

Examiners' Report
June 2014

GCE History 6HI03 B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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



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 2014

Publications Code UA039093

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

Introduction

The paper was divided into two sections: Section A was an In-Depth Study question, and Section B an Associated Historical Controversy question. As expected, there were far more entrants for *B1 – France, 1786-1830: Revolution, Empire and Restoration* than for *B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760-1830*.

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses in this examination series. Many candidates wrote insightful comments and very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. Unfortunately, some candidates continue to write too much generalised comment. As a consequence, their responses lacked precise analytical focus and detailed supporting evidence. Examiners want to see that candidates can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis. The paper provided candidates with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source material as and when necessary.

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

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

When attempting the Section B questions, a small number of candidates engaged more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Question 5, although it was still a small minority.

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

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

Question 1

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss to what extent the Directory (1795-99) was a failure. The weakest candidates tended to produce: (1) a descriptive account of the 1795-99 period which did not address the question; (2) a response which was heavily reliant on unsupported assertions about the Directory's failures and/or successes. A few very low scoring answers strayed extensively into the pre-1795 and post-1799 periods. Conversely, the best responses offered a sustained evaluation of the Directory's record using an agree/disagree essay structure. Here, candidates considered a range of failures (e.g. political paralysis, weak Treasury finances, lack of stability and support) and successes (prevented total financial collapse, avoided the extremism of 1793-94, successful military campaigns in Italy and Switzerland).

How far do you agree with the view that the Directory (1795 - 1799) was a complete failure?

After the collapse of Robespierre's Committee of Public Safety the ^{Assembly} ~~committee~~ gave way for a new Directory headed by five individuals, supported by two supplementary councils, the council of ancients and the legislative council. It is highly debated throughout history whether or not this directory was a failure or success, ~~however~~ Quite simply, the Directory could be seen to be a failure because it was followed by, and helped to cause, Napoleon's coup, which ~~then~~ then saw Napoleon becoming Emperor, in ~~as~~ the same vein of the absolute monarchy that was abolished by the revolution. The Directory ~~was~~ actions,

(Section A continued) of lack there of, was one of the reasons why a coup was staged and one of the reasons why it was so successful. ~~While the Directory~~

While the Directory can be blamed for essentially turning the French people against themselves, they cannot be blamed for the conditions surrounding them. It was difficult for the Directory to ~~pick up the~~ to restore order after The Terror, when they had ~~economic pr~~ there was an economic downturn, caused in part by ~~as~~ bad harvests and the ~~the~~ Royalist white terror. Therefore the Directory cannot be seen as a failure, however not successful either.

In many instances during their "reign", the Directory made poor decisions regarding their political enemies that ~~at~~ only increased dissatisfaction. ~~taken~~ elections. In 1795 during a Royalist protest, Napoleon, was authorised to use grapeshot to disperse the crowd. Then in 1798

(Section A continued) and 1799 when election results came out more radical than royalists, the election was annulled, showing signs of dictatorship that was evident in the Committee of Public Safety, ~~and~~ ~~was unpopular~~. The difference between the two governing bodies is that the Committee of Public Safety gave the French people, specifically the Sans culottes, what they wanted.

One of the only successful parts of the Directory were its wars. The French armies 'conquered' France under the guidance of Napoleon and waged war against the British. The only real blip during this time was when Napoleon invaded Egypt to undermine the British in Africa. While French victories encouraged, and showed the successes of the Directory, ~~it~~ ~~also~~ ~~not~~ they also increased the prestige of Napoleon, who returned from Egypt, to 'steady the ship'.

For me the Directory, ~~without~~ ~~considering~~ was a failure based

[Section A continued) on one thing alone. The main reason for the directory was ~~an~~ extension of the revolution began to give France stability while still reforming the economic and political systems. Instead the so called 'final act' of the revolution turned into a dictatorship and ~~to~~ ~~at~~ in the end handed France to Napoleon, who, in essence, returned to the absolute monarchy that the ~~revolu~~ the revolution had abolished.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response illustrates two typical weaknesses of low-scoring essays as it relies heavily on general statements about the failures and successes of the Directory rather than relevant detailed analysis. It is also quite brief.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

Question 2

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss the extent to which the influence of royalist extremists was responsible for the collapse of the Bourbon Restoration in 1830. The best responses weighed the impact of the stated factor against the role

of other relevant factors (such as Charles X's actions, the growth of liberal and republican opposition to Bourbon rule and the effects of the economic downturn after 1826). Weaker answers tended to: (1) offer unsupported assertions regarding the reasons for the collapse of the Bourbon Restoration; (2) produce narratives of the 1815-30 period with weak links to the question.

The French Revolution is one of the most complex events in European history. Its origin can say to have dated back to the storming of the notorious Prison (the Bastille), ever since events kept escalating and an end to the Monarchy and ancien regime was set. By 1814 however, the Bourbon Dynasty was restored by the Vienna settlement but again collapsed in 1830 as a result of various interrelated reasons, ~~with the~~ The Royalist extremists played some part in securing the downfall, but cannot be seen as the primary influence. Since it could be said that if it was ^{only} a result of the Economic crisis then Charles ~~the X~~ policies and ~~8~~, character and beliefs played one of the most significant reasons.

Looking at the period 1814-1830 ie from the reign of Louis ~~the~~ XVIII to the downfall

(Section A continued) of Charles X the royalist extremists played indeed some role that later influenced the collapse of the Bourbon Restoration.

It would be a good start to identify the royalist extremists. Among them were particularly the Ultra Royalists, the émigrés and foreign Princes. Basically they were the ones that wanted France to be brought back to the Pre 1789 stage and reinstate their rights and privileges that had been lost.

Therefore, they were a threat to some degree.

~~Have~~ However, why I do not agree to a large extent with the view that ~~they~~ ~~the~~ collapse in 1830 was primarily due to their influence is since the ruler of the country always sets the tone.

Sets the tone in the sense that eventually the king's ^{themselves} played the most significant role.

Despite there being ultra royalist attacks during Louis XVIII reign. In the early years of his reign he was able to suppress them. This shows the weakness of the royalist extremists. Only in the ^{the} 1820's came the turning point after the assassination of Comte de Berri. The Ultra royalists put pressure on the King and

(Section A continued) This time they proved to be very influential as a result of the King's sickness and weakness (captured in Diabetic gangrene). Therefore, we see that it was only when the Power of the Crown to suppress the White Terror and in general slackened that any advancements of the Ultra Royalists were likely to be secured. On the one hand they proved themselves as powerful but on the other they could not survive without support.

Another reason if not the most important for the downfall of the Bourbons in 1830 was Charles X himself.

Being the former leader of the Ultras he definitely had more radical views than his brother. Even though they both believed in the Divine Right of Kings, Louis XVIII in fact being the one to ~~dec~~ issue the Verona Declaration, their Policies were different.

Louis XVIII was ready to rule alongside the Charter but Charles was not. It was this that above all doomed the Bourbon's and put an end to their rule for the second time.

Charles X hated the idea of a bicameral Parliamentary system and a constitutional monarchy.

