

Examiner's General Advice on Unit 3

Students in this A2 unit are expected to demonstrate three particular skills:

- the ability to select, use and communicate accurate knowledge and understanding of the topic.
- when giving an historical explanation, the ability to make a substantiated judgement, that is, a judgement that goes beyond mere assertion and is backed up by appropriate evidence.
- the ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material, both primary and secondary, and also explain and evaluate interpretations of the topics studied.

These skills are also **assessment objectives**. All questions will aim to test more than one of these objectives, and in an examination answer will be marked accordingly. On any given examination paper, there will be a planned balance of the various skills across the questions to ensure that all are covered. However, individual questions or part questions will focus on certain skills, not necessarily all of them at once. One of the ways of writing an effective answer is therefore to learn to recognise the particular skill that is the focal point of a particular question. However, it is also important to remember that accurate knowledge and understanding are key elements in any A2 answer. Generalised statements showing, for example, a student's awareness that one piece of evidence is less objective and more biased than another will not earn much credit. There must also be a clear indication of some background knowledge and understanding of the topic in addition to the ability to make comparisons and contrasts between the sources.

Unit 3 (options A-N) contain **three** essay questions, and candidates have to answer two of the three questions. One of the three questions will be a 'breadth' question, covering most or all of the chronological period.

**AQA – A2 GCE
The State and The
People: Change and
Continuity
Unit 3 HIS3M**

**The Making of Modern Britain,
1951–2007**

**QUESTION 1
(01)**

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question is testing several skills and also your knowledge of the topic; in this case the decline of the Conservative Party and the rise of New Labour between the fall of Mrs Thatcher in 1990 and Tony Blair's landslide election win in 1997. You are also being required to provide a balanced historical explanation and to make a substantiated judgement.

As always with an essay-type question, relevance is the key – your answer can be selective rather than comprehensive as long as you address the precise question. There should be direct relevance to the key words of the specific question, backed by secure understanding of the overall context of political developments in the 1990s.

The key thing is not to narrate and describe, but to *use* your knowledge purposefully in order to explain and evaluate. You should also think about the length of your answer – a shorter, more coherent and controlled answer is *always* preferable to a longer, more detailed answer that is unfinished or lacking in clarity and accuracy. The amount of detail you include should take this into account and it should be selected to match your arguments. If, for example, you feel the key factor was the re-branding of 'New Labour' under Blair, Brown and Mandelson, then it would be right to cover this aspect in depth. But if your main argument is based on Conservative divisions you would need much less detail on Tony Blair and much more on the legacy of Mrs Thatcher and the problems that bedevilled John Major.

Exemplar Question

'Labour's stunning electoral victory in 1997 owed much more to the collapse of the Conservative Party than to the leadership of Tony Blair.'

How justified is this view of political developments between 1990 and 1997?

[45 marks]

Plan

- Introduction: outline the argument that will be presented and show an awareness of the context of political developments, 1990–97.
- Organized paragraphs to support a balanced judgement of the relative importance of Conservative weaknesses and the strengths of Tony Blair and 'New Labour' during the years from 1880 until the 'Labour landslide of 1997'.
- Conclusion: resolve the debate between various perspectives and show consistency with the arguments presented in the introduction.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

When Margaret Thatcher resigned in 1990 the Conservative Party had been completely dominant in British politics since 1979, while the Labour

(1) This beginning has implicit relevance, but does not directly

Party was seen as unelectable (1).

address the question.

Mrs Thatcher's successor, John Major, was quickly successful in improving party unity. He ran quite a strong election campaign in 1992 but the main reason Major won was that the Labour Party was still distrusted. People did not believe that Neil Kinnock would make a good prime minister and they did believe that a Labour government would raise taxes. The media, especially *The Sun*, was very against Labour and this made a big difference to how people voted. This was the fourth election in a row Labour had lost and it looked as if they would keep on losing in future elections (2).

(2) This is an accurate description of the political context of 1990–92 but it is still descriptive and implicit.

This changed in 1994, after the sudden death of the Labour leader, John Smith. Younger Labour politicians saw this as an opportunity to take over the party and make it electable to moderate, middle-class voters. Tony Blair became the new leader, backed by Gordon Brown, Peter Mandelson and others. They were determined to show the nation that the Labour Party was completely changed from the left-wing image of the 1980s. That is why they called the party New Labour.

Tony Blair's leadership was based on new policies and a new image. Clause Four, demanding nationalisation, was abolished. The party made promises to avoid high taxes and to encourage business. Blair deliberately upset the trade unions in order to please the middle classes (3).

