



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/2S

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



2 2 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](http://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 © 2022 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, 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.

**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 the impact of the Suez crisis.

**[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

- the source is valuable as an editorial from an influential and respected broadsheet newspaper
- however, the value of the source may be considered limited given its clear bias: its anti-government rhetoric and its relatively narrow readership/demographic
- the publication date is significant: it coincides with the beginning of hostilities and increasing global condemnation of the government both at home and abroad as the crisis reaches tipping point
- the editorial's emphasis and tone are valuable for reflecting the mounting criticism directed at the government; its language is extraordinarily scathing, just stopping short of directly accusing the government of lying about its actions.

### Content and argument

- the editorial condemns the government totally for its actions; it is actively urging 'every individual' to protest; it mirrors the viewpoint of the Labour Party – Gaitskill called for Eden's resignation
- its one-sidedness might be considered a limitation: such condemnation, as British troops were about to go into action, was viewed in some quarters as unpatriotic; it might also be thought limited in that it anticipated outcomes that did not occur
- nevertheless, the source can be thought valuable for highlighting the depth and scale of the impact of the crisis on Britain: uproar in parliament, criticisms of the House of Commons and the country being misled and international condemnation from all quarters
- students might refer, as support for the pressure being heaped on Eden, to condemnation from the USA, the Soviet Union, the UN and the Commonwealth.

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

### Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source reflects the views of the principal character in the Suez crisis; its value about the impact of the crisis is highly significant in this respect
- Eden's reflections are written shortly before his resignation (9 January 1957) and can be thought valuable in this context
- it is valuable for its 'private and confidential' nature: for senior colleagues only, it presumably reflects an 'honest', and measured, personal assessment of the lessons of Suez, emphasising the need for a broad reappraisal of the direction of future British policy
- perhaps its strengths as a source are also its limitations: thoughts only to a limited audience probably already knowing he is shortly to be out of office.

### **Content and argument**

- the crux of Eden’s argument is that the Suez crisis had not necessarily weakened Britain (‘not...changed our fortunes’) but that it had ‘revealed realities’ in Britain’s global position, suggesting that Britain needed to reassess priorities
- he suggests that Britain can still play an independent global role but that a re-think is needed: on imperial and defence commitments and on Europe
- students might refer to Macmillan’s application to join the European community, to decolonisation and relations with the Commonwealth, and to the Sandys White Paper on Defence, April 1957, as examples of this re-think
- Eden mentions the need for ‘financial and economic independence’ and students might link this to one of the main lessons of Suez that Eden does not address directly: Britain’s dependence on the US.

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

#### **Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- the source is valuable as contemporary, first-hand evidence of the impact on both the political elite and on the country as a whole – Crossman was a backbench MP in the Commons at the time of the crisis – and because it offers reflection and detachment eight years after Suez
- the review is dated May 1964, a full six months before Labour’s election victory, supporting Crossman’s emphasis that the Tories did not suffer any electoral impact as a result of Suez
- it has value too given that, in the process of writing a review, Crossman can express his own personal opinions but students might point out limitations: his anti-Tory bias and his role as only a ‘minor participant’
- the source has added value because Crossman is able to reflect on the key consequences of the crisis as he sees them, though students may see hindsight as a limitation as well as a bonus and that his tone is partially coloured by his political loyalties.

### **Content and argument**

- Crossman argues that the crisis, born of Tory ‘incompetence’, had a traumatic impact, showing Britain’s military and economic weakness and its reliance on the US, but that it did no lasting damage electorally to the Tories
- students may point out that in 1956 it seemed certain that the Conservative Party would suffer electorally, contrary to the reality expressed by Crossman; Macmillan quickly re-built relations with Eisenhower and continued prosperity kept the Tories in power
- students can refer to the US opposition to the Suez action and Britain’s inability to act without US approval as evidence of Britain no longer being able to ‘go it alone’
- students may also refer to the beginnings of decolonisation and Britain’s EEC application as further examples of the impact of the Suez crisis on British policy-making.

**Section B**

- 0 2** To what extent was the Labour Party's defeat in the 1970 General Election due to its failure to control the unions?

