be used in the canal. This highlights that the small acquisition of the Suez Canal (which later binned into the Nile valley to protect the canal, increasing formal British Empire), made it easier to control one of the world's most important trade routes ~~due to~~ ~~to~~ decrease British competition in trade in a Free Trade market.

Overall, Free Trade ^{has} ~~is~~ the most significant impact on the expansion of British trade due to its long reaching consequences, on the Industrial Revolution and trade with India through the Suez Canal, reducing the impact of the Americas on British trade as the abolition of the slave trade made them less economically viable.



This response was awarded a sound level 3. It identified some points related to the expansion of trade, eg the abandonment of mercantilism, and also commented on the significance of the Suez Canal. There were references to the nominated factor and there was a narrow definition of 'Americas', so the overall judgement lacked substance.



Candidates need to be aware of the meaning of key items in the specification and to recognise that 'Americas' meant more than trading relations with the United States.

Question 8

This was the more popular of the questions in this section. There was generally a sound understanding of the significance of the nominated factor and stronger candidates explained the geopolitical as well as the economic significance of Cyprus. Most candidates identified a sound range of other important naval bases and had a good understanding of their significance, eg Gibraltar, Ceylon and the Falklands. Stronger candidates were those who not only had range but focused on assessing the relative importance of the bases and how this evolved over the timeframe.

This question was the more popular choice in this section. Candidates were generally aware of the strategic significance of Cyprus both in a political and economic sense, eg to contain the threat of Russian expansion and to further British commercial interests in the East. These points should be measured against a range of other bases starting with Gibraltar and ranging through the Mediterranean (Malta) and across the Atlantic to the Falklands. Strong responses had range across the timeframe and assessed the relative significance of a range of points.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☒

From 1763 - 1878, the Royal Navy acquired and retained numerous strategic naval bases around the world such as Cyprus, Gibraltar* and Aden. But, it is ~~not~~ fair to say that the most significant acquisition was that of Cyprus in 1878.

The acquisition of Cyprus was in 1878 was significant. British interest in Cyprus began following the Napoleonic wars when Britain became the dominant force in the Mediterranean. In the 1870s, Britain's greatest rival was the rapidly expanding Russia. In order to ~~sub~~ combat the expansion of Russia into W Eastern and Central Europe, Britain supported the Ottoman Empire against the Ottoman-Russo War of the 1870s. However, Russia ~~quickly~~ quickly defeated the Ottomans and began mounting a threat on Constantinople. In the aftermath of the war, most Ottoman territory was added to Russia, including the Dardanelles. In response to this growing Russian threat, Britain occupied * and Malina.

Cyprus in 1878. This is significant because not only was Cyprus in a strategic location in the Mediterranean Sea, it had almost zero economic significance. For the first time ever, Britain had acted purely to stop the expansion of a rival - previous acquisitions such as Ceylon, the Falklands and Cape Town all had at least some economic value through commodities like cinnamon or the presence of trading ports. Because of how the acquisition of Cyprus in 1878 ~~was~~ marked the changing nature of British intervention - and because of how it saw Britain embrace the ~~Ras~~ *Pos Britannia*, it is fair to say that it was the most significant development in the acquisition of key naval ~~base~~ strategic naval bases from 1763 - 1878.

Another important acquisition in the years was that of Aden in 1839. There was little British interest in Aden in the early 19th century due to its lack of natural resources. However, East ~~Ind~~ ~~India~~ ~~Company~~ ~~Official~~ Robert Grant suggested that the best way to protect trade ~~with~~ between India and Britain was to acquire ~~significant~~ strategically-positioned areas in the Indian Ocean. And so ~~off~~ An expedition was launched to see if

any coal was present on Aden but returned not having found any. Despite this, without permission from either the British government or the East India Company, Grant took Aden in 1839. This is significant as it did allow for British ships to be better protected while travelling around North Africa and in the Indian Ocean. Aden became extremely important though upon the construction of the Suez Canal as it was perfectly positioned to protect ships merchant ships too travelling through the canal. However, because of its lack of utility and natural resources, and the fact that it did not become useful for some decades after its acquisition, it is unfair to say that the acquisition of Aden in 1839 was not the next significant development in the acquisition of the key strategic naval bases from 1763 - 1878.

The retention of Gibraltar, Malta and Minorca in the 1780s was also significant. During the American War of Independence, Spain and France allied against Britain both in North America and in Europe. Together, Spain and France had 122 ships whereas Britain had only 90. Spain and France used these ships to

Cyprus in 1878 was the most significant development in the acquisition of key key strategic naval bases from 1763 - ~~1878~~ 1878.



