

# **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F963/02**: Option B Modern 1815-1945

## **Mark Scheme for June 2011**

---

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 2011

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

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

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
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"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15-16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be</li> </ul>

	<p>issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-10</b></p>	<p>undeveloped or merely commented on discretely.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10-12</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted.</li> <li>A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence.</li> <li>Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it.</li> <li>Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8-9</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding.</li> <li>Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit</li> <li>Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-7</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-5</b></p>

<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li><li>• Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li><li>• No structure with extremely weak communication.</li></ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li><li>• Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li></ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>
----------------	---	---

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>AO2a and b</b>
<b>1</b>	20-22	42-48
<b>2</b>	17-19	35-41
<b>3</b>	13-16	28-34
<b>4</b>	9-12	21-27
<b>5</b>	6-8	14-20
<b>6</b>	3-5	7-13
<b>7</b>	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	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<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"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	<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>
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20-22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42-48</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed.</li> </ul>

		The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing.
	<b>17-19</b>	<b>35-41</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<b>13-16</b>	<b>28-34</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<b>9-12</b>	<b>21-27</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are</li> </ul>

	<p>evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>	<p>undeveloped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-13</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-6</b></p>

## The Condition of England 1815-1853

- 1 (a) **Study Sources B and C**  
**Compare these Sources as evidence for the causes of the agricultural disturbances in 1830-31 (the Swing riots).** [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.**

**The context** is the widespread riots (overturning hedges, burning ricks, looting property and destroying machinery) that spread across southern and eastern England in 1830 -31, thoroughly alarming the authorities, the last great labourer’s revolt against agrarian change and conditions. **Both** sources suggest reliance by the poor on the poor rate and suggest that it has become a feature of their life. For Hudson’s interviewees (**C**) this is a matter of regret and the Poor Law is seen as one of the several causes of disturbance (seasonal sacking using the Poor Law to keep them over the winter). For the **report, (B)**, it is also a cause for concern. There is some implied support from Hudson (**C**) for the **Report (B)** on the reliance of the poor on allowances as the **Report (B)** argues that it enabled labourers to be supported at very low ratepayer cost as a pool of continuing cheap labour when the need arose (planting and harvesting). For Hudson this is just one example of the poverty and oppression that he sees as at the root of the disturbances.

However the **differences** outweigh the similarities. The **Report (B)** blames the relative generosity of the poor rates in the disturbed areas, arguing that it produced sturdy and insolent idlers who regarded such payments as a right. It implies the disturbances occurred through to increase such inappropriate rights and payments, - ‘disappointment and hatred if the expectation is not fulfilled’. It argues that the rioters believed that the authorities were withholding their benefits either through an unwillingness to dig into their own pockets (‘greed’) or through corruption. **Hudson in C** makes no reference to such generosity and mentions the allowance system only as a secondary factor in the riots. There are no sturdy and insolent poor angry at insufficient handouts in his account. Instead his focus is on desperation from acute poverty and oppression, implying that in disturbed areas the authorities were far from generous. He identifies three key factors – very low wages, technological threats to employment (threshing machines) and the persistence of seasonal dependence and underemployment which, in the winter months, forced a subsistence on the Poor Law, something that the young, elderly and weak had to face throughout the year. Thus there are two views of the poor here – a weak and desperate poor, already forced to commit low level crime (poaching), and a sturdy and aggressive poor prepared to take what they arrogantly believed to be theirs.

The **provenance** of the sources is different. **Hudson (C)** bases his account on the memories of some of the rural poor themselves, albeit remembered long after.. It is an account of a lost way of life, remembered in bitterness and with sympathy by Hudson whose tone betrays these emotions (‘spiritless slaves’). His evidence is from one county, Wiltshire, and from labourers likely to be at the lower end of employment. He blames the oppression of the farmers and landowners but his organisation of points is convincing and is corroborated by other rural evidence, particularly in reference to machinery, enclosures and wages. In contrast the **Report (B)** is famous for its utilitarian, a priori and partial methodology. Its purpose was not to cast light on a vanished world but to change the way poverty was dealt with. Its commissioners, propertied and educated, often strangers to the areas they descended upon, were looking for evidence on out of control allowances and a consequently deleterious impact on the character of the poor; it was concerned to use the riots as evidence of this and to link outbreaks to high poor rates. It uses selective evidence

to conclude that the Old Poor Law caused the riots and would have seized on C's comments on the young, weak and elderly.

