



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative R Unit 5

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

The 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 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 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.

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) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: 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.

C: 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.

June 2007

Alternative R: Britain, 1895–1951

A2 Unit 5: Britain, 1918–1951

Question 1

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

To what extent do these two sources agree on why attitudes to Labour's proposals for the use of state power changed? (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 be thin in material and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2, responses will give points from the sources. Alderman in Source A argues that the experience of 'wartime socialism' had shown the electorate that action by the state could bring about social and economic change. Similarly, Adelman in Source B argues that wartime experience had seen growth in the support for collectivism and planning, and also adds support for development of a more egalitarian society. These concepts appealed to more than traditional Labour voters. Adelman quotes Blake in support of his thesis. Responses at this level may also refer to other reasons why attitudes changed, given in the sources (e.g. Attlee as Labour leader with 'constructive proposals' in Source A) and/or from own knowledge (e.g. views of the Forces). Neither source claims explicitly that proposals for using state powers were the main reason for Labour's election victory, but both imply that attitudes towards using them had changed and become positive.

Level 3 answers will demonstrate explicit understanding that both sources acknowledge the importance of changed attitudes towards collectivism/state action, and may well use own knowledge to develop the reference to 'Keynesianism' in Source B. That source also refers to broader reasons than just positive experience of 'war socialism' for changed attitudes: 'deeper changes in intellectual and social attitudes' and to memories of the pre-war Conservative record. Source A is even more direct on the Conservative record with reference to 'the blame for mass unemployment, social deprivation and appeasement'. It also refers to Labour having

become a national party. A difference in the sources, however, comes with Source A's citing of Labour's constructive proposals, whereas Source B refers to 'ideas'. Moreover, Source A emphasises more strongly that the Conservatives could not be trusted to build on advances made in wartime, implying their abandonment of using state power to effect change in line with changed attitudes. Some own knowledge, e.g. of proposals in the Labour Manifesto and/or Labour ministerial experience during the war by those who believed in the use of state power, should be utilized. Own knowledge does not have to be over-extensive, but assessment of the (high) degree of agreement in the sources should be demonstrated.

Level 4 responses will contain a sustained judgement on the extent of agreement with selective, relative material from own knowledge, to support the essential focus on a comparison of the detail and overall messages of both sources, that attitudes to Labour's proposals of using state powers had changed significantly since the 1930s and particularly due to the effects of wartime experience.

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

'It was not so much that Labour won the General Election of 1945, but rather that Churchill and the Conservatives lost it.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(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 is a synoptic question and reward should be given for argument which achieves balance in considering the relative strengths and significance of Labour's electoral appeal, as opposed to the relative weaknesses and lack of appeal of the Conservatives. In relation to Labour, Source A indicates that it had become a national party, mentions Attlee's leadership, stresses the significance of constructive proposals and the political climate to which they were related. Source B also links Labour's success to its broader support (than previously) and to the contemporary favouring of collectivism, planning and egalitarianism, including reference to the view of Robert Blake. Source C makes a similar point in its final sentence and refers to the five years of Labour ministerial experience. Responses should expand on some of these points from own knowledge, which should also be used to indicate other relative factors working in Labour's favour, e.g. *Let Us Face the Future*, commitment to full implementation of the *Beveridge Report*, proposal to (re)construct housing through central planning, nationalisation, promise to weaken class divisions, Attlee seen as a peacetime Prime Minister (even though lacking the dynamism of Churchill), young people voting for the first time, importance of the Forces' vote.

In relation to the Conservatives, Source A mentions lack of trust about the future and implies that Churchill's war record could not overcome the tainting of the Conservative Party by 'the triple stigmas of mass unemployment, social deprivation and appeasement'. Source B agrees that this last factor was the major negative one helping Labour. Source C does not see the wartime record of Churchill and the Conservatives as greater than that of Labour. It does not, however, criticise Churchill's campaign (though refers to it), but many have done so. Own knowledge may be used to criticise Churchill's election campaigning with his absurd attacks on Labour and also bring in other factors, e.g. the Conservatives' outdated image and lack of clear policies for post-war Britain. Responses will probably expand on the Conservatives' record during the 1930s.