(3) These two paragraphs set out some good accurate evidence here but they are still very descriptive and lacking balance.

Getting a new image was even more important. All Labour MPs were told to be 'on message' and to avoid giving any impression Labour was a divided party. Labour spent a lot of money on opinion polls to find out what voters want. New Labour leaders also made a huge effort to win over the support of the media, especially Rupert Murdoch. Eventually this was successful. The most important factor of all was Tony Blair's personality. He appealed to voters, winning over many who had previously voted for Mrs Thatcher (4).

(4) This uses sound evidence to develop the answer but the argument is very one-sided.

By 1997, Tony Blair looked like a real prime minister, unlike the Labour leaders before him. Labour was well ahead in the polls leading up to the election and the slick, efficient election campaign, backed by *The Sun*, made sure that Labour kept this lead up to election day. Labour

was so used to losing that many Labour supporters feared they would lose again but they need not have worried. Labour won a huge landslide victory. This was due to the brilliant leadership of Tony Blair and how he had changed the way people thought about the Labour Party since 1994.

Of course, there were other reasons. The Conservatives were divided over Europe and John Major looked a weak leader compared with Tony Blair or Margaret Thatcher. But none of this would have made any difference if it had been the same old Labour Party as in the 1980s. The main reason for the stunning election win in 1997 was Tony Blair (5).

(5) The two concluding paragraphs show implicit awareness of the question and, at last, provide a very brief evaluation at the end, but it is very limited.

Examiner's Assessment

This is not as effective an answer as it could have been. It uses solid and appropriate evidence, implicitly linked to the question. However, it is a very partial and one-sided answer, which relies too much on description. It merits Level 3 because it deploys convincing evidence and shows a sound grasp of the question in the concluding paragraphs. It might have reached Level 4 with a more direct approach and with some balancing evidence on other factors than Tony Blair.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

By the time of the 1997 general election, the Tory Party was seriously unpopular. After the slim 1992 election victory, the government had plunged into economic and political problems. Later in 1992, Britain was forced out of the ERM by 'Black Wednesday'. This destroyed the reputation the Tories had always cultivated of being competent economic managers. The 'green shoots of recovery' Norman Lamont had spoken of never appeared. John Major's image as straight 'Honest John' quickly disappeared. Eight months after Black Wednesday, Lamont was forced to resign from his post as Chancellor. He became a bitter and outspoken critic of Major's government from the back benches. This opposition from within his own party made Major seem weak and incompetent. This problem was later exacerbated

(6) This is in some ways a good opening paragraph. It shows good use of knowledge and good synoptic understanding. But it is not direct enough in approaching the key words of the question.

by the 'bastards' – eurosceptic MPs who attacked Major's policy towards the EU (6).

Despite the fact that Major had negotiated opt-out clauses from both the Social Chapter and the Single Currency, this was not enough for the eurosceptics who opposed the entire Maastricht treaty of 1992. These eurosceptics were able to exploit the small Tory majority in Parliament as they attempted to hold the government to ransom. There was also opposition within the Cabinet from Michael Portillo and others. Major's inability to control his own party and government gave him a poor public image (7).

(7) Again, this is well written and deploys convincing evidence but needs to be more closely linked to the specific question.

By 1995 the situation within the Conservative Party was so bad that Major resigned from the leadership and initiated a leadership contest. He won outright but 89 Tory MPs had voted against him and 111 had not fully supported him. By the time of the 1997 general election, which Major had delayed calling until the last possible moment, the divisions in the party were as bad as ever and Major's government was in a very weak position. Major was also badly undermined by Margaret Thatcher, partly because she encouraged opposition elements in the Conservative Party and above all because the press never stopped making unflattering comparisons between her strong leadership and his weakness (8).

(8) This shows good analytical depth and good implicit understanding of the question but it would have been more effective if there had been a more direct approach in the introduction.

The Conservative Party was seen to be divided and poorly led. This was made worse by the failure to deal decisively with the BSE crisis. Major seemed unable to cope with the economic and political problems the country was facing. In addition, the Murdoch press, usually a staunch supporter of the Conservatives, gave its backing instead to Labour in the 1997 election campaign. Several Tory MPs defected to other parties.

In contrast, Labour was a rejuvenated party, with a new, young and energetic leader. Labour did not need to build mass positive support for specific Labour policies. The negative attitudes towards Major from his own party, from the media and from public opinion made it certain in advance of the election that he would lose badly. Large numbers of former Conservative voters used tactical voting – they did so in protest against Major and his government, not because they adored Tony Blair (9).