In **judgement** candidates may well see Hudson's evidence as more nuanced, although there is some evidence of the abuse of the poor rates to support the Report. It is true that the Speenhamland areas, on the whole, saw the main disturbances but these were also the areas of most rural change with the least option of urban factory work. The North had higher wages. This would suggest that the evidence in Hudson, at a time of life when labourers would reflect without fear of the consequences, is more accurate, although we are not told whether he asked leading questions of those he interviewed.

- 1 (b) **Study all the Sources.**  
**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the most important reason for the reform of the Old Poor Law was its demoralising impact upon the poor.** [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.**

A variety of factors may be considered of importance in deciding the fate of the Old Poor law, including the assertion in the question. In addition there were fears over the rising costs, that the Laws were no longer the guarantor of law and order, new economists argued that they constituted a barrier to a free labour market and the Benthamites who stressed both the negative moral dimensions of the old system and its administrative inefficiencies. All these views are evident in the sources but candidates will need to prioritise their relative importance in the debate. Three sources (**A, B and E**) come from **opponents** of the Old Law, (a northern overseer in **A**, the condemnatory Poor Law Report in **B**, based on some rather selective evidence and approaches, and an Assistant Commissioner in **E**, although much of the extract here is a conversation intended to ridicule a local official whose view is that the poor and their problems were the way of the world). Candidates could view these as highly selective but they were influential in moulding property and governmental opinion. Two sources **support** the Old Law (**C and D**), to a greater or lesser degree, although Hudson in **C** considers that wages are so low that a Poor law can only scratch the surface, whilst the local official in **E** takes the view that all need a little land and a cow and until such time bread and wage handouts are inevitable. The MP in **D** affirms the right of the poor to some assistance and tries to counter the view that they are thus dependent and demoralised, although such views were not necessarily very typical amongst the governing classes.

**The view that the Old Poor Law demoralised** can be found in various forms in **A, B, C** (from different perspectives) **and E**. Sources **A, B and E** all come from those under the influence of Chadwick and the Benthamites who, taking their cue from Malthus, were worried that the Old Laws had become a cause of poverty rather than a solution to it. They stressed dependence and large families. Thus the **overseer in A** attacks the allowance system for de-incentivising the poor. The example he quotes, (a solitary one), is able to obtain well above the going wage rate in the rural South (55p as opposed to 35p) because of his large family and higher bread prices, both considered when his allowance was worked out. The overseer stresses that this is one reason for large families amongst the poor. He collects such evidence and is concerned to use it to question the existing system. The **Assistant Commissioner in E** corroborates this by quoting, with patronising concern, a local ratepayer who considers it natural and a God given right to procreate. The provenance of this might suggest that such a view on demoralisation was less widely held in local society and care needs to be taken not to overestimate the influence of Benthamite views. In the **Report (B)** the undermining of good work habits is also picked up, the emphasis is on a change of character from deferential and hard working to sturdy, insolent and belligerent concerned with handouts as of 'right'. **Source C**, from a much later period, takes a different view of demoralisation. For Hudson it is the demoralisation of poverty, low wage and underemployment. We find little example of generous allowances in his account of the rural areas. Candidates could stress either the untypicality of **A, B and E** (the methodology of the Report and those involved with it – leading questions etc) or their relative influence on government thinking and thus the importance of demoralisation in the debate.

Another nail in the coffin of the Old Law was **cost**. The sources, in stressing the generosity of the allowance system as the **Overseer in A** does, imply rising costs and candidates may well look at the rise of the poor rate in the period to 1834 and the pressures on government

to reduce it from the propertied classes. **Scrope in D** refers to this when commenting on the rate payers, whom he considers excessively penny pinching. However if this was the case, and **Hudson in C** confirms it with his comments on hard masters, then in the rural areas the squeeze on costs was already underway. Nonetheless governments might well not listen to Vestry opinion. Scrope's comments on them (**D**) betray a bias against such attitudes and this may well be shared by larger landowners.