Level 1 answers will use material from own knowledge or the sources, which will be thin and mostly descriptive. At Level 2, material will be fuller in terms of information, but lack range and depth and/or will be assertive in argument. Level 3 responses will contain evidence from the sources and own knowledge (though not necessarily equally), considering Labour's electoral appeal and reasons for success against the relative weaknesses and failure of the Conservatives. Level 4 answers will cover in depth both 'sides' in the election, have consistent analysis and make clear judgements about the issues for both parties. At Level 5 there will be conceptual awareness with sustained judgement based on a wide, selective range of evidence.

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

'The dominant statesman of the time.'

'Merely a prisoner of the Conservatives.'

Which description of Lloyd George during the years 1918 to 1922 is the more convincing? (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 is a synoptic question and focus should be on both views given: Lloyd George's political position, reputation, actions, achievements and his relations with the Conservatives during this period. A balanced view is sought, but responses may argue in favour of one rather than the other. In 1918, Lloyd George's reputation was at its peak as 'the man who had won the War' and he held a seemingly dominant position in British politics, enhanced by the overwhelming 'Coupon' Election victory of the coalition government (although the Labour party had left and began to provide some clear opposition). His reputation as a statesman (and not just as a politician), was in part enhanced by his dominance of foreign policy, notably at the Paris Peace Conference, but also at other international conferences up to 1922. However, his foreign policy was also increasingly criticised. Some Conservatives regarded the Versailles Treaty as too lenient, intervention in Russia was unsuccessful, as was the Genoa Conference. The most significant failure, however, in terms of relations with the Conservatives was his belligerent policy over the 1922 Chanak incident. What were perceived as developing failures in foreign policy by the public, as well as many Conservatives, undermined considerably his previous reputation as a statesman. Similarly, in domestic policies there was increasing failure, rather than success as time passed from 1918 to 1922. There were early successes with housing, industrial relations in ending disputes involving miners and dockers, and National Insurance. However, there was deterioration as the housing programme was cut along with other expenditure (e.g. in implementing the 1918 Education Act) by the Geddes Axe in early 1922; there was avoidance of a General Strike in 1921, but relations with the miners remained sour, and mass unemployment developed. Lloyd George's Irish policy lurched from an attempt at outright repression (with brutality), to eventual compromise with Sinn Fein, a solution which many Conservatives (with their traditional support for Unionism) disliked intensely. The honours scandal and stories about Lloyd George's private life also undermined any reputation for honesty and integrity. Indeed his reputation by 1922 was quite different from that in 1918.

He was hardly 'a prisoner of the Conservatives' at the end of 1918 when they needed him to be certain of remaining in government and power. However, some of the developments mentioned above led to gradual Conservative disillusionment over the period. Many disliked his continued 'dictatorial wartime style' and neglect of the Commons. Lloyd George was particularly weakened when Bonar Law, one of his main Conservative allies at the time, suffered from ill health. By 1922, Lloyd George was seen by most Conservatives (and many of the public) as a scoundrel who had failed to deliver the promises made in 1918 at the time of victory. The by-election defeat of a coalition candidate by an independent Conservative, helped persuade most Conservative MPs at the Carlton Club meeting in the autumn of 1922 that 'a dynamic force is a very terrible thing' (Baldwin). Over the four years from 1918, Lloyd George increasingly became a prisoner of the Conservatives, who gradually became disillusioned and eventually realised that they no longer needed him to remain in government and that they could win the next

election on their own. Lloyd George was fatally wounded politically. Moreover, the relations between 'his' Liberals and those who were in opposition with Asquith remained bitter. Despite Austen Chamberlain's efforts to save Lloyd George and the Coalition, the views of Baldwin and those who believed Lloyd George had become a liability rather than the major asset he had once been, prevailed at the Carlton Club.

Level 1 responses will be thin in information and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2, answers will be fuller in descriptive information, but still limited in range of material and/or judgement in relation to both views. At Level 3, responses will have clear evidence about both Lloyd George as a statesman with his achievements during the period and the degree to which he was a prisoner of the Conservatives. Level 4 responses will have clarity and developed assessment on both views and may question whether Lloyd George was a statesman over the whole period, rather than just 'a politician'. Level 5 answers will contain sustained judgement on the issues supported by a range of selective supporting evidence. There may be consideration of the term 'merely' in the second quotation.

