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|  | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 |
| 13 Conservative years. |  | Thirteen years of Conservative misrule. How far does this explain Labour’s election victory in 1964?‘Never had it so good’ How far does this explain Conservative dominance… | How successfully did Macmillan deal with the problems he faced as Prime Minister? |  | How successful was Macmillan as leader of the Conservative party? | Assess the reasons why the Conservative party remained in power from 1951 to 1964. |
| ‘64 election | Assess the reasons why the Labour party won the 1964 election. | Thirteen years of Conservative misrule. How far does this explain Labour’s election victory in 1964? |  | How important was the popular appeal of Wilson in explaining Labour’s election victory in 1964? |  | How far were Conservative scandals the MOST important reason for their defeat in the 1964 election? |
| Wilson 64-70 |  |  | The Labour governments of 1964-1970 were more successful than the Labour governments of 1974-1979. How far do you agree? | The failures of Wilson as Prime Minister are more significant than his achievements. How far do you agree? | The Labour governments of 1964 to 1970 and 1974 to 1979 failed to solve the economic problems they faced. How far do you agree? |  |
| Heath 70-74 | ‘The Heath government was a complete failure.’ How far do you agree? | How far did Heath change the Conservative party? |  |  |  | How successful was the Heath government of 1970 to 1974? |
| Wilson + Callaghan (74-79) |  |  | The Labour governments of 1964-1970 were more successful than the Labour governments of 1974-1979. How far do you agree? | How successful were the Labour governments of 1974 to 1979? | The Labour governments of 1964 to 1970 and 1974 to 1979 failed to solve the economic problems they faced. How far do you agree? |  |
| Thatcher | ‘Conservative strength rather than Labour weakness was the most important reason for Thatcher’s election victories.’ How far do you agree? | Assess the reasons why Thatcher’s domestic policies were so controversial. | Assess the reasons for opposition to Thatcher’s social and economic policies. | Assess the reasons for Thatcher’s electoral victories.Assess the reasons why Thatcher’s economic policies were controversial. | Thatcher’s economic policies failed to achieve significant economic change. How far do you agree? | To what extent were Labour weaknesses the MAIN reason for Conservative electoral victories under Thatcher?How successful were Thatcher’s domestic policies in the period from 1979 to 1990? |
| Northern Ireland |  | British Government policies were the most important reason for the failure to solve the Irish problem. How far do you agree?Assess the reasons why N I remained a problem for Britain until 1994 |  | Assess the reasons why Ireland remained a problem for British governments between 1970 and 1994 |  | How effectively did British governments deal with the problem of Northern Ireland to 1994? |

**How far were Conservative scandals the most important reason for their defeat in the 1964 election?** No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Labour won in 1964 by the large swing in the popular vote but only by a narrow margin of seats-317 to the Conservatives’ 304 and only a 5 seat majority in the Commons. Candidates should weigh up the importance of scandals in causing defeat against other factors. In considering the question of scandal most will consider the Profumo affair and its impact. Some answers will point to the youthful leadership of Wilson and his identification with all things modern, this contrasted well with the new aristocratic Conservative leader Sir Alec Douglas Home, who ran an ineffective campaign and did not handle television well. Wilson promoted his image with much talk of planning and the opportunities offered by the white heat of technology. The grey years of Gaitskell were over and Wilson exploited Conservative weakness, especially economic, with skill. However, many candidates will conclude that it was the Conservatives who lost the election in the years after 1959, rather than Labour or Wilson who won it. The Conservatives appeared too ‘Establishment’, the promotion of a peer to the leadership was a mistake given the satirists of the day. Party organisation lost its way after 1959; Butler replaced Hailsham and was in turn replaced by MacLeod. The affluence of the 1950s now appeared to be sluggish by comparison with elsewhere and the Conservative Chancellor imposed unpopular deflationary policies in 1961. Decolonisation and immigration unsettled some whilst a new economic policy, the New Approach, involving controlled expansion was undermined by De Gaulle’s veto of joining the EEC. A radical Cabinet reshuffle, the Night of the Long Knives, unsettled his ministerial colleagues when it was intended to create a fresh and dynamic government. Macmillan’s choice of replacement was botched; middle and working class voters were lost. Labour won on a modernising agenda.

