



National  
Qualifications  
2022

---

**2022 History**

**British, European and World History**

**Higher**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2022

These marking instructions have been prepared by examination teams for use by SQA appointed markers when marking external course assessments.

The information in this document may be reproduced in support of SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is reproduced, SQA must be clearly acknowledged as the source. If it is to be reproduced for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from [permissions@sqa.org.uk](mailto:permissions@sqa.org.uk)

## General marking principles for Higher History – British, European and World History

*Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates' responses.*

- (a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding; marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.
- (b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.
- (c) Where the candidate is instructed to choose one part in a section but instead answers two parts, mark both responses and record the better mark.
- (d) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.
- (e) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (f) The detailed marking instructions are not an exhaustive list. Award marks for other relevant points.
- (g) The question stems used in this paper are
  - How important . . . ?
  - To what extent . . . ?
  - *Quote* . . . How valid is this view . . . ?

### Marking principles for each question type

#### Essay questions (22 marks)

##### Historical context

Award **3 marks** where candidates provide two points of background to the issue and identify relevant factors. These should be connected to the line of argument.

##### Conclusion

Award **3 marks** where candidates provide a relative overall judgement of the factors, which are connected to the evidence presented, and which provide reasons for their overall judgement, e.g., *this factor was clearly more significant in bringing about the event than any other factor because . . .*

##### Use of knowledge

Award **6 marks** where candidates give evidence which is detailed and which is used to support a viewpoint, factor or area of impact.

Award knowledge and understanding marks where points are:

- relevant to the issue in the question
- developed (by providing additional detail, exemplification, reasons or evidence)
- used to respond to the demands of the question (e.g., explain, analyse).

## Analysis

Award up to 6 marks for analytical comments.

Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationship with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.

Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding to identify relevant factors (e.g., political, social, economic, or religious – although they do not need to use this terminology), or aspects within a factor (e.g., success versus failure; different groups, such as elderly versus youth; or different social classes), and clearly show at least one of the following:

- links between different components
- links between component(s) and the whole
- links between component(s) and related concepts
- similarities and consistency
- contradictions and inconsistency
- different views and/or interpretations
- the relative importance of components
- understanding of underlying order or structure.

Examples of relationships between identified factors could include:

- Establishing contradictions or inconsistencies within factors, e.g., *while they were successful in that way, they were limited in this way . . .*
- Establishing contradictions or inconsistencies between factors, e.g., *while there were political motives for doing this, the economic factors were against doing this.*
- Establishing similarities and consistencies between factors, e.g., *in much the same way as this group were affected by this development, this group were also affected in this way.*
- Establishing links between factors, e.g., *this factor led to that factor.*

OR

*At the same time there was also . . .*

- Exploring different interpretations of these factors, e.g., *while some people have viewed the evidence as showing this, others have seen it as showing . . .*

OR

*While we used to think that this was the case, we now think that it was really . . .*

## Evaluation

Award up to 4 marks.

Evaluation involves making a judgement based on criteria.

Candidates make reasoned evaluative comments relating to, e.g.:

- The extent to which the factor is supported by the evidence, e.g., *this evidence shows that X was a very significant area of impact.*
- The relative importance of factors, e.g., *this evidence shows that X was a more significant area of impact than Y.*
- Counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations, e.g., *one factor was . . . However, this may not be the case because . . .*

### OR

*However, more recent research tends to show that . . .*

- The overall impact and/or significance of the factors when taken together, e.g., *while each factor may have had little effect on its own, when we take them together they became hugely important.*
- The importance of factors in relation to the context, e.g., *given the situation which they inherited, these actions were more successful than they might appear.*

Award marks where candidates develop a line of argument which makes a judgement on the issue, explaining the basis on which the judgement is made. Candidates should present the argument in a balanced way, making evaluative comments which show their judgement on the individual factors, and may use counter-arguments or alternative interpretations to build their case.

	Mark	3 marks	2 marks	1mark	0 marks	
<b>Historical context</b>	3	Candidates establish at least two points of relevant background to the issue <b>and</b> identify key factors <b>and</b> connect these to the line of argument in response to the issue.	Candidates establish at least one point of relevant background to the issue <b>and</b> identify key factors <b>or</b> connect these to the line of argument.	Candidates establish at least one point of relevant background to the issue <b>or</b> identify key factors <b>or</b> a line of argument.	Candidates make one <b>or</b> two factual points but these are not relevant.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	3	Candidates make a relative overall judgement between the different factors in relation to the issue and explain how this arises from their evaluation of the presented evidence.	Candidates make an overall judgement between the different factors in relation to the issue.	Candidates make a summary of points made.	Candidates make no overall judgement on the issue.	
		<b>6 marks</b>			<b>0 marks</b>	
<b>Use of knowledge</b>	6	Up to a <b>maximum of 6 marks</b> , award <b>1 mark</b> for each developed point of knowledge candidates use to support a factor or area of impact. Award knowledge and understanding marks where points are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevant to the issue in the question</li> <li>• developed (by providing additional detail, exemplification, reasons or evidence)</li> <li>• used to respond to the demands of the question (e.g., explain, analyse)</li> </ul>			Candidates use no evidence to support their conclusion.	
<b>Analysis</b>	6	Up to a <b>maximum of 6 marks</b> , award <b>1 mark</b> for each comment candidates make which analyses the factors in terms of the question. Award a <b>maximum of 3 marks</b> where candidates make comments which address different aspects of individual factors.			Candidates provide a narrative response.	
		<b>4 marks</b>				
<b>Evaluation</b>	4	Award <b>4 marks</b> where candidates connect their evaluative comments to build a line of argument that recognises the issue and takes account of counter-arguments or alternative interpretations.	Award <b>3 marks</b> where candidates connect their evaluative comments to build a line of argument that recognises the issue.	Award <b>2 marks</b> where candidates make isolated evaluative comments on different factors that recognise the issue.	Award <b>1 mark</b> where candidates make an isolated evaluative comment on an individual factor that recognises the issue.	Candidates make no relevant evaluative comments on factors.

## Marking instructions for each question

### SECTION 1 – British

#### PART A – Church, state and feudal society, 1066–1406

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| <b>1.</b> | <p><b>Context:</b><br/>Feudalism is a term that is used to describe a society that is organised around relationships that emerge from the holding of land in exchange for service or labour. There is debate about what this means in detail, but the relationship between king, nobility, knights, the clergy and the peasantry is generally agreed to form the basis of feudalism.</p> <p><b>Role of the clergy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• it was the church that crowned the monarchs which led to the idea that the king was dependent on God for his role, and thus in a way subservient to the church</li><li>• Popes could apply religious/political sanctions against monarchs, through excommunication and interdicts. This was often used to bring political pressure against an opponent, as seen during the reign of King John in England and Robert Bruce in Scotland</li><li>• kings needed the literacy and numeracy skills of the clergy in order to help administer their realms. Therefore, clerics could hold high office in government</li><li>• the wealth of the church came mostly from large grants of land by the nobles and especially the Kings. Thus, the church became an integral part of the feudal structure, holding lands in both Scotland and England and being subject to military duties</li><li>• the importance of marriage, funerals and christenings brought people closer to attaining their passage to heaven. Therefore, the ceremonies that marked the passage of life had power and importance to people</li><li>• monasteries were seen as ‘prayer factories’ and used to intercede with God for the ordinary lay population. Many rulers clearly thought they were important and spent time and money resourcing the founding of monasteries. David I of Scotland is one example</li><li>• pilgrimage to holy centres was an important part of medieval life. People would travel long distances to places of religious importance, such as Jerusalem and Rome as well as places that had important religious relics like Canterbury and St Andrews.</li></ul> <p><b>Other factors:</b></p> <p><b>Role and importance of the landed classes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• barons and other powerful magnates received land from the feudal overlords. These lands offered rights and privileges that in turn led to wealth and a comfortable lifestyle</li><li>• these privileges usually gave the barons judicial control and the right to bear arms, build castles and hold tournaments. This often supplemented their income. Barons enjoyed a relatively leisured life, with pastimes such as hunting and hawking</li><li>• the main drawback for the landed classes was the requirement to provide military service. This was occasionally dangerous, even fatal. Many circumvented this by providing substitutes or making excuses for non-appearance.</li></ul> |
|-----------|---|

**Role and importance of the peasant classes:**

- peasants played an important part in feudal society, beyond the need for a productive class working in agriculture, providing goods and service for their lord
- it was expected that peasants would run their own day-to-day lives without the need for the feudal lord's presence. Local reeves and bailiffs, appointed by the peasants or the lord himself, would act in his stead
- the feudal term of villein or serf indicated a peasant who was not free to leave his home farm or village. They were bought and sold along with the land and were expected to work at least 3 days a week in the lord's lands without recompense and hand over the best of their produce in exchange for the rent of their farmland
- peasants, or villeins, tended to work hard, mostly in the agricultural sector. All the work had to be done by hand and this resulted in long hours of backbreaking work
- food was basic and, in times of famine, starvation was a real threat. As the 12<sup>th</sup> century progressed famine became rare in England, since the manor system pulled in isolated communities and helped create new more viable villages throughout the kingdom
- serfdom declined by the 14<sup>th</sup> century as economic conditions allowed landlords to end the idea of tying a peasant to their land and, instead, exchange the labour services of the peasant with cash from rents
- peasants became more important through the feudal period as their labour was in demand, especially after the Black Death
- peasantry could also have political importance, e.g., the Peasants Revolt of 1381.