Question 3

'The cinema did more to shape popular attitudes in Britain in the years 1918 to 1951 than any other form of mass communication.'

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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

This is a synoptic question and the focus should be on assessing how far cinema going was more significant in shaping popular attitudes than any other form of mass communication over the whole period. Cinema was a new medium at the beginning of the period. Initially, both silent films and 'talkies' were essentially for entertainment, but films were seen by a mass audience by the 1930s with huge increases in the number of cinemas and the numbers of people visiting them every week. By the later years of that decade three cinemas a week were opening in Britain. Appeal was particularly to young adults. Many went to the 'pictures' more than once a week and it was affordable to the unemployed as well as those in work. Audiences were in the main, though not exclusively, made up of both men and women from the working and lower middle classes. For many it became their main social activity. Increasingly during the decade newsreels became an established part of the cinema experience and were utilised during the Second World War by government for both issuing information (e.g. on air raid shelters and precautions) and for propaganda. The latter certainly continued into the period of the Cold War through the co-operation of companies like Pathe News. The medium was visual and therefore probably had more impact, whether for entertainment or in terms of news information and propaganda in shaping popular attitudes, than any other on a mass audience. Examples such as film of the Japanese invasion of China or bombing of Guernica may be cited as responses.

The other major development in mass communications that helped to shape popular attitudes was in radio. It began to provide entertainment in the mid-1920s. Most homes possessed a wireless set by the outbreak of the Second World War, if not before. Like cinema it was also

used as a news medium, (Baldwin was the first politician to use it for political purposes effectively, perhaps particularly successfully during the General Strike.) BBC radio was vitally important during the Second World War providing news, maintaining morale and providing entertainment. Entertainers like George Formby (who also appeared in films) and programmes like 'ITMA' helped both to entertain and maintain morale. Radio was significant as a medium which could be enjoyed at home at almost any time. It was also listened to at work with programmes such as 'Workers' Playtime'. Television was also a new form of mass communication, but of considerably less significance during the period. Broadcasts began in 1936, though few could afford the sets and the areas able to receive transmissions were limited. When BBC services began again after the Second World War, ownership of sets was still small by 1951. Newspapers developed over the whole period and most households came to receive a daily paper, despite the far greater growth rates for cinema going and listening to the radio. However, in terms of mass communications, newspaper reading lost the pre-eminence it had earlier in the period and certainly had strong rivals in cinema and radio in terms of shaping popular attitudes. The BBC officially had to remain politically impartial, though whether it remained so at various times such as during the General Strike and Second World War is debatable. Without doubt, cinema newsreels were often strongly biased in images and views expressed.

It is difficult to argue overwhelmingly for the greater impact of one medium of mass communication in terms of shaping popular attitudes over the period. Cinema-going, listening to the radio and newspapers were all important and all were used for propaganda during the Second World War. What is clear was the enormous and rapid growth in cinema attendances from the 1930s and maintenance of high levels of 'going to the pictures' before the onset of the 'television age' after 1951.

Level 1 answers will have only outline content and/or be assertive in argument. Level 2 responses will have fuller information but still be limited in range of material and argument. At Level 3, there will be clear information and some assessment about the importance of cinema-going as a means of mass communication in shaping attitudes together with consideration of other media over most of, if not the whole, period. Level 4 responses will be clear, developed and balanced, in assessing the relative impact of different forms of mass communication in shaping popular attitudes across the whole period of 1918 to 1951. Level 5 answers will have sustained judgement in analysing the relative impact of cinema as a popular attitudes-shaping form of mass communication in comparison with that of other forms.

Question 4

‘Labour’s ability to form governments at all in 1924 and 1929 was more surprising than the fact that both governments were short-lived.’

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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 is a synoptic question and responses should focus on the reasons for the formation of both Labour governments and those for their downfalls after relatively short terms in office. There should be judgement as to which were more surprising. There can, of course, be variation in view between each government.

