



A-level HISTORY 7042/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



2 4 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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the problems of the Labour Party in the 1980s.

[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 a view from the moderate right-wing of the Labour Party concerned about the impact of 'extremist infiltrators'
- the nature of the source, a major televised debate, emphasises how quickly and how public Labour divisions had become following its defeat in May 1979; Callaghan did not resign until November 1980
- debates such as this are a confrontational medium, with participants often reinforcing entrenched and uncompromising positions, which might be thought a limitation or a strength of this type of source; the emotional/extreme tone and language are valuable for emphasising the antagonisms in the party.

Content and argument

- Haseler is arguing that the Labour Party had been 'taken over' by 'extremist infiltrators' and that the country needed a new kind of social democratic party for moderates of the centre left; students can develop Haseler's belief that a new centre left party was needed by discussing the formation of the SDP in 1981 by the 'Gang of Four'
- he argues that the Labour Party had irrevocably changed and was moving to the far left, away from its social democratic roots ('the party of Attlee and Gaitskell'); students can refer to the election of Michael Foot as leader of the party in November 1980 as evidence of this drift (as well as Haseler's own expulsion from the party); Foot, a Bevanite, defeated the moderate, former Gaitskellite, Denis Healey
- students can explore the context of the Marxist infiltration of the party alleged by Haseler, referencing 'entryist' groups such as Militant Tendency, a revolutionary Trotskyist organisation; many Labour moderates regarded Militant as a party within a party and agitated for its expulsion from Labour
- students can explore the impact and influence of Derek Hatton in Liverpool where Militant gained its biggest foothold; Hatton came to be regarded as the figurehead of Militant, gaining much media prominence.

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

- the source is valuable as a view from outside the Labour Party; Mrs Thatcher's thoughts and conclusions on the state of the Labour Party, at the time of its crushing defeat in the 1983 election, would be particularly valuable to historians
- students might consider the strengths and limitations of autobiographies as historical sources: valuable first-hand accounts but leaning sometimes to partisanship and self-justification
- Michael Foot is often thought of as one of Labour's 'wild men', so Thatcher's measured and even tone in her references to his personal qualities offers a valuable counterbalance.

Content and argument

- Thatcher is arguing that the leftward drift of the Labour Party and the SDP split contributed greatly to its defeat in 1983; Labour's share of the vote fell by over 9%, only 700 000 votes ahead of the SDP-Liberal Alliance
- students can discuss Foot's 'extreme' policies referred to by Thatcher, which made Labour virtually unelectable, such as: unilateral disarmament, withdrawal from the EEC, widespread nationalisation and greater powers to unions; Gerald Kaufman referred to their 1983 election manifesto as 'the longest suicide note in history'; her reference to 'sinister revolutionaries' is a thinly veiled attack on the Trotskyist/Marxist elements of the party
- students can also develop the widespread stories in the right-wing press that proliferated at the time about the so-called 'loony left' and left-wing councils such as the GLC led by Ken Livingstone
- the political 'Alliance' of the Liberals and SDP can be explored; the support for the SDP certainly seemed to have peaked after its early successes; Thatcher's belief that the SDP would have served Labour better had they stayed seems borne out by the 1983 election results.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- the source is valuable as a view from a young activist and campaigner on the extreme left of the Labour Party in Liverpool, which was at the epicentre of the ideological conflicts within the party in the early 1980s
- reminiscences can be problematic: they are prone to the vagaries of memory and hindsight but can be valuable as evidence of what people actually thought, and particularly as oral history from 'ordinary' people
- the tone and language used is fervent and intense, even 30 years after the events recalled, which has value for understanding the passions of participants involved in the Labour in-fighting and in opposition to the Thatcher government.

Content and argument

- Hogan is arguing that Militant Tendency represented true ('proper') Labour and was the authentic voice of the working class fighting against the Thatcher government; for example, Militant supporters played prominent roles in the riots in Bristol, Brixton and Toxteth in 1980 and 1981, arguing that they aimed to inspire the youth to socialist ideas
- he suggests that at the grassroots they knew better than the Labour leadership what needed to be done; he argues that the leadership 'betrayed' them; several internal investigations into Militant were instigated in this period and five members of the Militant Editorial Board were expelled in 1983
- students can develop the bitter in-fighting that was continuing in the Labour Party under Neil Kinnock, who had replaced Foot as leader in 1983; he condemned Militant at the Labour Party conference in

1985, expelling it from the party in 1986; Kinnock's purging of the party proved insufficient to prevent another heavy defeat in 1987

- Hogan's references to fighting government cuts can be developed: Militant in Liverpool led a rate-capping rebellion in 1985 by setting an illegal 'deficit budget', which the Thatcher government was able to use to further discredit Labour, demonising Derek Hatton, the deputy leader of Liverpool City Council, as the revolutionary face of the 'loony left'.