**Role of the king:**

- vital importance of the king in the feudal structure as from them came grants of almost everything that it was in his power to give land, privileges, financial and judicial customs, and services
- his favoured lords, tenants-in-chief, performed a symbolic gesture of submission known as homage, a ceremony in which the vassal, on his knees, swore an oath of loyalty (fealty) to his overlord in return for land (fief)
- in return the king expected loyalty and military service from his vassals
- kings could expect military service from both his temporal and spiritual lords, e.g., William I created great fiefs for his more important vassals out of confiscated Anglo-Saxon land and gave military duties in return. This included all his bishops and most of his abbots.

**Changing role of knights:**

- a knight could be created by the king in return for military or some other service
- the medieval knightly class was adept at the art of war, trained in fighting in armour, with horses, lances, swords and shields. Knights were taught to excel in the arms, to show courage, to be gallant and loyal
- as time went by, the idea developed that they had a duty to protect the weaker members of society, particularly women. This ideal did not always extend beyond their own class
- Christianity had a modifying influence through the classical concept of heroism and virtue. The Peace and Truce of God movement in the 10<sup>th</sup> century was one such example, with limits placed on knights to protect and honour the weaker members of society as well as helping the church maintain peace. At the same time the church became more tolerant of war in the defence of faith, developing theories of the just war or crusade.

**Social divisions:**

- social stratification was relatively rigid, though it was possible for landowners to rise through the ranks of the nobility, through ability or exceptional service
- some peasants famously left behind their humble beginnings, proving that social mobility was possible in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. William of Wykeham became Bishop of Winchester and Chancellor of England, but such rises outside the church were rare.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**2. Context:**

David I was the youngest son of King Malcolm III and St Margaret. By the time he succeeded to the throne in 1124, he was well-connected with a good marriage, a rich inheritance and estates in Normandy, north England and southern Scotland. He sought to impose his authority on the kingdom of Scotland on his succession to the throne.

**Religion:**

- started by David's mother Margaret, the introduction of the Roman Church at the expense of the Celtic one offered a significant support to the development of royal authority. David gave significant grants of land to religious orders, the greatest being the Cistercian house at Melrose in 1136. Other grants of land included Benedictine at Dunfermline and the Augustinians at St Andrews and Holyrood
- David's actions were important in the monastic economic development of land and because the Church preached the divine grace of the king, it was hard to justify any rebellions against him
- loyalty was given from new religious orders free from corruption; in return David constructed magnificent Abbeys at Jedburgh and Holyrood. David established Diocese at Moray and Ross, and down the east coast from St Andrews to Edinburgh (East Lothian)
- David was also sensitive to local needs and displayed reverence to the native saints, e.g., St Mungo of Glasgow and St Columba of Iona.

**Feudal landholding:**

- during his time in England, David became an admirer of the feudal landholding system. He introduced a form of military feudalism into areas of Scotland, notably the Southwest, Lothian and the Northeast
- noble families were imported from his lands in England and France and given grants of land. In return they offered David their support, both politically and militarily. Examples include Robert de Brus in Annandale and Walter fitz Alan in Renfrewshire and East Lothian
- there was penetration into Fife and beyond. There was land given in feudal due to Flemish knights in Moray
- however, the Mormaers in Scotland were semi-independent and held autonomous power over large parts of Scotland. The Earls of Moray had a long tradition of independence, even going so far as to claim the crown during the reign of Macbeth. However, when its earl rebelled in 1130 and was killed near Brechin, David annexed the province for the crown and set up feudatories
- leaders in the far west and north of Scotland also had a history of independence. In the south, the lordship of Galloway was under the leadership of Fergus, who from 1124 styled himself as King of the Gallowegians
- there was no whole-scale replacement of the native aristocracy. By the 1160s there were still 10 native earls and David was close to those in Fife and Dunbar.

**Military:**

- the new feudal forces brought to David by his introduction of feudalism offered a significant advantage when dealing with the Celtic Mormaers
- traditionally it was the Mormaers who controlled the summoning of the 'common army' of Scotland. Now David had an independent force loyal to him
- the feudal forces and the common army raised by the Mormaers did not always work well together, as seen at the disastrous Battle of the Standard
- the peace settlement established during the disputed reign of Stephen and Matilda in England; extended Scotland's border further south than ever before.

**Law and order:**

- royal justice was usually reserved for more serious crimes. Issues of land, an important aspect of justice, were often poorly judged or unfairly settled
- expansion of royal castles: motte and bailey
- new Scottish barons were given the rights to hold their own courts within their fiefs. This was an extension of the king's law, rather than reliance on the traditional Celtic courts led by Brechons, experts in the law. Eventually these Celtic courts died out and were replaced with sheriff courts. The gradual acceptance of the king's law led the way to the decrease of importance of the Mormaers and the acceptance of central control
- a Justiciar was appointed to complement the sheriffs – highest administrative and judicial officer.

**Economic:**

- before David I, revenue in Scotland was mostly limited to the incomes from royal demesnes
- the lack of royal burghs limited international trade and early medieval Scottish kings lacked the financial resources to tackle the Mormaers directly without the Community of the Realm backing them
- as a result, David sought to develop more burghs, e.g., Perth, in order to generate revenue. Burghs allowed for privileged merchant communities. The rents, tolls and fines that the burghs provided were David's earliest and most important sources of money. By the end of his reign there were even burghs in Forres and Elgin in Moray
- moneyers were appointed by David and silver pennies were introduced.

**Royal government:**

- during David I's reign, he developed new offices such as Constable, Butler, Chamberlain and Chancellor. Supporters like Hugh de Morville and Ranulf de Soules became David's constable and butler
- however, his household kept the Gaelic speaking 'Rannaire' (Divider of Food) and the royal bodyguard (the 'Durward')
- sheriffdoms were introduced along the style of Norman Kings of England, larger than the traditional thanages
- sheriffs sought to replace thanes in the remote areas of the kingdom. They offered direct royal contact for those away from the traditional seat of power
- however, the continued use of officials with Gaelic names shows how David used the structures that already existed.

**Any other relevant factors.**

3.

**Context:**

Henry was the son of Geoffrey of Anjou and Matilda, daughter of Henry I of England. Matilda was involved in a dispute with Stephen of Blois over who should rule England. On Stephen's death, Henry became Henry II of England. Henry's aims were to preserve the Angevin dominions, strengthen royal authority and extend the King's justice.

**Nobility:**

- changes in taxes were also needed to firm up revenue, but also to formalise Henry's relationship with his main tenants-in-chief
- many of his actions were to re-establish the authority of the king after the chaos of the Civil War and that meant action against those who had used the war as an opportunity to extend their own power
- Henry vigorously pursued the destruction of illegally built castles and the recovery of former royal strongholds that were now in baronial hands, e.g., he acted against William of Aumale who refused to surrender Scarborough Castle
- Henry's introduction of scutage allowed him to get around the problem of 40 days' knight service
- many lesser nobles were employed as his royal administration expanded.

**Other factors:**

**Cost of warfare:**

- in part, royal government developed in order to fund warfare, which had become increasingly expensive in the 12<sup>th</sup> century
- Henry had various military needs, to defend his lands across the Angevin Empire, to recover lost territories, to keep vassals abroad in check and to crush uprisings across the extensive Angevin Empire. The baronial rebellion of 1173–1174 also shook him. In short he needed an army at times and that had to be paid for
- e.g., previously direct taxation had been on landed property, but to get money for crusades Henry ordered a tax on moveable property and in 1188, a Saladin tithe (one tenth of the value of rents)
- by the end of the period there was a soundly organised field army with the administration to produce the money for this
- fortifications were also repaired and by the end of the period, e.g., all Norman castles were part of a general defence plan
- this increased organisation can be seen in the Assize of Arms of 1181 – a survey of resources.

**Need to develop the economy:**

- in general, Henry oversaw a more settled age in England, which encouraged trade as did Henry's acquisitions abroad. This in turn helped Henry with revenue, but also stimulated Henry's position in the international world. e.g., his acquisition of Guienne stimulated the west-country ports
- the industrial centres of Flanders depended on English wool and welcomed grain from fertile East Anglian and Kentish fields
- there was a European demand for English metals
- Henry's England was at the centre of the Angevin Empire and French speaking world
- the period saw an increase in literacy, e.g., all his sons had some education.

**Law and order:**

- Henry favoured the extension of royal jurisdiction, partly for its contribution to the domestic peace and partly for its financial rewards to the crown, but also to extend control over his tenants-in-chief
- there was a general need to rationalise law and marry the Anglo Saxon with the Norman practices in order to simplify the system and stop people playing the system. Change was gradual throughout Henry's reign and did not conform to some grand plan, but royal power did increase as a result of this
- Henry believed that too few offenders were put on trial or caught. He reasserted royal jurisdiction over major crimes and sought to improve the efficiency of the legal process
- the Assizes of Clarendon of 1166, modified by the Assize of Northampton (1176) e.g., widened the scope of royal justice, now including indictment and prosecution of local criminals
- regional inquest juries should meet periodically under the royal eye to identify and denounce neighbourhood criminals
- extension of the king's justice into land disputes, which had once been dominated by the baronial courts, through the Assize of Novel Disseisin and Grand Assize. These rationalised a mass of local laws and customs into a uniform royal law – a 'common law' by which all subjects were ruled. They speeded up the judicial process, but also placed decisions in the hands of the king's own justices-in-eyre, going over the heads of the powerful local tenants-in-chief.

