
A-level HISTORY 7042/2S

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

Mark scheme

June 2020

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.

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 © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 Tony Blair's role in bringing about the Good Friday Agreement.

[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

- as Irish (Print) Journalist of the Year, 1998, for his coverage of the Good Friday Agreement, Millar will have had extensive knowledge of the peace process and its participants; a valuable, journalistic source, therefore
- written in 2007, the source has the value of perspective, offering a considered overview/judgement of Blair's role in the negotiations leading to the Good Friday Agreement
- it is also valuable as a source from a unionist standpoint; as a former UUP politician himself he would have had long, first-hand experience of Northern Irish politics and probably still had insider contacts
- though Millar's tone and emphasis offers some reservations about Blair as a politician, the significance he, a unionist, places on Blair's credibility – as someone genuinely committed to finding a solution to the Northern Ireland problem – is valuable.

Content and argument

- though very ambivalent in his comments about Blair's character and political methods, Millar is unambiguous in arguing that Blair played a significant role in the Good Friday Agreement and that he was in it for 'the long haul'
- Millar gives credit to Blair for having a long-standing interest in the problems of Northern Ireland, even as Opposition leader, 1994–97
- Millar does acknowledge the counter-argument to those who claim Blair as the key figure in bringing about the Good Friday Agreement: that he simply inherited a great political opportunity, and that much of the vital work in building confidence between unionists and nationalists had already been done – but he implies that Blair made a difference in getting the deal done
- students might refer to a number of other participants in the negotiations to argue that Blair's contribution was only one of many, and not necessarily the most important: John Major's groundwork – his strong relationship with Albert Reynolds (Taoiseach, 1992–94) and the Downing Street Declaration, December 1993; the secret talks between Major's government and the provisional IRA; the meetings between John Hume (SDLP) and Gerry Adams (SF) leading to their joint statements, 1994, on how the violence might be ended.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Trimble – leader of the UUP, 1995–2005 – was a central, first-hand participant in the peace process, placing him in constant, regular dialogue with Blair and the other key actors; his personal opinion, therefore, is extremely valuable in reaching any balanced assessment of Blair's role in the negotiations
- the book was published 6 years on from the Good Friday Agreement, allowing a sense of reflection over time, and awareness of the subsequent difficulties experienced in implementing the Agreement
- Trimble was speaking 'on the record'; his views are presented for a public audience, which makes his frank assessment of Blair's role particularly valuable
- Trimble's tone and emphasis is valuable for its ambivalence and his reluctant, grudging endorsement for Blair's role; he emphasises his contribution but not necessarily his motives; Trimble's views might be considered limited because of his tendency to downplay Blair's role relative to his own.

Content and argument

- Trimble acknowledges that Blair made 'a huge contribution' but he implies that the Good Friday Agreement was forged through the involvement of many actors/groups, and that he, rather than or as much as Blair, was central to the negotiations
- he leans to the argument that Blair saw the process as politically advantageous – an opportunity and that he always had one eye on image and personal promotion: such as his seemingly rather contrived 'hand of history upon our shoulder' soundbite
- Trimble also casts doubt on Blair's motives, suggesting he may have read too much into Blair's 'family connections' – his mother came from a Northern Irish Protestant background
- students might argue the centrality of Blair's role in the peace process; some might suggest that others are deserving of greater recognition: Trimble himself – rising above the natural fears and suspicions of the unionist community and his extraordinary bravery in stretching his own party to breaking point; President Clinton; George Mitchell; Bertie Ahern; Mo Mowlam (keeping the paramilitaries on side by her visit to the Maze); Gerry Adams; John Hume (who, along with Trimble, was awarded the 1998 Nobel Peace Prize).

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Campbell's role as Director of Communications and Strategy put him at the heart of Blair's government; he was one of Blair's closest confidantes and advisors for many years with round-the-clock access to the Prime Minister and closely involved in the shaping of government policy – the source offers, therefore, a valuable, personal, insider opinion
- Campbell kept a detailed daily diary but this extract is part of his commentary written in 2013, which allows him to view events with the perspective that time brings; considering all of Blair's high and low points between 1994 and 2003, it is interesting/valuable that Campbell sees the achievement of the Good Friday Agreement as his (and Blair's?) high point
- Campbell is a loyal Blairite and it is not surprising that his purpose is to highlight the importance of Blair's role to a public audience; this may be thought to either diminish/limit or increase the value of the source
- the emphasis Campbell places on Blair's deep personal desire 'to do something' about the Troubles in Northern Ireland, and on his tenacity, offers a valuable personal insight. The tone may be criticised as obsequious or 'sucking up' to his boss/friend, but there is also a sense of genuine sincerity/reflection in his words.