**17 How successful was the Heath government of 1970 to 1974?** No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many will see this period as one of failure and will point to the Miners Strike and the Three Day Week, which appeared to epitomise the failed economic policy of the government. Heath has been criticised for failing to carry through the promised tough programme of economic and industrial reform on which the party had won the election of 1970. They started out determined to carry through a ‘quiet revolution’ by reducing the scale of the public sector and government intervention in the economy. The government was beset by a series of problems, but also made tactical errors of judgement. The Trade Union legislation was brought in very quickly and without sufficient consultation. The Industrial Relations Act was so broad in scope that it became a target for labour hostility; the good aspects were lost in the general bitterness about the method of its passage. The general refusal to comply with the terms meant it never became credible. The Ugandan Crisis inflamed hostility towards immigration, Ireland was another problem as Heath relied on the support of Unionist MPs. There were some achievements: taxes were cut, radical reform of tax and benefits system was well advanced when the government fell. However, it was the reversals of 1972 that the government is best remembered for. The decision to bail out Upper Clyde Shipbuilders, a year after refusal, was seen as a humiliating climb down. There was rising unemployment, combined with the determination to speed the rate of growth before entry to the EEC led to deliberate economic expansion, which flew in the face of the previous commitment to solve the problem of inflation. Voluntary wage control was impossible and Heath had to do this by law, the ultimate U turn.

**18 To what extent were Labour weaknesses the main reason for Conservative electoral victories under Thatcher?** No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might offer for Conservative electoral success, however to achieve the higher levels candidates must write at least a good paragraph on the named factor even if they then argue that it was less important. When considering the weakness of Labour they might consider the weak leadership of Foot and Kinnock as major factors or they might look at areas of policy that were not popular with the electorate, particularly defence. Candidates might also consider the ‘Looney Left’ as a factor in discrediting Labour with the electorate. Labour were also closely associated with the Trade Unions and the question of too much union power, following the ‘Winter of Discontent’ might be seen as an issue. In the first period in office Labour weakness was an issue as with the economic problems of rising unemployment it should have been possible for Labour to have been a strong alternative. Against this candidates should consider the strength of the Conservative party. This might include the appeal of Thatcher as a strong leader, in contrast to the Labour party. Although she was controversial she appeared strong and willing to stand up to the Unions. The recovery of the economy helped later on, but crucial for the second term was the success of the Falkland’s War and restoration of pride that followed; the Conservative party were able to take full advantage of it as opinion polls beforehand were not good. Some answers might suggest that Thatcher had a strong set of ministers around her, others might comment on the reforms, particularly the denationalisation and selling of council homes which helped to create a new class to which Thatcherism appealed. There might be some consideration of changes in voting behaviour.

**Assess the reasons why the Conservative party remained in power from 1951 to 1964. [50]**

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the dominance of a political party during a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates may see national affluence plus Conservative leadership and organisation as being more important than Labour weakness. Labour weakness was certainly important in preserving the Conservatives in power. Candidates might argue that Labour failed to modernise its policies to a more affluent Britain and the party was constantly divided. The parliamentary party was split between the Left and Right, fuelled by Bevan’s left-wing hostility to Gaitskell. The former wanted an expansion of the public sector, Gaitskell and Morrsion did not. They succeeded to the leadership and agreed on a social democracy rather than a socialist one, attempting to remove Clause IV in 1961, but failing. Only with the gloss provided by science and technology were they able to offer the electorate an alternative in 1964. This enabled the Conservatives to avoid the electoral consequences of their mistakes; particularly Suez1956 and the resignation of Eden. Their worst moments did not coincide with elections, for example the Profumo Scandal in 1961 and the failure to join the EEC in 1963. Candidates might consider Conservative leadership, which apart from an aged-Churchill, the mistakes by Eden over Suez and Home’s unsuitability was proficient with Eden pre-Suez and Macmillan. The role of Macmillan may be considered and candidates might consider his skilful exploitation of television and the media. Macmillan could also be ruthless. The economy is likely to be considered as this was an important factor, there was recovery, the end of austerity and a period of relative affluence, all of which were credited to the Conservatives. Elections were well managed by the Conservatives in 1951, 1955 and 1959. The Cold War also aided the Conservatives. The Conservatives were well organised and this also impacted on more coherent policies with the work of Butler, Maudling, Powell and MacLeod.