**Effects of foreign influence:**

- Henry reigned for 34 and a half years, but he spent 21 years away from England
- the Angevin Empire ranged from the border with Scotland to the border with Spain and was united on only one sense, loyalty to Henry II
- arguably, the demands of holding this disparate group of lands together led to the need for taxation and a capable army
- foreign influence in England, especially from the Norman Lords who had extensive landholdings in both Normandy and England
- some unity of government was necessary, however and can be seen with the use of the Exchequer system throughout the Empire, e.g., use of the Seneschal's court – use of same legal procedure and interpretation of laws.

**Impact of the Civil War:**

- Civil War had developed between Stephen and Matilda on the death of Henry I
- bulk of the fighting was in Wiltshire, Gloucestershire and nearby private wars developed
- there was some devastation of land due to the Civil War, e.g., 1143–1144 Geoffrey de Mandeville laid waste to the Fens and in 1147, Coventry and surroundings was laid waste by the king
- in financing the Civil War Stephen began with a full treasury, however, the Exchequer was disorganised and yields from land were low. During the Civil War, barons and sheriffs had become increasingly lax in paying their taxes. The economy was weakened by the Civil War
- the development of the royal administration during Henry II's reign is due, in part to the need to put the Royal finances back on an even keel. E.g., this led to changes to the Exchequer, which improved the methods for receiving his revenues, as well as development of the Chamber and use of sheriffs.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**4. Context:**

King John was the youngest, and favourite, son of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine. On the death of his elder brother Richard, he became King of England despite the claims of his nephew, Arthur. He struggled to hold the widespread Angevin Empire together in the face of the challenges of the Capetian monarch of France and his own barons.

**Impact of the loss of Normandy:**

- had an impact on the royal finances as it reduced John's income
- the recovery of the royal lands north of the Loire became the focus of John's foreign policy and led to policies which eventually led to challenges to his authority
- the need to fund warfare to recover Normandy led to the frequent use of scutage to raise cash. It was used much more frequently than under Henry II and Richard I, levied 11 times in 17 years.

**Taxation:**

- John was more efficient in collecting taxes
- he used wardships to raise cash
- John introduced new taxes: e.g., 1207 tax on income and moveable goods
- he improved the quality of silver coinage.

**John's personality:**

- he could be generous, had a coarse sense of humour and was intelligent
- however, he could also be suspicious and cruel: vicious in his treatment of prisoners and nobles
- Arthur, his nephew, died in mysterious circumstances
- powerful lords like William de Braose fell from favour and were persecuted. William's wife and son were imprisoned and died. He died in exile in France.

**Relations with the nobility:**

- nobles refused to fight in France. This was especially true of the northern barons who had little stake in France
- nobles felt their status was reduced by use of mercenaries
- John became increasingly suspicious of the nobles
- high cost of titles led to nobles becoming overly indebted
- John took hostages to ensure nobles behaved. He showed he was prepared to execute children if their father opposed him.

**Relations with the church:**

- John fell out with Pope Innocent III over the appointment of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Innocent insisted on the appointment of Langton which John opposed
- papal interdict laid on England and Wales for 6 years
- in 1213 John made England a fief of the papacy
- noble uprising led by Archbishop of Canterbury.

**Administration of government:**

- John filled many of the roles in the royal household with new men, especially from Poitou. This was not popular with the English barons.

**Military power:**

- John established the Royal Navy
- John relied on extensive use of mercenaries rather than feudal service
- he was able to exert his military strength against the nobility and the French
- John was an able military commander; e.g., when conflict started with France and his nephew Arthur, he defeated them and captured Arthur
- his forces and his allies were decisively beaten at the Battle of Bouvines in 1214.

**Law and justice:**

- increasingly partial judgements were resented
- John increased professionalism of local sergeants and bailiffs
- he extended the system of coroners.

**Magna Carta:**

- relations worsened throughout his reign, ending with Magna Carta and rebellion of many barons.

**Any other relevant factors.**

<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Context:</b> Between 1603 and 1625 when King James I ruled in England, the House of Commons repeatedly challenged the Divine Right of Kings. Relations between Crown and Parliament deteriorated during this time. Before James ascended the throne, Parliament had been wielding considerable power since the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, but James wanted to exercise the same authority in England as he had been accustomed to as king of Scotland for over twenty years. Factors contributing towards James’s problems included the Divine Right of Kings as well as economic, political, legal and religious issues.</p> <p><b>Divine Right of Kings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• as there was greater accord given to the notion of the Divine Right of Kings in Scotland than England, James tried to assert Divine Right in England</li><li>• the English Parliament had increased its power during the 16<sup>th</sup> century in return for increasing supplies for various monarchs</li><li>• Parliament in London rejected the king’s proposed union between Scotland and England as they felt he was making no attempt to understand the English constitution, which accorded greater powers to Parliament in London than were accorded in Edinburgh</li><li>• James’s position as head of the Church in England troubled Scots who were willing to resist any increasing monarchical influence over the Church of Scotland which might be justified by the Divine Right of Kings</li><li>• James continued to exert the Divine Right of Kings in Scotland which led to some Highlands clans resisting his use of force to maintain order there.</li></ul> <p><b>Other factors:</b></p> <p><b>Political issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Parliament had been encouraged since the days of Henry VIII to make policy, and therefore its members felt they could criticise the Crown freely; James’s opposition to this made his status as a foreigner more unattractive to the English Parliament</li><li>• as legitimate king of Scotland, James was carrying out a role into which he had been born; however, his position in trying to maintain rule over two kingdoms, and the dominance of England, meant Scotland proved to be more than a minor irritation in his attempts to achieve stability and he therefore struggled to control both countries</li><li>• the House of Commons opposed James so much that the stability of the nation was affected</li><li>• the king conceded defeat in the Goodwin Case when parliament challenged his right to make it illegal for an outlaw to take his seat in the House of Commons, and this gave Parliament fresh impetus to challenge him further</li><li>• James attempted to curtail Parliamentary freedom of speech by imprisoning outspoken MPs in the Tower of London when Parliament was dissolved.</li></ul>
-----------	---

**Religious issues:**

- James had a lifelong hatred of Puritanism; Puritans existed in large numbers in the House of Commons and were demanding church reform.
- the king feared moves towards Presbyterianism and rejected the Millenary Petition at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, saying 'no bishops, no king', vowing to maintain an Episcopalian Church of England
- in 1607 the House of Commons presented a Petition for the Restoration of Silenced Ministers, requesting the reinstatement of preachers who had been previously dismissed for their Puritan views. This set MPs in direct opposition in policy terms to the sitting monarch
- James relaxed the Recusancy Laws against Roman Catholics, which revealed that there were more Roman Catholics than many in the House of Commons had feared
- the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 increased tension and turned many against Roman Catholics
- Parliament was horrified that the king allowed his son to marry a Roman Catholic French princess and allow her to celebrate mass privately at court
- James admired the religious power of the monarchies in France and Spain, both Roman Catholic countries and England's traditional enemies
- James conducted many negotiations with the Spanish Ambassador, Count Gondomar, whose influence at court many Puritans resented. In 1604 they concluded a peace, bringing their nineteen-year Anglo-Spanish war to an end with the Treaty of London
- eventually the king issued the House of Commons with the Rebuke of 1621, a ban on discussing foreign policy so that he could forge stronger links with Spain. This generated much anti-Catholic feeling amongst James's political opponents who disapproved of this developing relationship.

**Legal issues:**

- James attempted to control the court system by appointing judges who would favour the Crown; Parliament saw this as unfair and objected to the abuse of power
- the king also made sure that only he could sack Justices of the Peace, and not Parliament. This 'immovability of judges' was deeply resented by the House of Commons
- the king influenced proceedings in prerogative law courts such as the Court of Star Chamber and protected the landed classes who were exempt from flogging. Savage punishments were imposed on poorer people who could not pay fines, with Justices of the Peace frequently pronouncing 'No goods: to be whipped'
- the king imposed martial law in towns where troops were preparing to embark on foreign campaigns; Parliament opposed this
- the king billeted troops in the homes of civilians in order to enforce the law.

**Economic issues:**

- James wanted to be financially independent of Parliament and manipulated the statute books to re-impose anachronistic laws which were designed merely to raise revenue available for Crown spending
- Fiscal devices employed by the Crown- such as monopolies and wardships – were unpopular
- the king alienated his natural allies in the House of Lords by selling honours and titles and appearing to devalue the status of the aristocracy
- increases in customs duties caused resentment among merchants and members of the House of Commons
- the Bates' Case or the Case of Impositions (1606), when a currant trader opposed duties on imports, was won by the King, although Parliament declared the duties illegal in 1610.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**6. Context:**

The English Civil War lasted from 1642 to 1651 It was fought between Royalist forces who supported Charles I and Parliamentarians who opposed the king's authority. During the reign of James I, 1603–1625, the House of Commons had challenged the Divine Right of Kings. When Charles I ascended the throne in 1625, relations between crown and Parliament continued to deteriorate over a number of issues. As well as the legacy of James I, other factors included economic and financial issues, religious issues, political issues and the actions of Charles I and Parliament after 1640.