Labour’s first opportunity came as a result of the outcome of the December 1923 General Election when Baldwin had seriously misjudged the country’s opinion on abandonment of free trade. Indeed the Liberals as well as Labour united around protecting the traditional economic policy. Baldwin’s proposal was rejected, although the Conservatives remained the largest party with 258 Commons seats. The Liberals won 159, but Labour emerged as the larger of the ‘Free Trade’ Parties with 191. In the circumstances, and given the recent unhappy history of the Liberals in coalition governments, it was not too surprising that Asquith and the Liberals agreed to remain out of office and support the formation of the first Labour government, which would be a minority administration and control could be exercised by the Liberals by withdrawing support when felt necessary so that the government would fall. They believed the Labour Party would be seriously discredited and the Liberal Party would benefit in electoral terms. However, it was still surprising that the relatively new Labour Party, which had not enjoyed great electoral success until 1922, had come into office. It was not the largest party in the Commons, it would be restricted in policy implementation by its minority status and largely consisted of men from non-privileged backgrounds.

The 1924 government’s early fall was not surprising given its minority position. Of necessity it followed moderate policies. MacDonald pursued a policy of peace working through the League, but achieved little success whilst actually in office. There were domestic achievements with Wheatley’s Housing Act and easier payments of unemployment benefit. However, the government’s attempted legislation in education and in restoring some of the expenditure cuts by Geddes failed, as did weak efforts to reduce unemployment. The main reasons for the fall of the government were its relations with the Soviet Union and communism, and specifically MacDonald’s handling of the Campbell Case. That can be blamed on the Prime Minister and government, but its minority position meant that a combination of Conservative and Liberal votes, which could not be controlled, not surprisingly would defeat the government sooner or later. The Zinoviev letter, as a final development of the ‘Red Scare’, did not topple the government, but, appearing just four days before polling, undoubtedly assisted the Conservatives and harmed Labour in the outcome of the 1924 election.

The formation of the second Labour government was less surprising than that of the first. It was the largest party following the 1929 election, gaining 288 seats, 28 more than the Conservatives, and had benefited from a moderate stance during the General Strike. Baldwin’s

campaigning that Labour was dangerous and his *Safety First* approach fell flat. The Liberals, despite their far-sighted programme, failed to attract the electorate, partly because Lloyd George was still not trusted, and won just 59 seats. Labour offered a moderate image in *Labour and the Nation* and had the 'Red Clydesiders' well under control. The Liberals held the balance of power and, as in 1924, chose to allow Labour to form a government, but again as a minority administration. This status put the government once again in a vulnerable position. There were some successes (Housing Act, reduced hours for miners, Agricultural Marketing Act, origins of unified London Transport), but attempts at constitutional reform, raising the school leaving age and repeal of the Trade Disputes Act all failed. However, the government's life was completely dominated by the increasing unemployment and finally the financial and political crises of 1931. The government was not in control of the effects of the Wall Street Crash (although it can be argued that adoption of solutions offered by Keynes and Mosley might have produced some amelioration at least). As a minority government it was not surprising that the crises were on such a scale that a national approach involving all parties was needed. That became MacDonald's decision, though he could persuade only a few in his party to go with him.

Level 1 answers will contain only outline information and/or be assertive in argument. Level 2 answers will be fuller in terms of factual evidence, but be limited in range and argument about the reasons for the formation of both Labour governments and the ending of those governments after short terms in office. Not all aspects may be covered. Level 3 answers will demonstrate clear knowledge and understanding about the reasons for the formation of both governments and their demise. At Level 4, responses will demonstrate clarity on the synoptic demands to deliver a balanced answer, possibly with differentiation in conclusions about the two governments in terms of whether the formation or their fall was more surprising given the circumstances. Level 5 answers will display sustained judgement in dealing with the synoptic demands and justify a balanced conclusion.

Question 5

'A country deep in depression and with high unemployment.'

'A country developing new industries and with a high standard of living for its population.'