Section B

0 2 To what extent were the lives of British people transformed by Conservative governments in the years 1951 to 1957?

[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 lives of British people were transformed by Conservative governments in the years 1951 to 1957 might include:

- the Conservative governments presided over a post-war economic boom, which brought an unprecedented rise in living standards; the new affluence was most obviously evident in the increase in ownership of consumer goods, itself fuelled by the government's relaxation of hire purchase controls in 1954 and by Butler's 1955 'give-away' budget; most economic indicators in this period pointed upwards, justifying Macmillan's claim in 1957 that under the Conservatives the British people had 'never had it so good'
- the consumer boom had a huge effect on women, transforming their lives in the home by the increasing availability of labour-saving devices; the government's commitment to growth saw service industries expand dramatically, providing the opportunity for more women to enter employment, out of choice not necessity
- life for young people was also transformed by the booming economy; young people had money to spend and more leisure time in which to spend it; as a consequence, for the first time a discernible youth culture was appearing as national service began to be phased out from 1957
- the British people benefited from the decision of the Conservatives to embrace the post-war consensus, which had support for the NHS, full employment and a commitment to the welfare state at its heart; the result was a transformative effect on people's health and aspirations; these were years of optimism
- the Conservative governments were also far more ready to accept the need for state intervention in social policy: there were reforms in secondary and tertiary education; the commitment to build 300 000 houses a year was exceeded by 1955, including a massive increase in council housing; Macmillan had the full backing of Churchill to treat housing like a 'war job' tackled 'in the spirit of 1940'; another important intervention was the 1956 Clean Air Act; by 1957 the government was also ushering in a new era of social liberalism (the Homicide Act; the Wolfenden Commission).

Arguments challenging the view that the lives of British people were transformed by Conservative governments in the years 1951 to 1957 might include:

- the transformation of these years cannot be attributed solely to Conservative government economic policy; in some ways the Conservatives were lucky to be in power at the beginning of the post-Second World War economic recovery, which brought an end to wartime austerity; a booming global economy triggered a growth in overseas trade, which, together with rising demand at home, ensured full employment and growing affluence
- the economic picture was not as rosy as the growth in affluence would suggest; it can be argued that the Conservative's 'stop-go' approach to economic policy failed to address fundamental weaknesses in the economy, artificially raising and lowering demand and storing up problems for the British people in the future
- not all strata of British society experienced a transformation in living standards: there was an increase in pensioner poverty as the value of pensions dropped and a rise in child poverty in larger households
- the position of women did not change fundamentally: women were still seen primarily in the role of housewives and it was still relatively uncommon for married women, particularly those with children, to go out to work; fundamental social attitudes changed very little and Britain remained a deeply class-conscious society; more extensive social liberalisation would have to wait until the reforms of Wilson's government in the 60s
- Conservative social policies were also limited in scope and impact: much of Britain's existing housing stock remained sub-standard and much of the new build, particularly the tower blocks, lacked

architectural merit, sacrificing quality for quantity and with many new homes smaller than those built under the previous Labour government.

Undoubtedly this period was one of growing optimism and aspiration. The British people had more money, more goods, more housing, more leisure and benefited from full employment and the ending of wartime restrictions. Conservative government policies certainly helped facilitate these changes and for some it is probably true that life felt transformed. Students may, rightly, focus on different groups of British people in arguing this case. Nevertheless, it can be argued that propitious circumstances meant that much of this transformative change fell into Conservative laps and that basic social attitudes changed little. Some might argue that the Conservative governments had very little interest in transforming social mobility or in weakening the established order of things.

0 3 'Britain's international position grew stronger in the years 1970 to 1974.'

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’s international position grew stronger in the years 1970 to 1974 might include:

- entry to the EEC made Britain’s international position stronger; Heath was passionately pro-European and believed Britain would not only be stronger economically but also that membership would transform Britain’s diplomatic prestige and relevance
- Britain’s relationship with the USA grew stronger: Heath’s personal relationship with President Nixon was good; he publicly supported Nixon’s policy in Vietnam, often in the face of severe criticism from his European allies, thus repairing some of the damage done by Wilson’s lukewarm backing for American involvement in Vietnam
- the Atlantic Alliance also remained strong in the crucial respects of intelligence gathering and diplomatic co-operation and the continued nuclear collaboration between Britain and the US for the upgrading of Polaris missiles
- relations with China grew stronger: Heath was instrumental, with Nixon, in pursuing détente with China; Heath visited China in March 1972, a month after Nixon, and agreed an exchange of ambassadors; China and Britain established full diplomatic relations in 1972.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain’s international position grew stronger in the years 1970 to 1974 might include:

- the benefits of membership of the EEC were marginal; it diminished Britain’s relationship with the Commonwealth and lost markets for cheap foods and goods; a number of critics, notably Enoch Powell, argued that membership constituted a loss of sovereignty
- joining the EEC damaged the ‘special relationship’ with the USA because Heath’s orientation switched away from the Atlantic Alliance; he rejected attempts by Henry Kissinger for the USA to use Britain as a link with Europe
- relations between Britain and the USA further worsened in October 1973 during the Yom Kippur War: Britain refused, in co-operation with most European states, permission for the USA to use NATO bases in Europe to airlift supplies to Israel
- relations with the USSR did not improve in this period; Heath’s government offered little in terms of promoting the process of détente.