The Old Poor Law had always been seen as a **guarantor of stability** but **Sources B and C**, would suggest this was no longer the case. The **Report in B** is especially worried that the poor are demanding their 'rights' under the old system and that Speenhamland, devised as a temporary expedient during the revolutionary wars in the 1790s, was now seen as permanent. If the comments in the Report (**B**) are accepted then the Poor Law had caused the riots not prevented them. Scrope's language in **D** and his discussion of the poor's rights in Parliament would seem to corroborate this, although his is a very different perspective, comparing their rights equally to those of the propertied and titled and fully endorsing them. So too does the local vestry official quoted in **E**. He goes as far as to talk of ancient rights to a little land and a cow, alongside a natural order that welcomed children as part of God's plan. Candidates could comment on the impact of such traditional ideas in the 1830s when change and new intellectual views challenged them. Scrope is making Parliament aware that abolition of outdoor relief runs the risk of breaking traditional 'compacts' based on natural justice and he warns of the consequences. Nonetheless candidates need to question his typicality within Parliament, and thus the weight they would allow this source. Other issues would be the increasing acceptance of the need to **achieve a free labour market** in early industrial society and the perception that the Old Poor Law was an obstacle to this. Candidates may mention Ricardo and the new economists who took a dim view of the Poor Law settlement laws which prescribed that relief could only be administered in the parish of birth, thus discouraging labour mobility and the chance of the poor moving to new areas of employment. The **Overseer in A** makes this point when citing Robert Smith's reluctance to move outside his parish. In addition the Benthamites stressed the **administrative inefficiencies of the Old Law** and the sources amply illustrate this, albeit from a slanted angle. They clearly despise the ignorance and parochial nature of the Vestries, responsible for presiding over a haphazard system. The **Report (B)** refers to corruption and inefficiency, whilst **Hudson in C**, from a different perspective, condemns a system that sacks men after the harvest and allows the poor rate to keep them through the winter. Candidates may well know this was condemned as the larger landowners were enabled to keep a pool of cheap labour at the expense of the smaller farmers and local shopkeepers. The **Assistant Commissioner writing in E** to Chadwick, the main antagonist of the Old Law, mentions disapprovingly the parochial attitudes of a ratepayer, Vestry voter and tenant who chose those who administered the Old Poor Law.

Candidates may well conclude that the official voices in the sources (Overseers and Commissioners) were the most influential and their critique of a demoralised and rebellious poor the key factor but costs and administrative problems are also evident.

**The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886****2 (a) Study Sources D and E.**

**Compare these sources as evidence for attitudes to British achievements at the Congress of Berlin in 1878. [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.**

The sources are from the two main protagonists, Gladstone in D and Disraeli in E so the differences are more evident than the **similarities**. The only achievement that they can agree upon is that Britain’s material strength is regarded as impressive by her opponents and even here Gladstone only very begrudgingly acknowledges this; given his dislike of Disraelian sabre rattling.

On all else the achievements at Berlin are **disputed**. Gladstone considers Britain’s moral respect to have been lessened given Disraeli’s lack of interest in the Balkan peoples but Disraeli stresses that he has had the interests of the subject peoples at heart, considering their conciliation vital to the peace of the area – ‘improve the condition of its subjects’. Gladstone thinks that Disraeli and Salisbury have done deals with Europe and fallen too much under their self interested sway, whereas the latter disagrees, stressing the twofold set of principles he held to, one of which was Ottoman integrity the other a peaceful solution. Gladstone dismisses Disraeli’s pursuit of interests as illusory but Disraeli rebuts this by stressing the over-riding interest of maintaining the Ottomans, something he feels he has achieved with the dismemberment of the large Bulgaria of San Stephano. To Gladstone there is no principle but Disraeli stresses precisely these, perhaps as a means of irritating Gladstone.