(Section A continued) This was made clear by his remark that he would "rather chop wood than rule by the fashion of the King of England." This clearly shows that with the King himself possession royalist extremist ideas looking at the the turn of previous events it could foreshadow the final collapse.

When he became ruler in 1824 he restored the power of the Church and made an Archbishop head of education. He gave the emigrés a compensation of 100,000,000 francs and got rid of the Jesuit Society. Even Sacrilege was made punishable by death. Censorship was increased. It was those repressive reforms that caused considerable resentment among the population. The people were not ready to lose everything they had gained during the revolution and the reign of Napoleon.

This brings us to the next point that the opponents of the Restoration of the Bourbons played some part in the collapse of the Monarchy.

During the reign of Louis XVIII they did not favour the restoration of it but tolerated it. Like previously mentioned due to the personality of Louis.

(Section A continued) However, as a result of Charles X's radical nature even they became more radical. Among these opponents were the Republicans under Lafayette, the liberals led by Adolphe Thiers and the Bonapartists.

It was the resentment and infaturation with the King's policies that led to riots and revolts. Many were already highly suspicious after the ~~fas~~ display of the fashion of the King's (Charles X) coronation.

This brings us back to ~~the~~ blame Charles X for his downfall. Since even the Opponents were not that extreme or influential during Louis XVIII's reign. Louis even included the likes of Talleyrand and others in governance to create some harmony even where the Charter and Monarchy were uneasy bed fellows.

Furthermore the Economic crisis of 1825 and Financial Crisis of 1825 can also said to have played some part.

This is because it created unemployment, and bankruptcy but above all the crisis was seen as a display of the ineffectiveness of the Crown. Since Finance Ministers were not able to tackle it quickly this failure became the failure of the King and ~~made him~~ hence made him

(Section A continued) unpopular.

As well as considering the short term cause of the collapse of the Bourbon Restoration some of the effects of the St. Cloud Ordinances played an important role.

Charles X annulled the elections because to him the outcomes were unfavourable. It was then that the Opponents sprang to their feet protested and the royal extremists even were not strong enough.

Therefore it can be ~~can~~ concluded that the collapse of the Bourbon Restoration was as a result of various factors. With the influence of the royalists extremists being one but the ineptness ^(Charles X) and nature of Charles X rule the most significant, that eventually led to him abdicating on the 1st August 1830.

He was to a good part indeed the author of his own misfortunes



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 3 response is broadly analytical, and attempts to address the question, but offers only moderate detail and development. In putting forward reasons for the collapse of the Bourbon Restoration, the candidate demonstrates reasonable range and depth.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

Question 3

The majority of responses were able to assess the impact of the French Revolution on government policy.

Stronger candidates often demonstrated impressive range and depth by assessing the government's repressive reaction in detail and then balancing it against the impact of other consequences (such as the growth of popular loyalism and increasing radical protest). Low scoring responses typically offered: (1) a descriptive account of political developments in the 1790s with few or no links to the question; (2) a narrow focus on government repression which largely or wholly ignored other important consequences.

The storming of the Bastille in ^{July} 1789 followed by the August Decrees were welcomed by nearly all sections of British Society. Prime Minister, William Pitt the Younger, having been in office since 1783, welcomed the prospect of a Constitutional Monarchy in France and the majority of parliament assumed that the French political system was at last catching up with a Britain ~~over~~ 100 years since the Glorious Revolution had seen Parliamentary Supremacy over the Monarchy. For the opposition, Charles James Fox could barely contain his euphoria at the 'most wonderful event' that had ever happened. The Revolution, in the wake of 'the enlightenment' was partly inspired by the writings of the 'Philosophes', Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu, and Britain too had its own 'English and Scottish' enlightenment texts written by Adam, Hume, Newton and Millar. All of which were widely read and discussed in the emerging coffee houses of England. Nationwide people of all classes from Aristocracy, middle and lower orders became absorbed by events in France. The dormant reform movement suddenly found a new lease of life as

pamphlets, the press and other writings and speeches extolling the virtues of revolution appeared in their masses.

Radical extremes however, started to alarm the authorities when the prospect of the revolution spreading to Britain became a serious ~~prospect~~ possibility. Once defunct organisations, such as the Society for Constitutional Information, formed by radical leaders Major John Cartwright and John Jebb back in 1780 calling for economical and parliamentary reform, would be reformed in 1792 together with corresponding Societies such as the London and Sheffield societies who would openly exchange correspondence with other organisations in Britain and revolutionaries in France. Dissenters and non-conformists too would be in the vanguard of praise for the Revolution and when Richard Price, a non-conformist clergyman, addressed a meeting of the "Revolution Society", ironically formed to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Glorious Revolution, in 1789, his words, suggesting that citizens had the right to overthrow a bad king, caused much alarm in government.

In response the one time ideologist behind the Rockinghamite calls for economical reform, Edmund Burke, wrote a cautionary text entitled "Reflections on the Revolution in France" in which he warned that even mild reform could lead to bloody revolution. Burke's work sold many

copies within the middle and Aristocratic classes and his condemnation of the revolution gave cause for worry amongst these groups. Thomas Paine's response, "Rights of Man" however ~~all~~ challenged Burke and the whole system of government and became the 'Bible' of radical thought in Britain.

When war was declared in 1793 however, the government ramped up the repression of radicals, radical press and any concept of a British Jacobin revolution. Pitt himself openly suggested a 'Jacobin revolution' was imminent in London - a charge labelled 'fraud' by Fox who by now was the leader of a small rump of radical MPs in Westminster. With war comes patriotism and with patriotism comes allegiance to the established order.

As the excesses of the revolution in France and the war took hold, Pitt adopted a far more reactionary stance in quelling any threat of rebellion in Britain.

Home Secretary Dundas worked alongside Pitt to make full use of existing laws to counter any radical activity. Alongside legislation there was widespread use of a network of spies to infiltrate radical groups allowing the authorities to arrest the suspected leaders.

In 1794 Thomas Hardy and John Home-Locke of the London Society for Constitutional Information and the

London Corresponding Societies were arrested, along with several other prominent members, and charged with treason. When all were acquitted however at the so-called 'Treason Trials' Pitt ~~became~~ began a raft of legislation to supplement the existing laws and policy.

Pitt had actively encouraged local magistrates and the newly formed militia to clamp down on radical activity in their areas but to supplement this he gave extra powers including the suspension of Habeas Corpus. ~~The~~ 1795 was a bad year for the War and coupled with a harvest failure mass demonstrations began to appear. When the king's carriage was pelted with stones Pitt pushed through his new, repressive, legislation. "The Two Acts" of 'Treasons and Seditious activities Act' and the 'Seditious Publications' Act made it virtually impossible for radicals to meet and plan any activity.

Magistrates had the power to ~~be~~ refuse licences to any meetings of more than 50 people and ~~to~~ any surviving radical press was quickly shut down.

By contrast ~~the~~ ^{press} telegraphic ~~was~~ given both governmental and financial backing to champion the War and the establishment such as "The Sun" and Canning's "The Anti-Jacobin"

further legislation such as 'The Seduction from Duty'

Act' saw mutiny in the armed forces become a Capital offence as was the case with the leaders of the Nore Mutiny in 1797.