Which of these is the more convincing view of the economic condition of Britain during the 1930s? (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 is a synoptic question and focus should be on a synthesis to produce a balanced argument and evidence concerning both views. Regional variations should be taken into account. Those parts of the country largely reliant on the old staple industries suffered the worst unemployment levels and deep depression. There may be background on reasons for economic depression during the 1930s. The four staple industries – textiles, coal, iron and steel, and shipbuilding had dominated Britain's exports before 1914 and briefly during the short-lived boom after 1918. Only limited investment was made to help their revival during the inter-war period. Crucially, staple exports were no longer in such great demand following abandonment of most exports during the Great War and establishment of severe competition in the pre-war markets. Moreover, oil and electricity had begun to replace coal as a source of power, artificial fibres (e.g.

rayon) reduced demand for textiles, and greater carrying capacity in ships reduced orders for new ones. Generally there was poor management in all of the staple industries to accompany the lack of modernisation of equipment and methods, most noticeable in the old-fashioned coal industry. The decline of the staple industries continued through the 1920s with the overall national unemployment figure never below one million during that decade. One relatively short-term factor which hit exports from the staple industries hard, particularly coal, by making them more expensive abroad, was the return to the Gold Standard from 1925. Even its 'forced' abandonment in 1931 did not help in the context of the onset of the world depression following the Wall Street Crash. Decline and the rate of unemployment might have continued from 1929 in a similar way to that of the previous decade, but was intensified by the 'Great Depression'. Unemployment became much more serious. By the end of 1930 there were about two and a half million unemployed, and in 1932 over three million, the bottom of the trough in the Depression. The workers and communities hit hardest were those where the staple industries dominated, especially in the north-east, industrialised Scotland and south Wales. Some organised themselves into the National Unemployed Workers' Movement. There were protests and hunger marches, the most famous being from Jarrow. Undoubtedly throughout the 1930s the decline of the staple industries was responsible for most of the ongoing unemployment. However, it was the collapse of Wall Street and the ensuing global depression, which led to mass unemployment, especially in the early 1930s. In Britain, many workers outside the staple industries lost their jobs, but not to the extent of shipbuilding, mill and steelworkers, and miners. Gradual overall economic recovery still left two million unemployed in 1935 and well over a million in 1939. Unemployment was not 'ended' until after the outbreak of the Second World War. Government policies did little directly to tackle the causes of unemployment and were largely reactive. Their effects were limited in reducing unemployment especially in the staple industry regions. Protection helped British industries but mainly in the longer term. Low interest rates did help expansion of new industries. They also greatly stimulated house building with relatively cheap mortgages available. The Special Areas Act of 1934 gave only limited financial aid to areas hit by the Depression. Changes in the dole, including abolition of the means test, also did little to stimulate economic activity and thereby reduce unemployment in the worst hit areas. Re-armament programmes helped to reduce unemployment from c1935, although it can be argued that this was a policy 'forced' on government by external factors.

On the other hand, parts of Britain saw the emergence and development of new industries, mostly powered by electricity during the 1930s. In the main, however, they were not based in the areas of the staple industries, but in the Midlands and in the South. The major growth was in cars, transport especially in London, household and consumer electrical goods, chemicals, large retail stores, cinemas, the 'holiday industry', and, perhaps most importantly, construction especially of housing. Some unemployed workers did move to areas which were relatively unaffected by unemployment, but the vast majority could or would not. Unemployment statistics show a marked contrast between some towns in the south of England with little unemployment (e.g. Oxford, St Albans) with others with extensive unemployment in the North, Scotland and South Wales (e.g. Sunderland, Glasgow, Merthyr Tydfil). Many, especially those in the Midlands and the South, saw a rising standard of living during the decade of the 1930s with the developments in industry, housing and transport.

Level 1 responses will be thin in information and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2, answers will be fuller in descriptive information, but still limited in range of material and/or assessment of how convincing each contrasting view in the question is. At Level 3, responses will have clear evidence on the Depression and the extent and consequences of unemployment together with material on new industries and the standard of living for many. Level 4 responses will have clarity and developed assessment in comparison of the two views, giving a balanced view. The historiographical debate may be cited. Level 5 answers will contain sustained and balanced

judgement on the contrasting views, supported by a range of selective supporting evidence. There should be reference to the historiographical debate.