(9) This paragraph is based on very good concise analysis and balanced argument, directly focused on the question.

It is true that Labour did gain wide support by shifting towards the centre ground, such as abandoning Clause IV and trying hard to make Labour more acceptable to mainstream voters. Multilateralism replaced unilateralism and Labour pledges to improve public services were popular after many years when these public services had been neglected by the Tories. Labour also promised a referendum on devolution for Scotland and Wales. Perhaps most of all, Labour offered an image of unity at a time when the Tories were badly divided. But much of the Labour vote in 1997 was based on disillusionment with 18 years of Conservative rule and the backing for Blair and 'New Labour' was only skin deep (10).

(10) This is an equally effective paragraph because it has balanced arguments and some differentiated assessment and evaluation; it is already beginning to develop a judgement.

Certainly, Blair was an attractive new leader with excellent presentational skills and he did win considerable positive support in his own right. However, Major's opponents on the Right were much more important. The press relentlessly portrayed Major as weak, haggard and tired of power, having struggled ineffectively since 1992 to control his own party. The economy was actually recovering by 1997 but nobody was willing to give Major credit for this. After 18 years of Conservative governments, the people decided it was 'time for a change'. They voted against Major and the Tories rather than for Blair and Labour (11).

(11) This conclusion shows good depth of knowledge and is concisely expressed. There is independent judgement and conceptual understanding, used to provide a direct and focused answer to the question.

Examiner's Assessment

This is a very effective answer. It is confidently presented, and combines a clear, expert narrative with well-judged analysis and synoptic links throughout. The introduction is slightly indirect and descriptive but, after that, the question is directly addressed. There is balance and, by implication, an awareness of interpretations, since there is an implicit debate about how significant the 'New Labour Project' was in changing perceptions of the Labour Party between 1992 and 1997, even though the main theme of the answer is the internal weaknesses of the Conservatives. The answer is just worth Level 5, despite the slightly indirect and implicit approach at the beginning.

Mark Scheme
L1: The answer shows only limited understanding of the question, with either some descriptive material only loosely linked to the focus of the question or with some explicit relevant comment but lacking accurate support. Skills of written communication will be weak. [0–6 marks]
L2: There will be some understanding of the needs of the question. The answer will be either primarily descriptive with few links to the question or will contain some relevant comment with very limited supporting knowledge. Historical interpretations may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument. The answer will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. [7–15 marks]
L3: The answers will show good understanding of the demands of the question, with some assessment backed by relevant selected evidence, which may be lacking in depth. There will be some synoptic links although these may not be developed. There will be some understanding of varying interpretations and perspectives. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation. [16–25 marks]
L4: The answer will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links between the ideas, arguments and information included, showing an overall historical understanding. There will be good understanding and use of different interpretations and perspectives and the answer will show judgement through balanced argument backed by a range of precisely selected evidence. The answer will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. [26–37 marks]
L5: The answer will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing argument with a high level of synoptic links. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and mature understanding of historical debate will be displayed. Answers will be well structured and fluently written. [38–45 marks]

**AQA – A2 GCE
The State and The
People: Change and
Continuity
Unit 3 HIS3M**

**The Making of Modern Britain,
1951–2007**

**QUESTION 2
(02)**

Examiner's Specific Advice

This synoptic question is testing your ability to deal with history in breadth as well as depth. The key words are 'throughout the period 1951 to 2007', 'missed opportunities', and 'continuous failure'. It is important to cover the topic as a whole, with selected specific evidence, but it is not enough just to describe events – that might take much too long and in any case will earn relatively few marks. You need to provide a balanced argument which is a direct response to the question – perhaps strongly agreeing with the key quotation, perhaps refuting it conclusively, or perhaps offering a differentiated argument along the lines of 'up to a point but'. Make sure your answer is complete and controlled, reaching a focused conclusion.

Exemplar Question

'Throughout the years from 1951 to 2007, under both Conservative and Labour governments, Britain's policies towards European integration were a record of missed opportunities and continuous failure.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[45 marks]

Plan

- Introduction – make clear what the issues to be debated are and how the overall argument of your answer will respond to the demands of the question.
- Organised paragraphs to support your argument with precisely selected evidence, arranged either chronologically or thematically, carefully linked to the question.
- Conclusion that is the logical outcome of what has gone before, *not* tacked on at the end as an afterthought. It is important to make up your mind about the conclusion before starting out on the essay!