The criminal Courts were given extra powers and during this period any most radicals who found themselves the wrong side of the law faced long periods in prison, transportation or even execution. The government repression has become known as "Pitts Terror" but in many ways this is unfair. The reprisals were far less brutal than those seen after the Jacobite rebellions some 50 years earlier and in many ways 'popular loyalism' such as the Evangelical publications of Hannah More's "Cheap repository tracts" or "Robert Rankes" Sunday schools kept the majority of the population away from radicalism and firmly in the loyalist camp.

Archbishop William Paley's "Hellfire" threat to radicals also kept religious orders and checks on the population. The once vilified King, George III now became 'farmer George'.

The French Revolution inspired many radical organisations and sentiments in Britain but government repression was only partly responsible for its demise. For the relatively few incidents

that did occur and the relatively few prosecutions and executions it seems reasonable to assume that other factors such as Loyolism as typified by John Reeves 'A.P.L.P.' kept the 18th on revolution in Britain to a greater extent than repression.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate has produced a low Level 4 answer by offering extensive relevant knowledge of the 1790s within a moderately focused analytical structure. More extensive links to the question would have sharpened the argument and would have pushed this response further into Level 4.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When answering a 'stated factor' question, make sure you consider the role of other factors as well to give your response range.

Question 4

The majority of responses to Question 4 were able to offer an assessment of the extent to which the 1822 reconstruction of Liverpool's cabinet led to a new direction in Tory policy.

Stronger candidates often demonstrated impressive range and depth by examining both sides of the debate in detail. Such responses confidently balanced evidence of a new direction (e.g. the 'liberal' economic and social policies of Peel, Huskisson and Robinson) against evidence of a lack of change (e.g. continuity in several policy areas before and after 1822 and ongoing refusal to deal with controversial issues such as Catholic Emancipation and parliamentary reform). Low scoring responses typically offered: (1) a descriptive account of the Tory measures with few or no links to the question; (2) a narrow focus on one aspect of government policy (e.g. Home Office measures before and after 1822).

The reshuffle of Liverpool's cabinet in 1822 did lead to new directions in Tory policy, however it was not a completely new direction as some historians have suggested. This is because there are elements of continuity between Liverpool's administration pre- and post-reshuffle.

Liverpool's cabinet reshuffle in 1822-3 did see a new front-line of ministers. Castlereagh was dead, Sidmouth and Vansittart were demoted, and many ministers retired. There was an influx of younger politicians with stronger interests in trade and commerce, such as Huskisson. However, this was not a complete change - more of a ~~change~~ ^{rebalancing} of existing personalities - because many of these new front-liners had served lengthy apprenticeships under the government, and the two ministers most associated with Liverpool's first-wave administration - Sidmouth and Vansittart - continued to serve the government in more minor positions. Thus, though this period saw the rise of younger politicians, notably Huskisson, Robinson, Peel, and Canning, there was significant continuity with the past administration.

(Section A continued) Huskisson's time at the Board of Trade saw achievements that were far more liberal-minded than his predecessor. Immediately upon his promotion in 1823, he set about ~~red~~ codifying the over 1000 Customs Acts into just 8. He also began reducing indirect taxes, a burden left over from the 1816 abolition of Property Tax, starting with servants and carriages in 1823, and in 1824-5 reducing taxes on paper, linen, and glass. In 1826 he set a flat 30% tax on all raw imports, and a 10% tax on all British manufactured goods. He also changed the Navigation Laws and passed the Reciprocal Trading Act, which allowed foreign ships to enter British ports on the same terms as British ships and also trade on the same terms, ~~and~~ which was reciprocated when British ships were in foreign ports. These acts simplified customs and made them more efficient, and bolstered trade. Huskisson considered himself a businessman, and had a great interest in reducing the effects of the 1815 Corn Laws because they set the price at which foreign corn could be imported at a near-famine 80s a quarter, sacrificing the good of the British people to protect British agriculturalists. He finally succeeded in 1828 with an amendment that reduced the level to 73s a quarter, freeing up trade. Huskisson's actions demonstrate a clear free-trade policy, however it was anticipated in the first-wave administration by the vice-president of the Board of ~~Trade~~^{Trade} ~~the~~^{so} the changes.

(Section A continued) cannot be completely attributed to the 1822 change in personnel. Also, Liverpool had long held interests in free trade, evidenced by his relationship with Huskisson before the Cabinet reshuffle, how he would consult with Huskisson on economic matters frequently. Thus, it is clear that Huskisson accomplished much reform, with the help of Robinson at the Exchequer, but his predecessor anticipated - though not implemented - some moves towards free trade, and there is evidence Liverpool had a long-standing interest in freer trade, so continuity exists between Liverpool's two administrations. Thus, it is clear that while trade policy changed greatly under Huskisson's term, it was not a complete about-face turn from Liverpool's previous ministry.

Peel's reforms at the Home Office were a departure from the policy of his predecessor. Sidmouth had frequently used spies and informers, whereas Peel disdained this and did not. Also, Peel repealed all but one of the repressive Six Acts. Peel undertook significant codification of penal law, to make it more efficient and clear about how magistrates were to act, reducing 92 Acts to 5 statutes which covered four-fifths of common crimes. Also, he reduced the likelihood of juries committing 'pious perjury' and acquitting a criminal just because if they convicted him it would mean the death penalty. The death penalty applied to over 200 crimes,

(Section A continued) such as stealing a sheep or robbing a fish pond, and Peel reduced this by about half. He believed the state had every right to capital punishment, but wanted to secure more convictions by having less severe punishments. Notably, while Sidmouth used transportation as a deterrent for radicals, Peel reduced the number of transportable offences. He also enacted prison reform with his Gaol Acts of 1823, 1824 and 1825. With these he ^{paid} salaried jailers, required the magistrates to submit regular ~~the~~ inspection reports to the Home Office, introduced the panopticon system, and instituted a primitive rehabilitation system under which prisoners were taught to read and write, and had access to a chaplain and surgeon. However, these were not novel ideas - in 1819 there had been A Special Parliamentary Enquiry into criminal law, and ~~the~~ the MP Mackintosh had long lobbied for prison reform. Still, they were changes that marked a notable departure from Sidmouth's policy. Peel also helped lead a parliamentary campaign to repeal the 1799 and 1800 Combination Acts, because he believed bringing trade unions up from underground would neutralise working-class subversion and threat. In 1824, with the help of Huskisson, Peel helped push the repeal of the Combination Acts. However, after a spate of industrial violence and protests, an amendment was made in 1825 so that the Acts still had some restrictive power over trade unions. Peel will also be remembered for his Metropolitan Police Act, which set his uniformed, paid 'Peelers' and watchmen on some parts of London to reduce crime. This was a new idea.