**17. How successful were Thatcher’s domestic policies in the period from 1979 to 1990? [50]**

Focus: An assessment of domestic policies under a named PM.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although a very controversial PM, Thatcher did win three successive elections which might lead many to argue that her policies were successful. However, it was not always domestic policies that brought her success and therefore candidates need to be careful in using criteria against which to assess her ministries. There may be substantial consideration of her economic policies which did see unemployment rise dramatically, although it might be argued that this was essential if the substantial problem of inflation was to be brought under control. It could be argued that her first ministry had few economic achievements. It could be argued that her attack on the power of the Unions was both successful and necessary if modernisation of the economy was to occur, particularly in light of the Winter of Discontent under Callaghan. Some better answers might suggest that she was more successful in taking on the miners than Heath as she prepared for the confrontation. The denationalisation of industries brought many into share-holding, giving them a greater stake in the country, although in the long-term few kept their shares, but it was popular within the country. The availability of buying your own council house might be seen as very successful as it created a new class of property owner who would often support the party. However, in hindsight some have seen the consumerism and ‘loads of money’ culture that her time in office created as undesirable. For the ‘haves’ of the mid 1980s it was a period of prosperity as real wages outstripped inflation. It appeared in 1987 as if the government had delivered an economic miracle. However, for those who did not benefit from the economic policies it was a period of increasing social exclusion, this was shown with riots in Brixton and other cities. Unemployment in parts of the inner cities hit levels not seen since the inter-war years as a result of industrial decline. There may be an argument that the government had little regard for civil liberties. The Poll Tax and subsequent riots was not a success. The success depends upon the criteria used to measure success. It had been more difficult to roll back the state, government spending had hardly been reduced, the authority of the government had become increasingly centralised and interventionist. There were controls on local government, education and even privatisation was accompanied by the growth in quangos. This could be balanced against the reduction in Union power, the decline in the loss of the number of working days, the pattern of house ownership was changed and it might be argued that Britain’s political culture was changed as socialism as a domestic force was finished off.

**18. How effectively did British governments deal with the problem of Northern Ireland to 1994? [50]**

Focus: An assessment of policy in a key area.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The growing unrest and disturbances, at first in Northern Ireland and then on the mainland would suggest that policy towards Ireland was not successful. By 1960 there was resentment against the Northern Ireland government by about 1/3 of the population, by 1968 there was serious rioting and by 1969 rioting by the Nationalists became so serious that RUC was finding it difficult to keep control. Armed Unionist groups were attacking Nationalist areas in Belfast and Derry. This deterioration can be supported by the need to deploy an increasing number of troops on the streets of Northern Ireland, initially to protect Catholics, who then turned on them, highlights the failings and belief among Nationalists that the army were defending Unionists. There may be reference to events such as ‘Bloody Sunday’ and its consequences, particularly Direct Rule. This can be further developed by reference to the growing support for the various paramilitary organisations and support for Sinn Fein. The use of Internment without trial may be considered as it resulted in the arrest of large numbers and resulted in increased support for the IRA. There may be reference to the attempts at talks with various Nationalist groups, for example Whitelaw in 1972 which was a failure. The Sunningdale Agreement and its failure may also be discussed. The Prevention of Terrorism Act of 1975 may also be considered as may the success of direct rule as it resulted in the reorganisation of IRA into cells, which the British army could not break. Thatcher governments faced the problem of hunger strikers, which also led to an increase in support for Sinn Fein. There were attempts at ‘rolling devolution’, but more successful were the increased links between London and Dublin and this culminated in the Hillsborough Agreement, which did have long term consequences. The increased amount of terrorist activity on the mainland during the 1980s also suggests that government policy did not work and there may be reference to events such as the murder of Airey Neave, the murder of Mountbatten, the Hyde Park bombs or the bombing of the Grand Hotel in Brighton, which came close to wiping out the Conservative leadership. There may also be reference to the murder of various ministers as evidence that the democratic process was not working. At the end of the period there was a continuation of political violence, continued political success for Sinn Fein, the existence of paramilitary groups on both sides and limited support for a lasting peace involving both sides of the community; it was only with the 1993 Downing Street Declaration that success appeared possible and this can be seen with the IRA and Loyalist declarations of ceasefire in 1994 . Therefore it might be concluded that the more successful policies were towards the end of the period.

**How successful was Macmillan as leader of the Conservative party?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that he was successful and point to his ‘supermac image’ and to his electoral success. He was able to reunite the party after the disasters of Suez and was also able to win electoral popularity and defeat the new Labour leader, Gaitskell, who was popular with the middle classes. The electoral victory in 1959 was the first time a party had won a third consecutive election. However, this might be balanced by consideration of his final years which saw by-elections defeats and scandals. Some candidates might point to his skill in handling the media; he mastered television and understood the importance of addressing his own image in the age of visual media. His personal approval ratings rose dramatically in the first part of the period. He was able to modernise the party election campaigns which paid more attention to opinion polling and modern methods of public relations. He was able

to convince the country that they had never had it so good.