A clear level 4 response which identified and began to weigh up a range of points spanning the timeframe. The nominated factor was effectively dealt with in terms of political and economic significance and a sound range of other points were developed. The response was sound on political and economic aspects but lacked explicit discussion of the military importance of naval bases.

Question 9

This was the more popular question in this section. The majority of candidates were aware of the contribution of the nominated factor and cited specific evidence to back up their argument, eg Fisher's determination to give greater recognition to the engineering skills required in the Navy if it was to be an effective fighting force. Most responses had a reasonable coverage of the timeframe with sound coverage of the significance of the Graham reforms and the advances in technology which sometimes met with some initial resistance. Again, the most effective answers focused on assessing the relative significance of factors.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☐

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☐

~~Fisher~~ Between 1815 & 1918, there was significant change in the improvement of the Royal Navy. Whilst Fisher's reforms were significant in terms of Naval development, Graham's reforms were clearly just ~~not~~ as significant. The transition within ship design to steam & iron, influenced by French ships such as La Gloire & Redoubtable, were the key. The development of weaponry, spurred on by the industrial revolution & the naval arms race, was also vital. Therefore, this essay will strongly disagree with the view that Fisher's reforms ~~will~~ ~~be~~ ~~more~~ ~~significant~~ improvements to naval warfare.

Fisher's reforms were ~~any~~ introduced in 1904 as a way of streamlining & improving the Navy. As such, 17 ships were decommissioned & a further 74 placed in reserve to make space for newer ships or more reliable ships, such as the HMS Inflexible⁽¹⁸⁹⁶⁾ which was in ~~service~~ ^{service} until ~~1907~~ 1907. Consequently, it paved the way for ships such as HMS Lion and HMS Dreadnought, which proved to be more manoeuvrable & effective in battle. Thus, ~~they were~~ ^{they were} clearly ~~improvements~~ ^{improvements}.

to an extent, although it is perhaps limited by how they were only ~~started~~^{agreed} in 1904. Whereas it also increased the naval arms race, with Fisher encouraging the use of submarines & as a counter to German U-Boats. As well as the development of 18 Dreadnought ships. Here it is clear that ^{the} Fisher reforms were necessary in building up the force in the lead up to the WWI. Although ^{these} ~~to~~ ~~perhaps~~ these reforms are perhaps hindered by how they involved excessive spending in peacetime. Therefore, ^{the} Fisher reforms were somewhat positive. However, Fisher made great strides in the development of protection of British waters, removing 2 fleets from China & 2 further fleets from India & Australia in order to concentrate border protections for Britain after the 1904 treaty with France. Thus, it is evident that the Fisher reforms were ~~great~~ a significant improvement to an extent, although limited by the fact its short-term impact was intensive. Whereas the ~~German~~ Graham Reforms (1932) were also significant, for it ~~was~~ created a school for gunnery & HMS Excellent to standardise gun training techniques to improve efficiency across the fleet. It also maintained ship production, improving old ships, despite the fact only 17% of ships were in active duty. Thus, the Graham reforms improved

efficiency significantly. Yet, the Graham Reforms were also vital in encouraging technological advances in weaponry & ship design. ^{Arch} It is abundantly clear that the Graham Reforms were significant developments. Therefore, it is clear that both the Fisher & Graham Reforms improved the Navy to a great extent, however Naval Technology ^{Weaponry} was clearly more important.

The development of ^{Naval} weaponry, identifiable via the shift from the Brown Bess to the Minié Rifle is clearly the most ~~more~~ important factor within the development of the Navy. For example, many ships incorporated increasingly new technologies such as HMS Warrior. Developed by Armstrong in 1859, Armstrong developed artillery that was revolutionary to naval warfare. The flintlock mechanism ~~of the~~ ^{breach} to place ammunition in was incredibly valuable ^{tool} in travelling large distances, especially with the development of new cannon balls.

These expanded when they ^{the fact was sailors were} & loaded with grapeshot, ^{requiring} proving to be incredibly ^{useful}. ~~many~~ Armstrong's artillery continued to be a vital part of many ships, being incredibly significant, for they could travel up to 4500 km.

