



## ANSWER BOOKLET

### READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

Write your Centre Number, Candidate Number, Name, Syllabus / Component as written on your statement of entry, at the top of this page.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

DO **NOT** WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

Use both sides of the paper.

Write the question number in the left-hand column provided on each page.

Use a ruler to draw a line across the page after each answer.

Write the numbers of the questions you answer in the order attempted in the left-hand column of the boxes on the right of this page.

Do all your rough work in this answer booklet and cross it through without making it illegible. Do not tear out any part of this booklet. All work must be handed in.

Check that you have written the information required on each additional booklet used and have attached them to this booklet.

Write here how many booklets you have used, including this one.

1

Question number	Mark
34	22
35	23
39	24
Total	

This document consists of 16 printed pages.





Question  
numberFor  
Examiner's  
Use

34.

HERBERT Henry ASQUITH and David Lloyd George, who together considered to be significant factors in the downfall of the Liberal Party in this period. From the split in the Party in December 1916 all the way up to the great election victory of Labour in ~~1928~~ 1929, these two figures constantly clashed with one another. One could suggest that their struggles in relation to the Party's decline existed in a symbiotic relationship; ~~the~~ the fall may not have happened without both. The split in December 1916 is seen as a crucial moment in the decline of the Party's fortunes, and serves to evidence how they both contributed. If Asquith had not been blamed for the military failures in 1915 and 1916 - such as the Shell Scandal in May 1915 - and had Lloyd George not consistently fought as an ~~alternative~~ alternative war leader in that context, then there would have been no motive to split. Lloyd George's constant campaigning for conscription and a smaller war cabinet in January 1916 ~~placed~~ placed him as a good alternative to Asquith, who was not suited for the job. Therefore, if Asquith had been more successful on the war front, ~~both~~ and Lloyd George would have had no reason and Lloyd George not so determined to become

General  
Intro.born  
response

arg



the war leader then the split - which resulted in Kenneth O'Morgan's words, in 'a fundamental fissure in party unity which would not be sealed until the election of May 1923 - may not have occurred. Therefore Asquith and Lloyd George can be seen to be equally responsible in this respect.

However, Lloyd George's actions as Prime Minister from 1918 to 1922 would serve to place an increased emphasis on his responsibility for the decline of the party. Whilst Asquith remained in the Liberal party - notably with the majority of ~~the~~ experienced political advisors - Lloyd George proceeded to set about destroying the Liberal party's fundamental principles and ruining its reputation. His foreign policy failings in Chanak (September 1922), and Greece (April 1922), and Ireland (1918) not only served to destroy his personal reputation as an impressive and unparalleled politician but also, by association, that of the Liberal party. Contradiction of his Ten Year Rule in regards to maintaining peace, and contradicting Liberal principles in deploying violence and brutality, served to disillusion the Liberal electorate. The same can be said of his domestic policy in this period, in which his actions in regards to the ~~the~~ 'Bedford Act' of April 1921 and the failure of Addison's Housing Act of 1919 to provide 'Houses fit for

cphr

argues.

anal

yes.

Sure argument



Herbert's served for him to lose his reputation as a social reformer. ~~The~~ The disillusionment among the Liberal franchise thus drove them towards a much more united, and appealing, alternative: the Labour Party. It must be emphasised therefore, that Asquith was merely a spectator here; he may have been partially responsible for the split in December 1916, but he certainly was not for the destroying of the Liberals' reputation as a reforming and socially-minded party. He had no influence over Lloyd George at this time, other than the fact that he successfully managed to attract all of the Liberal Party's most experienced members to his side, and thus forced Lloyd George to recruit non-political experts to advise him. Therefore, Lloyd George can be more to blame here.

