

History A

Advanced GCE **F963/02**

Option B Modern 1815-1945

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a and b	AO2a
1	13-14	15-16
2	11-12	13-14
3	9-10	10-12
4	7-8	8-9
5	5-6	6-7
6	3-4	3-5
7	0-2	0-2

Notes related to Part A:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>

Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

<p>Level 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28-34</p>
<p>Level 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21-27</p>
<p>Level 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14-20</p>

Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

1 The Condition of England 1815-1853

(a) Study Sources B and D

Compare these sources as evidence for the causes of the Plug Plot disturbances in 1842.

[30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources agree that the reduction of wages would appear to have been the trigger and that it would seem that that this was done deliberately by employers. They also stress that others encouraged workers to strike and disturb the peace for their own ends. This is especially elaborated on by Cooper in **D**. They **differ** on the reasons why wages were reduced. The magazine in **B** hints at a general 'intention' to do this quickly, presumably as part of an employer reaction to the great Victorian Depression (1842 was the worst year of the 19th century). The need would be to reduce labour costs. **B** also lays the blame on the Chartists, to be expected from a new magazine anxious to appeal to the wealthy and to stress their command of northern topics. It identifies a 'spreading organisation of a most formidable' type, but it also adopts a dim view of the Anti Corn Law League. In contrast Source **D**, Cooper, blames the Anti Corn Law League, who, it claims, deliberately encouraged employers to pick a strike to paralyse the government and assist their case for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Source **B** also stresses poverty, hence the references to plundering (clothes from workhouses and food from shops). Source **D** introduces drunkenness and the Charter ("Strike for the Charter").

In part the similarities are explained by the date, 1842, a year of exceptional depression and poverty. However the Illustrated News (**B**), a contemporary source, takes a more propertied view, blaming radical organisations for stirring things up to satisfy their own ends. Source **D** is a Chartist source written by a key witness and participant in the event. It places the blame elsewhere, on employers, on drunken workers and the depression. Cooper takes care to stress drunkenness because he was almost immediately held responsible, with others, for the Pottery disturbances. As a radical Chartist speaker he was imprisoned. In his memoirs he may have wanted to clear himself, particularly as he later withdrew from radicalism and repented for a misspent youth. He claims that he was ashamed of the actions of those who destroyed property and broke the law. In practice he may have encouraged disturbance and be one of those members of Source **B**'s 'spreading organisation'. He certainly blamed the Anti Corn Law League.

Both are useful for the different perspectives. It is difficult to verify the sources of **B**'s information and it is certainly generalised. Its respectable perspective ensures Chartist and League blame but it does sympathise with the poor. Cooper in contrast was a participant and potentially the more informative but his memoirs portray reticence on his own involvement in physical force.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that force and provocation were tactics more used by the authorities and employers than the Chartists.

[70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set response is expected.

The sources may be used in a variety of ways to assess the relative use of force in the Chartist period. Only Source **A**, Thomas Dunning, unequivocally comments on state

violence and force. The other four sources can bear different interpretations. However when discussing Chartist physical force it is worth remembering that whilst four of the sources are from Chartist participants all are memoirs, often written long after Chartist collapse in a less violent and more reforming age. Three of these four represent moral force Chartism, Gammage in **C** particularly so. Only Cooper was identified with physical force in 1842 and by the time he wrote his memoir he had long changed his mind. All are likely to play down Chartist violence yet play up O'Connor's provocative stance, although Adams in **E** admits that this was more self delusional than forceful in practice.

