



A-level HISTORY 7042/2M

Component 2M Wars and Welfare: Britain in Transition, 1906–1957

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Ramsay MacDonald’s political decisions in 1931.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- minutes are a valuable record of what was discussed and agreed at a meeting and are generally factual and free from bias
- cabinet is composed of all government ministers and is chaired by the Prime Minister; its minutes, therefore, have great value to an historian studying government decision making
- its context is particularly valuable: it was held at the height of the financial and political crisis of 1931 when the government had to decide its response to the May recommendations
- a limitation of minutes is that they can fail to transmit the tenor or emotion of a meeting.

Content and argument

- the source is valuable for providing a clear statement of MacDonald's position and his reasons for accepting the recommendations of the May Committee in full
- MacDonald is presenting an ultimatum of sorts and students may focus on his reference to 'any important resignations'; in fact, when MacDonald's proposal was put to a vote 10 of the 21 members of the Cabinet rejected it
- students can use their own knowledge to challenge MacDonald's belief that the majority of the Party was in favour of accepting the May recommendations: there was a great deal of hostility to the recommendations not only in Cabinet but among the rank-and-file
- there is a great deal of scope for students to interrogate the content of the source by developing their contextual knowledge of the crisis and the recommendations contained in May's report.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Davidson is an experienced politician of high rank and close to Baldwin; his account, therefore, offers valuable insight
- diary entries can be of significant value to an historian: despite being published, they generally offer important, contemporary personal accounts/reflections of events
- the source is valuable for its explanation of how events unfolded from the perspective of a political insider
- Davidson provides valuable emphasis about how dramatic contemporaries viewed the turn of events.

Content and argument

- Davidson's account is valuable for indicating how remarkable MacDonald's overnight volte-face had been and how swiftly events had moved
- it also has value in intimating the important role that George V had played, given that initially MacDonald had intended to resign on his and the government's behalf
- the source is valuable for emphasising that the arrangement was to be a temporary crisis measure, but students can show their understanding that this did not occur; the October 1931 election was not held on normal party lines but was fought on MacDonald's appeal for a 'Doctor's mandate'
- not all the 'required measures' referred to by Davidson had the desired effect – in the end the government did go off the gold standard – but it can be argued that MacDonald's decision to lead a National Government did contribute to solving the immediate financial crisis.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Attlee was a member of the Cabinet at the time of the crisis and, albeit a relative newcomer, offers great value for our understanding of how MacDonald was regarded in the Party
- though political autobiographies are not without their limitations, they can provide valuable insights into people and events; turning down MacDonald's offer of a job in the National Government could be considered a strength, suggesting Attlee was a person of principle
- published in 1954, Attlee is able to put the 1931 crisis into the context of a long and distinguished political career
- his tone and use of language are very valuable in revealing his own, and others' interpretation of MacDonald's actions and character.

Content and argument

- Attlee, at the end of his career, has not moderated his own very critical view of MacDonald's action; he falls firmly into the 'betrayal' camp
- he also touches on the very great criticisms of MacDonald at the time, related to his ambition and vanity, the denial of his class and his partiality for aristocratic society
- there is much scope here for students to show their contextual understanding of the issues at stake: the split in Cabinet over the implementation of cuts and the gap between the Labour factions
- students can also be credited if they develop Attlee's reference to MacDonald's 'betrayal': victim of circumstances or personal limitations as a leader?

Section B

0 2 'The Liberal government's social and welfare reforms, in the years 1906 to 1914, failed to deal with the problems of poverty.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the Liberal government's social and welfare reforms, in the years 1906 to 1914, failed to deal with the problems of poverty might include:

- all the Liberal welfare reforms targeting old age, sickness, unemployment and low wages – the main causes of poverty – had significant limitations in both their range and application with many hundreds of thousands left untouched and remaining in dire circumstances
- other reforms, such as in education and housing, were permissive and not implemented by many local authorities, thereby having a very limited impact on the scale of poverty
- some reforms actually made poverty worse, leading to strong resistance from the very people they were intended to benefit: the contributory principle within the National Insurance (Unemployment) Act was, in effect, a wage cut and attacked by unions and in the press as 'theft'
- the Liberals made no attempt to reform the Poor Law, despite the findings of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, leaving in place an unsatisfactory dual system
- relief of poverty was not the primary aim of the reforms but they were designed to promote other priorities such as national efficiency, to head off socialism and conservatism or for political self-aggrandisement: politicians wishing to further their own careers.

Arguments challenging the view that the Liberal government's social and welfare reforms, in the years 1906 to 1914, failed to deal with the problems of poverty might include:

- although individual reforms had limitations, collectively the very extent and breadth of the Liberals' ambition was significant; taken as a whole, they were an important starting point in implementing state funded support for alleviating the problems of poverty and destitution
- the Liberals created a vital safety net for the young, elderly, sick and unemployed, reducing economic insecurity
- the work of Booth and Rowntree at the turn of the century had been important in providing the evidence needed to promote the case for state support to help the poor; a follow-up survey by Rowntree in 1936 showed the Liberals' reforms had helped alleviate 'primary poverty', indicating that the reforms did have a positive longer-term effect
- the reforms introduced by the Liberals filled many gaps in existing provision for alleviating poverty: self-help; charity; the Poor Law
- by introducing reforms outside the Poor Laws, the Liberals helped reduce the stigma attached to claiming relief, which was an important barrier in helping alleviate poverty.

