**Paper 2 Practice Paper #1**

Q1) Read again the first part of Source A from lines 1 to 12.

* Choose four statements below which are true.
* Shade the circles in the boxes of the ones that you think are true.
* Choose a maximum of four statements.
* If you make an error cross out the whole box.
* If you change your mind and require a statement that has been crossed out then draw a circle around the box. [4 marks]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Over 12,000 people have died from Cholera | T |
| 6,500 of those deaths occurred south of the Thames | T |
| 2,000 people a week were dying in these areas |  |
| The writer claims Lambeth is the worst area of all for cholera |  |
| Jacob’s Island survived the Great Fire of London | T |
| Huge improvements have been made to the area since the Great Fire |  |
| Jacob’s Island is over a hundred years move advanced than any surrounding area |  |
| The writer refers to Jacob’s Island as the capital of cholera | T |

\_\_\_/4

Q2) You need to refer to Source A and Source B for this question.

 Both sources describe the different ways poverty has impacted on people.

 Use details from both sources to write a summary of what you understand about the different ways poverty has impacted on people. [8 marks]

* Whilst both articles look at the negative effects of poverty on groups of people, Source A focuses on the destructive impact of disease as a byproduct of extreme poverty, whereas Source B focuses on governmental policies of austerity and how they have increased poverty in Britain.
* Source A looks in detail at Bermondsey and how unhygienic conditions (“bounded on the north and east by filth and fever, and on the south and west by want, squalor, rags and pestilence) have contributed to the spread of disease (“ravages of the pestilence in this malarious quarter”).
* In contrast, Source B primarily focuses on the impact of austerity on the poor in Britain (“abundant evidence of the damage wrought by austerity”) and argues money could have transformed the lives of these people (“Money that could have transformed the lives of the poorest has gone instead to tax cuts for the wealthy.”)
* In Source A, the writer describes the conditions he experiences as part of his visit (“the air has literally the smell of a graveyard”, “the air is thickly charged with this deadly gas”) and how the unhygienic conditions have contributed to the amount of disease in the area (“the dark streaks of filth down the walls where the drains from each house discharge themselves”).
* In contrast, Source B refers to a number of statistics to put across the writer’s opinions on austerity (“It is shocking and shaming that 4 million people live more than 50% below the poverty line”) and argues people from specific backgrounds have been heavily impacted on by austerity (“the costs of austerity have fallen so disproportionately upon the poor, women, ethnic minorities, children, single parents, and people with disabilities”). The writer of Source B quotes UN special rapporteur Professor Alston to explain his views on the government’s attitudes towards austerity (“He has described ministers as unconcerned; conversations have revealed a [staggering level of ignorance](https://twitter.com/Anoosh_C/status/1063405551852404736) and indifference”).
* Additionally, Source A describes the condition of the local water (“the bridges are swollen carcasses of dead animals, almost bursting with the gases of putrefaction”) and describes the conditions of the homes of local people (“until the last sleep of all comes upon them years before its time”), implying people die well before they should do because of their living conditions.
* Finally, the writer of Source A describes the people who live in the town and how they are affected by their squalor (“Either their skins are white, like parchment, telling of the impaired digestion”) and ends the extract by describing the young children of Bermondsey (“the poor emaciated things are suffering from continual inhalation of the vapour of carbonate of ammonia and other deleterious gases.
* In contrast, the writer of Source B looks at politicians rather than ordinary people and argues the government’s attitude towards poverty in Britain is insulting (“This is as inane as it is insulting to the 1.5 million people living in destitution”) and implies those running the country choose to ignore the issues with poverty in the UK or pretend it does not exist (“You just have to be willing to see – or be forced to do so” and argues it will be a ‘national embarrassment’ if we ignore the findings of the UN report.

Q3) You now need to refer only to Source B from lines 1 to 18.