(Section A continued) in political discourse, though there is some evidence the central government was beginning to criticize the parish system and magistrate's enormous discretionary powers. However, the police were a shock to some because they were so new, and some people were hostile to the idea. This emphasizes what a change they were though they were only finally enacted in 1829. While it is clear Peel ~~initiated~~ achieved some major reforms, his work was anticipated by some members of Parliament and the 1819 Special Committee. Also, his repeal of the Co Acts may be attributable to the fact that trade had improved, the economy was up and radical protest had died down quite a bit, allowing him to enact reforms. Also, prison reform and codifying of the penal system had long been considered. However, since Peel was the first to achieve these reforms, one must say that his policy was a change from Sidmouth's, though there is some continuity especially considering his response to the outbreak of protests after the 1824 repeal of the Combination Acts.

The reshuffle of Liverpool's cabinet in 1822 did lead to a change in composition of his administration, and the inclusion of ministers who enacted greater reform than their predecessors. However, there is continuity between the two administrations: the new front-line ministers had been involved with the government before their promotion, and some key ministers like Sidmouth and Viscount stayed on. Also, their

(Section A continued) predecessors had anticipated some of the second-wave minister's reforms. This suggests that the government had some continuity of policy, and perhaps the reason they had not been able to enact reform was because they were focused on maintaining law and order in the turbulent years of 1815-20. When the economy improved and popular radicalism quieted, reform became more feasible to pursue. Thus, while it is clear that Huskisson and Peel enacted greater reform than their pre-1822 predecessors, there is some continuity of policy.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response offers a precisely focused analysis of the change/continuity debate regarding the Liverpool government. Strong range and depth is evident. The arguments deployed are reinforced with detailed support throughout and the essay is rounded off with a nuanced judgement in the conclusion.

Question 5

This proved to be an accessible and popular question. Many candidates made good use of the sources and their own knowledge to develop a confident line of argument about the relative importance of war in bringing about the downfall of constitutional monarchy in 1792. The best responses were firmly focused on the relative importance of the stated factor and examined the debate thoroughly in the light of the issues raised by the sources. At this level, candidates were also likely to recognise the interaction of factors such as the links between the war and hardening public attitudes towards the King. Weak answers tended to: (1) generalise about the reasons for the downfall of the French monarchy in 1792 without offering specific development on the issue of the war; (2) describe (rather than assess) the evidence for the end of the monarchy presented in the three sources with little or no integration of own knowledge for support.

'War brought about the downfall of constitutional monarchy in France in 1792.'

The ~~is~~ end of constitutional monarchy ~~in~~ in France in 1792 was a major turning point in the course of ~~the~~ the French revolution. While war can be seen as the cause of the fall of constitutional monarchy, other ~~reasons that~~ factors such as the economic downturn, the actions of Louis XVI and popular pressure.

As stated in source 1 'war was a great divisive issue of the Revolution'. During the early stages of the Revolution

(Section B continued)

France was at war with Austria and Prussia, who both sought to stop the spread of revolutionary ideas and to return the king to his throne. It was during this time that the concept of no ~~more~~ neutrality, either you are ~~against~~ ~~the~~ ~~rev~~ for the revolution or you are against the revolution. Source 1 highlights this idea giving reference to the war stating "It identified the defeat or survival of the revolution with that of the nation itself, so that critics of anything achieved since 1789 could be defined as traitors". While we know of the King's true feelings towards the Revolution and what he did to undermine it, including the suggestion that the assembly should invade Austria, it was not until the Prussians had entered ~~Europe~~ ~~&~~ Paris that it was clear to the French people, as Source 1 states "the Prussian commander threatened to destroy Paris if the king was harmed." That completed the identification of Louis XVI with the enemy.

(Section B continued) This eventually led to his arrest, execution and the end of constitutional monarchy.

Source 1 is a history book written by William Doyle.

Its main focus is the French revolution and although this section only focuses on war there may be others to make this a balanced reliable source. While no other sources agree with the idea that war was the main cause, Source three similarly looks at the actions of the king, highlighting the Flight to Varenne.

The Flight to Varenne, on June 23 1791 ~~to~~ emphasised the king's dissatisfaction with the constitutional monarchy. Source 3 shows that in his grievances memorandum Louis XVI complained about 'the limits imposed on the royal right of appointment to office, on the king's ability to veto legislation, on his freedom to conduct diplomacy...' all parts of a constitutional monarchy. Source 3 argues that it was the actions of Louis XVI, in his flight to Varenne, and not the effect of war that

(Section B continued)

'Finally broke the spell of monarchy' and caused the downfall of absolute monarchy.

Source 3 is another history book entitled 'A concise History of France'. While it is reliable in an historical sense it is not mainly focused on the French revolution, so will not contain as much depth. Source Three begins by stating 'while he [Louis XVI] may make concessions under pressure...

This pressure can come from two main places. The National assembly, or, more effectively, the sans culottes or Parisian mob ~~high~~ described in source 2.

Source 2 highlights two causes of the fall of constitutional monarchy that feed into each other, economy and popular pressure. By 1791 and 1792 the French economy was as bad as it's ever been. ~~The economic downturn~~ Source 2 identifies features of the ~~econom~~ economic downturn including 'decay in the booming sectors of the pre-1792 economy,

(Section B continued) government shortage of money, paper currency failing to command public support and the collapse of business confidence'. Source 2 then links the economic status with popular protests stating ~~that~~ 'the growth of popular protests was both a cause and consequence of this sorry economic situation'. This point ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~an~~ ~~idea~~ is evidenced in the Great Fear, attacks on food convoys and supposed hoarders, and in the original protests of the 1789. Source 2 goes on to say that the 'Parisian popular pressure had contributed to the King's sense of being kept a prisoner in the city after October 1789', which he was after the ~~rev~~ women's revolt against the royals in the palace of Versailles. Not only could this popular pressure ~~cause~~ ~~the~~ ~~king~~ force the King into reform, it could ~~also~~ have also influenced his ~~freason~~ freason towards the revolution. ~~So~~ Source 2 is yet another history book, that unlike source 3, focuses on 'France from Louis XV to Napoleon

(Section B continued) and, unlike source 1, shows a balanced argument making it more reliable. While the sources at times have overlapping viewpoints, none of them really agree what was the cause of the fall of constitutional monarchy.

In my opinion, I can clearly see the effect that war had ~~on the fall~~ ~~and the social~~ had, especially in conjunction with the actions of King Louis XVI, on the fall of constitutional monarchy. However for me, just as was the case with the fall of absolute monarchy, economic factors ~~are~~ ~~the cause~~ were the main cause of the fall of constitutional monarchy. With assistance from popular pressure and war both of which are, in some way, causes and consequences of ~~the~~ France's dire economic situation. ~~By~~ My point of view contrasts starkly with the post-modernist view that ~~the~~ the French revolution's main cause was political and not ~~even~~ economic.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response has two major weaknesses. First, the candidate simply extracts points from the sources but does not really develop or cross-reference them. Second, there is only limited supporting evidence drawn from the candidate's own knowledge. Furthermore, comments on the provenance of the sources are not required.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

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

The constitutional monarchy fell in favour of a republic by September 1792 and this change came about as a result of a number of factors including the coming of war with Austria and Prussia as stated by Doyle. The controversy is often debated over the true cause of the change, with other causes such as the economic deterioration as seen in source 2 and the 'growing influence of the radical clubs' as noted by Price.