**17 ‘The Labour governments from 1964 to 1970 and from 1974 to 1979 failed to solve the economic problems they faced’. How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The period is often seen as one of economic decline that governments failed to reverse. In order to answer the question candidates might identify the economic problems faced and then consider how successful the policies were in addressing the difficulties. The governments faced the problem of shrinking manufacturing industries and a growing financial and service sector. The transition was not smooth and it caused difficult industrial relations. Candidates might consider Labour governments attempts to bring in statutory rules into industrial relations and how successful they were in removing industrial conflict; issues such as the 1966 National Union of Seamen strike might be mentioned. Labour did face problems in dealing with this issue as they did not want to antagonise its chief supporters and this prevented Wilson from persevering with its attempts to outlaw unofficial strikes as laid out in the White Paper of 1969. Candidates might also consider the failure of governments to address the problem of economic growth rates. The difficulties created by the oil price rise of 1973 might be considered as it resulted in a balance of payments deficit, inflation, a decrease in the value of sterling, rising interest rates and unemployment. Some might consider the reliance on loans from the IMF and devaluation of the pound as a sign of failure. It might be argued that if devaluation had been introduced earlier then difficulties could have been reduced. The government also failed to persuade the unions to co-operate consistently with it, despite the repeal of the Conservative Industrial Relations

Act. Candidates might also refer to the Winter of Discontent as evidence of failure. However, the failures might be put into context and candidates might suggest that the scale of the problems and their international dimension meant that some issues were outside government control.

**18 ‘Thatcher’s economic policies failed to achieve significant economic change.’ How**

**far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is much debate as to how far her policies brought about an economic revolution as there were significant changes in the economy and its management. Candidates might consider some of the following issues: the role of the government in managing the economy as market forces, rather than the government directed it, there was a new economic philosophy of monetarism, inflation was radically lowered, an enterprise culture was introduced, high personal taxation, public spending and borrowing by the government were ended, the role of Trade Unions in the economic life of the country was reduced and huge

sections of industry which were owned by the state such as Telecommunications and Electricity were privatised. Answers may discuss how far any of these issues deserve to be considered a revolution as all of the areas have alternative interpretations.

**How successful were the Labour governments of 1974-79?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is likely that many will focus on economic issues. The period is often seen as one of economic decline that governments failed to reverse. In order to answer the question candidates might identify the problems faced and then consider how successful the policies were in addressing the difficulties. The governments faced the problem of shrinking manufacturing industries and a growing financial and service sector. The transition was not smooth and it caused difficult industrial relations. Candidates might also consider the failure of governments to address the problem of economic growth rates. The difficulties created by the oil price rise of 1973 might be considered as it resulted in a balance of payments deficit, inflation, a decrease in the value of sterling, rising interest rates and unemployment. Some might consider the reliance on loans from the IMF and devaluation of the pound as a sign of failure. It might be argued that if devaluation had been introduced earlier then difficulties could have been reduced. Candidates might consider relations with the Unions and Labour government’s attempts to bring in statutory rules into industrial relations and how successful they were in removing industrial conflict. Candidates might also refer to the Winter of Discontent as evidence of failure. However, the failures might be put into context and candidates might suggest that the scale of the problems and their international dimension meant that some issues were outside government control. Some might comment on the criticisms of the Left that the governments made little progress towards social equality and there have been arguments that under Callaghan it was the rich that got richer. The failures might be balanced against the problems faced in terms of electoral support as governments had either a small majority or no majority at all from February to October 1974 and 1977 to 1979. There were also the problems of dissension within the party and some might comment on the numbers who left the party.

**17 ‘The failures of Wilson as Prime Minister are more significant than his achievements.’ How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many answers are likely to agree with the statement and may well focus on the ultimate failure of the economic policies of the governments. There is also likely to be discussion of the failure to develop good industrial relations. The problem of economic growth rates was not solved and the difficulties created by the oil crisis of 1973 resulted in a balance of payment deficit, inflation, a decrease in the value of sterling, rising interest rates and unemployment. Some might consider the reliance on loans from the IMF and devaluation of the pound as a sign of failure. It might be argued that if devaluation had been introduced earlier then difficulties could have been reduced. Candidates might consider relations with the Unions and Labour government’s attempts to bring in statutory rules into industrial relations and how successful they were in removing industrial conflict; issues such as the 1966 National Union of Seamen strike might be mentioned. Labour did face problems in dealing with this issue as they did not want to antagonise its chief supporters and this prevented Wilson from persevering with its attempts to outlaw unofficial strikes as laid out in the White Paper of 1969. The government also failed to persuade the unions to co-operate consistently with it, despite the repeal of the Conservative Industrial Relations Act. Candidates might also consider the failure of Wilson to bring about further social equality. However, the failures might be put into context and candidates might suggest that the scale of the problems and their international dimension meant that some issues were outside government control. It is also important to note that Labour governments frequently had either only a small majority or no majority at all and this limited their achievements. In considering whether there were successes answers might make reference to the establishment of Open University which enabled working adults to receive a university education at home. They might also mention the abolition of the death penalty and the legalisation of abortion and homosexual acts, 1968 also saw the granting of the franchise to 18 year olds. An Equal Pay Act was introduced in 1980 and Race Relations’ legislation in 1965 and 1968 made many forms of racist behaviour illegal. Perhaps the greatest achievement might be seen as the narrowing of the gap between the rich and poor through increased benefits. It might also be argued that the greatest achievement of Wilson was simply to survive. Perhaps the greatest achievement was the Health and Safety Act.

