



A-level HISTORY

The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007

Paper 2S

ADDITIONAL SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER

2 hours 30 minutes

Materials

For this paper you must have:

- an AQA 12-page answer book.

Instructions

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Write the information required on the front of your answer book. The **Paper Reference** is **2S**.
- Answer **three** questions.
In **Section A** answer Question 01.
In **Section B** answer **two** questions.

Information

- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- The maximum mark for this paper is 80.
- You will be marked on your ability to:
 - use good English
 - organise information clearly
 - use specialist vocabulary where appropriate.

Advice

- You are advised to spend about:
 - 60 minutes on Question 01
 - 45 minutes on each of the two questions in Section B.
-

Section AAnswer Question 01

Source A

From a confidential memo from Peter Ricketts, Political Director at the Foreign Office, to Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, in March 2002. This discussed forthcoming talks between Bush and Blair, where they would agree an approach to Iraq.

The truth is that what has changed is not the pace of Saddam's WMD programmes, but our tolerance of them post 9/11. The programmes are extremely worrying but have not, as far as we know, been stepped up. To get public and parliamentary support for military operations we need to be convincing that the threat is so serious that it is worth sending our troops to die for and that it is different to the threat posed by others who are closer to achieving nuclear capability, such as Iran.

Military operations need a clear and compelling objective. "Regime change" does not stack up. It sounds like a grudge between Bush and Saddam. Bush would do well to depersonalise the objective and focus on elimination of WMDs. Defining the objective in this way and working through the UN, will help to maintain European support and fits another important message, that Iraq is a threat to the international community and not just the US.

Source B

From the introduction, written by Prime Minister Tony Blair, to the Government dossier on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), presented to Parliament in September 2002.

It is unprecedented for the Government to publish this kind of document. But in light of the debate about Iraq and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), I wanted to share with the British public the reasons why I believe this issue to be a current and serious threat to the UK. I have been increasingly alarmed by the evidence from inside Iraq that despite sanctions and despite his denials, Saddam Hussein is continuing to develop WMD and with them, the ability to inflict real damage upon the region and the stability of the world.

What I believe the intelligence has established is that Saddam has continued to produce chemical and biological weapons, that he continues to develop nuclear weapons and that he has been able to extend the range of his ballistic missile programme. It is clear that the policy of containment has not worked. I am in no doubt that the threat is serious and current and that he has to be stopped.

Source C

From a transcript from a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee in June 2003 where the Chairman questioned Alastair Campbell (Downing Street's Director of Communications) about the government's evidence in favour of an invasion of Iraq.

Mr Campbell: I work in a pretty exposed position. I work for a Prime Minister who is answerable to Parliament. The media can bandy all sorts of allegations about me, but the one thing you cannot do, if you are an elected politician is lie to the House of Commons. Now, the allegation that has been made by the BBC's defence correspondent, is that the Prime Minister did exactly that, he put to the country and to Parliament a false basis for putting at risk the lives of British servicemen. That is an accusation against the Prime Minister, against the Foreign Secretary, against the Cabinet, against the intelligence agencies, against me and against the people who work with me. Now that is why I take it so seriously, not because of me because, as I say, I am absolutely used to being described in all sorts of ways by journalists who, frankly, I would match a politician's integrity against theirs any day of the week. I simply say in relation to the BBC story: it is a lie.

0	1
---	---

With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Britain's invasion of Iraq in 2003.

[30 marks]

Section BAnswer **two** questions

0 2

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

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]**0 3**

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

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]**0 4**

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

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]**END OF QUESTIONS**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-HOLDERS AND PUBLISHERS

Source B-C: © Parliamentary Copyright - UK Parliament (www.parliament.co.uk)Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.