On **provenance** candidates could point to the context. In 1878 Gladstone had been sidelined on the Eastern Question having initially seized the initiative over the Bulgarian massacres. Once Russia declared war British opinion changed and Disraeli was able to pose as the defender of British interests. In D Gladstone is still seeking to capitalise on the moral issue, perhaps with one eye on the nonconformists and Christian opinion in general, drawing attention to the re- imposition of Ottoman control over Macedonia and Eastern Rumelia, hence Disraeli’s reference to a concern for their interests. However Disraeli was now safe in the Lords (Earl of Beaconsfield) and can seek to gloss his achievements, confident in the knowledge that public and royal opinion had backed him on the issue. He can point to both European respect and to peace, thus taking the wind out of Gladstone’s sails. He certainly touches, no doubt annoyingly, the Gladstonian buttons of principle and peace. As to **judgement**, Gladstone’s was a minority view on British achievements at Berlin, although some candidates might question exactly what Disraeli achieved for the subject peoples there. His previous record would suggest that he prevented European pressure being effectively applied to the Ottomans to persuade them to implement reform and toleration in the Balkan provinces.

- 2 (b) **Study all the Sources**  
**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Disraeli pursued irresponsible policies on the Eastern Question during the period from 1871 to 1878.** [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.**

Gladstone and many highly placed Tories like Derby and Salisbury were convinced that Disraeli did pursue irresponsible policies on eastern issues but, from 1877 to 1878, popular and royal opinion saw his policies as both responsible and as representing a return to the prestige of the Palmerston years. The sources represent these opposing views, **Gladstone in A and D** (at the beginning and end of the 1871 -1878 period) and **Derby in C** being critical, **Disraeli in E** maintaining a responsible approach and **Barrington's report in B** of a private conversation with Disraeli perhaps providing a more critical yet friendly approach to Eastern policy. Together they provide a broad chronological survey of policy in the 1870s and candidates will need to put them into their appropriate context.

The accusation of **irresponsibility** is best seen in **Sources A, C and D**, although one reading of **Barrington in B** lends weight to the charge that he overestimated the 'treachery' and ambition of the Russians and might well have done better to work more closely with Russia on imposing a settlement on a disturbed Ottoman Empire in the 1874-6 period if he sought to avoid war. **Gladstone in A** might be expected to take a dim view of Disraeli's views yet his analysis of Disraeli's policies is convincing. He is responding to a speech that Disraeli made attacking the London Conference, which Gladstone had retrospectively called to give international 'approval' for unilateral Russian action in abrogating the Black Sea clauses during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 (forbidding Russian warships access to their own naval backyard). He was in a position to know that they had never been considered permanent and he rightly points out that Disraelian action was impossible given the deals other powers had made with Russia. Britain would have to fight alone without a European ally. As a naval power this was ridiculous. Disraeli's propensity to threaten a war that was unlikely to be won or prove smooth is corroborated in **Source C by Derby**. He writes with horror to Salisbury about Disraeli's sabre rattling. He is aware that Disraeli doesn't want war with Russia but he mistrusts the policy of military threats that could easily become war. Such views could be supported by the outbreak of jingoism and Disraeli's gestures of sending the fleet to the Dardanelles or plans to occupy the Gallipoli peninsula, and his playing up to war fever. **Source C** is telling evidence from his closest colleague, the Foreign Secretary, who was to resign over the issue by 1877. His view in **C** is that Disraeli was too obsessed with chimera like prestige and Empire to be realistic about cutting a diplomatic deal with Russia. His irresponsible posturing prevented this. However Derby himself took an independent line and eventually joined the liberals in 1880.

