1 International Relations: the changing international order 1918–2001

Page 6: Practice question

The Treaty of Versailles was written by Britain, France and the USA to punish Germany for the First World War. The main clause was Article 231, which blamed Germany for the war and gave the Allies the legal right to punish Germany. The punishments had several forms. Germany was made to pay reparations of £6.6 billion, which was a significant sum at the time. Alsace-Lorraine, the Polish Corridor and Northern Schleswig were among the territories lost by Germany, along with all its colonies. Germany’s military was reduced severely, down to 100,000 troops and banned from equipment like tanks, submarines and chemical weapons. Finally, Germany was barred from joining the League of Nations.

Page 6: Test yourself

1 David Lloyd George, Georges Clemenceau and Woodrow Wilson.
2 He had to balance the desire of his people for revenge with the need of his economy for a rebuilt Germany.
3 Article 231 – the War Guilt clause.

Page 7: You’re the examiner

Level 5. This answer sets out a clear overall concept in the opening sentence and then goes into precise detail to explain it.

Page 7: Eliminate irrelevance

Woodrow Wilson was an idealist who wanted to ensure world peace. One of his main aims at the Paris Peace Conference was to ensure this by creating the League of Nations. The League was designed to act as the world’s policeman, and it was going to need a lot of money and men to be able to do this. The US Senate decided that it did not want to waste money and lives on conflicts that had nothing to do with the USA, so it voted not to join. This meant that the League had lost the richest country in the world, and the only country that would have had the real desire to lead the League. Instead, Britain and France were left in charge of the League, and both countries were more interested in their own agendas and running their empires rather than ensuring peace.

Page 8: Test yourself

1 Italy and Greece.
2 The Aaland Islands.
3 The Dawes Plan.

Page 9: Practice question

The League of Nations had some successes in the 1920s, largely outside of the politics, where fewer people got in the way of progress. The first major success the League had was in preventing the spread of Spanish influenza at the end of the First World War. The flu killed millions, but would have been worse without the League’s help. The League also gave grants of money to Hungary and Austria, whose economies were so weak that they may have experienced anarchy without League assistance. The League helped over 400,000 refugees from the war find homes as well. There was also a lot of success in improving working
conditions for people all over the world, for example by banning certain chemicals which made workers ill.

**Page 9: Complete the paragraph**

It was critically important that the League had serious sanctions available to it that all member states would take seriously. Without American money, the League would not be able to ... afford to send troops to places in the world that needed them, as they would not be able to pay them or equip them. Additionally, the desire to do so among the people of the leading countries would be low – they would prefer that the money was spent fixing problems at home rather than using it to help people far away.

**Page 9: You’re the examiner**

Level 3. Good overall understanding, but lacks precise detail, such as when the crises took place, and the fact that Italy was a major member of the League of Nations.

**Page 10: Practice question**

The greatest impact of the Great Depression on international relations was to make some countries slip towards and become militaristic dictatorships. Germany and Japan both saw themselves suffer particularly severely from the effects of Great Depression – they both went from being relatively peaceful to attempting to seize neighbouring territories. In both cases this occurred because they lacked the resources to be able to be self-sufficient, and because the more peaceful, democratic elements of their governments were done away with when they failed to be able to cope with the unemployment and poverty caused by the Great Depression.

An additional consequence was to weaken the Western democracies financially, and thus make them much less willing to go to war. The fact that Britain and France were still recovering from the Great Depression in the mid-late 1930s is the key reason why they refused to step in to stop Hitler until it was too late – they believed that due to underspending, their military strength was not up to the task of stopping the Germans. This, for example, led them to being willing to let Mussolini seize Abyssinia in return for his continued support.

Ultimately, the Great Depression created a situation where aggressive countries had an excuse to act and peaceful countries had an excuse to do nothing.

**Page 11: Test yourself**

1. Chinese army soldiers.
2. Closed the Suez Canal.
3. Hoare and Laval.

**Page 11: Spot the mistake**

This answer is slightly poorly written, is too simplistic, and doesn’t really answer the question. It should read something like this:

The Great Depression caused extreme financial difficulties all around the world. Japan and Italy are two examples of countries that were dictatorships that chose to deal with their difficulties by invading other countries to grab their resources. At the same time, the leaders of the League, Britain and France, were not in a strong enough position to be able to stop them, and even went around the League themselves, leading to the eventual collapse of the League.
Page 11: Developing the detail

The League of Nations was led by Britain and France. During the 1930s, they were not prepared to go to war to defend other countries [because they were not in a financial position to be able to do so]. They did not help China when it [Manchuria] was invaded by Japan [in 1931. They sent a committee to investigate but still did nothing.] They did not make enough of an effort to stop Hitler rearming. [Despite the fact that Hitler started rearming publicly in 1935.] The British and the French tried to let Mussolini take over some of Abyssinia [with the Hoare–Laval Pact], but they were exposed and humiliated.

Page 13: Checklist

- Hitler began German rearmament in 1933. ✓
- Britain began arms sales to the Nazis in 1934. Incorrect.
- Saar plebiscite a huge success for the Nazis in 1935. ✓
- Spanish city of Salamanca destroyed by Luftwaffe. Incorrect: the Spanish city of Guernica was destroyed.
- Stalin attempted to create alliance with Britain and France. ✓
- Anschluss between Austria and Germany. ✓
- Chamberlain handed over all of Czechoslovakia at the Munich Conference. Incorrect: only the Sudetenland was given away.
- The Nazi–Soviet Pact was signed in 1939. ✓
- Britain and France declared war after Nazi invasion of Poland. ✓

Page 13: Spot the mistake

This answer has far too little detail to explain how Appeasement led to the Second World War. It should be more like this:

Appeasement was a policy of ensuring that Hitler did not get what he wanted, and to contain him within Germany. Initially, it saw the British and the French allow Hitler to rebuild his armed forces and to reoccupy the Rhineland. This made Hitler much more able to fight a war than he would have been if he had been stopped early. The same is true of the subsequent concessions, which Britain and France allowed him to take control of Austria, the Sudetenland and then Czechoslovakia. Because he had not been stopped up to this point, Hitler did not believe they would act when he invaded Poland and, so he became overconfident, leading to war.

Page 13: Test yourself

1 No.
2 The Sudetenland.
3 The Nazi–Soviet Non-Aggression Pact.

Page 13: Practice question

Hitler was a gambler who believed that he could not be defeated, and so all of his actions led to war. His build-up of his armed forces and his strength in Europe meant that he grew ever more confident that he would be victorious in a war against Britain and France. By seizing land, resources and people it made Germany become stronger and stronger and his desire to expand into eastern Europe made it inevitable that sooner or later he would try to seize back all of Germany’s lost territory, and then to try to achieve Lebensraum in the east. Hitler always wanted war, and he was careful to provoke in a way that best suited him.

Additionally, Hitler’s carefully ensured that he only had to deal with one or two enemies at a time. He made sure that at each crisis point he was only facing one or two enemies, which
made him feel as if he was in a much stronger position, and made him more willing to be
provocative. Hitler wanted to have a major war, and was even slightly disappointed when
the British and the French gave in at Munich as it prevented him from trying out his new
army.

Overall, Hitler always wanted a war, and it was because of his skill at manipulating his
opponents that it happened more or less when he wanted it to, and Germany was ready.

**Page 16: Review question**

![Charts showing the timeline of views on Appeasement](chart)

**Page 16: Review summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>When was this view</th>
<th>Who held this view</th>
<th>Pro/Anti Chamberlain</th>
<th>Pro/Anti Appeasement</th>
<th>Who would they disagree with?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Appeasement</td>
<td>1938–39</td>
<td>The public</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Orthodox and Guilty Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty Men</td>
<td>1940–45</td>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>Very Anti</td>
<td>Anti</td>
<td>Pro-Appeasement and Revisionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1945–68</td>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>Mildly Anti</td>
<td>Anti</td>
<td>Pro-Appeasement and Revisionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisionist</td>
<td>1968–90</td>
<td>Donald Cameron Watt</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Orthodox and Guilty Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-Revisionist</td>
<td>1990–Present</td>
<td>Mildly Anti</td>
<td>Anti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-Appeasement and Revisionist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 16: Practice question**

Parker’s interpretation is a very clear example of the counter-revisionist viewpoint,
highlighting that Chamberlain did not give in, but had a personal conflict with those who
wanted a tougher stance against Germany. Many earlier historians would have disagreed
with this viewpoint.
The historians who would have disagreed most strongly with this viewpoint would have been the revisionists, such as Donald Cameron Watt. These historians believed firmly that Chamberlain was a wise politician who had made the right decision in difficult circumstances. Parker explicitly rejects this saying that Hitler had ‘appealed to Chamberlain’s vanity and encouraged Chamberlain to think he had a special influence over him’. This indicates that Parker has quite low opinion of Chamberlain. Additionally, it is clear that Parker also has a low opinion of Appeasement when he says that Chamberlain ‘had made big mistakes’, referring to the later parts of appeasement. Watt, by contrast, had seen secret papers when they were released 30 years after Appeasement and was genuinely convinced that Chamberlain was a decent man and that there was no alternative. In short, a total contrast to Parker’s view.

The Orthodox view of historians, such as Churchill, would also disagree with Parker, although only about Chamberlain’s character. Churchill had known Chamberlain very well and as such was not willing to overly criticise Chamberlain personally, going to some pains to state his admiration for Chamberlain’s desire for peace. Parker sees the more recent interpretation that Chamberlain simply did not think clearly on this subject. It should be mentioned however, that Churchill and Parker would agree entirely that Appeasement was a bad policy.

Finally, the pro-Appeasement movement in the press in 1938–39 would also totally disagree with Parker’s interpretation. They saw that the avoidance of war, at any cost, was the right policy as Britain was not ready or willing for another war. Parker believes that a stronger alliance with France, and even with the Soviet Union, would have been far better at preventing the Second World War.

Ultimately, most historians would agree with the idea that Appeasement was mistake, although there are fewer who would agree that Chamberlain was guilty.

Page 18: Practice question

The fundamental reason that relations broke down between the USA and the USSR was that without a common enemy their ideological differences caused them to rapidly split apart. The way in which the Red Army had ‘liberated’ Eastern Europe, imposing communism and exacting retribution horrified the Western powers, but was standard practice for the Soviets. Similarly, when the USA offered financial aid to Europe it was meant to help Europe and to gain loyalty to America, but the USSR (and Stalin) perceived it as a huge attempt at economic warfare. The development of nuclear weapons also changed the relationship as it meant that the USSR was unable to resort to force to impose its views in the face of America’s atomic power.

Page 19: Identify an argument

Paragraph 1: Description and assertion.

Paragraph 2: Description, explanation and argument.
Page 19: Flow charts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roosevelt’s death</th>
<th>Soviet actions in Eastern Europe (USSR)</th>
<th>Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan (USA)</th>
<th>Berlin Blockade (USSR)</th>
<th>Formation of NATO (USA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Page 19: Test yourself

1. Roosevelt’s death.
2. Six.
3. The Berlin Airlift.

Page 20: Test yourself

1. The skilled workers of East Germany fleeing to West Germany.
3. 14 October: U-2 spy plane discovers missile sites.
   22 October: quarantine put in place, announced by Kennedy on TV.
   26 October: secret meeting between Robert Kennedy and Anatoly Dobrynin.

Page 21: Practice question

The Berlin Crisis was quite a long drawn out event, which steadily grew worse as Khrushchev attempted to press an advantage out of first Eisenhower, and then Kennedy. The various different summits held between 1958 and 1961 saw reasonably good-natured discussion – with the exception of the U-2 incident that caused the Paris Summit to end before it had started. In each case, it was clear that neither side wanted war, but that Khrushchev was willing to push a long way to end the problem of the brain drain that was crippling East Germany. He was not, however, willing to be the one who actually started the war.

Additionally, the construction of the Berlin Wall also gave both sides a chance to get out of a high-tension situation without actually resorting to a war that would have been devastating. Communist propaganda painted it as a victory for communism, labelling the wall an ‘anti-fascist defence rampart’, while it was presented in Western media as communism having to resort to force to keep its citizens from running away. Put simply, it allowed tensions to be eased without embarrassment to either side.

Ultimately, war did not take place over Berlin because despite how important the city was; neither side was willing to fight a war over it.
Page 21: Event overview grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Berlin Wall</td>
<td>A barrier built between East and West Berlin to prevent the escape of Eastern citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cuban Revolution</td>
<td>The overthrow of Batista by Communist guerrillas led by Fidel Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bay of Pigs invasion</td>
<td>A failed attempt by 1400 exiled Cubans to land in Cuba and lead an counter-revolution against Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spy photographs of Cuba</td>
<td>U-2 spy plane pictures of nuclear launch sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarantine of Cuba</td>
<td>The legal excuse to blockade Cuba with the US Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Kennedy and Dobrynin</td>
<td>President Kennedy’s brother, Robert, met Ambassador Dobrynin in the middle of the night and negotiated an end to the Cuban Missile Crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 21: Eliminate irrelevance

The Berlin crisis was caused by Khrushchev’s desire to show strength at the time when he had just seized power. He thought that a good way to show his strength to people in the Communist Party was to solve a problem that Stalin failed to solve with the Berlin Blockade. The various efforts he made, however, were all political and both Eisenhower and Kennedy correctly guessed that he was largely bluffing about his willingness to go to war. Their refusal to act, and Kennedy’s willingness to call up extra soldiers and increase defence spending, forced Khrushchev to consider a radical solution. The construction of the Berlin Wall is viewed as a failure for the USSR because it forced them to admit that brain drain was costing them dearly. Around 2.7 million East Germans had fled from the East and into the West during this period to seek a better life. The building of the wall brought this to a sudden end and thus brought the crisis to a swift close.

Page 22: Test yourself

1. Ngo Dinh Diem.
2. Guerrilla tactics.

Page 22: Practice question

Because the Americans never actually declared war in the Vietnam War, they actually simply escalated their support from simple advisers and weapons supplies to the ARVN, all the way to the point where they had nearly half a million men in the country fighting the Viet Cong. The various failures of the ARVN in fighting the Viet Cong, despite overwhelming technological superiority, led to the decision to allow US forces to engage in combat with Viet Cong forces directly. At the same time, a massive bombing campaign named Operation Rolling Thunder was undertaken to attempt to smash the ability of the North to fight.

Page 23: Spot the mistake

This answer is both too brief and has made the mistake that the Viet Cong used napalm and Agent Orange. It could say:

The Viet Cong used guerrilla tactics to fight US forces in Vietnam and force their withdrawal. It knew that it could not beat the US army in an open pitched battle, so it made certain that its forces never gathered in large numbers, and instead took on smaller patrols and groups.
of the American forces. Additionally, the Viet Cong was aware that all it had to do was continue to cause as many casualties to the US forces and eventually American public opinion would turn against the war. This certainly had happened, and Richard Nixon won his election campaign in 1968 in part based on the promise to withdraw from Vietnam.

Page 23: Event overview grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Geneva Conference</td>
<td>The conference where Vietnam was given independence from France but split into North and South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US support for Ngo Dinh Diem</td>
<td>America supported him not because he was a good choice, but because he was anti-Communist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Cong tactics</td>
<td>Guerrilla tactics designed to ‘make America bleed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American tactics</td>
<td>Incredible destruction of the North and violent search and destroy in the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US public opinion</td>
<td>Began cautiously supportive and became wildly anti-war by 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraki’s new Afghan government</td>
<td>Communist, anti-religious forces that took control in 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet intervention in Afghanistan</td>
<td>Brezhnev decided to make sure that the new Communist government stayed in power, by invading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter’s response to Soviet intervention in Afghanistan</td>
<td>Incredible anger, issued Carter Doctrine, cut off diplomatic relations and boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 25: Practice question

Interpretation B is a clear example of the new Cold War historians’ interpretation, blaming Stalin more personally than the Soviet Union as a whole, and conceding that the USA must shoulder a reasonable, although smaller, part of the blame for the Cold War. In this, most previous interpretations would disagree to a lesser or greater extent.

The interpretation that would disagree most strongly is the revisionist interpretation of historians such as Thomas Paterson who suggests that the USA was entirely to blame due to the attempt to wage economic warfare on the Soviet Union and establish dominance over all of Asia and Europe. This is different to Interpretation B, which only says that ‘the way that US aid was originally conceived under the Marshall Plan’ (that is, helping all of the satellite states as well) made the USSR more antagonistic. There is a degree of ambiguity in Interpretation B however, which suggests that the Soviets reacted to the actions of others, which to an extent agrees with the revisionist interpretation. It is important to consider the background of the revisionist interpretation, however, as they would inevitably seek to blame the USA under any circumstances, given their general anti-US feeling during the Vietnam War. In contrast, Interpretation B was written after the end of the Cold War and during a time of unusual popularity for the US government.

Similarly, it is inevitable that the orthodox view would disagree with the aspect of Interpretation B which suggests that the USA was in any way to blame. These views, from historians such as George Kennan, was the USA was totally blameless and that all blame should be heaped on the USSR. They were writing at a time when anti-Communist feeling was at its highest and when there was a feeling that the USA could do no wrong. As such, this view would strongly disagree that with the view that the USA should take any of the blame at all, even part of it.
Ultimately, the view of Interpretation B would find a mixture of agreement and disagreement, but would largely face disagreement from historians of other interpretations.

**Page 27: Test yourself**

1. Strategic Defence Initiative.
2. INF Treaty.

**Page 27: Practice question**

The Cold War came to an end due to a combination of the positive actions of Mikhail Gorbachev and the weaknesses of the USSR. Gorbachev was brought into power in 1985 as a reformer, but it was the Chernobyl Disaster in 1986 that made him realise the massive issues facing the Soviet Union. He immediately began to try to negotiate with the USA and President Reagan, who while willing to cooperate, always let Gorbachev take the lead. Without Gorbachev there would have been no INF Treaty and no START, either.

At the same time, however, Gorbachev was being forced into reform with policies like Glasnost and Perestroika, for example, because of the state that the Soviet Union was in. The huge cost of fighting the Cold War had left the whole country in a very difficult state, with poor infrastructure and a dissatisfied population. The war in Afghanistan and the escalated cost of military spending in the early 1980s had crippled the USSR further and Gorbachev could see no other way to save the Communist system than to end its biggest burden – the fighting of the Cold War – which he grew to see as unnecessary.

Ultimately, the burden of the Cold War and Gorbachev’s desire for reform worked together to ensure the end of the Cold War.

**Page 27: Developing the detail**

Once the Soviet leader Gorbachev had taken power, he realised the USSR could no longer afford to maintain its competition with the United States. After he had realised this, he told the leaders of the Communist countries in Eastern Europe that he would no longer be keeping the [Red] army in their countries. This meant that when many countries began to experience protests against communism in the later 1980s [such as Poland in 1989], they did not have the strength of the USSR to keep them in power. Most Communist governments were forced to agree to elections where they were voted out of power [with the exception of Romania, where the rule of Ceausescu was brought to an end when he was lynched].

**Page 27: Delete as applicable**

I agree to a fair extent that it was Gorbachev who ended the Cold War. Gorbachev showed willingness to completely change the stance on the Soviet Union over matching the USA in weapons capabilities. His willingness to let the countries of Eastern Europe be free from the Red Army showed his general reformist attitude, as did Glasnost and Perestroika. Additionally, he worked well with Reagan when ... they met at their summits during Reagan’s second term, agreeing the INF Treaty in 1987. On the other hand, both Reagan and Bush were also willing to compromise on many things that many of the predecessors would have refused.

**Page 28: Test yourself**

1. Saudi Arabian.
2. Sudan.
3. Five weeks.
Page 29: Practice question

The primary reason that al-Qaeda attacked the USA on 9/11 was the desire to weaken the United States and drive Americans out of the Muslim world. The attacks on US targets up to this point, such as the USS Cole attack on 2000 were not believed to have had sufficient impact on US citizens. As such, the plot to attack the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and (it is believed) Congress, was put into motion.

In the longer term, this stemmed from the belief that US culture was attacking Islam and that it was the duty of Muslims everywhere to wage holy war against the nation that embodied everything people like Osama bin Laden hated. They believed that an extremely repressive version of Islam should rule the world and that by destroying the USA, it would lead to that goal.

In short, the attacks on 9/11 were designed to further al-Qaeda’s aims of destroying America and making their extreme version of Islam dominant.

Page 29: Checklist

- War broke out when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. ✓
- There was a civil war in Czechoslovakia. Incorrect: it was in Yugoslavia. ✓
- A genocide took place in Rwanda in 1994. ✓
- The Mujahidin had been supplied by weapons by the USA. ✓
- Osama bin Laden was the son of an Afghan farmer. Incorrect: he was the son of a Saudi billionaire.
- Al-Qaeda was formed to defend Islam against threats from all over the world. ✓
- The 9/11 attacks were all successful. Incorrect: the fourth plane, United 93, did not reach its target.
- The American President, Bill Clinton, demanded that Afghanistan turn over bin Laden. Incorrect: the president was George W. Bush.

Page 29: Spot the mistake

The American response to 9/11 was swift and severe, although in many ways it caused more problems than it solved. The invasion of Afghanistan came less than two months after 9/11, following a massive air assault on the Afghan military. The takeover led to years of terrorist activity in Afghanistan that has still not entirely ended. The War on Terror then saw the invasion of Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein, an act which also a huge eruption of terrorist activity, including the emergence of the terror group ISIL.
2 Germany 1925–1955: The People and the State

Page 33: Test yourself

1 Positive aspects: Germany was able to join the League of Nations in 1926; industrial production increased; people were able to freely express their ideas. Three negative aspects: the government was a coalition, so it wasn’t stable; by joining the League of Nations people believed Stresemann had accepted the Treaty of Versailles; loans given to Germany by the USA could be called in at any time.

2 Business went bankrupt; many people lost their savings; unemployment rose.

3 The democratic politicians were unable to deal with the economic problems.

Page 33: Practice question

Stresemann agreeing the Dawes Plan with America in 1924. The Dawes Plan lent Germany £40 million in loans, which helped to stabilise the German economy.

Page 33: Checklist

- Hitler continued to use force to try to seize power. Incorrect: Hitler realised after the Munich Putsch that it was better to use democratic means to get power.
- The Depression made people turn against the Weimar Republic.
- Propaganda portrayed Hitler as Germany’s saviour.
- The Nazis used slogans which were confusing. Incorrect: the Nazis deliberately used generalised slogans to avoid criticism.
- Before 1928, the Nazis won over the workers. Incorrect: it wasn’t until after the Depression that the workers began to look to the Nazis.
- People were more willing to vote for Hitler after the Depression because the SA gave the impression of providing stable law and order.

