

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 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

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>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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"> • 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:

- (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

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a 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>
Level 1	<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>
Level 2	<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>

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
Level 3	<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>
Level 4	<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>
Level 5	<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>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
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>

The Condition of England 1815-1853

1 (a) Study Sources C and D.

Compare these sources as evidence for views on the Tolpuddle case of 1834.
[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 was the growing power of larger and more general Unions post 1829 and in particular the emergence of the GNCTU in early 1834. Both sources, from very different viewpoints, **agree** that the real issues involved are control of the workforce and the right to join a Union, the wage issue being secondary. Both focus on the use of the law to resolve the issue. **Frampton in C** is convinced rural labourers are ‘waiting to join the Union as soon’ as the case signals their right to do so confirmed by **Loveless in D** who has been instrumental in forming a Friendly Society and receiving direction from Trade Societies, a clear reference to the growing labour movement that produced organisations like the GNCTU. The testimonies of both show them to be the main protagonists in the case, Loveless labelling Frampton as one of the ‘unjust and cruel’ magistrates. Both agree that the impact of the case will be to deter trade unionism.

They **disagree** over the case itself. **Frampton (C)** comments in a matter of fact tone that the judge ruled that labourers could not join a Union without punishment and that the 6 labourers had broken the law, a clear warning to the workforce. In contrast **Loveless (D)** considers the verdict to be not just a simple statement of existing law but a travesty of justice, a trial marked by unjust methods and intimidation – that the authorities had found an old Act of 1797 (mutiny in the navy) and twisted its meaning to apply to oaths to join a civil Friendly Society, applied after the event (‘placards were then displayed’). Frampton implies that those on trial were troublemakers, whilst Loveless demonstrates how this impression was unfairly implied (idle drunkards). They also partially disagree. **Frampton (C)** is convinced that the judgement will discourage labourers joining a Union and that it was welcomed by the ‘higher classes’. On the other hand **Loveless (D)**, by his catalogue of injustice and the title of his pamphlet (‘Victims’), is trying to limit this by exposing the methods of the authorities (candidates may refer to the pardon issued in 1836 following the campaign against the harsh sentences).

In terms of **provenance** both are highly slanted sources. **Frampton (C)** is a local squire, magistrate and landowner concerned that a stand be taken against rural unionism and with clear contacts with government (he writes with familiarity to the Home Secretary, as though reporting on a successful and coordinated campaign with government involvement – ‘looked forward to’). He reveals his role in keeping the Home Secretary informed as to how the verdict has been received in Dorset, confirmed by **Loveless (D)** in his comment on Frampton – ‘a name I shall not forget’. Loveless writes from the labour and radical perspective. As one of the ‘victims’, his purpose is to campaign (after his pardon and return from Australia in 1837) to reverse the verdicts and use the case to advance the radical cause. He wants to link local and national authorities as jointly responsible for a miscarriage of justice – ‘Victims of Whiggery’. He clearly blames Frampton – the wage reduction seems to occur after an alleged negotiation was communicated to him. In terms of **judgement** candidates could regard both as equally useful. Together they provide a balanced view. The evidence of Frampton is valuable in providing an informed assessment of the impact and result of the case (detering Unionism). It is better evidence for the attitudes of government and local landowners, whilst Loveless provides the

perspective of the radicals and labourers with more detail as to the methods used to obtain conviction. Candidates may be aware of much harsher penalties than previously exacted (7 years' transportation instead of the maximum 6 months hard labour under the old Combination Laws).

1 (b) **Study all the Sources.**

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the workers and their leaders were the *main* reason for trade Union weakness in the period from 1824-1844 [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 interpretations on weakness is possible here and all but **Place (A)** support a variety of views – alongside the views of workers and their leaders there is the hostility of employers, the opposition of the authorities, both central and local, and economic conditions in general. Three of the sources (**Place in A, Loveless in D and Burt in E**) are from radical and Union leaders and may be the more revealing as to admitted weakness (odds stacked against workers) whilst two are from an establishment view, (**Frampton in C and the Cartoon in B**) and might be expected to demonstrate hostility, stressing either worker weakness or government determination to make a stand.

