

General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative U Britain, 1929–1998

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:

Either

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
 - analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
 - there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
 - there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
 - effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.
-

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:** generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative U: Britain, 1929–1998

AS Unit 2: Britain, 1929–1951

Question 1

- (a) Explain briefly, the meaning of ‘depressed areas’ in the context of Britain in the 1930s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source, e.g. areas that had been hit hard by the Slump/Depression of the 1930s; or areas of high unemployment/industrial decline in the 1930s. **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context, e.g. may name some of the areas or give some percentage figures on unemployment, or may explain that they were mainly in areas over-dependent on one or more of the depressed ‘staple’ industries. Credit any reference to the Special Areas Act but don’t expect. **2-3**

- (b) Explain how useful **Source B** is about why the Conservatives lost the 1945 Election. (7 marks)

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

Target: AO1.2, AO2

L1: Basic evaluation of the utility/reliability of the source either from own knowledge or based on provenance, e.g. description of what Attlee says, or points out that Attlee was the Labour leader in the 1945 Election. **1-2**

L2: Developed evaluation of utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue linking source, own knowledge and provenance, e.g. Attlee an informed, contemporary observer and as Labour leader at the very centre of politics in 1945; brings out the value of the content with Attlee identifying reasons why the Conservatives lost - importance of memories of the 1930’s e.g. about mass unemployment and Appeasement; feeling that the Conservatives were not forward-looking. **3-5**

L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context, e.g. also writing later when had time to reflect on the remarkable result in 1945; differentiates between support for Churchill and support for the Conservatives valuable in explaining paradox of Churchill’s popularity yet his electoral defeat; strong candidates should bring out the

limitations e.g. point to factors not mentioned in the extract or point out that the Conservatives did win almost 40% of the popular vote. **6-7**

- (c) ‘The decisive factor in Labour’s election victory in 1945 was that Labour had not only a programme with popular appeal but also politicians capable of delivering it.’ Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based on *either* own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The question suggests two factors for Labour’s election victory in 1945 but leaves open the possibility both from the Sources and from Own Knowledge of other factors as well. Source A plus own knowledge should reveal various reasons for the likely appeal of Labour’s programme – stress on modernisation, restructuring and building a better future, no return to the inequalities and depression of the 1930’s, the specific policies of maintaining full employment, decent wages, etc. This could be used in conjunction with Source B’s point about the electorate not wanting a return of unemployment. Source C can provide evidence that Labour’s leading men were not only well known by 1945 but had held major posts on the Home Front since 1940 and were closely associated with new and popular ideas. Source B can also be used to support capability by contrasting the record of Labour politicians during the War with the failures of pre-War Conservatives both in home and foreign affairs.

Own knowledge would allow candidates to both agree and disagree with the propositions. The sheer size of Labour's victory and the surprise defeat of Churchill suggests both the appeal of Labour's programme and belief that its leaders were capable of delivering it. Candidates may give more detail about the important role played by leading Labour politicians during the war notably Bevin as Minister of Labour and may suggest that this rebuilt Labour's reputation wiping out memories of the disaster of 1931. Equally, own knowledge and hints in some sources such as B, could be used to argue that the Conservatives lost the election as much as Labour won it. Well-informed candidates might point out that support for the Conservatives in terms of votes was actually quite high in 1945; that the Conservatives too had new ideas on such matters as health reform though perhaps not as well known as Labour's; that major social reforms had already been put through by the War Coalition such as the 1944 Education Act (by R.A. Butler, a Conservative) and the Family Allowances Act; and that there were other factors working against the Conservatives such as Churchill's 'Gestapo' speech, over-reliance on Churchill's wartime popularity, weaknesses in the Tory electoral machine, the workings of the British electoral system, etc. Some might argue however that Coalition reforms and plans such as those of Beveridge and Abercrombie had only whetted the appetite of the electorate for major social improvement after the War and that given memories of the 1930's – as B indicates – many voters felt that Labour was more likely to deliver. Some may point to other factors working for Labour such as the effect of the Army Education units on the Forces' vote though this has been exaggerated.

L1 and L2 answers will tend towards unsupported generalisations and assertions about Labour's appeal / leadership and be almost entirely reliant on the sources. At L3 answers will have greater depth both from own knowledge and the sources, and top Level 3 may well address both parts of the suggestion but with lack of balance. L4 answers will provide a balanced assessment of both factors and others. L5 will integrate own knowledge and sources to reach a clear, well thought-out judgement.