Page 34: Test yourself

1 Hitler rose to the position of Chancellor through political manoeuvring. Hindenburg and von Papen thought that by appointing Hitler as Chancellor, they would be able to control him, as it was clear that support for the Nazis was increasing. Consequently, Hitler was appointed Chancellor on 30 January 1933.

2 The Reichstag Fire helped the Nazis because they could use it to their advantage by claiming it was the Communists who started the fire. This meant that they were able to get rid of their opposition. It also enabled Hitler to persuade Hindenburg to pass the Emergency Decree, which removed people’s civil rights.

3 Hitler purged the SA. He was concerned with the growing power of the SA and Ernst Röhm. Thus, using the SS, Hitler murdered Hitler’s potential rivals and gained the support of the army. It also showed how ruthless the Nazis could be.

Page 35: Flow chart

| The Great Depression | Reichstag Fire | Enabling Act | Hindenburg’s death | Night of the Long Knives |

Page 35: Practice question

The poster was published in 1932 to encourage the German population to vote for the Nazi Party in the elections. Due to the Depression, unemployment levels had risen and there were large numbers of people who did not have enough to eat. The poster tried to get...
people to vote for the Nazis by portraying the image of a strong Aryan German, giving the impression that if the Nazis were elected they would rebuild Germany. Furthermore, the use of phrases such as ‘Work, Freedom and Bread’ linked to Nazi election campaign promises, in which they said they would reduce unemployment and ensure Germans had enough to eat. Therefore, the poster was published at this time to reinforce Nazi election promises, with the aim of increasing their number of votes in the Reichstag elections.

Page 36: Test yourself

1. The Nazis had total power over the government; there was no trial by jury; Heydrich set up the SD (intelligence service).

2. Nazi propaganda was effective because it was everywhere. No one could escape it. It was also simple and clear, so everyone could understand it. Goebbels used many methods of propaganda to ensure that the Nazis’ message got across.

3. By restoring family values; and convincing everyone through propaganda that everybody was working for the benefit of the state.

Page 37: Practice question

The source is useful because it provides some interesting information. For example, it reveals how politicians abroad, in this case in Britain, viewed Hitler in 1936.

However, it can be even more useful to historians. When we look at it more carefully we can infer that the Nazi propaganda machine and the ‘Hitler myth’ were having an impact on Germans. We can see this because the source says ‘The old trust him, the young idolise him. It is not the admiration accorded to a popular leader. It is the worship of a national hero’, which suggests that most Germans supported Hitler and saw him as a ‘hero’. Therefore, the message that Goebbels and his propaganda machine were attempting to portray was having an impact.

In some ways the source is biased because it is coming from a British politician. This is actually useful because it reveals that people abroad were aware of the impact Hitler was having, and at this time, the British would have wanted to get along with Hitler to prevent war from happening, so they would not say anything bad about him. Therefore, the source is useful because it reveals how some politicians in Britain felt about Hitler, and shows the impact that propaganda was having.

Page 37: Considering usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• He was adored</td>
<td>• Gives a foreign perspective</td>
<td>• Hitler myth; Hitler was depicted as a charismatic man and a man of the people, as shown by ‘... the worship of a national hero’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portrayed as a hero</td>
<td>• Shows views towards Hitler before the war</td>
<td>• Use of propaganda, as used by Goebbels and the Nazi Party to promote Hitler as the saviour of Germany and convince the Germans to support him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No one would criticise him</td>
<td>• Could be trying to persuade the British public Hitler wasn’t all that bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 38: Test yourself

1. Creation of the National Labour Service; reintroducing conscription.
2. Farmers were affected by Nazi policy as the Reich Food Estate meant that farmers had a market for their goods at specific prices. In addition, the Reich Entailed Farm Law meant banks couldn’t seize farms, and its racial aim led to the belief that farmers were the backbone of the master race.
3. Teachers had to join the Nazi Teachers’ League and the curriculum was rewritten to promote Nazi ideology.

Page 39: Practice question

Nazi economic policies, were, in part, geared to make workers feel part of the *Volksgemeinschaft*. One policy which affected workers was the ‘Strength Through Joy’ scheme, set up by Dr Robert Ley. This was a key economic policy that affected the lives of workers because the scheme was developed to organise workers’ leisure time. For example, the scheme gave workers access to cheaper holidays, cinema and theatre tickets, and sporting events. Therefore, it affected workers’ lives because the Nazis were able to use this policy to infiltrate workers’ private lives.

Another economic policy that affected the lives of workers was the creation of the General Labour Front, again run by Dr Robert Ley. Trade unions were banned by the Nazis, and thus workers were expected to join the General Labour Front. This affected the lives of workers because they could no longer strike for better pay and conditions, and wages were generally low. Consequently, by the late 1930s many workers were grumbling that their standard of living hadn’t improved since the Depression.

Page 39: Developing the detail

The Nazis used the education system in many different ways. For example, the curriculum was rewritten. [Children were taught to be anti-Semitic through the use of Biology lessons, which stated that Jews were inferior to Aryans. Consequently, the German youth were subjected to Nazi teachings from an early age.] In addition, teachers had to join the Nazi Teachers’ League. [This helped to indoctrinate the German youth because teachers were trained in Nazi methods and children had to report teachers who did not use them.] Physical fitness was emphasised. Boys and girls were given different opportunities. [Boys were taught skills such as boxing, whereas girls were taught home-making and childcare. This indoctrinated the German youth because children were educated in the different roles the Nazis envisioned for each gender.] Thus, the Nazis controlled all aspects of the education system and were able to influence what the German youth believed.

Page 39: Do/don’t list

- Come to a judgement which repeats everything you have said. *Incorrect*: your judgement should either explain the most important factor or reinforce links between points.
- Explain fully two clear reasons. ✓
- Use precise evidence to support points made. ✓
- Use lots of description. *Incorrect*: while you should include evidence in your answers, you must ensure that it’s explained and answers the question fully.
- Include everything you know about a topic. *Incorrect*: read the question carefully and only include information which is relevant to the answer.
- Spend no more than ten minutes answering the question. ✓
Page 41: Test yourself

1. Refusing to give the Nazi salute; the Edelweiss Pirates attacked the Hitler Youth and rejected Nazi ideas.
2. The Gestapo infiltrated everyday life; opposition was ruthlessly crushed; propaganda reinforced the belief the Gestapo was everywhere; people felt alternatives to the Nazis were worse; *Gleichschaltung* meant that people had to appear they believed in the Nazis; people respected Hitler.
3. By establishing concentration camps; setting up a euthanasia campaign which targeted physically and mentally disabled people; to get rid of genetic defects they set up a sterilisation campaign.
4. Jews were no longer considered to be German citizens and they had to wear a yellow star on their clothing.
5. *Kristallnacht* happened on the night of 9–10 November 1938 in retaliation to a German diplomat shot dead in Paris. Around 200 synagogues were burned down, thousands of businesses attacked, and it led to the death of 91 Jews.

Page 41: Delete as applicable

I agree to a great extent that the Nuremberg Laws where the harshest measure the Nazis took against the Jews.

Page 41: Practice question

One reason why there was little opposition to the Nazi regime in the 1930s was due to fear and terror. People believed that Gestapo agents were everywhere, a belief enforced by the propaganda campaign, and thus were afraid to speak out in opposition. In reality, there were not as many Gestapo agents as people thought. In addition, people were fearful of more political and economic stability, and people who disliked the Nazis thought the alternatives were worse. Consequently, there was little opposition because people conformed and fitted in even if they did not support the Nazis.

Another reason why there was little opposition to the Nazi regime in the 1930 was due to the speed the Nazis took over Germany. They ruthlessly seized power, and then got rid of their opponents speedily, such as through the Night of the Long Knives and the Reichstag Fire. Therefore, opposition movements no longer had their leaders, and as the movements were divided, they could not work together to mount an effective opposition to the Nazis.

Overall, the most important reason why opposition to the Nazis was ineffective was due to fear and terror. Through propaganda, the Nazis instilled a belief of terror into the German public, and this meant that people were afraid of speaking out.

Page 42: Test yourself

1. Morale changed between 1939 and 1942 as initially, when war was announced in 1939, morale was strong as the German people had been prepared for war. At the start, the German army also had many successes. However, morale began to decline with the invasion of the USSR in June 1941, and then bombing over Germany increased. Thus, morale started off strong in 1939, but as Germany’s fortunes in the war changed, morale decreased.
2. Opposition increased during the war because it was clear the Nazis were not doing as well as was hoped in the war. The German army became disillusioned with Hitler and attempts were made to assassinate him. The Church began to openly criticise the euthanasia programme.
Page 43: Complete the paragraph

One reason why opposition to the Nazi regime grew during the Second World War was because the German army became disillusioned and dissatisfied with Hitler and the Nazis. As a result there were different attempts to assassinate … Hitler, the closest attempt being in July 1944. Count von Stauffenberg left a bomb in Hitler’s conference room, with the aim of killing Hitler and taking over Germany. The attempt failed, but it shows that opposition to the Nazi regime grew during the Second World War because army officers were feeling that the war was lost and wanted to take matters into their own hands.

Page 43: Practice question

The sources disagree because they imply different things about Nazi policy towards women. For example, Source C outlines the ideal German family according to the Nazis. The Nazis wanted women to stay at home – ‘Kinder, Küche, Kirche’, and you can infer from this image that the role of women was to look after their families. In contrast, Source D reveals women working in an armaments factory, making weapons to aid the German war effort in the Second World War. Thus, they disagree because they show how the Nazis’ views on women had to adapt.

Page 44: Test yourself

1 Denazification refers to attempts made to rid Germany of all traces of the Nazis.
2 The division of Germany was cemented in 1949 because of the Berlin Blockade and airlift. It led to the formation of two separate states in Germany, and it was clear that the division, for the time being, was permanent.
3 After 1949, life in East and West Germany was different. West Germany prospered economically; it was a democratic nation and the standard of living increased. Comparatively, life in East Germany was argued to be worse. It was a Communist dictatorship with a secret police force – the Stasi. There were few economic improvements and a poor standard of living.

Page 44: Practice question

I agree to a fair extent that denazification had the biggest impact on Germany in the years 1939–46. After the Allies occupied Germany at the end of the Second World War, they set about removing the influence of Nazism from everyday life, for instance banning the Nazi Party and removing Nazi propaganda from the streets. This had a fair impact on Germany, because since the Nazis came to power in 1933, Germans were used to seeing propaganda posters in the streets, hearing speeches over the radio and generally living in fear of the Gestapo. Thus, this had an impact because Germans no longer had to deal with seeing Nazi propaganda, and banning the Nazi Party would suggest that Germany would be moving towards more democratic times.

On the other hand, the Second World War had a big impact on Germany in the years 1939–46. Germany was in a good position in the war until the invasion of the USSR and Allied
victories in 1942. The war had an impact because Allied bombing campaigns led to the destruction of major cities and huge numbers of civilian deaths; for instance, the bombing of Dresden in February 1945 killed between 35,000 and 150,000 people in just two days. This had a major impact because it weakened morale and support for the Nazi regime declined, and led to a rise in discontent.

The Second World War also had an impact on Germany in the years 1939–46 because it led to changing views on the role of women. Nazi policy towards women before the war favoured them staying at home and giving up their jobs. But, with the advent of war, more women were needed to fill the jobs that had been left by the men going to war, and after 1941 the number of women in work increased, especially in armaments factories. This shows that the Second World War had an impact on Germany because it forced the Nazis to rethink their policies, and it impacted the lives of women, who now had to go out to work.

So, overall, denazification did have a fair impact on Germany in the years 1939–46 because Germany was now occupied by the Allies, and the Nazi Party, which had ruled since 1933, was now banned. Nevertheless, the Second World War had the greater impact because it destroyed cities, caused huge numbers of deaths and casualties, and forced the Nazis to change their views on women.

Page 45: Which is best?

a) 3; b) 6. Example b) is the better answer. It is not complete, but it compares how democratisation differed in both states politically. Example a) just lists some of the ways in which democratisation differed.
3 The USA 1919–1948: The People and the State

Page 46: Test yourself
1. The Model T Ford.
2. Mass production and the production line meant that manufacturers could make products more quickly and on a greater scale meaning that their price dropped.
3. Farming, old industries, coal mining and the coal industry all struggled and started to fail in the 1920s.

Page 47: Practice question
One of the key Republican policies in the 1920s was to put tariffs on products from overseas, making them more expensive. This encouraged American business, protected the prices that companies could charge, and made sure that American people bought American products.

Page 47: Support or challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrees</th>
<th>Disagrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Low taxes set by the government meant that people had spare income</td>
<td>- The car industry employed a lot of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tariffs on overseas goods meant that American goods were more appealing</td>
<td>- People had confidence in the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The government left businesses to run themselves</td>
<td>- The First World War had improved production levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Businesses were asked about policies</td>
<td>- Advertising encouraged people to buy goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People could buy goods on credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mass production made a lot of goods much cheaper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 47: Checklist
- The First World War helped to cause the boom. ✓
- People bought shares in the stock market. ✓
- The Republicans interfered in the economy to make sure it worked. *Incorrect*: they actually left the economy alone believing businesses knew what was best.
- The production line made cars cheaper. ✓
- The coal industry suffered in the 1920s. ✓
- Farmers’ exports decreased. ✓
- Advertising encouraged consumerism. ✓
- People lost confidence in the economy. *Incorrect*: confidence grew and this meant that people were happy to spend on luxury items or purchase through credit.

Page 49: Test yourself
1. Women were given the vote in 1920 due to the campaigning of the Suffragists and because of women’s contributions during the First World War.
2. Al Capone was the famous gangster who contributed to the end of prohibition due to the St Valentine’s Day massacre which saw violence spill onto the streets in 1929.
3. Ordinary people became criminals every time they went to a speakeasy, whenever they smuggled alcohol across the border or if they distilled their own alcohol (moonshine).
Page 49: Evaluate the source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue to think about</th>
<th>How this makes the source useful</th>
<th>How this makes the source less useful</th>
<th>Overall?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>It is showing us a positive image of women in the 1920s as the woman appears happy and in the newest fashions</td>
<td>It only shows us a positive view. Beyond the fashion it doesn’t tell us about other freedoms</td>
<td>Quite useful. Could tell us more and be more balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context (knowledge that supports or goes against the source)</td>
<td>I know that this is a flapper. This source is also supported by my own knowledge as I know women became the focus of advertisers during the 1920s</td>
<td>It doesn’t tell us about the social freedoms of flappers (for example, drinking and driving). This doesn’t tell us about new luxury items that helped with housework. It also doesn’t tell us about the traditional views that continued</td>
<td>There is some detail from the period that supports this source. However, I also know that there were a lot of negatives for women that this source ignores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance (who, why and when)</td>
<td>This source is contemporary, meaning that it reflects the attitudes of the time</td>
<td>This source is an advert. Therefore, it is trying to show women what to aspire to and hope for. Therefore, it will be a very positive view of women</td>
<td>The source is likely to be exaggerated and show the best of what women could have to try to encourage women to spend their money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, I find this source very limited in how useful it is in telling us about women in the 1920s. It is narrow in its focus and doesn’t mention the hardships in rural areas. In addition, it is likely to be exaggerating the positives as it is trying to get women to buy new fashions.

Page 49: Practice question

There were two main reasons that the lives of women changed in the 1920s, the most important being the change in attitudes towards middle-class women in cities. This was also aided by the invention of new time-saving devices giving women more freedom.

Women’s lives became less traditional and restricted if they were wealthy and living in the cities due to changes in attitudes and, therefore, expectations. There were no longer the same traditional views of what sort of jobs women should have or how they should behave around men. They could smoke, drink and cut their hair short if they wanted to. They were given the vote and were seen more often in literature and on the screen. This meant that it was more acceptable in certain parts of society for women to behave as they wished, not as others expected them to.

In addition, new time-saving devices such as the washing machine and fridge meant that women had more time to be able to pursue these new-found interests. Women weren’t having to spend as long washing, cleaning and looking after the household, and so had more free time to socialise and enjoy the opportunities of the 1920s. Therefore, their lives improved as they had freedom to travel rather than remain in the house.
Essentially, the lives of some women improved in the Roaring Twenties because of freedom. They could leave the house and do as they wished due to new technologies, and the shift in attitudes gave them more freedom to behave as they wished without the same expectations that they would conform to traditional roles.

Page 50: Practice question

The execution of Sacco and Vanzetti was controversial because of the attitudes that led to the sentence and because these views were seen as acceptable.

There was very little evidence against Sacco and Vanzetti and they were only found guilty because of the fear of immigrants in the USA in the 1920s. These two men were from Italy and they were anarchists. At the time of the crime and trial, other anarchists in the USA were setting off bombs and suspected Communists were being followed. Therefore, there was a climate of fear, directed at people who did not fit the idea of an ideal American. This was particularly controversial in this case because the judge said that the men’s backgrounds resulted in the guilty verdict, rather than the evidence. This was a huge miscarriage of justice as the court was not listening to the evidence but to their own prejudice.

In addition, this case was controversial because it made these discriminatory views acceptable. The judge was open in his sentencing that there wasn’t much evidence against these men, but that they should be executed for the views they held. Courts are only meant to listen to evidence. This was also happening alongside the immigration quotas set by the government. If judges and the government were ensuring that people from different backgrounds were not allowed into the country or were found guilty of crimes they did not commit, then it made it acceptable for anyone to have these views. Therefore, it was controversial as it strengthened prejudice in the USA.

Overall, it was so controversial because it showed how deep the prejudice towards immigrants and anarchists was in the USA. These views influenced the judge to sentence the two innocent men to death and, by doing so, the judge influenced people in the USA to voice their concerns in everyday life.

Page 50: Test yourself

1. Sacco and Vanzetti were executed because they were found guilty of murder and robbery. However, it is likely that they were only found guilty because of racism and discrimination as they were Italian immigrants and anarchists.
2. The Red Scare was the fear that communism was spreading to America from Russia and Eastern Europe after 1917.
3. The NAACP was a civil rights campaigning group who demanded equality and an end to segregation for African Americans. It stands for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Page 51: Complete the paragraph

This is a suggestion of how you might have finished this paragraph. You may have taken a different line of argument or worded it differently.

One important reason why so many African Americans moved North during the 1920s was because of the violence of the KKK. The membership of the Klan was at its highest in the 1920s and thousands of African Americans were lynched. This resulted in people moving North because... they were scared about the possibility of violence if they remained in the South. People would be lynched with very little evidence and the level of fear was worsening. African Americans believed that they would be more accepted in the North.
Page 51: Turning assertion into argument

This is a suggestion of how you might have finished these sentences. You may have taken a different line of argument or worded it differently.

The fact that there was no evidence of their guilt made it controversial because ... it was a miscarriage of justice and it meant that there were influences on the decision that shouldn’t have been in a courtroom.

The two men were Italian immigrants and this made it controversial because ... it showed the level of prejudice and discrimination that existed in the USA towards immigrants.

The two men were anarchists and this made the case controversial because ... it revealed that if you had a different political belief to most Americans you could be discriminated against in the most extreme ways.

The fact that the judge was clearly prejudiced made the case controversial because ... this wasn’t something that was secret and unacceptable. The judge said things that showed prejudice and so other people might think it was reasonable to do the same.

Page 52: Test yourself

1 Roosevelt was a member of the Democratic Party and Hoover was a Republican.
2 Hoovervilles were shanty towns that appeared in many US cities as a result of increased homelessness during the Depression.
3 Roosevelt suggested that the government should spend money to help the poor and that government schemes should be used to create jobs. He also wanted to use experts to advise the government.

Page 53: Delete as applicable

This gives you a suggestion of how you might have completed the paragraph with one of the options selected. You may have chosen other lines of argument.

I agree to a great extent that Hoover lost the election because of his Republican policies. Aside from tax cuts and encouraging businesses to maintain higher wages, he did very little to help the ordinary American. Republicans believed that the government should not interfere in the economy and that issues would resolve themselves. Therefore, he lost the election only because ... of his failures as a president. People were very angry with his inaction and this anger was only reduced when Roosevelt came and promised a better life.

Page 53: Opposing views

This is an example of a balanced view that you might have taken. You may have decided on a slightly different view.

Roosevelt was victorious in the 1932 presidential election because he was wise enough to take advantage of Hoover’s weaknesses. He won because he offered Americans a New Deal and better conditions. However, this was only as effective as it was because of Hoover’s inaction during the Depression. If Hoover had done more to help the economy, businesses and the poor, then Roosevelt would have struggled to put forward such a convincing argument for being president.

Page 53: Practice question

The key message of this source is that anyone could be the victim of the Wall Street Crash and subsequent Depression. The man on the bench is dressed in a way that suggests he was wealthy, perhaps a businessman. This illustrates that it wasn’t just the poor getting poorer
after the Crash. In addition, he is telling the squirrel that he saved his money in a bank. This suggests that he was not speculating on the market or making risky decisions, but that he was careful with his money. This reinforces the idea that anyone could be hit, whether it was cautious savers or even the banks themselves. This is unsurprising as the cartoonist made this in 1932, by which point over 1000 banks had closed, taking people’s savings with them.

**Page 54: Test yourself**

1. Huey Long criticised the New Deal because he felt that it didn’t do enough to help people. He thought the very poorest and African Americans were still living in extreme poverty and he set up ‘Share our Wealth’, which called for limits to top wages.

2. The TVA was the Tennessee Valley Authority that used government money to build a dam. This provided jobs and improved the quality of farming land in the valley.

3. To get people working; to protect savings and homes; provide help for the poor and sick; to restart industry and agriculture.