Austria and Prussia allied in February 1792 and by 20th April the assembly had declared war on the Austrians, with 'Prussia' entering 'the war' later on as described in source 1. The war was disastrous, with French armies defeated in the Austrian Netherlands by April and being forced to retreat, leaving borders open to invasion. As Doyle says, 'generals called for peace negotiations' as a demoralised, ill-equipped and small army with a lack of noble generals faced defeat. As source 1 states, 'war was a great divisive issue'

(Section B continued) and 'forced everybody to take sides on everything else'. 'It identified the defeat or survival of the revolution with that of the nation itself, so 'critics' 'could be defined as traitors'. Counter revolutionaries were blamed by the revolutionaries for the defeat in battle as well as Girardin ministers. The assembly took action to deport refractory priests and label emigres as traitors, which the King used his 'vetoes' to prevent to further add to the action that he was undermining and against the revolution, increasing opposition to the current regime. The war meant that foreign powers were invading and by August Paris was threatened by an attacking Russian army, forcing 'the Assembly' to decree 'reinforcement of the line army', disband the King's Guard and bring 20,000 Fédérés to Paris. Fédérés were republicans that wanted the end to monarchy, bringing with them the patriotic 'La Marseillaise' song and increasing the atmosphere of monarchy opposition. Moreover, Danton appealed 'la patrie en danger', encouraging the people of Paris to take arms and volunteer to defend the capital. This was as a result of war and had the added consequence of the sans-culottes demanding the abolition of the passive citizen ruling, which gave republicans more power in the commune and in government. The Brunswick Manifesto was another result of war, in which 'the Prussian Commander threatened to desist

(Section B continued) Paris if the King was loved', which 'completed the identification of Louis XVI with the enemy' and infuriating the people of Paris with foreign intervention. On 3rd August, the mayor of Paris approached the assembly demanding the removal of the King and a trial as the Sections agreed, but this was denied and everyone knew a rising was necessary. War gave more power to the militants and republicans, gave opportunities for the King to identify himself as a traitor and further hardened the division between cautious revolutionaries and the radicals. Without it, the situation may have ~~been~~ ^{defused} and the important advancements such as the Tuilleries storm of 10th August would not have happened as the sans culottes would not have had as much influence in Paris and troops could have prevented an uprising if not away at war. Source 1 is strongly supportive that the war caused the downfall of monarchy in 1792.

Unlike source 1, source 2 places emphasis on the importance of the poor economy as the reason for the end to constitutional monarchy. Jones states that there was 'decay in the booming sectors' such as the textiles industry', a 'government shortage of money' as the state was bankrupt and incapable of thinking of a solution and there was a 'collapse of business confidence'. Also, the assignat 'paper currency' was

(Section B continued) 'failing to command public support' and decreased in value due to overprinting to accommodate the costs of war. This is similar evidence to that in source 1 as the expenditure of war dampened the economy and is another reason why war was the most important factor. Moreover, the price of bread was rising, the harvest was poor in a heavily agricultural based economy and unemployment rates were high. As James says, the 'growth of popular protest' which brought about revolutionary changes 'was both a cause and consequence of the sorry economic situation'. The bad economy provided a desperate mob willing to follow those who appeared to be able to control their situation. The argument that the economy was the driving force for change is supported in source 3 when it tells of 'the growing influence of the radicals', which was due to the starving crowds that looked for coordination.

As well as the role of the economy, source 2 discusses the impact of 'popular protest'. In Paris, these crowds forced the downfall of the King as the mob stormed the Hotel de Ville on 9th August and set up the Parisian commune as well as storming the Tuilleries where killing 300 Swiss guards to imprison the King and make the assembly accept their charges. They were the group that made the changes with what they didn't like, such as

(Section B continued) The first journey on the millers in which they asked Louis XVI to withdraw his veto (as stated in source 1) and drink to the health of the nation, which at the time added to the feeling of discontent for the King and changed the mood in Paris. Popular protest included 'provincial subsistence and anti-seigniorial riots' as in source 2, which made the original charges for the August decrees. This disagrees with the view that war caused the republic but states that it was the popular mob as they enforced the changes.

Source 2 also gives another factor for the change to a constitutional monarchy, citing the rise of the radicals as the strongest reason for the change, not war: 'the voice of extra-parliamentary radicalism in the capital, which was clearly growing, well organised and articulate, was more significant'. As there were no political parties, groups such as the Jacobins and Cordeliers (founded in 1789 and 1790) were responsible for informing the public on how to take an active role in politics, as well as providing political information and coordinating activities by linking economic protest to mass discontent and using the angry crowds to make change. Orators such as Desmoulins and Danton enthused and inspired the people, spreading republican ideas but also causing any changes in government. This view is shared in source 3 slightly when it describes

(Section B continued) 'the growing influence of radical clubs'. From the Paris, talkers influenced the crowds, as seen on 27th July 1792 when Robespierre incited the people to insure against the assembly, demanding an end to the new constitution, the removal of the King and the creation of a republic. Orators such as Robespierre caused the jacobins that brought an end to constitutional monarchy. As a political force, they ~~forced~~ panicked at any mistakes made by the King or government to provoke change and it was their coordination that controlled the parisian crowd and without them the revolution would have took a different direction. This disagrees with the statement.

Source 3 is strongly disagrees with the statement that was brought about the end to constitutional monarchy, instead naming King Louis' failings and unreliability as the playing factor. 'Louis XVI remained an unwilling participant in the process of political reform' this shows he was hostile to the revolution and refused change, which did not help his claim to be a constitutional monarch. It goes on to say 'on 23 June 1791 the royal family tried to escape from France leaving behind them a memorandum complaining about the limits imposed on the royal right of appointment to office, on the king's ability to veto legislation, on his freedom to conduct diplomacy, and about the growing influence of the radical clubs'. Louis hoped to escape to either the Luxembourg

(Section B continued) borders in Lorraine as to Austria under the protection of his brother in law Emperor Leopold II to renegotiate the capitulation to how he wanted under a better, military position. However, he fell short of the border and was stopped at Varennes before being brought back in deubly silence. The proclamation showed he was against the revolution, exposing him as a traitor and committing an offence close to abdication. He rapidly lost support and this became a turning point as Paris started to talk seriously about a republic. Source 3 goes on to say that it 'broke the spell of monarchy' and showed 'the king was willing to conspire with the internal opponents of the revolution, but also with emigres and foreign rulers'. Louis was a traitor, ~~at~~ the Austrian Committee and secret relationship of forming military plans appeared true and the constitution proved unworkable. Source 4 also gives a reason for the King causing the downfall of the monarchy, with Louis 'who persisted in his veto of laws against refractories and emigres'. Louis used his suspensive veto on most matters, including judges, disbanded the King's guard and laws against counter revolutionary suspects. This ties in with the judgement that he made constitutional monarchy untenable and his actions made it appear he was traitorous and untrustworthy.