**Legacy of James I:**

- James I, who reigned between 1603 and 1625, continually opposed the Puritan movement and resisted calls for Presbyterianism in the Anglican Church. He rejected the Millenary Petition in 1604 and persecuted Puritan leaders. This caused resentment amongst Puritan MPs
- in addition, his adopted a tolerant policy towards Roman Catholicism. He relaxed the Recusancy Laws in 1603 and approved of his son's marriage to a Roman Catholic princess from France
- James I used anachronistic laws to increase his personal wealth, raising taxes himself and selling honours and titles to those who could afford to buy them
- James I's imprisonment of MPs in the Tower of London showed absolutist tendencies. In addition, his assertion of Divine Right was a notion less accepted in England than in Scotland
- James I intervened continually the English judicial system, as he had done in Scotland. He allowed martial law in coastal towns
- James I attempted and failed to bring about a political union between the England and Scotland. This meant that the issue of ruling both countries was significant, making it almost impossible to achieve the stable rule of either.

**Other factors:**

**Religious issues:**

- in 1633 Charles I made William Laud Archbishop of Canterbury. Laud wanted to stamp out Puritanism and believed in the authority and discipline of the Anglican Church and sacred status of the clergy, ordering priests to wear elaborate vestments and conduct services from Communion tables railed off from the congregation
- Laud favoured the High Church, which was the grouping of those whose ideas about liturgy and prayer were not dissimilar to Roman Catholic practice. He oversaw the Court of High Commission, in front of which those who offended the Church were brought to trial and fined heavily
- Charles I authorised Laud's punishment of Puritan preachers and his clamp-down on conventicles, private meetings for worship. There was tight censorship of printed word to prevent criticism of the High Church. This led to 20,000 Puritans fleeing England to America in 10 years
- Charles I allowed his queen, Henrietta Maria to celebrate Mass publicly at court. He also permitted this to take place with a representative of the Pope in attendance. This development infuriated Puritans in Parliament
- the king used the Church for political purposes, with clergymen often holding public office in the civil service. Charles I appointed clerics to ministerial positions, including the Bishop of London who became Lord High Treasurer in 1636
- Archbishop Laud's imposition of the Book of Common Prayer in Scotland in 1637 was fiercely opposed by members of Scottish Kirk. His policies towards Scotland provoked hostility in Scottish Parliament

- thousands of Scots signed the National Covenant in 1638, pledging to defend Presbyterianism. The Covenanting movement was a political challenge to Laud, and was also therefore a challenge to royal power in Scotland. This led to a weakening of Charles I's position in England as the military threat from the Covenanters forced the king to attempt to reconcile his differences with Parliament
- Charles I's defeat in the First and Second Bishops' Wars in 1639 and 1640 further weakened his authority over Parliament in England. Threats of Scottish invasion in 1640–1642 led to drastic action by Parliament in forming its own army.

**Political issues:**

- Charles I's employed the Duke of Buckingham as his Chief Minister and together the two men excluded Parliament from their negotiations with France and Spain
- Parliament passed the Petition of Right in 1628 condemning Buckingham's work raising taxes and imprisoning opponents, both carried out with the king's approval and without parliamentary consent
- Charles I believed in Divine Right, treated his promises to Parliament lightly, was a poor judge of character and surrounded himself with advisors unsuited to their positions
- after Buckingham died, the king was increasingly influenced by three people: his wife, Henrietta Maria, who encouraged him to relax laws against Roman Catholics; Archbishop Laud, who encouraged him to promote High Church policies; and Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Stafford, whose work as Chief Minister from 1628 to 1633 and then as Lord Deputy of Ireland made Charles I more absolute
- Parliament tried to introduce bills and antagonised the king by impeaching serving government ministers to show that members of the His Majesty's government were responsible to Parliament as well as the Crown. Charles I disapproved of this, and imprisoned critics in the Tower of London
- Charles I's used the prerogative law courts such as the Star Chamber to enforce royal policy. One example is the 1637 case in which 3 men were sentenced to be pilloried, have their ears cropped, and be imprisoned for life, merely for writing Puritanical pamphlets. MPs objected fiercely, believing that the Star Chamber was an instrument of the Crown
- the king also allowed the Archbishop of Canterbury to use the Court of High Commission to put on trial anyone who opposed his religious policy and to persecute Puritans. Laud even used his power in the High Commission to reverse some decisions made in common law courts
- when Parliament was asked to support Charles I's foreign policy it drew up the Petition of Right in 1628 and forced him to sign it in exchange for funds. This stated that taxes should not be levied without Parliament's consent, no-one could be imprisoned by the king without trial, soldiers and sailors could not be billeted in civilians' houses, and martial law should not be imposed on civilians
- in 1629, however, Charles I dissolved Parliament because it criticised his levying of tonnage and poundage. He ruled on his own until 1640 – the 'Eleven Year Tyranny'.

**Economic and financial issues:**

- Charles I wanted to be financially independent, but resorted to anachronistic methods of raising revenue, such as a Declaration of Forced Loans in 1626 to fund wars with France and Spain, and a continuation of the enforcement of the Forest Laws re-discovered by James I
- the punishing of Distraint of Knighthood raised £150,000 between 1633 and 1635 by fining those with incomes of over £40, a practice unheard of since medieval times
- the raising of Ship Money in 1635 was highly controversial, as the king demanded money to the value of a ship from towns throughout the country, extending the medieval practice of requesting this only from ports to aid the defence of the realm. The Ship Money Case of 1637 involved an MP, John Hampden, who refused to pay but was defeated in court
- the Tonnage and Poundage allowance, which gave the king a share in profits from farm-produce in order to help fund English naval supremacy, was awarded by Parliament in 1625 for one year only as the Charles I allowed the navy to decay. However, the king continued to raise this without MPs' consent up until 1628. Opposition to this in the House of Commons would eventually be a factor in the king's dissolving parliament in 1629
- the king encouraged trade and empire as means of raising revenue. Parts of Canada were sold to France in 1629, and a Commission for Plantations established merchants in the West Indies between 1634 and 1637. Parliament objected not so much to the notion of trade but to the king's favouritism in awarding contracts and membership of trading companies
- Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Stafford, was the king's chief minister from 1628 to 1633, and was authorised by Charles I to use the Council of the North to enforce his ruthless 'Thorough' policies in the north of England to put down rebellions and influence the justice system. From 1632 to 1640, Wentworth was made Lord Deputy of Ireland, and although he revived Ireland's fishing, farming and linen industries this was merely to generate more money for the crown and make the Irish subservient to the king.

**Actions of Charles and Parliament after 1640:**

- by 1640-41, Puritans and the High Church were in bitter dispute over proposed reforms of Church of England. Parliament had imposed anti-Episcopalian conditions on its co-operation with the king in his request for funds to fight Scotland
- Charles I had asked for Parliamentary funding for the Bishops' Wars in 1639 and 1640. MPs took advantage of the situation, demanding the abolition of ship money which would be seen as a victory in the face of years of perceived financial tyranny
- Parliament insisted on the introduction of the Triennial Act in 1641, legislating for Parliament to meet for at least a fifty-day session once every three years. In response to rumours of plots against him, in January 1642, Charles I entered the House of Commons to try and arrest 5 Puritan MPs, including John Hampden, but they escaped
- Parliament made increasing demands on the king, such as the abolition of the prerogative law courts including the Star Chamber, High Commission and Council of the North. The House of Commons impeached Wentworth who was then arrested in March 1641 and condemned to death after Charles I signed the death warrant
- there were minor rebellions in Ireland, as hostilities broke out after people rose up against the ruthless policies imposed by Wentworth during 1630s. In addition, threats were faced from Scotland, as with England in crisis, invasion by the Covenanters seemed likely
- Charles I left London for the north, joined by two-thirds of the House of Lords and one-third of the House of Commons. By the end of March 1642, Parliament had completed forming its own army and the king responded by raising standard at Nottingham. The English Civil War had begun.

**Any other relevant factor.**

7.

**Context:**

The English Civil War formally ended in January 1649, with the execution of Charles I. Oliver Cromwell ruled until his death in 1658, followed by his son Richard until 1660. He abolished the monarchy and attempted constitutional rule through the Council of State, the Barebones Parliament, and the First and Second Protectorate Parliaments.

**Cromwell's dominance:**

- Cromwell dominated politics and was in a unique position to influence the direction of the country; however, he was a contrary character
- Cromwell espoused democratic principles but acted in a dictatorial manner; he knew an elected government would contain his enemies
- Cromwell's roots were in Parliament but his rise to the rank of general during the Civil War meant he favoured the military during his rule
- Cromwell was conservative but his policies were ahead of their time, such as relief for the poor and insane during the Barebones Parliament
- Cromwell was a Puritan but passed progressive reforms, such as civil marriages, which horrified many Puritans
- all the pre-Civil War problems – such as religious, political, legal and economic issues – plus additional foreign policy issues, meant that Cromwell was always going to encounter difficulties
- Cromwell approved the execution of Charles I in 1649, which horrified many and led to accusations of regicide from Royalists
- without a king in England, Cromwell ruled on his own during the Interregnum, drawing comparisons with the periods when Charles I had ruled on his own, including the 11-year tyranny.

