



A-level HISTORY 7042/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2021

Version: 1.0 Final



2 1 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 S / M S

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister.

[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

- Ashdown entered parliament in 1975 and became leader of the Liberal Democrats in 1989; his views/reminiscences are valuable, therefore, not only as a political contemporary but also as a parliamentarian who held high office and who would have had extensive, direct experience of Thatcher as Conservative leader and Prime Minister
- his statement was written, as a reminiscence, for a national audience on the occasion of Mrs Thatcher's death; it has value, therefore, in providing a perspective stretching over many years and offers the benefit of hindsight, and long personal experience, of Mrs Thatcher's political career
- the article appears in The Guardian newspaper (whose readership was not always sympathetic of Mrs Thatcher) and its relatively positive tone, therefore, might be thought valuable, though obituary articles can tend to be more 'forgiving'
- the general tenor or tone of Ashdown's comments is largely one of admiration for Mrs Thatcher as a leader, which is valuable coming as it does from a political opponent, emphasising her courage of conviction and her ability to inspire loyalty.

Content and argument

- perhaps the key value of the source comes from its ambivalence – Ashdown seems to admire her conviction politics but not her convictions nor the manner in which she pursued her agenda
- this ambivalence is very clear: on the one hand arguing that she had 'intellectual rigour', but on the other seeing her as an essentially destructive force; it is possible that some students might draw a link between Ashdown's former career as an officer in the Royal Marines and his admiration for how Mrs Thatcher put herself 'in the frontline'
- students might reference aspects of Mrs Thatcher's economic agenda touched on by Ashdown: her fixation with monetarism (Milton Friedman), the cutting of public spending and rate capping, and deregulation
- Ashdown's comment that Mrs Thatcher was a 'one-man demolition squad' might be exemplified by reference to her attacks on local authorities and the removal of local accountability, the drastic impact of de-industrialisation policies on employment and local communities, Howe's notion of 'managed decline' for cities such as Liverpool, the 1981 riots, and her conflict with the so-called 'enemy within'.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Gilmour had first-hand experience of Mrs Thatcher as leader, having been a colleague, holding cabinet office from 1979–81. The source is valuable as an insider view from a moderate, one nation Conservative (a ‘wet’), who opposed much of Mrs Thatcher’s economic agenda
- published in 1992, two years after Mrs Thatcher’s resignation, Gilmour’s views have the value both of chronological distance, from his sacking in 1981, and the perspective of hindsight – neither of which seem to have moderated his highly critical view of Mrs Thatcher; though the source might be considered limited by not covering the whole of her period in office and by his personal vitriol (sacked as a ‘traitor’)
- a significant aspect of the source’s value lies in its purpose: Gilmour seems to have a very personal wish to bring to public attention, in text, Mrs Thatcher’s intransigence and domineering style as leader (which was apparent throughout her premiership); given that it is a highly personal and critical commentary, this might be considered a strength or weakness of the source
- Gilmour’s tone is particularly interesting, demonstrating both the depth of his personal animosity towards Mrs Thatcher and his distaste of her dogmatic pursuit of her policies and her unwillingness to listen to reasoned objection.

Content and argument

- Gilmour is closely focused in this source on the dire economic situation in the UK in 1980–81, arguing that her policy was driven by a narrow grouping in cabinet, and which was responsible for the divisive March 1981 budget – the most clearly anti-Keynesian budget of the post-war period
- he clearly accuses Mrs Thatcher of over-riding the normal conventions of cabinet government in order to pursue her ideological monetarist agenda come what may
- students may reference material linked to the economic situation in 1980–81: by the end of 1980 the UK was in serious recession, inflation was above 15% and unemployment above 2 million
- Gilmour was perhaps the most outspoken of the ‘wets’, opposed to the pursuit of monetarist targets and the endless cutting of public expenditure; the ‘wets’ did not accept that reducing inflation should be the party’s sole policy objective and believed that her neo-Liberal dogma was leading directly to slump not growth.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is an insider view from a politician who worked very closely with Mrs Thatcher in her private office, and who considered himself a personal friend and confidant of the Prime Minister; it has considerable value as a source from a loyal Thatcherite; though it might be considered limited by his close professional and personal ties to Mrs Thatcher (sycophantic)
- it is valuable as a snapshot of, perhaps, Mrs Thatcher’s most difficult year as Conservative leader, written at a time when her popularity in the party and in the country was very low
- it is also of particular value given the private and personal nature of the source. Gow’s unwavering support and admiration for his boss, which might be interpreted as overly sycophantic, illustrate the extraordinary loyalty Mrs Thatcher could command
- its tone is valuable in demonstrating how polarising Mrs Thatcher could be as a leader – and in this context it would be valid to draw a contrast with Gilmour’s tone and language – but it also has value because of the symbolism of the language used by Gow to describe the political struggles of 1981, as if Mrs Thatcher is involved in some kind of existential war; a battle for the nation’s health and future prosperity.

Content and argument

- Gow is clearly an ardent Thatcherite in total thrall to the Prime Minister, arguing that almost she alone knows the solution to Britain's economic problems: Friedmanite monetarism – cutting government spending and borrowing; limiting the amount of money in circulation
- Gow was an enthusiast both of the style of Mrs Thatcher's leadership and of the direction of her economic policy: bringing an end to the post-war consensus; challenging the so-called 'dependency culture' and the unions; and ushering in a new wave of enterprise based on individualism and the market ethic
- he admires her confrontational style of leadership, which he praises as 'iron resolve', and he implies that the moderates in cabinet – the 'wets/wimps' – should be resisted (the traditional Heathite Conservatives constituted about three-quarters of her first cabinet)
- Gow seems to see her battle being as much about overcoming her opponents in cabinet as about winning over opinion in the country; he urges her to stand firm – despite being the most unpopular Prime Minister since Neville Chamberlain in 1939.

Section B

0 2 'By the early 1960s, affluence had totally reshaped society.'

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 supporting the view that by the early 1960s, affluence had totally reshaped society might include:

- living standards had been transformed: GDP was 40% higher in 1964 than in 1951; the average standard of living had increased by 30% in the same period
- leisure opportunities had been revolutionised: the country had experienced a huge growth in the number of private cars, television sets and other consumer durables; by 1964 the five-day week, plus two weeks' paid holiday, had become standard; foreign holidays were affordable for a greater proportion of the population
- a new generation of teenagers had emerged, their lifestyles fuelled by having more spending money than ever before; a more permissive, irreverent, anti-establishment youth culture caused a moral panic
- a greater number of women were in employment – women numbered almost one-third of the employed workforce in the 1961 census; new labour-saving devices in the home freed up women's time
- there was a gradual breakdown of social restrictions and a loss of deference; increased affluence seemed to be making Britain a more individualist and conformist society, as evidenced by the growth of satire.

Arguments challenging the view that by the early 1960s, affluence had totally reshaped society might include:

- affluence certainly had an impact on overall living standards but social mobility was still limited
- teenagers did not feel equally liberated by affluence; many in Northern England felt themselves 'behind the times' compared with the South
- more women might have entered the job market but the presence of women in public life, politics, the law and the professions remained limited; it was still relatively uncommon for married women, especially those with children, to go out to work; women's rights had not yet fully emerged onto the political agenda
- Britain's social structure had not really changed: Britain was still run by interlinked, 'old boy' establishment networks based on the public schools, Oxford and Cambridge and London's clubland
- much underlying conservatism remained in British life, particularly amongst the traditional working classes where social/cultural change was often less marked than in other sections of society.

Britain certainly looked different in 1964 than it had in the mid-1950s: new motorways, retail and housing developments, changing fashions, television and pop music, and expanding horizons all provided the physical evidence of rapid, revolutionary change. There were clear signs too that affluence was beginning to chip away at the class basis of British society and there was certainly a general sense of buoyancy and confidence in the air, reshaping the domestic rhythms of everyday life; the emergence of some generational conflict was also apparent. However, it is perhaps an exaggeration to suggest that British society had been totally reshaped. The period was marked as much by continuity as transformational change. According to one historian (Dominic Sandbrook), what is striking about British tastes and habits is that they changed so little, not so much. In most respects, Britain remained a markedly unequal society dominated by the Establishment. Britain was on the verge of the 'swinging sixties' but social conservatism remained Britain's dominant feature, even if affluence, rising living standards and an explosion in consumer demand was beginning to challenge traditional ways of life and established ways of thinking.

0 3 How effective was James Callaghan as Prime Minister in the years 1976 to 1979?

[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 supporting the view that James Callaghan was an effective Prime Minister in the years 1976 to 1979 might include:

- he steered the country effectively through what was arguably one of the toughest periods in office of any post-war Prime Minister; a 'safe pair of hands' commanding cross-party respect; a 'consensus figure' sensitive to both the needs of party and country
- he brought much needed stability to a minority government through the Lib-Lab pact
- he challenged the established post-war consensus by questioning Keynesian orthodoxies, moving economic policy towards a monetarist approach – effectively preceding Thatcher in this respect
- the economy recovered well in the period 1976–78: he navigated the IMF crisis effectively; inflation, unemployment and the number of days lost to industrial disputes all began to fall
- the scale and extent of industrial unrest in 1978–79 ('The Winter of Discontent') was much exaggerated by a hostile Tory press; other radical policy initiatives, such as devolution and prioritising improvements in teaching standards, have tended to be downplayed amidst the economic and industrial turmoil of the period.

Arguments challenging the view that James Callaghan was an effective Prime Minister in the years 1976 to 1979 might include:

- the IMF loan was only obtained cap-in-hand and he was forced to make significant public spending cuts; it was denounced by both Conservatives (a national humiliation) and his own left-wing (caving in to international financiers)
- his industrial policy was unsuccessful even before the Winter of Discontent: a state of emergency had to be declared in 1977 when firemen and ambulance drivers went on strike; mass picketing at Grunwick was redolent of Saltley in 1972
- other policies showed limited success: devolution was, ultimately, unsuccessful and only introduced as a sop to the Liberals; Northern Ireland remained deadlocked
- the Winter of Discontent demonstrated industrial relations out of control and a government in near paralysis
- he made several tactical errors of judgement: in hindsight it was an error not to call an election in autumn 1978; his demand for a 5% wages limit for 12 months from July 1978 suggested he was losing his touch; he allowed the press too easily to vilify Labour over the Winter of Discontent – 'Crisis, what crisis?'

A strong argument can be offered to suggest that Callaghan was ineffective, particularly in controlling the unions and in dealing with the underlying problems of the economy. The Winter of Discontent has entered the realms of folklore, in respect of national humiliation and the ineffectiveness of industrial relations policy, handing the political initiative to the Conservative Party and allowing it to claim that 'Britain isn't working'. However, a reasonable pro-Callaghan interpretation can be maintained. His economic inheritance was a major yoke around his neck, which would have tested any prime minister. It can be argued that it could have been much worse; he held together a minority government for three years at a time of great global economic uncertainty. A supporter of Callaghan might argue that he provided effective, pragmatic leadership through highly turbulent times; his detractors might argue that he was a pragmatist simply going nowhere, with no lasting solutions to Britain's fundamental problems.

0 4 'The Conservative Party was a pro-European party in the years 1983 to 1992.'

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 supporting the view that the Conservative Party was a pro-European party in the years 1983 to 1992 might include:

- Margaret Thatcher had been an enthusiastic participant in negotiating the Single European Act (SEA), which came into force on 1 July 1987 (only a few Conservative backbenchers, such as Enoch Powell, opposed the SEA); she established a good working relationship with Mitterrand over the Channel Tunnel project – both evidence of pro-Europeanism; Thatcher also supported European enlargement, believing that this would strengthen the single European market
- Thatcher's so-called 'handbag diplomacy' might have irritated some of her European partners, particularly over the extent of Britain's financial contributions to the EEC (a rebate was obtained in November 1984), but she retained a deep-seated attachment to the single market
- though Thatcher's Bruges speech in 1988 clearly opposed Federalism and 'ever closer political union', she reiterated her broadly pro-European beliefs: 'Our destiny is in Europe as part of the Community'
- Britain joined the Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) in October 1990; only 11 Conservative MPs voted against
- Major too supported broader integration: he established good personal links with European leaders, particularly Helmut Kohl, in negotiating the Maastricht Treaty; the opt outs he achieved – joining the single currency and the Social Chapter – were largely welcomed within the Conservative Party.

Arguments challenging the view that the Conservative Party was a pro-European party in the years 1983 to 1992 might include:

- Thatcher's Bruges speech represented a clear push back against Europe's integrationist agenda; it became a rallying cry for the eurosceptics in the Conservative Party and led to the foundation of the anti-European Bruges Group
- the Westland affair can be part-interpreted as an early dispute within the party over the extent of European ties
- whether to join the ERM was a long-running divisive issue in the Conservative Party; Thatcher was resistant for a long time, believing it would lead to a Federal Europe by the back door, and was only belatedly persuaded by Hurd and Major that it would help combat domestic inflation; Ridley was forced to resign in June 1990 when in an off-the-record interview he called monetary union 'a German racket designed to take over Europe'
- Britain's departure from the ERM (16 September 1992; 'Black Wednesday') was hailed by Conservative eurosceptics as a day of liberation ('White Wednesday'); it legitimised euroscepticism and de-legitimised the pro-Europeans
- at the 1992 party conference, both Thatcher and Tebbit accused Major of damaging Britain's constitutional freedom by signing up to the Maastricht Treaty; such an attack by the former Prime Minister and the former party chairman was unprecedented, inflaming divisions within the party.

Margaret Thatcher was never openly anti-European before she left office and the extent of euroscepticism in the party before 1992 was relatively limited, which largely reflected British public opinion. However, the departure from the ERM in 1992 seems to have been a turning point. It led to open civil war in the party on the issue of Europe, making it difficult for Major to obtain ratification of the Maastricht Treaty and forced him to threaten a vote of no confidence to get it through. Thatcher's role was crucial. Her increasing negativity on Europe after her resignation did much to widen divisions. On the whole, it might be convincingly argued that the majority of the party in this period remained broadly pro-European but from 1992 divisions deepened.