

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2S The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 1.0

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

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2S The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007

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 Britain's invasion of Iraq in 2003. | [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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance

- As this is a confidential memo from the Foreign Office to the Foreign Secretary, it is extremely valuable for historians seeking to understand the government's decision to involve itself in Iraq. It was not meant for any audience other than Jack Straw and so is a frank and honest discussion about what to do in Iraq.
- As this did not involve Blair himself and was more a discussion about what advice he should be given, we cannot be 100% confident that he actually acted on the advice within the document, which is a limitation. We also don't know how Straw himself acted in response to the memo.

Content and argument

- The content of this source is very useful as it suggests, quite openly, that a regime change is a key aim for the British Government in getting involved in Iraq, even in March 2002. However, this was not what was presented to parliament and the public.
- The source also helps to explain why this was the case as it points out that using 'regime change' as an excuse for war would probably not gain the support of the electorate for any invasion and it is clear here that WMDs are going to be used as an excuse. By using WMDs as an excuse, this is enough to frighten people that they might personally be affected by events in the Middle East.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone of the source is one that outlines clearly what Blair should be doing to try and gain the support of the public, as it outlines what the objections would be and then suggests how these can be dealt with. This is a very frank memo, which you might expect from its confidential nature. This makes it very useful for historians trying to piece all of the evidence together. However, in being so forthright, the source has some lack of balance.

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

Provenance

- As an official government dossier presented in the House of Commons this provides the official reasoning behind the Labour government's decisions over the question of Iraq. As such it has access to all of the secret intelligence which it refers to and has collated this into this document.
- The timing of the document is slightly problematic for historians as it comes some months before the actual deployment of troops in March 2003. This means that it can only discuss some of the background causes, stated here as the WMDs.
- Candidates might wish to discuss the questions about the integrity of this dossier which emerged in 2003 (and were confirmed by later inquiries into the Iraq War), where accusations were made, for example by Dr. David Kelly, about some of the content of the dossier being exaggerated. WMDs were not discovered in Iraq and so hindsight might suggest that this source has limited value in some ways, but is indicative of Blair's desire to try and convince the public and parliament, even if it meant stretching the truth.

Content and argument

- This source argues very strongly that British involvement in Iraq circles around the issue of whether or not Saddam has WMDs which he can deploy quickly. Blair, in his foreword, is trying to emphasise this threat and discusses why action needs to be taken to stop Iraq. What he is aiming to do is to gain parliament's support (and the support of the media and the public) for action being taken, although at this stage he is vague about exactly what should be done.
- In September 2002 the focus of Labour's approach was to push for UN inspections in Iraq, but it is clear from this content that the government wanted preparations to be made to stop Saddam by any means necessary.

Tone and Emphasis

- As a government document this source has been carefully prepared to convey a particular message and the tone and emphasis of it are trying to demonstrate that Saddam is a very real and present threat to international security. In mentioning that this type of document 'is unprecedented' Blair is clearly appealing to the unusual and serious threat posed by Iraq.
- The choice of wording is useful as it conveys, even at this early stage, that Blair is adamant that something needs to be done. He is vague about exactly what, but it is clear he is trying to gain support for something.

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

Provenance

- As a transcript of oral testimony in front of a parliamentary committee this source provides verbatim evidence of proceedings, which has not been edited for any particular purpose by an author.
- The government at this stage was coming under criticism (from BBC journalists such as Gilligan) that the evidence in favour of an invasion of Iraq had been over exaggerated. This would seem to be corroborated by the fact that this committee was clearly investigating these complaints. Therefore, its findings should be very useful for historians.

Content and argument

- In this source Campbell is defending the evidence which was put out by the government in its attempt to persuade parliament (and the public) that Britain should enter a war with Iraq.
- Campbell clearly denies that any lies were told in parliament and so historians can use this in their assessment of the government's dossier (Source B).
- Campbell also questions the integrity of journalists and thus historians could utilise this in assessing the criticisms of the government.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone of the source is highly charged – Campbell is clearly arguing that the Prime Minister did not lie to parliament – his use of phrases such as 'I simply say in relation to the BBC story: it is a lie' make his point very clear.
- Campbell is also very emotive and angry in his description of journalists and he implicitly accuses them of fabricating evidence.

Section B

0 | 2 'Conservative governments were more successful in finding a solution to the problems in Northern Ireland than Labour governments in the years 1969 to 1985.'