Question 6

'Neville Chamberlain cannot take all the blame for appeasement. All British governments from 1933 to 1939 were responsible.'
How valid is this judgement? (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 is a synoptic question and answers should weigh the arguments about the degree of blame apportioned to Chamberlain, as opposed to all governments from 1933, including the collective responsibility of his own government from 1937–1939. Responses can consider appeasement of Italy as well as Germany. Three national governments were in office during the period, those led by MacDonald, Baldwin and Chamberlain, but all were dominated by the Conservatives. Policy of all was considerably influenced by the public mood. Many in Britain, including ministers and MPs, did not wish to experience anything like the Great War again. Much of public opinion was anti-war, some of it pacifist, at least for the greater part of the period. MacDonald himself (like Lansbury, as leader of the Labour Party from 1931–1935), was a committed pacifist. The 1935 Peace Ballot, organised by League of Nations supporters, revealed that a majority in Britain still favoured disarmament despite the belligerence of Mussolini in east Africa and Hitler's early defiance of the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty. The famous Oxford Union motion no doubt hardly influenced Hitler, but that university's student body reflected the general desire to avoid another Great War. MacDonald and Foreign Secretary Simon from 1933–1935, together with the real power in the Cabinet, Baldwin, were not over-concerned with events in Germany, despite the beginnings of rearmament and increase in forces including conscription which were forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles. Dealing with the effects of the Depression and colonial issues (particularly in India) demanded more attention. Nevertheless, at the end of the MacDonald premiership the Stresa Front was formed with France and Italy because of concern over German rearmament.

In turn, Baldwin as Prime Minister was extremely cautious about rearmament in the 1935 election. Certainly there was support for concepts such as the Rhineland being Germany's 'backyard' in government policy. Hitler's occupation in 1936 was accepted with hardly a murmur. Under criticism from Churchill, Baldwin actually gave more accurate information about armaments both in Germany and Britain than Churchill himself, even with the backbencher's links into information inside the War Ministry and other ministries. Overall, the policy of Baldwin and his Foreign Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, was essentially reactive and conciliatory to Italian and German aggression. The proposal to give Mussolini most of Abyssinia in the Hoare-Laval plan met with a hostile public reception (out of line with normal opinion) in Britain and Hoare resigned in late 1935 to be replaced by Eden. The proposal did not prevent Italy being offended by the (British and French-led) League's mild sanctions, which drove Mussolini into Hitler's camp. Both Baldwin's government and the British public were more conciliatory towards Germany. The Anglo-German naval agreement in 1935 not only gave de facto approval to

some German re-armament, but also broke the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. There followed the 'gentlemen's' agreement of non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War which only Britain and France observed for the three years of fighting.

Under Chamberlain, avoidance of war in the form of appeasement became a more 'active' policy. What later came to be regarded as weak diplomatic responses of appeasement (though defensible in the context of the time) to the Abyssinian crisis, Spanish Civil War, occupation of the Rhineland, Austria, and especially the Sudetenland, did reflect a policy of avoiding involvement in conflicts by all governments. Churchill and other opponents of appeasement still remained a minority in the autumn of 1938. Overall to that point British government policy had essentially been reactive to Italian and German aggression and had been conciliatory. By the time Chamberlain became Prime Minister in May 1937, appeasement as the dominant policy with regard to Hitler and also towards Mussolini and Franco, had been well-established. When Eden resigned over the policy in February 1938, his successor, Halifax, was a strong supporter of appeasement and also allowed Chamberlain, who had little experience of foreign affairs, to take over the control of foreign policy. Both, as did many Tory MPs, had sympathy with the argument that Hitler was a useful barrier to any westward spread of communism in Europe. Chamberlain would not enter serious negotiations with Stalin about Germany's aggressive policies. His policy was to avoid war if at all possible. However, re-armament had in fact been stepped up under Baldwin following formation of the Stresa Front (despite the Anglo-German Naval Agreement and Churchill's continued scepticism), and increased after the formation of the Rome-Berlin Axis. But Chamberlain, though protesting, made it clear Britain was not prepared to involve herself with the Anschluss. Czechoslovakia, as a 'non-German' state with a stable democracy and relatively strong forces, was a different matter, despite being a 'far away country'. Chamberlain himself was prepared to fight over the Sudetenland against any blatant German aggression, if Hitler did not agree to settle the dispute by negotiation – as happened ultimately. Chamberlain gave way, and allowed Hitler by negotiation what he would not allow by force. Munich was the high-watermark of appeasement. However, he did in fact intensify the re-armament programmes after Munich. From March 1939, when Germany occupied the remainder of Czechoslovakia, Chamberlain made clear, if impracticable, commitments to Poland, Rumania, and also Greece which was threatened by Italy. Public opinion as well as government policy also clearly changed after the occupation of Czechoslovakia with realisation that appeasement, especially in relation to the fate of that country, had failed, and became more sympathetic to Churchill's warnings. By September 1939 the government reluctantly regarded war as the required response if Hitler would not withdraw from Poland.