The case for **workers and their leaders themselves undermining unions** is clear in **A, B, C and E**, although candidates will need to be aware of the exaggerated nature of the cartoon evidence in **B**. These sources stress that both industrial and rural workers were reluctant to act by combining into Unions and lacked an appreciation of how to proceed, despite the efforts of leaders like Place and Loveless. **Place in A** is revealing given his role in working to repeal the Combination Laws in 1824. In an unpublished account, part of his working notes for the MP Hume, he is quite scathing on the workers he is trying to rehearse to give appropriate evidence to the Select Committee on Combinations in 1824. He comments on the parochial nature of their grievances, their stress on isolated issues like machinery and their lack of politicisation and polish, especially their lack of understanding that outside a union they were isolated and unequal units in the population/wage situation. This is confirmed by the stress on wages in **D (Loveless)**. Bread and butter issues and local conflicts would lead workers to act individually or in local groups, (and here candidates may use knowledge to confirm this - by the late 1820s and 1830s Doherty's National Association on the Protection of Labour of 1829 failed to show solidarity in the Lancashire Spinners strike in 1831; the GNCTU failed to mobilise other trades to support the Derbyshire silk weaver's strike). The **anti Trade Union cartoon (B)** demonstrates feeble and corrupt leadership, greedy and drunken (a charge also evident in **D** at Tolpuddle). Policy in **B** would seem to amount to posturing – a procession will suffice or 'sommel o' that sort'. However this evidence is clearly exaggerated, although there were cases of Treasurers running off with funds (Doherty's NAPL). It does highlight the problems of national organisation for large and radical unions (too large?), such as recruiting able officials and the problem of funding through subscriptions (few below the craft unions could afford them – the GNCTU charged 3d and the box in the cartoon is empty). The point about funding is reinforced by **Burt (E)** who confirms, from a labour perspective, that unions had no resources or reserve funds for financing strikes. He suggests, reliably, that there was no eagerness to strike or even to unionise amongst workers. The GNCTU only

managed a membership, briefly, of 16,000 with the craft unions refusing to join (potters, builders, spinners and clothiers). Poor coordination, worsened by communication difficulties is referred to in the **cartoon (B)** when ignorance is shown about what was occurring in the west. However the existence of leaders like Place, Owen, Loveless and Doherty would suggest that not all were as the cartoon suggests, although Owen in particular might be seen as too idealistic. **Loveless in D** is clearly aware that rural workers would be put off joining a union given his fate. The cartoon reflects propertyed fears at the burst of Union activity between 1829 and 1834. The sources thus provide a mixed view on the assertion in the question.

The hostility of employers was also an important factor in union weakness (**A, C, D and E**). Place in **A** refers to the 'will of the masters' as a barrier to worker participation whilst Burt in **E** particularly emphasises this factor and is reliable given his personal experience in union and reform politics and the vantage of very informed hindsight. He speaks from personal experience, albeit as a child. He is referring to one of the most cohesive working communities in the country, a later Union vanguard, the N.E. miners. Yet in this period they are completely under the control of employers who could close employer owned shops, evict (mine owned pit cottages) and sack them, bringing in Welsh miners instead. It is not the workers, their leaders or the government which defeats them but employers who 'treat them as though they do not exist'. This is corroborated in the rural areas by **C and D** (Frampton and Loveless), although there may be some disagreement as Loveless argues that some farmers and landowners were prepared to settle until Frampton galvanised them into making a stand. Candidates might refer to the 'Document', which many employers post 1825 forced workers to sign, saying they would never join or pay a subscription to a union.

The hostility of government and local authorities were also important factors in weakening the unions. **Place in A** refers to the conduct of magistrates who were also employers and the context of this source is the illegality of Unionism before 1824 and the difficulty in obtaining repeal of the Combination Laws. Legal barriers are evident in the other sources. The **cartoon in B** has one of the leaders commenting on the need to be moderate enough 'to escape being put down by the government', the context of the Tolpuddle martyrs case in 1834 which helped kill off the GNCTU. The law was used in an increasingly restrictive manner, rendering union activity almost impossible (an illiterate workforce could not read and sign declarations, instead undergoing entry rituals and oaths, hence Loveless' tactics, then declared illegal under an old naval mutiny law). Candidates may know that Melbourne and government law officers advised Frampton on how to use the 1797 law and **Loveless in D** catalogues the pressures applied. Candidates might confirm this with reference to the Glasgow Spinners Case in 1837 (where the spinners' leader was deported after being charged with conspiracy over the murder of a blackleg).