**[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 Labour Party's defeat in the 1970 General Election was due to its failure to control the unions might include:**

- Labour was increasingly at odds with powerful union interests, particularly from 1966: Labour's prices and incomes policies fractured the relationship between the government and the unions, alienating many unionists who thought Labour was placating the City and international financiers at their expense
- a series of long and bitter strikes undermined Labour's economic strategy: a sterling crisis was caused in part by the National Union of Seamen's strike in 1966; a national dock strike in 1967 contributed to the balance of payments crisis and subsequent devaluation
- unofficial strikes created widespread public dissatisfaction: union bosses were losing control over 'wildcat strikes' organised by local shop stewards who would not take orders 'from the top'
- Unionists heavily criticised Wilson in 1966 when he publicly denounced the Seamen's leaders as communists more interested in ideological goals than in raising wages
- 'In Place of Strife' was a major setback for Labour: its withdrawal was seen as a humiliating climbdown by the government; it provoked a storm of protest from the unions and split the party, raising serious doubts in voters' minds about Labour's fitness to govern.

**Arguments challenging the view that the Labour Party's defeat in the 1970 General Election was due to its failure to control the unions might include:**

- the trade unions were not the sole source of Labour weakness: modernisation of the British economy proved difficult to achieve; the new Department of Economic Affairs (DEA) had to be abandoned; devaluation damaged its credibility; Britain's second application to join the EEC was rejected; Jenkins' liberalising agenda was not universally popular; the 'troubles' in Northern Ireland further destabilised the Wilson government; the issue of 'race' also emerged as a pertinent election issue in the later 1960s
- Labour divisions between the Left and the Right persisted throughout the span of the government
- a revived and credible Conservative opposition with new ideas emerged; Heath showed greater strengths than expected
- Wilson's magic thinned; general disillusionment with Labour's inability to deliver on its 1964 promises meant many Labour voters abstained from voting in 1970
- the Liberal share of the vote dipped in 1970, tipping results to the Conservatives in a number of marginal constituencies.

The Labour defeat in 1970 came as something of a surprise, confounding many pollsters. Labour seemed to spend too much time and energy in crisis management and it can be argued that the destabilising impact of an increasingly militant, uncooperative and out of control trade union movement was at the core of Labour's defeat in 1970. Nevertheless, elections are won as well as lost and Conservative strengths clearly contributed to their victory. Disillusionment with Labour was multi-causal and not helped by England's World Cup defeat in Mexico four days before the election.



**0 3** 'Privatisation and Right to Buy, in the years 1979 to 1987, were highly successful social and economic policies.'

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 Privatisation and Right to Buy, in the years 1979 to 1987, were highly successful social and economic policies might include:**

- created a stakeholder mentality, bringing about a transformative ‘feel-good’ mentality; approximately two million new homeowners and the number of individuals owning stocks and shares increased from three million to nine million (1979–90)
- wealth was spread much more widely, empowering millions in the economic life of the country, creating a new popular capitalism; each privatisation sale of a nationalised business contained special provisions for free and discounted shares for employees
- council house sales offered big discounts – up to 75% below market prices – to make them more affordable, transforming the housing market and generating a substantial amount of goodwill for Mrs Thatcher’s government
- privatising the nationalised industries introduced competition into unresponsive/stagnating state monopolies, giving customers greater choice and helped the economy perform better
- privatisation also solved the problem of capital shortage that nationalised industries often faced by freeing up privatised businesses to raise money for investment in the open market; this in turn helped lower the public sector borrowing requirement and fund tax cuts.

**Arguments challenging the view that Privatisation and Right to Buy, in the years 1979 to 1987, were highly successful social and economic policies might include:**

- ‘Right to Buy’ had negative consequences increasing wealth inequality: sales of council houses were largely in better-off areas, with many people unwilling or unable to buy their council house because they had low incomes or less desirable property
- the number of quality homes available for rent was reduced – the number of applicants for council housing more than doubled in the 1980s – and councils often used profits from sales to reduce debt not to build additional housing stock, which contributed to house price inflation; the unsatisfactory practice of housing people in B & B accommodation increased
- nationalised industries were sold off too cheaply in order to ensure all shares were taken up
- many privatised industries cut back on staff, reducing job security, which, in turn, contributed to raising the welfare budget
- many new small shareholders immediately sold their shares for profit; small investors declined over time, with shareholdings being bought up by big corporations and pension funds and many went into foreign hands.