**Other factors:**

**Role of the army:**

- army officers formed the Council of State with the Rump Parliament. Extremists in the army opposed Parliament's role in government
- creation of a military dictatorship from 1653 drew comparisons with the use of Stuarts' martial law, as did the formation of the 1st Protectorate in September 1654 and the drawing up of military districts under major-generals during the second Protectorate from October 1656
- Parliamentarians resented the influence of the army on constitutional affairs throughout the Interregnum.

**Role of Parliament:**

- the Rump Parliament consisted of MPs who had failed to avert Civil War in 1642 and who now had to address the same problems in 1649
- Puritans amongst MPs viewed church reform as their priority
- Parliament was opposed to the role of the army, and wanted to have a greater say in drawing up the constitution
- quarrels between MPs and army officers during the Interregnum
- Parliament opposed toleration towards Roman Catholics, preventing religious wounds healing
- the Council of State subsequently abolished the monarchy and declared a Republic, or Commonwealth.

**Foreign issues:**

- faced with possible invasion on more than one front, Cromwell was forced to fight several battles to control Scotland
- he had to put down rebellions in Ireland by Royalists and Catholics brutally, which caused further resentment and hostility
- war was waged on Holland to enforce the Navigation Acts
- in the mid-1650s war with Spain caused increased taxes
- foreign affairs led to social issues such as coal shortages in winter 1652–1653 being addressed inappropriately, increasing instability
- in Scotland, Charles II was crowned king and some of his supporters wanted him to ascend the throne in England also, which led to distractions for Cromwell as he attempted to form a non-monarchical government.

**Unpopular legislation:**

- the Treason Law and Censorship Law were introduced in 1649; in 1650 the Oath of Allegiance was imposed for all men over 18
- 1654: High Court was abolished, causing a backlog of 23,000 cases
- the Barebones Parliament introduced too many reforms in a short time
- Barebones Parliament consisted of well-intentioned but inexperienced figures who proved incapable of using power effectively
- the constitution was drawn up solely by army officers
- Roman Catholics and Anglicans were excluded from voting by the First Protectorate, which also introduced strict moral codes that curtailed popular forms of entertainment and enforced the Sabbath
- the Commission of Triers and Committee of Ejectors, who appointed clergymen and schoolmasters, were unpopular with the church
- a 10% land tax was resented by the aristocracy; taxation in general was increased in order to fund wars with Spain
- Cromwell's approval of his son Richard as his successor led many to feel that Cromwell viewed himself as a monarchical figure
- Royalists accused Cromwell of regicide
- army extremists pushed for greater martial authority
- Presbyterians impatiently demanded church reforms
- there was no longer any monarchical check on Parliamentary power as there had been during the previous Stuart dynasty.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**8. Context:**

After the Interregnum, the monarchy was restored in 1660. Charles II reigned until 1685, although he used loopholes in the Restoration Settlement to rule without Parliament from 1681 onwards. His brother James II ruled from 1685, but his attempts at absolutism led to the Revolution of 1688–1689, when his daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange were asked by Parliament to become joint monarchs, under terms known as the Revolution Settlement. Factors contributing towards the terms of Revolution Settlement included the roles of both Charles II and James II, as well as religious and political issues and the role of Parliament.

**Role of Charles II:**

- the king, exiled in France for the Interregnum, had accepted limitations on his power when the monarchy was restored in 1660. However, loopholes in the Restoration Settlement allowed him to make policy without Parliament. This caused indignation among MPs
- the legal terms of the 1660 Restoration had upheld the Triennial Act and the abolition of prerogative law courts and prohibited non-Parliamentary taxation. It also stated that Charles II should live off his own finances and not receive money from Parliament, although in return, Parliament granted the king taxation on alcohol
- in 1677 the king's Lord Treasurer, the Earl of Danby, who was anti-French, was persuaded by some MPs to arrange the marriage of the king's niece, Mary, to William of Orange, a Dutch prince. This was a response to Charles II's foreign policy which broke the 1668 Triple Alliance with Holland and Sweden against France, by allying himself with Louis XIV. This did not reduce Parliament's alarm at the king's pro-French and Roman Catholic leanings
- nevertheless, towards end of reign Charles II ruled alone for 4 years after dissolving Parliament in March 1681 and ignoring the Triennial Act in 1684. In 1683 he imposed a new Charter for the City of London which said that all appointments to civil office, including Lord Mayor, should be subject to royal approval.

**Other factors:**

**Role of James VII/II:**

- the king, a Roman Catholic, ruled absolutely by dismissing Parliament in November 1685 before it could condemn Louis XIV's persecution of Huguenots, French Protestants. He then stationed a 16,000-strong army, including Roman Catholic officers, outside London
- James II imposed his will on the judicial system, re-establishing Prerogative Courts in 1686. In 1687, he used the monarch's Suspending Powers to suspend laws against Roman Catholics, and used the Dispensing Powers later that year to dismiss these laws from the statute books
- James II replaced Anglican advisors and office-holders with Roman Catholic ones, including making the Earl of Tyrconnel the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Sir Roger Strickland the Admiral of the Royal Navy. He appointed Roman Catholics to important posts at Oxford and Cambridge Universities
- in late 1688 as MPs made clear their determination to invite the king's Protestant daughter Mary to become queen, he tried to use the Stuarts' links with Louis XIV to appeal for military and financial assistance. However, the French king offered little more than vocal support.

**Religious issues:**

- James II issued the First Declaration of Indulgence in 1687 which suspended the Test Act, which stated that all holders of civil office, both military and political, should be Anglican and should swear an oath against Roman Catholic doctrine
- the king also issued the Second Declaration of Indulgence in 1688, which stated that toleration towards Roman Catholics should be preached in every church in England on two successive Sundays
- Charles II had been an Anglican, but had secretly signed the Treaty of Dover in 1670, a deal agreeing with Louis XIV that he would declare himself Roman Catholic when his relations with Parliament improved. He entered the Third Dutch War in alliance with France in 1672 and eventually declared himself a Roman Catholic on his death bed
- James II promoted Roman Catholics to key posts in government and the army. The new heir to the throne, born in 1685, was to be raised as a Roman Catholic. This religious crisis this created in the minds of MPs drove the momentum for Parliamentarians to send for William and Mary
- the Restoration Settlement in 1660 had stated that the Church of England would carry on using the Prayer Book approved by the Stuarts. There were hostile divisions between Episcopalians and Presbyterians.

**Political issues:**

- James II's use of the Suspending and Dispensing Powers in 1687, although not illegal, was seen by Parliament as a misuse of royal privilege. Questions had also been raised by MPs over monarchical control of the army after the king called troops to London in 1685, which was perceived as another abuse of power
- as in the pre-Civil War era, both post-Restoration Stuart monarchs advocated Divine Right and practised absolutism. Charles II's dismissal of Parliament in 1681 and James II's dissolution in 1685 resembled Charles I's conduct at the start of his 'Eleven Year Tyranny' in 1629
- Charles II's Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Clarendon, had been unpopular due to his mishandling of the Second Dutch War between 1665 and 1667, and was even blamed for the Great Plague of 1665 and the Fire of London in 1666. MPs opposed his influence at court and impeached him in 1667, forcing him into exile
- so, in June 1688 as crisis approached, James II hastily promised to recall Parliament by November and announced that Roman Catholics would be ineligible to sit in it. He also replaced Roman Catholic advisors, as well as those in the high ranks of the army and navy, with Protestant ones.

**Role of Parliament:**

- Parliament resented James II's abuses of power but took comfort from the thought that he would be succeeded by his Protestant daughter Mary. However, the king's wife had a son, James Edward, in June 1688, to be raised as Roman Catholic. This led to Parliament writing to Mary, by now married to the Dutch Prince William of Orange, offering her the Crown
- William and Mary arrived at Torbay in November with an army of 15,000, and after many in the House of Lords declared their support for William, on Christmas Day James II fled to France. Parliament had also persuaded the king's younger daughter Anne, as well as leading generals, to declare their support for Mary. Subsequent to these events, William and Mary became joint sovereigns on 13 February 1689
- with no document resembling a Bill of Rights that would formalise the powers held by monarch and Parliament, some MPs felt that a settlement involving William and Mary would have to include one. Without one, future monarchs, including William and Mary, could preach notions of Divine Right, absolutism and passive obedience. This meant that Parliament wanted limitations on the power of the monarchy to be written into law

- in 1689, therefore, Parliament drew up a Declaration of Right, which legalised a new relationship between Crown and Parliament in matters such as finance, law, the succession and religion. This became the Bill of Rights in December that year and had to be signed by William and Mary as a condition of their remaining on the throne. The importance of the Bill of Rights confirms the view that the blurred lines between monarchs and Parliament had been a problem in the past.

**Any other relevant factors.**



9. **Context:**

The Atlantic slave trade involving British merchant fleets was important to the development of the British economy during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. British ports developed, and manufacturing and industry was stimulated by the supply of factory-made goods to British slave traders who used them to exchange for enslaved Africans with African slave traders on the west coast of Africa, particularly in Nigeria, Togo and Dahomey (now Benin). Profits from the slave trade provided the capital for investment in British industry and agriculture and the expansion of Glasgow, Liverpool, Bristol and London. The British insurance and banking sectors took off during this period. The reasons for the development of the slave trade included military factors, the importance of West Indian colonies, the shortage of labour, racist attitudes and religious factors.