For most of the 1933–1939 period, British governments, particularly that of Chamberlain, attempted to maintain peace by non-action (apart from diplomacy), or capitulation to aggressive demands. There was a public fear of war, especially with Germany, e.g. 'the bomber will always get through', evidence of Guernica and the results also of use of Japanese and Italian weaponry in China and Abyssinia respectively. However, British governments of the period and especially Chamberlain genuinely wanted to avoid war, pursued reactive policies, but ultimately not for peace at any cost.

Level 1 responses will be thin in information and/or assertive in argument. At Level 2 answers will be fuller in descriptive information, but still limited in range of material and/or assessment. Some may focus too heavily on Chamberlain to the neglect of the earlier period. At Level 3 responses will have evidence on Chamberlain and earlier governments with an attempt at evaluation of responsibility. Level 4 responses will have clarity and development with use of selective evidence in comparison of Chamberlain with all British governments of the period. Some may refer to Halifax, the sympathy of others in Chamberlain's government with Hitler as opposed to Stalin, or rejection of Churchill's views. Level 5 answers will demonstrate sustained

judgement throughout and reach a balanced conclusion. There may be consideration of relevant parts of the historiographical debate on appeasement.

Question 7

The granting of independence to India in 1947 was brought about more by the Labour government's commitment to it than by Britain's loss of international pre-eminence by that date.'

Assess the validity of this statement.

(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 is a synoptic question that should produce responses which are balanced in assessing how far the loss of pre-eminence led to the withdrawal from India as opposed to Labour's commitment (and indeed other factors). The full extent of Britain's loss of pre-eminence was not fully appreciated by many at the time, especially as Britain had been on the victorious side in the war against Germany and Japan. It was her two main allies which had emerged as the 'superpowers' despite the government's determination to develop nuclear weapons. Developments in the Cold War later, e.g. in the Berlin Blockade and formation of NATO, demonstrated Britain's important but subsidiary role in the opposition to the Soviet Union. Economic problems and financial difficulties forced the withdrawal of British military help to the Greek and Turkish governments in 1947. Those factors might have forced a similar withdrawal from India (and Palestine) if the Labour government had not in any case already decided to withdraw. It had been Labour policy since MacDonald's 1929 government to work towards dominion status for India. In 1942 the Coalition government, despite Churchill's premiership and record on the issue of independence, made an offer of independence after the war, an offer partly made out of political and military considerations given the state of the war in Asia at the time. Labour politicians had developed good relations with Gandhi, and Attlee and Bevin believed the Empire was as much a liability as an asset in times of danger. By 1945 the real problem for the Labour government was not whether to grant independence but how to avoid bloodshed between Congress and the Moslem League, Hindus and Moslems. The new India and Pakistan were nevertheless born in bloodshed under partition. The retreat from India in granting independence to two states in the sub-continent was a major decision taken by the Labour government, given Britain's pride in having India for so long as 'the jewel in the crown' of the Empire. Conscious decisions were also made to give independence to neighbouring Ceylon and Burma. British withdrawal from India was a commitment and policy fulfilled by the Labour government. It was the most significant retreat of British power overseas to that date in the 20th century, but took place in the context of Britain's less powerful political, military and economic positions in the world following the Second World War. Overall, historiography sees the Labour commitment as crucial, but the post-war international position of Britain was also highly significant as were other factors such as Gandhi's role and the nationalist movements in the sub-continent.

Level 1 answers will be thin in factual content and/or have generalised assertions. Level 2 responses will have fuller material, but still be limited in extent of argument. At Level 3, answers will have clear understanding of the significance of Labour's commitment in a context of Britain's

reduced status and role as a world power following the Second World War. Level 4 responses will be clear and balanced in reaching an overall assessment of the reasons for the granting of independence and retreat from India. Level 5 responses will display sustained judgement in a synopsis of the factors together with a balanced conclusion.