[25 marks]

Assess the validity of this view.

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 that suggest that the Conservatives had successes and failures might include:

- the escalation of ‘The Troubles’ was met head-on by the Heath administration. Government from Stormont was suspended and ‘Direct Rule’ from Westminster was established. This led to the 1973 ‘Sunningdale Agreement’, which was acceptable to moderates on all sides and established Power Sharing in Northern Ireland. This would hopefully help to end the discrimination Nationalists/Catholics suffered and the setting up of a Council of Ireland would help to improve North/South relations. However, the paramilitary groups on both sides refused to accept it
- Thatcher’s administration secured the Anglo Irish agreement of 1985 which, for the first time, saw the Republic of Ireland accepting Northern Ireland as a genuine state. This helped to open up discussions between the two competing sides. However, the violence continued and lasting peace remained unlikely whilst the paramilitary groups remained
- the Heath government contributed towards the rising pressure by allowing the policy of internment without trial. The result was that the Unionist dominated government and RUC rounded up large numbers of Nationalists/Catholics and placed them in an old military prison near Belfast. This inflamed feelings amongst groups like the Provisional IRA
- whilst not directly attributed to the government, the events of Bloody Sunday in 1972 did not reflect well on the British Government and led to revenge attacks, such as the British Embassy in the Republic of Ireland being burned down. By this point British armed presence in Northern Ireland was viewed negatively and with mistrust on both sides
- Sinn Fein became a great political threat in the 1980s, especially following the death of 10 prominent hunger strikers in 1981. Despite attempts by the Conservatives (e.g. “Rolling Devolution”), Sinn Fein continued to win c.40% of the nationalist vote in Northern Ireland. Sinn Fein was simply the political wing of the Provisional IRA, a paramilitary group committed to political violence.

Arguments that suggest that Labour had failures and successes might include:

- in 1974 Labour Secretary of State for Ireland, Merlyn Rees, allowed the Power Sharing executive to fail. This ensured that the Nationalists/Catholics would continue to be under represented in Northern Ireland
- it was under the minority government of Wilson from 1974 that the Provisional IRA began to organise itself into cells which were almost impossible to deal with and made violence in the future more likely. No solution could be agreed whilst the paramilitary groups remained committed to a violent approach
- a damning indictment of the lack of success by Labour in the 1970s was the increased and continuing political violence, including the murders of Lord Mountbatten and Airey Neave in 1979
- Labour was the first to fully appreciate that the British Government would need to intervene directly in Northern Ireland. Intervention was initially requested by the Ulster Unionists, but was welcomed by many of the Nationalists/Catholics in Ulster as the British Army tried to protect Catholics from Protestant mobs and discrimination

- in 1974 Labour passed the Prevention of Terrorism Act which gave the British police special powers of arrest over potential terrorists and prevented certain individuals from travelling to the British mainland. This was part of a wider policy which attempted to reduce political violence.

Students may conclude that British intervention in Northern Ireland was much complicated by other interested parties and that both Conservative and Labour governments faced an extremely difficult task. Students may argue in support of the proposition or may challenge it; any supported judgement will be rewarded.

0 3 'Without the Falklands War, Margaret Thatcher would have lost the 1983 General Election.'

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 Falklands War was vital in ensuring Conservative success in 1983, might include:

- Thatcher personally gained a lot of popularity from her handling of the crisis. She was decisive and stood firm, even in the face of difficult problems such as the sinking of the **General Belgrano** or the **Sheffield**
- Thatcher was also credited with taking quick action once news of the Argentine invasion reached her. She bypassed the Cabinet Committee and set up a much more efficient war cabinet with self appointed advisors. Throughout the conflict the initiative seemed to lie with the British, which helped to keep public support behind the war
- the difficulties of pursuing the war reflected well on Thatcher and her administration. The Falklands are a remote set of islands 8,000 miles from the British mainland and so the strategic problems were vast
- the victory, against an unprovoked attack, helped to increase national pride and also enhanced the UK's status in the eyes of the world as they were fighting an enemy who was well equipped and a real 'test' for the British forces. This was popular with the electorate
- this was helped by the nature of the war as a 'limited war'; it only lasted for 10 weeks and, whilst there were 236 British deaths, the limited remit meant that a protracted conflict was unlikely
- the opposition parties also, in the main, supported the war. This was largely because of the nationalistic element to it and the fact that the 1800 Falkland Islanders were adamant that they wished to remain British. This meant that public opinion and the Press were overwhelmingly behind the war and that the Conservatives, if they won, would reap the credit for any victory
- the financial cost of the war was mainly met by use of a contingency reserve, and there was no need to raise taxes. Raising taxes might have caused dissatisfaction with voters
- the conservatives were unpopular before the war: attempts to dampen inflation by using high interest rates backfired; a rise in the exchange rate affected the costs of British industry; led to recession and high unemployment which hit 3 million by 1982. There was a lot of evidence of deep hostility towards the Conservatives and their approach to the economy. In 1981 rioting broke out in Brixton and Toxteth for example. Thatcher herself remained committed to her approach and refused to make any of the U-turns which she had so heavily criticised Heath's administration for; she removed her main critics from her own cabinet and replaced them with her supporters.