In summary, I agree to an extent that was caused

(Section B continued) The downfall of monarchy in 1792. It was the most important factor as it provided every advancement in 1792, as Doyle says it 'forced everybody to his side on everything else' ^{and} caused 'the identification of Louis XVI with the enemy'. Source 1 fully supports the statement. However, source 2 and 3 give other reasons for the change to a republic, including the economy as a driving factor, the actions of Louis to ~~that~~ 'conspire with the internal opponents' and 'enigmas and foreign plots' and the heavy influence of 'radicalism' as explained in source 2. I believe the King was very important as he proved the constitution unworkable, but war was the most important as it put the nation in crisis and forced government to change.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several clear strengths. The candidate uses the sources provided, together with own knowledge, to assess the relative importance of a range of factors including the war, the condition of the economy, popular protest and the role of Louis XVI. Consequently, the answer has strong range and depth. This integrated approach is then rounded off with a clear judgement in the conclusion.

Question 6

The strongest candidates who answered this question offered a sustained source-led analysis with impressive range and depth to reach a judgement about the extent to which military overstretch undermined the French Empire. At this level, responses confidently weighed the stated factor against the unity of the coalition Bonaparte now faced, ongoing British resistance and the weaknesses of the Continental System, integrating relevant own knowledge where appropriate. Weaker answers often: (1) adopted a weak 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else include little or no own knowledge in support of their argument; (2) uncritically accepted the view that military overstretch undermined the French Empire and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the sources; (3) relied on largely narrative accounts of Napoleon's later campaigns.

It has long been debated amongst historians why exactly the French Empire declined during the years 1807-1814. Some, like David Ball in Source 4 argue that Napoleon's over extension of the French army meant that "By the time of Wagram in 1809 the battles were too large for one man to oversee". This argument differs from David Thomson in Source 5, who argues that it was the Continental System's ~~inefficiency~~ inefficiency which led to the overall defeat of Napoleon's empire; arguing that "By 1813 the continental system had to be abandoned because it was a failure".

In Source 6, Historian DG Wright argues that by 1814 Napoleon had made too many enemies in Europe and that his "...Only hope was that Austria, Prussia and Russia would

(Section B continued) quarrel over the future of Germany and Poland". This source supports the view that Napoleon's defeat at the head of the French Empire were as a result of his over-extension militarily, fighting too many wars against too many people to keep the Empire going. This view co-incides with Source 4 in which Ball states that "By 1809, France's troops were stretched ~~out~~ across theatres ranging from Iberia to Italy and the North German coast".

Another reason why it can be argued that the French Empire was in decline before 1814 was is the way in which Napoleon miscalculated the scale and difficulties of operations such as the Peninsular War and the Invasion of Russia.

These two wars stripped France of its most experienced and talented military men, meaning that by 1814, little stood in the way of the European Powers defeating Napoleon →

(Section B continued) → Source 4 and 6 appear to support this view as Source 4 states that "Napoleon had to entrust ~~more~~ more and more authority to his subordinates, who lacked his talent as a commander". Whilst Source 6 argues that "The 'Battle of Nations' cost the French 38,000 casualties... The Battle therefore marked a stunning defeat for the French". These sources may not be wholly reliable as they are attempting to argue the significance of Napoleon's defeats, meaning they may not give other factors the credit they deserve.

It can be said however that the decline of the French Empire in the years 1807-14 was down to poor management of France's economy/political system by Napoleon. Thomson, in Source 5 argues that "The Napoleonic Empire was doomed due to its inherent and self-defeating contradictions meaning that it was the Continental System's insistence on undermining British trade that weakened the Empire, he argues that "It was a vicious

(Section B continued) circle of conquest and resistance, the British trade could survive as long as the other continents were open to it." Here Thomson is arguing that the continental system failed due to its inability to restrict British trade globally, leaving France ever more isolated by 1813. It is difficult to see the failure of the continental system as the sole reason for the collapse of the Napoleonic Empire by 1814 as France's military defeats left it far weaker ~~that~~ than its failed attempts to disrupt British trade.

One thing which all three sources do appear to agree on is the role of Napoleon in France's decline. Sources 4 and 6 argue that his military defeats weakened France to the point of collapse whilst source 5 argues that Napoleon's continental system was the main factor in France's decline as an Empire by 1814. One major factor linking these sources is

(Section B continued) that they are all assessments by modern historians. These sources would be more reliable were they letters from or diary entries from key figures involved. Despite this they all seem fairly reliable ~~in~~ and fair in their judgements.

Though Source 5 appears at first to support the idea that Napoleon's poor domestic policy caused his downfall, it actually agrees that Napoleon over-extended himself militarily when it says "To make the system effective he had to extend his territorial conquests... But such further aggressions only intensified British resistance and threw Europe into active hostility". This shows then how even source 5 argues that Napoleon's military over-extension was largely responsible for the death of his Empire.

Pto.

(Section B continued) In Conclusion, the argument that the French Empire declined between 1807 and 1814 because Napoleon over stretched his military resources is a perfectly reasonable one. Sources 4 and 6 argue that Napoleon starting too many major wars with the rest of Europe left him isolated and the defeats in Spain and Russia can be seen to support this view. Source 5 argues that Napoleon's aggression and need for conquest far outstripped the positive effects of the continental system, leaving France poor and vulnerable in the face of the aggression of the other European powers such as Austria, Prussia and Great Britain. From the arguments these sources make it is therefore perfectly reasonable to attribute the decline and fall of the Napoleonic Empire to Napoleon and his over extension of the military to a point where victory became impossible.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

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

Question 7

Here, the strongest candidates demonstrated a firm grasp of the controversy and confidently assessed the source arguments about the potential for revolution in the years 1815-20. At this level, own knowledge was often extensive but, more importantly, it was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources (which concentrated on the activities of the revolutionary underground, the weaknesses of the radicals and the consequences of government repression). Weak responses typically offered: (1) a largely unsupported commentary on the dangers of revolution in the period 1815-20 which was inadequately linked to the sources provided; (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach; (3) a generalised narrative account of social disorder in the post-1815 period which barely addressed the question.

1815 - Corn Law, end of Napoleonic Wars

1816 - Spa Fields, East Anglia Riots

1817 - Pentrich Rising, March of Blanketeers, Gagging Acts

1818 - Manchester Cotton-Spinners' Strike

1818-9 - first Female Reform Societies

1819 - Peterloo, Six Acts

1820 - Cato St. Conspiracy

Source 7 - rev. close; active revolutionaries; justified repression; eco. driven

8 - rev. not close; small activity, lack of leaders; over-reaction; pol. driven

9 - rev. not close; lack of concrete ideology; government too strong

Britain was not on the brink of revolution in the years of 1815-1820. A revolutionary tradition did exist, and there were certain figures devoted to this cause, but the government was too strong, both in terms of popularity and force, as well as the fact that the revolutionaries lacked a decisive plan of action and a committed leader with a national movement behind him.