**Page 55: Doing reliability well**

These are simply suggestions about the rankings you may give and what you might say about the sources. You many have said slightly different things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Reason for rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cartoon published by the American Liberty League (ALL) in 1935. The ALL was a group of Democrats who were unhappy with Roosevelt’s policies</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>There is a political motivation behind the message of the cartoon. They are trying to make a point about how bad Roosevelt was as a president and that the New Deal was failing. Therefore, it was not balanced. However, it does accurately show the criticisms that existed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An extract from a book by the prominent businessman Howard E. Kerschner, called <em>The Menace Roosevelt and His Policies</em>, published in 1936</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>This was written by a historian and during the Depression, so it will be well researched and he will be an expert. However, the name of the book strongly suggests that he has a very negative view of Roosevelt and the New Deal, so this won’t be balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cartoon from the British magazine <em>Punch</em>, published in 1935. The caption read: The Illegal Act. President Roosevelt: ‘I’m sorry but the Supreme Court says I must chuck you back again’</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>As it was British, they are less likely to have strong views as they were not personally affected by the New Deal. However, this is a political magazine and tries to make fun of politicians. Therefore, the message with be designed with a particular reaction and audience in mind and so may distort some details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 56: Test yourself**

1. People could purchase war bonds. This gave the government money they could spend on the war. Those who had bought the bonds would receive their money back (with a profit) at the end of the war.

2. The war helped farmers as there was an increased demand for food, especially from Europe.

3. By the end of the war there was an extra 7.3 million women at work.
Page 57: Checklist

- Unemployment levels fell during the war because of work in industry. ✓
- Women were often respected by their bosses. ✓
- African American workers did not get more jobs during the war. Incorrect: there were 750,000 African Americans working in factories in the war.
- There were over 7 million more women in work during the war. ✓
- Women were accepted by men. Incorrect: women were often treated badly in the workplace.
- People supported the war effort. ✓
- People were happy to buy war bonds from the government. ✓
- Women were no longer bound by traditional views of their roles. Incorrect: a lot of people still thought about women in the same way. At the end of the war many had to return to family life.

Page 57: Complete the paragraph

This is a suggestion of two examples you might have used to support the point and explanation. You may have chosen something else.

The economy was helped by the Second World War because it provided jobs. ... There were 30 million people employed in the armed forces and in factories during the war. This included new people in the workforce, with 7.3 women and 750,000 African American workers.

This helped the economy because it provided people with spare income. This meant that they could spend it on goods, making America richer, or war bonds, which gave the government more to spend on the war.

Page 57: Practice question

Sources C and D are very similar.

Both of these sources are similar in their provenance and purpose. They are examples of Second World War propaganda, made by the US government to show the opportunities available to people if they wanted to help the war effort and strengthen the nation. In both sources, women are shown as important in the war effort. In Source C, the muscles of Rosie the Riveter illustrate both that she is effective in the workforce, and that she is helping America become stronger. The women in Source D seem hard working, focused and well organised, again demonstrating the jobs available and efficient levels of production in the USA.

There are some differences in the way these messages are demonstrated. In Source C, we do not see the woman ‘Rosie’ doing the work. We assume that she works in industry from her dress but it’s not clear which one, and she could be a farmer or driver. In Source D, it is more obvious that the women are working in some sort of construction. In addition, the audiences would have perceived these two sources differently. Source C would have been more obvious propaganda while Source D is subtler. The picture would have been staged, but for people working during the war may have been seen as accurate.

I think these sources mostly agree with each other. They are both trying to achieve the same outcome, of more women in the war effort, and while they do this in slightly different ways they are still showing us that there was a government effort to convince the American people of the strength of industry.
Page 58: Practice question

I strongly agree that the people of the USA supported the government during the war, but that some minority groups had a very poor experience nonetheless.

When the USA joined the First World War in 1917 there was an immediate response from Americans. Many joined the armed forces to fight against the racism of Nazi Germany. People wanted to help by working, even if they couldn’t go to Europe to fight, and given the tensions of the 1930s, it was clear that people were behind the government. New job opportunities allowed 750,000 African Americans and 7.3 million women to go to work and they benefited from increased wages. People were willing to buy war bonds (totalling $129 billion over the course of the war), which helped to fund the war effort. In all, America’s production levels were increased, the economy was stronger and there was a united effort to defeat fascism. Indeed, there was so much enthusiasm that the War Production Board had to invent jobs for people to do. In addition, the government was able to introduce rationing and increased taxes with little resistance. It seemed that the USA was fully on board with the government in helping the USA to win the war.

On the other hand, there were negative aspects to society during the war that severely affected women and minority groups. Women may have gained employment but they were still met with sexism in the workplace and their wages were half of what men received. African Americans were allowed to fight, but were often treated as second-class members of the armed forces. Presidential orders to improve equality or desegregate troops were largely ignored, signalling that some people were happy to help the war effort as long as they did not have to help African Americans at the same time. On the West coast, a combination of fear and racism led to the internment of around 120,000 Japanese Americans in camps in California. People were fearful of those who did not appear to be fully on the side of the USA, however misplaced this attitude was.

However, even though these groups were discriminated against, they still contributed to the war effort. One million African Americans joined the forces and 33,000 Japanese Americans signed up to fight as soon as they were allowed to in 1943. Women were deemed to be among some of the best workers in electrical construction and many stayed in the workplace beyond the war. Therefore, a vast majority of Americans fully supported the government and the war effort, with the exception of those who thought that violence and discrimination against non-white members of society was either acceptable or helpful.

Page 58: Test yourself

1. Internment was the placing of civilians into camps for the duration of the war. During the Second World War the US government interned 120,000 Japanese Americans.

2. The first executive order was Executive Order 8802 which said that businesses involved in the war effort had to end discrimination in the workplace. In 1948, Executive Order 9981 tried to ensure equality in the armed forces.

3. The race riots were, in part, caused by the increased racial tensions in the workplace. Some people didn’t like that 750,000 additional African Americans were employed in war industries.
### Page 59: Support or challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • There was a big reaction to calls to increase production during the war  
• 7.3 million women went to work  
• Morale was high  
• People wanted to fight to combat racism  
• 33,000 Japanese Americans joined up to fight  
• People spent a lot of money on war bonds | • Japanese Americans were interned  
• There was segregation in the armed forces  
• People ignored the executive orders to improve equality |

### Page 59: Do/Don’t list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Don’t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Include at least two paragraphs  
• Include a brief conclusion which indicates clearly your opinion  
• Look at both sides of the argument  
• When using evidence, follow it with an explanation of how that issue answers the question | • If you can’t remember the facts, guess  
• Tell the story of what happened  
• Write one big paragraph with everything you can remember  
• Be careful not to be too forceful with your own ideas |
4 The USA 1945–1974: The People and the State

Page 60: Test yourself

1. The House Un-American Activities Committee was set up by the US government and helped investigate suspected Communists for the FBI.
2. The Hollywood Ten were a high-profile group of people who challenged theHUAC on the grounds of freedom of speech. They failed and were jailed.

Page 61: Practice question

One example of the actions of theHUAC was their questioning of the ‘Hollywood Ten’. This questioning was done after the accusation that leading members of the film industries were members of the Communist Party. This accusation may not have had much evidence to support it. This case was interesting because no charges of spying were made, but the high-profile nature of the case meant that the ten people concerned never worked in Hollywood again.

Page 61: Checklist

- People feared capitalism. Incorrect: it was actually communism that they feared.
- Lots of other nations became Communist after the Second World War. Correct: this included a lot of South-East Asia. ✓
- TheHUAC interviewed people suspected of communism. Correct: they did so on behalf of the FBI. ✓
- There was a fear of the USSR after they developed the H-bomb. Incorrect: the Russians developed the A-bomb, in 1949.
- The Hollywood Ten were shunned from Hollywood after the accusations made against them. Correct: no one would hire them even though they weren’t charged. ✓
- The Rosenbergs were executed for being spies for the Soviets. Correct: in 1953, on some dubious evidence. ✓
- The FBI defended people who were accused of communism. Incorrect: the FBI was very anti-Communist.

Page 61: Complete the paragraph

There was a fear of communism at the end of the Second World War because the USSR developed their atomic bomb in 1949. This was sooner than American advisers had suggested. Therefore … people were concerned that their former allies were a new threat to security. The development of the A-bomb threatened America’s position as a superpower. There was also a fear that people from within the USA were giving away secrets about nuclear weapons and therefore that there could already be Communist threats within the USA. This all added to a fear and suspicion of this political ideology.

Page 62: Test yourself

1. Captain America came back in a comic book series after the Second World War to help fight the Communists.
2. McCarthy made his name when he accused General Marshall of plotting a Communist plan to overthrow the president. McCarthy then had a platform for condemning communism.
3. McCarthyism ended when McCarthy took it too far, accused people too high up in the army and government and when he was made to look foolish by lawyers on television.
The first reason why McCarthy rose to prominence was due to the accusations he made about people within the US government. He had claimed to know of 200 government employees who had sympathies with communism and who therefore might be spreading American secrets to the USSR. From here, his role as the head of Communist ‘witch-hunts’ escalated. He led a committee who helped the HUAC and FBI to investigate people who might be members of the Communist Party. The fact, that these were televised resulted in McCarthy himself increasing in popularity and fame.

In addition, McCarthy was allowed to do this because of the political context of the time. The USA had found a new enemy at the end of the Second World War: the Soviets. The fact that the USSR had developed a nuclear weapon at the end of the 1940s both worried and threatened America, and the rise of communism in South-East Asia made people fear a Communist invasion. The US involvement in Korea in the 1950s only made this fear more immediate. Therefore, people wanted to believe McCarthy, and his strong anti-Communist messages seemed to resonate with people worried about communism generally.

It was this international political context that was most significant to McCarthy’s rise to prominence. He was making accusations that people were willing to believe because of events elsewhere. There was an audience (the American public) that was ready to be scared and therefore McCarthy was able to capitalise on his own powerful position by spreading even more fear.

McCarthy rose to prominence in the 1950s because of his accusations of communism against people working in important government positions. He had a list of over 200 names, that then reduced to around 90 names before eventually becoming only 57 names. Even then, 35 of these had been cleared and only 22 of the people were still being investigated by the FBI. As a result of his list of names, he was asked to lead his own enquiries into prominent people and these were widely reported. He was helped by the context of the time. Other nations had become Communist. China had turned Communist in 1949, and then places such as Indonesia and Burma followed. People were worried that the Communists around the world were planning to attack. Films and comics added to this hysteria and made people believe that not only was McCarthy right, but he was the only one who could ‘save them’.

This is a suggestion of how you may have combined the two strong views of McCarthy into something more balanced. You may have done this differently, or used different words, in your answer.

It is likely that McCarthy believed he was working in the best interests of the American people, making them safer from the threat of communism. He saw a political opportunity to increase his own popularity when he made his accusation, but was also trying to prevent spies leaking American secrets to the USSR. The wider political context meant that his message was particularly powerful, and many people were scared to the point of hysteria. The decline of McCarthy signalled that the USA finally saw through his accusations and rediscovered the need for more thorough evidence to back up these accusations.

These are suggestions of how you might have linked these assertions back to the question to make them into arguments. You may have chosen different words or had different ideas.
Progress was made as a result of legal challenges because ... it helped to make sure that the different states desegregated their public services and schools. When the Supreme Court ruled that schools had to be integrated, there was a legal requirement for the state to make sure it happened.

Progress was made because of Martin Luther King because ... he helped to organise the MIA and continue the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Despite threats of violence and being arrested, his speeches inspired people to organise car pools and continue to boycott. This eventually led to the end of segregation on public transport.

Progress was made because of the interests of Eisenhower because ... he both aimed to enforce the decision of the Supreme Court and because he desired to introduce new laws to help end discrimination. He used federal troops to force the school in Little Rock to accept African American students. This, along with the Civil Rights Act, showed that the president was interested in making the situation better, inspiring many in the civil rights movement to continue.

Progress was made as a result of violence against African Americans because ... it demonstrated to people why it was so important to make progress. The murder of Emmett Till in 1955 was horrific and showed people that violence was still a huge threat, and that there needed to be a non-violent and cooperative response to the problems.

Page 65: Test yourself

1 The outcome of the Montgomery Bus Boycott was that the court ruled that segregated bus travel was illegal and therefore all public segregation must have been illegal.

2 The case of Emmett Till was important because the murder of the fifteen-year-old showed the level of racial violence. Many people were cross that those accused were found not guilty.

3 The two aims of the 1957 Civil Rights Act were to end segregation and to make it easier to report cases where people were stopped from voting.

Page 65: Practice question

One example of the early successes of the early civil rights movement was the Brown v. Board of Education case of 1954. The case, which lasted two years, challenged the Jim Crow laws in school, which had segregated black and white students in their access to education. There was presidential intervention following the court’s decision that education should be desegregated which demonstrated that there was some federal support for improving the position of African Americans in society. The legal nature of the decision also meant that it was easier, in theory, for further challenges to Jim Crow to take place.

Page 67: Test yourself

1 The sit-ins were a peaceful form of protest where people protested segregation in restaurants by sitting in the ‘wrong’ seats.

2 The Freedom Rides were started to show that there was still segregation on public transport even though it was meant to be illegal after the Montgomery Bus Boycott.

3 The Selma marches were needed because there was huge discrimination against African Americans, especially related to voting rights. The consequence of the march was the Voting Rights Bill of 1965.

Page 67: Considering usefulness

In the table below you can see some suggestions of what you might have included in your table. You may have had different points, interpretations and judgements.
This source is quite useful as it makes it clear that the purpose of the march was to be peaceful. It says that it wanted to show the ‘brutality’ of the ‘oppressor’ in the open. This meant that they didn’t want violence to happen, but they did want to show that African Americans were treated badly, and they wanted this to be public.

However, the source does not give a clear indication of what the march generally wanted to achieve.

This source is useful in some respects as it was written by Martin Luther King. He was the one who had organised the march and so he is most likely to have known what its purpose was. He can speak with an overall knowledge of the events in Birmingham and therefore his views are likely to be reliable. However, these comments were made after the march and he is defending himself against some criticism. Therefore, he may be overemphasising the peaceful nature of the march to protect his campaign from further criticism.

This source does support the fact that the SCLC was dedicated to non-violent peaceful protest. Since the mid-1950s, it had used peaceful methods to get the issue in the public eye and so Martin Luther King seems to be reinforcing that in Birmingham. We also know that it was the chief of police, ‘Bull’ Connor, who decided to use the dogs and water cannons. The only limitation is that this source does not give a wider context of the civil rights movement in the early 1960s, which would show more thoroughly why protest was needed in 1963.

Page 67: Practice question

Source A is very useful in telling us about the violence that happened during the civil rights march in Birmingham in 1963. It illustrates that Martin Luther King was upset that the protesters were accused of starting this violence and they were ‘peaceful’ and that protesting is not enough of a reason to be met with violence. It also shows that the march was publicised and that Martin Luther King wanted the issues surrounding race relations to be publicised. The fact that we know that ‘Bull’ Connor instigated the violence and that the protesters had not obviously started this, supports the source, and we have to believe that Martin Luther King, who organised the event, would have had a good knowledge of the day.

However, we must also remember that there had already been violence in the 1960s (in the Freedom Rides, for example) and this feature of the campaign is overlooked. In addition, in this source, Martin Luther King is defending himself. He has been accused of starting the violence and therefore could be overemphasising the peaceful nature of the protest.

Overall, this source is useful because of what it tells us, who said it and what we know about the violence the protesters faced in 1963.

Page 68: Test yourself

1 Some people were frustrated by the approach of Martin Luther King because they felt violent action was needed and justified if real change was going to happen.
2 Affirmative action was the introduction of quotas to ensure more African American people were represented in jobs and society.
3 Route 40 illustrated the discrimination African Americans faced. African diplomats were targeted by police and refused service in restaurants.
Page 68: Practice question

I do not fully agree with this statement, although the presidents in this period did have a significant role to play. However, they were pushed into a position where it made political sense to pass new laws as proposed by the civil rights movement.

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson were significant in helping African Americans to gain more rights by 1968. Most importantly, they helped to pass crucial legislation that extended and protected the voting rights of African Americans and tried to end social discrimination. The efforts of these two presidents were high profile and would have set a tone for the whole nation. In 1964, the Civil Rights Act made sure that discrimination in housing and employment was illegal. Kennedy appointed African Americans to important and high-profile offices in government and this showed his support and dedication to the idea that African Americans should have the same opportunities as white Americans. Fundamentally, while the civil rights campaigns may not have always been their primary focus, it was the presidents who had the power to make changes. They were the only people with the ability to make sure that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed and therefore the presidents were crucial in trying to eradicate legal segregation or discrimination.

However, presidents are politicians. They would make these decisions and push for these changes partly due to their own beliefs and morals but also because it was the right time to do it politically. Civil rights campaigners were putting huge pressure on the governments to make their lives better and ensure equality. The March on Washington in 1963 was a hugely high-profile criticism of the situation and of previous governments, and Martin Luther King called directly on the people with power to make changes. This march had 250,000 attendees. In addition, the Selma march of 1965 ended in horrific violence, which was widely reported and publicised. Therefore, the presidents had to do something. The activists and campaigns, using peaceful methods, demonstrated that the government had little choice but to make changes.

Therefore, I only partially agree with the statement. In terms of legal changes and the ability to force companies to treat everyone equally, it was the presidents who achieved so much. However, the grass-roots support of the civil rights movement not only made it impossible for the presidents to ignore the situation any longer, but also had a greater impact on shifting opinions among so many.

Page 69: Spot the mistakes

Mistake 1: ‘… they were resident in the South of the USA and Martin Luther King was mostly focused on the North’. This should read that ‘they were resident in the North and Martin Luther King was mostly focused on the South.

Mistake 2: ‘The country of Islam’. This should read ‘The Nation of Islam.’

Mistake 3: ‘African Americans should leave and return to Africa’. This should read ‘African Americans should set up their own nation state.

Mistake 4: ‘The Black Tigers’. This should read ‘The Black Panthers’.

Page 71: Test yourself

1 In 1968, 1971, 1972 and 1974, Chicano students walked out of schools as a protest. They hated segregated education and their facilities and the quality of teaching was much worse when compared to white students.

2 Cesar Chavez led the United Farm Workers who fought for better pay and conditions for grape pickers in California.
Nixon tried to help Native Americans by appointing a Commissioner for Indian Affairs, he returned 48,000 acres of land, he prevented children being taken from their families with the Child Welfare Act of 1974 and he passed the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 allowing Native Americans to govern themselves.

**Page 71: Practice question**

I think there was some progress for Chicanos and Native Americans between 1954 and 1974 because both groups started to challenge their situations, although with only a little success.

The Chicanos made only limited progress in terms of improving their position in American society but they did significantly alter the way they dealt with discrimination. The Chicano national movement saw the Chicanos group and organise behind a sense of common heritage and they focused on demanding land back for their people from New Mexico and the government. This was ultimately unsuccessful but showed the power of joint work. The United Farm Workers’ strike in 1966 did lead to increased wages and again showed the power of cooperation, whereas the challenges to the segregated education system in the high-school walkouts of 1968 were unsuccessful. They all made progress, however, as for the first time there was a united voice of dissent. The Chicanos started to feel united against discrimination and were becoming more vocal in their criticism of it. This type of progress should not be underestimated.

Native Americans made some progress during this period due to their ability to protest, and they achieved some political success. The Wounded Knee siege in 1973 was not a success in terms of claiming back land from the US government or removing the power of the BIA, but it was widely publicised. It showed the US government and the people of the USA that there was a new united voice against the forms of discrimination that were taking place and that the Native American people were willing to go far to achieve their aims. There were some successes. The Indian Child Welfare Act protected the future of Native American children (and by association their culture) and Nixon made key appointments of Native Americans to positions where they could inform policy on Native American issues. This would have led to Native Americans starting to feel more politically included. The Native American population in much of the USA also used this period to unite behind the common aim of equality. They used protest effectively and this led to some significant progress. There was a move to political freedom and protecting children, which was welcomed by the Native Americans. However, the continuation of reservations and the insistence not to return disputed land meant that many of the social issues of the period remained.

Overall, this period saw some progress for these minority groups as they started to organise themselves to challenge what had become the accepted treatment of them in society. This clear protest, focusing on central issues, had some success, more so for Native Americans and more so in politics. Socially, there was not as much progress for these groups and much of the anger remained.
### Page 71: Essay style

The planning grid below gives some suggestions of what could be written in the planning grid. You may have equally suitable arguments, evidence or explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Set out your opinion</th>
<th>I think there was some progress for Chicanos and Native Americans between 1954 and 1974 because ... both groups started to challenge their situations, although with only a little success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 1: Chicanos</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>The Chicanos made only limited progress in terms of improving their position in American society but they did significantly alter the way they dealt with discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Claiming land (Chicanos’ national movement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to question</td>
<td>Therefore, the different types of protest used hadn’t really helped the Chicanos to make progress in this period. They still had lower wages, they didn’t receive any land, and education was still segregated and very poor. However, for the first time the Chicanos started to feel united against discrimination and were becoming more vocal in their criticism of it. This type of progress should not be underestimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 2: Native Americans</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Native Americans made some progress during this period due to their ability to protest, and they achieved some political success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Wounded Knee siege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to question</td>
<td>The Native American population in much of the USA also used this period to unite behind the common aim of equality. They used protest effectively and this led to some significant progress. There was a move to political freedom and protecting children, which was welcomed by the Native Americans. However, the continuation of reservations and the insistence not to return disputed land meant that many of the social issues of the period remained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Come to a judgement and link the issues</td>
<td>Overall, this period saw some progress for these minority groups as they started to organise themselves to challenge what had become the accepted treatment of them in society. This clear protest, focusing on central issues, had some success, more so for Native Americans and more so in politics. Socially, there was not as much progress for these groups and much of the anger remained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Page 73: Test yourself

1. People were concerned by the attitudes of hippies. They rejected ‘mainstream’ society and worse different clothes, had different hairstyles and their lifestyle and music challenged what was seen as normal.
2. NOW was the National Organisation for Women. It organised protests and challenged discrimination against women through the courts.
5 War and British Society c.790 to c.2010

Page 77: Test yourself
1 Wessex.
2 Harold Godwinson.
3 Motte and bailey.

Page 77: Developing the detail
The most obvious short-term impact was the looting and violence which took place [when Viking raiders would arrive at an English coastal settlement and steal everything of value]. The long-term impact was that some of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were weakened by the attacks [as they were continuously having to defend from small raids which weakened their armies. This led to many kingdoms being conquered and becoming part of the Danelaw].

