

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE**

**GCE HISTORY B**

Unit F981: *Historical Explanation - British History*

**Specimen Paper**

**F981QP**

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 1hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet (...pages)



### INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Write your name, Centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the answer book. Write your answers on the separate answer book provided.

This paper contains questions on the following 4 Study Topics:

- Lancastrians and Yorkists 1437-85
- Problems facing Elizabeth I and her Government 1558-1603
- Liberal Sunset – the Rise and Fall of ‘New Liberalism’ 1890-1922
- The End of Consensus: Britain 1945-90

There are **two** questions for each topic. Answer **one question** from your chosen study topic. Each question is in **two** parts. Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

### INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- Each question is marked out of **50**.
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.

### ADVICE TO CANDIDATES

- Read each question carefully and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.

**Lancastrians and Yorkists, 1437-85**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question

Answer **either**

**1 Preparation for Civil War, 1450-55**

- (a)** How is the outbreak of Cade's rebellion in 1450 best explained? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b)** Why did rival groups of nobles resort to armed conflict at St.Albans in 1455? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Or**

**2 Edward IV and Warwick, 1461-71**

- (a)** Why was Edward IV able to become king in 1461? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b)** How is the breach between Edward IV and Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick best explained? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Problems facing Elizabeth and her Government 1558-1603**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

Answer **either**

**3 Problems with Men and Marriage**

**(a)** Why was it assumed that Elizabeth would marry? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

**(b)** Why did Elizabeth refuse to marry on several occasions during her reign? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Or**

**4 Problems posed by Mary Queen of Scots**

**(a)** What was it about Mary that made her such a threat to Elizabeth and her government? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

**(b)** Why did Elizabeth consistently resist calls for Mary's execution? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Liberal Sunset: The rise and fall of 'New Liberalism', 1890s – 1922.**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

Answer **either**

**5 The Liberal Reforms 1906-1914**

- (a) What does the social welfare legislation passed between 1906 and 1911 reveal about the intentions of Lloyd George and the Liberal government? [25]

[Explaining actions]

- (b) Why was there a constitutional crisis in 1910-11? [25]

[Explaining events]

**Or**

**6 The problems of Ireland, 1912-1922**

- (a) Why were views for and against Home Rule so passionately held in the years leading up to 1914? [25]

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) Why did Pearse and his followers carry out the Easter Rising of 1916, knowing it would have little chance of success? [25]

[Explaining actions]

**The post-war Labour government: the beginning of consensus:**

Answer **both** parts of your chosen question.

Answer **either** :

**7 Post War Politics**

- (a) Why did post-war Britain provide conditions conducive to political, economic and social consensus? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) Why did the Labour Party win the General Election of 1945? **[25]**

[Explaining events]

**Or**

**8 The Thatcher Revolution (1979-83): the end of consensus**

- (a) Why did 'Thatcherism' become such a potent political force from 1979? **[25]**

[Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs]

- (b) Why did Mrs. Thatcher decide to go to war over the Falklands in 1982? **[25]**

[Explaining actions]

**Paper Total [50]**

*Copyright Acknowledgements:*

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (OCR) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest opportunity.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.

SPECIMEN

SPECIMEN

The maximum mark for this paper is 50.

SPECIMEN

## Generic Mark Scheme for Unit 1

Maximum mark: 50

Each question is marked out of 25.

Allocation of marks within the Unit:

|         | <b>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</b> |
|---------|--|
| Level 5 | 41-50 marks                            |
| Level 4 | 31-40 marks                            |
| Level 3 | 21-30 marks                            |
| Level 2 | 11-20 marks                            |
| Level 1 | 1-10 marks                             |
| Level 0 | 0 marks                                |

