

## 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
25	16
37	19
39	22
	57
Total	

This document consists of 16 printed pages.

25

PLAN

Trade unionism was vital to the growth of Labour as a viable political group.

Despite importance of socialism, trade unionism provided policies, money and mass support.

- LRC born 'in bowels of TUC' (begin).

Dominated by unions from beginning. Solid

Vale, growth (1900-1914), slowly

1910-14 also growth in membership,

or McIlkinn 'worker class consciousness'.

- Socialists: vital for policy ideas (Fabians, ILP), gave party distinct identity from Liberals, but ultimately retains a unionist, left-Lab.

- Union money, Osborne judgement, 'opt-in': mass support. Policies, growth attribution to Labour from 4/5 (1909). Money reception 20 below paid mts (1911).

From its inception, the Labour Party was a part of the trade union movement. Most of the members of the Labour Representation Committee were unionists, and throughout the period 1900-14 the Labour's fate was inextricably bound up with that of the union: and as they grew in strength and numbers, so Labour became a serious political force, having several dozen MPs by 1914. Labour needed the ideas of the socialists and, initially, the support of the Liberals, but ultimately the votes and money supplied by the unions were the key to Labour's development.

new



The LRC was 'born in the bowels of the TUC' according to Benin. 7 of its 13 original members were trade unionists. Originally, it did badly in elections, but as trade union membership started to grow after the 1901 Taff Vale ruling - that unions were liable for costs incurred during strikes - so the working class became a more potent political force. The Liberal Party saw this too, hence the 1903 'Lib-Lab' pact. And just as the same link between union growth and Labour expansion was seen in the years 1910-1914, as union membership grew from 2.5 million to 4 million and strikes dominated the news. Ross Ackitt attributes a growth of 'working class consciousness' as the key to Labour's growth, and ~~there was~~ this was reflected in union support. The mass switched their affiliation from Liberal to Labour in 1909. Most Labour MPs were sponsored by unions, having ~~no~~ no independent source of income.

Taff Vale  
- but marked  
exempl. of  
impact  
on habits

general

exempl.

There were other factors in the development of Labour, of which the key one was the ideas of the Socialists. Groups such as the Fabians and the Independent Labour Party helped give the trade 'new', mass trade union movement a distinctive image to separate it from the older unions which were traditionally elitist and Liberal-supporting. But Labour's policies, even in this early period, were always focussed on

other  
elements.



benefits for workers and not on more abstract  
proccat<sup>32</sup> ideas. Labour's only complaint with the  
'New Liberal' reforms was that they were not generous  
enough to the workers, not that they were  
revisionist or welfare-capitalist. The significance  
of this focus on workers, not socialism, is seen  
in the fate of the ILP which eventually  
withered away while Labour kept growing.

So Socialists  
the key loss  
Labour?

From the standpoint of money and an  
electoral base, the most important ~~fact~~ factors  
in the growth and survival of a political  
party, the trade unions were the key. Union  
money funded Labour until the 1909 'Osborne  
Sadgerene' made contributions a matter of  
'opting in' rather than 'opting out'. The importance  
of this union money cannot be overstated -  
and when the 1910 elections made the Liberals  
~~retreat~~ retreat on Labour the latter duly obtained  
the reversal of the Osborne Sadgerene. The party  
~~also~~ ~~also~~ Liberals also passed a bill to  
pay MPs a salary in 1911: this allowed for  
more working class MPs.

not  
v. doubtful

Such as important as the unions' cash was  
their ready support. The miners' decision to  
go with Labour in 1909 was crucial in  
establishing an electoral base for Labour and  
the mining areas would prove to be solidly  
pro-Labour for most of the century. Even as  
the Liberals were conflicted between their  
traditionally aristocratic/business base and their 'New

expl.

\*Liberal' appeals to the vast working class,  
The unions provided a reliable vote and a  
ready-made grassroots organisation. Even though  
Labour's performance in key-elections from 1910-14  
was often far from impressive, it was steadily  
building up support in local councils.

While the growth of the trade unions was  
not the only factor in the development of  
Labour from 1900-1914, it was definitely the  
most significant. Union support provided the  
ready financial help with funds, votes and an  
electoral base, and while the temporary support  
of the Liberals and the ideas of the Socialists  
helped Labour along the way, it was these  
three factors which ultimately determined  
the survival and success of Labour.

limited depth  
clear  
answer  
in some  
aspects  
fairly  
considered.