Source 7 argues that a revolution during the years 1815-1820 was close, claiming that these years "brought Britain

(Section B continued) nearer to the brink of revolution than at any other time in history." The source claims that the victims of the Peterloo Massacre were "billed as martyrs to the cause", that the Cato Street Conspiracy was evidence of a "revolutionary underground", and ~~that~~ implies through its argument that the repression of the Six Acts was justified, ~~hinting~~ ~~that~~ hinting that they were needed to "suppress revolutionary movements." ~~The~~ Source 7 seems to suggest that ~~Peterloo~~ the meeting at Peterloo in 1819 was somehow revolutionary in intention, since a martyr has to be fighting for something, and also because the source employs the word "cause". Furthermore, the Six Acts were introduced almost immediately after the Peterloo Massacre, indicating that they were introduced because of the event; this would mean that Peterloo was ~~one of the~~ ~~revolutionary movements~~ one of the "revolutionary movements" source 7 is invoking. The presence of women and children at the Peterloo ~~meeting~~ ~~was~~ would indicate that the event was viewed as more of a family day-out than as an opportunity to mobilise revolution, and so the 11 who were killed there, as well as the 421 who were injured, would not be seen as "martyrs to the cause", since there was no "cause" at the precise event, but ~~instead~~ ^{instead} as victims of a repressive and fear-stricken oligarchy ~~intent~~ ~~on~~ intent on holding onto power by any means necessary.

Source 7 also refers to the Cato Street Conspiracy

(Section B continued) as being "evidence that a revolutionary underground was clearly active." However, the source does not question the size of this "revolutionary underground"; source 8, on the other hand, does, referring to the Pentrich Rising in 1817 instead, but claiming that this event did "confirm the existence, albeit small, of a revolutionary underground tradition." Source 8's statement clearly contradicts source 7's initial assertion that the five years following 1815 brought the country "nearer to the brink of revolution than at any other time in history." Moreover, source 9 corroborates with ~~source 8~~ source 8, stating that the threat of revolution by 1815 had been "greatly reduced". ~~One~~ One is more inclined to agree with sources 8 and 9, since source 7's ~~justif~~ argument rests ^{upon the} ~~upon~~ Cato Street Conspiracy essentially. The Cato Street Conspiracy involved Arthur Thistlewood being tricked by a government hoax and inspiring a handful of fellow revolutionaries ~~to~~ in a room in a London tavern to join him in assassinating the entire Cabinet. The plan was ambitious to say the least, and Thistlewood was driven to this obvious despair by the lack of capitalisation on the part of the reformers after the Peterloo Massacre. The whole conspiracy was eccentric and, even if they had succeeded, Thistlewood possessed that "lack of leadership" and "lack of revolutionary vision and ideology" that source 8 argues.

In addition, all three sources make some reference to the activity of the authorities. Source 7 refers to the

(Section B continued) Six Acts, and implies that they were justified, as suppressing "revolutionary movements". Source 8, on the other hand, suggests a much more ~~positive~~ ^{unjustified} role played by the government, arguing that ~~the~~ there was an "over-reaction" to the March of the Blanketeers, and that this may have contributed "significantly to popular disenchantment" and strengthened the radical underground. Source 9 agrees with source 8 in effect, asserting that the "armed forces remained loyal" when called upon, as indeed they did in the March of the Blanketeers and the Pentrich Rising. One ~~source~~ is inclined to agree with sources 8 and 9 once again on the topic of government activity, since the Six Acts were introduced more as a repressive measure in their own right rather than as a way of dealing with "revolutionary movements", since Peterloo was not "revolutionary" in nature. E.P. Thompson posits that the government "wanted blood" at Peterloo: "not a holocaust, but enough to make an ~~example~~ example." It does seem that the government just wanted to "make an example", as it was within a fortnight that the Prince Regent and Lord Sidmouth had expressed their congratulations and gratitude to the magistrates and local yeomanry. The Six Acts were almost totalitarian in nature, allowing the magistrates to search houses if under suspicion without a warrant, which seems to suggest that this is the level of control the government had wished to exercise since the 1790s, and especially

(Section B continued) since the days of Luddism. Source 8's claim that the authority's handling of the Blanketeers was an "over-reaction" seems justified as well, since the Blanketeers themselves were simply local labourers from the Lancashire area, carrying blankets, unarmed, and merely wishing to travel to London so as to present a petition to the Prince Regent. The whole affair seems ~~not~~ rather harmless and innocent in comparison to the Cato Street Conspiracy, the latter indeed showing revolutionary and malicious intent, but not capability. The employment of the military to handle a group of unarmed travellers does seem an "over-reaction", and only goes to ~~a~~ prove source 9 correct in asserting that the "armed forces remained loyal."

In addition, the ~~radical~~ revolutionary movement does show a "lack of leadership" and a "lack of revolutionary vision and ideology", as source 8 indicates. In 1816, at the Spa Fields meetings, the most popular speakers were those who belonged to the Society of Spencean Philanthropists, yet ~~these~~ never ~~this~~ organisation never attracted the followers to enter the mainstream radicalism, despite having a very clear "ideology". Source 9 implies just as much when it states that British radicals spoke of the "ancient constitution and the rights due to a 'freeborn Englishman'" rather than adopting the liberal ideology of Paine's 'Rights of Man', which was used by their French counterparts; ~~this~~ this also

(Section B continued) suggests that the British wanted to have a revolution on their own ~~own~~ terms and ideology rather than following the successful French example. These vague notions of the "ancient constitution" and "freeborn Englishman" ~~to~~ ~~as~~ ~~say~~ indicate the "lack of ~~revolutionary~~ revolutionary vision and ideology" that source 8 references. The lack of leadership is apparent in the way that the leaders that emerged during these five years were so different: the Society of Spencean Philanthropists (Spa Fields); the March of the Blanketeers' leaders: Jeremiah Brandreth (Pentrich Rising); Henry Hunt (Peterloo); and Arthur Thistlewood (Cato Street Conspiracy). Brandreth and Thistlewood both show a convicted devotion to the revolutionary cause, since neither of them gave up when all hope was pretty much lost: Brandreth, despite his following on his march dwindling away and becoming apathetic and exhausted, kept travelling to London until he was stopped by the military; Thistlewood was in naive bliss of the fact that the Cabinet meeting was a hoax and he ~~did~~ did not have enough supporters to exact mass political assassination. The two of them were eccentrics, and ~~could~~ could not be more different from Henry Hunt, the main speaker at ~~the~~ Peterloo. Hunt possessed charisma and attracted big crowds, but he also possessed vanity, and the months following the Peterloo Massacre exemplify

(Section B continued) that: he invited thousands to the funeral of his favourite horse; he did not continue the momentum ~~of the~~ afforded by the Peterloo Massacre; and most of all, he was happy to leave the radical cause at Peterloo, claiming a moral victory instead. Just as the Hampden Club Convention in 1817 had emphasized the incoherence of the national movement, so had the months following Peterloo, which involved much dissension and bickering. The leaders during the years 1815-1820 all signify the "lack of leadership", the "lack of a revolutionary vision and ideology", and the lack of a national ~~movement~~ ~~the~~ radical movement, which all testify to the fact that ~~revolution~~ the "prospects ~~of~~ for revolution during Liverpool's premiership were not good."

In conclusion, ~~the~~ Britain was not on the brink of revolution in the years 1815-1820, mainly because the revolutionary movement was both too small and because it lacked a leader, a vision, and a precise revolutionary ideology.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This low Level 5 response integrates source material and the candidate's own knowledge to good effect. The key arguments in the sources are identified, examined and extended (with other supporting evidence) to develop a sustained analysis. However, a longer, and stronger, conclusion is required in this case to facilitate a well-informed final judgement.