Nonetheless the **argument that Chartists used force and provocation** as a tactic can be found in **Sources B, D and E**. Riots are mentioned in the magazine (**B**), with hints of trained 'discipline' and the possibility of 'rebellion'. Gammage in **C** refers disparagingly to O'Connor's provocative demagoguery and posturing that own knowledge can link to threats of physical force ('peacefully if we may, forcefully if we must'). However Gammage is also at pains to point out that other chartist organisations, notably the London Working Men's Association, disclaimed physical force. There is a convincing argument that the Chartists avoided force whenever possible, knowing its potential for harming the cause, as Cooper reminds his audience outside the Crown in Source **D**. Adams in **E** corroborates Gammage's view on O'Connor provocations with his comments on 'denunciations', 'rabble rousing' and regal 'delusions', something which his republican sympathies would find uncongenial. As noted, only Cooper in **D** fully describes one of the two main physical force moments in Chartism, the Plug Plots of 1842. The other moment, the Newport Rising in 1839 may have had hopes of triggering a wider rising but was localised and the jury remains out on who was responsible for the shooting. Cooper refers to a 'wild general strike' which wasn't necessarily 'physical'. The evidence in the Potteries is muddled by Cooper's subsequent arrest and trial, but it would seem from this account that much of the force was random, disorganised and focused on the destruction of property. From hindsight he clearly disapproves. The magazine in **B** also refers to plundering. Own knowledge might refer to the violent and physical force language used, the reports of military drilling, the intimidating tactics of large scale meetings and the occasional surfacing of weapons.

Three of the sources contain strong **suggestions that the authorities and employers used force and provocation** on every possible occasion (**A, B, and D**). In **B** we are told that the employers reduced wages without notice and troops 'poured into the disturbed districts' during the Plug disturbances, a fact confirmed by Cooper in **D** who refers to employers who, for their own ACLL ends, provoked workers whilst cavalry and artillery were deployed by the authorities. Own knowledge may mention the use of the new railways enabling troops from other areas to be deployed quickly. Source **A**, Dunning, is however the strongest evidence for forceful tactics by the authorities. He refers to persecution and imprisonment, a long standing tactic used by governments to take dangerous radicals out of circulation and starve them of the oxygen of publicity. A series of mock trials were held and, on grounds of sedition, radicals were sentenced to a couple of years in gaol. Dunning cites precise numbers (93) and provides effective commentary given his legal role in challenging the evidence in these trials (and his success in 1834 in defending some trade unionists). He is well aware of the pressure brought to bear in Court (the weapons on constant display to remind juries of a Chartist threat of force). The fate of Cooper in 1842 (**D**) and of all the Chartist leadership, including moral force leaders like Lovett, supports this. During the Chartist Petitions and especially at Kennington Common in 1848 the government was armed to the teeth, using the tactic of special constables sworn in for an auxiliary role. Although Dunning's memoirs were written at the very end of a long life he clearly kept records and writes of the cruel conviction of all governments.

2 The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886

(a) Study Sources C and E

Compare these sources as evidence for the attitudes of those who opposed British imperial expansion. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both sources **C** and **E** agree that there was resistance to expansion although their attitudes are different, as is the type of resistance they are discussing (from Afghans in **C** and Egyptians in **E**). Both are from a western, British viewpoint and stress in **C** a sense of 'freedom' (Gladstone) and in **E** (Churchill) a sense of nationhood (Arabi as 'the movement of the nation'). Both agree that the opposition is righteous ('naturally and not wrongfully' in **C**; 'we should have approved their action' in **E**) and they agree that Britain has wrongfully oppressed opposition. Their tone is remarkably similar – to Gladstone such oppression is 'horrible', to Churchill it is 'devastation', 'struggling wretches' and the 'mess of oppression'. They both condemn British military expansion and intervention and sympathise with the attitudes of those who resisted.

They **differ** in that Gladstone in **C** is discussing the Afghan attitude to British political methods (the Indian model of establishing British Residents as Trojan Horses, hence the Afghan opposition to Disraeli, Carnarvon, and Lytton's proposal for a Resident at Kabul to counter Russian influence) whereas Churchill in **E** is discussing fiscal infiltration. He objects to the entrapment of the Egyptians via debt and the crippling interest rates incurred through spendthrift rulers. However Gladstone would not have agreed with Churchill's point on the legitimacy of Egyptian debt repudiation. The flouting of fiscal rectitude was not, in his eyes, to be equated with the unwarranted destruction of Afghan hill villages. The bombardment of Alexandria was legitimate; burning and subsequent death in the Afghan snow was not.

