



A-level HISTORY 7042/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2025

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 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 © 2025 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Supporting Marking Guidance

A separate Supporting Marking Guidance document has been created for use in this series and any future series.

It has been written by the senior examining team. It applies to all A-level History options. The purpose of the guidance is to clarify key aspects of the mark scheme and further ensure consistency of approach across all options. The guidance does not reflect a change in the standard applied, but clarification and amplification of the standard. We hope that the guidance document will aid you in your understanding of how the standard should be applied and deepen your understanding of how the key aspects of the mark scheme work. The Supporting Marking Guidance should always be used in conjunction with the mark scheme, and any relevant examiner standardising and teacher training material.

Examiners can find the Supporting Marking Guidance on the associate extranet.

Teachers can find the Supporting Marking Guidance alongside the current mark scheme on Centre Services on results day. It will also be published with any future assessment materials on the public website.

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.

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 political situation in 1963/64.

[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 for illustrating how the Profumo Affair was covered in the popular press; its sensationalist style may lessen its value; it might be argued that the 'Daily Mirror's' left-leaning bias reduces its objectivity and limits its value
- it is valuable for its immediacy, published the day following Profumo's admission that he had lied to parliament; it cannot provide longer-term perspective but it is valuable for the way it faithfully reflects the drama of the moment
- the sensationalism was not simply to sell copy, important as this was for any paper, but the anti-Tory 'Daily Mirror' also had a political purpose: to embarrass and challenge the government; the issue of Tory sleaze had dominated the press for months
- the language and tone used reflects that of an increasingly less deferential society, emphasising a popular mood critical of the 'establishment'.

Content and argument

- the 'Daily Mirror' is arguing that the scandal reflects wider corruption at the heart of government
- the reference to 'fallen idols' is a reminder to its readership that Profumo is not the only leading Tory to have blatantly lied to the public and to parliament; Eden, too, had been accused of lying to parliament over the Suez affair and forced to resign
- the 'Daily Mirror' seems less concerned about Profumo being unfaithful to his wife – 'a beautiful and pleasant woman' – but hints at wider corruption and stagnation in society, reflecting wider criticisms by social scientists and writers (the 'angry young men') who were critical of Britain's class-ridden society, its lack of social mobility and the behaviour and attitudes of the upper classes
- the 'Daily Mirror' is clearly intent on heaping pressure on Macmillan and questioning the competence of the government; the source has value in illustrating how sleaze and corruption, as manifested in the Profumo Affair, was weakening the Conservatives' moral authority to govern.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- investigative journalists may spend months or years researching issues in depth; as such ‘Scandal 63’ might be considered highly valuable and relatively objective in its assessment
- ‘The Sunday Times’ is a newspaper with a relatively well informed, middle-class audience respected for its ‘serious’ journalism, so the authors’ connection with this paper might be thought to add value to the source
- the date of the book’s publication is key: the book is clearly valuable for its contemporary nature and immediacy to events but its value is limited because it cannot offer longer-term perspectives; the scandal did contribute to the Conservative’s difficulties in 1963/64, but it might be argued that the book was rushed to publication to capitalise on the national interest in the Profumo Affair, which further limits the value of its judgement
- the source is valuable for the emphasis it places on the Profumo Affair being a distraction for Labour and for letting the Conservatives ‘off the hook’ in respect of their wider domestic and foreign difficulties.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Labour Party feared that the Profumo Affair had, contrary to expectation, actually led to much public sympathy for Macmillan and did not benefit Labour as much as they had anticipated
- it concludes that Labour had taken its eye off the ball and allowed the scandal to deflect the party from maintaining its focus on attacking the Conservatives’ domestic and foreign policy failings, such as: underlying problems in the economy; immigration and racial violence; CND; its failed application to the EEC
- reference to events prior to the Profumo Affair might support the source’s claim that Labour was in the ascendancy: Macmillan, for example, seemed to be losing his political touch, best exemplified perhaps by his dramatic reshuffling of the cabinet in July 1962 – the so-called ‘Night of the Long Knives’
- the source is valuable in suggesting that the Profumo Affair, whilst ‘scandalous’, was not necessarily of longer-term importance in explaining the political difficulties of the Conservative government in 1963/64; by August/September 1963 it looked to the authors of ‘Scandal 63’ that the dust was settling and that Macmillan might be able to ride out the political storm.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- a key campaign speech from Wilson, the leader of the opposition, is necessarily of great value to historians in understanding the political situation in 1963/64 and Labour’s campaign focus on Tory ‘apathy and cynicism’
- Wilson is speaking at the beginning of the election campaign; it is a public speech to the party faithful but it will be widely reported and is valuable, therefore, because it clearly sets out the party’s pitch to the nation
- Wilson’s purpose was to present Labour as a distinct, modern-looking alternative to the establishment Tories now led by the Eton-educated Sir Alec Douglas-Home, whom Labour characterised as yet another out-of-touch aristocrat
- Wilson’s tone is upbeat and invigorating, with an emphasis on change, modernity and youth; it is valuable in the way the speech seeks to harness Labour to the Zeitgeist of the early 1960s, personified by Wilson: classless, state-educated, and youthful; it might be thought of limited value for its relatively one-sided, unbalanced attack and as little more than electioneering rhetoric.