This can be perfectly ~~manifest~~ demonstrated by the downturn in votes in the 1922, 1923, and 1924 elections. Had Lloyd George not successfully damaged the party's reputation from 1916 to 1922, and thus ~~not~~ drive the Liberal electorate to vote Labour, then they may have been able to win more than 115 seats in the 1922 election, compared to Labour's 144. This was the point at which the Labour Party successfully overtook the Liberals in Parliamentary performance, and can only be attributed to the damaging effects that Lloyd George's foreign and domestic policy had on

Perhaps  
- a bit  
Cautious  
after the  
split  
1916



the Liberals' image. However, despite the overwhelming evidence to suggest that Lloyd George was not to blame, Asquith's decision in the ~~May~~ 1923 election to back the Labour Party sealed the Liberal Party's fate as the notorious 'third party' in the first-past-the-post electoral system - ~~with~~ a position that was very hard to get out of once in. Had Asquith not committed to such support he would have been able to allow his party time to reflect upon the purification under his leadership that the free trade - tariff reform battle led to, and given it time to develop in time for the next election. Instead, he allowed Labour to utterly reject the party in this relationship by emphasising its superiority in carrying out successful domestic reforms, such as Wheatley's Housing Act (which ended up producing far more houses than Addison's ever did, 500,000 compared to 170,000) and the expansion of unemployment benefit, which admittedly Lloyd George did do in his premiership, but not to such an extent. Therefore, by the 1924 election, the Liberals had no opportunity to ~~re~~organise and attract for the next election, winning only 40 seats compared to Labour's 151. This can be shown by the fact that by 1929, the Liberals had ~~no~~ funds and were unified under ~~the~~ Lloyd George, possessing

yes

yes



a Manifesto rich with Plans of M.O.M to be funded by an increase in ~~the~~ income tax to raise \$200 million. However, this was at a time when the world plunged into ~~the~~ recession with the Wall Street Crash, and so Labour's 'No Marking' and the 'Tories' 'Safety First' campaigns proved to be much more appealing at a time when financial stability was required. ~~Therefore~~ <sup>Asquith</sup> had Asquith not committed the Liberals to propping up Labour in 1923, then the Green, orange and yellow papers of their ~~the~~ 1923 election campaign may have seen fit to better use ~~the~~ when the economy was not in a tailspin, thus maybe allowing them to ruin their fortunes. So, in this period, Asquith can be blamed for allowing Labour to place the final nail in the Liberals' coffin.

Some points -  
argument - tries to  
relate Corbett to  
the 9. Lesson war  
- Mann Debate

B2  
22

35

The inter-war years, as identified by J.B. Priestly, was a period of mixed fortunes for the British people. In his 1934 book 'An English Journey', Priestly identified three very distinct Englands in the air:



'Old' England; 'Industrial' England; and 'Suburban' England. The last two appear to have been characterised perfectly by the north and south of England respectively. The economic depression in the north can be attributed to the decline of the old 'Staple' industries, and the subsequent inability or their belief to diversify into more modern industries, as is what happened in the south.

N-S  
spen

The post-war decline in world trade must be viewed as the main reason as to why precisely 'Industrial' England suffered so much more. The decline in demand due to overproduction (from WWI levels of manufacturing, this being of huge proportions) led to these industries' profit margins declining significantly. Demand for steel, iron, and coal - the ~~the~~ dominant industries in the north - collapsed completely after this phase of overproduction, and meant that the industries could not afford to update their 'primitive' manufacturing and managerial techniques and diversify into other ~~industries~~ industries. This decline in demand would have been compounded further by the foolish decision in 1925 to return to the Gold Standard, which had the effect of making British exports extremely expensive, and foreign imports very cheap. Thus, not only did the export market witness a huge decline, but also the domestic industries and producers,

explan

explan



With their prices becoming uncompetitive in relation to foreign steel from rising powers such as Japan. Furthermore, the commodities crash in the period after WWI resulted in British colonies being unable to purchase British exports, with their primary exports being commodities. ~~Thus~~ Thus, the staple industries in the north were hit by three major developments in the first five years of the 1920s, all of which severely limited their ability to sell produce at ~~cost~~ ~~cost~~ competitive prices, and therefore make a profit. It is important to note that whilst the north was predominantly filled with these staple industries the south was not, and thus did not experience the same levels of depression.