In terms of **provenance** Gladstone (**C**) is speaking in an election campaign to denounce the forward Imperialism of Beaconsfieldism, using emotive language in the wake of disasters in both South Africa and Afghanistan. Its purpose is to see the Afghans in the same light as one would one's own and to rally popular emotion behind one of the great campaigns of modern political history. Churchill in **E** is, similarly, a political and public speech, 3 years later, in an area that was part of the Midlothian constituency that Gladstone won from a Conservative landowner. He is concerned to stress the hypocrisy of Gladstone, now Liberal PM., who had justified his decision to bombard Alexandria, having condemned Disraeli for retaliating against the Afghan Amir. Interestingly Churchill was a Conservative but he condemns both Tory and Liberal for pursuing illegitimate ends. His angle is the political outsider keen to make an impression within Conservatism and to pressurise his leader, Lord Salisbury. Identifying with the deceased Disraeli he cannot resist having a go at Gladstone. Both are partisan sources, neither especially balanced, but a case could be made for Churchill as the more useful source, unless one sees Gladstone as more typical in the attitudes of those who opposed imperial expansion. Both sense the attitude of those on the receiving end, as well as opponents at home, and both are useful for gauging public opinion given their attempts to mould it.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that there was little difference between the Imperial policies of Gladstone and Disraeli. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

D, E and parts of Sources A and B contain evidence that Imperial policy differed little in practice. Given that **D and E** come from opposite political ends (Gladstone and Churchill) one might consider them effective evidence on continuity but **D** is Gladstone in office as PM and this is an official diplomatic offer to Kruger continuing the pursuit of Confederation. It is not necessarily his personal opinion or policy and indeed we are told that the advice came from the Colonial Office. Nonetheless Gladstone did not challenge it. Churchill is making a point about the similarity of intervention under both men, whether it is Afghanistan or Egypt, but his view is that of the outsider and his agenda might be suspect. Perhaps better evidence is **parts of A and B**, both public statements of Gladstone and Disraeli whilst in opposition (and therefore more reliable, or simply more suspect in terms of point scoring?). Interestingly, in **A**, Disraeli condemns Gladstone's Liberal moves whilst PM on Imperial **Confederation**, although he acknowledges that he has no objection provided the terms were right. The bounds of empire have become too loose. Yet later, whilst PM, Disraeli encourages Frere in Cape Colony to pursue a South African Confederation along Canadian lines, which led to disaster with the Zulus. In **D** Gladstone, at the instigation of the Colonial Office, is prepared to continue with Confederation and attempts to persuade Kruger to accept British Sovereignty (it cannot be given up). Again, as the introduction indicates, it led to disaster (the First Boer war) and the policy was abandoned in the Convention of Pretoria (which acknowledged the Transvaal's independence, saving some vague fig leaf on suzerainty). On the issue of Confederation there would seem to be continuity. There is also evidence of a policy of **forceful intervention** by both when challenged. Source **C** demonstrates Disraeli's apparent use of force to woo the Amir (knowledge might suggest he was reluctantly dragged into it by Lytton) whilst Source **E** shows Gladstone's use of force in Egypt to preserve financial stability in the Canal zone, perceived as a vital British interest since Disraeli's Purchase in 1875. However both sources come from the mouths of opponents, although the fact of military and naval intervention cannot be disputed. Both justified it, but on very different grounds. In **A and B** both agree on a '**mighty mission**'.

The alternative view, that there was a considerable difference in imperial policy between them, can be found in Sources A, B and C. Sources **A and B** establish the key public difference between the two men and both are classic statements of their kind. However both are written whilst in opposition, keen to establish clear blue water between them. Each uses the Empire as a stick to beat the other. Thus **Disraeli in A** accuses the Gladstone government of a plot to dismember the empire using the means of unfettered Confederation. He accuses Gladstone of fiscal meanness, throwing away our greatest asset to save money and reduce taxes to buy further power. There may be some truth in this as Gladstone notoriously economised with both army and navy. On the other hand **Gladstone in B** accuses Disraeli of needless and reckless expansion regardless of British interests and of the means to pay for it (no 'men or money to sustain it'). A clear difference emerges on Imperialism. For Gladstone the Empire is a Pax Britannica with Britain as its core, setting an example by justice, reform and improvement. Welfare and peace are the key, even to the extent of 'friendly independence'. Knowledge would suggest this to be the case given Gladstone's reluctance to intervene and his Confederation policy in Canada and South Africa in the first and second ministries, (**Source D** refers to the Transvaal having 'the fullest liberty to manage their local affairs', although this was 'to be without prejudice to the rest of the population', a reference to continued antagonism with the