The same generic mark scheme is used for both questions:

|         | <b>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</b>   |
|---------|--|
| Level 5 | Proposes complex explanations by analysing the interactions between component ideas, actions and events. Uses relevant and accurate knowledge to support the explanation. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling. Structure of explanation is clear and coherent. <b>[21-25]</b>                                       |
| Level 4 | Proposes valid explanations of ideas, actions and/or events that assess the relative importance of elements within the explanation. Uses relevant and accurate knowledge to support the explanation. Uses historical terminology accurately. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling. Structure of explanation is mainly clear. <b>[16-20]</b>                              |
| Level 3 | Proposes valid explanations that differ according to what is being explained: ideas, actions or events. Provides an explanation that is unevenly structured. Uses knowledge that is mainly relevant and/or accurate. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of explanation lacks some clarity. <b>[11-15]</b>  |
| Level 2 | Proposes valid explanations by establishing causal connections between patterns of ideas, actions and/or events. Uses knowledge, some of which lacks relevance and/or accuracy. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level. Structure of explanation may lack clarity in significant areas. <b>[6-10]</b> |
| Level 1 | Proposes simple but valid explanations of why ideas were held in the past, why actions were taken or why events occurred. Uses knowledge that mainly lacks relevance to the question. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. <b>[1-5]</b>   |
| Level 0 | Shows no understanding of how to order information in an historical explanation. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. <b>[0]</b>  |

| Question Number | Answer   | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 1(a)            | <p><b>How is the outbreak of Cade's rebellion in 1450 best explained?</b><br/><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, explaining popular attitudes towards the state of the kingdom at this time including issues of government and kingship, political and military events, and economic and social conditions and circumstances. Given the wording of the question candidates should be expected to develop some sort of hierarchy of explanations. Candidates should take into account the background of the King's failings and the popular belief, ostensibly at least, that the fault lay with his advisers. There was certainly strong opposition to the unpopular Suffolk and his clique who dominated the court. The Manifesto of the rebels requested that the King should 'take about his person' men of 'his true blood' that is, York and other major nobles. This revived the idea of 'the Good Duke' previously associated with Humphrey of Gloucester. There was also a demand for 'good governance' and dissatisfaction with the Suffolk clique was based upon popular views concerning corruption, the perversion of justice and unlawful violence (all traditional causes for concern). Candidates may also wish to make a connected, although somewhat different, point as to whether Cade was an agent of York and why he adopted the name of 'Mortimer'. Candidates should consider the interaction of events and attitudes/beliefs upon the outbreak of the rebellion. Defeats in Normandy and the strains of the French war had not only further discredited the government but had damaged trade and exposed the southeast coast to French raids. Candidates might be expected to use this kind of issue to discuss the extent to which Cade's rebels raised national issues as well as those affecting the south-eastern counties and London.</p> | [25]     |
| 1(b)            | <p><b>Why did rival groups of nobles resort to armed conflict at St. Albans in 1455?</b><br/><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be an intentional explanation, chiefly the motives, concerns and fears which brought two opposing groups of nobles (one accompanied by the King) and their followers to battle at St. Albans in May 1455. Candidates will recognise that there is a background of turbulence, and dissatisfaction with the government of Henry VI, as well as the personal rivalries between nobles. The central rivalry, between the Dukes of Somerset and York, was of longstanding. York was ambitious and rash but he had genuine causes for grievance. He had been superseded in his command in France, excluded from royal influence, was owed considerable sums of money by the Crown and had been virtually banished to Ireland. At the centre of his grievances was his arch rival Somerset. Candidates may wish to investigate ideas and beliefs as to the greater legitimacy of York's claim to the throne (above those of Henry VI and Somerset).</p>   |          |

| Question Number               | Answer   | Max Mark           |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <p><b>1(b)<br/>cont'd</b></p> | <p>It is also important to judge the extent to which York's concerns were shared by a wider group of the nobility based upon fears surrounding the King's incapacity, his collapse into mental illness in 1453, defeats in France culminating in Castillon and a court dominated by a clique (whether led by Suffolk, Somerset or Margaret of Anjou).</p> <p>As to shorter term issues candidates should be aware of York's earlier failure at Dartford, his appointment as Protector and subsequent dismissal (together with Somerset's release from the Tower and restoration to favour). The immediate cause of York's defiance was his summons to a Council at Leicester, the purpose of which he deeply suspected. It should be understood, however, that York may not have been able to oppose Henry VI, Somerset and their supporters without the support of the Nevilles, whose rivalry with the Percies had driven them into York's arms (needless to say, the Percies and their followers gave support to Somerset).</p> <p>Candidates may also wish to make the connected point that the clash at St. Albans may well not have taken place without the existence of noble affinities (or, if they wish, 'bastard feudalism').</p> | <p><b>[25]</b></p> |