A case could also be made that weakness was due to the **nature of the economy** and conditions in general. **Loveless in D** refers to the very low wages in rural areas, and the **cartoon** mentions the non payment of subscriptions. **Place in A** mentions the link between population and wages and to technical changes in the economy (machinery) that deskilled workers. Later (1840s) this is corroborated by **Burt in E** when he refers to the abundance of unskilled labour desperate for work, hence low wages. In the rural areas there was mechanisation and an overstocked labour supply that disadvantaged Union activity whilst in the urban areas neither artisans nor factory workers found it easy to control new economic forms in which they had no ownership and in which the educated consensus was for a freer market and *laissez faire*. As **Burt in E** comments, from the vantage of hindsight, they were 'not destined to prevail at that time'.

The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886**2 (a) Study Sources A and B**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the views of Disraeli on extending the right to vote. [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 are speeches to Parliament by Disraeli and both comment on extending the suffrage. In both there is caution. In 1865 it is only to happen if the opportunity is favourable and as a matter of necessity. Disraeli implies that he is merely considering a remote possibility. In 1867 he is again at pains to suggest that his proposal will extend the vote no more than the Gladstone/Russell Bill of 1866. He relies on the personal payment of rates to exclude the many that would, as Householders, otherwise get the vote. He is not pursuing mere numbers, although he goes on in the same speech to admit that change has created numbers which it is ‘desirable’ to enfranchise. In both proposals he is concerned to set limits.

The **differences** are that Disraeli is less convinced of suffrage extension in 1865 than in 1867. In 1865 he is cautious and anti democratic, warning against extending downwards to the working man and skilled artisan. He prefers more votes for the middle class and stresses the traditional view that voting was a privilege to be earned rather than a right to be exercised. In 1867, in contrast, he has opted for household suffrage, restricted only by an insistence on the personal payment of rates and, if own knowledge is used, by other fancy franchises. This proposal would reach the skilled working man in a way that his 1865 ideas would not. In 1867 he goes on to talk grandly about change, population growth, knowledge and progress in an almost Gladstonian manner.

As regards **provenance** the dates and changing contexts are crucial. Both are public speeches to Parliament by Derby’s deputy and are thus likely to be less than candid, moulded by the rhetoric of the constitution, progress, virtue and the common good in a world that had been Liberal for over two decades. In both he seeks to avoid over commitment but has to come up with a concrete proposal in 1867. In 1865 Disraeli is concerned to scotch a Liberal Bill, appealing in an anti democratic and privileged way to conservative Liberals worried by the death of Palmerston and the advent of more reform minded Liberals like Russell and Gladstone. He is also concerned to reassure members of his own party that any Conservative extension to the franchise would be in keeping with the traditional constitution. Household suffrage was not a political possibility in 1865. However, by 1867 it was. The ‘opportunity’ of power has arrived if not the ‘urgent necessity’ – the Hyde Park riots in 1866 had followed the rejection of the Liberal Bill. The context was Disraeli considering extending the vote to appeal to Liberal reformers whilst securing his own right wing and thus Tory unity, hence the reference to no greater numbers than in 1866. He is at pains, at the end of the speech, to appeal for the cooperation of all MPs.

Candidates are likely to **judge** Disraeli’s views as changeable according to circumstance. He is attempting to leave his options open, approving an extension but qualifying via generalities and specifics according to the political situation.

- 2 (b) **Study all the Sources**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Disraeli's approach to parliamentary reform was purely opportunistic during the period from 1865 to 1867. [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.

The sources support **three possible interpretations** – that he was **entirely opportunistic** and pursued party and personal power at the expense of consistency and principle; that he **stuck to the general principle** of a moderate extension of the vote based on household suffrage and had done so since 1859; that he had general principles but was prepared to be **flexible** as the only way of securing a Conservative measure of Parliamentary reform. The question covers the period from the death of Palmerston, a key opponent of reform, through various proposals, to the successful Conservative Act of 1867.