Question 2

- (a) Comment on 'long-term unemployed' in the context of the effects of mass unemployment in Britain in the 1930s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based on either the source or own knowledge, e.g. those out of work for a long time, those with little hope of getting a regular job. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. may give a more detailed definition e.g. those out of work continuously for a year or more, or may write about the debilitating effects on individuals, families and communities of long-term unemployment, or may give some relevant statistics based on regions or on trades. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why ‘Mosley’s British Union of Fascists’ attracted some support in Britain in the 1930s. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. may quote figure in the extract, or general comments about excitement, something to do. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Mosley was a powerful speaker with ideas for reducing mass unemployment at a time - the early 1930’s – when unemployment was at its worst ; that Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany seemed to have policies to reduce unemployment ; a feeling that the existing parties could not cope especially after the break up of the Second Labour Government ; splits in the Labour and Liberal parties ; unpopularity of National Government measures like the Means Test; support from certain sections of the Press; attractions of uniform and comradeship. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. disillusionment with traditional political parties and loss of faith in the political system but points out that overall extreme parties were never a serious challenge to the established political parties in Britain and that what support they had declined sharply in the late 1930s. **6-7**

- (c) Explain the importance of the policies of the National Government, in relation to other factors, in explaining why extreme political parties did not gain mass support in Britain in the 1930s. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The focus of this question is on the relative importance of the various factors in explaining why Britain did not experience the rise of a powerful Fascist or a powerful Communist Party in the 1930s. Candidates might argue that the policies of the National Government in aiding economic recovery were a factor. NG economic policies e.g. low interest rates, Imperial Protection and by the late 1930s Rearmament, did help reduce unemployment. Candidates may well argue that the fall in unemployment was a key factor by drying up the likely recruiting grounds for extremism. They may point to a halving of total unemployment 1933-38. Equally they may argue that most NG policies were not that effective and that some policies in the 1931-34 period such as cuts in wages and the Means Test may well have kept unemployment high by reducing Demand. Anyway, though the national level of unemployment fell, regional unemployment especially in the old industrial areas remained high throughout the decade. They may also argue that there was no direct correlation between high levels of long-term unemployment and political extremism; indeed they could use the extract to suggest that the long-term unemployed often became politically apathetic as they coped with the problems of poverty. Some answers will put more emphasis on the political rather than economic reasons for why there was little support. In regard to NG political policies candidates may be expected to refer to the 1936 Public Order Act which curbed the activities of extremists.

In looking at other factors candidates may point to the Communists having no outstanding leader, the refusal of Labour to enter into an alliance with the Communists and the determination of trade union leaders like Bevin to fight Communist influence within Organised Labour. Similarly the Conservatives had no need to flirt with the BUF since they dominated the National Government, and Fascism was quite alien to men like Baldwin and Chamberlain. Candidates may also argue that the street violence associated with both the Fascists and Communists e.g. at Olympia and Cable Street frightened off many potential supporters. Some candidates – and probably very good ones – may argue that unlike Italy or Germany there was no sense of national humiliation after the Great War in Britain, that traditional institutions like the monarchy continued to provide a focus for national loyalty, that the empire maintained the image of Britain as a World Power and that the parliamentary system was deep-rooted.

Question 3

- (a) Comment on ‘the Phoney War’ in the context of Britain and the Second World War.
(3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge, e.g. no real fighting, no real feeling of being at war. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge, e.g. identifies dates as September 1939 to early 1940, little military action by BEF, mass bombing not begun. Perhaps links to appeasement i.e. still possibility of a negotiated settlement, or challenges term by pointing to action at sea and in Norway. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Britain issued an ultimatum to Germany in September 1939. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue, e.g. German invasion of Poland on 1st September 1939. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. growing distrust of Hitler since his invasion of Czechoslovakia in spring 1939 despite assurances given at Munich; British guarantee and treaty with Poland in mid-1939; Hitler's demands for Danzig and the Polish Corridor seen as insatiable. Loss of faith in appeasement. Chamberlain responding to demands in Parliament for ultimatum to Germany once German invasion of Poland began on 1st September 1939. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation, e.g. issue of ultimatum not ending Chamberlain hopes for a deal with Hitler as a way of limiting the spread of war. Chamberlain hoped that a settlement with Germany might still be reached if Hitler would call off his invasion of Poland. Chamberlain's delay in issuing – pressure in the Commons. **6-7**

