
AS History

7041/2S-The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007
Component 2S Building a new Britain, 1951–1979
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

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.

The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007

Component 2S Building a new Britain, 1951–1979

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining changes in moral attitudes in the years 1964 to 1970? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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 address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- this is a contemporary source valuable for considering the earlier period of the 60s 'permissive society'; The Times was/is a respected national newspaper, an establishment paper known for its sober, relatively objective reporting; it is valuable that this new, 'flimsy' organisation, meeting in the 'provinces', has received sufficient attention to attract the interest of the national broadsheet press
- the report is largely sympathetic, valuable for highlighting the national debate about changes in moral attitudes; certainly The Times reporter seems impressed by this 'successful and memorable' meeting; it is valuable in suggesting that there is popular support for the campaign
- a limitation students might identify is the relatively unrepresentative age and gender profile of the audience ('middle-aged women') and that Mary Whitehouse herself was in her mid-fifties; no male perspective.

Content and argument

- the campaign is newly founded, but its supporters are clearly unhappy with the BBC ('dirty plays'), arguing that the loosening of censorship has gone too far and is threatening the nation's moral fibre
- Mary Whitehouse became a household name for leading the backlash against all things permissive, describing herself as an 'ordinary housewife' concerned about the terrible risks the young were taking, and particularly how the 'liberal' BBC was undermining traditional Christian family morals (Lynch writes that Mary Whitehouse attacked 'the debased standards and immorality of much of public broadcasting')
- the 'Clean Up' campaign transformed itself into the National Viewers' and Listeners' Association in 1965; Lord Longford and Malcolm Muggeridge were other notable 'establishment' voices campaigning against the new permissiveness
- students might refer to some of the later liberal legislation that campaigners such as Mary Whitehouse wanted to reverse such as: the Abortion Act, 1967, the Sexual Offences Act, 1967 (Leo Abse), the Divorce Reform Act, 1969, and the relaxation of censorship controls in the theatre and on film as well as on television.

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

Provenance and tone

- this is a reminiscence, valuable for its first-hand personal experience of the 60s; it might be 'rose tinted' by looking back with a degree of nostalgia but it is valuable in suggesting that even after the passage of 20 years (these reminiscences were published in 1988) this woman regards the 60s as a very liberal, positive and progressive era
- it could be thought limited as being just 'one view' (though she seems to feel she is speaking for all Liverpool teenagers at this time) and because it is again an unrepresentative sample – a teenage girl in the home of Beatlemania
- it seems a wistful, thoughtful reminiscence; more reflective students might discuss whether it is truly representative of the 'baby boomer' generation and whether changes in moral attitudes were as extensive as this source seems to suggest.

Content and argument

- the key message of the source is that the 60s changed a lot of things for the better (the opposite of Source A); it specifically mentions greater tolerance, less prejudice, more equality and freedom and a new openness of expression and opinion
- it certainly suggests that the changes were not only positive but very significant ('all that upheaval'), not just 'pop' and 'fashion' but deeper moral changes about attitudes to others, about the justness of wars (Vietnam) and equality (women, homosexuals)
- students might touch on a broad range of contextual references about the 'permissive society' and changes in behaviour and lifestyle in the 60s: the pill, promiscuity, feminism, reduction of censorship; youthful rebellion: mods/rockers/hippies, anti-war protests (Grosvenor Square, 1968), drugs, pop, fashion.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that the sources reflect two polarised views of those who experienced the 60s: that of the middle-aged, like Mary Whitehouse, and that of a teenage girl. It could be argued that either is 'most valuable'. Certainly, Source A represented a strong body of opinion of not only, but particularly, the middle-aged who worried about the loss or decline of traditional moral values – faith, family, marriage. This source can perhaps be used to question the generalist notion that the 60s was a wholly positive decade, bringing substantial and new personal freedoms and a clean break with the 'stuffy' world of the post-war generation. Source B could be thought more valuable: it represents what many who were young at that time believed they had gained; a period which opened up a great number of new possibilities and which encouraged more open, less prejudicial attitudes, bringing about very positive changes in moral attitudes of which the 60s generation can be proud. It may be that the lack of a male perspective is noted and commented on by students.

Section B

- 02** 'The British economy was weak in the early 1960s because of 'stop-go' policies.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that the British economy was weak in the early 1960s because of ‘stop-go’ policies might include:

- the ‘stop-go’ pattern was an erratic economic strategy which weakened the economy because it concentrated on short-term expedients, producing cycles of mini-booms and slumps
- ‘go’ policies led to inflation and increased imports which created periodic balance of payments crises, creating an unstable economic climate hindering steady growth; ‘stop’ policies curbed demand and increased unemployment, undermining the manufacturing industry by adding to its costs, deterring investment and making long-term planning difficult
- ‘stop-go’ was indicative of Conservative governments putting political gain ahead of economic stability; evidenced in the budget election giveaways of Conservative Chancellors: Butler, 1955; Heathcote-Amory, 1959; Maudling, 1964; Wilson inherited high unemployment and a significant balance of payments deficit
- by putting votes ahead of long-term economic planning, Conservative governments in this period ignored underlying structural economic weaknesses – such as poor industrial relations, lower productivity, and limited social mobility (as exposed by Michael Shanks in ‘The Stagnant Society’, 1961); Macmillan only belatedly recognised the need for greater forward planning – setting up the National Economic Development Council (NEDC) in 1961.

