
A-LEVEL

History

Component 2S The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

June 2017

A-level

Component 2S The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons for the 1984/85 miners' strike. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Arthur Scargill was the miners' (NUM) leader; Margaret Thatcher's nemesis; his role was absolutely central to events
- he is speaking at a significant commemorative occasion: the 25th anniversary of the ending of the miners' strike
- he is the founder of the SLP, and is speaking, therefore, in front of a sympathetic audience
- Scargill's tone is emotional and forthright; his anger, directed at the Thatcher government, seems unabated even 25 years after the event; his conviction that the government had left the miners 'no option' but to strike is completely undiminished.

Content and argument

- Scargill emphasises that it was the government not the miners who precipitated the strike; he clearly puts the strike within an ideological context: socialism versus capitalism; he is clear that the coal industry had a future
- there is some evidence to support Scargill's view that Thatcher had planned to act against the miners: coal stocks had been kept high; the Cabinet had agreed on a strategy of avoiding power cuts for the duration of what was expected to be a lengthy strike
- legislation had also been introduced to limit union action: the 1982 and 1984 Employment Acts forbade mass picketing; the closed shop had been outlawed; industrial action had been declared illegal without a formal ballot
- there was much talk in Conservative circles about the need to avenge Edward Heath's defeat at the hands of the miners in 1974; Thatcher was committed to 'taming' the unions
- Thatcher had appointed Ian McGregor as chairman of the NCB; his remit was to cut the costs of the coal industry through an extensive area pit closure programme.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- along with Scargill, Margaret Thatcher was the key 'player' in the miners' strike; she and Scargill were arch-adversaries
- Thatcher had been ousted as Prime Minister in 1990 and left parliament in 1992; this autobiography, written shortly afterwards, offers a self-justification of her policies and her actions in power
- it is clearly valuable as a view from the highest level of decision-making

- her voice is authoritative and as forthright (pejorative) as Scargill's; she strikes an almost righteous tone, completely certain of the rightness of her opinions.

Content and argument

- Thatcher argues that the strike was 'wholly unnecessary'; like Scargill, she believes that the strike was 'political', but she puts the blame for this on disruptive, militant unions which she calls the 'Fascist Left'
- she presents the view that the coal industry did not have a long-term future; her argument is equally ideological: the coal industry could not be protected against market forces ('a free economy')
- her argument that the strike was fomented by militants unrepresentative of the union rank and file can be supported by reference to Scargill's refusal to hold a national ballot, and by the perception that Scargill was bullying ordinary unionists
- moreover, it is correct that the mining industry was in a long-term state of decline, and that many mines were running at a loss; overall it was an industry in deficit requiring heavy government subsidy
- limiting the power of the unions and the nationalised industries lay at the heart of Thatcher's political agenda, as can be supported by reference to the legislation outlined above.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is an internal strategy paper, not a document intended for publication (though it was leaked to the press – to *The Economist* – in May 1978)
- it is particularly valuable because it clearly pre-dates the miners' strike, showing the long-term thinking and planning leading to this confrontation
- it is important for evidencing the right wing drift of the Conservative Party, demonstrating the weakening position of so-called 'one nation' Conservatives (Thatcher's 'wets')
- the tone is clear and unambiguous; plain-speaking not bureaucratic 'officialese'.

Content and argument

- the Report clearly argues in favour of denationalisation and for a commitment to confront any major union opposing this policy
- it emphasises that the party must have the political will to see this policy through and that it must proceed by 'stealth', preparing the ground carefully to defeat any union opposition; it sees the miners as its most likely 'enemy'
- Thatcher was at first careful to avoid provoking the unions too much: she backed down over the miners' demands in 1981
- continuing high levels of unemployment favoured Ridley's waiting strategy: union membership fell from 13 million to 10 million between 1980 and 1983.
- Ridley's call for careful preparation was a reality by 1984–85: for example, coal had been stockpiled; the police had been equipped and drilled to deal with mass picketing; haulage companies willing to hire non-union drivers prepared to cross picket lines had been identified.