- (c) Explain the importance of public opinion, in relation to other factors, in explaining why Britain followed a policy of appeasement towards Nazi Germany in the period 1935 to 1939. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Candidates should be credited for any attempt to define and explain ‘appeasement’ whether in the broad sense of attempting compromise and conciliation or in the sense of the specific policy associated with Neville Chamberlain from 1937 onwards. Public opinion was seen by politicians such as Baldwin and has been credited since by some historians, as a major reason why British policy towards Hitler was conciliatory and compromising rather than more openly hostile and combative. Candidates might refer to the 1935 Fulham by-election as evidence of public opinion limiting rearmament. They might refer to opinion poll findings suggesting support for Collective Security and the League of Nations. They might refer to support in the Press for Chamberlain, notably the Times under the editorship of Geoffrey Dawson, and the national sense of relief on Chamberlain’s return from Munich in October 1938. Reference might be made to memories of the horrors of the Great War, fear of mass aerial bombing, concern with domestic problems like unemployment, as reasons why Public Opinion did not want another war.

Candidates who challenge the view that Public Opinion was always pro-appeasement should be rewarded. There is evidence that even in 1938, early 1939, the Public was more sceptical of appeasement than were Chamberlain and his colleagues. Candidates, probably good ones, might differentiate between the relief at the Munich Settlement in the autumn of 1938 and the change in public mood in the spring of 1939 when Hitler absorbed the rest of Czechoslovakia or the general feeling by the summer of 1939 that war was almost inevitable. Also reward highly any candidates who refer to the work of Richard Cockett on Chamberlain and Henderson’s manipulation of the media. Candidates might differentiate between Baldwin’s tendency to shape his policy by his feeling for public opinion and Chamberlain’s messianic belief that he could do a deal with Hitler and save Europe from another great war.

Good answers ought then to consider ‘other factors’. Amongst these might be Chamberlain’s personality and background; his particular view of appeasement; his belief that German demands could be met as in his handling of the Sudeten Question in 1938; his reluctance to ally with Soviet Russia and his over-optimism about French military strength. Candidates might also consider Britain’s weak defences in the mid-1930s and the need to buy time for rearmament – which began seriously under Chamberlain. Some might point to Britain’s relative economic decline as an industrial power compared to before 1914. Others might point to British governments being conscious of the range of potential enemies facing Britain and her Empire – Germany in Europe, Italy with ambitions in North Africa, Japan as a threat in the Far East. This formidable ring of enemies, with Britain unable to expect help from an isolationist United States or from a Soviet Union absorbed in internal economic change and the Stalinist Terror, made any attempt to reach an arrangement with Germany appear sensible.

Alternative U: Britain 1929-1998**A2 Unit 5: Britain 1951-1997****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Sources A and B** and your own knowledge.

To what extent do these sources agree on the role of the government in the miners' strike? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Extracts simple statements from the sources or refers to own knowledge to demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of aspects of agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate, with reference to either sources and/or own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of similarity and difference of interpretation in relation to the debate and offers some explanation. **6-8**
- L4: Uses appropriately selected material, from both sources and own knowledge, to reach a sustained judgement on the extent of similarity and difference in interpretation in relation to the debate. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will simply provide literal evidence to show that Source A denies blame for the strike or that Source B recognises the government's hostility towards the miners and their current plight. Slightly better answers, at Level 2, should begin to demonstrate a more accurate grasp of the evidence, perhaps pairing a series of source extracts to show differences of attitudes e.g. Thatcher's 'miners' strike was not of the government's seeking' v Kinnock's 'That turmoil is the product of Thatcherism'. These answers should highlight the different emphasis given to the strike from very differing political positions. For Level 3 candidates should clearly show the difference in attitude and tone of both the sources towards the strike. Source A suggests that far from wanting a strike, the government have been seeking to invest in the mining industry ('new investment is happening in abundance'), whereas Source B stresses wilful neglect ('the withdrawal of welfare support'). Furthermore, Source A seeks to lay the blame at the feet of a political minority 'whose real aim is the breakdown of law and order'. Source B's interpretation is that the miners' strike is the logical culmination of deliberate Tory policies ('pit closures would trap them, entomb them, in unemployment'). Level 4 answers will build on Level 3 to provide clear judgement. It should point out that Sources A and B differ greatly in their justification, tone and attribution of blame for the strike. In Source A Thatcher seeks to present an argument that, far from causing the strike, in fact the government has been drawn into events, not of their doing e.g. she implies that why would a government invest £2 million a day into the mines if it sought conflict? Using Source A and own knowledge, one can see how Thatcher is determined to deflect