Temperamentally he was more inclined to a peaceful solution, as was his colleague Lord Salisbury, whose work before and behind the scenes at the Congress of Berlin helped Disraeli appear triumphant. Candidates might refer to these deals to put Disraeli's policy at Berlin into perspective. His behaviour there was gauche and irresponsible - threatening to leave - and more concerned with prestige. **Gladstone in D**, with much less ammunition than in **A**, again tries to suggest that Disraeli ignored real British interests in protecting the weak, a minor point for most by 1878. He was on stronger ground when referring to 'imaginary interests' and candidates could consider the wisdom of continuing to support a decaying Turkey through a military alliance, especially the guarantee Britain gave to maintain Asian Turkey, an all but impossible and unrealistic commitment, taken on board as a quid pro quo for Cyprus ( all part of his imperial string of naval bases to protect the route to India, soon

redundant once Alexandria was acquired). Candidates could comment on Disraeli's apparent lack of responsibility over the Bulgarian horrors prior to this.

The alternative view, that Disraeli **took a responsible view** on the Eastern Question is to be found by questioning the reliability of **A, C and D** and by taking seriously the evidence in **B and E**. It could be argued that he was right to be sceptical about the atrocity stories in the Balkans and he certainly feared, probably rightly, that it would enflame Russian passions and make war against Turkey more likely. In **Source B** Disraeli speculates in private with a friend and colleague, in **E** he glosses and explains his work at Berlin, after the event. In opposition Disraeli would appear to have been irresponsible in demanding action be taken over the Black Sea clauses but **Derby in C** perhaps underestimates the use of bluff (arguably the fleet was in no fit state to make much of a show) to get to the negotiating table, whilst **Gladstone in D** is clearly clutching at ancient straws (Bulgarian atrocities). **Barrington in B** indicates that Disraeli had a clear idea of the need to stop Russian domination of the Ottomans and that a simple carve up along the lines of Russian control at Constantinople and British control of Egypt would ultimately prove counter productive. Whether or not Constantinople was the key to India was and is a moot point. In contrast to Derby's view of Disraeli's jingoism, **Barrington in B** at least in 1876, comments that Disraeli was 'guarded' as to peace or war and stresses his 'grand object is victory in diplomacy'. Nonetheless, by 1877 and San Stephano, Disraeli, as promised to Barrington, has treated Russian entry to Bulgaria very seriously. His policy was responsibly firm. He was determined to uphold traditional British policy in the area. **Source E** sees Disraeli justify himself in relation to a tradition that he has become the triumphant heir to, but was he wise to do so? He was aided by the horrified reaction of the other European powers to San Stephano which made Salisbury's deals at Berlin easier. Conclusions will largely be determined by a convincing evaluation of the sources, with much weight being put on Gladstone in A, Barrington in B and to the chronology of Eastern policy in the 1870s.

- 3 (a) **Study Sources C and D**  
**Compare these Sources as evidence for the relationship between Asquith and Lloyd George in 1916.** [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.**

Their view on how to direct the war is central. Both sources recognise the importance of Asquith’s reluctance to accept the proposals to change the War Committee as the source of conflict between him and Lloyd George. In **Source C** this is made explicit in the second sentence and, later, Asquith makes it clear that the proposals risk ‘undermining my own authority’. The entry for December 2<sup>nd</sup> in **Source D** explains that Asquith refused the proposals to preserve his influence and control. It is also apparent that neither man respects the other. Whilst acknowledging Lloyd George’s ‘many qualities’ Asquith, in **Source C**, nonetheless, considers Lloyd George to be untrustworthy. In return, it is claimed in **Source D** that Lloyd George thought Asquith was ‘absolutely hopeless’. Bonar Law was an important figure without whose support each would be weaker in relation to the other. In **Source C** Asquith states how he appreciates his ‘loyalty’ absolving him of any treachery. In **Source D**, it appears that Lloyd George does not feel strong enough to act without the support of Bonar Law. A key point of difference between the sources is the motives ascribed to Lloyd George. Asquith is suspicious of Lloyd George who, in **Source C**, he accuses of wanting to ‘displace me’, simply, it implies, to satisfy personal ambition. By contrast, in the entry for 30<sup>th</sup> November in **Source D**, Lloyd George is motivated by the obligation to serve his country responding to the call of the people. However, some may read the first line of the same entry as similar to **Source C** in suggesting selfish ambitions by Lloyd George.