**18 Assess the reasons why Thatcher’s economic policies were controversial.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although a very controversial PM, Thatcher did win three successive elections which might lead many to argue that her economic policies were successful, even though controversial. Her economic policies which did see unemployment rise dramatically, although it might be argued that this was essential if the substantial problem of inflation was to be brought under control. It could be argued that her first ministry had few economic achievements. It could be argued that her attack on the power of the Unions was both successful and necessary if modernisation of the economy was to occur, particularly in light of the Winter of Discontent under Callaghan. Some better answers might suggest that she was more successful in taking on the miners than Heath as she prepared for the confrontation. The denationalisation of industries brought many into share-holding, giving them a greater stake in the country, although in the long-term few kept their shares, but it was popular within the country. The availability of buying your own council house might be seen as very successful as it created a new class of property owner who would often support the party. However, in hindsight some have seen the consumerism and ‘loads of money’ culture that her time in office created as undesirable. For the ‘haves’ of the mid 1980s it was a period of prosperity as real wages outstripped inflation. It appeared in 1987 as if the government had delivered an economic miracle. However, for those who did not benefit from the economic policies it was a period of increasing social exclusion, this was shown with riots in Brixton and other cities. Unemployment in parts of the inner cities hit levels not seen since the inter-war years as a result of industrial decline. There might be consideration of some of the shifts in taxation, with the rise in VAT shifting tax to consumption from income and the reduction of tax on wealth creators.

**How important was the popular appeal of Wilson in explaining Labour’s election victory in 1964? [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to reach the higher levels candidates will need to write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they conclude it was not important. Labour won in 1964 by the large swing in the popular vote but only by a narrow margin of seats-317 to the Conservatives 304 and only a 5 seat majority in the Commons. Candidates should weigh up the importance of Wilson in explaining Labour’s victory against other factors. Some answers will point to the youthful leadership of Wilson and his identification with all things modern. This contrasted well with the new aristocratic Conservative leader Sir Alec Douglas Home, who ran an ineffective campaign and did not handle television well. Wilson promoted his image with much talk of planning and the opportunities offered by the ‘white heat’ of technology. The grey years of Gaitskell were over and Wilson exploited Conservative weakness, especially economic, with skill. However, many candidates will conclude that it was the Conservatives who lost the election in the years after 1959, rather than Labour or Wilson who won it. The Conservatives appeared too ‘Establishment’, the promotion of a peer to the leadership was a mistake given the satirists of the day. Party organisation lost its way after 1959; Butler replaced Hailsham and was in turn replaced by MacLeod. The affluence of the 1950s now appeared to be sluggish by comparison with elsewhere and the Conservative Chancellor imposed unpopular deflationary policies in 1961. Decolonisation and immigration unsettled some whilst a new economic policy, the New Approach, involving controlled expansion, was undermined by De Gaulle’s veto of joining the EEC. A radical Cabinet reshuffle, the Night of the Long Knives, unsettled his ministerial colleagues when it was intended to create a fresh and dynamic government. Macmillan’s choice of replacement was botched, middle and working class voters were lost. Labour won on a modernising agenda. Some may consider the question of scandal, particularly the Profumo affair and its impact.

**17 Assess the reasons for Thatcher’s electoral victories. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a number of reasons that candidates might consider, but at the higher levels they should evaluate the relative importance of the factors. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might offer for Conservative electoral success. When considering the weakness of Labour they might consider the weak leadership of Foot and Kinnock as major factors or they might look at areas of policy that were not popular with the electorate, particularly defence. Candidates might also consider the ‘Looney Left’ as a factor in discrediting Labour with the electorate. Labour were also closely associated with the Trade Unions and the question of too much union power, following the ‘Winter of Discontent’ this might be seen as an issue. In the first period in office Labour weakness was an issue as with the economic problems of rising unemployment it should have been possible for Labour to have been a strong alternative. Against this candidates should consider the strength of the Conservative party. This might include the appeal of Thatcher as a strong leader, in contrast to the Labour party. Although she was controversial she appeared strong and willing to stand up to the Unions. The recovery of the economy helped later on, but crucial for the second term was the success of the Falklands War and restoration of pride that followed; the Conservative party were able to take full advantage of it as opinion polls beforehand were not good. Some answers might suggest that Thatcher had a strong set of ministers around her, others might comment on the reforms, particularly the denationalisation and selling of council homes which helped to create a new class to which Thatcherism appealed, particularly in the third election victory. There might be some consideration of changes in voting behaviour.