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 1

The idea that Britain's relations with Europe amounted to missed opportunities and 'continuous failure' is completely wrong. Britain's history and

economic interests are very different from Europe. Britain was a world power in 1951 and had very close ties to the Empire and Commonwealth, as well as to the United States. It was never a good idea for Britain to become part of a federal Europe (1).

(1) This is a lively and relevant introduction, showing a good grasp of the demands of the question.

Britain gained somewhat economically from joining the EEC but only as a common market. The way the EEC changed into the EU was bad for Britain. This was proved by the way public opinion steadily turned against Europe after the Maastricht treaty in 1992 (2).

(2) This is an attempt to provide balance but is very assertive and undeveloped.

Margaret Thatcher showed how to stand up to the European federalists by her refusal to give more power to Brussels. She got a rebate on Britain's payments to Europe. She knew membership of the ERM was bad for Britain, even though she was pushed into accepting it by Geoffrey Howe and John Major. When Major's government was forced to pull out of the ERM on Black Wednesday in 1992, Britain's economy immediately benefited. (It should be known as White Wednesday). Britain was right to opt out of the so-called social chapter in 1992, which would have dragged down British business with heavy labour costs, and Britain was right to stay out of the euro in 1999 (3).

(3) This is a much stronger paragraph, with bold statements supported by selected evidence.

Britain was also right to follow an independent foreign policy and to keep close to the United States. This enabled Margaret Thatcher to play a key part alongside Ronald Reagan in winning the Cold War. It enabled Tony Blair to sort out the Balkans through NATO military power in 1999, after the EU had made a complete mess of dealing with Milosevic and Yugoslavia (4).

(4) The candidate again makes a relevant case but without enough factual support concerning relations with Europe.

Right up to and after, 2007, Britain's place in world affairs was strong, shown by the leading role in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. None of this would have happened if Britain had joined in some kind of weak compromise foreign policies made in Brussels. Britain might have gained more economically from joining the EEC sooner but that was not really a missed opportunity because Britain gained more in the long run from being outside Europe and not controlled by federalists in Brussels (5).

(5) This is quite a strong conclusion. It is consistent with the ideas in the introduction and has sensible links to the key words of the question.

Examiner's Assessment

Overall the answer has strong opinions made relevant to the question but it is not a well-

developed answer. There is a tendency to make sweeping assertions without supporting evidence and there is little indication that the candidate knows or understands much about developments before 1979, although there is quite good awareness of the issues in the period as a whole. There is sufficient argument and conceptual understanding here to potentially reach Level 4 but not the necessary balance or depth of specific evidence. Overall, the answer merits Level 3.

Examiner's Exemplar Answer 2

There is no denying the fact that there were many missed opportunities in British policies towards Europe. From the very beginning, Britain 'missed the European bus' by failing to take part in the Messina conference of 1955 that led to the Treaty of Rome in 1957. When Britain belatedly did recognise the obvious need to join the EEC, the previously open door was slammed shut by President De Gaulle. This meant that Britain missed out on the vital formative stages of European integration during the prosperity of the long postwar boom. Although British entry was secured in 1973, by then Europe was dominated by an established French-German partnership and Britain's role was as an outsider. From the 1980s, negative attitudes and political divisions at home ensured that Britain never reached a position 'at the heart of Europe' (6).

(6) This is a very good synoptic introduction, showing a good understanding of the question and good awareness of the period as a whole.

It is not true, however, that British policies were a continuous failure. There were many examples of close cooperation between Britain and Europe; and many ways in which Britain benefited greatly from membership of the 'European club'. In recent years, the relentless hostility towards Europe from the right-wing press and from Eurosceptic MPs has obscured the facts of Britain's positive and influential role in Europe. But this role has never become what it might have been if crucial opportunities had not been thrown away (7).

(7) This is a very effective paragraph, offering balanced judgement of the issues in the question.

Up to 1997, Conservative governments generally took a positive approach to Europe. Even in the early 1950s, Winston Churchill encouraged European cooperation, even though he did not think Britain needed to be involved. Harold Macmillan

attended the 1955 Messina conference as an observer, and started moves for British membership of the EEC very soon after he became prime minister in 1957. Macmillan and Edward Heath gained close links with European leaders during the lengthy negotiations over Britain's first application for membership in 1961-63. When Heath became prime minister, at a time when De Gaulle had disappeared from the scene, he succeeded in bringing Britain into the EEC and was seen in Europe as a committed pro-European (8).