A strong argument can be maintained that membership of the EEC was a key turning point, enhancing Britain’s international position and providing a new international identity for a post-imperial Britain. Georges Pompidou, the French president was convinced that British membership strengthened Europe as much as it strengthened Britain. Similarly, Britain’s ‘special relationship’ with the USA, though strained, particularly in 1973, was never in danger. However, it can be argued that the international realignment which occurred in the years 1970 to 1974 weakened Britain’s international position, inflicting long-term damage on Britain’s relationship with the Commonwealth and worsened, at least in the short-term, relations with the USA.

- 0 4** How significant were sleaze and scandals in weakening John Major’s government in the years 1992 to 1997?

[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 sleaze and scandals were significant in weakening John Major's government in the years 1992 to 1997 might include:

- 'Tory sleaze' dogged Major's government throughout its period in office, generating unfavourable headlines; there were more than a dozen sex scandals involving MPs having extramarital affairs; David Mellor and Tim Yeo, both cabinet ministers, were forced to resign
- the issues of sleaze and scandal became a highly public, damaging factor in the 1997 election: Martin Bell ran as an independent candidate against Neil Hamilton ('cash for questions') campaigning on a platform of clean politics; neither Labour nor the Liberal Democrats ran candidates in Hamilton's Tatton constituency, keeping the public spotlight firmly on Bell's crusade
- the 'cash for questions' affair was a running sore for Major: Neil Hamilton and other Conservative MPs were accused of accepting money in return for lobbying on behalf of the owner of Harrods, Mohammed Al Fayed; Hamilton's refusal to resign, despite losing a widely reported and damaging libel case, heaped further criticism and embarrassment on the party's lack of accountability
- scandals linked to corruption also severely dented the party's credibility; the 1994 Scott Enquiry proved that government ministers were involved in illegal arms dealing – in supplying arms to Iraq – and had been 'economical with the truth' when questioned
- the ever-present sleaze and scandal inundating the government found an outlet in press and TV satire lampooning Major and his government, adding further humiliation.

Arguments challenging the view that sleaze and scandals were significant in weakening John Major's government in the years 1992 to 1997 might include:

- though most economic indicators by 1997 were positive, the impact of Black Wednesday (16 September 1992) had significant, catastrophic long-term political consequences: trust in the competency of the government to run the economy collapsed
- the government also lost public support over a range of misfiring policies, which contributed to the government's image of incompetence: unpopular pit closures continued as the mines were privatised; the BSE crisis; the failed post office privatisation; the Citizen's Charter, which was heavily satirised (the 'Cones Hotline')
- divisions in the party were a self-inflicted wound undermining its appeal: leadership challenges became the subject of almost daily speculation, with the right-wing press itself increasingly hostile to Major, accusing him of weakness; the 'back me or sack me' leadership election starkly highlighted the party's lack of unity, with 89 MPs voting for Redwood; the battles over Europe were a further source of division
- the Thatcher legacy was poisonous for Major: comparisons with Thatcher were consistently negative; she encouraged Eurosceptic rebels and backed Redwood in his leadership bid; she was lukewarm about Major in her memoirs (1993) and in 1997 seemed to imply that a Blair government was preferable to a Major government
- for all the problems afflicting the government, it can be argued that the landslide defeat in 1997 was driven by a resurgent New Labour under Blair and Brown and that sleaze and scandals were not the fundamental causes of Conservative weakness.

It can certainly be argued that sleaze and scandals were a significant factor weakening John Major's government, acting as a constant sore throughout the years 1992 to 1997, building an image of corruption, incompetence and self-interest that it could not shake off and drowning out any positive achievement. Major said in his autobiography that all the public saw and heard were 'the exotic follies' of a small number of MPs. However, governments do not fall purely on image. The government suffered

significant policy failures. Major's 'back to basics' and the party's social conservatism in particular seemed out of kilter with late twentieth century society. On balance, it might be concluded that the Conservatives ran out of steam after being in office for so long, tearing themselves apart amidst a backdrop of wide-ranging grievances and issues, thus opening the door wide for New Labour.