Zulus). However for Disraeli the Empire is the 'Empire of England', to be based on a keen sense of national interest, (such as imperial tariffs - although he never attempted anything like this whilst in power). It implied he would spend money (although in power he too was reluctant to incur expenditure). Gladstone maintained in **B** that Disraeli also desired territorial acquisition, which candidates might dispute in practice. Certainly the Empire increased more in size under Gladstone than under Disraeli. As to Disraeli's supposed propensity to use force Gladstone also resorted to it, albeit reluctantly. **Source C** also underlines the differences, but it too is produced in opposition, part of one of the great political campaigns to win an election on the basis of an opponent's immoral and forward imperialism. Its tone is sincere but emotional. The sources certainly support a rhetorical difference but they are less certain in their evidence and provenance as to practice.

**3 England and a New Century 1900-1924
Post War Problems 1918 to 1924**

(a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for views on government spending on social problems during the immediate post war period. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation, and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There are obvious differences in the **content** of the two sources. **Source B** supports government spending, particularly on housing and legislation on industry, as a means of reducing the danger of revolution. But, in **Source C** the focus of the Geddes Report is on shortage of money, although the committee does suggest greater efficiencies as well as cuts in government expenditure. **Source B** is mainly concerned with housing, urban renewal and working hours. But it also urges improvements in industry, particularly where working conditions are concerned. **Source C** has wider economic and financial concerns within a particular remit, and seems to regard social conditions as a lower priority. However a close reading reveals that this extract focuses more on savings than cuts per se. Health programmes are considered to have merit. **Both sources** reflect a background of post war social and economic difficulty.

In terms of **provenance**, the two years between the dates of the sources reflect a radical change in the situation. By 1922, the Coalition Government is no longer able to provide large sums of money for housing, and other social reforms. In **Source B**, Tom Jones (a close friend, as well as an adviser) would expect the Prime Minister to respond positively. Lloyd George had promised "Homes for heroes" in the run up to the 1918 Election. He has already supported the setting up of the Whitley Councils, bodies which represented both managers and workers in the main industries. Jones sounds optimistic and clearly goes beyond a civil service remit to endorse a progressive Liberal agenda when Lloyd George was at the height of his power. Lloyd George, already known for his energy as a war time leader, is in a strong position at this time. However, by the time of the Geddes Report (**Source C**), economic problems and trade union militancy have weakened Lloyd George's position. Right wing opinion (the Committee is composed entirely of business men and financiers) favours retrenchment to avoid tax increases on business. Less sympathy is shown here for working class interests. Lloyd George, having set up the Committee himself, will be forced to agree to massive cuts in social expenditure.

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Labour Party was better placed than its rivals to deal with Britain's post war problems 1918-1924. [30]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

Candidates will benefit from knowing (in outline at least) the main political events of 1918 to 1924. All of the parties, including Labour, suffered from having to confront the serious social and economic problems bequeathed by the First World War. The issue is who was best placed to deal with the social and economic consequences of the War.

Supporting the assertion. Source A. Having made important war-time contributions to Government, the Labour Party shows a new confidence in laying out ambitious plans for

what would effectively be a welfare state, replacing the discredited efforts of the pre-war Poor Law. After the Election of 1918, Labour only had 63 seats. Yet, effectively, with the Liberals split, and Lloyd George the leader of a Conservative dominated coalition, Labour was moving towards becoming the second party. However, candidates may point out that the conference resolutions in **A** were probably unrealistic. At this stage, Britain's post-war economic weaknesses were not yet fully appreciated. Labour was informal opposition aware of the new democratic vote to all men and was eager to claim the progressive agenda.

Source B mentions the revolutionary pressures of 1919. These would tend to strengthen Labour's appeal to the newly-enfranchised working classes but it also suggests Lloyd George's Coalition to be the best placed, indicating significant achievement to date.

Source D strengthens the view that the Liberals are on the way out, and that Labour has now (late 1923, and with 191 seats gained in the recent election) replaced them as the chief rival to the Conservatives although Amery calculates politically that both Liberal and Labour would be hampered by coalition and lack achievement – a calculation that was proved correct. The eventual result, mentioned in **Source E**, is the formation of the First Labour Government under Ramsay MacDonald. One might suppose that (by 1924) Labour was in a much stronger position to introduce its social reforms, although it was a minority government. **E** condemns it for selling out on more radical solutions to post-War problems. The main success was the Wheatley Housing Act of 1924.