**18 Assess the reasons why Ireland remained a problem for British governments between 1970 and 1994. [50]**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Thatcher governments faced the problem of hunger strikers, which also led to an increase in support for Sinn Fein, suggesting the problem had not been solved. There were attempts at ‘rolling devolution’, but more successful were the increased links between London and Dublin and this culminated in the Hillsborough Agreement, which did have long term consequences for a solution. However, the increased amount of terrorist activity on the mainland during the 1980s also suggests that government policy did not work and there may be reference to events such as the murder of Airey Neave, the murder of Mountbatten, the Hyde Park bombs or the bombing of the Grand Hotel in Brighton, which came close to wiping out the Conservative leadership. There may also be reference to the murder of various ministers as evidence that the democratic process was not working and that the Irish problem remained as insoluble as ever. At the end of the period there was a continuation of political violence, continued political success for Sinn Fein, the existence of paramilitary groups on both sides and limited support for a lasting peace involving both sides of the community; it was only with the 1993 Downing Street Declaration that success appeared possible and this can be seen with the IRA and Loyalist declarations of ceasefire in 1994. Therefore it might be concluded that the more successful policies were towards the end of the period. Some answers might compare this with the situation earlier in the period to show that progress was being made, but examiners should be aware of candidates who spend too long on the early period.

At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of ‘how far’ and not simply provide a list of reasons for their electoral dominance. There is a wide range of factors that might be considered and it is not expected that candidates will cover them, what matters is the quality of analysis. However, in order to reach Level III candidates must consider the named factor even if they argue that it was not the most important factor. Economic success certainly played a role in their dominance. Prosperity made Conservative disputes petty and made it harder for Labour to attack their policies. The Conservatives were fortunate that economic recovery was underway in the 1950s once Korea was over and this enabled them to dismantle the apparatus of austerity and gain the credit. The ability to reduce taxes and increase social expenditure gave the feeling of prosperity and many wanted to maintain this. This was also reflected in full employment, which helped to spread the gains more widely and affluence was more marked by the end of the 1950s. They were fortunate that the booms coincided with the times of elections, for example in 1959. Elections were fought on the economy and issues of taxation and on both Conservative policies appeared to be successful at the time of elections. However, these issues could be balanced against Labour divisions and weakness, the timing of elections which, fortunately for the Conservative party avoided moments of potential disaster (Suez and Profumo). Conservative leadership might be seen as a strength, at least until Alec Douglas Hume in 1963-4, particularly as Churchill’s health problems were hidden from the public. Eden was popular pre-Suez and Macmillan was seen as modern, exploiting affluence. Conservative Party organisation and economic management, until 1960, was competent. The importance of economic factors could be shown through the loss in 1964 when economic uncertainty had returned.

At the higher levels answers will need to consider ‘how far’ and reach a balanced judgement. There are many issues that candidates could consider and it is not expected that they will deal with them all, what matters is the quality of analysis. In terms of electoral results it could be argued that Wilson was more successful, winning in 1964, 1966 and 1974, whereas Callaghan lost in 1979. There might be a comparison between Callaghan’s handling of the 1979 ‘Winter of Discontent’ with Wilson’s management of strikes, the need for an IMF loan and inflation. Some might compare their success in handling the problem of Trade Unions; Callaghan had a difficult time in office as unions would not agree to pay restraint and this might be compared with Castle’s attempt to bring in ‘In Place of Strife’, which also angered union leaders and had to be withdrawn in the face of union threats not to support Labour. It might be argued that both leaders alienated moderates, Wilson in 1970 who saw many voters defect to Heath in the hope that action would be taken against union militancy and this could be compared with 1979 when Thatcher won. The issue of inflation might also provide an area of comparison, with both facing large rises, although Wilson’s were more dramatic. There are other areas where the Wilson government did appear to be less successful and candidates might point to Wilson’s failure to join the EEC or tackle immigration. However, it would be unfair to argue that Wilson’s government witnessed only failure and there might be mention of some of the successes in the period 1967-79; this might include the success of devaluation and a rise in exports.

Answers may start by identifying the problems faced by the governments and this might include issues such as the divisions, the growth of terrorism, economic discrimination, the use of violence, the development of paramilitary groups and perceptions of the police and army. Although the topic starts in 1951 some answers might place the problems in context of earlier developments and this can be credited provided the main focus is on the period from 1951. Candidates might consider the problem of the division between Nationalists and Loyalists and the emergence of more extreme forms within the period which resorted to more violent approaches. The sizeable proportion of the population, about 1/3, who felt resentment against the government made the problems more difficult to resolve. Candidates might examine the importance of the events of 1968-9 in exacerbating the problems and they might also argue that the issues had largely been ignored until then and that this had made matters worse. There might be an examination of the issues of discrimination in policing, social and economic areas and the anti-Catholic nature of the Unionist majority that added to the difficulties and this might be linked to the problem of a Unionist dominated government. Answers are likely to consider the role of the IRA and the emergence of the Provisional IRA following the split in 1969. Attitudes towards the British army among many Catholics did not make the situation any easier. Policies such as internment may also have exacerbated the problem and this was added to by events such as Bloody Sunday. There might be an exploration as to why the Sunningdale Agreement and power sharing failed and this might include the change in government and a lack of decisive leadership. There might also be some consideration of international support for terrorism and reference made to the hunger strikes of the 1980s. Some candidates might also examine the problem of the relationship between Britain and the Irish government, particularly when Fianna Fail was in power, particularly during the Falklands crisis. Candidates might also make reference to the political success of Sinn Fein, the divisions within the Unionist movement and the limited support among both communities for a lasting peace.