Arguments challenging the view that the Falklands War was vital in ensuring Conservative success in 1983, might include:

- the First Past the Post voting system definitely helped the Conservatives in 1983. They ended with a huge majority and 375 seats, despite polling only 42.2% of the vote. They also had very limited success in certain geographical areas (Northern England, Scotland and Wales), but the organisation of the constituencies favoured them

-
- the Labour Party, under the leadership of left-winger Michael Foot, were not sufficiently united enough to capitalise the Conservative problems in the early 1980s. Radical left-wing changes were forced through at the Labour Party conferences in 1980 and 1981. Things became so bad that four prominent MPs even left the party to form the SDP
 - the Labour election campaign in 1983 was uninspiring and their manifesto (nicknamed ‘the longest suicide note in history’) was deemed by many to be too left wing. Vote-losing promises included the pledge to abandon Britain’s independent nuclear deterrent and the reintroduction of nationalisation
 - although there were, undoubtedly, still serious economic problems in 1983, there were signs of improvement by the time of the election; interest rates were coming down and consumer spending was starting to rise. The 1982 budget in March was slightly expansionist and opinion polls suggested that the Conservatives were gaining back some ground they had lost.

Students may conclude that the Conservatives would probably have won the election without the Falklands War, mainly because of the internal weaknesses of the Labour Party. However, the conflict may have influenced the scale of the victory. However, they may argue otherwise and any convincing judgement should be rewarded.

0 4 'By 1964 Britain could no longer consider herself to be a world power.'

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 Britain was no longer a world power by 1964, might include:

- the aftermath of the Suez Crisis in 1956, where it was obvious that Britain would struggle to operate without US support. The withdrawal was embarrassing for Britain and led to the end of Eden's career
- in 1963 de Gaulle blocked Britain's entry into the EEC, despite much planning and rhetoric from Macmillan's government. This was humiliating but, also, a real blow to the British economy
- Britain was struggling to keep up with the two big superpowers in terms of nuclear capability. Mainly the issue was economic, but there was also a lot of public opposition via the CND. The British independent Blue Streak inter-continental missile project had to be abandoned and she became reliant on the US Polaris missiles
- Britain faced the further disintegration of her once huge empire and also lost the support of pro-British governments in the Middle East (e.g. Iraq by 1958)
- whilst Britain was involved in much negotiation, she seemed to achieve little, e.g. Eden's attempts to find a resolution in Asia and Macmillan's attempts to secure an agreement during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain was no longer a world power by 1964, might include:

- Britain was a nuclear power, like the US and the USSR and had successfully built her own atomic (1955) and hydrogen (1957) bombs. This meant that Britain would play a central role in discussions about nuclear capability and Macmillan was central in securing the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
- Macmillan was an international statesman of some repute and was on good terms with Khrushchev especially. He helped the detente process and even got the two sides to sit down at a conference. He also persuaded the USSR not to push for Western withdrawal from West Berlin
- in 1954 Britain was a key backer of the new SEATO organisation and would continue to play an important role in NATO and the United Nations. Britain's involvement in Korea is a good example of this
- whilst Macmillan oversaw a withdrawal from Empire, this was controlled and deliberate; partly intended to help the British economy, but also to help prevent the spread of communism by encouraging former colonies to become active members of the Commonwealth. Largely this was successful
- during this period, Britain remained committed to keeping troops East of Suez, where she was an important barrier against Communism.

Students may conclude that, whilst Britain still played an important role, she was lagging behind the superpowers, mainly because of the economic strain which came with this new type of nuclear-backed foreign policy. Some may argue that the 'special relationship' with the US was becoming increasingly important in this period.