



A-level
HISTORY
7042/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

196A7042/2S/MS

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

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 Conservative Party's defeat in the 2001 election. **[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

- Peter Mandelson was a New Labour ‘insider’, close to Tony Blair and Gordon Brown – hence the title of his book. As such it is valuable because it can give significant personal insights into political developments and relationships within NL; he probably knew the thinking of Blair and Brown better than anyone
- his book was written and published at the end of the Blair-Brown ‘project’ – it is a contemporary record and will be valuable for its immediacy to events, though students may question the objectivity of sources such as memoirs; this extract is particularly valuable because it focuses on the run-up to the election when key decisions were being taken
- his tone and emphasis point clearly to Blair having a clear concern for his own place in political history and how he will be viewed by posterity – he wanted ‘to leave a mark’
- Mandelson emphasises that Blair wanted a radical agenda, sensing that the electorate wanted more from Labour than merely to fight the election on its first term record.

Content and argument

- Mandelson is very dismissive of William Hague – ‘a fool’ – and suggests that the Conservative Party had shot itself in the foot in its choice of leader
- moreover, he argues that the key internal disagreement prior to the election was over where to focus their campaign, hinting at tensions between Blair and Brown; it is valuable to read that Mandelson thought that victory was a given
- the ‘facts’ suggest that a second New Labour landslide was indeed on the cards: opinion polls gave Labour a lead of anything between 12 and 30 points; that the Tories would have a tough fight because of the healthy economy; Hague’s populism, his lack of personal appeal and its policies did not have the same appeal and immediacy as Blair’s decision to focus on health and education
- overall, the source is valuable for its clear summation of the political situation in the run up to the election from a politician very closely involved in day-to-day planning and strategy.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Whiteley and Seyd are not politicians or political insiders, which in terms of provenance can be a strength – as a source it is non-subjective and ‘scientific’ in its approach – and a weakness – it is limited by its distance and narrow field/context
- however, on balance it is valuable for looking at the election results in the immediate aftermath of the election (the source is post-election) from an objective, non-partisan viewpoint; it is purely about *how* the Labour campaign was planned and fought
- as such, it will have a limited audience but it will be important for party workers and election strategists whose responsibility it is to analyse the effectiveness of Labour’s political campaign; the statistical study of trends in voting and voter behaviour has become an important feature of modern elections
- it could also be considered valuable as it is an ‘expert’, academic source; Whiteley and Seyd are specialists in their field, authoritative and, presumably, respected.

Content and argument

- Whiteley and Seyd argue that the Labour campaign was highly focused and better than its rivals; in particular, it was better than the Conservative and Liberal parties in getting its vote out on the day
- the source also highlights the success of the campaign in targeting its own supporters in key constituencies rather than, by implication, trying to convert non-Labour voters
- the research is valuable for showing the effectiveness of targeting campaign resources, and that this was a factor not necessarily in Labour winning, but in the scale of its victory; the nature of the British first-past-the-post election system favours this approach as elections are often won or lost in marginal seats
- the Conservative Party traditionally had been recognised for its efficient, election-winning party machine but it had been superseded by Labour in this respect; commentators had been very critical of the Conservative campaign, both before and after the election; party morale was low prior to the election; party membership had plummeted – from about three-quarters of a million in 1992, down to 400,000 in 1997, and 330,000 in 2001; it had an ageing membership – the average age of its members was 62
- overall, the source is valuable for focusing on strategy and the respective campaign strengths and weaknesses of the parties, but that this is only a narrow aspect in explaining the Conservative Party’s defeat in 2001.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- The Economist is an authoritative, highbrow periodical/newspaper with access to high-ranking senior politicians, policy makers, political commentators and academics; as such it is a valuable source of well-informed, largely unbiased, non-partisan opinion
- the article was published a week before the election so it is valuable in its emphasis/prediction that the Conservative election defeat appeared a near certainty; indeed, it looks like the election post-mortem has already begun
- The Economist’s audience is relatively limited or narrow – although it is widely available it is not a mass publication; it will be valued by its educated readership which wants well-informed, clear and incisive analysis
- it is written in a very frank manner and pulls no punches; it is very negative in its summation of the Conservative’s election prospects.

Content and argument

- the article essentially argues that the Tories will lose the election largely as a result of its own weaknesses, and suggests that it was no longer credible as a potential governing party
- it identifies a number of weaknesses but concludes that the party's problems go back beyond 1997, supporting Lord Blake's view that the party was fundamentally weakened by long-term issues and that a second defeat was likely because that is what often happens to parties which suffer catastrophic defeats, as the Conservatives had in 1997, and not because of simplistic criticisms of 'the leadership'
- the article's reference to Labour's capture of the centre-ground is valuable for our understanding of its success in 2001: Brown's successful macroeconomic management was decisive as voters no longer questioned Labour's economic competence; under Blair, Labour had become a catch-all party
- clearly, the Tory campaign criticised in the article was falling on deaf ears: the public didn't want to hear about the Euro, asylum seekers, tax cuts and crime; Blair was more attuned to the electorate, focusing on health and education and connecting to the public in a way that Hague found impossible; perhaps the argument expressed in the article – that the outcome of the election was a foregone conclusion – might explain the low turnout: down from 71.5% in 1997 to 59.4% in 2001, the lowest since 1918 and the second-lowest ever
- overall, the article is valuable in providing a prescient, pre-election summary of the impending election catastrophe facing the Conservative Party.

Section B

02 'Britain became completely dependent on the United States in the years 1956 to 1962.'

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 Britain became completely dependent on the United States in the years 1956 to 1962 might include:

- the Suez Crisis was a landmark event in Britain's foreign policy, demonstrating conclusively that Britain could not act independently of the United States; the US voted against British unilateral action at the UN and withdrew its support for sterling, forcing an abject British withdrawal from Suez
- another consequence of the Suez Crisis was that Britain lost all credibility with the French, tipping Britain further away from its European neighbours and increasing her dependence on the US; arguably, this antipathy was the main reason why De Gaulle vetoed Britain's application to join the EEC in 1963
- Britain continued to maintain its own independent nuclear deterrent but it was completely dependent on US delivery systems: Blue Streak, approved in 1957, proved too expensive and was cancelled in 1960; Britain was forced to rely first on Skybolt then Polaris; in 1962 Kennedy insisted on assigning Polaris to NATO, only allowing Britain to use Polaris independently where 'supreme national interests' were concerned
- Sandys' defence White Paper (1957), which prioritised nuclear capability over conventional forces, cemented Britain's dependence on the US; effectively, Britain would not be able to pursue any foreign policy goals which conflicted with American interests
- Britain was unable to play any meaningful, independent role in the two major Cold War crises of these years: Berlin 1958–61 and Cuba 1962; Kennedy phoned Macmillan several times during the Cuban crisis but his decision to remove US missiles from Turkey was taken unilaterally.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Britain became completely dependent on the United States in the years 1956 to 1962 might include:

- Britain continued to be an important member of a number of defensive alliances: the Baghdad Pact, SEATO, ANZAM and, above all, NATO, as well as being a permanent member of the UN Security Council, giving Britain an independent voice and a significant world role
- Britain retained its independent nuclear deterrent, detonating its first hydrogen bomb in 1957, ensuring that Britain remained a vital part of America's policy of containment
- aspects of the 'special relationship' were quickly repaired; Macmillan met Eisenhower in March 1957, agreeing joint operations on intelligence sharing and weapons targeting; Macmillan also reached agreement with Eisenhower to base American IRBMs in Britain, which would be operated by a dual key: one held by the British and one by the Americans – so Britain had an equal share in the control of the missiles, clearly suggesting partnership rather than complete dependence
- this developing partnership was confirmed by the Washington agreements in November 1957, by which Eisenhower and Macmillan agreed the exchange of information on the design and manufacture of nuclear weapons
- it can be argued that Macmillan's visit to Moscow in February 1959, in which he established a working relationship with Khrushchev, was at least partly responsible for Khrushchev's decision not to press for a Western withdrawal from Berlin.

Clearly, Britain's scope to implement policy after 1956 was much restricted. American cooperation was fundamental for any so-called independent action in the years 1956 to 1962. The inescapable political and economic realities of the Cold War meant that Britain inevitably would have to play a supporting role

to the United States. Nevertheless, a balanced judgement might be that the 'special relationship', though an unequal one, fell short of complete dependence. Britain largely retained 'great power' status, the third of only four nuclear powers, and remained America's most reliable ally with global interests and commitments greater than all states, except the US and the Soviet Union. Macmillan forged good relationships with Eisenhower and Kennedy. Overall in this period, at the peak of the Cold War, Britain continued to be consulted more than any other power but was never able to claim equality in any decision-making.

- 03** To what extent can the Labour government take credit for the liberal reforms of the years 1964 to 1970? **[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 Labour government can take credit for the liberal reforms of the years 1964 to 1970 might include:

- the Labour government which took office in October 1964 was publicly committed to a programme of energetic social reform; Wilson's slogan referring to the 'white heat of the scientific revolution' can be applied more broadly to his genuine desire to undo the damage of 'thirteen wasted years' of Tory rule and to embrace social as well as technological progress
- Roy Jenkins, as Home Secretary from 1965 to 1967, was instrumental in bringing about what he called a 'civilised society'; in many respects he epitomised the mood of 1960s Britain in challenging reactionary conservatism
- the government was assiduous and consistent in guaranteeing parliamentary time for reforming legislation, for example in piloting the Divorce Reform Act, 1969, through the Commons; Leo Abse was fulsome in his praise for Jenkins' support for homosexual reform, being present for all the debates on the issue in the Commons
- the Labour governments not only supported private members' bills but legislated in favour of protest groups, such as the Women's Liberation Movement, facilitating, for example, the legalisation of abortion in 1967
- reform was also initiated by government: Wilson promoted women in politics and was passionate for the establishment of the Open University, as was Anthony Crosland for his championing of comprehensive secondary education.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Labour government can take credit for the liberal reforms of the years 1964 to 1970 might include:

- Labour support for reform was by no means universal: the government did not set out with a liberalising agenda and was often at odds with itself on policy issues; Jenkins' unreserved support could be regarded as an exception; arguably the only liberalising issue on which the party was united was the abolition of the death penalty
- though the government provided encouragement, much of the liberal reforming legislation was achieved through private members' bills: Leo Abse: the Sexual Offences Act, 1967; David Steel: the legalisation of abortion, 1967; George Strauss: the Theatres Act, 1968
- other legislation was the culmination of long campaigns that preceded the Labour government, such as the abolition of the death penalty; divorce reform was largely the work of a group appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and of the Law Commission
- in many respects, the Labour Party can be seen as simply facilitating rather than leading, reacting to events and the pressure of changing attitudes in society; critics of Wilson, for example, have accused him of short-term opportunism and not believing in anything very much.

Clearly, it can be argued that much of the liberal reforming legislation was not driven by, or originated with, the Labour Party, and that credit for the reforms needs to be more widely distributed. Moreover, much of this legislation was not party-political and, perhaps with the exception of Jenkins, generated little enthusiasm in the party. However, Wilson's governments deserve credit for overseeing a hectic period of liberal legislation, ensuring a considerable advance in achieving rights for minority groups and for helping create a more tolerant and open society. Wilson's governments had caught the mood of the moment; Wilson himself was a committed egalitarian and meritocrat. Irrespective of whether the liberal legislation originated with the government or with others, the Labour Party's achievements in this field were important in dragging Britain into the modern era in turbulent times.

04 Thatcher's economic policies created an 'economic miracle' in the years 1983 to 1987.'

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 Thatcher's economic policies created an 'economic miracle' in the years 1983 to 1987 might include:

- the economy experienced successive years of growth averaging 3.7%, putting Britain amongst the fastest expanding economies in the Western world, which suggests an 'economic miracle' was underway; such was the buoyancy of the economy that by 1987 Nigel Lawson was predicting a budget surplus – the first since 1969; the basic rate of income tax was reduced from 30% to 27% in 1987
- other economic indicators were positive: inflation fell marginally from 4.6% to 4.2%; productivity and investment showed continued rises throughout the period and the number of days lost through strikes by 1987 was at its lowest for nearly two decades; unemployment peaked in 1986 and fell every month thereafter
- privatisation represented one of the most radical restructurings of the economy ever and became the flagship policy of the Thatcherite 'economic miracle': it delivered massive efficiency savings and went a long way towards creating a shareholder democracy; it was a complete reversal of the nationalisation programme that had dominated the political consensus since 1945; it was a policy that swept across the world
- instead of being considered the 'sick man of Europe', inward foreign investment was being secured – Nissan arrived in the north-east in September 1986; in the same year the 'Big Bang' set in motion the rejuvenation of the City
- the balance of power in industrial relations shifted decisively in favour of employers, particularly following the defeat of the miners in 1985.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Thatcher's economic policies created an 'economic miracle' in the years 1983 to 1987 might include:

- critics argue that the 'economic miracle' was a myth because the Thatcher government was adept at massaging statistics: for example, the government continuously changed the way the unemployment rate was calculated – the actual total by the end of 1987 was more like 3 million (not the official 2.5 million), of whom 1 million had been out of work for more than a year; the fall in unemployment was mainly due to the increase in part-time jobs
- the budget surplus too was largely fictitious: the government included the receipts from privatisation sell-offs to hide actual budget deficits; public expenditure continued to rise in real terms because of high unemployment and large increases in social security payments
- manufacturing output was savagely hit as a result of a conscious policy to shift to a predominantly service economy; prosperity was not uniform across the country: coal mining and steel areas were savagely hit, whereas by 1987 the economy in the south-east was overheating and faced skill shortages
- the government benefited from North Sea oil receipts, which provided a huge annual windfall income; good fortune rather than an 'economic miracle'
- privatisation and 'supply side' economics boosted the creation of a property owning, shareholder democracy but in reality shares were quickly concentrated in the hands of rich individuals and large institutions.

By the time of the 1987 election Margaret Thatcher was able to claim that she had cured the so-called 'British disease': backward technology, low productivity, low growth, high inflation and strikes. On the surface, Thatcher's 'enterprise culture' seemed to have delivered an 'economic miracle'. However, the

economic balance sheet does not bear close scrutiny: manufacturing industry suffered enormously and poverty and a 'dependency culture' increased dramatically as the wealth gap widened. Supporters of Margaret Thatcher argue that she saved the UK economy; detractors argue that she made it unbalanced, benefiting the few not the many. A balanced assessment may be that the truth lies somewhere in between. The economy overall in the years 1983–87, became more productive, more competitive and more profitable, but much of Britain's industrial base was wiped out and North Sea oil income was squandered on unemployment pay and tax cuts. Perhaps narrowly judged, Thatcher's economic revolution was a success – Britain's relative decline came to an end – but it seems a great exaggeration to call it a 'miracle'. If there was a miracle, it came with a great deal of misery.