Opposing the assertion. **Source B** suggests that Lloyd George (Prime Minister in a strong Coalition Government, dominated by the Conservatives) by taking bold action, especially on housing, can head off threats from the Left. The Whitley Councils are an example of LG's success in his early reforms, as is Addison's Housing Act of 1919 and Fisher's Education Act. However, by 1922, Lloyd George is being overwhelmed by his problems. The Whitley Councils were scrapped in 1921. Lloyd George was forced to accept the Geddes call for cuts in expenditure (see **Source C**). This source could be used to measure the extent of the problem for all parties. It clearly limited the prospect of the then government and especially the Lloyd George Liberals. The economy continued to stagnate. Later in 1922, LG fell from office, and was replaced by Bonar Law. The Conservatives had a tendency to split over tariff reform, the traditional Conservative solution to Britain's problems, but soon recovered given the prospect of government freed from Lloyd George's spell.

Source C clearly suggests a severe blow to any political party considering social reform, especially the kind of proposals favoured by Labour. The implication in **Source D** is that the Conservative Party, despite a loss of electoral support in 1923 over protectionist policies, will soon recover its pre-eminent position, although it fails to mention post-War economic/social problems. With hindsight, Amery's advice to Baldwin (which Baldwin took) is seen to have been well-founded. Indeed, the First Labour Government was to be short lived. And **Source E** indicates that a Labour Government under Ramsay Macdonald was less likely to support the radical social reform that socialists like the Webbs wanted than the Lloyd George Liberals. There were some radical plans to deal with rising unemployment, but most never came to fruition.

4 **Churchill 1920-45**
The Election of 1945

(a) **Study Sources A and B.**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the appeals made to the electorate in the campaign leading to the General Election of 1945. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence’ for....The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Content: **A** refers to Labour’s experience in war; **B** seems to denigrate it by reference to ‘Gestapo’ – something that Labour had been fighting against. Both refer to the ordinary man- but **A** is more effective, claiming that the victory in the war was won by the people. For **B** the people must be protected against the power of the state. **A** says that the state will provide full employment and proper social security – the emphasis is on collective protection against hard times. **B** stresses individual liberty against the power of the state. Essentially **A** is offering a view of a beneficent state making up for deficiencies in past Conservative policy. **B** is seeing an oppressive state and equating Labour with totalitarianism, both Nazi and Communist. **A** is far more positive and effective, pointing to actual past Conservative failures. **B** relies on a less realistic view of Labour with the emphasis on what Labour might do – ignoring their wartime achievements. The tone of the passages is different – **A** looks forward positively, though it is critical of opponents; **B** offers, here, no positive commitments but a negative – Labour is going to threaten liberty and the Conservatives offer the status quo of traditional liberty, something **A** dismissed as equating to “mean and shabby treatment”.

Provenance of Sources: **Both** are election appeals; **both** exaggerate the weaknesses of the opponents because it is election time. However, **Source A** is a considered and prepared written response. In fact the Conservative written manifesto said much the same about social reform and Churchill’s government endorsed the Beveridge Report. However, **Source B**, Churchill’s speech is much less considered and more improvised – he seems to have gone back to his early attacks on socialism and is equating Labour with totalitarianism in an extreme manner which runs contrary to his own manifesto. **A**, a collective document prepared by Labour as a whole must be contrasted with **B**, a flight of oratory which met with little enthusiasm within the Conservatives and showed Churchill to be out of touch with the mood of the times. The sources are useful for showing the reasons for Labour’s victory and Churchill’s limitation as a peacetime politician. Whereas **A** is quite typical of Labour’s appeal in 1945, **B** is not typical of what the Conservatives were actually offering although they are, classically, Churchill. Candidates might consider that **A** is more valuable for explaining the issues of the election while **B** showed why the Labour appeal was strengthened, so there is no set answer required for the relative value of the two sources, but candidates have the opportunity to assess this.

