

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 :

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

Question Part

1.		<p>The views presented in source A and C, both written by key influencers in the People's Budget 1909 within the liberal party, is of the budget coming about to help people through "the brambles and thorns of poverty". The view of the budget being used as a device to create a clash with the lords over new taxes in particular such as the 20% tax on increases in property value is a view presented by those who are affected. It was obvious the lords would challenge the reforms as their background of being rich landowners would be under attack.</p>
		<p>The budget of 1909 was "raising money for pensions... and to provide against the evils of po unemployment and sickness". Source A makes it clear that the Budget was not ^{put} in place to cause a constitutional clash, instead aiming to make a British society more equal. Lloyd George argues that the rich are simply "protesting against paying their fair share of taxation".</p>



Question Part

In the years leading up to the budget the upper classes took advantage of low taxes, cheap labour and very low regulation in order to develop massive profits off of industries such as coal and steel production. As argued in source A and C ~~the~~ the reforms seen in the budget were trying to amend this although they knew the "Lords have deliberately chosen their ground" to cause a clash.

The ~~new~~ idea presented in source D is that the budget was "manoeuvred" in order to create a reaction from the Lords. Lord Willoughby argues that the liberals had aimed to weaken the Lords whilst disguising it under "welfare for the people". The budget focussed on higher taxes on ~~the~~ the well-off as well as small tax increases on middle-classes to fund the pensions Act 1909, Education Act 1910 and to fund maternity and sick leave for the people. This could be interpreted, as it has been in sources B and D, as ~~a~~ reforms



Question Part

that won over crowds of the normal working classes in order to anger the rich with new tax reforms and suppress the rising support for the labour party.

Source A ~~is~~ challenges "the lords to judge the Budget". The explanation of this in July 1909 is that the liberals knew the lords would react and therefore paint them in a bad light as they would be seen as against welfare reforms. This is again brought up in source C over a divided chamber once the liberals are voted into power which backs the argument of the liberals knowing that they must cause a constitutional clash in order to remove the power of the "dormant second chamber". This would in turn allow the Liberals in the future to pass reforms without the threat of a house of Lords veto.

In conclusion, sources B and D strongly back the idea of the Budget being used to cause a constitutional crisis. The argument being that the liberals cared "not for" the welfare



Question Part

of the people" but instead had to create "war upon the constitution of this country" in order to damage the Lords. This is also backed by the views presented in sources A and C that the liberals knew that ^{the} reforms would "judge the budget". ~~From the sources it~~ therefore, the sources for the most part support the view that the Budget of 1909 was used to cause a clash with the House of Lords.

3 In the period ~~1929~~ 1929-1931, Ramsay MacDonald was faced with a ~~wide~~ very hard task of maintaining the UK's wellbeing amongst the chaos from the 1929 crash. Trade between the UK and other nations was massively affected and caused problems for the government in paying debts as it simply did not have enough capital flowing in from abroad.

~~It~~ It could be argued MacDonald didn't do enough to support the massively affected staple industries.



Question Part

The workers within the coal mines, ship building and steel works who made up a large portion percentage of the labour parties original support, did not receive any government investment or tax breaks. However, the country was in a position of massive strain so this may not have been the best plan of action. Moreover, the staple industries had been in decline for a few years following the new generation of electricity. Although this may have been against the initial labour party motives it would have been in the national interest to keep the country working within the less affected southern electricity industries amongst others.

The decision by MacDonald to create the National Government in 1931 could also be argued as a betrayal to the labour party as it damaged the position of the party as it appeared they couldn't sustain



Question Part

a strong leadership Albert in
a time of a lot of turmoil.
~~This would be~~ However,
MacDonald once again created this
based on uniting the nation
so there could be no
arguments over what decisions
were made.

Overall, Mac Donald did not
betray the Labour party 1929
- 1931. His decisions to not assist
the staple industries after the 1929
crash may elucidate the impression
that he had gone against the party's
original beliefs. However, these were
the necessary changes needed in
order to keep the UK's economy
running especially considering the
high levels of unemployment, focus on
house building to create cheap
housing was necessary rather than
reviving industries that were
already massively struggling due to
new technology.