Privatisation and ‘Right to Buy’ continue to be highly controversial policies, often generating polarised debates. Apologists for their success see both policies as central to the Thatcher project of ‘rolling back the state’ and promoting democratic, or popular, capitalism, while the money raised from privatisation and ‘Right to Buy’ also gave central government the means to cut taxes, transforming people’s lives by putting cash in more people’s pockets. It can also be argued that privatisation, in particular, has been one of Britain’s biggest export success stories. Critics point to the social inequalities inherent in both policies and the ‘get rich quick’ mentality they fostered. Overall, both have come to be seen as a symbol of Margaret Thatcher’s enduring legacy, imposing a new social and economic order and sweeping away old orthodoxies.

**0 4** 'In the years 1997 to 2007, no Conservative leader was able to heal the party's divisions.'

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 in the years 1997 to 2007, no Conservative leader was able to heal the party's divisions might include:**

- Hague was largely ineffective in rebuilding the party and the divisions of Major's premiership remained; the 2001 election was a catastrophe: his key policies, 'the fight to save the pound' and a hard line on immigration, failed to resonate with the electorate or unite the party; he found it difficult to be taken seriously, especially his attempts to appear ordinary
- Duncan-Smith was similarly ineffective: he replaced Hague in 2001 only because of negative voting against Clarke and Portillo; largely unknown outside Westminster, he re-opened Eurosceptic divisions, was socially conservative and his decision to support the Iraq War made it impossible to capitalise on Blair's unpopularity
- Howard showed he too had learned nothing from Hague's mistakes: Portillo described Howard's 2005 platform as the 'Victor Meldrew' manifesto – a grumpy old man complaining about the state of modern Britain; he was too closely associated with the governments of Major and Thatcher and it seemed to voters that the Conservative Party he led had barely changed since the 1980s
- Cameron's rejection of key elements of Thatcherism alienated many on the right-wing of the Conservative Party who remained sceptical of his 'modernising' tendencies
- by 2007, none of the leaders had been able to resolve the party's 'civil war' between the 'mods' and 'rockers'; all, with the exception of Cameron, failed to bring clarity of future direction and the vision to overcome public perceptions of the Tories as the 'nasty party'.

**Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1997 to 2007, no Conservative leader was able to heal the party's divisions might include:**

- Hague was able to heal some of the divisions over Europe; the party outperformed Labour in the 1999 European elections; he did attempt to build a more modern, caring image, such as his 'Listening to Britain' campaign
- Duncan-Smith tried to initiate elements of what he called 'compassionate conservatism', which attracted some support from both the socially conservative and socially liberal wings of the party
- Howard brought experience and stability; he promoted modernisers into his shadow cabinet, even though he himself was on the right of the party; he had support from both 'mods' and 'rockers'; he performed strongly against Tony Blair in the Commons and improved party organisation and morale
- Cameron started to make the Conservative Party look electable again; he had success in detoxifying and modernising the party; by 2007 the party was more united than at any time since the end of Major's premiership
- it can be argued that the Conservative Party experienced the natural swings of a two-party political system, suffering the staleness of 18 years in office and a Thatcherite legacy that had created deep divisions over ideology and direction, which any leader would have struggled to manage, particularly given the circumstances of Labour revitalised as New Labour and capturing the political middle ground.

A strong argument can be made that Conservative leaders, in the years 1997 to 2005 particularly, contributed significantly to the party's failure to dent Labour's lead and credibility. Having suffered a crushing defeat in 1997, the party made little discernible progress in 2001 and in 2005 elections and after eight years in opposition, the Conservatives still returned fewer MPs than Labour at its nadir in 1983. Perhaps Howard bears the primary responsibility, having faced Blair at his weakest. Apologists may point to wider factors, particularly a revitalised 'New Labour', as reasons for mitigating the performance of the Conservative leaders in this period. Overall, the carousel of Conservative leaders did not sit well with the public. Until the election of Cameron as leader, the party seemed resolutely outmoded and unelectable.