| Question Number | Answer   | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 2(a)            | <p><b>Why was Edward IV able to become King in 1461?</b><br/><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, explaining ideas and beliefs concerning legitimacy with specific reference to claims to the English throne. Although the throne had been usurped in 1399 (and was to be on three further occasions in the fifteenth century) ideas and beliefs concerning legitimacy, claims to the throne, pedigree and royal blood were deeply held. Once crowned and anointed the monarch was genuinely regarded as God's representative on earth so depositions were not undertaken lightly. Edward IV did have a credible claim to the throne which some believed to be stronger than that of the Lancastrians. This had been advanced by Edward's father, Richard, and recognised by the Act of Accord in October 1460, but negated by Richard's death at Wakefield later in that year. Nevertheless, it might be argued that Edward, in practical terms, had a stronger claim since he had not been discredited by his father's failures. It might be argued that Henry VI was dethroned, and Edward IV elevated in his place, because of Henry's failings as King but this does not altogether explain why he was not deposed until 1461. Many of the nobility were reluctant to contemplate it. Candidates might argue that, in terms of contemporary beliefs, Edward had proved and tested the legitimacy of his claim by his victories in battle at Mortimer's Cross and Towton (God had pronounced in his favour). Candidates should be able to challenge the view that Edward IV won the crown simply because of Henry VI's failings, or Lancaster's supposedly inferior claim, and they may be expected to consider the interaction of events and attitudes/beliefs/ideas. Edward IV had the support of the Nevilles led by the most powerful magnate in the realm, Warwick. Nevertheless, Warwick had lost the Second Battle of St. Albans within days of Edward's victory at Mortimer's Cross. Not only this, but he lost possession of the person of Henry VI who fell into the hands of his own Queen, Margaret of Anjou. Having lost control of one king Warwick had to find another which made him all too willing to support the proclamation of Edward. The Yorkists and Nevilles were desperate men; fortunately for them they triumphed at Towton.</p> | [25]     |
| 2(b)            | <p><b>How is the breach between Edward IV and Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick best explained?</b><br/><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>Initial focus should be an intentional explanation, chiefly the motives and actions which caused divisions between Edward IV and Warwick culminating in the Earl's open defiance and subsequent imprisonment of the King in 1469. Given the wording of the question candidates may be expected to evaluate the relative importance of the various explanations. A starting point, although somewhat over-simplified, would be to present the quarrel as a result of Warwick's boundless ambition. However candidates will need to move on to an analysis and evaluation of the motives, fears, ambitions and actions of both men.</p>  |          |

| Question Number | Answer  | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 2(b)<br>cont'd  | <p>Edward might be seen to have been under Warwick's tutelage in 1461 but he clearly grew in confidence, especially after Lancastrian opposition had been largely dealt with by early summer 1464. Warkworth's Chronicle ('they never loved each other afterwards') suggests that the origins of the breach lay in Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville in May 1464, although candidates should recognise that this is not the only explanation. Warwick was already angered at not being consulted and was, furthermore, attempting a French marriage alliance. For Warwick the longer term consequences of the Woodville marriage were more serious.</p> <p>The enrichment of the Queen's family was assured by its advantageous marriages into the nobility and the King seemed to be building up a parvenu-noble counterforce to Warwick's own position. Warwick was concerned to marry his own two daughters to the King's brothers, an ambition which Edward opposed. In the end 'foreign policy' may have been the principal factor in the breach. Edward came to favour a Burgundian alliance, whilst Warwick held to his preference for Louis XI and France. Warwick was angered by the style and outcome of Edward's diplomacy in 1467 (as described by Waurin) and this led him into an alliance with Edward's disaffected brother, Clarence. Warwick and Clarence's subsequent coup d'etat was thus set in train.</p> | [25]     |