Section B

- 02** ‘The Conservative ‘stop-go’ economic policies in the years 1955 to 1964 fundamentally weakened the British economy.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that the Conservative ‘stop-go’ economic policies in the years 1955 to 1964 fundamentally weakened the British economy might include:

- ‘stop-go’ showed that the Conservatives lacked a consistent economic strategy, offering only political expediency rather than a sustained solution to ‘stagflation’ – slow or sluggish economic growth, increasing unemployment and rising inflation
- each of Macmillan’s four chancellors – Thorneycroft, Heathcoat-Amory, Selwyn Lloyd and Maudling – represented this ‘stop-go’ pattern, vacillating between tax cuts/increases, higher/lower interest rates and fewer/tougher curbs on credit
- the Conservatives used budgets for political purposes to ‘buy’ votes in general elections – Butler 1955; Amery 1959 and Maudling 1963 – supporting the argument of short-termism rather than longer term planning
- Britain lagged behind its world competitors, notably the USA and the FRG, throughout this period, averaging just over 2% annual growth; Britain’s GDP was the lowest in Western Europe and by the early 1960s unemployment was at its highest since the end of the Second World War.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Conservative ‘stop-go’ economic policies in the years 1955 to 1964 fundamentally weakened the British economy might include:

- ‘stop-go’ policies did not lower living standards; Conservative policies satisfied consumer demand creating the so-called ‘affluent society’ and a feel-good sense of growing material prosperity
- real wages kept ahead of prices; the average weekly wage of the adult male worker doubled between 1951 and 1964
- easier credit contributed to a growth in house building and home ownership further contributing to rising living standards and affluence
- ‘stop-go’ policies alone did not necessarily make Britain less productive: heavy expenditure on defence spending can be advanced as a reason for slow economic growth; Britain had costly military and naval bases worldwide and an expensive nuclear weapons programme, which consumed 10 per cent of GDP.

A compelling argument can be made that the British people ‘never had it so good’ in this period and did not particularly suffer from ‘stop-go’ policies. The Conservatives won two election victories; overseas trade grew, the car manufacturing and construction industries expanded as did the production of electrical goods. The conclusion may be reached that by 1964 the economy was far from completely healthy but that ‘stop-go’ had not fundamentally weakened growth as a whole.

Nevertheless, the Conservatives were fortunate to experience relatively benign global economic conditions in this period. It could be equally argued that the Conservative concentration on short-term expedients and the lack of a long-term economic strategy weakened the economy. Indeed, Macmillan belatedly recognised this and, with the backing of the unions and the Labour Party, set up the National Economic Development Council (NEDC) in 1962 in order to focus on central economic planning. However, this was overshadowed by another giveaway election budget in

1963: Maudling's 'dash for growth', which in fact worsened Britain's balance of payments problem and showed Macmillan's government to be increasingly out of touch.

- 03** ‘The reason behind Britain’s attempts to join the EEC in the years 1967 to 1973 was that Britain could no longer claim to be a world power in its own right.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that the reason behind Britain's attempts to join the EEC in the years 1967 to 1973 was that Britain could no longer claim to be a world power in its own right might include:

- reference to Britain's increasingly unrealistic attempt to maintain her status as an independent nuclear world power; the cost of Polaris was particularly challenging
- the view that the Commonwealth had failed as a vehicle for British influence in the world; overall, the Commonwealth nations showed a declining degree of loyalty to Britain: the failure to bring Smith to heel in Rhodesia and the restrictions placed on Commonwealth immigration to Britain alienated many in the Commonwealth
- Britain's 'special relationship' with the USA, which was also under strain, particularly in relation to Wilson's lukewarm 'moral' support only for American escalation in Vietnam
- Britain's ailing economy, which made it more difficult for Wilson to maintain Britain's increasingly anachronistic world role; in particular, the costs of empire resulted in a decision in July 1967 to withdraw from all territories 'east of Suez' but Hong Kong.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the reason behind Britain's attempts to join the EEC in the years 1967 to 1973 was that Britain could no longer claim to be a world power in its own right might include:

- Britain's investment in Polaris (and later Trident); this was not dependent on EEC membership
- the limits to economic decline: trade with Europe was growing as that with the Commonwealth was declining, and in 1973 Britain experienced record post-war 7.4% economic growth
- the political personalities: Labour's Roy Jenkins and Tony Benn, were strongly pro-European and Edward Heath was a long-standing enthusiast of the European project; younger politicians in both major parties, therefore, added fresh momentum towards embracing the European option; an 'if you can't beat 'em, join 'em' view now dominated
- De Gaulle's retirement in 1969, which removed a key barrier to Britain's entry into the EEC; Britain was 'invited' to re-submit an application.

On balance, Britain joined the EEC from a position of relative weakness rather than strength, but it is less clear-cut that Britain joined to maintain her 'world power' status, though this was clearly a factor, and this was certainly in Wilson's mind in 1967. However, probably the most compelling reason was economic. It was economic fears at home (IMF loan; devaluation) that largely prompted Wilson's government to apply in 1967, feeling that Britain was being left behind by an economically successful EEC. Heath too felt that Britain's economic position made it vital to join. It might be concluded that the prevailing view at the time was that Britain could not afford to remain outside.

- 04** How successful was New Labour in creating a fairer and more equal society in Britain by 2007? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that New Labour was successful in creating a fairer and more equal society in Britain by 2007 might include:

- New Labour built on its 'New Deal' (1997–2001) by introducing a number of policies to further social inclusion: the creation of police community officers; the repeal of Section 28; the extension of the legal rights of workers
- it continued its socially progressive approach to minority groups through the Civil Partnership Act and the Gender Recognition Act, both of which promoted greater social integration; the number of Labour's female MPs increased significantly
- there were significant increases in expenditure in the public sector to improve welfare services, the NHS and education, including access to higher education, for all
- the number of people in employment continued to grow: by 2007 29.1 million people were in work – an increase of 2.5 million since 1997; in many ways the years 2001–2007 were a boom time, with house buying, retail and consumer spending increasing significantly
- the Religious Hatred Act, 2006, provided protection to people from being abused and attacked for their religious beliefs.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that New Labour was successful in creating a fairer and more equal society in Britain by 2007 might include:

- Labour MPs such as Frank Field argued that the New Deal was creating a dependency culture, broadening rather than narrowing social divisions
- employment did rise, but the growth was unequal; the weakest growth was amongst the unskilled and the young: by 2007 5.4 million people of working age, many in the 16-30 age group, had never had a job, deepening social divisions
- multi-culturalism seemed to be failing; Trevor Phillips, Chairman of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) argued in 2005 that integration was not happening as hoped, and that multi-culturalism in practice was creating social division, not social harmony
- despite the vast investment in education, there was a growing belief that state education was failing to provide equal educational opportunity for all; the lowest performing schools were in the most socially deprived areas; university expansion predominantly benefitted the middle classes
- the gap between rich and poor was widening; Gordon Brown's stealth taxes tended to hit pensioners, married couples and savers rather than powerful corporations and financial institutions.

Clearly, the legislative and economic record of New Labour in this period appears impressive and Blair's achievements won him three consecutive election victories. However, New Labour's progressive image has come under considerable criticism. Blair has been accused of merely tinkering with the system, abandoning socialism and essentially taking a Thatcherite approach to social problems. Overall, a balanced conclusion might acknowledge the attempts to limit social exclusion and to broker harmony and integration, but by 2007 Britain was becoming a rather disordered society with privilege as entrenched as ever and growing signs of corruption and authoritarianism emerging amongst the governing elites. Perhaps fairness and equality were more 'spin' than reality, suggesting that there was greater continuity than change.