The **pure opportunist argument** is to be found in **Sources D and E** and, according to interpretation, Disraeli himself in **A, B and C** as well. The latter three may be the more convincing sources as two are public speeches by Disraeli (**A and B**) and one a private letter to an influential colleague, Gathorne Hardy, sounding him out by explaining the reasoning behind the volte face of accepting the abolition of compounding. There is plenty in the public speeches of **A and B** to suggest opportunism. In 1865 (**A**) Disraeli himself stresses the importance of 'opportunity' and the let out clause of 'urgent necessity'. His only concern is to play on post Palmerstonian Liberal divisions by opening the door to both liberal opponents of reform (Robert Lowe and the Adullamites) and moderate radicals whilst reassuring the aristocratic Conservative right (General Peel and Cranborne), hence the reference to more middle class voters (fancy franchises). In 1867 Liberal divisions have led to resignation and Derby heads a minority Conservative government. He and Disraeli had to consolidate their reform reputation if they were to break Liberal dominance. The expectations raised in 1866 could not be put back in the bottle (Hyde Park riots), hence the announcement in **B** of household suffrage, mitigated by the personal payment of rates. Disraeli was still hoping to keep the Tory right but failed to do so when Cranborne resigned. **Source C** refers to the most obvious moment of opportunism when Disraeli, exploiting splits in the liberals and putting an end to Gladstone's attempts to force him to reintroduce some limit to borough household suffrage (£5, £6 or £7) by letting the hare of compound abolition run, accepted compound abolition. He thus admitted the numbers he had been so concerned previously to prevent (400,000 extra urban voters). The letter to Hardy admits the motive was to put an end to Gladstone's dominance of the issue and silence radical agitation but also tries to gloss the volte face by asserting no retreat from principle. Candidates might also refer to other measures electorally to advantage the Conservatives.

Sources D and E are very critical of Disraeli's tactics and opportunism, one from a conservative Liberal, Lowe, angered that Disraeli failed to make common cause to resist reform and the other from Disraeli's rival from the aristocratic right, Cranborne. Their view will be coloured by Disraeli's defeat of their 'conservative' views. Lowe uses the telling metaphors of a shy horse and an overloaded ship to describe Disraeli's tactical opportunism but there is a sense of admiration for how he conned his party into supporting a radical measure. A comparison of **C**, the letter to Hardy, with **D** is telling. In **Source C** Disraeli argues there is no retreat from a rating franchise based on residence, yet Lowe is right to suggest duplicity here by pointing

out that he must have realised personal rating and compounding were different and without the former the electorate would double. Lowe's points, albeit from an opponent, are convincing. Those of **Cranborne in E** are more personal and less convincing. His view is of one dishonest opportunism and intrigue, and he points to one of Disraeli's possible motives, personal ambition. That he writes this to a local party organiser suggests that his anger and sense of betrayal is deep.

The counter interpretation that **Disraeli held to general principles** is, not surprisingly, found in his own speeches and correspondence, **Sources A, B and C**. From 1859 he had been in favour of some extension and politicians on both sides, from the 1850s, had moved in favour of change, not least Gladstone. Disraeli's progress is marked by careful reference to principle and he never became a democrat ('the right to vote' in **A**) or shared Bright's view of universal household suffrage. He believed that the concession on compounding in **C** would be ineffective as they would fail to register. Thus there was no retreat from the rating and residential principle. In **C** he refers only to the 'spirit' of Hodgkinson's amendment, not its actual implementation. This was why so many were entranced by his rhetoric and parliamentary performances in 1866/7. He still felt, as in **A**, that the vote would remain a privilege allowed if 'virtue, intelligence, industry and integrity' were in evidence. Candidates may be aware of the Edinburgh speech in late 1867 where he was to expound, in grander terms, on a consistent and noble strategy to include the working man.

A third interpretation is a **general belief in extending the vote when circumstances allowed** (Source **A**) but like any politician in a minority he would have to be flexible to attract votes. He had to woo liberal, radical and conservative. To maintain absolute consistency was impossible. Lowe in **D** recognises Disraeli as an 'able tactician' and the rhetoric in Disraeli's own speeches could be used to exemplify this. Cranborne too recognises his 'mastery over the movements in his own party'. His ambition was to restore it and to secure the succession to Derby, as Cranborne bitterly recognised. The three public speeches (**A, B and D**) all suggest a belief in suffrage extension and all three provide evidence of Disraeli's tactical skill and flexibility. The more private sources (**C and E**) are divided; Cranborne convinced of his naked opportunism, Disraeli himself juxtaposing principle and good timing, 'the critical moment' in **C**.