(8) This paragraph shows secure knowledge and good grasp of the chronological context.

Even after Heath had been replaced by Margaret Thatcher, the Conservative Party was firmly in favour of Europe. Mrs Thatcher's key ministers, such as Geoffrey Howe, Willie Whitelaw and Michael Heseltine were pro-Europe. Under Mrs Thatcher, Britain joined the Single European Market and the ERM (Exchange Rate Mechanism). It was only at the end of her premiership, after her aggressive speech at Bruges in 1988, that Mrs Thatcher became identified with negative Eurosceptic views.

Thatcher's successor, John Major, was also pro-European and made a success of the negotiations for the Maastricht treaty in 1992. But Major was increasingly attacked from within his own party by Eurosceptics (encouraged by Margaret Thatcher, who took a very different line in the 1990s than when she was prime minister). After Major's massive defeat in 1997, the Labour government strongly supported the expansion of the EU to include the states of Central and Eastern Europe. Tony Blair became a key spokesman for the EU in foreign affairs and on aid to Africa. So it is clearly wrong to talk about Britain's relations with Europe as 'continuous failure' (9).

(9) These two paragraphs deploy accurate and selective knowledge, culminating in a precise and well-differentiated link to the question.

The many successes of Britain's relations in Europe were badly undermined, however, by disastrous missed opportunities. The first, crucial one was failure to take the lead at the beginning. Britain could have assumed the key leading role in an integrated Europe in the early 1950s but both major political parties failed to see this. Attitudes in the Labour Party were dominated by trade unionists who were frightened of Europe being a 'capitalist conspiracy'. The Conservative Party, especially Anthony Eden, was obsessed with outdated ideas about Britain's world role and links to the Commonwealth and Empire. By the time realism dawned, from 1958, De Gaulle had come to power in France and the opportunity for British leadership

was blocked. This setback was especially serious because the period to 1973, when Britain finally joined, was one of prolonged prosperity; Britain missed out badly (10).

(10) An effective paragraph, which pulls the arguments together and shows some perspective.

The second major missed opportunity was in the 1990s. The successful negotiations for the Maastricht treaty showed how respected Major was by other European leaders. Major was also prominent in EU foreign policy in the Balkan Wars and in steps to widen the EU to include states in the 'New Europe' east of the old Iron Curtain. But all this was sabotaged by the attacks on Major from Eurosceptics in the Conservative Party and their backers in the popular press. Major said openly he wanted to be at the heart of Europe but many in his party wanted to be at the edge of Europe, or outside altogether (11).

(11) Develops the argument efficiently, with concise expression.

When Tony Blair came to power, it seemed possible that he might succeed where Major had been unable to. He had a strong majority in Parliament and it was the defeated Conservatives who were associated with anti-Europe views. Blair had many successes at first, even though Britain opted out of the single currency when the euro was launched in 1999. But Blair and his New Labour colleagues were obsessed with keeping the support of the media, especially Rupert Murdoch, and the chance for Britain to really take the lead in Europe was missed.

Finally, there was Iraq. Blair believed he could provide the essential link between the foreign policies of Europe and the United States. But he could not. Instead his misplaced faith in George Bush and the 'special relationship' drove a wedge between Britain and Europe. Blair became a discredited leader. In 2007, the Conservative Party elected a new Eurosceptic leader, David Cameron. Tony Blair had missed his opportunity, the best since 1957, to place Britain at the heart of Europe (12).

(12) A neat conclusion that grows logically out of the arguments expressed throughout the answer.

Examiner's Assessment

This is a strong answer. The candidate shows depth and range of relevant knowledge, used confidently to explain a number of reasons why Britain's relationship with Europe remained ambivalent. There is a lot of evaluation and balanced judgement also, and the answer shows analytical depth as well

as synoptic understanding. It merits Level 5.

