



General Certificate of Education
Advanced Subsidiary Examination
January 2012

History

HIS2R

Unit 2R A Sixties Social Revolution? British Society, 1959–1975

Monday 23 January 2012 1.30 pm to 3.00 pm

For this paper you must have:

- an AQA 12-page answer book.

Time allowed

- 1 hour 30 minutes

Instructions

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book. The **Examining Body** for this paper is AQA. The **Paper Reference** is HIS2R.
- Answer **two** questions.
Answer Question 1 and **either** Question 2 **or** Question 3.
- In answering the questions you must use your own knowledge and understanding of the period.

Information

- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- The maximum mark for this paper is 72.
- You will be marked on your ability to:
 - use good English
 - organise information clearly
 - use specialist vocabulary where appropriate.

Advice

- You are advised to spend about 45 minutes on each question.

Answer Question 1 and **either** Question 2 **or** Question 3.

Question 1

Study the following source material and then answer the questions which follow.

Source A From an editorial in *The Times* entitled 'Who breaks a butterfly on a wheel?' by William Rees-Mogg, 1 July 1967. The editorial was commenting on the prison sentence and fine given to Mick Jagger of the Rolling Stones for the possession of drugs.

The anarchic quality of the Rolling Stones' performances, dislike of their songs and their influence on teenagers have nothing at all to do with the case. One has to ask a different question: has Mr Jagger received the same treatment as he would have received if he had not been a famous figure, with all the criticism and resentment his
5 celebrity has aroused? If a promising undergraduate had come back from a summer visit to Italy with four pep pills in his pocket, would it have been thought right to ruin his career by sending him to prison for three months? It should be the particular quality of British justice to ensure that Mr Jagger is treated exactly the same as anyone else, no better and no worse. There must remain a suspicion in this case
10 that Mr Jagger received a more severe sentence than would have been thought proper for any purely anonymous young man.

Source B From an article by Charles Curran, a BBC executive, in the *London Evening News*, July 1967, commenting on the punishments given to Mick Jagger and his fellow Rolling Stone, Keith Richards.

I believe that people who break the law ought to be punished. The law that Jagger and Richards broke is not a small matter either. It seeks to prevent people from using dangerous drugs for fun. Look at Jagger and Richards. Each of them is a millionaire at twenty-three. How does it come about that they are so rich? Their
5 wealth flows from the fact that they are manufactured pieces of wish-fulfilment. So long as the pop idol sticks to bawling and wailing – well, we can put up with that. But once he starts to add drugs to his drivel, society must take immediate note of it.

Source C The trial of the two Rolling Stones was symbolic of the contest between traditional values and the changes brought by the Sixties. The Home Secretary sought to halt the 'rising tide of permissiveness' and introduced the Misuse of Drugs Act to the Commons in March 1970, a measure that increased the maximum sentence for drug
5 pushers to 14 years imprisonment. He was supported by the morally indignant who perceived in the late sixties a growing sense of social crisis. The leading figure in the campaign for moral revival was Mary Whitehouse.

Adapted from M DONNELLY, *Sixties Britain*, 2005

0	1
---	---

Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the punishment of Mick Jagger for drug possession in 1967. *(12 marks)*

0	2
---	---

Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How far had Britain become a 'permissive society' by 1970? *(24 marks)*

EITHER

Question 2

0	3
---	---

Explain why the Profumo Affair undermined Macmillan's premiership in 1963. *(12 marks)*

0	4
---	---

'It was the contrast in style between Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Harold Wilson that led to the Labour Party's election victory in 1964.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(24 marks)*

OR

Question 3

0	5
---	---

Explain why the Open University was established. *(12 marks)*

0	6
---	---

'Between 1963 and 1975, secondary and higher educational opportunities were broadened for all young people.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(24 marks)*

END OF QUESTIONS

There are no questions printed on this page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-HOLDERS AND PUBLISHERS

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright-holders have been unsuccessful and AQA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgements in future papers if notified.

Question 1 Source B: Quoted in B WYMAN, *Stone Alone*, London, 1991.

Question 1 Source C: M DONNELLY, *Sixties Britain*, Pearson, 2005.

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.