Arguments challenging the view that that the British economy was weak in the early 1960s because of ‘stop-go’ policies might include:

- ‘stop-go’ was an effective means of managing short-term fluctuations in the economy to maintain currency stability; when Labour loosened ‘stop-go’, devaluation occurred (1967)
- students might argue that the economy was not weakened: for most British people living standards were rising and it was a time of affluence; unemployment remained below 3%; inflation remained low, on average less than 4% per annum in the 1950s; average wages rose from circa. £8 per week in 1951 to circa. £15 per week in 1961
- ‘stop-go’ policies generated capacity in the economy increasing part-time employment, particularly benefiting women, and making possible the rise of two-income families; this, together with easy credit and low taxes facilitated a boom in consumer consumption
- annual rates of economic growth in this period averaged 2.5%; even West Germany’s economic miracle only averaged 4.9%; underlying weaknesses in the economy were due to longer-term factors such as historic low levels of investment and a decline in Britain’s staple industries over many decades – not ‘stop-go’.

Like most Western economies, Britain in the years 1951–64, benefited from a rapid expansion of global economic activity in general; ‘stop-go’ created cycles of booms and slumps but did not prevent economic growth overall. Low unemployment in particular had a beneficial impact for many in the working class – it was relatively easy to switch jobs, which forced up wages as employers competed for labour. Nevertheless, it is true that the British economy lagged consistently behind its European competitors. Britain’s share of world trade was also declining – 25.5% in 1950 to 16.5% in 1960. Perhaps the greatest criticism of ‘stop-go’ is that Conservative governments in this period focused too much on the short-term, failing to address underlying weaknesses in the economy and bequeathing a difficult situation to Labour from 1964.

03 'The 'special relationship' between Britain and the United States collapsed in the 1970s.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that the ‘special relationship’ between Britain and the United States collapsed in the 1970s might include:

- Britain’s membership of the EEC (1973) weakened the relationship: Heath was a ‘Europhile’, preferring closer European integration, seeing this as an alternative means of increasing international prestige and influence; he talked of a ‘natural’ rather than a ‘special’ relationship with America; he had a poor personal relationship with Nixon
- policy differences strained the relationship: Britain had not supported the US in Vietnam (under Wilson); differences over the Arab-Israeli conflict (Yom Kippur war, 1973) pushed the relationship to breaking point – Heath shocked the Americans by refusing to allow American forces to fly missions from British bases until he had consulted his European partners
- the low point in the relationship was the American decision (October, 1973) to place American forces on a higher level of nuclear alert – suspecting that the Soviet Union was preparing to support Egypt – without consulting Britain or her European allies
- the relationship seemed in drift throughout the decade: Britain was convulsed with economic difficulties and was pursuing closer defence ties with the EEC; the belief was growing in the United States that Britain was a declining economic power, and the USA seemed increasingly preoccupied with developing other relationships, particularly closer ties with China and rapprochement with the Soviet Union.

Arguments challenging the view that the ‘special relationship’ between Britain and the United States collapsed in the 1970s might include:

- Callaghan was an ardent ‘Atlanticist’ and had a close personal friendship with Carter; Labour under Callaghan allowed the deployment of Cruise missiles in Britain, though this was not publicly revealed until 1980
- close military and intelligence co-operation was maintained throughout the 1970s, particularly as regards nuclear collaboration; the US was careful to consult Britain in Cold War matters – SALT 1 (1972), Helsinki (1975); both countries condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979)
- both Heath and the 1974–79 Labour governments welcomed American rapprochement with China; NATO remained central to both countries; the US continued to make use of more than 100 UK bases and other facilities, as well as British overseas bases
- shared political and Cold War ideological aims remained constant; historical and common cultural ties helped keep the attachment intact.

Despite frequent policy disagreements, particularly in the early 1970s, and despite some personal antipathy among the leaders, there was much continuity in British-American relations throughout the decade. Certainly, the relationship came under strain with both countries searching for common ground as new international circumstances developed – European integration, détente and Ostpolitik; both countries also had a general perception of the other being in decline – the USA’s defeat in Vietnam and Watergate; labour problems in the UK and the IMF crisis – but it would appear an exaggeration to suggest that the ‘special relationship’ collapsed. Certainly, it changed. By the early 1970s Wilson and Heath – the only post-war British prime minister who consistently gave greater priority to Europe than to the ‘special relationship’ – were displaying more political independence from the US. However, this cooler phase of the relationship came to an end under Callaghan and with the coming to power of Thatcher and Reagan a renewed, warmer ‘special relationship’ followed.