At the higher levels answers will need to focus on ‘how successfully’ and not simply list his achievements and failures. Some candidates might establish criteria against which success can be judged or outline the problems he faced and assess how successfully he dealt with them. In considering the problems he faced there are a number that might be discussed; these include the issue of austerity, economic problems, scandals, the image of his leadership and his party and the changing social context. Some might argue that one of the reasons for the Conservative victory in 1951 was voter disillusionment with the continued austerity measures. Macmillan was fortunate that an economic recovery occurred and that success was not entirely due to the government, but an upturn in the economy. In dealing with the economic problems some might argue that Macmillan was successful in so far as problems did not coincide with elections, but that there were periods of inflation and slow growth. The problems of the depressed areas continued and there was a balance of payment crisis after 1960. On the surface the period appeared to be one of affluence and allowed Macmillan to claim that the people had ‘never had it so good’, but answers might examine whether this was only superficial. In dealing with scandals, particularly Profumo, Macmillan was less successful and although he survived it did damage his image. The same might be said about trying to reinvigorate his party through the Cabinet reshuffle or ‘night of the long knives’. He was able to adapt the party and conservative leadership to the new media age and was very proficient in front of the cameras and gave the party a new image. However, some might balance this against social changes that were taking place in the 1960s and argue that the party was out of touch, appearing to be upper class and public school dominated. It might be argued that while labour was divided this mattered less, but under the youthful and forward looking Wilson it did lead to electoral defeat for the Conservatives

At the higher levels answers should focus on ‘how far’ and not simply list the successes and failures of the two governments. Candidates might suggest that that the first period was more successful as Labour was able to win a second term in 1966, although some might argue that two elections were won in 1974, although this could be challenged as they were a minority. Candidates might consider a range of issues such as the economy, relations with the Unions and living standards. It could be argued that both periods saw economic problems, with inflation, unemployment and balance of payments problems playing significant roles in both periods. The problem of having to ask the IMF for a loan in the 1960 was repeated in the 1970s. However, there were periods of success in both periods; in 1967 devaluation brought the pound down which helped exports and they rose in the period 1968-70 and this could be compared with the decline in inflation from 15% in January 1978 to 8% in January 1979. Relations with the Unions were problematic in both periods. In the first period Castle’s attempt at reform with ‘In Place of Strife’ was a failure and angered unions and this can be compared to the Winter of Discontent in 1979, when the government tried to impose a 5% limit on pay increases and it resulted in a series of strikes and a government climb down, leading to higher pay settlements and rising inflation. In considering living standards candidates might suggest that the credit squeeze in the first period had an impact as did cuts in spending on housing, schools and other public works. This might be compared with the relative decline in public sector pay compared with private in the second period. Both periods witnessed similar problems and candidates could put forward a case for either period or argue that both saw large scale problems.

At the higher levels answers must go beyond simply listing reasons for opposition and evaluate their relative importance and reach a balanced judgement. Some might argue that it was the controversial nature of the policies that caused opposition. The selling off of nationalised industries was seen by some as selling off the family silver and there were fears that private ownership would be more concerned with profits than service. There were concerns about the monetarist policies as the control of inflation took precedence and candidates might consider the impact on unemployment. The attack on the powers of the unions might be argued to be unpopular, but some might argue it was a reason for electoral victories as moderates wanted to see union power controlled. The decline in the manufacturing sector also caused opposition and was reflected in the division between a prosperous south and poorer north and the government was associated with a ‘loads of money’ culture, which was uncaring and simply made the rich wealthier. opportunity to buy your own council house might be seen as very successful as it created a new class of property-owner which would often support the party. However, in hindsight some have seen the consumerism and ‘loads of money’ culture that her time in office created as undesirable. For the ‘haves’ of the mid 1980s it was a period of prosperity as real wages outstripped inflation. It appeared in 1987 as if the government had delivered an economic miracle. However, for those who did not benefit from the economic policies it was a period of increasing social exclusion, this was shown with riots in Brixton and other cities. Unemployment in parts of the inner cities hit levels not seen since the inter-war years as a result of industrial decline.

