

# Candidate Marks Report

*Series : 6 2018*

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

---

Centre No :	Assessment Code : Y112
Candidate No :	Component Code : 01
Candidate Name :	

---

**Total Marks : 38 / 50**

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.  
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

<b>Paper:</b>	<b>Y112/01</b>	
<b>Paper</b>	<b>38 / 50</b>	
<b>Total:</b>		
Question	Total / Max Mark	Used In Total
1	25 / 30	✓
2	NR / 20	
3	13 / 20	✓

Question Part

3	<p><del>It may be argued that MacDonald betrayed the Labour Party</del></p> <p>The second Labour government from 1929 to 1931 came about as a result of the failure of the previous conservative government led by Baldwin from 1924-1929 - in which Churchill failed to deal with economic problems in his role of Chancellor of the Exchequer, leading to high unemployment and depression persisting. The Labour government was therefore initially faced with the poor economic situation in Britain. MacDonald can therefore be seen as betraying his party to an extent in his actions when calling the National Government, however the economic crisis that he faced, during a time of economic hardship in Britain means that he cannot be seen as the only factor which led to their fall from power. There was also many beneficial policies brought in by the Labour government prior to the crisis, therefore he cannot be seen to have betrayed the Labour party to the extent that this question suggests.</p>
	<p><b>F</b> MacDonald may be seen to have betrayed the Labour party in his actions when he formed the National Government. Throughout the Labour ministry there were consistent economic problems that had <b>EXD</b> faced, mainly due to the failure of Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the previous government. The Labour party was split into three different views over the economy: orthodox, <b>ILL</b> Keynesian and socialist. Those who held an orthodox view such as Snowden who was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted to balance the budget, and prevent devaluation of the pound due to their belief that public spending is 'immoral'. Those with a Keynesian view would see government intervention in the economy as the best way to solve economic crisis while those with a socialist view promote nationalisation and high taxation on the rich. MacDonald</p>



Question Part

was therefore faced with a hugely divided government regarding economic situation, and was forced to make a decision which would please some and disappoint many. This situation was worsened with the Economic Crisis of 1931 when European banks effectively collapsed. MacDonald met with the cabinet and the king ~~EXP~~ to propose how they would deal with the issue, and the only possibility was to implement significant cuts which would affect domestic and social reform. MacDonald therefore acknowledged that this went against socialist principles and due to the unwillingness of liberals and conservatives formed a national government without consulting the cabinet. In this sense, MacDonald can be seen to have betrayed the Labour Party during ~~EXP~~ his second ministry, however many of these factors were out of his control due to the economic crisis.

A more significant reason for the problem during the second Labour ministry was therefore the ongoing economic problems in society. Unemployment was still over 1 million, and slum areas persisted. Therefore it can be suggested that MacDonald had very little control over what happened economically, as he was faced with a ~~EXP~~ divided party and was forced to go against socialist principles if he wanted to fix these problems. During the national govt. however MacDonald can be seen to have betrayed the Labour Party as he was manipulated to a great extent by the ~~EXP~~ conservatives who used the opportunity to pass through Tariff ~~EXP~~ Reform which had previously been opposed. MacDonald cannot be seen as ~~EXP~~ betraying the Labour Party, as the formation of the National Government was advocated by not only conservatives and liberals, but also the King, who saw the ~~EXP~~ crisis as economic



Question Part

situation as a national crisis which required solidarity in the face of other countries in order to retain the confidence of these countries during international crisis. Change of government at this point would have been seen as unstable and problematic therefore MacDonald cannot be blamed for betraying the second labour ministry. Factors such as the economic crisis of 1931, ~~division~~ **EXP** within the labour party and the fact that reforming the economy would undertake policies which go against fundamental socialist values means that the formation of the National government was out of necessity, rather than MacDonald simply 'betraying' the ministry.

The domestic reforms which were passed during the labour ministry **F** of 1929 to 1931 also evidence that MacDonald cannot be seen as betraying the party. The most significant domestic policy was the housing act which brought huge improvements through slum clearance, which had been ~~to~~ ignored during the previous **EXP** conservative government. The government also brought in reform to ~~the~~ road safety through the Road Traffic Act which established **EXP** speed limits, introduced driving tests and ensured safety after all ~~the~~ <sup>2000</sup> road traffic incidents in previous years. MacDonald cannot be seen as abandoning or betraying the labour ministry as he even implemented some nationalisation through the reforms to public transport which brought all buses and trams under one authority - which is a major socialist policy. This is especially **EXP** significant in evidencing that MacDonald did not betray labour as although these reforms weren't extremely radical, he managed to pass them in a minority government. The reforms were also hugely beneficial in times of economic hardship,



Question Part

Therefore MacDonald cannot be seen as completely betraying the labour minority.