**Military factors:**

- the Seven Years War which started in 1756 was chiefly an imperial war fought between Britain, France and Spain. Many of the most important battles of the Seven Years War were fought at sea to win control of valuable overseas colonies where slavery could be used to exploit the richness of the land
- profits from slavery plantations could be used to justify British prosecution of the war
- Britain emerged from the war as the leading European imperial power, having made large territorial gains in North America and the Caribbean, as well as India
- the further development of slave labour was necessary to exploit these gains.

**Other factors:**

**Importance of West Indian colonies:**

- the slave trade generated capital for the British government as it was an important source of tax revenue due to the vast profits made by British traders in cotton, sugar and tobacco
- West Indian colonies were an important source of valuable exports to European neighbours
- financial, commercial, legal and insurance institutions emerged to support the activities of the slave traders
- Lloyds of London was founded to serve the interests of the slave trading companies
- slave traders became bankers and many new businesses were financed by profits made from slave trading
- as a result of the slave trade with Africa and the West Indian colonies canals were built to allow access from places like Stoke and Manchester to the port of Liverpool
- because of the slave trade with Africa and the West Indies, Bristol expanded greatly, with over 2000 ships registered as leaving for Africa and the West Indies during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Even more so in Liverpool
- as a result of profits from West Indian trade, many buildings were built in Glasgow by the tobacco lords.

**Shortage of labour:**

- huge profits made from the trade in tropical crops like rice, indigo and tobacco created a demand for labour to work on plantations to exploit the trade as much as possible
- crops such as sugar cane required a large labour force to plant, tend, harvest and process in harsh conditions
- a high death rate among native populations due to lack of resistance to diseases brought by Europeans and ill-treatment at the hands of colonists created a labour shortage in the West Indies
- there was a decline in the number of native West Indians who were first used as a source of labour in the West Indies due to poor diet as well as European diseases
- few colonists were willing to work voluntarily on the plantations as manual labour, believing it to be beneath them
- there were limits to the number of British criminals who could be sent to the West Indies as forced labour
- transportation to the West Indies to serve in forced labour was an alternative to hanging. Harsh British laws at the time meant there were over 300 capital crimes e.g., pickpocketing more than 1 shilling's worth of goods, shoplifting 5 shilling's worth or more, stealing a sheep or a horse, poaching rabbits, which were punishable by death
- as a result, for economic reasons plantation owners started to turn to enslaved Africans for labour
- enslaved Africans were cheap and that while an indentured servant (a British citizen pleading poverty in order to serve 3-7 years in the plantations) would be working for a limited number of years, the enslaved African would work for life.

**Racist attitudes:**

- the unequal relationship created because of the enslavement of Africans was justified by racist ideology
- there was a widespread belief in Britain that Africans were naturally inferior to Europeans and should therefore be subservient to them
- entrenched racism among members of the merchant and landowning classes – who were represented in the House of Commons- meant that enslaving African captives was accepted by colonists
- many Europeans claimed that African captives would suffer if the slave trade was abolished, e.g. criminals and prisoners of war who would normally be sold to Europeans as enslaved people would be butchered and executed at home instead if there was no Atlantic slave trade
- many colonists believed that enslaved Africans were fortunate to be provided with homes, protection and employment, in the care of enlightened Europeans rather than African despots.

**Religious factors:**

- the Church of England had links to slavery through the United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel missionary organisations which had plantations and owned enslaved people
- the Church of England supported laws stating that enslaved Africans should not be educated
- some Bible passages such as the Curse of Ham from Genesis were used to justify slavery since in the Book of Genesis it can be interpreted that God sanctions the enslavement of Canaanites by the Israelites
- other Bible extracts such as the Book of Exodus were banned in British colonies because they could be interpreted as being anti-slavery
- many believed that Africans benefited from slavery as they became Christian, resulting in the spread of 'civilisation'. However, this did not necessarily mean that slaves would be treated as equals
- some clergy tried to push the idea that it was possible to be a 'good slave and a Christian' and pointed to St Paul's epistles, which called for enslaved people to 'obey their masters'
- very little missionary work took place during the early years of the Atlantic slave trade, since merchants felt that religion would get in the way of a moneymaking venture by taking Africans away from their work on plantations
- Christianity was also felt to inadvertently teach enslaved people potentially subversive ideas and make it hard to justify the cruel mistreatment of fellow Christians.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**10. Context:**

During the peak period of the Atlantic slave trade in the 18th century, the relationship between enslaved people and their owners varied. In essence, the slave trade and the institution of slavery were commercially based, and most British slavers, traders and sailors on slave ships, as well as colonial farmers, entered the trade or owned or worked the plantations as a means of income. Financial considerations were usually paramount.

**Humanitarian concerns:**

- humanitarian concerns had little impact on the treatment of enslaved people in slave factories in Ghana such as Fort Nassau, Cape Coast Castle or Fort Christiansborg where living conditions were dungeon-like
- on the Middle Passage humanitarian concerns were rarely applied on the ships where enslaved Africans were kept in cramped conditions with only enough food and medical care to get them across the Atlantic alive
- some slave ship captains were more humane than others and lessened the harsh conditions of the Middle Passage
- British sailors and slavers were not in daily close contact with enslaved people and did not get to know them personally
- contrarily, in the West Indian plantations, small communities existed where members of the owner's family were present and sometimes bonds of affection grew between enslaved people and free people
- where such personal ties did not exist, however, there was often brutality towards enslaved people.

**Other factors:**

**Religious concerns:**

- slave traders and owners cited the existence of slavery in the Bible and used this as a justification for the institution. Passages from the Books of Genesis and Exodus, especially the Curse of Ham which illustrated Israelite enslavement of the Canaanites were presented as evidence for the morality of slavery
- slave traders and owners claimed that enslaved people were being exposed to Christianity
- enslavement could therefore be claimed as being good for enslaved people, as it gave them the chance of eternal salvation through Christianity
- some slave traders or owners were religious and in fact this moderated their treatment of enslaved people who might otherwise have been exposed to brutality.

**Financial considerations:**

- slave ships carried as many enslaved people as possible in order to make as much profit as possible and the issue over 'loose' or 'tight' pack on board enslaved people ships had little to do with humanitarianism
- in loose pack, enslaved people were treated better and had better conditions, but the prime motivation was not humanitarian concerns, rather the transport of as many enslaved people as possible to the auctions in the West Indies, alive
- at auctions at the end of the Middle Passage, enslaved people were chosen for their ability to work to raise plantation profits, and little thought was given to family bonds
- to extract as much work from enslaved people as possible on the plantations, enslaved people were often beaten, or exposed to even worse treatment
- as enslaved people were property, bought and paid for, they were valuable which meant that some owners were reluctant to use brutality on them
- on the other hand, in the period before abolition, enslaved people were cheap enough to work, or beat, to death, which was known as 'wastage'
- the British Caribbean islands were affected by the culture of absentee owners, leaving estates to be managed by overseers whose main interest was to amass profits in order to gain a foothold in the plantation economy
- owners and overseers were aware of the risks to their own health from a lengthy stay in the West Indies and often were concerned to make as much money as quickly as possible in order to return to Britain and enjoy their wealth.

**Fear of revolt:**

- on both slave ships and plantations, there was constant fear of a slave revolt because of the intolerable conditions which enslaved people might risk their lives to escape from
- on ships, security was paramount, as crews were heavily outnumbered by their cargoes, meaning that enslaved people were kept under decks for long periods
- enslaved people were usually shackled for the whole passage, being released for carefully guarded exercise on deck for short periods only
- as the number of revolts on slave ships grew so did the cost as larger crews were required
- on plantations, there was fear of slave resistance, both aggressive and passive
- draconian legal codes were enacted by legislative island assemblies which were dominated by planters, which covered the treatment and punishment of runaways as well as those who resisted openly
- escaped ex-slaves called maroons raided plantations, killed militia and freed slaves due to the inability of the planters to crush them, leading to the planters entering into a treaty with the Maroons which gave them some toleration in return for leaving the slave system alone.

**Racism and prejudice:**

- the harsh treatment of enslaved Africans was often justified by racism, with 18<sup>th</sup> century values including the belief that Africans were inferior to Europeans
- slave traders who bought enslaved people at trading posts on the African coast often believed that African captives would otherwise be executed as prisoners of war or for crimes by their African rulers, so for the traders this justified the buying of slaves to take them to the West Indies where Christianity would civilise them
- there was ignorance of African culture and achievements, and Africans were regarded by some Europeans as almost another species, which was used as an excuse for extreme brutality
- enslaved people were treated not as fellow human beings but as moveable property belonging to traders and then owners
- even the case of the Liverpool slave ship, the Zong, with its killing of enslaved people en route to the West Indies was not considered to be murder in the eyes of the law.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**11. Context:**

The Atlantic slave trade changed the lives of millions of Africans who were forcibly transported to the Northern American continent and West Indies during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The impact of such population loss on Africa itself was profound, socially, culturally and economically. Individual enslaved people were exploited for the benefit of wealthy European traders and businessmen, and powerful Africans.

**Slave sellers and European ‘factories’ on the West African coast:**

- Europeans seldom ventured inland to capture the millions of people who were transported from Africa as captives. African ‘middlemen’ usually sold slaves to European factors who collected the enslaved people on the coast. In the areas where slavery was not practised, such as among the Xhosa people of southern Africa, European slave ship captains were unable to buy African captives
- European ‘factories’ were developed on the coast to control the slave trade. These ‘factories’ or forts held slaves until the arrival of slave ships.