The industries of the south were very much a part of Priestly's 'Suburban' England, filled with cafes, cinemas, modern factories, and solely modern produce. The staple industries were very much confined to the north, with Scotland and the regions from the Midlands upwards ~~relying~~ relying predominantly on iron, steel, coal, and shipbuilding. The rising industries of car manufacture, electricity, gas, and chemicals all experienced their growth in the south, mainly in the south-east. ~~This is why~~ This can therefore serve to explain Sir William Beveridge's discovery that 85% of unemployment in the 1920s period (1924-40) was to be found in

Sord  
exphat

Conpin

new  
modern



Old industrial areas - such as the north. The north's dependence ~~for~~ on the staple industries meant that it suffered the worst from the post-war collapse in trade, perhaps being exacerbated by the Wall Street crash in October 1929, which saw world trade slump by 35%, and coal being ~~at~~  $\frac{1}{3}$  of its pre-war value. The fact that unemployment never fell below 1 million throughout these years (lowest being 1.6 in 1921 and the highest being 3.5 million in 1933) serves to demonstrate the effects that the collapse of trade had on the north, and serving to reinforce the idea that these years were 'wasted', and that the 1920s was the 'Ruhr's Decade'. Conversely, the South, with an absence of a reliance on declining and outdated industries, was able to escape the worst effects of the collapse of world trade by focusing on new industries and supplying domestic demand.

The relatively high wealth in the South ~~meant that~~, directly linked to the provision of jobs that the 'new' industries ~~provided~~ (could offer), meant that families could spend more on material goods; cars, for instance, saw private ownership figures exceeding 1.8 million in 1937 and radio licences reaching 1 million in 1938. The increased availability of contraception (and acceptance in a more modern day society) allowed the average family size to fall from the 4.6 children of

Comp  
part.

Contrast

detail  
suppr



the 1880s to the 2.19 of 1930, and thus held up a greater proportion of family income to be spent on luxuries. Perhaps what is most significant is the fact that in the South, wages always kept ahead of prices, whereas in the North they didn't. Thus, the people in the South could directly benefit from their well-paid and secure jobs and the 33% decline in standard of living in this period, whereas ~~the~~ those in the North - many of whom did not have a job at all, with long-term unemployment reaching a peak of 400,000 in August 1932 - could not indulge to nearly as much of an extent. ~~Therefore~~

In conclusion, the inter-war depression could hit the North so ~~bad~~ badly due to the predominant industries there relying so heavily on exporting goods; the decline resulting from the crash in world trade, ~~thus~~ in addition to the return to the Gold Standard in ~~1925~~ 1925, thus made making a profit from exports nearly impossible, and ~~led~~ led to severe unemployment. On the other hand, the South, with no reliance on such industries, could exploit the people's ~~growing~~ growth in real wages in a domestic market which was brimming with demand, thanks to a lack of unemployment.

39.

The Conservative government of ~~1951-54~~ 1951-55 can be credited with establishing the beginnings of 'Consensus Politics', as it is largely apparent from



their actions in reaction to the preceding Labour government that they wished to continue the expansion of the welfare state and myriad of social reforms which exploded after 1945. The Conservatives under the leadership of Churchill, Eden and MacMillan aimed to ~~the~~ maintain social reforms whilst also allowing for full employment - a policy which would also be announced ~~by~~ ~~that~~ Harold Wilson in his 1964-70 Labour government. However, whilst there are similarities there are also notable differences.