- 3 (a) **Study Sources A and D**
Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to State intervention in dealing with poverty. [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 agree on the ideology or principle of State intervention. **Source A** argues that ‘laissez-faire’ is ‘not the cure’ and ‘old Liberalism’ is castigated. **Source D** emphasises the duty of the State to the working man. Both stress that the State should only help the poor rather than control their lives. In **Source A** the key word is ‘assistance’ and **Source D** says the State should support the ‘able-bodied man’ to look after himself. Indeed, the inability of individuals to fend for themselves is highlighted in both. ‘Self-reliance (was) not powerful enough’, according to **Source A**, and in **Source D** ‘haggling in the market’ is considered inadequate. The means and power of the State is accepted by both: **Source A** claims the State to be ‘not incompetent for the work of social reform’ and **Source D** implies the same in references to ‘the State to ensure economic conditions’. Further, State intervention is considered a positive force for the freedom of the individual. **Source A** argues intervention ‘may extend the bounds of liberty’ and **Source D** presses the ‘right to work’ and ‘the right to a ‘living wage’’. If there is a difference it is that **Source A** is more general in terms of conditions and remedies in contrast to **Source D** which identifies specific problems of food, housing, clothing and wages. **D** identifies the right to work and to a living wage. Both also nod to traditional liberal ideas of self-reliance and hard work.

In evaluating the sources candidates might suggest the similarities are unsurprising given that both were written by new Liberals. Further commentary on the authorship is possible. Written by a politician, **Source A** seems to place emphasis on the wellbeing of the individual whereas **Source D**, written by an academic, focuses on the broader concerns of society as well as the individual. Candidates may consider this consistent with their personal stance and interests. The dates of publication are important. Written before the Liberals came to power **Source A** is concerned to articulate and clarify the principles of new Liberalism, hence the denunciation of old Liberalism. Its purpose is more obviously political to convince people of the soundness of State intervention by reassuring the reader that freedom will not be lost. **Source D** has to be seen against the context of five years of Liberal government and many reforms. It is less concerned with presenting the case for new Liberalism as highlighting the priorities of the time, notably wages (candidates could link to the debate on a minimum wage) and the notion of the reciprocal duties of State and worker (the Insurance Act of 1911 might be mentioned). The reference to ‘the rights of person and property’ might be an allusion to the struggle with the House of Lords since 1909 culminating in the Parliament Act of 1911.

- 3 (b) **Study all the Sources**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the main reason for tackling poverty was a moral obligation to help the poor. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Arguably only **Source E** is unequivocal in supporting the interpretation although all sources attest, in varying degrees, to a widely held view that society had a moral obligation to help the poor. In addition, political, economic, social and ideological motives explain why it was thought necessary to tackle poverty.

Archbishop Lang articulates the feelings of those who were uncomfortable in a society racked by gross inequality: 'poverty in all our cities is appalling' and he is clear that inequality 'ought not to be'. In part this is because of the 'increasing prosperity' of the period, denied the poor, but more likely, because he is stung by the denial of 'every sign of the beauty of God's earth' to the poor. Candidates will rightly argue this is unsurprising in a man of the Church with strong religious convictions. Some may suggest he verges on the sentimental in his comments on the 'great multitude' whom he has 'learnt to revere'. In both respects any evaluation of the source might conclude that the evidence of **Source E** is not entirely reliable. On the other hand the author had first-hand experience of the slums of three cities and he is described as 'a strong advocate of 'enlightened capitalism'' in the introduction so it could be argued his remarks carry weight.

Each of the other sources can be used to support **Source E** in so far as they denounce the scale and depth of poverty. Perhaps **Source C** is as forceful as any scolding Elgar's notion of a "Land of Hope and Glory" and suggesting that the poor were a 'discredit'. This may be regarded by candidates as expected from a Commission that had spent 4 years investigating poverty and compiled 50 volumes of information cataloguing the horrors of poverty. **Source A** admits that it is impossible to tolerate poverty any longer. Like **Source C** the view expressed in **Source A** is based on evidence stating that 'the facts of poverty are now known' probably referring to the research of Booth and Rowntree. **Source D** seems to accept that poverty should be tackled as a moral obligation in so far as 'the rights' of the workman should be acknowledged and that 'society owes him the means of maintaining a civilised standard of life'. This may be regarded as consistent with the whole tenor of the passage which places stress on the contract between State and individual. Many may dismiss **Source B** as not offering anything in support of the interpretation although some may refer to the prospect of 'new social systems' making 'England a better place for the poor'. Churchill's strong support for the reforms of the period might be mentioned to confirm the sincerity of his moral obligation to the poor.