B3

~~16~~  
16



37

~~PLAN~~ In short, yes it does. Labour policies were not revolutionary: had precedents. But they were necessary, radical and 'great'. <sup>Person</sup>

- Social: N.I. N.A. NHS especially important: ~~Labour patch patchwork into organised system.~~ Some precedents: New Lib, Chamberlain. 'Labour's Ample hour'.
- ~~Automation: reform, a close connection by connection to full employment.~~ Not radical: 'from above'.
- Economic: complex but orthodox. + Education: no real changes.

When talking about Labour's domestic policies 1945-50, 'reform' is the key word. None of their policies were revolutionary: despite the left of the party's insistence, socialism was not introduced. The class system did not fundamentally change. Nevertheless, Labour's reforms were truly astonishing. It ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> true they were not without precedent, but the political will and effort needed to actually enact them was considerable, yet even in adverse economic conditions, the Attlee government passed an astonishing 342 acts. For the sheer scale ~~and~~ of reform, not only was it a great reforming administration, it was quite possibly the greatest.

The key area of reform was social policy. The 1946 National Insurance Act was preceded in 1911 by Lloyd George's, and extended its provisions. There were also acts passed concerning

Scale  
clear  
w



Family allowances, industrial injuries and National Assistance (for those who had no source of income). Not only were these acts reforming, they were universal. The new welfare state, unlike the old reforms - insurance, ~~not free~~ but piecemeal - was for all to use and contribute to. And unlike earlier reforms passed by earnest radicals such as Lloyd George and Neville Chamberlain, they were systematic: based on the popular Beveridge Report. Welfare wasn't new, but a universal and contextual welfare state was. It was not a revolution, but equally, it was a series of reforms like no other.

Arguably the cornerstones of the new welfare state was the National Health Service (NHS), created in 1946 and formally implemented two years later. It was a truly great reform: while it didn't completely socialise and nationalise health care as its creator, Aneurin Bevan, wanted it to, it provided health care to the population free at the point of access: a radical step up from the previous patchwork of 'friendly societies'. As Henry Pelling states, this truly was 'Labour's finest hour'.

There are arguments to be made against the view of Labour as great reformer, but they are at best only not convincing or significant enough to outweigh the arguments in favour. From an economic Labour stuck to its Clause IV of its constitution and duly nationalised the coal, steel



coal, gas, electricity, road transport, air traffic control, ~~the~~ the railways and iron. But while Morrison, ~~was~~ who oversaw these nationalisations, was ~~not~~ no socialist. For him 'public ownership' simply meant purchasing in civil servants to replace the management, and no meaningful moves were made towards 'workers' democracy' or co-operation. Despite the conservatism of this process, however, it must still be seen as a reform - certainly relative to the non-or-less 'laissez-faire' policy of the interwar years, especially by committing to full employment.

Some discussion here

In its handling of the economy, Labour too proved traditionalist. While Hugh Dalton experimented with macroeconomic policy of 1947, the bitter winter of 1947 and subsequent Sterling crisis, resulted in austerity, & presided over by the austere Stafford Cripps. ~~Liberal in education~~, classical policies were pursued to prop up the Sterling: cuts and deflation. Liberal in education no real reforms were made, though to be fair the Butler Act of 1944 had already dealt with that area.

arg skewed to 'radical'

Despite remaining conservative in some areas, overall the Labour government of 1945-50 can rightly be called a 'great reforming administration'. Superstated by the traditionalist but earnest Attlee, cabinet members such as Bevan and Morrison enacted some of the most wide-reaching and important reforms in British history, creating the universal welfare state which is still with us today even as nationalisations were reversed and the economy changed beyond recognition. Where it national,

also not



Re Labour administration was not only radical but risky. It quite simply made Britain a better country to live in, and there can be no higher standard for reform.