A persuasive argument can be made that the Liberal social and welfare reforms were ineffective in dealing with poverty given their numerous limitations, and that it is too easy to be impressed by the amount of legislation implemented rather than its effectiveness. Alternatively, a counter-argument can be put forward, presenting the Liberal government's reforms as a significant first step towards the creation of a 'welfare state' dedicated to addressing the problems of poverty.

0 3 To what extent was the rise of Labour, in the years 1916 to 1922, due to divisions in the Liberal Party?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the rise of Labour, in the years 1916 to 1922, was due to divisions in the Liberal Party might include:

- Labour benefited from the split in the Liberal Party between Asquith and Lloyd George in 1916, from which it never recovered
- the 'coupon' election in December 1918 cemented Liberal disunity; its continuing division favouring Labour: only 28 Asquithian Liberals were returned and Asquith himself was defeated, while Labour increased its seats and vote share
- the domestic and foreign policies of the Lloyd George coalition, eg Irish issues, further alienated traditional Liberal supporters; Labour was ideally placed to appeal to post-war disillusionment with the coalition to ensure that Labour would supplant the Liberals as the second party
- the 1922 election revealed the extent of Liberal division and the rise of Labour: Labour won 142 seats compared to the 116 won by Lloyd George and Asquithian Liberals combined; Lloyd George's fall meant the return of two-party politics, with Labour, not the Liberals, as the main opposition party
- the drift of voters to Labour was accentuated by unfavourable perceptions of Asquith and Lloyd George as leaders: the former weak and indecisive, the latter corrupt and self-serving.

Arguments challenging the view that the rise of Labour, in the years 1916 to 1922, was due to divisions in the Liberal Party might include:

- Labour benefited considerably from the impact of the First World War, which encouraged ideas of state intervention and equality; trade union membership also doubled during the war, boosting Labour funds, which allowed the Party to field more candidates
- the Representation of the People Act, 1918 gave Labour much bigger electoral support from the working class
- the Labour Party benefited from its war record, dispelling fears it was non-patriotic; its senior politicians gained experience as cabinet ministers
- it improved its constituency organisation during the war, focusing on building up local party branches and it adopted a formal constitution in 1918, setting out its programme
- MacDonald emerged as an outstanding leader in the years 1918 to 1922, convincing voters that Labour could be a respectable progressive alternative to the Liberals and ruthlessly blocking any possibility of a Lib-Lab coalition.

The chronic split between Lloyd George and Asquithian Liberals in the years 1916 to 1922 was clearly an important factor in enabling the rise of Labour from third-party status. In this sense, the Liberals were the architects of their own downfall and of the rise of Labour. However, it is perhaps an exaggeration to argue that the rise of Labour in these years was due to Liberal division. The impact of the First World War clearly played a big role. The Liberal Party emerged in 1918 weak, divided and in near terminal decline. Labour too had experienced division as a result of the war but it emerged united. Moreover, deep-seated social and economic changes, such as the growth of collectivism and the extension of the franchise, also contributed to Labour's rise.

0 4 'The Labour government was deeply divided throughout the years 1945 to 1951.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the Labour government was deeply divided throughout the years 1945 to 1951 might include:

- already by 1947 major disagreements were surfacing in the Party over Attlee's leadership and his handling of the economic crisis; the proposed nationalisation of steel was also deeply contentious within Cabinet
- the government experienced an acrimonious split over the introduction of prescription and dental charges in 1951; the issue led to angry public disagreements between Bevan ('Bevanites'), the Minister of Health, and Gaitskell ('Gaitskellites'), the Chancellor
- divisions in the Party over foreign policy persisted throughout the lifetime of the government: many on the left wanted a more internationalist and socialist approach; in particular, the 'Bevanites' opposed Gaitskell's plans for increasing defence spending to pay for Britain's involvement in the Korean War and for maintaining Britain's independent nuclear deterrent; this 'national security' versus 'social security' split created public perceptions of disunity in the government
- Bevan's resignation over the imposition of charges in the NHS in April 1951 symbolised the rift between 'left' and 'right' over future party strategy
- the divisions presented a spectacle of a government falling apart and hopelessly divided, contributing significantly to Labour losing office in 1951.

Arguments challenging the view that the Labour government was deeply divided throughout the years 1945 to 1951 might include:

- Attlee was highly adept at balancing the different factions within his government and reconciling its opposing elements; he assembled an able, talented ministerial team, which successfully implemented a radical programme of reforms
- the so-called 'Dalton years', 1945 to 1947, was a period of exceptional buoyancy, unity and reforming zeal
- Labour entered the 1950 election confident and united around its manifesto 'Let Us Win Through Together'; its loss of seats was more due to constituency boundary changes than a lack of unity
- disunity was not the key issue for voters in Labour's defeat in the 1951 election: the cost of living and housing shortages, austerity and rationing were more important
- the prescription crisis of 1951 was the first time that the Labour Party appeared seriously divided in public.

A persuasive argument can certainly be maintained that disagreements over several aspects of policy weakened the Labour government throughout the years 1945 to 1951 and had created a perception, by 1951, of a deeply divided Labour Party. The Gaitskell-Bevan rift in particular was clearly a symptom of deeper, long-standing tensions between the left, wanting more socialism, and the right of the Party, which wanted to consolidate its achievements. However, the argument that the Labour government was deeply divided throughout the years 1945 to 1951 can be challenged, with very public divisions only becoming apparent in its final years in office when the government had lost momentum and senior ministers were becoming old, ill and exhausted.