However, many may set Churchill's remark against the comment that follows to argue that his motive in tackling poverty was political hoping that improvements in the lot of the poor would lead to 'the country' giving 'solid support to the government'. Indeed, elsewhere in **Source B** the timing and type of reform is regarded in political terms calculating that 'the miseries of this winter' would secure support from the poor and expenditure on 'social systems' would find favour with the Lords. Churchill's concerns seem to be as much to do with matching Germany – for economic and imperial reasons? – as any sense of moral obligation to the poor. It might be argued that Churchill is alert to the conservative instincts of Asquith to whom he is writing, at a time when he has just become Prime Minister, and that he is trying to win the latter's support by presenting reform of poverty in political terms.

Certainly the second sentence can be interpreted as a fawning attempt to flatter Asquith. Some candidates might link comments on **Source B** with **Source A** which, it could be argued, hints at a political agenda. Comments about the limitations of 'laissez-faire' and the attack on 'old Liberalism' might be regarded as an indication of how the issue of poverty was a political football used by the likes of Samuel to promote new Liberalism.

Some may see **Sources C** and **D** as placing emphasis on economic motives for tackling poverty. After all, in **Source C** the poor are decried as 'useless and costly inefficients' who have to be transformed into productive members of society. **Source D** implies, softly perhaps, the economic imperative in highlighting the importance of 'useful labour' and 'the duty of working hard for his family'. Both **Source C** and **D** seem concerned to address poverty in the interests of law and order. The former regards the poor as 'a peril to the whole community' and the importance of converting the poor into 'respectable members of the community' is stressed whilst the latter is concerned to create 'conditions of a good social order and civic efficiency'. The clinical language of both sources may be explained as a feature of an official report and an academic appraisal both of which would have been objective in intention. On the other hand candidates may point out that the Majority report favoured retaining the Poor Law (in contrast to the Minority report), with the reference to poverty being 'possibly from their own failure and faults' denying, perhaps, any sense of moral obligation.

Some may regard **Sources A** and **D** as concerned to tackle poverty as a matter of libertarian principle. **Source A** emphasises that 'Liberty is of supreme importance' and that extending 'the bounds of liberty' appears to be a major objective. Equality of rights is stressed in **Source D** too. However, in both cases it could be argued that the promotion of liberty and individual rights is synonymous with a moral obligation to help the poor; if liberty was a right, tackling poverty, which stifled freedom, was a moral imperative. Candidates might dismiss the tenor of **Sources A** and **D** as the musing of dry theorists but they were, nonetheless, typical of new liberalism.

- 4 (a) **Study Sources D and E.**
Compare these Sources as evidence for views about Churchill's economic policy in 1925. [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.

Sources D and E take very different views of the policy of returning the £ to the Gold Standard in 1925. The £ had been taken 'off Gold' during the First World War and consequently the exchange rate had fallen. The decision to get the £ 'back to normal' and to link it to gold reserves had been urged by the financial sector, eager to give complete confidence to users of sterling world wide and to boost income from 'invisible exports' which were of huge importance to the economy. However it did mean that revaluation brought an increase in the exchange rate of the £ against the \$ and therefore made exports more expensive. One of Britain's major exports was coal and the decision is said to have had a major impact on the coal industry and to have been a cause of the General Strike, unemployment and falling purchasing power and therefore internal demand.

Content: **D** argues that it brought about 'the present troubles' of British export industries; **E** in direct comparison argues that it would be to the advantage of British industries. For **E** it is a heroic move which will lessen the cost of living (by making imports cheaper). For **D** it is a dangerous and unnecessary decision, rather than being momentous and heroic and will reduce spending power by reducing everybody's wages by 2s (presumably because export industries will sell less and cut wages), **E** congratulates Churchill; **D** sees his policy having a negative effect on exports.