Some blurred  
lines but very  
doubtless & analysis

32  
(19)

39. PLAN Same underlying framework and assumptions: postwar consensus i.e. commitment to full employment, state intervention in economy. But different <sup>pol</sup> policies, esp. social, plus Labour denial of any mess of economy.
- Sim. Similar: increased public spending. Broadly accepted the unions (Hugh Wilson tried reform). Tried to limit immigration. Broadly expansionist economics.
  - Different: Labour's social reforms (NHS) v. Tory reaction. Labour denial of economy v. Tory budget politics. Labour failed attempts at modernisation (National Plan) v. Tory complacency. Labour reorganisation v. Tory reform.

Re governments of 1951-70, at both political stages, operated in the same basic postwar framework: a commitment to full employment, the importance of the welfare state and state intervention in the economy. So that even many of their policies were broadly similar: both parties increased

Some

public spending and effectively appeared. The unions; both were focused more on growth and employment than on inflation, and both dealt similarly with immigration. At the same time, though, there were marked differences: in social policy the Conservatives effectively did nothing, while Labour introduced the reforms known collectively as the 'permissive/consent society'. Labour also had to contend with Conservative economic mismanagement and attempted structural reform. To call all their policies broadly similar would therefore be an insult to Labour's attempt at change.

When the Conservatives entered office in 1951 they had already committed to the reforms of the previous ~~general~~ government: from pamphlets such as 'The Industrial Charter' and 'One Nation' promised that the Tories would run the welfare state more efficiently, not abolish it. And indeed, expenditure on public services increased under the Conservatives, just as it did under Wilson. Of the three Conservative prime ministers of the period, Harold Macmillan was the most committed to the postwar consensus, having seen the effects of depression in the 1930s. He was advised by expansionary budgets even against the advice of his Treasury team, who promptly resigned when he refused to make enough cuts for their liking. If anything, Labour were slightly less expansionary.

Both parties also sought to tackle the problems of industry and inflation by dealing with overmanned unions. Macmillan was keen not to provoke

Sims

diff.

view

Cons.



Industrial action and was also generally scared of the effects of another slump, and thus bought off the unions with pay increases, whilst his predecessors also ignored the issue. Wilson did attempt to tackle it, but failed. In Clarke's words, 'he thus "Labour" thus conceded the case for [union] reform while showing itself incapable of implementing it.'

Labour and the Conservatives also handled immigration in a very similar way. Both parties passed restrictive immigration acts (in 1962 and 1968 respectively) while paying lip service to multiculturalism: a consensus attacked by Enoch Powell in his famous 'Rivers of Blood' speech in 1968. But he was expelled from the Conservatives. It seems how close they were to Labour on this issue. Lastly, both parties tried (and failed) to join the European Economic Community (EEC), both in the name of an improved economy.

Despite the similarities, though, the differences are great enough and varied enough to invalidate them. The Conservatives managed society and the economy but made no real attempt to change either - Labour tried to change both, ~~there~~ succeeding in the latter former but failing in the latter.

Labour's social reforms were long-lasting and revolutionary. Under Home Secretary Roy Jenkins, successive private member's bills were

passed (with Labour support) to legalise abortion, make divorce a far easier process, decriminalise homosexuality acts, end theatre censorship and abolish the death penalty. Jenkins called it the 'Civilised Society'; critics called it the 'permissive Society'. At any rate, more social change took place under 6 years of Labour than under 13 years of the Conservatives.

Wilson entered office promising to moderate the economy ('the white heat of his technological revolution'), but economic circumstances killed his proposal 'National Plan'. Successive Conservative Chancellors had run the economy by 'stop-go', making sure that the lever was set to 'go' in election years. The pre-1964 election budget was no exception, with Chancellor Mandelson's 'dash for growth' helping the elect campaign (the 1964 election was closer than many expected) but leaving the country's finances in a mess, with a £800 million balance of payments deficit.

By contrast, Labour - while dropping the National Plan - ran a tight financial ship and began 1964 with a £1 billion surplus, with Chancellor Roy Jenkins restoring the urge to play budget politics.

In short, while there were marked similarities in how Labour and the Conservatives viewed the postwar world, agreeing on increased spending and the postwar consensus as well as the

Valid

ch 4.



Question  
numberFor  
Examiner's  
Use

had to clamp down on immigration and join the  
EEC, there were fundamental policy differences  
resulting from the contrast between a  
Labour government keen to choose out a  
comprehensive constructive approach. Their attitudes  
were similar; their policies were not.

Controlled & organized  
response → some  
argued to be more appropriate.

B32

22