(b) **Study all the Sources**

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the main reason for Churchill’s election defeat in 1945 was the policy of social reform offered by Labour. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The debate here is whether Churchill’s conduct of the election and the poor Conservative record on social issues before the war were the key reasons, or whether it was Labour’s ability to offer a strong campaign and the public’s expectations for greater social reform

that were the main reasons. The war had brought a lot of changes and hopes. Did the electorate think that Labour was more likely to deliver those hopes; or did the Conservatives throw away the trump cards they held by poor electioneering? The actual popular vote was closer than the large parliamentary majority gained by Labour suggests and Churchill thought that he would win until very close to the actual poll.

Sources B, C and E support the view that Churchill misjudged the campaign, and by implication this rather than the offers of social change was the most important factor. though Thatcher also stresses some advantages that Labour had. **B** is a famous opening speech in which Churchill equates Labour with the Gestapo and stands, as he did in 1940, as the champion of liberty.

With wartime propaganda stressing the fight for freedom, this might have seemed a good idea. However, as Attlee and his colleagues had stood alongside Churchill since 1940 as bitter enemies of Fascism, this sort of rhetoric seemed absurd. Also, the USSR was popular at this time and there was an increased interest in state planning. Wartime reports such as Barlow and Uthwatt had recommended this. Full employment was thought possible and the Conservatives were pledged to implement Beveridge and to provide a health service. Wartime reconstruction could not be left to private enterprise. Few were convinced by the simplistic rhetoric produced by a leader whose main preoccupations had been foreign policy.

The reactions of Thatcher (**E**) and Sackville-West (**C**) are similar. However Thatcher is writing with the benefit of hindsight. Knowing that Churchill lost the election might colour her view of remembering that he had gone too far as she listened to the broadcast in her Oxford College. She is balanced enough to provide some wider analysis – this is after all a published work. Vita Sackville West is not attempting analysis but a ‘gut reaction’ in a private letter. Unlike Thatcher, she knew Churchill and there is some personal disappointment that he seems not to be rising to the challenge of domestic politics.

Labour on the other hand responded more successfully to the highly emotional mood of the nation which the cartoon (**D**) so vividly represents. The issue of a lasting peace and a post-war Europe which will avoid the destruction of war and the sufferings of soldiers seems here to be paramount rather than social reforms or Churchill’s misjudgements. This is an appeal to the emotions from a left wing newspaper on the eve of the election. That cartoon represents an injured and battered soldier amid destruction offering a very hard won peace to the nation. The poor Conservative policies of the inter-war years referred to in **A** must not come again. As **A** says, this was a war won by the ordinary people represented in **D**. **A** is obviously intended as election propaganda but offers ‘proper social security’. This is the source that supports the view of the question most fully. Not the rhetoric of **B**, but the firm promises of social services and full employment were needed. As **E** says Labour could outbid the Conservatives on this front. The Labour ministers had been in charge of domestic policy during the war. Conservative commitment to Beveridge was doubted by many. This was Labour’s home ground and they could point to the apparently poor record of the National Governments of the 1930s – Means Test, high unemployment etc. Churchill had not been part of this, but he was shackled to a Conservative party which had been seen, despite its reforming aspects in the 1930s, as uncaring. Thatcher’s analysis can be defended. Also Churchill could not gain all the credit for victory in what **A** rightly identifies as a people’s war led by a coalition involving Labour and Liberals.

Candidates might know about the younger generation’s radicalism, the influence of the Army Current Affairs discussions, the influence of wartime discussions about the post-war world, especially the Beveridge Report of 1942, about which many Conservatives were privately and publicly luke warm. Churchill gave priority to military and diplomatic concerns rather than post-war social policy. There were concerns about the disappointing aftermath of World War I, and an admiration for the Soviet achievement. They might contrast dynamic Labour figures like Bevin, Bevan, and Morrison with some lacklustre performances by the Conservatives who were over-reliant on Churchill’s prestige now squandered in what **C** considered a “confused and wordy” response. Certainly, Churchill’s

concerns in 1945 – for the post-war settlement, for Eastern Europe, for Britain's Empire – were not the concerns of many of his voters.

Three of the sources are Conservative, their focus is on Churchill (his speech and the reaction to it) but **B** and **E**, implicitly and explicitly, acknowledge the role of social reform. The two Labour sources, **A** and **D**, focus largely on this and imply success for this very reason.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2010