| Question Number | Answer   | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 3(a)            | <p><b>Why was it assumed that Elizabeth would marry?</b><br/> <b><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></b></p> <p>The initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, explaining ideas concerning, for example, the succession, expectations of monarchs in terms of providing an heir and of sixteenth century ideas, attitudes and beliefs regarding, for example, women and marriage, and gender roles in government. May use knowledge of other female monarchs such as Mary Tudor or Mary Queen of Scots to assess why these attitudes were held at the time. May use evidence of the development of ideas separating the constitutional role and physical aspects of the queen during Elizabeth's reign to explain changing attitudes towards Elizabeth and marriage. May use knowledge of the changing security situation of England to explain changes in attitude to Elizabeth's marriage, for example the scare at the time she contracted smallpox.</p>   | [25]     |
| 3(b)            | <p><b>Why did Elizabeth refuse to marry on several occasions during her reign?</b><br/> <b><i>Explaining actions</i></b></p> <p>The initial focus should be on intentional explanation, for example the motives behind Elizabeth's decision not to marry Dudley, Alencon or any other of her suitors. May explain this with reference to her idea of her role, married to her people, or to her early experiences of the role of wife and mother (Anne Boleyn, Catherine Parr) or early experience of men (Thomas Seymour). May consider broader issues of the problems associated with marriage in terms of the subordination of a wife to her husband and the problems associated with reconciling the dual role of queen and wife. May consider the potential danger of childbirth. May broaden the scope of the explanation to consider the danger posed by internal factional conflict in the case of an English marriage, objections to Catholic suitors on religious grounds or to foreigners in general because of associations with Mary's Spanish match.</p> | [25]     |

| Question Number | Answer  | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 4(a)            | <p><b>What was it about Mary that made her such a threat to Elizabeth and her government?</b></p> <p><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on empathetic explanation, with religious and succession issues emphasised. Mary was a Catholic and Elizabeth's heir in hereditary succession. This may be developed via attitudes towards Catholicism from Mary Tudor's reign, coupled with xenophobic attitudes, stemming from the association of Mary's anti-Protestant actions with her husband, Philip II, as well hostility towards French influence from Mary Stuart's relations. Candidates may also refer to moral outrage at some of Mary's actions while Queen of Scotland, for example her association with Darnley's death and her marriage to Bothwell. Ideas of obedience may also be cited as explanation for the lack of widescale support in England for rebellion and the plots associated with Mary. The perception of danger from Mary is also important: what Elizabeth's government could believe was possible in terms of internal Catholic plots and support from Catholics abroad. In offering a complex explanation, candidates may refer to circumstances such as the extent of Catholic survivalism in England and the danger of foreign intervention on Mary's behalf.</p> | [25]     |
| 4(b)            | <p><b>Why did Elizabeth consistently resist calls for Mary's execution?</b></p> <p><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on an intentional explanation, identifying Elizabeth's motives in refusing to countenance Mary's execution. Candidates may consider the implications for Elizabeth of killing a fellow monarch and cousin, the legal implications of putting a Scot on trial in England, perhaps for alleged crimes committed in Scotland, or for treason against Elizabeth. At a simple level they may consider the problems of proof of guilt. At a more sophisticated level they may consider the implications for relations with James VI of Scotland. Candidates may broaden the scope of the explanation to invoke causal factors such as the international situation and the possible reaction of France and Spain. They may consider the changes in circumstances that influenced Elizabeth's resistance to sanctioning Mary's execution, including increasing pressure from parliament and her Councillors after various plots and Elizabeth's excommunication.</p>  | [25]     |