The reliability of the sources is questionable. Asquith, in **Source C**, is defending his stance by attacking Lloyd George whom he regarded as responsible for the situation. In contrast, in **Source D**, Stevenson is naturally protective of her lover. Indeed, the comments in **Source D** are not explicitly those of Lloyd George and their veracity might be challenged. Candidates may consider the reliability of the sources by another approach. Both sources are confidential: the opening line of **Source C** makes this point and **Source D** was clearly intended to be private. As such both may be regarded as the free expression of the writers’ views although Asquith could not be sure his letter would remain secret given Bonar Law’s association with Lloyd George and Stevenson’s diary was clearly published later, an event the authoress may have anticipated. Yet, Asquith’s charge against Lloyd George was an assumption, never proved, and Stevenson’s account about the War Committee (**Source D**) and Asquith’s response to it (**Source C**) fits the facts. Something might be made of the dates. **Source C** was written immediately after the first moves in the crisis whereas the last two entries in **Source D** were reflections at a time when the crisis had deepened. Judgement will be a matter of weighing up these provenance factors and many will conclude that they are both useful in terms of the perspective taken.

- 3 (b) **Study all the Sources**  
**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Asquith should bear the major responsibility for splitting the Liberal Party in 1916.** [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.**

**Elements of support for Asquith's role** can be found in **all the sources** but mainly in **Source D**. The alternative view, that **Lloyd George and/or the Conservatives bear the major responsibility**, can be found in **Sources B, C, D and E** with evidence that Asquith held the party together in **Sources A and B**. Most sources provide evidence on Asquith and some candidates might present the evidence thematically. A key charge against Asquith is that he lacked the qualities needed for effective leadership. Most damning in this respect is **Source D** where he is described as indecisive and to 'have lost all will-power'. However, candidates should evaluate the source as unreliable to the extent that the authorship of the comment is ambiguous and, whether the views of Stevenson or Lloyd George, they represent the views of opponents of Asquith. In **Source A** Asquith cuts a sorry figure who 'looked old and worried' and, rather than provide direction, he appears dependent on his colleagues in so far as 'He flung himself on our mercy'. However, the fact that Asquith received 'an over-powering ovation' suggests his speech had inspired his colleagues. Knowledge about Asquith's formidable intellect and ability and also how effective he was as leader before 1914 may be known by candidates. Even Asquith, in **Source C**, admits to the 'intolerable daily burden' a comment candidates may evaluate as reliable given it is self-critical and knowledge of his weaknesses (drinking problems etc) could be added.

Asquith might also be criticised for the formation of the Coalition in 1915. **Source A** emphasises the opposition within the ranks of the Liberal Party to it with some speaking 'very strongly against a coalition' although he could be defended as simply taking a position that 'had become inevitable'. It is clear that Asquith did not want to join forces with the Conservatives who he describes as 'his bitterest enemies'. Candidates may explain this reluctance as a consequence of the struggles of 1910-11 and more recent criticism by the Conservatives of the conduct of the war. The fact that the split did not occur till late 1916 suggests that the formation of the Coalition was not an immediate cause of the split at least. Nonetheless, Asquith's failure to foresee the consequence of the Coalition in terms of the Press is picked up in **Source E**. Candidates might explain this reference: the Press now adopted the role of opposition which had been forfeit by the Tories when they joined the Coalition. Indeed, his naivety is suggested in the fact that he 'informed Northcliffe of the shell shortage'. Over time, the Press was a factor 'in the overthrow of Asquith's administration'.

Asquith's war policy might be assessed. **Source B** portrays a Cabinet divided on conscription and Gallipoli and problems with the supply of munitions. Knowledge about each of these issues might be provided and some may add to the list details about events in Europe, then and later notably the Battle of the Somme, all of which weakened Asquith. However, candidates might excuse Asquith responsibility for these divisions and instead blame the failure of commanders and ministers: Lloyd George is said to have 'muddled ... Munitions'. However, demands for the reform of the War Committee, mentioned in **Sources C, D and E**, hint at disappointment with Asquith's conduct of the war and his refusal to concede could be viewed as culpability on his part. Knowledge of the discussions and letters between Asquith and Lloyd George could be discussed by those well versed in the subject. In evaluation candidates could argue that Asquith's defensive position reflects a sensitivity and pride, revealed in **Source C** in his concern not to 'undermine his own

authority, even if the other two sources are treated with some suspicion given the position of their authors.