Thus, ~~they~~ ^{the} Armstrong artillery was incredibly useful ^{advantageous} in battle, shooting far distances with impeccable precision. The development of machine

guns was also a key development, for they provided distinct accuracy. Able to shoot 25 rounds a minute at incredible speed & accuracy, the Vickers machine gun (1912) & the Maxim (1881) became a key part of Naval weaponry, especially on ~~an~~ ^{many} ships such as ~~the~~ HMS Dreadnought. Whilst one perceives them to have been limited by the fact they were developed by 1918, they had proven to be vital, with over 33,000 being developed in munitions factories ~~per month~~. Therefore, the development of machine guns was a key naval development. Whereas, the development of torpedoes was significant, specifically as an anti-submarine defence during the FWW. They began to be incorporated in ships such as HMS Dreadnought as well as submarines, for they ~~pro~~ ^{impeccably} travelled at speeds at distances of up to 1,800m, enabling ^{British} ships to attack enemy ships ~~submarine~~ at a great range. Thus, torpedoes were also a key naval development. Therefore, the development of Naval weaponry ^{was} clearly a key & the most important significant improvement, for it was able to mitigate problems such as distance.

Yet, the shift regarding ship design & transition to steel & iron ^{was the most} ~~was clearly~~ ^{was a significant improvement} important. They ultimately came hand in hand for the

development of iron facilitated the development of steam. ^{Despite initial opposition & fear it would destroy naval superiority} The first ship steamships such as HMS Meade (1833) & HMS Agamemnon incorporated a small steam paddle. This was due to the fact it was made out of wood, & engines had to be small in order to prevent fires & weighing the ship down. Thus early steamships necessitated the development of iron. Inspired by the French ship 'La Gloire', HMS Warrior (1860) was developed as the first fully iron clad ship. In order to increase the size of the engine. This was largely the case, for as iron cladding began to be used increasingly, ships were able to remove gunports due to the power of steam. & As was the case for the HMS Inflexible (1876), with only a pure sail rigging, with its power removed in 1885 due to the manoeuvrability created by the steam engine. Therefore, by the mid-late 19th century, iron cladding led ships to increasingly employ steam power. Furthermore, HMS Dreadnought (1906) became the apogee of sail & steam & iron warfare. As a result of steam power, it was able to move at a speed of 21.6 knots & was bulletproof in light of its 11-inch steel plating. It epitomised the development of naval warfare, with 12-160 guns, steel plating & the

most powerful steam engine to date. Thus, HMS Dreadnought demonstrates the importance of ship design developments. Therefore, the shift in ship design was ~~the most~~ ^{an} equally important factor, although limited by how progress was slow & limited initially due to opposition.

To conclude, Fisher's reforms were undoubtedly the most significant factor in the improvement of the Navy as a fighting force. Whilst Fisher's reforms prepared the Navy to be a fighting force for the FWW, it is fundamentally limited by its scope as well as how much the reforms were primarily facilitated by a multitude of changes in weaponry & ship design.

~~The~~ Changes to ship design facilitated weaponry developments as well as increased power in battle, for ships were more manoeuvrable & ~~powerful~~ impervious against the enemy. ~~Yet~~ ^{the} ~~was~~ ^{was} weaponry clearly ~~the~~ ^{was} the most significant factor, for it mitigated issues such as submarines, distance & power, which demonstrates how weaponry consistently evolved unlike reforms. Therefore, I strongly disagree with the view that Fisher's reforms brought about the most significant improvements to the Royal Navy ^{Navy} as a

Fighting force between 1815 & 1918.



This response merits a sound level 5. A range of factors are identified and weighed against the nominated factor to promote an informed debate. The answer is structured and well organised with effective use of specific evidence to back up points.



In questions in which there is debate about which factor is the most significant it is important to debate the relative impact of each contribution and to establish links between different factors throughout the response.

Question 10

This question was the less popular in the section and was not effectively answered by a significant proportion of candidates. The question is clearly rooted in Theme 2 Bullet Point 2 of the specification but clearly some candidates were unaware of the meaning of an 'organised home front' and focused instead on general surveys of evolving battle tactics.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☒

World war one was a completely new type of war which ~~meant that~~ was labelled the Total war. It meant that every man, woman and child had to put their efforts in and established a fully organised homefront to ensure the success of the soldiers on the front line. However, to ~~st~~ state that the key developments did not come until WW1 is wholly incorrect as ~~the~~ during the French wars, it set the precedent that the home must must be organised as well as effective to therefore support the war efforts abroad. But with the fact that ^{WW1} ~~it~~ was a Total war did mean that everyone had to be organised and play a role in rationing, conscription and manufacturing therefore the organised homefront was ultimately ~~more~~ larger and medically, educationally, socially and politically more organised than the previous war.