responsibility by highlighting the role of an ‘organised revolutionary minority’ bent on politicising the strike. Her line is that she is simply upholding democracy. Source B clearly disagrees-it is a typically impassioned Kinnock speech which sees the miners as victims of a rampant political force – Thatcherism and maintains that the miners’ strike is the latest act of social vandalism from a government bent on fuelling discontent. The tone is one of despair whereas Source A is one of detachment. Some of the judgement may wish to make explicit the political/ideological positions held by both speakers and the audience to whom they are addressing.

(b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

“Margaret Thatcher achieved her victories at a terrible cost “.

Assess the validity of this view of the impact of Margaret Thatcher’s social and economic policies in the years 1979 to 1990? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This question involves a variety of factors centred on one main assertion-did the policies of Margaret Thatcher between 1979 and 1990 create a Britain that was harsher and more unequal? Successful answers will examine a full range of her policies, particularly the

motivation behind her policies and the social, economic and political impact on the population. Some may examine the period and highlight the different phases of Thatcherism and how "victories" were variable in their success depending on the period of time. Others may go further than 1990 and explain that some of the policies lived on after 1990 in different guises under Major and Blair. Good candidates may recognize the difference between Thatcher and Thatcherism in assessing impact.

The sources clearly help candidates and should help them achieve balance to their answers.

Source C gives a concise appraisal of Thatcher's intentions ("her crusade to transform Britain") and how she set about "dancing on the grave of Keynesian consensus"). It highlights several key Thatcherite policy agendas and candidates may wish to use this as a form of template for discussion.

Those concurring with the premise of the question will be able to use Source B to confirm the thrust of the title, particularly the view of social disintegration borne by many in society, not just miners.

Good candidates may use Sources A and B to highlight the polarization happening in British society and also recognize the entrenched politics/bias/propaganda of the 2 leaders and the meaning of a democratic society, or lack of it.

Answers at L3 and above will make direct attempts at assessing whether Britain became more unequal and, if so, how much was due to Thatcher's policies. Careful selection of sources and own knowledge to support and sustain the candidate's argument will take it into L4; a strong and sustained attempt at judgement will take the answer into L5.

Section B

Questions 2-7 are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the generic A2 Levels of Response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (without reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

“Despite some superficial similarities over political and economic policies, the basic long-term clash of values between the Conservatives and Labour remained.”

How valid is this view of the so-called “post-war consensus” in the years 1951 to c. 1970? *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark schemes for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The central issue is to analyse the political and economic records of Conservative and Labour governments between 1951-1970 and to assess whether there really was a ‘post-war consensus’ or were the motivations and values of the two parties simply different. As the question is looking over two decades and several governments, candidates should seek to offer a broad overview and not just adopt a “list of policies/values” approach.

The validity of a consensus is contentious. Some candidates may adopt Paul Addison’s view that, as a result of wartime experiences, the leaders of both Conservative and Labour parties came to pursue roughly similar attitudes towards change- i.e. the mixed economy, full employment and the welfare state. In this sense, both parties adopted the ‘middle ground’. Other candidates may pursue Ben Pimlott’s complete rejection of consensus as just a myth and that having such a strong two-party system meant a consensus was highly improbable. At Level 4 and above, the better candidates may differentiate between, on the one hand, political ideas and attitudes of the electorate and, on the other, government policy and policy-making. They may also suggest that ‘broad consensus’ began to break down in the 1970s, but that the differences were more party rhetoric than practical policy. Candidates should be rewarded for putting the period in context; for example, they may argue that compared to what came after 1970, the period 1951-1970 does appear to be one of moderation, not only in terms of politics and economics, but also of values.

Question 3

“The ‘permissive society’ of the Sixties was mostly a myth; the lives of most of the British people changed very little.”

