
A-level History

7042/2S-Component 2S The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007
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.

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

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons why Labour won the 1997 election. **[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 Bruges Group was set up in 1989 – Margaret Thatcher was its Founder President – to promote discussion on the EU but it quickly became a focus for Eurosceptic opinion; the key point regarding its provenance is that it is far from being an objective source
- its tone is angry and accusatory, suggesting that Major's pro-European views virtually split the party; its emphasis is clear: Major's European policy contributed significantly to the party's defeat in 1997
- the article is written in the immediate aftermath of the election when the inquest to explain the party's calamitous defeat was in full swing; it represents the views of the Eurosceptics and is directed both at the party and the wider electorate
- the source is valuable as a clear and unambiguous voice of an important segment of Major's critics, though it is limited by its one-issue focus.

Content and argument

- the source argues that party splits over Europe were a significant cause of its heavy defeat
- the inference is that Major was virtually a traitor to his party, appointed to 'heal' but instead determined to push a divisive pro-European agenda come what may
- Major is accused of mis-reading public opinion and the inference is that he is personally responsible for the end of Tory rule
- rebellious backbench Conservative MPs were prominent voices in the heated parliamentary debates over the Maastricht Treaty (1991–93)
- Major believed that some elements within the party were obsessed by 'Europe', but not the voters; he was not an integrationist or Federalist and at Maastricht he refused to commit to the single currency (though he was pragmatic enough not to rule out Britain joining the Euro in the future) and he was against the Social Chapter, but his Conservative Eurosceptic critics argued that he was, in the final analysis, prepared to put European interests before national interests.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Gould was a New Labour 'insider', a close friend of Blair and central to its election strategy in 1997; it is not surprising that he emphasises the part 'strategy' played in winning electoral support
- he has a slightly satisfied, self-congratulatory tone, though not arrogant or triumphalist; he emphasises that the electorate voted positively for New Labour

- his diaries are valuable as a contemporary source written from the perspective of someone who worked very closely with New Labour's triumvirate: Blair, Brown and Mandelson; his diaries are in the public domain and are, therefore, a key part of the public record.

Content and argument

- Gould argues that people voted overwhelmingly for Labour because the party had modernised – examples of this could be: ditching Clause IV and adopting the principles of a market economy
- he suggests that Labour, as New Labour, now appealed to a wider cross-section of social classes; it was no longer a party associated with 'extremism and failure' and that its positive message succeeded in attracting dissatisfied Conservative voters who in previous elections voted for Margaret Thatcher not Labour
- the Labour victory was certainly a landslide; in 1983 Labour had lost by 144 seats, in 1997 it won by 179 seats, a shift of 323 seats in 14 years – Labour's greatest ever election victory
- New Labour's election strategy was very up-beat; it no longer presented its policies in the context of an out-moded 'class struggle' but as the party of 'aspiration', targeting middle class floating voters.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the leader of the Conservative Party from 1990–97, Major, is a key figure; his views and insights as Prime Minister, therefore, are of great value and central to our understanding
- his tone is very personal and honest; he does not make excuses but emphasises a range of issues that beset the Conservative Party at the time, which in his view virtually handed the election to Labour on a plate
- the source is a political reminiscence, an autobiography; as such it is subjective and perhaps coloured by the author's natural desire to defend his legacy and policies.

Content and argument

- Major argues that the Conservatives started 'as losers' in 1997, the victims of their own success; he suggests that after 18 years in office the party had run out of steam and was engaged in too much in-fighting
- he identifies 'sleaze' and 'impatience' as key factors in their defeat – a sense that the voters wanted a change, though he does not credit any enthusiasm for New Labour; he also acknowledges the inability of the Conservative campaign to get their message across
- Major's call for moral rectitude – 'to get back to basics' – backfired badly. A series of scandals rocked the party: David Mellor, Tim Yeo, Stephen Milligan. Allegations of 'cash for questions' also undermined the party's credibility, particularly Neil Hamilton being accused of receiving bribes from Al Fayed, the owner of Harrods
- Major rejects the view that Europe was a key issue with the voters, but this may be self-justification; he regarded himself as a 'good' European, agreeing the Maastricht Treaty in February 1992 and securing important opt out clauses. But the UK's withdrawal from the ERM in September 1992 strengthened the Eurosceptic argument against 'ever closer union', split the cabinet into pro- and anti-Europeans and damaged the Conservative's reputation for financial acumen.