Page 77: Complete the paragraph
After initially attempting to be conciliatory in his approach, William realised that the Anglo-Saxons would continue to resist unless he made an extreme show of force. Therefore he ... ordered the Harrying of the North, which was an astonishing brutal attack on the people and lands of the whole of northern England. Norman soldiers deliberately inflicted an famine on the whole of region which may have killed as many as 100,000, or one tenth of the population, in order to show the Anglo-Saxons what would happen if they resisted further.

Page 77: Practice question
The Norman Invasion was extremely significant for the Britain as a whole as it totally changed the nature of England.

First and foremost, it now meant that England had far more in common with France rather than central Europe or Scandinavia. French was spoken at court for the next two centuries and English armies would use Norman and French tactics for the same period as well. The Normans spent the next century or so bringing all of England and most of Wales under their control, and in doing so it changed the country a very great deal, removing a culture that had existed for centuries and replacing it to a point that much of Anglo-Saxon culture was lost.

At the same time, it also ensured that England now had possessions in France (that is, Normandy) and would spend much of the next 1000 years competing with France in almost every way imaginable. This dramatically affected Britain throughout its history, in a way that would have been much less likely had it remained in Anglo-Saxon hands.

In conclusion, the Norman invasion was hugely significant, and had a very long-term impact on Britain.

Page 78: Test yourself
1 The feudal system.
2 Stephen and Matilda.
3 1215.

Page 78: Practice question
While most of the period from 790 to 1215 was technically not at war, some of the conflicts which did take place profoundly affected the English people.
The Norman Conquest dramatically changed life for the English, in almost every way imaginable. The entire ruling class was largely replaced and a whole network of castles was built to control the kingdom, a fact that actually had a strong effect in bringing England together more effectively than previous rulers had managed. The new feudal system which was imposed created far more control from London over the kingdom than had ever been seen before. At the same time, the Church was given a more significant role in ensuring obedience and loyalty to the Crown. This was huge consequence of a war that affected England.

This said, most of the actual warfare which took place in and around England over this 400-year period had very little effect on the English people. Before the Norman Conquest, Viking raids certainly took their toll on the north-east coast of England, but in terms of England as a whole, it was not actually terribly badly affected and in general life continued more or less as normal for most people, as wars tended to be on a fairly small scale.

Even after the Norman Conquest, and the outbreak of war between supporters of Stephen and Matilda, it was not a huge amount of the whole period. There was some serious breakdown of law and order and near anarchy, though once Henry II was crowned this returned England to a peaceful state, largely thanks to the control previously established by the Normans. This was the age of chivalry, but while this affected the gentry and nobility, it did not particularly affect ordinary people. Even the signing of Magna Carta after some limited conflict, did not affect the English people a great deal.

Ultimately, while the Norman Conquest and actions to pacify England had a huge impact, in general the English people were not terribly affected by war during this period.

Page 79: Complete the diagram

- **King**: the ruler of the kingdom, but required cooperation of the tenants-in-chief.
- **Tenants-in-chief**: major landowners who were trusted by the king to rule their parts of his kingdom.
- **Knights**: skilled horsemen who were expected to lead soldiers into battle and rule over small sections of land.
- **Peasants**: ordinary people, usually farmers, making up 99 per cent of the population.

Page 79: You’re the examiner

Level 3. This is correct, but too basic, it does not use enough detail, nor does it fully explain.

Page 80: Test yourself

1. The chivalric code.
2. Daffydd ap Gruffydd.
3. 1337–1453.

Page 81: Turning assertion into argument

The extended nature of the wars meant that Edward I was forced to ... impose heavy taxes on the kingdom to pay for his armies, particularly because he was fighting in Scotland and Wales.

Henry V’s archers’ destruction of the French cavalry proved that ... warfare was changing and that knights on horseback were no longer as important as they had been.

The growing wealth of the nobility meant that instead of providing leadership and soldiers, they were now providing money. This meant ... that the nobility were more independent and grew more powerful.
Page 81: Event overview grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viking attacks on England</td>
<td>Raids from Norway and Denmark which killed people and destroyed or robbed whole communities from the seventh to tenth centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut’s capture of England</td>
<td>King Cnut fought wars to bring the Danelaw and Mercia together in the tenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Norman Conquest</td>
<td>Duke William of Normandy invaded and took over England in 1066, imposing new laws and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Harrying of the North</td>
<td>The deliberate starvation of 100,000 people in northern England to force them to accept William’s rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feudal system</td>
<td>The social organisation of England with the king at the top, then tenants-in-chief, then knights and then peasants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War between Matilda and Stephen</td>
<td>The two children of Henry I fought for control of England until Matilda’s son Henry was crowned Henry II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Magna Carta</td>
<td>A document which King John signed that theoretically forced him to obey certain rules, but he ignored it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward’s invasion of Wales</td>
<td>Edward III invaded Wales in order to take total control and make it part of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward’s wars in Scotland</td>
<td>Edward III attempted to seize control of Scotland, but died before he was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hundred Years’ War</td>
<td>The wars between England and France for control of France. England was generally successful until its total defeat in 1453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 81: Practice question

Feudal warfare had a considerable effect on English society because it affected all levels of society, and it affected the economy. The chivalric code meant that nobles and knights were obliged to provide soldiers and leadership to the king, and in Edward III’s wars in Wales and Scotland many thousands were needed to attempt to fully capture Wales and attempt to capture Scotland. All of this was on an unheard of scale and cost a huge amount of money. Edward was forced to raise taxes to support these wars, and armies which could number in the tens of thousands. This obviously had a profound effect on the English economy as it meant that people were made poorer for a long time as a consequence.

Another more significant consequence of the continuous warfare in this period is that an English ‘identity’ began to emerge at this time. Instead of being a collection of ‘Anglo-Saxons’ and ‘Normans’, there was now a clearer sense of ‘being English’. Additionally, Edward III called the Model Parliament in 1295 which became the model for the king raising taxes only with the consent of Parliament, a model which would remain for the rest of England’s history. Even with this consent though, it led to some barons to consider rebellion because of the constant strain of war on their finances and on their people.

War had a very significant effect on English society in this period – most notably because it may well have created ‘English’ society.
Page 82: Test yourself

1. It meant that she was no longer ‘protected’ by Catholic faith.
3. Fear of invasion; high taxes; food shortages and disease.

Page 82: Practice question

The key factor in deciding whether wars were popular in this period was how brief they were, whether they were against a foreign enemy, and how successful England was. In general, England was fairly successful and so the people were willing to support war, but longer wars became less and less popular.

Wars against France and later Spain were, in general, popular with the English people so long as England was victorious. There was rarely a feeling that England was likely to be invaded, so people were willing to support wars, so long as taxes were not too excessive. There were exceptions when the wars had gone for too long, or the king had asked for too much tax too recently, such as with the Amicable Grant in 1525 or with Edward’s wars in the 1290s, but, in general, foreign conflict and the promise of glory, honour and wealth was enough to give a sense that the people of England were willing to support these wars. Critically, of course, these wars did much less damage to England and its people than wars in Britain, and so were more popular.

The various conflicts fought within Britain, were generally much less popular, with the death destruction and hardship caused by conflict on British soil, from Viking raids at the start of the period to risings in Ireland at the end. People generally found themselves tolerating conflicts which were relatively brief, or as above, in Wales and Scotland. When conflicts such as the Wars of the Roses or the civil war between Matilda and Stephen took place, it was largely something which affected the nobility and the gentry and the majority of the population was not too directly affected, but such conflicts tended to see a breakdown of law and order which was, of course, unpopular.

Finally, all wars required soldiers in armies that could sometimes number into the tens of thousands, at a time when England’s population was less than 2 million. This meant that a great many men were called away to war on a regular basis. Obviously, this affected those men and the families, but it also affected the productivity of the local areas having so many men called away so frequently. It was generally accepted as being a part of life, but it was very rarely popular, saving those individuals who returned from war wealthier than they had left, although this was uncommon.

Ultimately, warfare was a common occurrence throughout this period, and it was generally far more popular when it was brief, successful and taking place somewhere else.

Page 83: Complete the paragraph

Recruiting 385,000 men put a huge burden on the English government and economy. Not only did the Crown have to pay the salary of a very large number of people, but also ... these men were a key part of the productivity of the nation and as a result the economy began to struggle at a time when taxes were required in large amounts.

Page 83: Developing the detail

England was extremely lucky during the war with Spain. When the Armada attacked, some [around ten per cent of the] ships got sunk by the English navy, and some [around half] of the rest were destroyed by a storm [a once-in-a-century hurricane]. After this, [In 1587, the English destroyed another fleet that the Spanish were building in the port of Cadiz].
Throughout the war, the queen [the English government] had been recruiting many [as many as 385,000] people for the army and navy.

**Page 84: Practice question**

The English civil wars were so devastating because of the nature of the conflict and the availability of new technology and methods. Both sides held a huge amount of territory and both had a good chance of winning the war. They were utterly ruthless in their methods and would demand a huge amount from every town and village they came across, and if the town or village could not or would not give them what they wanted, they would brutally punish the town. During this time also, there was a general breakdown of law and order, which saw a huge rise in theft, destruction and murder. It got so bad that most communities formed groups of Clubmen to defend their communities from both sides to prevent them from being robbed and attacked.

Equally devastating was the fact that the two armies had new methods at their disposal. Both armies had traditional weapons such as cavalry, pikemen and infantry armed with swords, but they now also had cannon and muskets, which could be hugely devastating. Furthermore, the New Model Army was a revolution in the way an army was formed and trained. These soldiers were given specific training and practice, something that had been quite rare in warfare, but it meant that the army was even more lethal that it would have been, leading to much more significant destruction.

**Page 85: Spot the mistake**

This is very unspecific for its first point, and does not really made a clear second point. It could read:

English settlements would often be visited by both Royalist and Parliamentarian forces, who would demand food, money, supplies and sometimes men. If a community had already been visited by the opposing side, they would be punished for having helped that side, and then be forced to give over whatever was left.

**Page 85: Test yourself**

1. Personal rule.
2. The New Model Army.
3. 180,000.

**Page 85: Support or challenge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agrees</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagrees</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The wars against Spain were defensive and therefore ‘right’</td>
<td>The wars with Spain and intervention in Ireland by Queen Elizabeth were extremely expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elizabeth treated the people well and was a well-loved monarch</td>
<td>Both sides of the civil war treated non-combatants appallingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wars against France were popular as France was an enemy and victory brought the possibility of wealth</td>
<td>The civil wars were devastating to England, Scotland and especially Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wars against Spain had a religious character and defeat would mean the reimposition of Catholicism</td>
<td>The wars against Spain had a religious character and defeat would mean the reimposition of Catholicism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 86: Test yourself
1. Berwick-upon-Tweed.
2. Reivers.
3. 1715 and 1745.

Page 87: Practice question
The two key factors were a lack of support even among the Scottish and the superiority of the English forces. Most of the support for Bonnie Prince Charlie came from people who lived in the Highlands of Scotland and were more traditional, and often still Catholic. The majority of the population of Scotland however, lived in the south of Scotland and general supported the English. Even in 1745 when Charles Stuart launched a rebellion while the British army was in Europe, he was unable to raise very much support and was still defeated at the Battle of Culloden in 1745. At the same time, the likelihood of success in these rebellions was low thanks to the strength of English forces. By the eighteenth century, the English army was more modern, more powerful and more advanced than anything that a rebellion was likely to be able to field, and so defeat was inevitable to an overwhelming force.

Page 87: Event overview grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reiving in Scottish Borders</td>
<td>Communities on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish border would raid villages on the other side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King James becomes King of England</td>
<td>Because he was the eldest blood-related successor to Elizabeth, James VI of Scotland became James I of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Act of Union</td>
<td>The legal joining of England and Scotland in 1707 that made Scotland subject to the Parliament in Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rebellion of 1715</td>
<td>Jacobites briefly took control of Scotland, but were forced to retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rebellion of 1745</td>
<td>Bonnie Prince Charlie tried to make Scotland independent but failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 87: Change over timeline
Page 89: Test yourself

1 North America.
2 Trafalgar and Waterloo.
3 Concentration camps.

Page 89: Practice question

Technology made a huge difference to the impact of war on the British people in this period, both in the ways that wars were fought, and also by significantly changing Britain and the countries it was fighting.

New technology meant that wars were being fought further away, in Africa, Asia and North America, and that battles were becoming larger and more deadly. The Napoleonic Wars, for example, saw battles where armies of hundreds of thousands of men fought each other with extremely modern methods. This progressed considerably during the nineteenth century, but the most significant advancement was the advancement of medicine, which meant that men who would previously have died were now surviving major wounds, which obviously had a profound impact on the British people, as more men were returning from war. New technology also meant that by 1900, news of war could get to Britain in just a few hours, rather than weeks or months, which meant that public opinion was significant.

The biggest change however, was in the nature of England, which in this period had a huge population expansion due to the Industrial Revolution, but also became considerably more democratic. The huge increase in population meant that for much of this period, Britain’s very modestly sized army did not need to use conscription, and so the amount of men directly involved in conflict fell quite considerably. Additionally, because of the increase in the ability of the media to be aware and comment on wars, and the fact that more people had influence over policy, meant that the government became much more reactive to the will of the people when it came to warfare.

Overall, technology had a huge influence on changing the impact of war for the British people.

Page 89: Event overview grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Seven Years’ War</td>
<td>War between France and Britain for dominance in North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Revolution</td>
<td>War for independence between American and British forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The French Revolution</td>
<td>The overthrow of the monarchy in France and its replacement with a more democratic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Napoleonic Wars</td>
<td>A series of wars between Napoleon’s France and a series of coalitions for dominance in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crimean War</td>
<td>A war between Britain and France on one side and Russia on the other, to prevent Russia trying to threaten British possessions in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boer Wars</td>
<td>British wars to gain dominance over Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 91: Test yourself

1 Germany.
2 The USA.
3 The right to vote.

Page 91: Practice question

Some aspects of the British response to the Second World War were similar to the First World War. The differences lay in the understanding of the government and population of what a world war was going to be like.

In both wars, all political division was put to one side and much of the country’s effort went to fighting the war. Despite the length of the war, support for the war effort and a national determination to win the war were found all the way through the conflict – even at points like 1917 and 1940 when it appeared that defeat might well be looming. The decision of the government in both wars to turn to total war meant that virtually everyone in the nation was put to work, in one capacity or another, to fighting the war or producing materials for the war. The media, partly because of censorship and partly because of patriotism almost exclusively backed the war effort.

This said, there are many marked differences between the two wars that stem from the nation knowing in 1939 what it had not known in 1914. Fundamentally, the First World War was fought for dominance, while the Second World War was fought for survival. The massive celebration at the start of the First World War found its opposite in the building of shelters and a quietly determined attitude at the start of the Second. Britain also turned to total war and conscription at the very start of the war, and even then nearly faced defeat at the hands of the German army in 1940. Although the First World War had resulted in the vote for most people, the huge social change that came as a result of the Second World War was considerably more significant, with the establishment of the welfare state.

Overall, though there were similarities between the two wars, this was mostly a reflection of the fact that Britain had learned the lessons of the First World War and applied them well in an even more devastating conflict.

Page 91: Event overview grid

- Britain expected to win the First World War quickly. ✓
- Britain went to war in 1939 to defend Czechoslovakia. Incorrect: it was Poland.
- DORA allowed the British government to turn the country into a total war economy. ✓
- The creation of the Italian Empire in 1871 led to tension between the powers. Incorrect: it was the German Empire.
- Both wars were popular with the people, but for different reasons. ✓
- Britain was entirely self-sufficient in both wars. Incorrect: Britain was only able to survive with American help in both wars.
- Women’s position in society was improved after both world wars. ✓
- The working class only saw improvements after the Second World War. Incorrect: there were improvements after both wars.
Page 93: Test yourself

1  Vietnam.
2  The Good Friday Agreement.
3  7 July 2005.

Page 93: Practice question

The two world wars had such a profound effect on British governments that the relative impact of other conflicts is hugely overshadowed.

The First and Second World Wars made colossal changes to British government. The impact of DORA and the coalition government was not only to end the Liberal Party as a major force in British politics, but to give the vote to all men and married women over 21 and unmarried women over 30. This was a huge political shift. This is relatively minor however, compared to the colossal impact of the Second World War, which transformed British government fundamentally with the creation a huge national government to manage not only the welfare state, which included the NHS, but also the industries which were nationalised for the sake of keeping Britain productive. The British government of 1945 was vastly transformed, and considerably poorer, than the government of 1918. The two wars caused the most significant change to English government since the Civil War.

This said, outside of the two world wars, warfare had very little impact at all on government in the twentieth century. Other than embarrassment over the Suez Crisis and a boost in popularity to Margaret Thatcher’s government in 1982 following the Falklands War, warfare had remarkably little impact on British government. Terrorism in Northern Ireland had a major impact in Ireland itself, but very little impact on the governments of the day.

In short, most wars of the twentieth century did very little, but the two world wars utterly transformed British government quite irrevocably.

Page 93: Spot the mistake

This answer has flipped around the population percentages of the two sections of the population.
**6 Power: Monarchy and Democracy in Britain c.1000 to 2014**

**Page 97: Practice question**

The Church was important because it supported the king in running the country. The most important churchmen helped to rule the shires by carrying out administrative tasks for the king.

The Church was also important because churchmen helped to advise the king. The Witan was made up of important nobles and churchmen. It acted like a council and gave the king advice on important matters.

**Page 97: Test yourself**

1. Efficient administration and trade was prosperous.
2. The biggest landowner in England and was often made king.
3. One reason for the problems was that he did not have an heir.

**Page 97: Checklist**

- Normal people had a lot of power and representation in Anglo-Saxon England. *Incorrect: Anglo-Saxon England had a hierarchical society; the people at the top (such as the king, nobles and churchmen) held the power.*
- There was an efficient system of government in Anglo-Saxon England. ✓
- There was a hierarchy of power in Anglo-Saxon England. ✓
- Churchmen were in charge of tax collection. *Incorrect: the lesser nobles (or thegns) carried out tax collection.*
- The Vikings successfully took over England in 980. *Incorrect: by 980 Vikings raiders had started to attack the coasts of England again.*
- England stabilised during Aethelred’s reign. *Incorrect: Aethelred faced many problems, such as issues with his subjects and Viking invasions.*
- Cnut divided England into five earldoms. *Incorrect: Cnut divided England into four earldoms: Northumbria, East Anglia, Mercia and Wessex.*
- Cnut let many Anglo-Saxons keep their land. ✓
- By 1052 Godwin effectively ran England. ✓

**Page 97: Developing the detail**

Anglo-Saxon kings had a lot of power and authority [– it was the king’s job to make laws to govern the country]. But there were other important people, [such as churchmen and nobles,] in Anglo-Saxon England that the king needed on side for effective running of the country. The king would also take advice from a council [called the Witan].

The king was seen as the country’s defender [– it was his role to raise an army in times of need, and because of frequent Viking raids people saw this as important.] It was also important for the king to make sure that England had effective administration [including tax collection], and that it was prosperous [as a result of trade].

**Page 99: Practice question**

When William took over as King of England he changed who was in control. Initially, a few Anglo-Saxon landowners were allowed to keep their land, but because of rebellions the majority of them were eventually replaced by Normans – between 4000 and 5000. William also replaced a lot of English sheriffs with Normans, and he did the same to the Church:
important English bishops and abbots were exchanged for Normans. Therefore, William changed the ruling classes in England.

William also changed England physically: castles were built and church design was altered. William built a lot of castles as a sign of permanence, to show the English that the Normans were there to stay. The castles were initially motte and baileys, but were quickly rebuilt in stone, which meant that the Normans were a permanent presence. William also updated church architecture so that it mirrored French styles. Some churches were rebuilt completely. Therefore, England changed as a result of the Norman Conquest as it looked physically different, with new churches and a series of castles.

**Page 99: Test yourself**

1. A group of the richest and most important nobles (earls) and churchmen (bishops). They acted like a council and gave advice to the king.
2. William built castles to show that the Normans were a permanent presence. He also rewarded loyal supporters with land.
3. It was powerful and owned a lot of land.

**Page 99: Support or challenge?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon systems of administration were used by the Normans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of castles were built</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaves had existed in Anglo-Saxon society</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion was still important to the king</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of Anglo-Saxon land was confiscated</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon churchmen were replaced by Normans</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 99: Complete the paragraph**

The majority of Anglo-Saxon thegns (between 4000 and 5000) lost their land, and a lot of English sheriffs and other officials were replaced by Normans, as were important English bishops and abbots.

**Page 100: Test yourself**

1. Barons.
3. A Parliament called by Edward I. It contained knights and representatives (burgesses) from major towns were invited and this group made up the Commons.

**Page 101: Identify an argument**

1. Description.
2. Assertion.
3. Argument.

**Page 101: Practice question**

The Magna Carta was significant because it brought about changes to the way in which England was ruled. The power of the king was limited by the Magna Carta; for example, the king could no longer accept justices. In theory, this meant that the way in which England was
ruled was more representative as the king could not do anything he wanted. Therefore, the political system in England was becoming more representative.

However, while the Magna Carta brought about some change, less than 40 years later there were further challenges to the power of the monarchy and therefore it could be argued the Magna Carta did not bring about enough change. In 1251, Simon de Montfort forced Henry III to accept the Provisions of Oxford. The king now had to rule with the advice of a council. The Magna Carta had placed some limitations on the king’s power but its significance could be disputed because of the fact there was a need for further change soon afterwards.

**Page 103: Practice question**

Henry VIII restricted the power of the nobles. He reduced the number of retainers that a nobleman could have, and this meant that fewer people were directly loyal to a noble.

In 1534, Henry passed the Act of Supremacy. This Act removed England from the Catholic Church and made Henry head of the Church of England.

**Page 103: Test yourself**

1 The Act passed in 1534 which removed England from the Catholic Church.
2 The break with Rome and Dissolution of the Monasteries.
3 In 1569, northern nobles plotted to replace Elizabeth I with Mary Queen of Scots.

**Page 103: Turning assertion into argument**

Henry VII limited the power of nobles by ... only allowing nobles who attended the royal court to be part of important decisions.

Henry VIII extended his power by ... removing England from the Catholic Church and appointing himself as head of the Church of England.

Elizabeth I had challenges such as ... the Northern Rebellion in 1569, which was carried out by a group of rebels who wanted to see Mary Queen of Scots on the throne.