How convincing is this view of the social and cultural changes between the late 1950s and the early 1970s? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Basically candidates need to assess how great were the cultural and social changes in Britain from 1951 to the early 1970s. Indeed, was there actually a ‘social revolution’ or has time created a Sixties myth? Marwick has suggested that the Sixties started in 1958 and finished in the early 1970s. Some candidates may well use material from just after the Second World War to show that trends were identifiable before the Sixties and so the permissive tag is rather an erroneous one. Others may focus on continuity and change. Basic answers may produce masses of relevant examples of changes, centring on gender, race and immigration but will generally be of the narrative variety. Often answers will display specific knowledge of the “Swinging Sixties” in terms of music and youth culture but have a tendency to be rather uncritical. This may result in stereotyping the 1950s as a time that was ‘old-fashioned’ and therefore the 1960s were dramatic and full of change. More effective answers will evaluate judgements and make differentiated comments with regard to change versus continuity. Causation is not called for but many answers will support their argument by highlighting the extent and importance of social change (or lack of change). The best answers will demonstrate some synoptic aspects as the period is examined as a whole but coverage of the whole period is not expected to be comprehensive. In fact, many high quality answers will remain within the dates of the question.

Question 4

“Economic realism rather than political enthusiasm was behind Britain’s three attempts to join the EEC in the period 1961 to 1973.”

How valid is this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The key issue centres on why Britain decided to join the EEC on three occasions in the 1960s, early 1970s. Candidates should avoid giving a list of reasons why Britain attempted to join- the question is inviting them to assess whether Britain joined for economic expediency or actual desire to become involved in a developing project. Good candidates may offer other key factors and disagree with the premise of the question. These may involve disillusionment with the performance of EFTA or simply that Britain was ‘missing the boat’ when they could be directing it. Candidates may perceive an element of cynicism in each bid. They should differentiate between the 1961, 1967 and 1973 attempts, examine party political issues and look at the political and economic contexts of the time. Thus effective answers may portray the future of Britain in the early 1960s as a ‘fading’ world power. Others will pursue party-political interests and assess the personal agendas of leaders such as Macmillan, Heath and Wilson and their dissenting colleagues. The question invites a variety of approaches and candidates should note that the question goes to the 1970s; therefore evaluation should be seen over a period of time. This may produce high quality answers which go outside the period to identify trends involving both foreign and party political interests.

Question 5

‘The oil price crisis of 1973 was a political and economic disaster for Britain.’
Assess the validity of this view in the years 1973 to 1979. (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The question is looking at a narrow period of time and is centred on both the economic and political impact. It demands a thorough evaluation of the consequences. The economic aspect will see candidates examining how and why did the 1973 oil-price crisis affect and influence the subsequent recession and industrial strife. The political dimension is more profound- it raises huge political problems- Edward Heath and the decision to have a three-day week and the eventual rise of Margaret Thatcher. With regards to Labour, how did it affect Wilson’s and Callaghan’s ability to govern? How great was the correlation between the 1973/4 crisis and the rise of the Bennite left and the coming Winter of Discontent? A balanced answer will require both aspects of the question to be addressed, although this may not involve balanced coverage, e.g., answers may be more ‘political’ than ‘economic’ in evidence or emphasis. It is critical however to focus on 1973 and its effects. Some adequate answers may make a brief analysis of the 1973/1974 oil-price crisis but the answer requires much more than a simplistic narrative account of the Winter of Discontent and the election of Thatcher in 1979. Differentiated answers, showing the importance of key factors and key events will often be placed in Level 4 and above.

Question 6

“The Conservatives were certain to win because the country felt that it was time for a change.”

“Labour threw away victory by calling the election at the wrong time.”

Which of these two statements provides the more convincing explanation for the Conservative victory in 1979? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This question centres on one key issue: why did the 1979 election turn out as it did? The two statements invite a variety of factors and possibilities for Conservative success. Good candidates will recognise change over time and that the answer will involve a mixture of short and longer term factors and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Discussion will clearly examine the role of the Thatcher factor, the tactics of Callaghan and perhaps the so-called “sea-change” in British politics. Some will refer to the changes happening within the Conservative party from 1974 onwards; others will flag up the record of Wilson and the problems inherited from the Conservatives and those which developed in the late 1970s. Clearly the Winter of Discontent will feature but analysis will attempt to prioritise the factors involved to produce a relevant argument. A balanced answer might focus much more on either Conservative victory or on Labour’s defeat. Factual coverage need not be equal as long as a range of factors is used to reach a coherent conclusion. Scope is for answers to go back before 1978/9 to allow for longer term factors but this is not a requirement.