Question 8

On Question 8, the strongest candidates made good use of the sources and their own knowledge to develop a confident line of argument about the impact of economic change on the living standards of the labouring classes from c1780 to 1830. At this level, responses offered a sustained source-led analysis with impressive range and depth. Indeed, several in this category extensively cross-referenced the sources to develop a nuanced analysis which emphasised that economic change affected living standards in both material and psychological ways. Weak candidates tended to produce: (1) a largely unsupported commentary on the impact of economic change on the labouring classes between 1780 and 1830; (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach; (3) a generalised narrative account of the British economy and/or working class life from 1780 to 1830 which barely addressed the question.

Most people think of the industrial revolution as a rapid change from rural Britain into industrial Britain, but this was not the case. The industrial revolution was a gradual process and therefore the benefits and rewards would also come gradually. Some people of the time did not even realise that they were living through a time of change. The sources offer a wide range of evidence concerning the effects of the industrial revolution on the labouring classes. But it is important not to generalise as huge regional variations and occupational variations existed. In Source 12 Thompson wrongly refers to the 'average working man' but there was no such thing as many labourers experienced different effects. A London dock worker, for example, is part of the labouring class but did not experience half the benefits a specialised cotton weaver in East Lancashire did who was

(Section B continued)

Also in the labouring class.

There is plenty of evidence suggesting a decline in living standards for the British workers. Source 10 directly agrees with the claim in the question as Evans mentions the 'environmental deterioration'. Both living and working conditions fell for the labouring classes mainly because workers moved to towns as there was an increased opportunity for 'regularity of employment' (Source 11). However this meant the towns became heavily over-populated and resulted in 'lower standards of public health' (Evans). Edwin Chadwick's Sanitary Report of 1842 stated that many workers 'lived in poor quality housing which, as well as lacking adequate sanitation, were often damp, crowded together and of small size in relation to occupying levels'; Chadwick's report strengthens Evans' view. Evans takes a predominantly middle course as he acknowledges there may have been insignificant material gains in terms of ~~per~~ real wages but agrees that the debate can not be won or lost when examining such data and

(Section B continued)

This must be focused on living and working conditions.

Thompson, who is a pessimist historian, agrees with Evans by stating that the 'Working class share of national wealth had almost certainly fallen relative to property owning-classes'. This is an important point raised as although the national wealth was increasing it was only the 'middle and upper classes' share that was increasing. And therefore it was the middle and upper-classes who contributed to the 'greater stability of consumption' (Source 11) as they were spending more. Sara Horrell agrees with this as she concludes that the 'working classes' ability to buy luxuries was low and remained fairly low.

Evans does mention 'contested evidence for a rise in real wages after 1790' and it is upon this criticized data that optimists base their arguments. Between 1780-1840 real wages did increase by 12% but output per worker increased by 46% (Evans). This represents Engels' Pause which shows that the middle-classes were

(Section B continued)

enriching themselves at the expense of the labouring classes. Evans states that the benefits were 'first enjoyed by the middle and upper classes' and this is exemplified by an increase in spending and income inequality increasing.

In Source 11, Ashton does not deal with the living and working conditions in Britain as he simply adopted a statistical route that focused on wage and price data. Both pessimist and optimist historians find it hard to disagree with Ashton's statistics but argue it does not show the entire picture.

Evans and Thompson also raise an interesting point highlighting the 'psychological decline in standards'. Evans also refers to the 'psychological shock' brought about by working conditions and how the workers felt like the standard of their lives was decreasing.

Dauton agrees by stating 'British workers were the most miserable on the face of the globe'. The fact that they felt their living standards were falling shows that in actual

(Section B continued)

fact they were.

However, the sources also offer evidence suggesting the lives of the working class, or at least some, did prosper. Evans states that 'skilled workers did see a benefit' and it was these workers who made up the labour aristocracy (about the top 10%-15% of wage earners in Britain). They did see a benefit but 'had to wait' for a long time. ~~As~~ Source 12 corroborates with this by stating the 'benefits of economic progress' which shows that some of the working class did experience benefits but in most cases were fairly minimal.

Ashton states the 'Merits of the factory system' which meant more and more workers were seeing an increase in wages but not necessarily an increase in conditions. However it must be remembered that only 5% of the British workforce in 1840 were employed in factories. Therefore the merits of the factory system were only experienced by a few. Some workers still worked at home, some in small workshops but most were still agricultural workers.

(Section B continued)

Agriculture was still the largest employer in Britain and the economy still depended upon it. However agricultural work also experienced a change as Source 10 highlights 'the changes in agriculture'. These changes were both in work and in home life, as the enclosure movement led to a loss of traditions in villages. Village greens were disappearing along with local shops and village halls. This could be considered a decrease in living standards by a section of the labouring class. Also agricultural labourers were formed a large proportion of the 20% of the British working class which were losers in the industrial revolution. 8 out of the 10 poorest countries were rural rather than agricultural and this shows how the industrial revolution affected huge areas of Britain.

The industrial revolution did bring about prosperity in Britain as 'factory production increased rapidly' (Source 11) but the benefits were reaped by the 'employers'. There was consequently a fall in prices in terms of

(Section B continued)

'flexibles' and 'tea and sugar' but the labouring classes were only able to consume small amounts as it was the middle and upper classes who did most of the spending. None of the sources mention the increase in opportunity the labouring class experienced. They were able to join Sunday schools, political and religious clubs which bettered them and did result in self-improvement throughout the period. Also many workers were marrying at a younger age, some believe this was because pressure was put on them to do so in order to survive in difficult times. But I disagree, I believe this is another example of the labouring class experiencing greater opportunities.

Evans states in his book 'The Forging of the Modern State' that; 'The first generation of workers in industrial base Britain, though their real wages probably improved slightly, laboured in worse conditions than their parents had known. This sums up the debate very well as it signifies that material gain was fairly insignificant and the conditions did decline.

(Section B continued)

It was the middle and upper-classes benefited from the industrial revolution mainly through exploitation. However it is important to remember the wide range of effects the revolution had. Ling and Timmins state that 'Between 15-20% were Unwages, 20% were losses and the other 60% were subjected to the instability of economic cycles with an increasing risk of falling into poverty'. Poverty did increase and the number of people of claiming poor relief also increased this does represent a deteriorating standard of living. Every member of the working class in different regions and occupations experienced different effects and that must not be forgotten. The material gains were fairly insignificant and the living standards did drop but there was an increase in opportunity. As the industrial revolution was a gradual process, the labouring class did only experience benefits gradually. Hence initially it was a deterioration for most.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

In this Level 4 response the candidate integrates source material and own knowledge to develop the argument about the living standards of the British labouring classes between 1780 and 1830. Most of the main arguments in the sources are examined and extended (with other supporting evidence). More rigorous cross-referencing of the sources and the inclusion of more detailed own knowledge would have pushed this response further into Level 4.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

Paper Summary

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

In-Depth Study question

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

Associated Historical Controversy question

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

Grade Boundaries

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

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE