

Examiners' Report January 2013

GCSE History 5HB03 3B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your candidates' exam results.

- See candidates' scores for every exam question
- Understand how your candidates' performance compares with class and Edexcel national averages
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where candidates may need to develop their learning further

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes using Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your candidates at: www.pearson.com/uk.

January 2013

Publications Code UG034685

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Limited 2013

Introduction

This was the seventh series of this Schools History Project Source Enquiry on Protest, Law and Order in the twentieth century. The focus of the enquiry was how far the General Strike posed a serious threat to the government and the constitution. Most candidates were able to produce responses that were worthy of some credit and many provided answers that were well argued, developed and supported by additional recalled knowledge (ARK) and good use of the sources.

There was continuing evidence that more candidates were able to access all five questions. Few responses produced answers that were not worth at least basic level marks. As in all previous series, attaining high Level 4 marks on Q5 was more challenging than achieving top levels in Q1–Q4. In this series of the specification there were three additional marks on Q5 for SPaG. Failure to answer Q5 therefore cost candidates a potential 19 marks. This alone should encourage candidates to ensure that they allocate their time well, concentrating their efforts in proportion to the mark tariff available for individual questions. Q5's focus on the threat to the government and constitution caused few candidates problems, although ARK was notably absent from some responses.

There was evidence that centres are responding to advice given in reports. There were far fewer blank responses to questions and fewer answers to Q4 were written on the last page allocated to responses for Q3. Most candidates produced reasonable answers to Q1 and Q2 but many failed to cross-reference in Q3 and simply trawled through each source in turn, describing what it said or showed. Few candidates succeeded in commenting on differences in content while at the same time commenting on how much support for the hypothesis in the question was provided by the nature and provenance of each source. Q4 produced many answers that were good on content but made little or no reference to a source's nature, origin or purpose. Moreover, many comments on utility focused on simplistic learned response.

Timing was generally less of a problem for candidates than in earlier series. However, some candidates produced answers that were overlong in response to Q1 and Q2, which left them with difficulties completing developed answers to Q3–Q5. There were fewer, although still too many, responses that considered all primary sources reliable and useful and all secondary ones made up and therefore worthless. A surprising number of candidates continue to express a negative view of historians and history books and to put faith in the veracity of people who were there at the time.

Question 1

Most candidates were able to achieve at least a basic Level 3 on this question, and many provided a high Level 3 answer. A few described only the details of the source (Level 1); some made inferences without using the source (Level 2); but most were able to infer something about the negative attitude to the strikers. Other answers made valid inferences but did not support them by explaining which details formed the basis for the inference. A good number developed two well-supported inferences, which enabled them to reach Level 3.

The majority of candidates focused on the newspaper's attitude, siding with/defending the government's stance or being concerned to stop communities' suffering. Some directly described the government's attitude rather than the newspaper's attitude. Other responses were generalised and said 'some people's attitude'. Valid attitudes inferred were mainly:

- negative, eg clearly against the strike – it was revolutionary, not industrial
- scared and fearful, eg communities will suffer; rights and liberties of ordinary people are threatened
- angry and defensive, eg the strike must be stopped at all costs; civilised governments shouldn't tolerate this.

Very few responses focused on the attitudes of the TUC or miners alone, usually mixing these with the other attitudes. Those that did focus on the TUC/miners offered valid support from the sources, although mainly simple and often basic:

- Miners were determined about the strike and believed in their cause.
- The TUC supported them so thought it was a good idea to win what the miners wanted.

Overall, candidates answered this question well, with very few remaining at Level 1 or Level 2.

To support teaching and learning:

- Candidates should be encouraged to start by making an inference and then support it directly from the source. This should be followed by an explanation of the implications of this inference.
- Candidates must remember that more than one inference is needed for full marks.

1 Study Source A:

What can you learn from Source A about attitudes towards the General Strike?

(6)

From Source A you can see that many had the impression that the General Strike was an act of revolution and those people were against it. For example Source A shows that the General Strike "is not an industrial dispute. It is a revolutionary movement". This shows the General Strike as purely a revolutionary act hiding behind the pretense of an industrial dispute. Also from Source A we learn that many saw it as an uprising against the general population. For example we are told the strike will 'cause suffering to ordinary people'. This shows that many divided the strikers and thought them abnormal for going against the collective needs and wants of the 'community'. Overall we learn that most were against the General Strike as they it 'cannot be tolerated' and many would go against the strike that they did not believe was valid.



ResultsPlus
examiner comment

This is a Level 3 response. It makes several inferences and provides support from the source.



ResultsPlus
examiner tip

Avoid simply describing what the source says.

Question 2

This question was usually well answered. Candidates were able to identify the impression given by the cartoonist, such as the weakness of the TUC taking on the strong government by using a General Strike. There was also a good understanding of the way that the source built up this impression and the sense of a doomed effort by the TUC.

Many candidates obtained Level 3 by explaining how the details in the source contributed to an overall portrayal that emphasised the impossible task the TUC had taken on. It was also pleasing to see that many answers offered a conclusion that explicitly identified the cumulative effect of details in creating the overall impression.

In general, candidates answered this question well, with very few failing to progress beyond Level 1. Many had a good grasp of the question and were confident in using the source to answer it, with most responses attaining top Level 2 and above. At Level 2, some focused on the impression by describing what they saw in the cartoon, such as the TUC trying to move a rock, a man on his own trying to beat the government, how the lever of the General Strike is breaking. Some candidates also referred to the biased nature of the impression but at this level often did not deploy the skills necessary to show how this impression was portrayed by the cartoonist.

At Level 3, many candidates used key words/observations/methods of portrayal such as:

- 'This is done on purpose to show the futility of the General Strike, eg The TUC is using all its might and looks desperate and the lever snaps.'
- 'The lever being snapped is drawn deliberately to show that the TUC had not prepared well enough and had not built the strike up strongly enough to win and beat the government which hasn't moved.'
- 'The solid rock is drawn to look bigger and stronger than a man, who is shown on his own to symbolise that there was more support for the government than for the strikers.'
- 'The words 'constitutional government' are used to show that the TUC is not democratic and not constitutional.'

At the top of Level 3, candidates systematically showed how the cartoon's impression of the failure and weakness of the TUC was built up and reinforced.

To support teaching and learning:

- Candidates should be reminded to analyse individual details in a source but link them to the overall impression created. In many ways, this is a more developed version of Q1.
- Candidates need to infer the overall impression and identify the parts of the source that create that impression, but also to analyse the way that images and treatment of these details combine to produce that effect.
- Candidates need to have a clear idea of the difference between an impression and a message and make sure they address the correct aspect in answering the question set.

2 Study Source B.

What impression of the TUC is the artist trying to give in this cartoon? Explain your answer, using Source B.

(8)

Source B shows a man with a lever trying to displace a large boulder. This represents the TUC's attempt to compromise the constitutional government and break it. From this, the artist gives the impression that the general strike was intended as an attempt at a revolution. The man representing the TUC is dressed inappropriately, in a suit and dress shoes which is not suitable when carrying out physical work. This shows that the artist is giving the impression that the TUC were unprepared and unorganised during the 9 days that the general strike took place. The man is stood on rocky, uneven land, insinuating that he had a lack of support and were easily destabilised. The man is wrongly positioned and stood to lift such a heavy weight, and although he's attempting to lift the boulder you can see he's not putting all his effort into it. This tells us that the artist is giving the impression that

the TUC were not fully ~~comf~~ committed to continuing the General Strike. The constitutional government were represented as a huge, heavy, solid boulder. ~~to~~ This ~~then~~ ~~the~~ tells us that the government, were strong, stable and would be hard for the miners to beat. The lever which the man is using to move the boulder breaks which represents the end of the General Strike. Here, the artist gives the impression that the TUC were not strong enough to beat the government.



ResultsPlus
examiner comment

An excellent explanation of the impression given by the cartoonist with solid support from details in the source, this is a Level 3 response.



ResultsPlus
examiner tip

Make sure that you clearly understand the difference between message and impression.

Question 3

Most candidates understood that Source A was clearly against the miners and said their intentions were revolutionary; Source B was perceived as mainly agreeing with Source A, although many candidates stated that it was more subtle and not as explicit, and in fact could be interpreted as just saying that the miners were trying to challenge the government but not necessarily in a revolutionary way; Source C was clearly understood not to support the statement that the miners' intentions were revolutionary.

A few answers simply repeated details from the sources and some candidates included their own knowledge, which cannot be rewarded here, but they were in the minority. Most answers covered all three sources and were able to reach at least Level 2 by identifying details in the individual sources that suggested either revolutionary intentions or, where the TUC was concerned, the intention to act legally. There was evidence of good teaching in that a number of answers at Level 2 showed an awareness of the need to consider reliability in order to assess the weight of evidence. Unfortunately, when the sources are treated separately in an answer, it remains at Level 2 and these additional comments make little difference to the mark.

At Level 2, good answers typically matched the content:

- 'A provides support for the thesis as it definitely says it is not an industrial dispute, it is revolutionary.'
- 'B provides both support and opposition. It shows the TUC trying to overturn the constitutional government/shows the miners failed to be revolutionary and they didn't intend to be or perhaps they were just challenging the government.'
- 'C was against the view as it says there was a threat – it's just an industrial dispute to get decent wages.'

Also at Level 2, some candidates discussed the content of only one source mixed with the nature of others. At this level, there was no sustained attempt to select the detail from the content to show differences or similarities, nor was there any significant reasoning.

A number of answers edged into Level 3 in their conclusion, where they attempted to pull together the comments on each source and assess the degree of support for the hypothesis. At Level 3, candidates often used source content to support comments made about bias, nature and provenance. Typical of these were comments such as the following:

- 'A is clearly biased as not one positive thing is said about the miners and TUC nor is their cause explained.'
- 'B is also biased as the words constitutional government are deliberately used to draw attention to the intentions of the miners to overthrow it. Alternatively, it is not directly biased but is perhaps based on hindsight of failure.'
- 'C is also biased as the TUC is saying that there is only one aim and it's not revolutionary as it is defending itself against the other newspapers saying its intentions are revolutionary to gain public support.'

The most successful answers were those that did not just work through a checklist of each source before assessing the extent to which the sources suggested a revolutionary intent. These high-level answers were often characterised by an introduction that treated the sources in combination and then made frequent links between sources throughout the answer. It is at this level, when the sources are being used in combination, that comments about reliability or the origin of the source become particularly relevant. It was therefore extremely pleasing to see a number of answers commenting on the fact that Source A was written at an early stage in the General Strike and Source B at its end.

When candidates showed evidence from the source to support their answers, responses were well developed and coherent, and both the nature and the authorship of the sources were acknowledged. Some candidates were less able to demonstrate cross-referencing or reach a judgement in their answers. A number of candidates focused only on the content of sources with little, if any, in-depth examination of the nature of the sources. Those candidates who obtained Level 3 were more successful in their analysis of the sources; those obtaining Level 2 either matched, or gave examples from, the sources to support/challenge the view that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary.

To support teaching and learning:

- Candidates should avoid treating sources individually as this rarely allows them to rise above Level 2.
- Candidates are more successful when they look at the overall package of evidence from the sources in this question.
- Centres need to address the skill of cross-referencing so that more candidates can achieve Level 3.

3 Study Sources A, B and C.

How far do Sources A, B and C suggest that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary? Explain your answer, using these sources.

(10)

Revolutionary can be interpreted as a threat to the government and their leadership; A threat to overthrow the government. I'll be analysing how far sources A, B and C suggest this.

Source A, an extract from an article written for the Daily Mail ~~is~~ strongly suggests that the General Strike were ~~definitely~~ definitely a threat to revolution and the strikers' intentions were revolutionary. This is evident as source A says "A General Strike... not an industrial dispute... it is a revolutionary movement. only ~~could~~ succeed by destroying the Government." This strongly suggests that source A believes/gives the impression that the strike was a threat to revolution and the strikers' intentions were revolutionary. The provenance of source A, supports the idea that the General Strike were a threat to revolution. Source A originates from the Daily Mail, a newspaper (the media). From my own knowledge, ~~is~~ most of the media

(Question 3 continued) was under the influence of the government which implies source A may be slightly over exaggerated & and unbalanced. Source A suggests that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary to a large extent.

In comparison to source A, ~~source B~~ it ~~can~~ can be argued that source B suggests that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary. This is evident as source B shows a man trying to overthrow a large rock/~~the~~ boulder with a lever, that looks as if it's about to break. The man represents the TUC, the rock being the government and the lever the General Strike. ~~The~~ This cartoon very strongly suggests that the General Strike and its strikers' intentions were definitely revolutionary as it shows the TUC ~~man~~ trying to overthrow the government with the General Strike, which was portrayed as weak. This cartoon very strongly suggests 'revolution.' The provenance supports this view as it's from Punch magazine, ~~known~~ However Punch magazine is known to make a mockery and that may have been what they were doing, showing the General Strike was too weak as 'The lever breaks' implying the

(Question 3 continued) government can never be overthrown. Overall, this shows that source B supports the idea that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary to some extent.

In contrast to source A and B, it can be argued that source ~~B~~ C doesn't support the idea that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary as the source says 'The TUC doesn't challenge the constitution... it doesn't want to challenge the power of parliament.' This shows the strikers' intentions were far from revolutionary, ~~but~~ ^{and} quite the opposite. The source continues, saying 'the TUC is... an industrial dispute... no more to... constitution.' This very strongly says the strikers' intentions weren't revolutionary, in contrast to sources A and B.

The provenance of source C suggests the source may be unbalanced as it's from the 'British Worker', which was in support of the General Strike and the TUC. This shows that source C implies that the strikers' intentions were not revolutionary, in contrast to sources A and B. Source C supports the idea that the strikers' intentions were revolutionary to no extent.

(Total for Question 3 = 10 marks)



ResultsPlus
examiner comment

A very good response that combines effective cross-referencing and both nature and content to make a balanced assessment of the suggestion. This is a Level 3 response.



ResultsPlus
examiner tip

Avoid dealing with each source on its own and make sure you cross-reference them.

Question 4

Generally, candidates answered this question well. However, Q4 continues to pose problems for some. A large number of answers were more concerned to describe what a source showed and failed to understand that the thrust of the question required them to consider the value of the sources as evidence to be used by a historian.

The vast majority of answers remained in Level 2. Candidates tended to select and repeat details from the sources – the implication was that such information was self-evidently useful to the historian – but few really developed why or how that content helped to answer the historian’s enquiry. Candidates found it easy to explain the value of the photograph – Source D – in terms of it showing the use of police, army and food trucks and that the government was prepared, well organised, etc. There was also emphasis on what it did not tell us, ie what happened before and after. For Source E, candidates focused on the usefulness of being given more details and, in particular, that the government needed volunteers and expected some trouble.

A few candidates discussed the limitations of the content, in particular when commenting on the photograph, but many of these comments remained undeveloped, simply stating that the photograph was a single moment or, more unlikely, had been staged. There were more comments on the value of Source E, with many identifying that it came from the government minister responsible for law and order who was aware of the government’s tactics throughout the strike. One such was the following:

‘Source E was valued by some as it showed government plans about what they want to do. However we don’t know if this happened or not but the government’s own tactical plans explained by themselves is useful.’

Some candidates commented that the government used the newspapers and media as a means to win over the public and to make a personal appeal to the public. The intention was to make people feel part of defending the country against any possible trouble. However, others simply dismissed the newspaper as biased and of no real use at all. The concept of bias (and the spelling of ‘biased’) is one that some candidates find difficult. They tend to simplify it to mean that anything that expresses an opinion is one-sided and therefore unreliable. The fact that a source can be biased but still of value to a historian escapes many candidates.

Candidates have clearly been taught how to approach Q4. Although most focused on content, a large number realised they should be looking at how the reliability or origins of the source affect the value of its content. Unfortunately, these responses tended to take a formulaic approach, based on generalisations: anything from the time in question is reliable; personal opinions are biased; a single person’s view is unrepresentative; photographs are reliable but show only a single moment. Candidates struggled to apply the ideas learned to these specific sources and this enquiry.

To support teaching and learning:

- Candidates should go beyond describing the content of sources, which they often do well, to examine the value of a source's nature.
- After they have dealt with the content of a particular source, candidates should probably stay with the same source and comment on its reliability and utility. Generalisations about primary sources being better than secondary sources, or 'photographs never lie', should be avoided.
- Candidates should ensure that the focus of their response is specific to the historical investigation specified in the question.
- Candidates would benefit from exploring the various aspects of a source's nature and the fact that it is not always possible to state beyond doubt whether a source is biased/reliable, etc.

4 Study Sources D and E.

Which of Sources D or E is more useful to the historian who is investigating Government tactics during the General Strike? Explain your answer, using Sources D and E.

(10)

From source D one can infer that the government were very protective and ~~defensive~~ defensive. This is backed by the quote "It shows police ~~at~~ on the street and soldiers on the food trucks." From this evidence and the source one can imply that the government tried to maintain order ~~by~~ by staying around public areas where strikes may commence. Furthermore it seems as if the government are either attempting to threaten the public, which is backed by all the public making space for the government or the government being threatened hence why having to protect 'food trucks'. However the utility of the source is limited as firstly it's it's a photograph, meaning ~~we~~ ^{one} can only see a specific area of the strike so ~~we~~ one is unaware of what is occurring outside the picture which may affect ones opinion. Therefore source D is unreliable due to not providing full information so is not entirely useful.

On the other hand when observing source

(Question 4 continued) E one can infer that the government are actually trying to protect the ~~govt~~ public from strikers, which is backed from the quote, "Give me these men and there will be little fear of serious trouble". Indirectly the Home secretary are trying to say ~~we need~~ without volunteers to go against strikers they cannot be protected. Therefore both sources share a similar purpose, however one more specific which is source E. The similar purpose they share is that the government want to protect the public, however source E is also having it's utility limited as it's a newspaper which although generally reflects public's attitudes it's unreliable due to giving subjective views and in this case the subjective view is portraying the government as good.

Overall both sources are useful to their individual extent, for instance: Source D is useful as it shows an actual image of what occurred which is considerably accurate, which can then be used nonetheless it's missing what else is going on and source E is accurate as it reflects public's attitudes and

(Question 4 continued) contains key points, but also gives a subjective view, so both sources are useful to an extent.



ResultsPlus
examiner comment

A response that achieved Level 3 as it combined comment on both source content and nature to examine how useful it might be in investigating government tactics during the General Strike.



ResultsPlus
examiner tip

Try to include comment on both sources and both their content and nature.

Question 5

There were some blank scripts (and also some blank answers on earlier questions which candidates had presumably skipped in order to reach Q5). Time management is crucial in this examination since the enquiry works through the sources to culminate in this final question.

Many candidates adopted a checklist approach, working through the named sources in relation to the question, and then added some extra detail. Such a strategy fails to create the sense of a reasoned response and is likely to remain at Level 2. At the lower levels (Levels 1 and 2), candidates were often able to recount relevant details, but failed to formulate these details into anything equating to an argument. Some candidates resorted to bland assertions without any support from the sources or additional recalled knowledge (ARK). One particular concern was that candidates seemed to find it quite difficult to use sources in an argument, ie where the source does not give an obvious answer to the question at hand, candidates sometimes think it is irrelevant to the enquiry.

At Level 2, candidates typically made supporting statements:

E = 'Was a threat as government preparing to deal with a threat/Not a threat as government says there was little fear of serious trouble if they got extra help.'

F = 'Was a threat as Cook says 'beat' the government and 'greatest struggle' and they have a plan to prepare for it/Not a threat as he is focusing on helping the miners through it with food only/Mentions the government as being a threat with their rifles, not the miners.'

G = 'Was a threat as talks about parades, meeting and speeches for the miners/Not a threat as it was treated as a holiday with police and people playing football.'

Other answers did not score highly because they did not analyse the question. Many candidates simply wrote about the General Strike rather than addressing the question's focus about whether the General Strike was a threat to the government. Some candidates challenged the view that the strike was revolutionary but others suggested that many people did believe it was, especially given events in Russia.

Analysing the question is therefore an essential first step and those candidates who did this usually reached Level 3. Their mark within Level 3 generally depended on whether they had taken note of the instruction to use Sources E, F and G and their own knowledge. Additional detail supplied at this level often consisted of comment on the Russian Revolution, the moderate stance of the TUC, and the organised way in which the government prepared to deal with any possible problems caused by the strike.

However, the key characteristic of Level 3 was that the material was manipulated into an overall argument – sources were used in combination; own knowledge was worked in with the sources, instead of being a stand-alone paragraph; and the answer had a sense of being planned, so that comments led on from one another instead of being just a list of points.

At low to mid Level 3, there tended to be a focus on the strike being or not being a threat, with no ARK but good use of sources and attempts at reasoning, eg 'Yes it was as it was treated as a serious threat by the government and media.' Some candidates used the sources to argue that there was no real threat as the government was well prepared and 'the TUC tells them it isn't a threat and G says it wasn't a threat.'

At the top end of Level 3 and bottom of Level 4, ARK was used with good reasoning to evaluate more the extent of the threat – discussing perceptions and how real the threat was, rather than taking the sources at face value. More historical context was used to weigh up the extent and what was being said in the sources. Examples included:

'Source E shows government preparing as they didn't want to take risks around revolutionary attempts after the threat of the Russian revolution and the Zinoviev letter. The TUC weren't revolutionary but Cook was and there were elements inside the trade union movement which were and which the TUC couldn't control. Although the TUC sent back strike funds from Russia to show its intentions the government was not taking risks.'

'Source F: Both sides knew it was going to be a battle but the government had also had a year to prepare whilst subsidising the mines and therefore had enough time to get ready – and Cook says it's going to be difficult for them so not really a big threat [and] more a challenge to the government as source B shows. The triple alliance was not united nor communicated well so it was more difficult for the miners to try and orchestrate the strike which was a weakness.'

At Level 4, there were sustained, balanced answers, which looked at both sides and tended to conclude that the threat was real due to historic circumstances at the time. A few responses attained top marks by commenting in their conclusion on the weight of reliability or testing the strength of evidence in the sources.

To support teaching and learning:

- Candidates need to leave themselves sufficient time to approach this question properly.
- Candidates **must** recognise that they need to use sources and own knowledge for Q5.

*5 Study Sources E, F and G and use your own knowledge.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in this question.

'The General Strike was not a threat to the Government of Britain.'

How far do you agree with this statement? Use your own knowledge, Sources E, F and G and any other sources you find helpful to explain your answer.

Zbro -
TUC - Leadership
well organized

James - Local defence
militia
Communist Party 1900

(16)
The General Strike occurred in 1926,
caused by an ongoing disagreement between
the mining community and the mine owners
over hours and pay. Following the Russian
Revolution in 1917, there was a great
fear of Communism in the UK. With the
call of a general strike in 1926, it
is debatable as to whether the
TUC was ever a threat to the Government
of Britain. I personally agree with this
statement due to a number of factors.

Firstly, the TUC itself was reluctant to
go on strike. It realised it posed
posed far too great a threat to the
government and would therefore not
~~there~~ receive any of the arms. As a
result, it tried to only call out non-essential
workers, leaving health workers in their jobs
so as to cause less of a threat,
putting the government under less strain.

This lack of a threat is also highlighted in the abandonment of the strike after 9 days, indicating a "loss of control" as the reason for ending the action without any victory. This shows a fear of revolution and an eagerness to get out of the strike.

Furthermore, the Government was extremely well organised with the recruitment of 200,000 policemen under the 1920 Emergency Powers Act, the formation of the OMS in 1925, which recruited volunteer labour, and the Great Hoarding of Food. These measures, but to name a few, effectively reduced the threat of not having a functioning country, as well as calling the army to guard against any attempts at revolution. The sheer preparation meant the strike had little impact in the short term and thus wasn't a threat.

Source C also supports this view as it alludes to the fact that there was very little conflict during the 9 days of the strike and was in no way revolutionary, with

"Strikes and police" spending their time "playing football". This ease of cohabitation shows me TUC's drive for a non-violent strike succeeded, and therefore very little threat was posed to the government.

Conversely, the speech contained within Source F by AJ Cook shows a resolute and Government opposed view, "we will beat the Government". This shows an intention to attack and is embedded in the text of Source E, which claims a desire by Churchill to have a "mobile force" to put down any trouble. As threatening as these two sources make the strike sound, ~~the~~ fact the reliability of ~~each~~ each is weak. Source F, is a rallying speech and could be exaggerated, but of the two contains a purpose that is threatening, and Source E is government propaganda, so likely a show of strength and bravado.

Secondly, the formation of local defence militias ~~by~~ by strikes shows an

aggressive intent to attack the government and take control from the peaceful TUC and attack food supplies unexpectedly in their area. This combined with the threat of Communist movement ~~in 1921~~ with the UK Communist party joining in 1921 meant that the strike could be hijacked and thus posed a serious threat.

To conclude, the overall context of the TUC and the good nature with which the strike was held meant that Government planning was sufficient to negate the effects of the strike and to remove the threat to the Government.



ResultsPlus
examiner comment

A good Level 4 response that makes effective use of ARK and sources with a sustained and focused argument.



ResultsPlus
examiner tip

You must use ARK to access higher marks. You can use other sources, if appropriate, as well as the three specified in the question.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UG034685 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