Content and argument

- Campbell's argument – by implication – is that Blair's role in the peace negotiations was crucial; that he was determined 'to do something' and that, like a dog with a bone, he would not be deflected from the task
- Campbell argues that Blair's strength was his 'essential optimism' and that he was able to reach out to all parties, keeping alive the flame of hope; he implies that the almost 'miraculous' nature of the Good Friday Agreement was down to Blair
- Blair's engagement with Sinn Féin, which he recognised was an early priority, might be used as an example of engaging publicly with those who 'others only saw (as) bad' – within a few months of assuming office Blair became the first British Prime Minister since Lloyd George in 1921 to hold face-to-face talks with the republican leadership
- Blair's ability to forge important relationships, which had a powerful impact on the eventual success of the negotiations, could be exemplified by referencing his key affinity with Bertie Ahern and his strong personal connection with President Clinton; likewise his 'hand of history' intervention when the talks seemed to be foundering on last minute unionist concerns is an example of him not giving up.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The Conservatives were politically dominant, in the years 1951 to 1959, because they had effective leaders and policies.'

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 Conservatives were politically dominant, in the years 1951 to 1959, because they had effective leaders and policies might include:

- Churchill, in 1951, remained a very popular figure – many still saw him as the hero who had led the country to victory during the Second World War
- Conservative dominance can be attributed to other popular ministers who had a positive impact during this period: Eden – as a charismatic Foreign Secretary, 1951–55; Butler – as Chancellor, 1951–55 and as Home Secretary, 1957; Macmillan – particularly as Housing Minister, 1951–54 and as Prime Minister 1957 – ('Supermac'); Maudling – various posts
- the decision to continue the post-war consensus contributed significantly to their dominance: the maintenance of a mixed economy, welfare and full employment resonated positively with the electorate
- the Conservatives presided over a post-war boom; their economic policies created a 'feel-good' factor; affluence was associated with, and attributed to, the Conservatives; rising wages, high living standards and cuts in income tax contributed to their electoral success
- other policy achievements also contributed to Conservative political dominance/popularity, especially: housing (Macmillan) – Conservatives took credit for what was becoming a 'property owning democracy'; Butler championed a number of key liberal reforms at the Home Office (homosexuality; the death penalty); education policy was progressive – the first purpose-built comprehensive schools were constructed under the Conservatives; social reforms – the Clean Air Act (1956), Factory Acts.

Arguments challenging the view that the Conservatives were politically dominant, in the years 1951 to 1959, because they had effective leaders and policies might include:

- Churchill was largely ineffective as leader and was little more than a figurehead – he was ageing rapidly and had a number of health problems; his absenteeism left a day-to-day vacuum that had to be filled by other senior ministers; not only were there tensions, 1951–55, between Churchill and Eden (the 'coming man') but also between Butler, Eden and Macmillan
- Eden proved an unsuccessful successor to Churchill as Prime Minister: he lacked experience in domestic affairs – economic policies in particular – but he also led Britain into the disastrous military intervention in Suez, forcing his resignation
- increasing affluence and consumerism tended to hide structural weaknesses in the British economy, which Tory 'stop-go' economics failed to tackle, and which proved ineffective in the longer term, leading to 'stagflation'
- other aspects of Conservative economic policies can be criticised: unemployment was never fully brought under control, maintaining an upward trajectory throughout the 1951–59 period (367 000 rising to 621 000); increasing living standards were built on heavy government borrowing, high levels of consumer credit and short-term pre-election tax manipulation
- it can be argued that internal Labour divisions – particularly the Bevan-Gaitskell split – rather than Conservative effectiveness was responsible for Tory dominance.

It was not immediately obvious in 1951 that there would be a long period of Conservative dominance. Indeed, Labour had actually won more votes than the Conservatives in the 1951 election. A strong argument can be made that the Conservative Party proved itself adept at presenting a modernising image through leaders who were very effective at presentation, particularly Macmillan. Churchill, though very much an absent leader behind the scenes, also offered an important link to Britain's victory in 1945. Undoubtedly, economic policies and the easy availability of credit could be considered key. The

Conservatives were able to claim, convincingly, that Britons had never had it so good – the underlying structural weaknesses in the economy were not apparent to the general public. Nevertheless, Conservative dominance could be attributed to other factors, particularly Labour divisions. Perhaps, on balance, it might be concluded that there was little viable alternative to the Conservatives who dominated almost by default.

0 3 To what extent did race relations improve in the years 1964 to 1970?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that race relations improved in the years 1964 to 1970 might include:

- the Race Relations Act, 1965, was the first legislation in the UK to address racial discrimination in public places – ‘on the grounds of colour, race or ethnic or national origins’; a Race Relations Board was also set up to deal with complaints and was also responsible for conducting publicity, research, finance and other aspects of promoting positive race relations
- a second Race Relations Act was passed in 1968, strengthening the 1965 Act by banning discrimination in housing, employment, insurance and other services; the Race Relations Board was also given stronger powers; a Community Relations Commission was created with the brief of promoting good community relations
- Enoch Powell was widely condemned in political circles for his ‘rivers of blood’ speech; Edward Heath sacked him from the shadow cabinet
- the Notting Hill carnival became an annual event from 1964, suggesting that a more positive environment for race relations was emerging, and that communities, at least in the capital, were integrating
- there was also evidence of broader cultural acceptance and change: in the range of foodstuffs and dining out that was becoming available (‘Indian’; ‘Chinese’); youth culture was particularly prominent in popularising new trends in music and fashion in particular – originating from the ethnic minorities.