| Question Number | Answer  | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 5(a)            | <p><b>What does the social welfare legislation passed between 1906 and 1911 reveal about the intentions of Lloyd George and the Liberal government?</b></p> <p><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on an intentional explanation, examining the motives of the Liberal government during the period. Candidates may refer to the intention to provide direct relief to the most vulnerable in society, the intention to encourage the poor to provide for themselves via contributory schemes that were subsidised by the state, and the intention to make the rich contribute to the welfare of the poor through a graduated system of taxation. Candidates may refer to the difficulties experienced with the 1909 budget and what this shows about the determination of the Liberals in fighting the 1910 election campaign to defend their welfare legislation in the face of Conservatism alarmism regarding Liberal policies. Candidates may test their explanation of Liberal intentions against their willingness to alter the constitution with the 1911 Parliament Act, or consider the circumstances of the increasing support enjoyed by Labour and the need for the Liberals to appear as the party dedicated to the welfare of workers and poorer people if they were to survive this development.</p> | [25]     |
| 5(b)            | <p><b>Why was there a constitutional crisis in 1910-11?</b></p> <p><i>Explaining events</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on a causal explanation, identifying and explaining the circumstances and events leading to the passing of the Parliament Act of 1911. The opposition of the Lords to Liberal policies such as Gladstone's Home Rule legislation, for example in 1894, could be identified as a situation making their opposition a possibility, while their opposition to the graduated taxation that would affect the power base of the landed elite, could be cited as circumstances making their opposition more likely. The redefinition of Liberalism to counter the threat of Labour by moving further to the left, in conjunction with the precise circumstances of the rejected budget of 1909 and two elections of 1910 which left the Liberals dependent on Irish Nationalist support should be weighed against each other in reaching a judgement.</p>   | [25]     |

| Question Number | Answer  | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 6(a)            | <p><b>Why were views for and against Home Rule so passionately held in the years leading up to 1914?</b></p> <p><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on an empathetic explanation concerning the holding of views on Ireland: Home Rule, Unionism and republican nationalism. The development of these ideas and the reasons for different groups holding them should be explained. English procrastination in addressing the issues associated with ruling Ireland had led to the development of views that could not be appeased by Home Rule, such as the republican nationalism of Sinn Fein and the loyalist Unionism of Ulster. Candidates may invoke other explanatory modes in assessing why Ireland had reached the brink of civil war by 1914. The need for the Liberals to seek Irish nationalist support, the need to invoke the 1911 Parliament Act before the Home Rule Bill could become law and the characteristics of the British military presence in Ireland might be used to reach a judgement about the reasons for the views being held so passionately.</p>   | [25]     |
| 6(b)            | <p><b>Why did Pearse and his followers carry out the Easter Rising of 1916, knowing it would have little chance of success?</b></p> <p><i>Explaining actions</i></p> <p>The initial focus should be on an intentional explanation, identifying and explaining the motives of Pearse and his followers that led to them carrying out the Easter Rising. These include the mystical precedents and glorious sacrifices, as Pearse saw it, of former martyrs, and the Socialism of Connolly, the trade union leader. Candidates should also address the issue of 'knowing it would have little success', perhaps emphasising the Pearse's perceptions of his heroism and martyrdom. The desire to inspire future generations may also be cited. The circumstances of 1916, with the British government engaged in a major European war, removing from Ireland thousands of moderate Irishmen who might otherwise have opposed the rising, the promise of arms to Germany and even the circumstances of a holiday weekend when many of the British officers stationed in Dublin would be at the races could all be included in a complex explanation of why Pearse and his followers undertook the uprising. The wider context of the long struggle for Home Rule which had been postponed yet again by the outbreak of war in 1914 could also be used in analysing the reasons for the rising being carried out at the time that it was.</p> | [25]     |