Candidates must consider how far Conservative policies or mistakes were the main reason for their defeat in 1964 if they want to achieve the higher levels, even if they conclude that it was not the most important reason. There are many factors for candidates to consider and these need to be weighed up and a balanced judgement reached. Labour won in 1964 by a large swing in the popular vote, but only by a narrow margin of seats. Candidates might consider the leadership of Wilson, who was young and dynamic, and his association with the ‘white heat of technology’, whereas the Conservatives appeared out of touch with the young electorate. The Conservative campaign under Home was ineffective and he appeared to represent the old aristocratic Conservative party. Many may argue that it was the Conservatives, especially after 1959, which lost the election. The party appeared too ‘establishment’, the promotion of a peer to the leadership was a mistake, its organisation had lost its way. The affluence with which they had been associated now appeared rather sluggish compared with elsewhere and the unpopular deflationary policies of Selwyn Lloyd did little to win support. Decolonisation, the Profumo affair, the Night of the Long Knives, immigration might also be seen as evidence of misrule, as might the economic policies. However, if candidates want to argue that it was not a period of misrule they might point to ‘you have never had it so good’ and the economic prosperity under Butler and the ending of wartime rationing and controls.

This is a key issue and there is a great deal that candidates can write about and examiners should not expect all issues to be covered. At higher levels candidates will need to consider ‘how far’ and this will provide scope for a wide discussion. There might be consideration of the change from Home to Heath and how far Heath took the Conservative party away from its old image and association with privilege and the aristocratic order, but some might go on and balance this against Thatcher to argue that it was under her that greater changes took place, however there is no need for this in order for candidates to achieve any level. There might be discussion about his election as leader and this might be contrasted with Home, although again Thatcher’s election might also be considered. There might also be discussion as to whether his policies changed the party. In considering these areas it is likely that the issue of Europe and industrial relations, particularly the miner’ strike, will figure prominently. Once again candidates might contrast his polices and the transformation with that under Thatcher. He failed to carry through the promised tough programme of economic and industrial reform on which the party had won the election of 1970 and carried on the policies of consensus. He started out determined to carry through a ‘quiet revolution’ by reducing the scale of the public sector and government intervention in the economy. The government was beset by a series of problems, but also made tactical errors of judgement. The Trade Union legislation was brought in very quickly and without sufficient consultation. The Industrial Relations Act was so broad in scope that it became a target for labour hostility; the good aspects were lost in the general bitterness about the method of its passage. The general refusal to comply with the terms meant it never became credible. There were some achievements in transforming policy: taxes were cut, radical reform of tax and benefits system was well advanced when the government fell. However, it was the reversals of 1972 that the government is best remembered for. There was rising unemployment; the determination to speed the rate of growth before entry to the EEC led to deliberate economic expansion, which flew in the face of the previous commitment to solve the problem of inflation. Voluntary wage control was impossible and Heath had to do this by law, the ultimate U-turn.

Candidates must discuss government policies if they want to achieve the higher levels, even if they conclude that there were other factors that were more important. Answers may start by identifying the problems faced by the governments and this might include issues such as the

divisions, the growth of terrorism, economic discrimination, the use of violence, the development of paramilitary groups and perceptions of the police and army. Although the topic starts in 1951some answers might place the problems in context of earlier developments and this can be

credited provided the main focus is on the period from 1951. Candidates might consider the problem of the division between Nationalists and Loyalists and the emergence of more extreme forms within the period which resorted to more violent approaches. The sizeable proportion of the population, about 1/3, who felt resentment against the government made the problems more difficult to resolve. Candidates might examine the importance of the events of 1968–9 in exacerbating the problems and they might also argue that the issues had largely been ignored

until then and that this had matters worse. There might be an examination of the issues of discrimination in policing, social and economic areas and the anti-Catholic nature of the Unionist majority that added to the difficulties and this might be linked to the problem of a Unionist

dominated government. Answers might consider the role of the IRA and the emergence of the Provisional IRA following the split in 1969. Attitudes towards the British army among many Catholics did not make the situation any easier. In considering government policies candidates

might discuss some of the following: internment may also have exacerbated the problem and this was added to by events such as Bloody Sunday. There might be an exploration as to why the Sunningdale Agreement and power sharing failed and this might include the change in

government and a lack of decisive leadership. There might also be some consideration of international support for terrorism and reference made to the hunger strikes of the 1980s. Some candidates might also examine the problem of relationship between Britain and the Irish

government, particularly when Fianna Fail was in power, particularly during the Falklands crisis. Candidates might also make reference to the political success of Sinn Fein, the divisions within the Unionist movement and the limited support among both communities for a lasting peace.