Content and argument

- Wilson is arguing that Labour is best equipped for the new 'jet-age', presenting it as in touch with the youth of Britain and much more in tune with current social and cultural trends and technological innovation; the 'white heat' of technological change
- his attack on the Tories reflected widespread criticism of the Conservative ruling elite with its privileged 'old boys' networks blocking youthful talent from outside the 'establishment'
- Wilson's vision of a 'new Britain' emphasised social mobility and advancement by merit not birth; the 'establishment mentality' he derided had been lampooned by the boom in irreverent, satirical magazines, stage and TV shows
- the source is a highly valuable insight into the positioning of Wilson's Labour Party, attempting to attune itself to a more permissive, socially liberal decade and to bring 13 'wasted years' to an end; it has value for highlighting, in particular, the importance of Labour's appeal to youth.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The trade unions were responsible for the economic and industrial failures of Heath's government 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 the trade unions were responsible for the economic and industrial failures of Heath's government in the years 1970 to 1974 might include:

- Union opposition to the Industrial Relations Act, 1971, completely undermined Heath's economic and industrial strategy; the TUC organised a nationwide 'Kill the Bill' campaign in 1971 and instructed its member unions not to comply with its regulations; a seven-week miners' strike at the beginning of 1972, ostensibly over pay, was fatal to the government's industrial relations policy
- strikes and go-slows contributed to stagflation and rising unemployment, forcing Heath to U-turn on his manifesto promises that he would no longer bail out 'lame duck' industries: Rolls Royce was nationalised and he poured huge subsidies into Upper Clyde Shipbuilders to stop it going bust
- many unionists believed that Heath intended to break the unions; union leaders such as Arthur Scargill argued that Heath was waging a 'class war' against the union movement; union opposition fatally undermined his government's attempts to implement industrial reform, wage controls and free market economic liberalism
- the 1974 miners' strike led to a three-day week, forcing Heath to call a February election on the issue of 'Who governs Britain'; Heath lost; in this respect, it can be argued that the miners brought down the government
- militant unionists, characterised by a new breed of left-wing shop stewards, were willing to use industrial action as a political weapon, utilising secondary picketing and wildcat strikes; union membership increased substantially – almost 20% between 1968–74; presented Heath with industrial problems he could not control.

Arguments challenging the view that the trade unions were responsible for the economic and industrial failures of Heath's government in the years 1970 to 1974 might include:

- Heath's own inadequacies contributed to his failures: many thought him arrogant, too prickly and cold to command loyalty or win over opponents; others argued that he lacked the ruthlessness to manage the difficulties he faced: 'good at policies, not at politics'
- he was unlucky: the end of the post-war boom undermined his economic and industrial policies: inflation and rising prices led to stagflation; sectarian violence exploded in Northern Ireland, which distracted his government from economic and industrial priorities
- he was unlucky: the OPEC oil crisis, 1973–4, quadrupled oil prices, leading to recession and fuelling union demands for wage rises to match inflation
- Heath lacked political will: he was panicked by rising unemployment, choosing to do a 'U-turn' on his industrial strategy rather than tolerate 1 million unemployed, a figure that would raise the spectre of Conservative failures in the 1930s; his government declared 5 States of Emergency in three and a half years – further evidence of political incapacity
- his economic and industrial failures have been exaggerated, particularly by his Thatcherite critics; by 1973 unemployment had dropped to 500 000; the Conservative Party and the country were not yet ideologically ready for the Selsdon Park programme.

Whether Heath's government was a failure and who or what was to blame for any failures is a matter of continuing re-interpretation. Apologists for Heath might argue that he was unlucky, becoming prime minister when domestic and international circumstances, particularly the OPEC crisis, undermined his government at every turn. Certainly, the 'oil shock' in 1973/74 dealt the miners a winning hand, which they were more than willing to play. Others may reject any suggestion that Heath was simply unlucky. His economic and industrial strategy had come off the rails long before the oil crisis emerged and his unwillingness to compromise on his industrial relations policy, which so enraged the unions, condemned

him to industrial war. Whether Heath was the right man in the right party to control the unions is open to debate, but there does seem a strong argument that he lacked both the political will and firmness of conviction to control the unions.

0 3 'Britain became a backward-looking and less tolerant society in the years 1987 to 1997.'