 How does the writer use language to describe the impact of austerity on poor people? [12 marks]

* The very first sentence of the editorial, "Truth alone is not enough", provides an impact on the reader because from the very start it implies the truth about poverty in the country is known but it will not be enough to change which gets to the core of the writer's argument that the government is aware of poverty but refuses to do anything about it.
* The writer continues in this vein when they write, "It has been only too easy for campaigners and experts to amass abundant evidence of the damage wrought by austerity." The adjective 'abundant' suggests there is a huge amount of evidence to dismiss any notion of denying the existence of extreme poverty, and the verb 'wrought' helps to paint an association of suffering and callousness with austerity. Wrought means to beat out or hammer, suggesting austerity is cruel and aggressive.
* Additionally, the writer makes the direct contrast between the lack of funding in public services and the welfare state to an allusion to tax cuts for the wealthiest members of society: "Money that could have transformed the lives of the poorest has gone instead to tax cuts for the wealthy."
* In order to help accentuate the issues that are being caused by austerity in British society, the writer employs alliteration: "how divided, damaged and diminished the nation is becoming." They couple this with sibilance to further exaggerate their point: "Sometimes people must be shamed into action."
* The writer alludes to the UN's special rapporteur to provide added authencity to his arguments, directly quoting his report on several occasions: "the UK government has inflicted “great misery” through “mean-spirited, and often callous” policies; that it has done so by choice; and that Brexit is set to make matters much worse."
* Finally, the writer uses metaphors to highlight the need for change: The difference is that his position and plain speaking have exposed this country before the world’s gaze." The whole world, the writer argues, is now watching us and waiting, and this is designed to affect our common "conscience" and "self-respect".

Q4) For this question, you need to refer to the whole of Source A, together with the whole of Source B.

 Compare how the writers convey their different perspectives on poverty.

 In your answer, you could:

* compare their different perspectives on poverty
* compare the methods the writers use to convey their perspectives
* support your response with references to both texts.

 [16 marks]

* Both sources provide very different perspectives and attitudes on poverty. Source A describes the conditions that the people of Bermondsey live in during the period and seems to condemn the situation without offering recommendations of how to do so, whereas Source B condemns the scale of poverty in Britain and pins the blame entirely on the austerity policies of the UK government.
* Source A is very descriptive and provides long, detailed accounts: statistics surrounding disease in the area ("Out of the 12,800 deaths which, within the last three months, have arisen from cholera, 6,500 have occurred on the southern shores of the Thames"); exaggerates the significance of Bermondsey in relation to the outbreak of disease (using alliteration and irony to refer to it as "the very capital of cholera"); describes the sewerage system around the area ("a patch of ground insulated by the common sewer"); provides some historical background in terms of industry and paints a past picture of an idyllic and halycon setting ("the bowers under which the citizens loved, on the sultry summer evenings, to sit besides the stream drinking their sack and ale") and how this has all been eroded away ("now the running brook is changed into a tidal sewer"); he describes the smell of the place, the places where the people live, the actual people themselves and in particular the children. All of these areas paint a detailed and disturbing picture of disease, deprivation and disgust.
* In contrast, Source B heavily relies on statistics and facts to support its arguments and add weight and authority to its opinions (“the Institute for Fiscal Studies predicts a rise of 7 percentage points in child poverty between 2015 and 2022”). The writer provides statistics in almost every paragraph to counter any arguments put forward by the government and directly quotes the UN’s special rapporteur Philip Alston as a way of creating a sense of authenticity to his ideas.
* Within their arguments the writer employs a number of language features to help convey their arguments to the readership: short sentences (“Truth alone is not enough”); direct contrast (“Money that could have transformed the lives of the poorest has gone instead to tax cuts for the wealthy”); alliteration (“how divided, damaged and diminished the nation is becoming”); adjectives (“scathing analysis”). By combining their own arguments with the authority of others and this range of language features, the writer is able to create a significant bias against the counter arguments of the government in the readers’ minds. The writer wants the reader to feel austerity has led to an increase in poverty in this country and needs to be reversed.
* Whereas in Source A the writer seems more interested in simply conveying to his readers how awful Bermondsey is and how blighted it is by diseased, highlighting its causes in the issues with hygiene and the conditions in which people live. The tone is clearly one of disgust and abject horror (“Either their skins are white, like parchment, telling of the impaired digestion, the languid circulation, and the coldness of the skin peculiar to persons suffering from chronic poisoning”) – adjectives like “chronic”, “impaired”, “languid” and the simile “like parchment” really helps to build this sense of disgust in this example). As this is a Victorian text we don’t know whether the writer has a political agenda and wants change or he is simply aghast at the poverty he sees and wishes to tell other people about it.
* The tone in Source B is pretty angry throughout and as a reader you get the sense that the writer is seeking immediate change and to highlight the indifference of the government despite warnings about poverty coming from the United Nations (“It is indefensible that we deny people both dignity and hope.”)