**Development of slave-based states and economies:**

- Africans could be taken into slavery as punishment for a crime, as payment for a family debt, or most commonly of all, by being captured as prisoners of war. With the arrival of European and American ships offering trading goods in exchange for captives, Africans had an added incentive to enslave each other
- some societies preyed on others to obtain captives in exchange for European firearms, in the belief that if they did not acquire firearms in this way to protect themselves, they would be attacked and captured by their rivals and enemies who did possess such weapons. At the height of the Atlantic slave trade, only those states equipped with guns could withstand attacks from their neighbours. The acquisition of guns gave rulers an advantage over rivals and gave them greater incentive to capture and sell enslaved people. This led to the growth of kingdoms such as Dahomey whose key purpose was the slave trade. The mass importation of guns for enslaved people affected the balance of power between kingdoms
- as the Atlantic slave trade developed, more African societies were exposed to become involved in the trade of enslaved people.

**Destruction of societies:**

- rich and powerful Africans were able to demand a variety of consumer goods, such as textiles, glassware, pottery, ironmongery and in some places, even gold for captives, who may have been acquired through warfare or by other means, initially without massive disruption to African societies
- by the end of 17<sup>th</sup> century, European demand for African captives, particularly for the sugar plantations in the Americas, became so great that they could only be acquired through initiating raiding and warfare; large areas of Africa were devastated, and societies disintegrated. As the temptation to go to war increased, existing systems of rule based on kinship and consent were destroyed
- it is estimated that over 12 million people were transported from Africa over the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In addition, many more Africans died during the journey from the interior to the coast – a journey which could take weeks. This was a huge drain on the most productive and economically active sections of the population, and this led to economic dislocation and falls in production of food and other goods
- Europeans also brought diseases which contributed to the decline in population of African societies.

**Development of foreign colonies:**

- West Africa was impoverished by its relationship with Europe while the human and other resources that were taken from Africa contributed to the economic development and wealth of Europe and the European colonies in the New World
- the transatlantic trade also created the conditions for the subsequent colonial conquest of Africa by the European powers.

**Roles played by leaders of African societies in continuing the trade:**

- African slave sellers grew wealthy by selling African captives to European traders on the coast. They were able to deal on equal terms with European traders who built 'factories' on the West African coast to house captives before selling them onto the slave ship captains who in turn transported the captives to the colonies of the New World
- on the African side, the slave trade was generally the business of rulers or wealthy and powerful merchants, concerned with their own selfish or narrow interests, rather than those of the continent. At that time, there was no concept of being African – identity and loyalty were based on kinship or membership of a specific kingdom or society, rather than to the African continent
- states based on slavery, particularly Dahomey, grew in power and influence. The Asante (Ashanti) people who traded in gold and in enslaved people dominated the area known as the Gold Coast (Ghana).

**Any other relevant factors.**



12. **Context:**

The Atlantic slave trade was exploited by British merchants during the 18<sup>th</sup> century but was eventually threatened by the abolitionist movement. The early progress of abolitionist campaigns was temporarily stalled by events outside Britain. One such event was the slave rebellion in St Domingue, the effects of which led to a fear of similar slave rebellions breaking out across the West Indian colonies. The obstacles to abolition included the importance of the trade to the British economy and the effects of the French Revolution, anti-abolition propaganda and the attitudes of British governments.

**Slave rebellion in St Domingue:**

- an obstacle to abolition was the fear of the impact of ending the slave trade including the actions of potential former enslaved people against their former owners
- fears over the consequences of abolition were increased in 1791 when 500,000 slaves on the French colony of St. Domingue rose up against their rulers and ended slavery, with a high loss of life, perhaps as high as 200,000
- under the leadership of Toussaint L'Ouverture, the former slaves were victorious and the French slave colony of St. Domingue became the free black Republic of Haiti
- abolition was associated with the St. Domingue rebellion, which became a symbol of violence and possibly exaggerated the general fear of slave revolts to an artificial level
- such slave violence as reported from St. Domingue played into the hands of the slave lobby, confirming their warnings of anarchy if enslaved people became free after abolition of the trade
- the defeat of the colonial French by rebellious slaves on St. Domingue sent shock waves throughout the Atlantic world and unsettled owners of enslaved people everywhere
- leading British slavers were worried that similar slave rebellions might break out on neighbouring British islands the enslaved people in Jamaica, St. Vincent, Demerara (now Guyana), Grenada and St. Lucia all rebelled
- these Britons in the West Indies attempted to ban any moves towards abolishing the slave trade claiming it would encourage enslaved people in the West Indies to revolt
- Britain suffered humiliation when it attempted to take the rebel French colony, beaten by disease and the ex-slave army
- when the Revolutionary government of France attempted to regain control, however, support for abolition grew as a means of striking at the French once war was declared.

**Other factors:**

**Effects of the French Revolution:**

- the French Revolution had a detrimental effect on the progress of the abolitionist campaign as there was the belief among many British MPs that the abolitionist cause was associated with French revolutionary ideas
- the abolitionist campaigner, Thomas Clarkson, openly supported the ideals of the French Revolution, which allowed the anti-abolition cause to link abolitionists with the subversive views developing in France
- although initially the French Revolution was generally welcomed in some British political circles, the execution of Louis XVI and eventual war between Britain and France changed the views of both the public and Britain's politicians

- wealthy and powerful people in Britain were shocked by the events in France which were viewed as being far too radical, and British politicians subsequently became worried about the activities of British radicals, fearing they had links with their French counterparts
- in Britain political societies which had supported the French Revolution were now forced to shut down, and some basic civil freedoms began to be withdrawn, anti-republican associations were formed, and government informers became more common due to a fear that events in France may be repeated in Britain
- a few acts of parliament were passed which limited civil rights, such as approval for any political meeting being required if more than 50 people were in attendance
- people could be arrested if they spoke or wrote in any way which could stir up hatred or criticism of the government, and despite his support for abolition William Wilberforce gave his support to these acts
- the result was a slowing down of popular grassroots support for the Abolition Societies, which had made such an impact in the 1780s
- due to the similarity in tactics between abolitionists and British radicals – associations, petitions, cheap publications, public lectures, public meetings, pressure on Parliament, etc some abolitionists were linked to radicals who themselves were linked- at least by association with the French Revolutionaries
- anti-republican associations produced petitions and evidence suggests some people were frightened to refuse to sign these, and in this climate it became difficult for the abolitionists as anti-abolitionists linked them to French radical politics and made them appear unpatriotic
- by the late 1790s very few, apart from hardened radicals, still supported abolition, and so the momentum towards abolition had slowed down as a direct result of the French Revolution
- Britain's involvement in the French Revolutionary Wars also delayed the abolitionist campaign, as opposing the slave trade during a major war against an abolitionist French government felt unpatriotic, leading to a loss of support for the abolitionists' cause
- it was argued that the slave trade was vital in Britain being able to sustain an expensive war effort against France, as not only did Britain need ships and sailors to protect itself and the Empire but a lot of money was required to pay for the war with France, so Britain could not risk ending the slave trade, as this might result in a loss of much needed finance.

**Importance of the trade to the British economy:**

- the slave trade generated finance, being an important source of tax revenue from slave shipping companies who made massive profits and the developing banking and insurance industries who also profited greatly from slaver clients
- West Indian colonies were an important source of valuable exports to European neighbours so if abolition occurred then taxes would have to be raised to compensate for the loss of trade and revenue
- abolition could help foreign rivals such as France as other nations would fill the gap left by Britain
- British cotton mills, particularly in Lanarkshire and Lancashire, depended on cotton produced by enslaved people
- individuals, businesses and ports in Britain prospered on the back of the slave trade
- Africa provided an additional market for British manufactured goods, which benefitted not just ports but also manufacturing towns such as Manchester and Stoke
- shipbuilding benefited, as did maritime employment in areas such as ropemaking and sail making.

**Anti-abolition propaganda:**

- vested interests spurred on by bankers, insurance executives and shipping magnates conducted a powerful propaganda campaign to counter that of the abolitionists, even though some of the arguments and evidence were specious
- slave owners and their supporters argued that millions of pounds worth of property would be threatened by the abolition of the slave trade
- it was argued that the slave trade was necessary to provide essential labour on the plantations
- some in the anti-abolition movement argued that abolition of the slave trade would ruin the colonies.