Question 7

“Neil Kinnock’s decision to take on the Militant Left in the 1980s was much more significant in the revival of Labour’s electoral fortunes than the emergence of Tony Blair and New Labour.”

How valid is this assessment of the reasons why Labour was able to recover so successfully in the 1990s? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This question is asking students to assess why Labour was able to return from the political wilderness by 1997. It might seem to be mainly or entirely about the internal affairs of the Labour party but, as always, relevant material on the decline of the Conservatives which opened the path for Labour, might be profitably used. Care should be taken over pre-prepared answers which may answer a different question i.e. one which simply lists factors in the rise of Tony Blair and which doesn’t look at change over time. The key focus should be on the relative merits of a range of factors which explain the Labour recovery and specifically on the vital contributions of the key personalities. This may well result in references to New Labour figures such as Gould, Mandelson and Campbell. This question is designed to provoke debate. Candidates need to explain the destabilizing impact of Militant on Labour after it lost the 1979 election and effective answers will evaluate the contributions of Kinnock and Blair in Labour’s recovery. The thrust of the question is negative towards Blair and New Labour and candidates will either support the “gradualist” tone to the question or challenge the quotation and give support to Blairism. Alternatively, candidates may offer a different explanation of the phenomenon that is New Labour. Answers should show awareness of developments across the 1980s and 1990s but the analytical detail may not necessarily be even or complete.

Alternative U: Britain 1929-1998

A2 Unit 6: Britain and Ireland, 1969-1998

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source C** about the significance of the introduction of direct rule. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. **6-8**
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

Indicative content

Candidates may detect that Patrick Buckland writes from a “mild” anti-IRA, anti-British perspective. Answers at Level 1 and 2 will be able to show that the introduction of direct rule was highly significant. There will be literal evidence to support e.g. relations between Belfast and Westminster had deteriorated to such an extent that Britain was not prepared to support Stormont any longer. Better answers will evaluate Buckland’s views in light of other perspectives, such as:

- Relations had become a “rift” over time and that MPs of all parties in Britain were unhappy with the developing situation.
- The dismissive tone used to describe how Faulkner and the unionists were “consulted” by the British.
- The defence of the unionist position-“strong enough and organised enough” in coping with such a major suspension of power.
- Using own knowledge and understanding to highlight Buckland’s curt comment about the IRA’s contribution to the downfall of Stormont and the increased use of violence. They may give the IRA perspective that the collapse opened the way for the final push towards a united Ireland. Good candidates may project forwards to demonstrate the impact of direct rule on the two communities in Northern Ireland but this is not essential for the highest level. They may also show awareness that in some British eyes direct rule was never intended to be anything other than a temporary measure
- Better candidates may well develop the significance of the final 2 lines-a watershed-and the issue of power and who was to wield it. They will probably explain the build up in tension to March 1972 and how the 2 communities viewed direct rule-betrayal

and victory. Also they may highlight the British government’s radical approach to governing Northern Ireland, particularly the stripping of power from Stormont after a “50 year regime”.

- (b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the clash between the British and Northern Ireland governments in March 1972? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. 3-5
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. 6-8
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. 9-10

Indicative content

Edward Heath was PM in 1972 as the situation in Northern Ireland was reaching a serious breakdown in law and order between the 2 communities. The role of internment and the actions of the British army were of great importance. Brian Faulkner had become PM in 1971 and was perceived as a hardliner on security issues and unionism’s last chance to save the Stormont system. This account is taken from Heath’s autobiography and so all candidates should be prepared to examine his account in light of this, especially the need for other sources to offer a unionist perspective. Basic, adequate answers will be able to summarise the literal evidence and/or offer opinions about Heath’s relationship with Faulkner and the unionists, just as direct rule was being considered. For example, Heath dominated the agenda and put Faulkner in an untenable position. Better answers will go beyond this to evaluate the source, perhaps by:

- Noting the language and tone adopted by Heath in his dealings with Faulkner, especially the final insinuation about Faulkner’s “poor” political judgement. (Over the years amongst the unionist community Faulkner had gained a reputation for shiftiness and lack of loyalty).
- Showing awareness of Heath’s desire to appear as politically reasonable in suggesting direct rule as a breathing space before considering power-sharing. By implication Faulkner is portrayed as rather reactionary and naïve-“he seemed to think we were bluffing”. Faulkner was also a key supporter of internment without trial.
- In March 1972 Heath would clearly wish to put a good gloss on the intended policies of the British government. Candidates would need to examine Heath’s motives here – did he really intend to consult with Faulkner or was his decision a *fait accompli* or a

panic reaction to the circumstances? The British government was caught between its anxiety to avoid direct rule and opposition to Stormont's requests for a harsher security policy.

- Using own knowledge to show that there was a major battle between Heath and Faulkner over the future conduct of security in Northern Ireland. Candidates may highlight Faulkner's objectives-the rearming of the RUC and the re-establishment of the B-Specials. Heath, in turn, wanted the British army to be in charge of all security, including the RUC. Clearly this was unacceptable to Faulkner.
- Good candidates will recognize Heath's change in tone from needing Faulkner's support at the start to one where he was expendable. Own knowledge will confirm that when Heath became PM, the cosy, old relationship between Conservatism and Unionism had gone. London had made it clear that if internment failed-"very fundamental questions could arise".
- According to minutes, at the meeting Heath did suggest handing over some areas to the Republic, having a referendum and discussing what would happen if troops were withdrawn etc. Faulkner did urge Heath to keep internment. Faulkner later claimed he asked several times if direct rule was on the cards and he was assured it was not.

(c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C**, and your own knowledge.

"The main reason why the events from January 1969 to March 1972 resulted in the introduction of direct rule was the apparent willingness of the British government to sell out its friends in order to appease its enemies".

Assess the validity of this view of the collapse of the Stormont system in 1972?

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This question requires an evaluation of the period of time from January 1969 to March 1972 when direct rule was introduced. It should focus on the premise that the British government “betrayed” the unionists and, by ignoring their fears, gave way to republican pressure. Candidates can attempt the question in a variety of ways. There is a lot of own knowledge available to complement the sources. The best candidates may well challenge the view – especially that the British government deliberately alienated the unionists and actively acceded to republican demands. Candidates should examine a range of possibilities for the collapse of Stormont- the sources are helpful, particularly where they highlight the relationship between Heath and Faulkner and where blame for the collapse might lie. They raise a series of key questions:

- Wouldn't an event of such significance as “Bloody Sunday” have destroyed any system of government? Did Faulkner's resignation weaken the unionist position? Was Stormont failing because of a lack of credibility with the Catholic community?
- Buckland in Source C claims the IRA may have brought down Stormont but what hopes for change had the British government, given the republican movement's response between 1969 and 1972? In light of Source B, what did the republicans know of the conversations between Belfast and Westminster re. possibilities for power-sharing? If so, did it enhance their strategy? The prospect of power-sharing will be interpreted in different ways by candidates-the first stage towards Irish unity or British kite-flying to try and avoid more violence?
- Some candidates may argue that far from appeasing the republicans, the British government and Belfast were seeking solutions to bolster their own positions. Some may claim direct rule strengthened British control-a logical step given the deteriorating circumstances. Had Heath recognised by mid 1971 that the SDLP walkout had deprived Stormont of any remaining legitimacy and new strategies were required?
- Candidates should consider the key events in the years and try and evaluate their impact as perceived by the 2 communities and the British government. Also the emergence of PIRA and unionist reactions.
- Some students perhaps will conclude, as Heath did, that Faulkner could deliver neither security success nor political progress. Internment, not only counter-productive on the streets, was destroying all hopes of political advance. Far from appeasing the republicans, in fact it was a time of nationalist alienation. The collapse of Stormont was no more than a pragmatic British response to the escalating sectarian problems.
- Comprehensive cover is not expected and answers may contain arguments outside the time frame but which advance the answer. As always answers challenging the premise of the question will be well rewarded. It is not expected that “balance” will mean even-handed, “middle- of- the- road” assessments. Clearly there will be highly effective answers which are trenchantly unionist or nationalist-this is valid as long as they are well argued, backed by specific evidence from own knowledge, from the 3 sources and (at Level 4 or 5) from a grasp of other perspectives from the nominated texts or from other independent reading.