

AS HISTORY 7041/2S

The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007
Component 2S Building a new Britain, 1951–1979

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 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

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

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

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 attitudes to race and immigration in the 1970s? **[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 transcript from a one-to-one interview with the leader of the opposition and the next prime minister, so it is particularly valuable for providing an explanation of Conservative party policy in relation to immigration
- the interview was broadcast on national television, which adds further value to the source; it allowed Margaret Thatcher to bring the issue of immigration back to the mainstream of national politics following a year of street riots and action from the National Front (NF)
- the language and tone she adopted was very calculated: measured, calm and authoritative; her use of the term 'swamped' was particularly controversial, but designed to resonate with white voters attracted to the NF; she is articulating what the political 'left' would describe as a reactionary and racist programme but in respectable, empathetic tones.

Content and argument

- her argument is clear: good race relations depended on restricting or completely stopping immigration; she seemed to be implying that immigrants ('people with a different culture') threaten, or do not possess, 'fundamental British characteristics'
- she argues that immigration controls – to 'reduce people's fears on numbers' – are key for preventing race-motivated violence and hostility, and though she stops short of openly condoning violence she suggests that it is understandable because people get 'frightened'
- students may discuss Thatcher's remarks in the context of the re-emergence of fascism in the form of the NF: the polarisation of attitudes towards race in the years following Enoch Powell's 'rivers of blood' speech in 1968; in the light of the 1970s economic recession which led to concerns being expressed that immigrants were 'taking our jobs'; successive, increasingly restrictive anti-immigration laws (1962, 1968, 1971); and the mass mobilisation of both fascists and anti-fascists in the mid to late 1970s
- Thatcher's interview was just five months after the Lewisham riots; she was determined to adopt a tough stance on immigration to steer the Conservative Party away from her predecessor's more moderate position, which had prompted some Tories to turn to the NF (her standing in the polls soared after the interview).

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

Provenance and tone

- this is a retrospective article (which students might argue adds/detracts value) written by an individual of a very different political persuasion and background to that of Margaret Thatcher; 'International Socialism' is clearly a left-wing journal likely to promote strong anti-fascist and anti-Conservative views; it is valuable for presenting a counter argument to that expressed by Thatcher
- his own mixed-race background and the nature of his vocation – a campaigner for race equality – reinforce the political provenance of the source; his sympathies clearly lie with the immigrant community
- the language and tone he adopts is challenging and confrontational, leaving the reader in no doubt about the anger he directs at both the perpetrators of the race attacks and establishment figures, such as the Metropolitan Police Commissioner who deny, or downplay, racist violence.

Content and argument

- Mahamdallie does not see immigration controls as the solution for improving race relations (he says that such controls are 'barbaric'), but argues that 'direct action' and 'mass mobilisation' were the most effective means of combatting racism
- he draws attention to public comments by John Kingsley Read, an elected councillor, to show the depth and extent of racist hostility
- students may discuss Mahamdallie's remarks in the context of the founding of the Anti-Nazi League (ANL) in early 1978, following the successful mass confrontation with the NF in Lewisham (August 1977) and Rock Against Racism (RAR), which transformed the anti-racist cause into a mass movement, and which attracted many young people in particular
- context might also be developed by linking the emergence of Rock Against Racism to the furore caused by Eric Clapton's comments at a concert in Birmingham in 1976, telling the audience that Enoch Powell was right and that there were too many 'foreigners' in Britain.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that Source A is most valuable because it shows clearly that Margaret Thatcher was prepared to adopt a tougher line on immigration in an attempt to win back Conservative voters who had defected to the NF, as a result of the moderate leadership of Edward Heath, and effectively illustrates the attitude of the future prime minister on the issue of race relations and the political positioning of the Conservatives in the run-up to the next election. Others might conclude that Source B is more valuable because of its personal element, outlining Mahamdallie's [presumably] first-hand experience of racism as a mixed-race youth growing up in London in the 1970s. Neither source is impartial – the provenance of each, clearly demonstrates this – but both are valuable in expressing different perspectives about attitudes to race and immigration in the 1970s.

Section B

02 'Britain applied to join the EEC in 1961 because it had lost its empire.'

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 Britain applied to join the EEC in 1961 because it had lost its empire might include:

- the application to join the EEC emerged from the consequences of decolonisation: the Commonwealth had failed to fulfil Macmillan's hopes that it would boost Britain's international standing and diplomatic influence; many of its members had little international significance; it lacked the structure, unity or political strength to provide Britain with the world role it had had before it lost its empire
- the economic weakness of the Commonwealth was also an important factor: the case for imperial preference had diminished by 1961; for example, former dominions such as Canada and Australia were developing stronger trading connections with the USA and Japan than they were with Britain
- in addition, by 1961 the loss of imperial markets seemed less significant: British trade with Europe was growing at a much faster rate than with the empire and Commonwealth; moreover, Britain lacked free access to European markets because of her Commonwealth links
- the Commonwealth was further weakened by South Africa's withdrawal in May 1961 and by international condemnation, from both within and outside the Commonwealth, of white colonists hanging on to power in some of Britain's former African possessions, particularly in Rhodesia; the Commonwealth seemed to be slipping away from Britain's control and remained a peripheral influence in world affairs.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain applied to join the EEC in 1961 because it had lost its empire might include:

- the strong economic performance of the EEC countries, compared to that of Britain, can be presented as the major pull factor for applying to join the EEC; Britain's GDP was the lowest in Western Europe; Britain's comparative economic decline was unprecedented
- membership of EFTA did not match the economic success of the EEC; it was a poor substitute with fewer prospects for growth
- it was more important for Macmillan to safeguard the special relationship with the USA than it was to sustain imperial and Commonwealth ties; the Suez Crisis had weakened the special relationship; Eisenhower met with Macmillan in 1961 and made it clear to him that the USA had a clear preference for Britain to pursue membership of the EEC to strengthen Western alignment at the height of the cold war; Macmillan believed that Britain could benefit diplomatically as the link between the USA and the EEC
- newer, younger members of the Conservative Party, such as Edward Heath, were increasingly pro-European in outlook; they believed that if Britain remained outside the EEC its political influence as a world power would continue to weaken.

By the early 1960s, Macmillan had realised that the new Commonwealth was not a strong enough political and economic substitute for the loss of empire. He had recognised the new 'Zeitgeist' in his 'winds of change' speech to the South African parliament in February 1960. Equally clear was that cold war realities were pushing Britain towards a new European alignment. Students might link the loss of empire with these new realities: by remaining outside the EEC Britain risked becoming isolated as a world power, fulfilling Dean Acheson's caustic remark that Britain had 'lost an empire [but] not yet found a role'. Fundamentally, Macmillan determined that the balance of political and economic advantage lay with joining the EEC and, in particular, that access to the EEC could accelerate British economic growth

in a way that her remaining imperial possessions and the Commonwealth could not. Students may conclude that by the early 1960s it had become evident that Britain was a power in decline and that its former world role was contracting towards a more regional, European alignment.

- 03** 'The civil rights movement was responsible for the beginning of the 'troubles' in Northern Ireland in the 1960s.'

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 civil rights movement was responsible for the beginning of the 'troubles' in Northern Ireland in the 1960s might include:

- the civil rights movement can be blamed for acts of conscious provocation: particularly, its tactical decision to march on the streets, most significantly at the unionist 'shrine' of Londonderry (5 October 1968), taking the precise route normally used by the Protestant Orange Order marches, which precipitated violent confrontation
- it can be argued that its actions became progressively more radical: activists sought to provoke a reaction from the authorities, believing that Protestant violence, captured on film, would elicit broader sympathy and support for their demands
- NICRA initially contained a wide spectrum of political representation but its membership was mainly Catholic; persuasive arguments have been raised about its republican and communist members, often in leadership positions, accusing them of using the movement to push for a more radical, unity, agenda; many Unionists claimed that NICRA had been infiltrated by the IRA and was simply a cover for republican agitation
- the People's Democracy movement, in which radical campaigners such as Bernadette Devlin and Eamonn McCann were prominent, increased tensions and re-doubled Protestant fears and reaction; indeed, the Cameron Commission referred to their actions as 'calculated martyrdom'.

Arguments challenging the view that the civil rights movement was responsible for the beginning of the 'troubles' in Northern Ireland in the 1960s might include:

- more significant in explaining the beginning of the 'troubles' was the historic, institutionalised discrimination against Catholics – in law and order, the civil service, local government (gerrymandering), the franchise, education, housing; Northern Ireland had become a Protestant state for Protestant people, which had deliberately limited the civil rights of the Catholic and nationalist minority
- it was also significant that O'Neill's Stormont government was weak and divided; his modest, modernising reform programme was opposed by members within his own government; the Unionist government proved incapable of controlling events and the reforms it conceded were insufficient to quell Catholic demands, and it allowed the use of unnecessary and ill-controlled force in the dispersal of demonstrators by the RUC and USC
- neither were the British and Irish governments blameless: Jack Lynch, the Irish Taoiseach, inflamed Protestant sentiment in Northern Ireland by demanding (in a TV broadcast, August 1969) the dispatch of UN peacekeepers to the province and immediate talks on the reunification of Ireland; British governments had long ignored Northern Ireland, presiding over an ailing economy and supporting a narrow political culture
- much criticism can also be levelled at the Reverend Ian Paisley, responsible for condemning O'Neill's attempts at reconciliation and for exploiting Protestant bitterness and inflaming tensions.

Students might lay responsibility for the 'troubles' on either side of the sectarian divide. The actions of the civil rights protesters clearly precipitated events. Its tactics became increasingly confrontational and NICRA moderates seem to have lost control of the movement to radical activists who had an agenda that went well beyond the rectification of civil rights. However, it is perhaps an exaggeration to accept Unionist conspiracy theories that the civil rights movement was no more than a cover for IRA agitators. Students might argue that the blame for all the ills of Northern Ireland, and the start of the 'troubles', lay with the prejudices and intransigence of Ulster Unionists personified by Ian Paisley. A more balanced

view might be that the sectarian divide itself was too fundamental and self-perpetuating. Perhaps the political violence can be largely attributed to the failure of leadership on all sides in Northern Ireland to manage change; the actions of the civil rights movement unleashed communal conflict, with moderates on both sides losing control of events, leading to an almost inevitable slide into violence.