**Page 103: Complete the paragraph**

The Tudor monarchs increased the power they had in Parliament. Parliament was recognised as an important tool to help the monarch rule. For example, Henry VIII made sure that he worked with his nobles to force his decisions through Parliament. ... This meant that Henry’s wishes were carried out, and the fact that they were made law sanctioned his views. Therefore, the power of the monarchy grew in the Tudor period because Tudor monarchs knew how to work with Parliament.

**Page 105: Test yourself**

1 He believed in absolutism – some people thought he had too much control.
2 A document created by MPs that listed over 200 criticisms of Charles I, and demands.
3 A Parliament of 144 men who were sympathetic to Cromwell’s views.

**Page 105: Practice question**

People were critical of the way in which King Charles I ruled because they disagreed with the fact that the monarch should have total control. Charles and his father believed that they had been appointed by divine right, which meant they thought they should not be answerable to anyone. This meant that Charles acted as he wanted; for example, in 1626
Charles dissolved Parliament and ruled without consulting any MPs. This meant that his rule was not representative, which made people angry.

Charles also placed a lot of taxes on the country, which the people disliked. In 1635, Charles made everyone pay ‘ship money’ – this was usually only applied to people living near ports if the ports were being threatened, but Charles made everyone pay it, even if they were not living near a port. The taxes that Charles made people pay were to fund his wars, and a lot of people did not want to support this. Therefore, people were critical of the way in which Charles ruled because they opposed harsh taxes, and did not agree with what the taxes were funding.

Page 105: Flow charts

| People became angrier about Charles’ pro-Catholic views | Charles waged wars against France | Charles dissolved Parliament in 1626 | Charles enforced payment of ship money | Charles refused to accept the Grand Remonstrance |

Page 105: Eliminate irrelevance

Charles I was executed in 1649 after he had been put on trial. Cromwell was then put in charge of the country. There were a series of Parliaments that ruled the country and Cromwell was even offered the Crown but he refused. Charles II’s return to the throne was a significant change because the country had previously been ruled by Parliaments without a king. However, this change was not hugely significant as only eleven years previous a king had ruled England and therefore it was a return to how power in England used to be distributed. Some people disagreed with Charles II at first – some of his own supporters disagreed with him pardoning the people responsible for the execution of his father. Charles II had to rule in a different way to his father. People did not want the king to gain too much power again and so his power was limited. Charles could veto any law, but he could not raise taxes by himself and had to ask Parliament for permission to do so. The Cavalier Parliament also stopped Charles from attacking his opponents through special courts. These were significant changes because it was the king having rights like this that caused the Civil War in the first place, but events such as the signing of the Magna Carta show that, for a long time, there had been a gradual shift in power. On the whole, Charles II was a successful monarch and many people liked him.

Page 107: Test yourself

1. He was not trusted, and as he was married to a Catholic, people thought he would produce a Catholic heir.
2. The ruler of the Netherlands.
3. Parliament had to meet at least once a year and MPs were given freedom of speech in Parliament.

Page 107: Practice question

In c.1000, England was a hierarchical state and the king was clearly in control. Although the Witan existed to advise the king, the king was still regarded as the most important figure in society. Gradually, as the statement suggests, there was a decrease in the amount of power held by the king. The first big challenge to the king was the Magna Carta. One of the terms of the Magna Carta was that John had to take advice from 25 barons, which proves that the monarch had less control. The English Civil War and execution of Charles I show that people were willing to openly challenge the monarchy. And the aftermath of the Glorious...
Revolution left a weakened monarchy, as the Bill of Rights stopped a monarch’s ability to suspend laws.

On the other hand, the power of the monarch did not decrease throughout this period. The Tudor monarchs were very strong: Henry VII and Henry VIII limited the power of nobles and extended the power of the monarch. For example, Henry VII used to discipline nobles who went against him in the Star Chamber, and Henry VIII created his own Church. In addition, the fact that the monarchy was restored after Cromwell’s rule demonstrates that people still wanted to be ruled by a sovereign. Even the Bill of Rights, which placed some restrictions on the king, still stated that the important decisions should be made by the monarch – such as whether or not a country should go to war.

Overall, it could be argued that while there was generally a gradual decline of the power of the monarchy over this period, this decline was not linear. There were still moments where the monarchy became stronger (such as during the Restoration), and throughout this period it is clear that the country wanted a monarch as the head of state.

Page 107: Checklist

- James married a Protestant. Incorrect: James married a Catholic.
- James forbade Anglican ministers from preaching anti-Catholic sermons. ✓
- James banned Protestants from England. Incorrect: James did pass some pro-Catholic legislation, but he did not ban Protestants.
- James’ wife gave birth to a Catholic son. ✓
- English nobles asked William and Mary to come and take over the English throne. ✓

Page 107: Spot the mistake

This answer does not get into level 4 because:

- It lacks a good range of evidence.
- It only discusses the significance of one change.
- The analysis is not always convincing.

Here is a Level 4 answer:

The Glorious Revolution was significant because it brought about changes to Parliament. As a result of the Glorious Revolution, Britain gained a Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights put limits on the power of the monarch and protected the rights of Parliament. It also gave the right of free speech in Parliament to MPs and ensured that Parliament would meet every year. The Bill of Rights also ensured that a Protestant monarch would take the throne of England.

However, while the Glorious Revolution brought in a lot of changes for some groups, many historians believe that the way Britain was governed did not change all that much. The monarch was still by far the most powerful figure in the land. Parliament gained the right to be listened to, but king and Parliament working together to rule the country was not really a new idea. Some historians argue that the Revolution did not affect ordinary people, it just secured the position of those already in power, such as the nobility.

Page 109: Test yourself

1. A constituency that returned an MP but had very few voters.
3. 50,000.
Page 109: Practice question

Although the Great Reform Act brought some positive change to the system to elect MPs to Parliament, there were still criticisms as working-class people did not have the vote. The Great Reform Act favoured middle-class voters, and although the electorate had increased (one in seven males could now vote), working people could not vote because of the property qualifications: in the boroughs people had to be paying £10 in rates to be able to vote. In addition, no women could vote at this point. Therefore, although the Great Reform Act brought some change, there were still criticisms that the voting system in England was not fully representative.

There were also criticisms of the system after the Great Reform Act because corruption remained. Some people had been campaigning for a secret ballot act. A secret ballot would mean that people would not have to declare who they were voting for in public. This would have reduced corruption because people would not have known who someone was voting for, and so people could not be bribed, which used to happen. Groups such as the Chartists continued to campaign for this even after the Great Reform Act, which showed that the Great Reform Act had not removed corruption from the system.

Page 109: Change over timeline

Page 110: Test yourself

1 This Act gave the vote to all men over the age of 21 and some women.
2 Due to the fact that blockades were used to prevent supplies from reaching their destination.
3 Trade unions.

Page 110: Practice question

The government controlled people through conscription. In 1916 (during the First World War) and in 1938 (before the Second World War), conscription was introduced, which meant that men had to enlist.

The government also used censorship to control the information people could access. In both world wars, the government had special powers to control what people could see and hear: the Department of Information was created in 1917 to enforce censorship.

Page 111: Identify an argument

1 Argument.
2 Assertion.
3 Description.
Page 113: Test yourself

1. British Steel.
2. That some industries should be independent from government control.
3. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. It aimed to remove nuclear weapons from Britain.

Page 113: Practice question

Thatcher’s prime ministership resulted in a lot of change for big businesses. This was because Thatcher wanted businesses to have more independence and so she cut tax on businesses so that they could have more control over their own money. She also privatised some of Britain’s major industries (such as British Steel), which allowed businesses to thrive and make more profits. This change was long lasting and the same approach was taken by ‘New Labour’ under Blair. Therefore, Thatcher’s prime ministership was significant because her actions gave more freedom to big businesses.

Thatcher’s prime ministership was also significant because it could be argued that the relationship between government and some people broke down during this time. Thatcher did not want to support loss-making industries, such as the coal industry; as a result of this, she decided to close coal mines. A year-long strike followed as agreements could not be reached between the government and strikers, and there were many violent clashes between the strikers and police. People still argue today about who was at fault, so you could argue that the significance of Thatcher’s time as prime minister was that there was a breakdown of trust between the government and some groups of people.

Page 113: Delete as applicable

I agree to a great extent that Parliament lost power throughout this period. The Tudor dynasty represented a strong monarchy and lots was done to centralise power – Henry VIII even got rid of the threat religion posed to the Crown by breaking from Rome and declaring himself head of the Church of England. The execution of Charles I clearly showed that people were beginning to lose faith in the monarchy. ... The evidence given shows that the monarchy started strong, but a gradual decline followed.

Page 114: Review questions

Student’s own answer.

Page 115: Review questions

Student’s own answer.
7 Migration to Britain c.1000 to c.2010

Page 116: Test yourself

1 Examples include Jews – invited as moneylenders and administrators; Flemish weavers – to find work; Hanseatic merchants – to trade.

2 There was a mixed response: Jews eventually suffered extreme violence and were expelled, but many immigrants were welcomed and settled. There was opposition, for example from craft guilds, and some violence against foreigners.

3 The overall economic effect was positive. In the early Middle Ages, funds from Jewish moneylenders made it possible for kings to build castles and cathedrals. Artisans from Europe later boosted England’s manufacturing of woollen cloth and beer. Merchants and bankers created a financial and trading centre in London. However, some English people felt their jobs and wages were threatened by immigrant labour.

Page 117: Practice question

1 In 1190, the Jews of York were attacked and fled to the castle, where they were massacred.

In 1275, King Edward I made a law called the Statute of Jewry which banned Jews from collecting interest on loans. This made them so poor that many were forced to ‘clip’ coins and melt down the metal to sell.

[Many other possible answers including being accused of killing Christian children (‘Blood Libel’), being made to wear yellow cloth badges, being forced to convert to Christianity, being imprisoned and hanged; being expelled from England in 1290.]

2 One reason why medieval monarchs were keen on Flemish and Dutch immigration was economic. During the early Middle Ages, England’s wealth was based on the export of wool, which was then woven into cloth by weavers in the Low Countries. King Edward realised that, if the cloth could be made in England and then sold overseas, the kingdom could become far richer. He therefore needed skilled weavers to come and settle in England and spread their craft. He encouraged them with special benefits and many came in search of a better life. He also restricted exports of wool to force a local cloth-making industry. Flemish weavers helped kick-start a manufacturing economy that brought great wealth to many towns. They created many jobs linked to wool production such as sheep-shearing, wool cleaning and dyeing. Immigrants even started the textile business in Manchester.

Another reason why English monarchs encouraged immigration from the Low Countries was political. During the Hundred Years’ War many Flemish and Dutch people were suffering under French rule and there was often civil war in their homelands. They were seen as allies against the French enemy and many came as refugees. They brought many useful skills including beer brewing, tailoring, glassmaking, clock-making, brick-making and printing.
Page 117: Turning assertion into argument

Jewish settlers had a significant economic impact because ... the money they lent to the Crown enabled castles to be built to control the population. The money they lent to the Church also made it possible to build great churches and cathedrals.

Flemish and Dutch craftspeople changed England’s economy because ... they brought skills such as weaving and brewing. This helped to transform England from a nation just producing raw materials to one based on manufacturing.

German and Italian merchants and bankers affected the economy because ... they started London’s importance as a financial and trading centre.

Page 117: Support or challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrees</th>
<th>Disagrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish settlers were under royal protection from the 1070s onwards</td>
<td>People resisted Norman rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several monarchs welcomed Flemish weavers</td>
<td>Many Jews were executed for coin clipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records show that people born in other countries were living all over England</td>
<td>Craft guilds objected to immigrants undercutting their members’ pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many Flemish immigrants were murdered during the 1381 Great Revolt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 119: Checklist

- On ‘Evil May Day’ in 1517, King Henry VIII did nothing to prevent thirteen foreigners being murdered by rioters. **Incorrect**: Henry sent soldiers to put down the riot and protect foreigners, and executed thirteen rioters.
- Laws passed by Tudor monarchs aimed to get rid of all Romani Gypsies living in England. ✓
- By the time of Queen Elizabeth I, England had become a Protestant country. ✓
- Protestant Huguenots were persecuted in France in the 1570s and again in the 1680s. ✓
- When the Bank of England was started in 1694, several Huguenot refugees helped to finance it. ✓
- The 1707 Foreign Protestants Naturalisation Act allowed all Protestants except the Palatines to come to settle in England. **Incorrect**: Palatines came to England because the Act allowed all Protestants, including them, to come. ✓
- Many Palatines who did make it to England were deported to Ireland. ✓
- In 1712, the law was changed so that England was no longer open to any Protestants who wanted to come to settle. ✓
- Oliver Cromwell did not want Jews to settle in England because he believed that this went against the teachings of the Bible. **Incorrect**: Cromwell allowed Jews to settle, partly because he believed that it followed the teaching of the Bible.
Page 119: Do/don’t list

**Do**

- Include at least two paragraphs
- Include a brief conclusion which clearly indicates the main factor in your answer
- When using evidence, follow it with an explanation of how that event led to the outcome
- Link your ideas back to the question
- Use second-order concepts like ‘change’, that is, how this thing led to that thing

**Don’t**

- Give a narrative account of key events
- If you can’t remember the facts, guess
- Write one big paragraph with everything you can remember

Page 119: Practice question

The Reformation was a very significant cause of immigration to England in this period. Protestant England was opposed to the main Catholic powers France and Spain, so European Protestants saw England as a place of safety. In the 1560s, Walloon refugees suffering under Spanish rule came as refugees and settled. They were followed by French Huguenots after the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre in 1572, and then again in the 1680s when the French monarchy ended the protection of Protestants. English rulers encouraged this as they wanted to be seen as the leading Protestant power in Europe. Although Huguenots and Walloons had a mixed reception, their impact on English life was huge, bringing a wide range of advanced skills such as silk weaving.

Another arrival, the return of Jews to England, was also due to the Reformation. Religious conflict was a major cause of the 1640s civil wars that brought Cromwell to power.

Although not all immigrants in this period (the Gypsies, for example) came because of the Reformation, it was a key factor in the biggest wave of migrants. England’s growth as a European and world power owed much to these Protestant immigrants. The movement of skilled Huguenots caused the English economy to overtake that of France’s. Huguenots were important investors in the Bank of England and many served in the armed forces, some at high rank. It can be argued that without Protestant immigration England may not have become a superpower.

Page 119: Test yourself

1. The main reason was as refugees – Protestants fleeing from persecution under Catholic rule.
2. Treatment depended on who they were. Protestant refugees were often welcomed by fellow Protestants but Romani Gypsies were seen as ‘other’ and treated badly. It also depended on wealth – rich Huguenots had an easier time than poor Palatines – and how useful they were to the economy.

Page 121: Delete as applicable

The following is an example of a possible answer – there are many other possibilities.

I agree to a **fair** extent that black people had hard lives in Tudor England. The small amount of evidence of black lives suggests that most were part of the working poor and therefore shared the hard lives of most people in this period. There were some negative attitudes to
black people and there may have been attempts to expel them. British privateers were beginning to get involved in the Atlantic slave trade. However, there is considerable evidence that Africans who settled in England were free and treated equally, such as ... the cases of trumpeter John Blanke who was granted a pay rise by King Henry VIII. There was also diver Jacques Francis, whose word was allowed equal value when giving evidence in court, and Mary Fillis, whose father was a Moroccan basket-weaver. Most black people in Tudor of England appear to have been living under the same conditions as everyone else. Their lives were hard in the same way that everyone's lives were, and there may have been some negative treatment due to the colour of their skin, but their lives were probably no harder than the lives of others.

Page 121: Practice question

During the late 1600s, the East India Company increased its presence in India. Several officials of the Company, on their return to England, brought young Indians as child servants. They also brought women – known as ayahs – to work as nannies for their children. At the same time, Britain was heavily involved in the trade in enslaved Africans. Some plantation owners in the Caribbean and North America brought enslaved servants with them when they came to England. Many of these were children. It became fashionable for rich families to have African or Indian child servants and many of the elite had their portraits painted showing off these children as their property.

Many African and Indian migrants stayed because they had little choice. Some servants and ayahs were abandoned when they became adult or were no longer needed. Others ran away and found freedom in poorer areas of towns, joining black people who already lived there. Parish records of births, marriages and deaths show that black people were living in many parts of the country. Most came here as a result of Britain’s expanding empire.

Page 121: Test yourself

1. Parish and court records.
2. East India Company officials bringing child servants and ayahs to Britain. Enslaved Africans brought from Caribbean and North African plantations by their owners.

Page 123: Developing the detail

Indian, Malay and Chinese merchant seamen suffered discrimination in many ways. They were often treated badly on board ship, working under worse conditions than white seamen. [They often received less food and lower pay, and had more cramped living space. They suffered violent abuse and punishments that offended their religion.] The law made it hard for them to settle, although many had been abandoned in British ports against their will. [The 1823 Merchant Shipping Act denied rights allowed to white seamen and prevented Lascars from settling in Britain, and the 1894 Merchant Shipping Act made owners round up Lascars and remove them by force.] Many were forced into poverty. [They had to stay in segregated lodgings and beg to support themselves. The port] areas where they lived, such as Chinatown in London and Tiger Bay in Cardiff, gained negative reputations for being dangerous, crime-ridden and to be feared.

Page 123: Practice question

The labour of migrant merchant seamen helped Britain’s industrial economy to a significant extent. Britain depended on trade. Ships brought imports of raw materials such as tobacco, cotton, sugar and spices as well as commercial products such as textiles and ceramics. They then carried manufactured goods and coal to sell all over the world. Shipping between Britain and Asia was handled first by the East India Company and later by private shipping
Lines. Large numbers of men were hired in India, China, Malaya, Yemen and Somaliland to work on the ships. Known as Lascars, these seamen formed up to 40 per cent of crews. Company owners liked employing migrant workers because they had to accept much lower wages and worse conditions than white seamen. This increased the shipping companies’ profits. Shipping routes in the Atlantic, Mediterranean and Baltic also had large numbers of foreign seamen from the Caribbean, west Africa, Malta and Scandinavia. Britain’s wealth depended on the merchant fleets and they in turn depended on seamen from all over the world.

This significance became very apparent during the two world wars when Lascars replaced many white seamen who joined the armed forces. Britain’s survival depended on food convoys across the Atlantic and the shipment of soldiers and armaments to theatres of war. On many of the ships carrying these, over half the crew were Asian and African, often facing great danger. Migrant merchant seamen therefore played an important role in Britain’s survival as well as its economic strength. It was their awareness of this that encouraged Bengali seamen to go on strike in 1939.

Migrant seamen affected British society in another way, too. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries many began to settle in port areas of London, Cardiff, South Shields, Liverpool, Glasgow and Hull. Some married local women and put down roots, beginning the UK’s first modern working-class multicultural communities.

While there were many other reasons for industrial Britain’s economic strength, the labour of migrant seamen, often badly treated, was an important link in the chain.

Page 123: Test yourself

1 As a result of the ‘triangular trade’ in enslaved Africans, the black population grew. Some were brought as slaves, many became part of the working class and some came after fighting for Britain in the American War of Independence. Asian and African merchant seamen – known as Lascars – were employed on ships bringing goods from India and the rest of Asia. Several of them made their lives in port cities, often marrying local women. Some upper class, wealthy Indians also settled in Britain.

2 Some were treated very cruelly and suffered bad working and living conditions, while others shared the lives of the British working poor. A few achieved wealth and status.

3 Until the 1830s, the lives of black people were seriously affected by enslavement, which the law did not prevent. The 1772 Somerset judgment gave them some protection, the final abolition of slavery more so. Lascars suffered controls and restrictions such as the 1823 and 1894 Merchant Shipping Acts which imposed a ‘colour bar’. Immigrants took many forms of action including campaigning, court action, writing and activism in working-class movements.

Page 124: Test yourself

1 People migrated mainly because of poverty, famine and in search of work. Many Irish migrants had been evicted from their homes.

2 They had an impact on many aspects of British life, from new business, political and scientific ideas to foods and entertainment.

3 Laws made it easier for immigrants. The 1870 Naturalisation Act made it easier to become a British citizen and restrictions on Jews were ended.
Page 125: Eliminate irrelevance

During the nineteenth century, many people migrated to Britain from mainland Europe, especially from Italy and Germany. Italians settled in distinct communities in cities such as London, Manchester and Glasgow, while Jews were concentrated in east London and other cities such as Leeds and Manchester. Over time, European migrants had a significant effect on the way the British eat: we owe pasta and ice cream to the Italians, breakfast sausages to the Germans, and fish and chips to the Jewish refugees. European migrants also had an important effect on British business success. Many major companies such as General Electric and Harland & Wolff were started by German immigrants. Towards the end of the century, Jewish refugees from Russia, Poland and Ukraine also arrived in large numbers. Many Jews were involved in the textile business working as tailors and seamstresses, and some major high street stores such as Burtons and Marks & Spencer were started by Jewish refugees. The Jewish textile trade made it possible for the first time for most working-class Britons to afford new clothes. Immigrants therefore created key profit-making businesses that were major employers and important for the prosperity of British people, contributing to the rise in living standards by the end of the century. Immigrants therefore had a significant influence on the daily lives of people in Britain.

Page 125: Complete the paragraph

Poverty was the main reason for nineteenth-century Irish migration. Thousands of families suffered from poor harvests, bad treatment by landowners, lack of employment and, in the 1840s, the potato famine. Meanwhile, England's factory system was booming, with many jobs available in the northern mills where there was a labour shortage. England also needed workers to dig canals and railways. Therefore, ... people living in in Irish countryside were forced to leave their homes and, finding no work elsewhere in Ireland, to leave the country. They were drawn to the north of England by the promise of work in construction or the factory system. This offered a chance of survival.