Provenance: **D** is from an economic theorist and **E** is from the professional world of finance. **D** has no real vested interest in policy whereas the Bankers' Association had everything to gain from greater confidence in sterling even at the cost of higher prices for the manufacturing sector. Both are contemporary views but whereas **E** is a report of the head of an association congratulating the government on a policy they welcomed; **D** is a controversial study from someone outside manufacturing and finance. Some may know that Keynes was famous for his criticisms of Versailles and for his later advocacy of deficit finance so will be approaching this from a more radical perspective than the 'establishment' opinion of **E** but **knowledge of Keynes is not to be expected and marks should not be held back if there is not a focus on this.**

Judgement. Some may say that **Keynes (D)** is far more justified – coal exports did fall and there was discontent; unemployment stayed high in the 1920s; Gold had to be abandoned in 1931. However, in 1925 there was a case for **E's** view of the Return – Italy too revalued its currency; there was a strong fear of inflation such as occurred in Germany in 1923 without a firm gold basis for the currency. There was a considerable shift in the economy away from the value of manufactured exports to a more modern economy based on investment, insurance, and financial services which needed a secure currency. Churchill was at one with most of the experts in 1925 and Keynes was not the 'miracle worker' that he became to post-war British politicians. Do not look for a particular point of view, but reward attempts to assess the relative value of the Sources.

- 4 (b) **Study all the Sources.**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Churchill's domestic policies and attitudes in the 1920s were disastrous for his reputation. [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.

Sources that suggest his policies were disastrous for his reputation in the 1920s are **A , B, C and D.** **Source E** is full of praise and there are elements of **A** and **B** which stress that he retained his reputation due to his qualities of confidence, patriotism, guts, brilliance and his effectiveness as an opponent of the left.

The debate here is whether Churchill was a discredited politician by the end of the 1920s.

One view might be that his rabid anti-communism had made him a target for the left and almost a caricature of a Tory (as suggested by **A and B**) Some claim that his tenure of the Exchequer had resulted in unwise economies that had alienated the armed services (**C**) and many in the Conservative party. His handling of the General Strike has come in for considerable criticism, both in terms of his own financial policy helping to cause it (**D**) and his misunderstanding of the challenge to the Constitution being the issue (**B**). For some he came close to Fascism (**A**), for others he took a responsible and statesmanlike path, accepting sound advice (**E**). Was he out of office after 1929 because his reputation was already tarnished?

The most critical sources are from the left, **B, and** from the intellectual centre, **D.** These are hardly impartial. Shinwell was a Labour supporter on the left of his party; Keynes was a radical academic. Both write in quite a partisan way. If Churchill was a hate figure at Labour conferences, then this could be seen as entirely natural in politics. Shinwell shows his admiration, nonetheless for Churchill's brilliance. However, evidence could be presented to support Labour's dislike, for instance by Churchill's over reaction to the General Strike and his branding all labour movements as Communist. Contrarily, Churchill's attempts at conciliation and his concern for social conditions at home might be presented to counter this. Some cross reference might be made with **A** which sees Churchill as being close to Fascism. He did admire elements of Fascist Italy and there are certainly elements of his hostility to the left that could be seen as being unbalanced and detrimental to his reputation. Low as a cartoonist was a close observer of the political scene; but a cartoonist is by nature critical. Note that both he and Shinwell offer some balance in their views. **D** does not - for **Keynes** Churchill is pursuing a disastrous economic policy which will, by implication, harm his reputation as export industries, purchasing power and exports suffer. However, critics might point out that Keynes was not actually describing effects but predicting them. British export industries had been in long term decline and faced foreign competition.

The Return to Gold was not the cause of the problem and Churchill had to balance making exports dearer with the supposed benefit to the more thriving sectors of the economy. This is quite an opinionated view and needs to be considered as an economic opinion. **C** too is opinionated, written by someone with as much of a special interest as **E.** Beatty might have expected special treatment given Churchill's previous work with the admiralty, but Churchill was his own man. Should the cuts actually be admired? Would millions of pounds spent on 1920s battleships have actually been of much use after 1939? (especially given the rise of air power) . Why did Beatty want big naval expenditure? The letter expresses a candid view but it is a

'heat of the moment' response. Candidates may well agree with him and point to the damaging effects of the 10 Year Rule and military cuts. **E** is more admiring, but the bankers have got just what they wanted. The origin of the source could be discussed – this is from a particular sector of the economy. Manufacturing industry might have taken a different view. However, Churchill's financial policies as a whole have not been overly criticised by historians, and though without expertise when appointed, he did hold his position and showed some flair as Chancellor. **Keynes** seems to have won the argument about Gold so many candidates will take issue with **E** and see it as selfish and overpaid bankers getting their own way.

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