Mark Scheme
L1: The answer shows only limited understanding of the question, with either some descriptive material only loosely linked to the focus of the question or with some explicit relevant comment but lacking accurate support. Skills of written communication will be weak. [0–6 marks]
L2: There will be some understanding of the needs of the question. The answer will be either primarily descriptive with few links to the question or will contain some relevant comment with very limited supporting knowledge. Historical interpretations may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument. The answer will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. [7–15 marks]
L3: The answers will show good understanding of the demands of the question, with some assessment backed by relevant selected evidence, which may be lacking in depth. There will be some synoptic links although these may not be developed. There will be some understanding of varying interpretations and perspectives. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation. [16–25 marks]
L4: The answer will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links between the ideas, arguments and information included, showing an overall historical understanding. There will be good understanding and use of different interpretations and perspectives and the answer will show judgement through balanced argument backed by a range of precisely selected evidence. The answer will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. [26–37 marks]
L5: The answer will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing argument with a high level of synoptic links. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and mature understanding of historical debate will be displayed. Answers will be well structured and fluently written. [38–45 marks]

Chronology: Key Events in *The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007*

- 1951** Defeat of the Attlee government in the General Election.
- 1952** Accession of Queen Elizabeth II.
- 1955** Winston Churchill replaced as prime minister by Anthony Eden; Conservative victory in General Election.
- 1956** Suez Crisis.
- 1957** Resignation of Anthony Eden and emergence of Harold Macmillan as Conservative leader in preference to Rab Butler.
Treaty of Rome signed, bringing about the European Economic Community, without Britain.
- 1958** Formation of CND (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament).
- 1959** Decisive Conservative victory in General Election.
- 1961** Britain's application to join the EEC.
- 1963** Rejection of Britain's application to join the EEC.
Harold Wilson elected Labour leader after the death of Hugh Gaitskell.
The Profumo Affair.
Resignation of Macmillan and the emergence of Lord Home as Conservative leader.
- 1964** Narrow Labour victory in General Election.
- 1966** Labour victory, with a Parliamentary majority, in General Election.
- 1967** Rejection of Britain's second application to join the EEC.
- 1969** Outbreak of the 'Troubles' in Northern Ireland.
- 1970** Surprise victory of the Conservatives, led by Edward Heath, in General Election.
- 1973** Success of Britain's third application to join the EEC – now enlarged from six states to nine.
Major economic problems following the OPEC oil-price crisis.
National Miners' Strike and imposition of the Three Day Week.
- 1974** Heath's government defeated in General Election, February; return of Harold Wilson as prime minister.
Narrow victory for Wilson in new General Election.
- 1975** British membership of the EEC confirmed by clear 'Yes' vote in referendum.

Access to History Online AQA The State and The People: Change and Continuity – The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007 – A2 Question

- 1976** Surprise resignation of Wilson and emergence of Jim Callaghan as prime minister.
Heath replaced as Conservative leader by Margaret Thatcher.
- 1979** 'Winter of Discontent'; Conservative victory in General Election.
- 1980–81** Economic crisis and imposition of 'Thatcherite' policies.
- 1983** Decisive victory for Mrs Thatcher in General Election.
- 1984–85** Bitter social and political divisions exacerbated by prolonged Miners' Strike.
- 1987** Third sweeping electoral victory for Mrs Thatcher.
- 1990** Resignation of Margaret Thatcher caused by opposition within her own party; emergence of John Major as prime minister.
- 1992** Victory for Major and the Conservatives in General Election.
Serious financial crisis and 'Black Wednesday'.
- 1994** Emergence of Tony Blair as Labour leader; beginning of the rise of 'New Labour'.
- 1997** Landslide Labour victory in General Election.
- 2001** Decisive victory for Blair and Labour in General Election.
- 2003** Invasion of Iraq led by USA and Britain.
- 2005** Third successive election victory for Tony Blair; emergence of David Cameron as new Conservative leader.
- 2007** Resignation of Tony Blair, replaced as prime minister by Gordon Brown.
Collapse of confidence in Northern Rock, foreshadowing a coming banking crash.

Teaching Activities

- For each of the five issues in the table below, note down how each of the political groups on the left of the table would have responded.

	The Welfare State	Membership of the EEC/EU	The 'special relationship' with the United States	State intervention in the economy	Immigration and Britain as a multicultural society
Right-wing Conservative					
Moderate Conservative					
Liberal					
Moderate Labour					
Left-wing Labour					

- For each of the four prime ministers – Harold Macmillan, Harold Wilson, Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair – list up to ten achievements and up to ten failures (divide your lists into three main headings: political, economic and social). Using these lists as evidence, assess which, if any, of the four deserve to be called 'great' prime ministers.

Additional Sample Questions

- (a) To what extent did the British economy experience 'continuous decline' between 1951 and 1979?

[45 marks]

- (b) To what extent was there a 'Thatcher Revolution' in British society between 1979 and 2007?

[45 marks]

Websites

www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk

www.bbc.co.uk/history/on_this_day/