Moreover, some may agree with the statement

that the key development of an organised home front came at WWI due to the fact that everything was scaled larger. This is evidenced by DORA in which had the rules of no whistling, watering down beer, no buying rounds, curfews and taking over ~~millions~~ ^{400,000} of factories to establish that Britain was in a total war. Dora meant that there would be a reduced level of communication of people ~~as well~~ to reduce espionage, as well as increasing the production in factories to outproduce the self-sufficient Germany. Dora was successful as women took over the roles of the 5 million men who went to fight in France which did increase the production rate by 40%. Where 60,000 shells per month were being sent to the front line. Another key development is rationing, this was never used on the people of Britain in any past conflict, even with the Continental System that Napoleon ~~not~~ ordered to stop trade with Britain. Rationing had to be established as Germany was sinking $\frac{1}{3}$ of import ships and ~~46,000~~ 4,600 tonnes of meat.

per year, thus meaning that Britain needed to establish rationing to ensure that the home front was organised enough for the ~~so~~ detrimental affects. Another key development was the dig up campaign where 1 1/2 million allotments were made to accustom to the tightening supply of food being imported. Moreover, more key developments within the airforce ensured that the home front was organised as, with the development of 266 anti aircraft guns and the Buckingham bullets, as well as the 277 day and night fighter pilots, it meant that Britain was being more protected from the former Scourge era's and the Zeppelin Bombers that committed 51 attacks on British soil. With these key developments being made, it ensured that the home front had a boost of morale as the RFC was respected as well as a sense of security in which ^{overall} kept the home front more organised with the knowledge of what ^{to} do with an attack ~~as well as~~ ^{development} which thus enabled that WWI did ensure that the home front was more organised.

However, some may disagree with the statement that the key developments made the home front more organised due to the fact that the home front still had challenges from people striking for better pay, as well as the stay at home campaigns that occurred because the public were scared of the Zeppelin ~~and~~ and Gotha bombers that dropped 6000 tonnes of bombs on Britain. Moreover another reason it was not organised is due to the fact that the governments were undecided on whether to use air raid sirens or not which was a new development of the time; air raids were crucial for letting the public know that Britain were under attack but the governments main concern was that they did not want to give anyone a heart attack. Therefore, these key developments ~~that~~ ultimately did not lead to a fully organised home front as ~~as~~ the people were still discontent with their position in terms of work ^{and pay as well as} ~~and~~ with the indecisiveness of the government.

Furthermore, some may further disagree with the statement that it was WWI developments that led to an organised homefront as it was during the French Wars that the developments such as William Pitt the Younger's income tax ~~to~~ of 1798 was established, this ultimately set the tone that not only the people at home had to help out with the everlasting French Wars, but also that the home front had to be financially organised ^{to support the war}. Another key development during the French Wars was that ~~the~~ ^{countering to} with 1/6 of the male population ~~leaving~~ to fight the war against Napoleon, it meant that more women had to work the male jobs such as working the new machinery within factories, or working on farms to boost their food supply. This most definitely parallels to WWI as many of these key developments were replicated in which organised the home front.

Additionally, within the other wars such as the Boer War, the ~~home~~ logistic homefront

did have some key developments such as the very beginnings of the Pals Battalion development where during Black Week ~~many~~ 70,000 men went to join the fight for the empire in which many friends and workplaces such as offices ~~the~~ went to South Africa to fight. Within Crimea the homefront was organised through the media by which William Howard Russell in charge of Times newspaper had a readership of 334,000 people, this new key development of a war correspondent ensured that the homefront were kept knowledgeable on the horrors daily in which helped them volunteer as well as question what was truly going on. Ultimately the Crimean war allowed the key developments of public opinion and interference to organise the homefront through raising money, troops and awareness.

In conclusion, although the French ~~Boer~~ Crimean and Boer war did establish some key developments such as war correspondents and the beginnings of organised pals

battalions, it was WWI that was more organised as WWI directly impacted the civilians as well as the key development being so significant in controlling and ~~cont~~ organising the home front. Although there were some areas not organised such as the curfew system, the homefront in terms of work was so sufficiently organised that ensured Britain to winning WWI.



This response is a sound level 5 and has a clear understanding of the term Home Front and shows an awareness of how it developed from its origins when the country required a significant contribution from the civilian population during the French wars, culminating in the massive contribution during the First World War. The argument links points together and has effective specific illustration.



It is very important that candidates are confident about the meaning of all the key terms that are in the specification. The increasing civilian contribution to Britain at War is a very significant element of the course.

Paper Summary

SECTION A

Read the questions carefully and address both enquiries.

Candidates should not simply paraphrase the source but must identify and develop reasoned inferences

Candidates should deploy appropriate contextual knowledge which must be illustrating points being made.

Candidates must take note of the caption and other appropriate evidence to evaluate the source.

SECTIONS B & C

Planning is essential in order to produce an analytical response

There should be a clear and accurate sense of chronology and appropriate coverage of the timeframe in Section C

Higher level responses require an assessment of the relative significance of a range of factors leading to a balanced judgement.

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>