Page 125: Practice question

In some ways, the reasons for migration to Britain between 1500 and 1900 did not change considerably. Throughout the period, people came as refugees. Huguenot Protestants in the 1570s and 1680s were escaping persecution in Catholic France. Nineteenth-century political activists such as Frederick Douglass from the USA, Karl Marx from Germany and Giuseppe Mazzini from Italy were at risk from their governments. Eastern European Jews in the 1890s were seeking safety from anti-Semitic pogroms in Russia and Poland. The details were different but the reasons were the same. With few immigration controls and growing prosperity, England (later Britain) was attractive to migrants. During this 400-year period, the growing economy and business freedoms attracted entrepreneurs, from sixteenth-century Hanseatic merchants to the German engineers who started up many key companies in the nineteenth century such as Reuters, Schweppes and Harland & Wolff. There was a steady flow of foreign artists and writers who came to settle in Britain, not to mention foreign aristocrats who married British monarchs. However, migration patterns did change massively because of important developments in British politics and society. One of these was the expansion of the British Empire. Enslaved and freed Africans in the eighteenth century, wealthy Indians in the nineteenth century and Lascar seamen who settled in port cities all began to arrive as a result of British expansion into Asia, Africa and the Americas. Migrant communities such as the Chinese in east London and Liverpool and the Yemenis in South Shields and Cardiff began to establish themselves.
Another important change affecting migration was the Industrial Revolution. The fast growing demand for labour attracted migrant workers from Ireland, Scotland, rural England and southern Europe who were also pushed to migrate by poverty. Most worked in the factories of the north of England or building canals, roads and railways. This was mass immigration on a scale not seen in previous centuries.

The statement is partly untrue in that the factors pushing people to migrate to Britain – finding work, doing business and seeking safety – did not change so much between 1500 and 1900. However, the developments in Britain pulling people – global empire and industrialisation – changed utterly, making the statement largely true. These changes in migration patterns were helped by huge technological advances in shipping that made sea travel faster, easier and more comfortable. They were also helped by the general absence of immigration controls. Both these factors would change again in the twentieth century, with ever tighter controls on the one hand, and mass air travel on the other.

**Page 126: Test yourself**

1. The 1905 Aliens Act brought in tight immigration controls. This was partly because of rising social and economic problems and anti-immigrant feeling stirred up in some of the press and by some politicians. The 1914 Act that made ‘aliens’ register with the police reflected strong anti-German feeling as war broke out.

2. There was strong feeling, and some violent attacks, against Germans and Austrians who were seen as the enemy and were interned. Belgian refugees, however, were welcomed in large numbers as they were seen as the victims of the German enemy.

3. During the war, many merchant seamen were called up to serve in the armed forces. Their places were taken by Asian, Arab, African and Caribbean seamen. When the war ended, returning ex-servicemen wanted the jobs now held by migrant men. Conflict over employment mixed with racist attitudes led to violence.

**Page 127: Checklist**

- The 1905 Aliens Act stopped immigrants coming into the UK if they did not already have work or the means to support themselves. ✓
- The 1905 Act also closed the door to refugees. *Incorrect:* the Act made clear that refugees could be accepted. ✓
- The Sidney Street Siege of 1911 was one of several incidents that fuelled anti-foreigner feeling. ✓
- About a quarter of a million Belgian refugees were welcomed into Britain early in the First World War. ✓
- Millions of people from across the Empire joined the British war effort. ✓
- During the First World War, mobs attacked some German businesses. ✓
- The British government decided not to intern British residents of German and Austrian origin. *Incorrect:* they did intern Germans and Austrians.
- After the war there were riots in several port cities, with violent attacks aimed at migrant seamen and their families. ✓
- During this period the number of people coming to settle in the UK was far higher than the number leaving to find a life overseas. *Incorrect:* emigration numbers were far higher than immigration numbers.
Page 127: Which is best?

The first box, a), is a low Level 3 answer – 5 marks. It gives a lot of clear factual detail which is directly relevant to the question. However, there is no explanation or analysis of why these factors led to the Act.

The second answer, b), is a good Level 4 answer – 7 or 8 marks. It uses the same factual detail to explain and analyse how these factors meant that there was pressure on the government from different sections of society to control immigration.

Page 127: Practice question

The main significance of the 1919 riots may be that they revealed problems in British society that still remain today. The fighting between white and ‘coloured’ seamen that resulted in deaths in Liverpool and Cardiff showed that there were serious underlying racial tensions. In Cardiff the spark was an attack on black seamen going out with white women. Violence in South Shields started with attacks on Arab boarding houses. However, although the Cardiff inquiry concluded that white attackers started the riot, some black and Arab seamen were deported. A significant long-term outcome of the riots was that a ‘colour bar’ became legal in the ports as a result of union pressure: in 1925 the Coloured Alien Seamen Order took away many rights from migrant seamen.

However, the underlying causes were about employment and the effects of war. After many white merchant seamen were conscripted into the armed forces during the First World War, shipping owners replaced them with Lascar seamen. When the war ended, men returning from the hardship of the trenches felt that the migrant seamen had taken their jobs and that employers preferred them because they could pay them less. Their union encouraged them to blame immigrant workers. Many of those migrant seamen, meanwhile, had also suffered extreme hardship on Atlantic convoys attacked by German submarines. Both groups felt they had a right to employment. The riots showed how racial conflict can erupt at times of economic crisis and competition for jobs.

The tensions that boiled over in 1919 continued to simmer. In 1930, more rioting happened in South Shields because of different treatment of white and Arab seamen, and in 1968 London dockers led marches in support of Enoch Powell’s anti-immigrant speech. Today, the belief that immigrant workers take away British jobs is still widely held and encouraged in some of the media. But the 1919 riots were in many ways untypical: violent racial conflict between workers has been rare in the UK since, so perhaps the significance of 1919 is limited.
**Page 129: Event overview grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 1925 Coloured Alien Seamen Order</td>
<td>This law took away rights from Asian and African merchant seamen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1936 Battle of Cable Street</td>
<td>Mass protests stopped a fascist anti-Jewish march through East London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kindertransport</td>
<td>Ten thousand Jewish children were brought from Nazi controlled Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia to safety in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1939 Lascar Seamen's Strike</td>
<td>Bengali merchant seamen on British ships went on strike demanding a 100 per cent pay rise: the strike was successful on some ships and not on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of ‘enemy aliens’ during the Second World War</td>
<td>Germans and Italians living in the UK were interned for a time, but most were later released after a ship carrying internees was sunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1947 Polish Resettlement Act</td>
<td>This allowed the families of Polish men who had fought alongside Britain to join their loved ones and settle in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways in which the UK was welcoming to immigrants</td>
<td>Action by religious and community groups to receive refugees (the Kindertransport); a law to allow particular immigrants (the Polish Resettlement Act); solidarity with Jewish immigrants (the Battle of Cable Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways in which the UK was unwelcoming to immigrants</td>
<td>The 1925 Coloured Alien Seamen Order – a ‘colour bar’ aimed at Asian seamen; The British Union of Fascists; internment; trade unions wanting to ban Polish workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways in which migrants themselves took action to improve their lives</td>
<td>The League of Coloured Peoples; the Bengali Lascar strikes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 129: Practice question**

1. The League of Coloured Peoples supported black people in the 1930s and campaigned against the ‘colour bar’.
   
   In 1939, Bengali Lascar seamen, who were paid far less than white seamen, went on strike demanding higher wages.
   
   [Other possible answers include the Pan-African Movement; black people – such as John Archer and Shapurji Saklatvala – getting involved in working-class politics; individual celebrities such as Paul Robeson and Learie Constantine speaking out.]

2. At the start of the Second World War in 1939, Poland was invaded by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. Over a 100,000 Polish refugees came to Britain and many joined the armed forces. About 14,000 joined the Royal Air Force and played a key role in the Battle of Britain and the rest of the war. When Germany was defeated, the British government allowed Polish servicemen to choose whether to return home or stay in Britain. About 120,000 decided to stay.
   
   At first, the government did not allow the wives and children of Polish servicemen to come and join them. They tried to settle them in places as far apart as Mexico, Palestine and Uganda. By this time, however, it was clear that Poland was coming under the control of the Soviet Union which was seen as Britain’s enemy. Families could not easily
return to Poland. In spite of opposition from the trade unions, the 1947 Polish Resettlement Act enabled the servicemen to be joined by their families.

Page 129: Test yourself

1. After the 1905 Aliens Act immigration numbers were very low and Britain received very few except for the Kindertransport children. It was not very welcoming and there was strong racist and anti-Semitic feeling.

2. Jews and their supporters organised against the fascist Blackshirts. Black people supported their communities through the League of Coloured Peoples. Bengali seamen went on strike for better pay and conditions.

3. People from countries in Nazi-occupied Europe and from the British Empire came to serve in the armed forces. Polish families were allowed to join their loved ones and settle in the UK after the war. The shortage of labour after the war led to the UK recruiting migrant workers from the Commonwealth.

Page 130: Test yourself

1. People in the Commonwealth had the right to work in the UK and have British passports.

2. To ban racial discrimination and promote good race relations.

3. That the Metropolitan Police Force was ‘institutionally racist’.

Page 131: Practice question

At times in Britain’s history since 1750 it has certainly been a difficult place for many immigrants. Most have been poor and working-class, taking up poorly paid employment in often difficult conditions and living at first in overcrowded conditions in neighbourhoods with poor sanitation and facilities. This was true, for example, for Irish communities in nineteenth-century Liverpool, eastern European Jews in the late Victorian East End of London and Caribbeans in west London in the 1950s.

In addition, some migrant communities have suffered direct attack, especially at times of economic or political crisis. Examples of this include anti-Irish riots in nineteenth-century Salford, the 1919 riots in port cities, the Notting Hill race riots in 1958 and the rise of the National Front in the 1970s. At the same time, especially since the 1905 Aliens Act, government restrictions on immigration have become ever tighter. Immigration acts in the 1960s and 1970s made it harder for Commonwealth immigrants to enter the UK or be joined by their families. The riots in London and Liverpool in 1981 grew from a perception – according to the Scarman Report – that black people were being unfairly targeted by police. In the 1990s and 2000s, tighter laws have created real hardship for asylum seekers, removing access to benefits and the right to work. In parts of the country where migrant and host communities have grown up separately, violence has at times erupted, as it did in Yorkshire and Lancashire in 2001.

However, these are the stories that hit the headlines. The fact that migrant communities have been poorer means that we often do not have a record of their lives and experiences. And for most of the time over the last 250 years, no extreme events were recorded. This suggests that people were living their lives peacefully. As records of births, marriages and deaths show, for most people the experience of migration has probably been that they settled and lived ‘ordinary’ lives. On a personal level, immigrants have often been accepted and have become part of the nation’s cultural mix. Children of immigrants have been leading politicians, entertainers and business leaders and a child refugee (Mo Farah) became a British sporting hero.
It is true, therefore, that Britain has at times been a very difficult place for some immigrants – but not for all, and not always. The stories of this country as welcoming and unwelcoming are both true. Behind the headline-grabbing stories both negative and positive, other realities are at work. One is that prejudices fuelled by racism still exist – most recently directed against Muslims and Eastern Europeans. Statistics show that ethnic minorities lag behind the wider population in employment, income, health and promotion. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry in 1999 reported high levels of institutional racism in the police. Another reality is that on a daily basis people get on with their neighbours and work colleagues and build friendships, including in the most intimate ways: by the next census it is likely that ‘mixed heritage’ people will be the country’s largest ‘ethnic minority’.

Page 131: Identify an argument

The first example is a Level 5 answer because, while it contains the same detailed description as the second example, it also includes:

- organisation of the information into factors that support the statement, followed by those that contradict it
- explanation of how some factors support and others contradict the statement
- a concluding statement that justifies the assertion.

The second example includes relevant description and an assertion but no explanation or argument. It is a Level 4 response.

Page 132: Test yourself

1 The number of immigrants minus the number leaving the UK, therefore the overall population increase caused by migration.
2 It has increased rapidly.
3 It made it much easier to travel between EU countries, and therefore easier for migrants from outside the EU to travel across Europe.

Page 132: Practice question

The question of whether immigration brings benefits or problems has been hotly argued throughout the period since 1500 and continues to be so today, especially in the light of the Brexit referendum. On the one hand, opponents of immigration argue that migrant labour threatens native people’s jobs, undercuts wages and leads to overcrowding and severe pressure on housing, health services and education. They argue that the rich benefit and the poor suffer. This opinion was used to stir up the London apprentices in a riot against foreigners in 1517. It was used again in the 1840s to blame Irish migrants for the spread of disease in Liverpool. In the early 1900s, similar accusations against east European Jews and Chinese seamen led to the 1905 Aliens Act. In the 1930s, the Seamen’s Union used this argument in support of a ‘colour bar’ in the docks. However, the fact that these complaints arise usually at times of economic hardship suggests that the problems may not be caused mainly by immigration.

Another argument is that mass immigration causes racial tension. This was expressed in an extreme way in Enoch Powell’s ‘rivers of blood’ speech in 1968 when he predicted racial war. But it is also the view of many leading politicians today who argue that immigration controls protect ethnic minorities from racism because racial tensions rise when people feel ‘swamped’. It is also claimed that some religious cultures cannot coexist with ‘British values’ – although what is said now about Muslims was said about Jews and Catholics in the past.
On the other hand, supporters of immigration argue that it has brought huge economic and cultural benefits to Britain. Huguenot investors and entrepreneurs helped the rise of the Bank of England and the City of London as a financial centre. The manufacturing boom of the Industrial Revolution would have been impossible without migrant workers from Ireland and Italy. We owe much of our mass-market retail sector to eastern European Jews. Taxes paid by young EU migrants help pay for the care of our ageing population. Social and cultural life in the UK has been transformed by immigrants – from fish and chips to curry and kebabs, from pantomime to grime.

One benefit of immigration has been human contact between people of different cultures leading to greater respect and understanding. This leads many to argue that immigration lessens racial tensions and makes wars less likely. In time, each wave of immigrants becomes part of the mainstream. In the short term, at times of mass immigration there are certainly tensions and difficult problems to be faced. With a long view, however, immigration brings undoubted benefit. And when there are problems as a result of immigration, it tends to be policies – not immigrants themselves – that are the cause.

Page 133: Which is best?

The a) box is a good Level 4 answer – 7 or 8. It gives relevant factual detail and uses it to explain and analyse how both mass immigration and rising anti-immigration feeling were affected by membership of the EU.

The b) response gives the same clear, relevant factual detail but is a Level 3 response – 5 marks rather than 6 because of the lack of analysis or explanation.
## Page 135: Essay style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Answer the question</th>
<th>It is clear that most immigrants were successful in settling during this period because evidence shows they were living all over England and accounts of anti-foreigner feeling are rare. On the other hand, however, some groups experienced extreme rejection and there were occasional violent outbursts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 1: Public attitudes to foreigners</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Throughout this period, there is evidence that attitudes to foreigners were mainly positive although there were also cases of negative attitudes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prove</td>
<td>Positive: Alien subsidies and letters of denization; parish records. Negative: attack on York’s Jews 1190; Great Revolt 1381; Evil May Day 1517; impact of enslavement on attitudes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Tax and parish records show presence of foreigners throughout England in a range of occupations. When they happened, outbursts of anti-foreigner feeling were violent and bloody.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>This suggests that most immigrants in most periods settled and assimilated peacefully, although there were occasional cases of extreme violence aimed at foreigners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 2: Government attitudes to foreigners</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Throughout this period, government attitudes varied considerably. Some groups at some times were encouraged to come to England. Other groups at other times were discriminated against.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prove</td>
<td>Positive: Invitations to Jews (William I) and Flemish weavers (Edward III); Foreign Protestants Naturalisation Act. Negative: Expulsion of Jews 1290; taxation of aliens; laws against Romani Gypsies; treatment of Palatines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>At times governments actively encouraged immigration when it was seen to be of benefit to the country. At other times, rulers took extreme action against immigrant minorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Official attitudes varied according to many factors including the political situation, the strength of the ruler and how useful to the nation immigrants would be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph 3: Actions of immigrants</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Throughout this period, many immigrant communities established themselves successfully, though some did not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prove</td>
<td>Successful: Impact of migrants from Low Countries and Huguenots; John Blanke and other Tudor Africans. Not successful: Closure of the Steelyard; Palatines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Introduction:

Throughout this period immigrants arrived in England and settled all over the country. To decide how successfully they settled it will be necessary to look at the attitudes they came across from the general public and from governments, and how successful they were in establishing a new life through their own actions.

This will show how the very different experiences were affected by social and political conditions and by their own skills and resources.

### Conclusion:

The evidence we have shows that most immigrants settled successfully, but there were some striking cases of failure. The key factors seem to have been a combination of the skills immigrants had to offer, the state of England at the time and the strength and authority of the rulers. I therefore agree with the statement to some extent as it applies to the majority of medieval European artisans and later Protestant refugees. However, the cases of failure – Palatines, Romani Gypsies and medieval Jews – were so extreme and painful that it is impossible to agree wholeheartedly. England was both welcoming and unwelcoming: success came for some but not for all.
8 Personal Rule to Restoration 1629–1660

Page 138: Test yourself

1  He tried to make the English Church more Catholic by introducing a form of Arminianism.
2  Charles should obey the law like anyone else. Charles’ ministers had too much power and it should be reduced. They disagreed with the ship money.
3  A levy which was usually only applied to people living in or near ports. Charles applied it in peacetime.

Page 139: Practice question

Source B convinces me that it was Charles’ beliefs about his role that led to his poor relationship with Parliament. In Source B, Charles demands that money from Parliament when he says ‘hasten my supply or it will be worse for yourselves …’. This tone is illustrative of Charles' belief in absolutism – he thought that he should have total control and that he should not be answerable to Parliament. Although the source was written in 1626, the attitude displayed here is representative of why Charles’ relationship with Parliament broke down in the period 1629–42. In 1634, Charles brought in a new tax called ship money, which he said he could collect without permission from Parliament. This angered Parliament as Charles was trying to rule without consulting Parliament, and many of Charles’ opponents in Parliament said that this tax was illegal. Therefore, Source B convinces me that it’s reasonable to blame Charles for the poor relationship he had with Parliament.

On the other hand, Sources A and C suggest slightly different reasons for Charles’ poor relationship with Parliament in this period. Source A shows that Parliament was opposed to the wars Charles was waging due to their cost, and this was certainly a reason for a breakdown in their relationship. Charles actually suspended Parliament in 1629, partly due to the fact that it was reluctant to fund his failing war with Spain (this led to the period of Personal Rule). Source A reveals that after Parliament had been recalled, tensions about the cost of Charles’ wars remained – it says that ‘revenue is much wasted’ on the conflict with Scotland. However, it could be argued that Source A supports the statement in part as it is Charles’ belief that Parliament should grant him taxes for wars due to the fact he is the monarch.

Source C presents a third reason for the poor relationship between Charles and Parliament – religion. The source has been produced to show that the Puritan pictured is the only truly religious figure. This is in opposition to Laud. William Laud was very influential in the period of Charles’ Personal Rule and he was hated by many in Parliament as he wanted to make England more Catholic. When Parliament was recalled in 1640, Charles was forced to impeach and imprison Laud at the request of Parliament. This shows that Charles’ advisers were a key reason for the breakdown in their relationship, but as it’s a pro-Puritan source it might have exaggerated the bad feeling towards advisers such as Laud.

In conclusion, although there is a lot of evidence to suggest that Charles’ beliefs about his role caused him to have a poor relationship with Parliament, it’s clear that there were other factors that caused tension. However, it’s arguable that the other reasons highlighted by the sources were largely due to Charles’ poor decisions, and the fact that he was responsible for choosing his advisers and wanting to wage wars lays the blame with Charles.
Page 139: Checklist

- Charles was an absolutist monarch. ✓
- Charles ruled without Parliament from 1625 to 1640. Incorrect: Charles ruled without Parliament from 1629 to 1640.
- Charles held no religious beliefs. Incorrect: Charles was married to a Catholic and many people believed that he was pro-Catholic.
- Charles recalled Parliament in 1640. ✓
- Only a few MPs made challenges to Charles’ methods of rule. Incorrect: Many MPs raised grievances (‘formal complaints’) against Charles.
- Laud reformed religion in England and Scotland. ✓
- Laud introduced ship money. Incorrect: Richard Weston levied ship money.
- Wentworth did not go through the normal courts when punishing people. ✓

Page 140: Test yourself

1 A radical MP. He wanted to limit Charles’ power and influence over Parliament.
2 A summary of the grievances John Pym, and others, had with Personal Rule.
3 He thought the demands were too harsh and would give Parliament too much power.

Page 141: Checklist

- The Grand Remonstrance proposed the expulsion of all bishops from Parliament. ✓
- Charles arrested 100 MPs. Incorrect: Charles tried to arrest five MPs in January 1642.
- Edward Hyde and some moderate MPs thought that the king’s power was being restricted too much. ✓
- John Pym was the chancellor of the exchequer. Incorrect: Charles offered John Pym the position of chancellor of the exchequer, but Pym rejected the offer.
- Charles rejected Parliament’s ‘Nineteen Propositions’. ✓

Page 141: Support or challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some people argue that MPs such as John Pym had unrealistic expectations of how far the power of the king should be limited</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group of moderate MPs remained loyal to Charles and thought his powers should not be so severely limited</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grand Remonstrance limited the power of the monarch greatly, but was passed by a majority of MPs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles used military force to try to arrest MPs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament took control of armed forces without the consent of the monarch</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles refused to accept the ‘Nineteen Propositions’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 141: Practice question

The Civil War broke out because Parliament was divided and could not come to an agreement on how to deal with Charles. By 1641, moderate MPs such as Edwards Hyde...
thought the power of the monarch had been limited enough, but extreme MPs such as John Pym wanted further limitations on the power of the monarch. This meant that compromises with Charles would not be made as the MPs couldn’t agree.

The Civil War also broke out because Charles refused to cooperate with Parliament. Charles made concessions by agreeing to some of Parliament’s terms, such as the Triennial Act which stated that Parliament had to sit every three years. But after Parliament continued to ask for more concessions, Charles stopped cooperating. Charles tried to arrest five of the MPs who had been making harsh demands, on the charge of high treason. This showed Parliament that relationships had broken down.

Lastly, the Civil War also broke out because Charles rejected the ‘Nineteen Propositions’. Parliament presented these demands to Charles on 1 June 1642 – these included harsh demands such as that Parliament should be in control of the army and approve the appointment of ministers. This was the last straw and when Charles rejected Parliament’s terms the Civil War was triggered.