| Question Number | Answer   | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 7(a)            | <p><b>Why did post-war Britain provide conditions conducive to political, economic and social consensus?</b><br/> <i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></p> <p>Arguably, the greatest threat to the success of Democratic Socialism came from the Left rather than the Right. The Conservatives were in disarray, with their leading lights cheering on the reform programme. However, Consensus could not be finally achieved until the perceived threat from the Communist Party could not be destroyed – or at least neutralised. The CPGB attracted over 100,000 votes in 1945 and systematic infiltration of the trade union movement would follow. Communism was held in check by the actions of the Government in collaboration with more moderate trade union leaders; but more than this, it was discredited by Stalinist excesses in Russia, by soviet aggression in Eastern Europe and by the actions of several high-profile traitors. This confirmed to the voters of middle ground, middle England that, whilst Democratic Socialism was acceptable, nothing more extreme would be tolerated.</p>   | [25]     |
| 7(b)            | <p><b>Why did the Labour Party win the General Election of 1945?</b><br/> <i>Explaining events.</i></p> <p>Explanation of the Labour victory in 1945 is necessarily complex. The economic misery and persistent appeasement of fascist dictators that seemed to characterise the 1930s discredited the Conservatives and all they stood for. Despite winning the war, Churchill's election speeches, with their crude appeals to patriotism and equally crude attempts to link the Labour Party with the worst excesses of Stalinist Russia, indicated significant misjudgement of the mood of the British people in 1945. For this had changed as a result of wartime experience and took almost everyone by surprise. The perceived benefits of a well-organised command economy, of adequate if not plentiful food supplies and of the effective removal of social privilege gave the people of England a glimpse of how a society based on social justice and equality of opportunity might work. The failure of the Conservative-led Coalition to implement the Beveridge Report of 1942, combined with Butler's Education Act of 1944, which was a worthy reform but one that did nothing to abolish the privileged status of public schools, convinced the electorate of 1945 that the society they wanted was more likely to be realised under the democratic socialism of a Labour government. The result of the 1945 General Election was not, therefore, an ungrateful rejection of traditional values but the enthusiastic embrace of a brave new world.</p> | [25]     |

| Question Number    | Answer  | Max Mark    |
|--------------------|---|-------------|
| 8(a)               | <p><b>Why did ‘Thatcherism’ become such a potent political force from 1979?</b></p> <p><b><i>Explaining ideas, attitudes and beliefs</i></b></p> <p>The situation as Margaret Thatcher perceived it on April 2, 1982 was far from auspicious. The Chiefs of Staff advised against military intervention on the grounds that it was likely to fail on the grounds that it would be very difficult to conduct a full-scale war 8,000 miles from home. The easy (and by far the least expensive) option would be to evacuate and resettle the islanders and negotiate away sovereignty of the islands. This would be consistent with the policy of ‘decolonisation’ that had been going on in different parts of the world for some years. A more aggressive option, short of using military force, would be to apply diplomatic pressure and threaten Argentina with economic sanctions. This was done, and might have had the desired effect over a longer term, but was ineffective in any immediate sense. The only other option was military force – and all the expense and danger that this entailed. Thatcher was assisted in making the decision by a critical contingent factor – controversial naval cuts (that would have scrapped many of the Navy’s surface warships) had not yet been implemented, so carriers, such as ‘Hermes’ and ‘Invincible’ were still available to lead a task force to the South Atlantic. It is also unlikely that Mrs. Thatcher would have ignored the benefits that military victory could bestow on the sagging popularity of her government in the opinion polls. In the end, she decided on the least easy but potentially most lucrative option. In other words, she took a huge gamble.</p> | [25]        |
| 8(b)               | <p><b>Why did Mrs. Thatcher decide to go to war over the Falklands in 1982?</b></p> <p><b><i>Explaining actions</i></b></p> <p>To explain why the Thatcher Government decided to re-take the Falklands, we have to recognise that the explanation is complex – relying on the <u>interaction</u> of several factors, some weighty, others apparently trivial, some intended, and others fortuitous. The most obvious example of an external, contingent event imposing itself on the decision-making process was the Argentinian invasion that set the crisis in motion. This triggered a flurry of diplomatic, military and political activity, during which a lot of very important decisions had to be made at great speed, since the longer it took to respond the more established the Argentine military presence in the islands would become. ....In many ways, the most important factor was the one that occurred by chance – the fact that the planned naval cuts had yet to be implemented, meaning that sufficient surface warships were available to give Thatcher the option of military retaliation. ....The final interaction would have surrounded the decision itself, when immediate practical details and feasibility plans were jostling for priority with wider diplomatic initiatives and even wider considerations of imperial citizenship and the role of Britain as a world power.</p>  | [25]        |
| <b>Paper Total</b> |   | <b>[50]</b> |