Clearly, Lloyd George could be blamed for splitting the Liberal Party. In several sources Lloyd George's actions are described as deliberately targeted on his attaining the top spot. As early as October 1915 his eye for an 'opening to the leadership' is identified, in **Source B**, which may be dismissed as the subjective view of one man but which suggests some observation of Lloyd George over time. In **Source C** Asquith is convinced that Lloyd George had 'engineered' things 'with the purpose of displacing me' but such a judgement might be dismissed as a ploy by Asquith to undermine the credibility of Lloyd George's proposals. The implication of the comments for 30 November in **Source D** is that Lloyd George intended to 'smash the government' but this is the assessment of his mistress. In **Source E** 'Churchill claims that the resignation of Lloyd George led to the fall of the government' which might be used to argue that the latter bears responsibility for the split in the Party. However, it could be argued that Lloyd George had no alternative given the contradictory positions adopted by Asquith in his dialogue with Lloyd George on the reform of the War Committee. In all cases the evidence that Lloyd George conspired against Asquith is hard to verify.

Strong candidates will make mention of other politicians. Liberals inside and out of the Cabinet, could be blamed for their reluctance to back Asquith fully or to put principle to one side at a time of national emergency. This could be substantiated with reference to **Source A** although the source explains that initial concerns about the Coalition were calmed by Asquith. The fragility of support for Asquith from colleagues is evident in **Source C** and their stubborn adherence to principle is revealed in **Source B**. Bonar Law might be blamed for siding with Lloyd George as indicated in **Source E**, the importance of his alliance with Lloyd George recognised in **Source D**. Although Bonar Law is portrayed as a reliable colleague in **Source C** this might be evaluated as insincere as a device to divide him from Lloyd George and **Source B** shows Bonar Law was prepared to resign over Gallipoli. In **Source E** Northcliffe is said to have 'exercised a commanding influence' and candidates may be aware of some of the devastating attacks made on the Coalition by the papers mentioned which confirms the influence they had even if it does not explain the split in the Liberal Party.

- 4 (a) **Study Sources B and D.**  
**Compare these Sources as evidence for the relationship between Churchill and Roosevelt.** [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.**

The issue here is whether the apparently warm relations between Churchill and Roosevelt which **D** exemplifies were borne out by the realities of US-British relations. **B** seems to offer a more hostile view. Roosevelt may have been concerned that the US should not be drawn into spending US lives in propping up the British Empire. Churchill worked very hard to charm and impress Roosevelt, but was not always successful in actually influencing US policy.

**Content:** **D** refers to the help and comfort America brought. **B** makes it clear that the help was not extended to preserve the Empire with its ‘mediaeval’ ideas. There is no hint of this resentment by FDR in **D**. **B** does not refer to the ‘unsordid’ Lease Lend, but there is a direct reference to the Atlantic Charter – giving a very different interpretation. In **B** the Charter is something that Churchill might want to wriggle out of, by implication because of the Empire. In **D** the Charter is seen as part of a great cooperative effort by both sides (We drew up together the Atlantic Charter) although Churchill is careful to refer to its impact on ‘other peoples’ which may not include the subjects of the British Empire. There is little personal warmth expressed by FDR in **B**, and Churchill is not mentioned by name, whereas **D** is in the nature of an emotional tribute to a personal friendship (personal regard and affection) There is little reflection in **D** of the obvious concern that the US is not subordinated to Britain that appears in **B**. Roosevelt in **B** is referring to British interests in general; Churchill in **D** to a personal relationship based on US generosity.