Arguments challenging the view that race relations improved in the years 1964 to 1970 might include:

- the Race Relations Act, 1965, was very limited in its range and full of loopholes: it did not extend to Northern Ireland and specifically excluded shops and private boarding houses; similarly, the Race Relations Board was very weak in terms of enforcement: it could not compel witnesses to attend hearings and more than three-quarters of the complaints it handled in its first year were dismissed through lack of evidence
- the Race Relations Act, 1968, also contained major loopholes: perhaps the most glaring was that employers could still discriminate against non-whites in the interests of ‘racial balance’; the so-called strengthened Race Relations Board remained largely ineffective: complaints against the police were excluded in law and only about 10% of complaints received about discriminatory employment were upheld
- Powell’s ‘rivers of blood’ speech inflamed race relations and illustrated the persistence of anti-immigration/racist sentiment; he received strong support from public opinion, particularly from dockers and meat porters in London who went on strike in support of Powell and marched on Downing Street
- the government was not immune from popular anti-immigration opinion: concern over the sudden arrival in Britain of Kenyan Asians prompted the passing of the Commonwealth Immigration Act, February 1968, limiting the right of return to Britain for non-white Commonwealth citizens
- there was wider evidence that widespread racist views persisted: the Smethwick election in 1964 (the Conservative candidate won with a racist slogan); a 1968 Gallup Poll recorded that 75% of the population supported Powell’s views.

Labour’s policy in the years 1964 to 1970 seemed to represent a difficult, conflicted balancing act, instigating tougher immigration controls on the one hand, while introducing legislation to tackle racial discrimination on the other. A broad conclusion may be that in this period some of the more public and open manifestations of discrimination began to be challenged, but high levels of discrimination persisted.

Immigrant disadvantage and institutional discrimination continued, resulting in increasing protests from black and Asian youths in particular. Colour bars remained prominent throughout Britain in the 1960s. Although grounded in good intentions, Labour policy on race relations seemed largely an imperfect and often ineffective attempt at dealing with integration and the 'problem' of non-white immigration.

- 0 4** 'John Major's successes as Prime Minister, in the years 1992 to 1997, outweigh his failures.'

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 John Major's successes as Prime Minister, in the years 1992 to 1997, outweighed his failures might include:

- it was a remarkable success to lead the party to a fourth successive victory, overturning a large deficit in the opinion polls ('soapbox' politics) and overcoming Neil Kinnock as the more credible candidate for change; the only Prime Minister to have gained more than 14 million votes (51.6%) in a general election
- Major inherited a fractured Conservative Party but he was successful in stopping the party from splitting, though it continued to be divided, notably over Europe; moreover, he was able to consolidate the Thatcher agenda, forcing Labour to move to a centre ground defined by the Conservatives, introducing new models for quality assuring state provision such as: performance indicators; greater information about the rights of consumers and more effective complaints provision
- Major did not receive the credit he deserved for the recovery of the economy after Britain's withdrawal from the Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM); by 1997, inflation, unemployment, living standards and economic growth had all moved in a positive direction
- he developed a reputation as an even-handed, respected statesman in foreign affairs; Britain was a significant contributor to the NATO intervention in Bosnia and he was one of the signatories to the conflict-ending Dayton agreement in December 1995
- Major had success in Northern Ireland: the Downing Street Declaration, 1993; securing an IRA ceasefire, August 1994; he showed great patience and negotiating skill in beginning the peace process continued by Tony Blair.

Arguments challenging the view that John Major's successes as Prime Minister, in the years 1992 to 1997, outweighed his failures might include:

- the 1992 election victory was less of a success for Major than his apologists claim; it owed as much to distrust of Labour than it was a clear vote of confidence in the Conservatives
- Major failed to halt the growing habit of disloyalty within the party; neither was he able to rid himself of its association with 'sleaze': sex scandals, illegal arms dealings, 'cash-for-questions'
- Britain's exit from the ERM (Black Wednesday, 16 September, 1992) was regarded as a huge failure of government; a hammer blow to Major and the Conservatives' reputation for economic competence; voters' sense of economic optimism disappeared; Major's poll ratings collapsed and never recovered
- the Conservatives became associated with the underfunding of public services; by 1997, education, health and transport were all suffering from under-investment; the privatisation of British Rail was botched
- Major never successfully managed to put himself at the heart of the European project; he failed to reconcile his party to Europe and his 'wait and see' attitude to joining the euro was particularly contentious.

It can be argued that John Major's government, in the years 1992 to 1997, has not received a fair hearing from historians. Major consolidated much of the Thatcher agenda despite inheriting a very difficult political legacy, presenting him with great problems in balancing the need for both continuity and change. He never resolved the dilemma of how to present Thatcherism with a human face. Moreover, he was hampered by having to deal with emboldened Eurosceptic critics (increasingly including Thatcher); he was unable to overcome the perception of disunity and incompetence subsuming his administration, and was unlucky in having to deal with BSE ('mad cow disease').