Page 142: Test yourself

1 That all land and property should be shared equally.
2 Presbyterians and Independents.
3 Parliament.

Page 143: Event overview grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Levellers</th>
<th>The Levellers believed that society should be ‘levelled’ – that all men should have the right to vote, and that property should be equally distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Quakers</td>
<td>A group that thought that people could be close to God through Bible study (church was not necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Presbyterians</td>
<td>A group of MPs who wanted to work with Charles to achieve a settlement at the end of the first English Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Independents</td>
<td>A group of MPs who wanted to force Charles to accept their demands at the end of the first English Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denzil Holles</td>
<td>Leader of the Presbyterians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Cromwell</td>
<td>One of the key MPs leading the Independents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Newcastle Propositions</td>
<td>Parliament’s settlement offer to Charles – 1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heads of Proposals</td>
<td>The army’s settlement offer to Charles – 1647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 143: Practice question

Sources F and G disagree with the statement and do not suggest that Parliament was to blame for the failure of attempts to reach a settlement. Source F was written by a Leveller soldier. The Levellers believed the society should be ‘levelled’ and that all men should have the right to vote; as a result they entirely disagreed with Charles’ style of rule, and during the Civil War they opposed all attempts at compromise with Charles I. Some of the Levellers in the New Model Army refused to stop fighting even once negotiations had started as they wanted a say. This suggests that the Levellers’ uncompromising nature meant that a settlement was impossible. An alternative reading could be that the source is suggesting
that Charles’ style of rule meant that attempts to reach a settlement would not be possible as it had led to the emergence of radical groups.

Source G also disagrees with the statement. The source describes the military support the Scots agreed to provide Charles with. Even after Parliament offered Charles a peace settlement in 1646, Charles escaped to Scotland and got Scottish military support after offering to trial Presbyterianism in England. This eventually led to the start of the Second Civil War. This source therefore shows us that despite Parliament’s offer to negotiate, Charles was not willing to, and therefore it was in fact Charles’ uncompromising nature that was a reason for the failure of attempts to reach a settlement by 1647.

However, Source E convinces me that the statement is, in part, correct. In 1646, Parliament offered the Newcastle Propositions. These were a list of demands of Charles. As Source E shows, they asked for anti-Catholic laws to be enforced; they also asked for Parliament to be called at least every three years and for Parliament to nominate commanders of the army. Although it was Charles’ belief in absolutism that led him to reject this peace settlement, it could be argued that the blame lay with Parliament as the settlement terms were very harsh, and it was unrealistic Charles would accept them.

On balance, it is certainly true that Parliament’s harsh demands meant that reaching a settlement would be very difficult, but I believe that Charles’ refusal to compromise at all was the underlying reason for the failure of attempts to reach a settlement. Charles even rejected the army’s settlement terms (the Heads of Proposal), and his decision to seek Scottish military support shows that he wanted to fight to the bitter end rather than negotiate.

Page 144: Test yourself

1 As a result of Charles escaping to Scotland and getting military support.
2 When Colonel Pride (of the New Model Army) arrested all MPs who had voted to continue negotiations with Charles. This happened in December 1648.
3 The MPs that remained after Pride’s Purge.

Page 144: Practice question

Charles and Parliament had not come to an agreement by 1647 because Parliament was divided. MPs were split into the Presbyterians and Independents, which slowed their efforts to make a settlement with Charles as he knew he could negotiate a better deal with both sides.

Another reason why Charles and Parliament had not come to an agreement by 1647 was the actions of the New Model Army. The New Model Army was partly responsible for the failure to reach a settlement – the army seized Charles from Parliament’s control in June 1647 and offered their own terms, which encouraged Charles to keep negotiations open.

A final reason was Charles’ actions at the end of the First Civil War. Charles escaped to Scotland after he had been captured, and he managed to get the military support of the Scots after offering to trial Presbyterianism in England. Charles lost the trust of some MPs after he sought the support of Scotland because they did not think they could negotiate with him, and this sparked the outbreak of the Second Civil War.
Page 145: Complete the mind map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why was Charles executed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charles’ refusal to cooperate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles refused to accept both settlement terms and Parliament’s charges when he was on trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 145: Identify an argument

• Description.
• Argument.
• Assertion.

Page 147: Test yourself

1 Some people refused to sign the Oath of Loyalty so it lacked legitimacy. It was divided, and some radical groups were growing. People were opposed to the high taxes they imposed.
2 In 1649, the leaders of the Levellers were arrested and imprisoned.
3 A body formed by Oliver Cromwell after he dissolved the Rump.

Page 147: Flow charts

| Cromwell heard rumours that fresh elections in 1653 would not be supervised by the army as he had negotiated | Cromwell dissolved the Rump Parliament | Cromwell formed the Nominated Assembly | The Nominated Assembly couldn’t function due to disagreements between moderates and radicals | Moderate MPs voted to dissolve Parliament |

Page 147: Practice question

Cromwell forcibly dissolved the Rump Parliament in April 1653 because of the Rump’s lack of religious reform. Cromwell wanted Parliament to reform the Church of England so that people could practise freely. Many Rump MPs thought that a strict Church was needed to keep people in order, so they disagreed with Cromwell. Eventually, Cromwell dissolved the Rump so that he was free to pass religious reform.

In the short term, the Rump was dismissed because it failed to keep its promise regarding elections. The Rump had promised that fresh elections could be supervised by the army.
Cromwell had pushed for this so that the army could influence who was voted in (he wanted people who were for religious reform). The Rump actually planned to hold the elections without supervision from the army and so Cromwell used soldiers to dismiss MPs from Parliament.

Another reason for Cromwell dissolving the Rump was because he was unhappy that the Rump seemed to be passing laws to protect its own power, rather than laws for the good of the country. Cromwell thought this would leave the Rump with too much power.

Page 148: Test yourself
1 Regional rulers that Cromwell used to enforce his aims.
2 A tax on ex-Royalists.
3 It went against his principles as he did not want to take the position of monarch.

Page 149: Practice question
People disagreed with Cromwell’s introduction of the major-generals. The major-generals used military discipline to impose a Puritan lifestyle (for example, no drinking was allowed), and they were recalled in 1657 after they failed to persuade MPs to grant Cromwell new taxes. This demonstrates their lack of popularity and shows why people challenged Cromwell’s rule.

There were also challenges to Cromwell’s rule because some MPs thought he had too much power. The Instrument of Government limited Cromwell’s power, but also allowed him control of the army. MPs (such as Heselrige and Bradshaw) said that the Instrument of Government was illegal as it gave too much power to Cromwell. Cromwell dissolved his First Protectorate Parliament on 22 January 1655 after repeated attempts from MPs to rewrite the Instrument of Government.

Also, people generally did not trust whoever was in charge after the death of Charles. Some people thought that the Commonwealth lacked legitimacy and integrity, and as a result some refused to swear an Oath of Loyalty.

Page 149: Developing the detail
Cromwell wanted change in England – he did not agree with the way in which the Rump Parliament had ruled [because he thought the extent of religious reform was too limited. He also wanted to re-establish a social hierarchy in England].

Cromwell made some changes so that England was more religious [– he made sure that all MPs sitting in Parliament were of a ‘godly’ character]. He also changed the way in which parts of England were controlled [by introducing the major-generals, who used military force to impose Cromwell’s aims].

During his term as lord protector, Cromwell faced some challenges [– the army wanted him to rule England as a military dictatorship, whereas moderate MPs wanted him to assume the role of king].
Page 149: Support or challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agrees</th>
<th>Disagrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell was created head of state as lord protector</td>
<td>Cromwell’s power was limited by the Instrument of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radicals voiced ideas which the moderates disagreed with</td>
<td>Cromwell tried to get MPs to agree by presenting a different version of the Instrument of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were deep divisions within the Barebones Parliament</td>
<td>The Instrument of Government presented a religious settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 150: Test yourself

1. People were worried about the radical groups that were developing. The regicide was generally unpopular. People wanted a return to stability and they thought Charles II could provide this.
2. Charles’ terms for his return to the throne.
3. The king was the sole commander of the army and navy. The Book of Common Prayer was reintroduced.

Page 151: Turning assertion into argument

People were happy with instability; for example, ... the radical groups that had developed during the Civil War had continued to grow and many desired the return of a stricter Church.

Many people never agreed with the execution of Charles; some thought ... that Charles I was a martyr and these people supported the return of his son.

The Protectorate showed signs of weakness such as ... Richard Cromwell, who was not a strong leader and did not have total control of the army.

Page 151: Practice question

Source K disagrees with the statement that the Protectorate failed because there was popular support for the return of a king. Despite the fact this may have been true, Source K suggests another reason: Charles II’s willingness to compromise. Although some of the English population wanted the return of a monarch, many feared the return of an absolutist monarchy. The extract from the Declaration of Breda (Charles II’s proposed solution to the country’s problems) shows us that Charles II was willing to compromise, and this calmed people’s fears. The extract calls for English people to ‘enjoy what by law is theirs’ – this was a very different approach to that of Charles I who would dissolve Parliament when he could not secure its approval. The promises made in the Declaration of Breda were recognised, in part – although many of the monarch’s powers were restored, the monarch could no longer rule without Parliament. Therefore, it was Charles II’s willingness to compromise that led to the failure of the Protectorate.

This alone, however, does not explain why the Protectorate collapsed. It is true that many people in England wanted the return of a monarch. Source J agrees with the statement and shows that many people welcomed Charles II to England in 1660. The regicide had been very unpopular with some, and cults developed in honour of Charles I. Source J is a good example of the popular feeling that the monarchy should return. However, we might want to question why this source was produced. It’s likely that it was produced at the request of a support of Charles’ II, and therefore could have exaggerated the extent to which there was popular support for the return of a king.
However, Source I does also suggest that the statement holds some weight. The fact that a leader of the Levellers (who were strictly opposed to Charles I’s style of rule) is criticising the decision to execute Charles could serve as evidence that the removal of the king was never popular and that the Protectorate would inevitably fail as people were not on board from the start. But Source I was produced in direct response to the regicide, and in 1649. We cannot infer from this that Lilburne was asking for the return of a king, in fact the Levellers had refused all attempts at compromise during the Civil War. This source may just demonstrate that many did not approve of the regicide.

Overall, despite that fact that there was some popular support for the return of a king, Sources I–K don’t convince me fully that this statement is correct. It’s clear that the regicide was not approved by all, and that Charles II’s willingness to compromise played a part, but the sources don’t mention the weakness of the Protectorate itself which was a key reason for the Restoration.
9 The English Reformation c.1520–c.1550

Page 152: Test yourself

1 £400,000 per year.
2 Heaven, Purgatory and Hell.
3 Great Chain of Being.

Page 153: Practice question

The Church was hugely important to English people in the early sixteenth century. At a time when the government did next to nothing provide welfare for the peasantry, it was left to the Church, and particularly monasteries, to provide charity, education and medical aid to ordinary people. Without their help, many poor people would have faced a very difficult situation. The education element was also important, because many peasants found themselves being educated by the Church to the point that they could potentially find themselves rising through the ranks of the Church to very significant positions of responsibility, such as Cardinal Wolsey. This then was a very important part of the Church to the people of England.

Even more important though was what the Church was doing for the souls of the worshippers. At this time, all people in England were Catholics and believed very strongly in the afterlife. Given the high rates of infant mortality, child mortality and death from disease, it was rare for the average person to live much past 30, and as such people were extremely keen that their souls, and those of their loved ones, be looked after well in the afterlife, and that they should spend as little time in Purgatory as possible, and progress to an eternal afterlife in Heaven and avoid Hell. This was a huge concern and it impacted everyone in society, not just the poor, hence being even more significant than the social aspects of the Church mentioned above.

Fundamentally, the Church had a huge role in people’s lives and afterlives.

Page 153: Considering usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Reasonably useful content as it shows us how seriously Church was taken at the time</td>
<td>8 A modern historian who has clearly looked a range of evidence and placed it into context for the reader</td>
<td>8 The author is presumably an academic who has studied the period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 153: Complete the paragraph

Because people were not very educated, and because they had no other source of support, most peasants relied on the Church for many things. For example, if they were unwell they would visit ... a monastery and seek help from the monks, who would have some medical knowledge and would perhaps be able to help them. Additionally, if they were struggling financially, they could come to the church and receive alms from the Church to help with feeding their family or looking after their land.
Page 155: Test yourself

1. The Lollards.
2. The Bible.
3. Thomas More.

Page 155: Considering usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Shows us a very clear idea of what Luther and many other Protestants actually wanted</td>
<td>9. Luther is obviously the source of a great deal of the ideas of the Protestant faith</td>
<td>9. This source comes from around five years after Luther’s initial complaint, thus making it very useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 155: Practice question

There were two main strands of the Protestant criticism of the Catholic faith. The first was that there was a very great deal that evolved about the Catholic Church that was not actually written in the Bible and had been added as traditions or rules of the Church after the Bible. For example, the Bible suggests that churches should be simple and the priests should be humble, and yet at the time of these criticisms, the Catholic Church was the richest and one of the most powerful organisations in the world. Additionally, there were many extra elements of worship, such as the worship of saints and idols, that again are not found in the Bible. Essentially, Protestants wanted to strip away anything from the Church that was not explicitly found in the Bible.

Linked to this is the fact that as far as most Protestants were concerned, Christianity should have as little unnecessary addition as possible, and that the worship should be conducted by an individual with their own Bible, and that that should be their main link to God. This was quite different to the extravagant hierarchy of the Catholic Church, with a very big hierarchy running from the Pope in Rome down to normal priests in local churches. Most Protestants wanted to strip this away entirely.

Ultimately, Protestants want to hugely simplify the Church and take out anything that was not directly related to worshipping God through the bible.

Page 156: Test yourself

1. An annulment.
2. Promoting the authority of the papacy over the king.
3. Supreme Head of the Church.

Page 157: Which is best?

Answer b) is the better answer because while it is similar, it uses far more specific detail to answer the question.

Page 157: Practice question

The sources all show very strongly that the broad issue of the Reformation was hugely provocative to many very senior members of the English government and Church, but only Source C is convincing on the extent of resistance.

Thomas More’s words about the Oath of Succession are quite convincing about the extent of the resistance to Henry VIII becoming the Head of the Church. These words, when spoken,
were already treasonous and this sentiment would directly result in his execution the following year. For More, he would rather have died than place his soul in jeopardy, as he explains when he says that he could not make the oath without ‘condemning my soul to perpetual damnation’. This said, the whole statement is very personal to More: it begins with the phrase ‘but as for myself’, which would indicate that he is referring purely to himself and his own beliefs, thus this source is only convincing to a limited extent, as we can only infer that there may have been others who would have agreed. Indeed, More was the highest figure who was executed for this belief and there were not a great many others.

Source E is also moderately convincing for a number of reasons. Written in 1537, it is three years after Henry has become Supreme Head of the Church. The suggestion that Throgmorton would have had any link to Pole would have enraged Cromwell and Henry VIII. Pole was very strongly against Henry’s changes to the Church and even wrote a book rejecting everything that Henry had changed. The threats that are mentioned in the attribution are very real – many members of Pole’s family were executed because of Pole’s loyalty to the Pope and Catholicism. Similarly, the tone of this source suggests the sheer disgust that Cromwell has for Pole when he describes him as a ‘detestable traitor’. This shows that Cromwell and the government are not willing to tolerate any resistance at all to their changes to the Church, however it is only moderately convincing on the specific issue of resistance to the issue of Henry becoming Head of the Church, as it is not mentioned specifically, and by 1537 other aspects of the Reformation were taking place.

Finally, Source D is not very convincing at all on the subject as it only loosely gives instructions to anyone in the Church who might be preaching. It is showing that Cranmer at least was more interested in Protestant reform in general rather than forcing people to accept the fact that Henry VIII was now Head of the Church. This source therefore indicates that the issues of pilgrimage, clerical marriage and miracles are more important and thus that perhaps there was not a great deal of resistance at this stage.

Ultimately, these sources are not particularly convincing that there was a great deal of resistance to Henry becoming Supreme Head of the Church. Thomas More was clearly against it and paid with his life, and Cromwell was willing to threaten a friend of Reginald Pole with death, but they do little to indicate that there was widespread resistance.

Page 158: Practice question

The Dissolution of the Monasteries had a profoundly negative impact on the peasantry because it took away so much from their spiritual and secular lives. The monasteries had represented a great deal of the hope offered to people at a time when peasants’ lives were extremely hard and offered little in the way of comfort. Given the high death rate and extremely high infant mortality, the Catholic belief in Purgatory and the afterlife, represented in the monasteries, was extremely important to people who hoped they might see loved ones again in the afterlife. Taking this away and replacing it with the stark reality of the Protestant interpretation of Heaven and Hell was very difficult for many people to take, and indeed many people continued to maintain private Catholic beliefs for this very reason.

In real terms though, the biggest impact came from the simple removal of such a great deal of wealth from local communities. The beliefs mentioned above meant that many people would leave much of their wealth to the monasteries and the dissolution took all of this wealth away in just three years – approximately £3 million worth, which was a colossal sum at the time. This wealth had been used to support the peasants through education, health care and poor relief through difficulty times. Monks would look after the sick, take in
orphans and generally do a great deal to help local communities and all of this was taken away in just a few short years, in many cases doing significant harm to their communities.

Ultimately, it was so devastating because it attacked both the spiritual and the daily lives of the peasantry at the same time.

**Page 158: Test yourself**

1. Valor Ecclesiasticus.
2. Lesser monasteries.
3. Pensions for the monks and nuns.

**Page 159: Flow chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The break with Rome</th>
<th>The Act of Ten Articles</th>
<th>Dissolution of the lesser monasteries</th>
<th>Pilgrimage of Grace</th>
<th>Dissolution of the friaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Page 159: Which is best?**

Answer b) is the better answer as it shows clearly the impact of the visitations, rather than explaining what they were.

**Page 161: Test yourself**

1. Louth.
2. Stripping of wealth from monasteries.
3. Enclosure.
4. Robert Aske.

**Page 161: Developing the detail**

After a previous uprising [the Lincolnshire Rising], the Pilgrimage of Grace began in the summer of 1536. The people of northern England had some economic concerns [particularly regarding enclosure which was threatening the livelihood of many], but the main thing that they were concerned about was the changes that were being made to the Church. [They drew up a list of complaints called the Pontefract Articles which listed these issues, such as attacks on the monasteries and dislike of the Act of Ten Articles]. The rebels, [led by Robert Aske,] hoped that by marching through the north, they would make the king reconsider what he was doing, particularly to the monasteries.

**Page 161: Practice question**

These sources are reasonably unconvincing that the Pilgrimage of Grace was mainly a response to King Henry’s desire to seize control of the Church, as there is some evidence that it was also about concern about the loss of the monasteries themselves.

Source H certainly indicates that Henry was indeed trying to seize control of the English Church, although this does not necessarily indicate that this was why the Pilgrimage of Grace took place. The instruction to hang the abbot and monks of Salley in order to discourage towns and villages from assembling was doubtless brutal, but we can only infer from this source that it was the key reason for the Pilgrimage of Grace. Additionally, this source was written after the Lincolnshire Rising, and indeed refers to Henry’s command to suppress rebellion in the north, so this indicates that this action by Henry was in response to the rising, not the cause of it. So, while the source might indicate the overall attitude of the government and monarch that would have led to the uprising, it does not show us...
convincingly that the rebellion was a response to Henry’s desire to seize control of the Church.

Similarly, Source G, the indictment of John Bulmer, shows very strongly that Henry and the Crown were willing to attack anyone who might be willing to challenge Henry’s position as Supreme Head of Church, but once again the link to the motives of the Pilgrimage of Grace is only implicit. Even the accusation that the rebels were attempting to ‘deprive the king of his title of Supreme Head’ is unconvincing, as that was something that the rebels were careful to avoid stating anything of this kind as it would have constituted treason and thus would have been foolish to state. As a legal document from the Crown, this source is obviously hugely biased, given it is against a rebel. Once again, we can say that this shows an attitude that the rebels were trying to resist, but it was much more to do with the rebels’ desire to save the monasteries and prevent the further spread of enclosure.

Indeed, this is exactly what we see in Source F, where Robert Aske is giving a speech in York, at the beginning of the Pilgrimage of Grace. We must obviously be careful with such a public proclamation, as it was designed to help suggest that the rebellion did not constitute treason, but nonetheless, the source indicates that the heart of the rebellion is the desire to prevent ‘the suppression of the monasteries’. Aske simply would not have been foolish enough to actively denounce Henry, and this this source is not at all convincing about the idea the rebellion was a response to Henry’s desire to seize control of the Church.

Ultimately, these sources paint a picture of a Crown that was willing to violent suppress resistance, but they do not convince at all that the rebels were trying to resist Henry’s attempts to seize the Church.

Page 162: Test yourself

1 The Act of Six Articles.
2 The English Prayer Book.
3 £2.

Page 163: Practice question

The changes made by Somerset and Northumberland to the English Church essentially involved shifting it from being Catholic with some Protestant ideas to being genuinely Protestant. The most significant change was the introduction of English as the language of worship, both from the pulpit but also in the English Prayer Book, the first which was introduced in 1549, helping spark the Western Rebellion; a second, even more Protestant version was released in 1552. This was also a profound change as it meant that for the first time, worshippers were able to engage directly with scripture in a way that they had not before. The imposition of a £2 fine for refusing to use an English Bible was steadily more vigorously enforced during Edward’s reign.

At the same time, further stripping of Church wealth took place, with the dissolution of the chantries in 1548. The stripping of Church wealth had two central goals: the first was to make the churches more Protestant in look and feel, with very little decoration. The second was that the Crown was essentially stealing the wealth of the these churches for its own ends. By the time Northumberland was lord president, most churches had been stripped of their wealth and much Church land had been confiscated, hugely reducing the wealth and power of the English Church.

Overall, the major change that took place was to strip away all of the Catholic trappings of the Church and make the Church considerably poorer.
Page 163: Spot the mistake
This should read ‘the dissolution of the chantries’.

Page 163: Complete the mind map

The Act of Ten Articles: The highly reformist law which imposed several Protestant ideas on the Church of England.

Royal Proclamations: Laws passed directly from the king without consulting Parliament.

The Treason Act: The law which made it illegal to challenge or speak against the Reformation.

The Chantries Act: The law the eliminated the final form of monastery in England.

Page 164: Test yourself
1 Exeter.
2 The sale of treasures.

Page 165: Practice question

The nature of Protestantism, from Luther onwards, was based on deep study of the Bible. In the early sixteenth century, most copies of the Bible which were available were in Latin, not in English (although this changed during the Reformation). While most peasants received no education and thus could not understand Latin, study of Latin was essentially standard for children of nobles. For this reason, the nobility were able to read and form their own interpretations of the scripture, which for many people was the central concept of Protestantism: that the worshipper should read their own Bible and form their own relationship with God. This gave Protestantism great appeal, therefore, to a great many educated people. This was not something that was available to the peasantry or gentry until the advent of the English Bible.