Section B

- 02** To what extent was Labour Party policy directly responsible for the growth of trade union militancy in the years 1964 to 1970? **[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/factors suggesting that Labour Party policy was directly responsible for the growth of trade union militancy in the years 1964 to 1970 might include:

- Wilson was determined to limit wage increases as part of his strategy of combatting inflation – led to endless problems with the unions, culminating in a TUC-led revolt against the White Paper ‘In Place of Strife’
- Labour was portrayed in the right-wing press as the tool of the over-powerful unions – Wilson felt he needed to be seen as ‘tough’ on industrial relations, which antagonised the unions, accusing the government of adopting anti-union policies
- relations also soured as a result of Wilson’s occasional angry rhetoric, blaming some union leaders of putting their sectional interests ahead of the country’s economic needs as a whole; for example, Wilson alienated striking seamen in 1966 by accusing the NUS executive of being in the control of communists: ‘a tightly knit group of politically motivated men’
- ‘In Place of Strife’ was an error of judgement, incredibly divisive and controversial – even its title inflamed union opinion; over 1 million workers downed tools on 1 May 1969 protesting against the proposals for compulsory strike ballots, a cooling-off period of 28 days and financial sanctions against non-compliant unions; it also led to in-fighting within the party (James Callaghan led the anti-faction within the cabinet) which added to the air of crisis in industrial relations
- Wilson dug his heels in and made ‘In Place of Strife’ an issue of confidence in the government, threatening to resign; the abandonment of ‘In Place of Strife’ was a humiliating defeat for Wilson and resulted in a considerable radicalisation of the trade union movement – over 6 million days lost to strikes in January-July 1970 alone, almost double that of the same period in 1969; Denis Healey, the Defence Secretary, suggested the affair had done ‘permanent damage’ to the party’s relationship with the unions.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Labour Party policy was directly responsible for the growth of trade union militancy in the years 1964 to 1970 might include:

- the return of a Labour government in 1964 was initially welcomed by the trade union movement; there were no significant strikes before 1966
- events in 1965 also showed more partnership than division. The TUC: supported Wilson’s ‘National Plan’, which looked to implement a prices and incomes policy; agreed a voluntary pay norm of 3.5%; accepted the setting up of a Royal Commission (the Donovan Commission, 1965–68) on Trade Unions; and welcomed the Trades Disputes Act which restored legal safeguards threatened by the *Rookes v Barnard* judgement (1964)
- militancy was caused as much by economic uncertainties as government policy: weak economic growth, devaluation and rising inflation limited the government’s room for manoeuvre; unions looking to protect the interests of their own members in an uncertain economic climate would inevitably come into conflict with the government
- changes within the trade union movement were also leading to greater militancy: some key unions were electing more radical left-wing leaders less prepared to compromise (Hugh Scanlon – AEU; Jack Jones – TGWU); the increasing power of local shop stewards additionally contributed to the proliferation of unofficial and ‘wildcat’ strikes
- trade union membership was also growing significantly – from 10.2 million in 1964 to 11.2 million in 1970 – another factor which increased unions’ confidence to ‘take on’ the government.

Party policy, particularly the attempts to limit or freeze wage rises and the proposals enshrined in 'In Place of Strife', certainly played a key part in increasing trade union militancy. Castle and Wilson could also be accused of considerable naivety in not anticipating the depth of feeling in the TUC against the White Paper. However, neither were the trade unions blameless: TUC intransigence was significant in escalating tensions, refusing any curbs on their power whatsoever. The TUC was perceived by many to be challenging the government's right to govern. Indeed, Wilson's humiliating climb-down over 'In Place of Strife' was widely interpreted as a total surrender to the unions. Perhaps the most persistent theme, however, was the deteriorating economic situation, particularly from 1967, which contributed immensely to industrial strife. The government found itself in a cul-de-sac: it needed wage restraint and some means of blocking the epidemic of unofficial strikes, but the leftward swing of the unions and their implacable hostility towards any trade union reform that limited their range of manoeuvre, together with their broader disillusionment with the government's economic performance, was probably more significant in the drift towards greater union militancy than party policy.

- 03** 'The achievements of the feminist movement in the 1970s did not amount to a social revolution.'

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/factors suggesting that the achievements of the feminist movement in the 1970s did not amount to a social revolution might include:

- the movement was too political and too diverse in nature: socialist feminists, radical feminists, groups defending the interests of Black and Asian women; a lack of cohesion limited progress and led to much in-fighting, preventing a genuine social revolution
- many women reacted negatively to 'feminist' issues, such as free abortions, and many resisted the pressure to return to work; indeed, there is some evidence that by 1979 progress was being reversed, in gender segregation at work, for example
- legislation was implemented too slowly, such as the Equal Pay Act, passed in 1970 but delayed until 1975 – to allow employers time to prepare their payroll adjustments! – and it was not until 1983 that the act was amended to recognise the principle of equal pay between the sexes for work of comparable value
- despite the Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act, 1976, there was a steady rise in domestic violence, including rape and wife battering, and child abuse
- existing attitudes and economic realities resisted change: women still tended to have the lowest paid jobs; sexual discrimination remained prevalent in every aspect of national life; women remained vastly under-represented in parliament and in senior professional positions.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the achievements of the feminist movement in the 1970s did not amount to a social revolution might include:

- the 1970s feminist movement was very different from previous forms of feminism: it was dynamic and aggressive – in this respect harking back to the suffragettes, providing powerful intellectual arguments for women's rights by influential protagonists such as Germaine Greer in 'The Female Eunuch', 1970; such authors did much to raise women's consciousness leading to a widespread re-appraisal of women's rights and roles in society
- 1970s feminists – outspoken and challenging – provoked a greater readiness by government to address issues of inequality, leading to the passing of a wide range of important legislation such as: Equal Pay Act (1970); Sex Discrimination Act (1975); Employment Protection Act (1975); Social Security Pensions Act (1975); Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act (1976); Employment Protection Act (1977)
- the National Women's Liberation Conference, February 1970, was a major catalyst for change, identifying four key feminist objectives: equal pay, equal education and opportunity, 24-hour nurseries and free contraception and abortion on demand; it set up an umbrella organisation for local women's groups: the National Co-ordinating Committee
- the Women's Liberation Movement had an enormous impact on raising awareness on issues, such as the extent to which sexism was still prevalent, particularly within the education system; the limiting stereotyping of the status of the female within the family; the persistence of violence within the home; class issues related to early, unwanted pregnancy and back-street abortions
- the assertive and confident tone of the movement had a rapid impact on public awareness and perceptions, which could not be ignored.

Despite the incremental progress in securing women's rights in terms of employment, welfare benefits, pay and status, and despite the powerful impetus given to public awareness, by the end of the decade the feminist movement remained far from achieving the goals set out in 1970. It proved difficult to sustain momentum and, indeed, the government of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s worked actively to limit

‘women’s lib’. Underlying social and economic conditions inevitably meant that some women remained more equal than others. Nevertheless, the movement challenged many accepted norms by its fresh, uncompromising approach. But fundamentally, women still lacked the depth of representation in parliament to influence government legislative programmes on women’s issues. Overall, the gains made by feminists in the 1970s were far out-weighted by the inequalities and discrimination that persisted, though a framework for future action had certainly been provided.

04 'Tony Blair's foreign policy in the years 2001 to 2007 failed on all counts.'

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/factors suggesting that Tony Blair's foreign policy in the years 2001 to 2007 failed on all counts might include:

- the Iraq war was a disaster for Blair's personal legacy; he is accused of misleading British public opinion regarding 'weapons of mass destruction' (WMDs), resulting in the collapse of public trust for himself and New Labour
- the Iraq war not only destabilised the country and the region, at great cost in lives and money, but it also undermined the goal for which it was undertaken: national security; the so-called 'war on terror' actually encouraged the spread of terror, for example the London bombings, 2005 (7/7)
- the 'special relationship' with the USA has also been much criticised, being in reality very one-sided; Blair's unwavering personal support of George Bush tied Britain too closely to American ideological aims; his attempt to make Britain the 'bridge' between the USA and Europe ultimately foundered over Iraq
- Blair failed to put Britain at 'the heart of Europe'; his so-called 'Third Way' proved unsuccessful: he failed in his efforts to do a deal over reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP); he gave up Britain's budget rebate (December 2006); he was thwarted by Gordon Brown in his intention to join the Eurozone; he reneged on his promise to hold a referendum (2005) on The Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe; British public opinion became more Eurosceptic
- British involvement in Afghanistan became a cause of friction between Britain and Europe; intervention failed to stabilise Afghanistan, increasing lawlessness and violence and failed to eliminate the Taliban.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Tony Blair's foreign policy in the years 2001 to 2007 failed on all counts might include:

- the Blair doctrine of 'liberal interventionism', based on a combination of 'hard' and 'soft' power, has been applauded as establishing a significant new strategic, ethical approach to British foreign policy in an era of enormous global uncertainties
- interventionism had its successes: it significantly damaged the Taliban in Afghanistan; the invasion of Iraq has been defended on moral and practical grounds – Saddam's systematic abuse of human rights would ultimately have had to be confronted; toppling Saddam was a necessary part of defeating global terror
- Britain under Blair was a 'big player' in Europe, espousing an important strategic vision for Britain's role in the EU and the EU's role in global affairs; he recognised the need to reform European institutions; he played a leading role in the negotiations for European enlargement (2004); he believed profoundly that closer ties with Europe was in the British interest and that this achievement was a key part of his legacy
- the 'special relationship' with the USA, Blair believed, enhanced Britain's ability to influence international issues such as climate change, world trade talks and the Middle East process, making Britain a global player; the Gleneagles Summit, 2005, was a personal triumph for Blair, turning the attention of the Western world to Africa – international aid to Africa doubled
- the general consensus in Britain was that intervention in Afghanistan was justifiable and proportionate; similarly intervention in Libya was also considered a major coup, bringing Gaddafi in from the cold.

Blairite foreign policy was distinctive, turbulent and controversial; the current consensus is that much of it ended in failure, but certainly not all. Undoubtedly, the alleged illegality of the Iraq war and its disastrous

failure to bring peace to the region dominates any judgement of Blair's foreign policy in the short-term – it overshadows everything else. Blair's personal commitment to Bush, though widely appreciated in the USA, cost him dear in Britain, giving rise to the popular view that he was America's 'poodle'. Similarly, his Europeanism was more admired in Europe than in Britain. Nevertheless, the principles he adhered to in foreign policy were deeply aspirational and idealistic as he attempted to find a new way to meet the challenges of twenty-first century globalisation. It may be that the emphasis he gave to 'liberal values' in determining foreign relations will, in the long-term, be a more positive legacy for Blair than the current critical furore over Iraq.