The Conservatives' preparations for the 1951 election suggested that they wished to continue what Labour started in 1945. The Industrial Charter in 1947, for instance, highlighted the importance of co-operation in industry and also the desire to operate a mixed economy, whilst the 1950 Manifesto 'The Right Road for Britain' hinted at the continuation of Labour reforms and a commitment to constructing 300,000 houses a year, which they would achieve in 1953 under Harold MacMillan's watchful eye as Housing Minister. These Labour-esque commitments can be reflected in a number of successes under MacMillan's premiership from 1957-63, which witnessed a significant number of reforms aimed at ~~the~~ keeping the wellbeing of the electorate a top priority. The emphasis on housing, for instance, was paramount with the passing of the Rent Act in 1957, which abolished rent controls and placed six million new

Continuity

cp.

Support

Living



Properties on the market. Similarly, Education ~~and~~ was committed to strongly with the effect that the Robbins Report of 1963 - recommending expansion of universities and student grants (linked - 2d) - was published, and that the Conservatives built many more ~~grammar~~ comprehensive schools than any other party in the 20th century. The significant number of acts passed under Harold Wilson from 1964-70 would reflect the same ethos of committing to public wellbeing. A number of these include the Abortion Act 1967; the ~~Racial~~ Race Relations Acts 1965 and 1968; the Theatres Act 1968, and the Open University Act 1969. Therefore, social acts appear to have been quite similar between the Conservative and Labour governments in this period. \$

However, social policies appear to be where the majority of similarities stop, as it would appear that the Conservatives in this period had no active policy deciding to update industry. Whilst the likes of Churchill and MacMillan may have picked themselves on the addition of war controls ~~and~~ and rationing, and the populace 'never having ~~it~~ had it so good' in terms of material prosperity, but they seemed to have ignored the fact that from 1951-64, ~~the~~ GDP growth rate and industrial production were the lowest in Western Europe, with 2.3% growth on average every year, ~~for~~ compared to Italy's 5.6% and Germany's 5.1%. This can be directly related to the massive overspending on the defence



Tory economic management, leading to the industrial stagnation and huge inflation and a balance of payments ~~the~~ deficits which would plague Wilson's government. The introduction of tax cuts and reduction of bank rate just before an election in order to gain popularity and votes, with subsequent deflationary measures to combat the awful effects became a defining feature of all the Conservative governments, the most notorious being the Budgets of ~~April~~ April 1958 and ~~April~~ April 1959 - both of which cut taxes by up to £30 million and were before elections. Such a non-policy as this was led to Wilson in 1964 having to deal with the 6% 15% inflation and £800 million balance of payments deficit that the Tories left behind in a completely different manner. Wilson had to apply the 'brake' extremely heavily according to Peter Clarke, introducing major deflationary measures in the November 1964 and April 1965 Budgets as an alternative to devaluation of the Pound. This was when an economic strategy had to be formulated to combat the extremely aggravating effects of 'Budget Politics' and 'Stop-go', with problems posed by Labour's manifesto commitments negating any notion of devaluation, or any notion of economic boom for that matter. Therefore, the two parties cannot be said to have carried broadly similar policies in this respect, in that the Conservatives never attempted in 12 years

*reforms*



to introduce ~~a~~ a proper one, whereas Wilson did: the National Plan and expansion of exports and industry to wipe out the balance of payments deficits.

In conclusion, one cannot say that the two governing parties in this period shared similar policies; Social acts/policies may have indeed carried on the consensus set down by Labour in 1945 and the benefits of the welfare state, but ~~but~~ ~~economic~~ management and approaches to industry varied hugely.

Saved for  
a supper

B2

(27)



Question  
numberFor  
Examiner's  
Use

to introduce ~~a~~ a ~~Proter~~ one, whereas Wilson did: the National Plan and expansion of exports and industry to wipe out the balance of payments deficits.

In conclusion, one cannot say that the two governing parties in this period shared similar policies; Social acts/policies may have indeed carried on the ~~casus~~ set down by Labour in 1945 and the benefits of the welfare state, but economic management and approaches to industry varied hugely.

Score for  
a super

B2  
234