The other reason for the English nobility favouring Protestantism was to do with fashion and favour at the court of Henry VIII. Throughout much of the early-mid 1530s, the Boleyn faction were dominant in Henry’s court, and they were a Protestant family. It therefore became politically wise to show Protestant sympathies during this time. After the execution of Anne Boleyn and the political elimination of the Boleyn faction, Protestantism had taken hold, largely because of the appeal mentioned above.

Ultimately, the Boleyns made Protestantism temporarily fashionable, but the very nature of Protestantism made it stick with much of the nobility.

Page 165: Eliminate irrelevance

The Prayer Book Rebellion took place in 1549 and was partly caused by religion. In the southwest of England, people tended to be very old-fashioned in their views, and therefore resisted the attempts of the government to make the Church more Protestant. The rebellion also took place because Lord Somerset had imposed a new sheep tax which hit the livelihoods of the Cornish and Devonian people very hard. The rebels were also very angry about how the clergy in the south-west were being treated by these reforms. Eventually, the rebellion was put down by a rebellion led by Lord Russell.

This answer is quite wordy, and repeats itself a bit – try making this shorter.
Page 165: Doing reliability well

- 5/10. Askew, having been a victim of torture is unlikely to give an unbiased account, however it would show what some people were feeling.
- 6/10. A painting with a title like this is obviously meant to be propaganda, but still shows us what the government wanted people to think.
- 8/10. Given that this man is admitting to and discussing this action, it is likely to be fairly honest and unbiased.
10 The Impact of Empire on Britain 1688–c.1730

Page 167: Flow chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ‘Glorious Revolution’</th>
<th>Siege of Derry</th>
<th>Battle of the Boyne</th>
<th>Battle of Aughrim</th>
<th>Treaty of Limerick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Events you might have chosen are:

- James landed in Ireland with a French army.
- Siege of Derry.
- Battle of the Boyne.
- Battle of Aughrim.
- Treaty of Limerick.
- Penal Laws.

Page 167: Considering usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It tells us about James, his soldiers and the relationship between them</td>
<td>This is a first-hand contemporary account in the words of a person central to events</td>
<td>The words were spoken as a direct result of the battle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/10. On the one hand, it suggests reasons why the Jacobite army was weak. On the other hand, James’ view may not be reliable and the weakness may have been with his leadership. It certainly shows that the relationship between James and his troops was poor, which makes the source very useful.

Page 167: Test yourself

1 The long-term causes include the tension between Catholics and Protestants as a result of the plantations; and the tensions in Europe which had led to the Nine Years’ War. The short-term cause was the ‘Glorious Revolution’ and William III taking the Crown from James II.

2 It was ruled by wealthy Protestants (known as the Ascendancy) with harsh penal laws imposed on Catholics. In reality, Ireland was controlled from England.

3 The Treaty of Limerick, the penal laws and the Protestant Ascendancy caused Catholic resentment and division that continues until now.

Page 167: Practice question

The war in Ireland between 1689 and 1691 had deep long-term causes in Irish history but was sparked off by events in England and continental Europe. The deep roots were in the English conquest of Ireland from the early Middle Ages and hostility between the Irish and the invaders. After the Reformation, Ireland remained Catholic while England became a Protestant state. To weaken Irish rebellion, the English government encouraged Scottish Protestants to settle and set up plantations in the north of Ireland where the strongest resistance had been. Catholics lost their land to these Protestant settlers. By 1689 there were therefore two communities deeply hostile to each other.

The spark was the ‘Glorious Revolution’, when in 1688 William of Orange became King of England, seizing the throne from Catholic James II. Meanwhile, Europe was at war, with William alongside other European powers against King Louis XIV of France. When James,
supported by Louis, landed in Ireland to lead a Jacobite army against William, the conflict in Ireland became part of the wider European war. Most Catholics supported James and most Protestants supported William. So the war of 1689–91 was an Irish civil war, a colonial war and a war between European nations all at the same time. It was about religion, land and power. Its immediate cause was the ‘Glorious Revolution’ but its deeper roots lay in hundreds of years of English involvement in Ireland.

**Page 168: Test yourself**

1. One reason for the failure was that Scottish people were divided and most Lowlanders did not support the rebellions. Another was the harsh English military control of the Highlands.

2. Scotland was facing economic crisis as a result of English pressure, bad harvests and the failure of the Darien Scheme. The Act of Union offered a way out of the crisis. Many Scottish MPs were bribed.

3. Union had mixed effects. For many in the Lowlands it brought greater wealth and new opportunities. However, it led to poverty and tight military control in the Highlands and the destruction of the Highland way of life.

**Page 168: Practice question**

At first sight it seems strange that the Scottish Parliament voted to abolish itself and come under Westminster rule when there was mass opposition in Scotland and relations between the two Parliaments were so poor.

By 1707 the Scottish economy was in crisis. In the 1690s there had been severe famines and many suffered from extreme poverty. Scotland was prevented from trading freely by restrictions imposed by the English, including the Navigation Act which prevented Scottish ships from trading with England and its colonies. The government’s attempt to boost the economy, the Darien Scheme in central America, was a disaster. In spite of deep anti-English feeling in Scotland, politicians began to think that union with England might help solve their problems.

A major reason for the decision was clever tactics by the English government. One tactic was bribery. After the failure of the Darien Scheme, England offered to cover the costs. This was ironic because, although the collapse was due partly to huge mistakes by Scotland, it had also been undermined by the English Crown. Several Scottish politicians were offered large amounts of money and seats in the House of Lords. England also offered to remove the controls over trade it had imposed. Another tactic was reassurance. They said Scotland would be able to keep its separate legal system and Church. The English also used the threat of force, moving troops north towards the border.

Some in Scotland genuinely believed in the Union, believing it would help protect Scotland from enemies, improve the economy and guarantee permanent Protestant rule. In the end, Union with England brought mixed blessings. Many Lowlanders prospered but it brought greater poverty in the Highlands.
Scottish reactions to the ‘Glorious Revolution’
were varied: some felt that William was not rightful king under Scottish law and many Highlanders supported James as a Stuart from the ancient Scottish royal family, but there was support for Protestant William from the Scottish Parliament and many Lowlanders.

The 1689 Jacobite Rebellion
aimed to restore the throne to James but was defeated by William’s army at the battles of Killiecrankie and Dunkeld, after which William imposed strict military control of the Highlands.

The Massacre of Glencoe
in 1692 was when 38 women, men and children from the clan McDonald were murdered by Williamite soldiers – with 40 more freezing to death – after their leader had arrived late to sign an oath of allegiance to the king.

The Darien Scheme
was an attempt by the Scottish government to start a colony in central America that failed disastrously at great cost to Scotland’s economy.

The Act of Union
in 1707, which abolished the Scottish Parliament and created the Kingdom of Great Britain, was very unpopular with many Scots but also brought benefits to the Lowlands and middle classes.

The 1715 Rebellion
was an uprising against King George I that aimed to put the son of James II on the throne but was defeated.

Page 169: Identify an argument
The first conclusion is at the higher level. It supports the assertion with an argument backed by evidence about the content, provenance and context of the sources. If the rest of the response shows a strong knowledge and understanding of the history of the Jacobite Rebellion and the Williamite control of the Highlands, as well as detailed analysis of the sources, this could be a Level 5 conclusion.

The second conclusion makes valid statements about the sources and the beginning of an argument (the government wanted to punish the McDonalds and may have planned the massacre). However, there is not a direct link between the assertion and any explanation. As it stands, this conclusion is at Level 3.

Page 171: Test yourself
Some emigrated to escape poverty and in hope of a better life. Others were forced, either as political prisoners or transported convicts.
Page 171: Checklist

- Scottish Protestants took over Irish land after the treaty of Limerick in 1691. ✓
- English people agreed to work as enslaved labourers in America to be sold in auction for a fixed number of years before getting freedom. ✓
- Irish Catholics took over Scottish land after the 1691 defeat of the Jacobite uprising. Incorrect: exactly the reverse was true as Scottish Protestants took over Irish land.
- Convicted prisoners were sent to North America as a punishment. ✓
- Scottish Jacobite rebels were banished to the Caribbean and not allowed to return. ✓
- Irish soldiers served in the French army. ✓
- Vagrants and beggars were transported until the 1718 Transportation Act stopped this. Incorrect: the 1718 Act started the transportation of vagrants.
- Some Scottish emigrants worked for the East India Company. ✓
- Prostitutes were forced to leave England. ✓

Page 171: Practice question

In the early eighteenth century, large numbers of people from the British Isles migrated overseas, mostly to North America. Most were pushed to leave by poverty. The majority were indentured labourers who ended up working alongside enslaved Africans on plantations. So were they also slaves? Evidence that they were includes the fact that they became the property of plantation owners and could be bought and sold. Many were auctioned by ships’ captains on arrival in America. They worked unpaid, often in terrible conditions with high death rates, and in some cases rebelled against their masters alongside African slaves.

On the other hand, unlike Africans they were only temporarily owned. Once they had worked off their period of indenture, if they survived, they were free to lead their own lives. Many then prospered and some joined militias to protect plantation owners from uprisings. If they were slaves at all, it was only for a time.

So to what extent do these two sources support the idea that indenture was a form of slavery? Source D appears to: it describes the emigrants as ‘slaves’ who are bought by planters. Defoe groups indentured workers with transported convicts and says they were not treated differently. The implication is that those on indenture were as unfree as those convicted of capital crimes. The tone of Source E is very different: the indentured workers are described as ‘excellent planters and soldiers’ with their Christianity stressed. They are not only a workforce but a potential defence against slave uprisings and foreign invasion. Whereas Defoe portrays them as being seen by the planters as no better than criminals, this writer sees them as allies of the planters. The two sources present very different impressions of the relationship between planters and indentured workers.

There are problems with both sources. Source D is from a work of fiction and so the writer may be using creative imagination. But Defoe was also a journalist and political writer and wrote elsewhere about this topic. He was well informed. In the case of Source E, we are told it is a contemporary account but we do not know who wrote it, or for what purpose. The account may be the result of direct observation, or not.

On the face of it, Source D supports the assertion while Source E opposes it. However, as Defoe ends with the statement ‘until their time is out’ he clearly recognises that these workers’ enslavement is temporary. This is in stark contrast to the fate of enslaved Africans. On balance, therefore, the sources do not convince us of the statement; they suggest, rather, that indenture was quite different from enslavement.
The first British company to transport enslaved Africans to plantations in the Caribbean and North America was the Royal African Company. It belonged to the Stuart royal family – Charles II and later James II – and had a monopoly, which meant no other businesses could compete with it. After the monopoly was ended in 1698, private businesses began to run the trade. These businesses made great profits in several ways.

Plantation owners profited by growing more and more sugar and tobacco without having to pay their enslaved workers. They then sold their crops on to merchants who then sold them in Britain where demand was growing, again making high profits. Ship owners made profits at every stage of the triangular trade, exchanging commodities for slaves and then selling them to the plantation owners, then making money again by transporting tobacco and sugar to Britain.

Some of the profits from the slave trade were spent on luxury goods, some funded building projects and some was invested in industry. As so many businesses were free to trade, the wealth was spread in ways that helped boost the economy. This would not have been possible under the RAC’s monopoly, which piled up riches only for the one family.

All of these profits depended on the violent exploitation of the unpaid labour of millions of Africans.

The system was an effective way of making money because ... there was more demand for sugar, tobacco, and so on. Slaves therefore brought huge profits for slave traders, shipping companies, plantation owners and British merchants. Enslaved and indentured workers were very cheap workers, allowing more profit for the owners.

As enslaved workers were captive for their whole lives, over time their work produced far more profit than the cost of buying them.

The system was not such an effective way of making money because ... enslaved Africans often resisted, rebelled or sabotaged the business. Because they were not paid, enslaved and indentured workers often did not work hard.
Page 173: Considering usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This extract shows the attitudes of those who enacted the law, and that such marriages must have been frequent enough for them to want to ban them.</td>
<td>It is extremely useful because it is the actual wording of the law enacted at that time, rather than someone’s opinion of it.</td>
<td>This was a time when alliances between white and black plantation workers were frequent enough to cause planters to fear joint uprisings. This law is an example of how the system began to divide the indentured and enslaved from each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/10. This is very useful for historians because it is a contemporary document. As the wording of an actual law, it tells us what was actually decided. At the same time it suggests something about the relationship between enslaved Africans and indentured labourers on plantations, and about the fear by the authorities that they might find common cause and rise up.

Page 175: Delete as applicable

I agree to a fair extent that the sources show that Britain benefited from the EIC. Sources G and H suggest a likely benefit: Child believes the move to Bengal will lead to the company dominating India and the emperor’s firman will be a great help to British trade, but the sources do not tell us whether that actually happened. On the other hand, Source I claims that India is profiting and Europe is losing. But we cannot know from this source whether it was Indians or the wealthy men of the company who were profiting at English weavers’ expense.

Page 175: Practice question

The East India Company was a joint stock company which depended on investment by wealthy shareholders, each of whom had one vote. The company had 24 directors who were selected every year and who helped with the day-to-day running of the company. They chose the chairman who was responsible for the overall running of the company. Directors could only serve on the board for four years, after which they had to take one year off. In India it had British administrative officers who organised its trade and business from its bases in Surat, Madras and Bombay.

In many ways the company it was similar to a modern multinational corporation, with its board of directors and shareholders. However, it was different in two very important ways. Firstly, it had a monopoly on British trade with India and east Asia, something which meant it had enemies among business leaders in Parliament. Secondly, although it started with trading posts on the Indian coast, over time it developed its own standing army and became increasingly involved in politics. Under its governor, Sir Joshua Child, it fought and lost a war against the Indian emperor but then started to build a base in Calcutta from where it would eventually take control of the whole of India.
Page 175: Test yourself

1. It had shareholders who invested in it and a board of directors with a chairman who ran the company. A royal charter allowed it to have its own army and navy and print its own money. It had bases across India and developed trading routes between Britain and many parts of Asia.

2. A parliamentary inquiry revealed deep corruption at the top level at the same time as weavers protested about low wages and pushed successfully for Indian cloth imports to be stopped. Parliament decided to close down the company.

3. It managed to escape being closed down by merging with the company that was meant to replace it. It expanded into South-East Asia, set up a base in Bengal and made a deal with the Mughal Emperor that meant it did not have to pay tax on goods exported from India.

Page 176: Test yourself

1. The Bank of England was set up and the national debt was created. There was a big growth in joint stock companies that depended on people buying shares.

2. Wealth and military force combined. New businesses grew up thanks to the system of credit. Profit from trade was invested in businesses, banks and the navy helping them to grow. With the navy, Britain conquered more territories across the world, giving access to raw materials.

3. People rushed to buy shares in the South Sea Company. When they realised it was overvalued, people rushed to sell their shares and the price collapsed. Many people lost money and many businesses folded.

Page 177: Which is best?

The response a) is the better one because it shows understanding of the content of the sources, shows background knowledge of the historical context, and explains, with reference to the sources, the reason for the conclusion.

It could be part of a Level 5 response if the rest of the response shows more historical knowledge, and if there is some analysis of the provenance of the sources. Both writers were experts to some extent, with considerable understanding of how their economy worked.

As it stands, the response b) would be part of a low Level 3 answer. Like the a) response, it shows understanding of the content but does not link that with the conclusion.
The South Sea Bubble was an economic crash that resulted from a rush to buy shares in the South Sea Company, set up to deal with selling enslaved Africans to the Spanish South American colonies. The company encouraged people to buy shares by artificially inflating the share price to make people believe it was doing well, and by claiming there were vast reserves of gold and silver where it would be working. To increase its shareholders, the company lent large amounts of money to people so they could buy shares, and then sold shares to be able to pay people the dividend on their shares. There was also corrupt insider dealing in the company.

When people realised the company could not support the high share value, some started selling their shares. The shares began to fall in value, so others panicked and sold too. The company could not afford to pay people back, so most lost their money and the company collapsed.

There was a serious effect on the lives of many people who lost all their savings. Some even killed themselves. Many lost confidence in the banks and the chancellor of the exchequer was forced to resign. The government passed a new law, the 1720 Bubble Act making it necessary for any new company to be granted a royal charter.

We might think that the most important effect was for banks to learn from the mistakes of 1720, but the very similar 2008 banking crisis suggests that these lessons have not been learned.

1 People in all walks of life profited from the enslavement system as it provided work for people making all the goods shipped out to the plantations, for those involved in shipbuilding and for the businesses trading in goods such as sugar and tobacco. These goods became widely popular and affordable. Cities such as London, Bristol and Liverpool and many major institutions grew rich from the profits of slavery. Racist ideas spread and seriously affected the lives of black people in Britain.

2 Asian goods such as textiles, ceramics, spices, furnishings became fashionable. Coffee houses became popular.

3 Coffee houses were centres of discussion with a big influence on business, politics and economic decisions.

New trade routes brought commodities from Asia that became fashionable, [such as textiles, furnishings and ceramics from Asia brought by the East India Company]. Ordinary people could afford products that had previously been luxuries, [including tea, coffee and slave-grown sugar and tobacco]. People of all classes in Britain benefited economically from the plantation and enslavement system. [In booming cities such as Liverpool, Bristol and London, artisans and tradespeople supplied equipment, ships, armaments, and so on.] Business expansion brought new opportunities and risks: [the establishment of the Bank of England and new businesses created wealth and provided jobs, but also brought the risk of collapse such as the South Sea Bubble]. [New ideas spread with the expansion of broadsheets and newspapers and the growth of coffee houses. These led to the development of the political party system and ideas of personal liberty, but also the spread of racist ideology, with a negative impact on ethnic minorities in Britain.]
There is no doubt that access to Asian and American commodities changed the lives of British people as the empire expanded and trade boomed. As shipping routes between Britain and Asia were opened up by the East India Company, south Indian textiles, Bengali tea and Chinese porcelain became available. Meanwhile, sugar and tobacco grown on the slave plantations of the Caribbean and North America arrived in increasing quantities. At first, these were luxuries for the rich, but as supply increased and prices fell, demand grew which in turn led to greater supply. Commodities from the colonies were then within reach of poorer people. So did this improve the lives of the British?

Both sources are by writers living at the time who were commenting on a Britain they knew and observed. Both are evidence that commodities such as tobacco, tea and silk were both fashionable and readily attainable, even in the countryside. In Source L, Tryon writes that tobacco is common even among farmers, and in Source M Defoe describes how ‘plain country Joan’ can – thanks to cheaply available goods – match the fashion of the rich.

Thomas Tryon, however, is strongly critical of the effect of tobacco. Drugged by pipe smoking, men forget their suffering families and become involved in ‘mischiefs and inconveniences’. We know now how addictive and damaging to health smoking is: this source shows that there were warnings over 300 years ago. It clearly contradicts the statement. Defoe’s attitude, however, is harder to read. Is he being satirical? He does seem to be poking fun at the servant with ideas above her station. But, in the way he describes it, this is not necessarily a bad thing: he is observing how class distinctions are blurred without taking a clear position.

During this period, sugar, tea, tobacco and new textiles became widely available. This improved the lives of working people in many ways. Stimulants made hard lives easier to bear and brought some comfort and recreation. Fabric and ceramic designs were copied by British craftspeople and became widely popular on affordable textiles and pottery. These brightened up the homes of a wide sector of the population. But tobacco and sugar addiction brought their evils, too – ones we are still grappling with. On balance, Tryon’s outrage and Defoe’s amused observation fall against the statement that lives improved. Looking back, however, although these sources do not convince us that there were benefits, other evidence suggests strongly that they were. The fact that British lives improved was one reason why people strongly supported the empire and even, until later, the slave trade.
### Event overview grid for the whole unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Key Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglo-Mughal War 1686</strong></td>
<td>The East India Company fought Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb of India and lost, but in moving to Kolkata the company began to build its power and influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Glorious Revolution' 1688</strong></td>
<td>William, Duke of Orange arrived from the Netherlands with a huge fleet and army to remove James II from the throne with the support of Members of Parliament, and reigned under an agreement that gave Parliament greater powers than ever before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parliamentary inquiry into the East India Company 1688</strong></td>
<td>The inquiry revealed serious corruption at the top of the company and it was given three years to close down, but in fact survived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treaty of Limerick 1691</strong></td>
<td>The treaty ended the Williamite wars in Ireland and established British rule through the Protestant Ascendancy: 14,000 Jacobite soldiers left for France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massacre of Glencoe 1692</strong></td>
<td>In 1692, women, men and children from the clan McDonald were murdered by Williamite soldiers after their leader had arrived late to sign an oath of allegiance to the king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishment of the Bank of England 1694</strong></td>
<td>The bank was set up to loan money to the government which had to be paid back with interest, enabling the government to fight wars, and this became known as the national debt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penal Laws 1695</strong></td>
<td>Harsh laws imposed on the Irish after William’s victory took away rights from Catholics, including the rights to vote, inherit property or stand for Parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of the Royal African Company monopoly 1698</strong></td>
<td>Until 1698, Britain’s trade in enslaved Africans was run entirely by a company belonging to the royal family, but in 1698 the trade was opened up to any private businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Darien Scheme 1698</strong></td>
<td>The Scottish government tried to start a colony in central America that failed disastrously at great cost to Scotland’s economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Act of Union 1707</strong></td>
<td>In 1707, the Scottish Parliament agreed to abolish itself and the Kingdom of Great Britain, ruled from London, was created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treaty of Utrecht 1713</strong></td>
<td>Under the treaty, Britain gained territories from France and Spain as well as the asiento, the right to control the slave trade for Spanish territories in the Americas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacobite Rebellion 1715</strong></td>
<td>In 1715, Scottish supporters of the ‘Old Pretender’, the son of James II, rose up against King George I under the leadership of the Earl of Mar, but were defeated in battle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Sea Bubble 1720</strong></td>
<td>Large numbers of people bought shares in a joint stock company dealing in slaves believing that they would make money, but corruption and mismanagement led to the company’s collapse and a financial crisis in which many people lost all their savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treaty between British forces and the Jamaican Maroons 1739</strong></td>
<td>Unable to defeat the Maroon colony of escaped slaves in the Jamaican highlands, the British army made an agreement that allowed the Maroon settlement to remain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>