**Nature :** **B** is a reported conversation between father and son after FDR had made a considerable journey to an unfamiliar environment. It was at a difficult time in the war, when there had been a number of differences between the USA and Britain over strategy, Vichy France and the post-war world. **D** on the other hand was spoken when the war was nearly over. Whatever the differences, a massive Anglo-American expeditionary force had landed in France and was approaching final victory. Churchill’s hopes for US help had materialised and it was important that differences should be forgotten and ongoing US economic help and help against the Soviet threat should be continued. This was a public speech as opposed to a private conversation made in very different circumstances and with a different purpose. **Judgment:** Neither is entirely trustworthy or typical. FDR did have warmer relations with Churchill than this outburst suggests; Churchill had more problems with FDR than his eulogy suggests. Both are problematic – there is no corroboration that these were FDR’s words and we have to accept Elliot’s version (Churchill was angry at the book and thought it misrepresented the facts). Similarly, in the emotional aftermath of FDR’s death, Churchill would not be likely to produce a balanced analysis. He was a highly emotional person and this was a very emotional tribute. Candidates are free to decide which offers the more typical and authentic view of the relationship.

- 4 (b) **Study all the Sources.**  
**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that relations between Britain and the USA were very successfully managed by Churchill between 1941 and 1945. [70]**

**Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence 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 a successful management of Churchill's relations with the US is valid. **Sources A, B and C** suggest a failure to manage relations, or at least that Britain had to take a second seat to the US. **Sources D and to some extent E** implies more success based on Churchill's assiduous personal diplomacy and management of Roosevelt. Of the sources here **E** attempts a balance – a special relationship but not as special as Churchill thought. **D** suggests the special personal relationship, but has to be viewed with some caution, given the circumstances and intentions of the tribute. **B** suggests more that Best is right to see the relationship as less special than Churchill supposed. It can be supported by US sympathy for Indian independence and an unwillingness to divert any resources to the recovery of British colonies taken by Japan. It can also be supported by the insistence of US military predominance in the second front and US refusal to press ahead to get to Berlin before Stalin. However, the nature of the Source does need to be considered critically as a hearsay account published some years afterwards. **A** is the German view which actually confirms the view in **B** that the US wanted to remain dominant. Obviously the purpose is to show Churchill in a humiliating way and hope for a rift between the allies. By the time of publication in 1943 the campaign in Russia had suffered a fatal blow. A second front was feared and the German people needed to be reassured that the Anglo-US alliance was fragile. This was actually widely held to be the case. Hitler is said to have believed that FDR's death in April 1945 was a sign that Germany now had a chance of survival if the US split from its ally. However the cartoon also shows US economic power and actually FDR and Churchill are hand in hand. The **cartoon** is not however entirely fanciful as Lord Moran's diary reveals Churchill's pique at being treated as the junior partner. As Moran was close to Churchill and saw the immediate effect of Roosevelt's snub, this is a useful source; but it does refer to a specific conference. The diaries were not published until after the war. They were seen as a breach of confidentiality, but do offer a unique view. Both sources show a Churchill out of control in his relations with the USA. Roosevelt was concerned that Churchill did not see the Atlantic Charter as having application to Britain; Churchill was concerned that FDR did not see that Stalin would have little interest in the principles of the Atlantic Charter in post-war expansion – hence his desperate deal with Stalin done independently of the US to establish spheres of influence in Eastern Europe in October 1944. Candidates could question the typicality of **A and C** and the sources as a whole do not have enough evidence of the good humour and warmth of the personal relationship between the leaders, for example in Churchill's successful visit to Washington in December 1941 or his witty and well-received speech to Congress. His face to face meetings are said to have overcome FDR's initial hostility to him when they first met and begun a remarkable partnership in which shared democratic ideals led to cooperation and victory. Candidates could point to Churchill's success in persuading FDR to invade North Africa, in persuading him to delay D Day and then giving massive military aid – these could support the judicious view in **E**. However, there is enough material to support some truth in the more skeptical views in **A, B and C**. Churchill had to accept a hard bargain for any US help, no certainty of US intervention against Germany and then facing a lot of problems in relations with the USA which involved virtual appeasement of FDR. By 1943 Churchill could not prevent Roosevelt becoming closer to Stalin and failed to get US understanding of the threat from Stalin. Churchill had to accept US military leadership and the predominance of US Strategy.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2011