In conclusion, although MacDonald's actions in forming a national government without the consent of the cabinet may be seen as abandoning his party, this was necessary due to the fact that implementing effective reforms to solve the crisis would have gone against socialist principles even further. MacDonald was also faced with very little choice due to the divisions in his party over the economy, which were worsened even further after the crisis of 1931. He therefore can be seen to have betrayed his party to an extent, however the situation was in a sense inevitable. He also provided a domestic reforms which can be seen as moving towards socialism through the nationalisation of transport, which is especially significant due to the nature of the minority government.



Question Part

1.	<p>Some A-D present a variation of views regarding the budget of 1909 and the extent to which its purpose was to avert the constitutional crisis of 1911, or whether it was proposed in order to help the people, as it suggests.</p>
	<p>Some A is a speech by Lloyd George who was a Liberal<sup>5</sup> promoting the People's budget of 1909. Speaking in 1908, he was clearly intending to persuade people of the benefits of his measure for the aged and the poor, rather than to force a constitutional clash with the lords. From my own knowledge I know that the people's budget was a fairly extreme measure which Lloyd George proposed when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. It <del>was</del> involved raising taxes for the rich through a 'super tax' which would lead to redistribution of wealth. It also suggested taxes on land, which would inevitably affect the rich to the greatest extent, hence why the lords opposed this measure. This <del>some</del> is therefore accurate in its <del>stages</del> promises, as when the budget was <del>passed</del> passed in 1909, old age pensions were introduced as well as a compulsory insurance scheme for workers. Therefore this <del>some</del> disagrees to the greatest extent with the assertion that the Budget of 1909 was a device to force constitutional clash, as it explains the true intentions of the "People's budget" which <del>was</del> was to help the people.</p>
	<p>Some B on the other hand suggests that the commons were only trying to pass the budget in a way to challenge the <del>supreme</del> sovereignty <del>of the</del> and power of the House of lords at the time. The <del>some</del> portrays the House of lords as a form of constitutional <del>pro</del> protection from short term governments. From my own</p>





Question Part

knowledge I know that the House of Lords at the time was seen as the sovereign chamber of government, as <sup>all</sup> legislation had to be passed through them in order to maintain legitimacy. However, the House of Lords had a huge conservative majority ~~and~~ was therefore unrepresentative of the electorate which had voted in a liberal government. Once elected the liberals tried to implement significant amount of legislation which were rejected by the lords and were thus becoming frustrated with their ~~legitimate~~ <sup>legitimate</sup> sovereignty. The Budget may therefore be seen as a vehicle to cause the constitutional crisis due to its forcing the lords to break convention which states they cannot vote against money bills. Therefore some B reflect the <sup>assertion</sup> ~~assertion~~ that the budget was used as a ~~strategy~~ <sup>strategy</sup> device to cause constitutional crisis. However the article was published in the times which is traditionally quite conservative, thus the article may be slanted towards the plight of the upper class and rich.

Some C highlights the undemocratic nature of the House of Lords through Asquith's decision to call another election in 1909. Asquith argues that when the government is a conservative majority they do not oppose any legislation, however after the liberal landslide of 1906, the lords began rejecting all their suggestions for legislation, which actually breaks convention. From my own knowledge I know that the conventions of the House of Lords implies that the lords cannot vote on any money bills therefore this is what caused outrage for the liberals, eventually leading to the constitutional crisis of 1911. However blame Asquith was leading the liberal party and campaigning for re-election this some may be an attempt to tarnish the Ashmole



Question Part

of the lords in order to shift his own political advantage. This source then supports the idea that liberals used the budget as a device for constitutional clash to an extent, as Asquith is using it as a way to discredit them, however he notes that they "have not provoked the challenge"

Source D is a speech from a lord explaining his opposition to the Parliament Bill. From my own knowledge I know that the Parliament Bill, ~~was~~ when passed in 1911 significantly ~~reduced~~ reduced the power of the lords by preventing them from rejecting legislation, and prevented them from voting on any money bills such as the Budget of 1909. The speech ~~is~~ therefore inevitably biased, as he will be defending the power of the lords in order to maintain his own authority. The source does imply that the purpose of the People's Budget was to damage the power of the lords, arguing that the liberals were defying tradition, and insinuating that the lords had been manipulated by the liberals to reject this, so that the constitution would have been brought into question, thus agreeing to ~~a~~ a large extent with the assertion.

Overall, the sources as a whole seem to suggest that the liberals used the budget as a vehicle to destroy the power of the lords. Source B promotes this view to the greatest extent, followed by Source D which is from a lord himself, followed by Source C which describes Asquith's opinions on the power of the lords. Finally Source A opposes the assertion to the greatest extent, and is the most accurate in terms of the real purpose of the budget, as it is a speech from Lloyd





Question Part

George who was the minister who proposed the budget in the first place, then shows the true intentions of it's passing, to help the people.







Question Part

Question	Part	