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 became a backward-looking and less tolerant society in the years 1987 to 1997 might include:

- social conservatism and the promotion of ‘traditional moral values’ lay at the core of Thatcher’s ideology: for example, Section 28 (1988) banned the promotion of homosexuality by local authorities, marking a step back from the tolerance and inclusivity that had occurred since 1967; fear of AIDS contributed to greater prejudice about gay people
- John Major’s ‘Back to Basics’ campaign (1993) – despite being intended as a repudiation of Thatcher’s claim that ‘there is no such thing as society’ – was widely interpreted as an attempt to restore a more socially conservative Britain
- a number of moral panics in the early 1990s suggested that traditional attitudes towards marriage, family and sexuality persisted; moral campaigners such as Victoria Gillick and Mary Whitehouse were active in the early part of this period; the media attention given to the sleaze and scandal that surrounded the Conservative Party under John Major offers a further dimension of public moral outrage
- moral panics also surfaced re youth culture: the late 80s rave scene provoked a tabloid backlash against drug-taking; the Criminal Law and Justice Act, 1994, provided greater police powers to break up ‘free’ parties
- progress in improving race relations was limited: continued tensions between black youth and the police; the Stephen Lawrence murder (1993) raised widespread concerns that the police remained ‘institutionally racist’; other stresses to social cohesion emerged over the sharp rise in asylum seekers in the 90s, and over Muslim integration.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain became a backward-looking and less tolerant society in the years 1987 to 1997 might include:

- the pressure groups Stonewall (1989) and Outrage (1990) were formed to resist Section 28; there was some evidence of a greater acceptance of gay and lesbian groups: the age of consent for gay men was reduced in 1994 from 21 to 18
- progressive attitudes were seen in a continued decline of deference to the Establishment; students might reference anti-monarchism, the Arts and youth culture (post-punk)
- anti-establishment culture was also seen in the growth and popularity of environmental groups: Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth; direct action groups against controversial road developments
- the growth of ‘third-wave feminism’ challenged traditional gender views; the phenomenon of ‘girl power’ became the public face of this movement
- despite high profile cases such as that of Stephen Lawrence, there was some sense that Britain was becoming more comfortably multicultural; there were fewer occurrences of significant racial disorder; 4 non-white MPs were elected in 1987 – the first since the 1920s – and re-elected in 1992.

The extent to which social attitudes changed in this period is difficult to establish. The Thatcher legacy has been much debated (she was certainly no fan of feminism) and there is little doubt that backward-looking, so-called traditional values remained deeply entrenched in some quarters. Some contemporary social commentators argued that there was evidence of a steady and inexorable progress of progressive attitudes throughout the period, emphasising the coming of age of the 1960s generation. Nevertheless, it is possible to argue that there was as much continuity as change.

0 4 How successful was Tony Blair's foreign policy in the years 1997 to 2007?

[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 Tony Blair's foreign policy was successful in the years 1997 to 2007 might include:

- Blair's 'liberal interventionism' was successful in the Balkans; he persuaded a reluctant President Clinton to back military action against Serbia, forcing Milošević to pull out of Kosovo
- intervention in Sierra Leone (SL) was successful; British armed forces contributed to removing rebel forces from the capital Freetown and supported UN peacekeeping forces; the civil war in Sierra Leone was brought to an end in 2001
- following the Al-Qaeda attacks on the USA (9/11), Britain and the US (with NATO and UN support) invaded Afghanistan to overthrow the Taliban; a new democratic regime was established
- by joining the 'coalition of the willing' for the invasion of Iraq, Blair ensured that the US avoided unilateral action; military victory and the overthrow of Saddam Hussein was swift; Blair was convinced that any short-term difficulties related to prolonged intervention in Iraq was necessary in an era of globalisation, in which common action was vital to combat extremism; a democratic regime in Iraq was established
- Britain took a leading role in negotiations for EU enlargement (2004); he also was successful in strengthening the role of the EU in the wider world: leading EU initiatives on climate change and global poverty.

Arguments challenging the view that Tony Blair's foreign policy was successful in the years 1997 to 2007 might include:

- the invasion of Afghanistan had very limited success; the leaders of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda escaped; Afghanistan remained unstable and by 2006–7 British troops had become bogged down fighting a resurgent Taliban
- the invasion of Iraq was highly controversial and divisive; weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) were never found; the invasion had irreparably split UK public opinion; 4 ministers, including the Foreign Minister, Robin Cook, resigned; Blair failed to win support from key European allies; as in Afghanistan, the occupation of Iraq proved long and costly – in lives, money and reputation
- the ideology of liberal interventionism was discredited by the interventions in the Middle East, and fatally undermined his attempt to establish a new, ethical foundation for British foreign policy, making it much harder in the future to persuade a sceptical British public of the rightness of any case for intervention abroad
- support for President Bush over Afghanistan and Iraq had been intended to reinforce and strengthen the 'special relationship', in reality it seemed only to confirm that Blair was no more than a junior partner – 'Bush's poodle'
- Blair's record in strengthening the EU was very mixed; though his personal prestige in Europe remained high, he had few concrete achievements; he was unable to persuade Gordon Brown, and the country, to join the Euro; an enlarged EU proved difficult to reform; initiatives on climate reform and aid to Africa stagnated.

It can certainly be argued that Blair achieved success, particularly prior to 2003, but his reputation was hugely undermined by the controversy and divisiveness caused by the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, as was his vision of a Britain which could act as a diplomatic bridge between the USA and Europe. Though a democratic regime was installed in Iraq, the invasion did very little to stabilise the country or the region. It might be argued that Blair achieved precisely the opposite of what he had intended and that 'ethical' liberal interventionism had been discredited.