**Attitudes of British governments:**

- initially British governments were anxious to protect the rights of property, which attacks on slavery seemed to threaten
- the tactical decision to concentrate on the abolition of the slave trade circumvented this to an extent
- successive British Governments were influenced by powerful vested interests in Parliament and industry that had the wealth and power to buy votes and exert pressure on others in support of the slave trade
- many absentee plantation owners and merchants involved in the slave trade rose to high office as mayors or served in Parliament
- William Beckford, the owner of a 22,000-acre estate in Jamaica, was twice Lord Mayor of London and had friends in parliamentary circles
- in the mid to late 1700s over 50 MPs in Parliament represented the interest of slave plantation owners
- many MPs themselves had become wealthy as a result of the slave trade which made it difficult to get a law abolishing the slave trade through Parliament, since some of these MPs were wealthy and powerful enough to bribe other MPs to oppose abolition
- Liverpool MPs Banastre Tarleton and Richard Pennant used the House of Commons to protect their families' business interests
- Members of Parliament who supported the slave trade made speeches in Parliament opposing abolition, arguing that millions of pounds worth of property would be threatened by the abolition of the slave trade
- anti-abolitionist parliamentarians also argued that the slave trade was necessary to provide essential labour on the plantations and that abolition of the slave trade would ruin the colonies
- MPs with business interests which made money from associations with the slave trade used delaying tactics to slow down any moves towards abolition or supported compromise solutions
- in 1792, in a response to Wilberforce's bill to end the slave trade, Henry Dundas proposed a compromise of gradual abolition over a number of years, and Dundas- termed the 'uncrowned king of Scotland' – was Secretary of State for War and First Lord of the Admiralty, and as such, protected the interests of Scottish and British merchants in the Caribbean
- wealthy merchants from London, Liverpool and Bristol also exerted pressure on governments to oppose the abolition of the slave trade, with a 1775 petition sent to Parliament by the mayor, merchants and people of Bristol in support of maintaining the slave trade
- the House of Commons was dominated by various interest groups, of which the West India Lobby was for long the most powerful, and their tactics included producing pro slave trade witnesses to testify in parliamentary inquiries into the slave trade
- the West India Lobby included the Duke of Clarence, one of the sons of George III, and proved tough opposition to the abolitionists
- governments were often coalitions of interests, and often relied on patronage, either through the distribution of posts or the appeasement of such interests.

**Any other relevant factors.**

13. **Context:**

Context In 1851 political power was in the hands of a small number of land-owning men. By 1928 this had totally changed, and Britain could be described as a democratic country. This happened for a variety of reasons, including Party advantage.

**Party advantage:**

- in 1867 the Conservative Party became the government after 20 years out of power. To an extent the Second Reform Act could be seen as ‘stealing the Liberals’ clothes’ to gain support
- the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act of 1883 limited the amount of spending on elections; the Liberals believed the advantage held by wealthier Conservative opponents would be reduced
- by placing the reforms of 1883 and 1884 close to the next election, the Liberals hoped to gain advantage from grateful new voters in towns more fairly represented after the redistribution of seats
- politicians combined acceptance of changes which they suspected were unavoidable while ensuring that their own party-political interests would be protected.

**Other factors:**

**Effects of industrialisation and urbanisation:**

- urbanisation and growing class identity within an industrial workforce and the spread of socialist ideas led to demands for greater voice for the working classes. Also, the growth of the Labour Party offered a greater choice
- demographic change, including rapid urbanisation, sparked demands for redistribution of seats
- the growing economic power of middle-class wealth-creators led to pressure for a greater political voice
- basic education, the development of new cheap, popular newspapers and the spread of railways helped to create an awareness of national issues
- after 1860 the fear of the ‘revolutionary mob’ had declined. Skilled working men in cities were more educated and respectable. That was an argument for extending the vote in 1867.

**Pressure groups:**

- the Suffragists and Suffragettes were influential in gaining the franchise for women
- the Reform League and Reform Union were active in pushing for franchise change.

**Examples of developments abroad:**

- in a number of foreign countries there was a wider franchise than in Britain; in other countries, such as New Zealand, Finland, Australia, some American states, women could also vote
- neither development had threatened the established social order.

**Effects of the First World War:**

- the war necessitated more political change. Many men still had no vote but were conscripted to fight from 1916
- as further reform for males was being considered, fears of a revival of the militant women's campaign, combined with a realisation of the importance of women's war work led to the Representation of the People Act of 1918 which gave votes to more men and some women.

**Changing political attitudes:**

- political reform was no longer seen as a threat. In the USA and in Europe struggles were taking place for liberty and a greater political say for 'the people'. Britain tended to support these moves abroad, making it logical for this to happen in Britain
- the growing influence of the Liberal Party in challenging older vested interests. The Liberal Party opposed the power of the old land-owning aristocracy, e.g., the secret ballot to assist the electorate to use their 'political voice' to promote social reforms
- the death of former PM Palmerston represented the changing tone of politics as the reactionary ideas of early 19<sup>th</sup> century gave way to new ideologies
- the veto of the unelected House of Lords was removed in the 1911 Parliament Act partly as result of the 1910 elections fought on the issue of 'peers v people' and the financing of social reform to help the poor, especially in urban areas.

**Popular attempts to gain the franchise:**

- the Hyde Park demonstration 23 July 1866 organised by the Reform League
- the 1867 Reform Act was passed amongst considerable popular agitations.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**14. Context:**

The campaigns for women's suffrage must be seen within the wider context of a changing society and the massive social and political changes happening in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The campaign for women's suffrage was a clear attempt to influence the development of democracy in Britain at a time of changing attitudes to women in society. Women finally gained the right to vote on equal terms as men in 1928.

**Changing attitudes to women in society:**

- the campaigns for women's suffrage could also be seen within the context of societies' changing attitudes towards women in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries e.g., in the words of Martin Pugh, 'their participation in local government made women's exclusion from national elections increasingly untenable.' From 1888 women could vote in many local council elections
- several laws were passed to improve female standing in society e.g., 1873 Infant Custody Act, 1882 and 1893 Married Women's Property Acts
- women increasingly became involved in work that was seen as traditional male jobs such as teaching and other white-collar jobs
- Millicent Fawcett, a leader of the NUWSS, argued that wider social changes were vital factors in the winning of the right to vote.

**Other factors:**

**Suffragist campaign:**

- Millicent Fawcett leader of the NUWSS believed in moderate, peaceful tactics to win the vote such as meetings, pamphlets, petitions and parliamentary bills
- membership remained relatively low at about 6,000 until around 1909 but grew to 53,000 by 1914 as women angered by the Suffragettes' campaign, found a new home.

**Suffragette campaign:**

- Emmeline Pankhurst formed the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) in 1903. WSPU adopted the motto 'Deeds Not Words'. The new strategy gained publicity with noisy heckling of politicians. Newspapers immediately took notice. The Suffragettes had achieved their first objective – publicity. Violent protest followed, e.g., window smashing campaign and arson attacks aimed to provoke insurance company pressure on the Government. The prisons filled with Suffragettes
- women used hunger strikes as a political weapon to embarrass the government. In response the government introduced the Prisoner's (Temporary Discharge for Ill Health) Act – the Cat and Mouse Act
- the actions of the Suffragettes mobilised opinion for and against. It can be argued that were it not for the Suffragette campaign, the Liberal Government would not even have discussed women's suffrage before World War One. But for opponents the militant campaign provided an excellent example of why women could not be trusted with the vote.

**Women in the war effort, 1914–1918:**

- Britain declared war on Germany on 4 August 1914 and two days later the NUWSS suspended its political campaigning for the vote. Undoubtedly the sight of women ‘doing their bit’ for the war effort gained respect and balanced the negative publicity of the earlier Suffragette campaign. A WSPU pro-war propaganda campaign encouraged men to join the armed forces and women to demand ‘the right to serve’
- women’s war work was important to Britain’s eventual victory. Over 700,000 women were employed making munitions
- the creation of a wartime coalition also opened the door to change. The traditional explanation for the granting of the vote to some women in 1918 has been that women’s valuable work for the war effort radically changed male ideas about their role in society and that the vote in 1918 was almost a ‘thank you’ for their efforts. But the women who were given the vote were ‘respectable’ ladies, 30 or over, not the younger women who worked long hours and risked their lives in munitions factories
- another argument about the 1918 Act is that it only happened because politicians grew anxious to enfranchise more men who had fought in the war but lost their residency qualification to vote and women could be ‘added on’ to legislation that was happening anyway
- the war acted more as a catalyst, but the tide was flowing towards female franchise before it started.

**Example of other countries:**

- many parts of the British Empire had given women the vote. Women in New Zealand were given the vote in 1893, Australia in 1902 and some areas of Canada in 1916
- Finland was the first country in Europe to give women the right to vote in 1906. Some US states such as Washington, Oregon and Kansas gave the vote to women before World War One potentially embarrassing if the ‘. . . mother of parliaments’ did not give women the vote at home
- little evidence of parliamentary debates showing concerns or worry about parts of the Empire enfranchising women.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**15. Context:**

Attitudes towards poverty in the 19th century were laissez-faire. The Liberals had not been elected on a social reform ticket in 1906. However, the overwhelming evidence regarding the scale of poverty, as well as developing concerns about the health of the nation (as an Empire Britain could ill afford to let her economic lead slip), led to a series of limited social reforms that were initiated by the Liberal Party. This was in part due to New Liberalism.

**New Liberalism:**

- New Liberals argued that state intervention was necessary to liberate people from social problems over which they had no control. New Liberal ideas were not important issues in the general election of 1906. Only when 'old liberal' Prime Minister Campbell Bannerman died in 1908, was the door opened for new 'interventionist' ideas
- leading New Liberals like David Lloyd George and Winston Churchill were important in initiating reform
- New Liberalism provided the rationale for increased state intervention in people's lives. This was limited however.

**Other factors:**

**Social surveys of Booth and Rowntree:**

- the reports of Charles Booth in London and Seebohm Rowntree in York demonstrated that poverty had causes such as low pay, unemployment, sickness and old age rather than a problem of character. These were largely out with the control of the individual
- they provided the statistical evidence detailing the scale of poverty that was difficult for the government to ignore
- the extent of poverty revealed in the surveys was also a shock. Booth's initial survey was confined to the east end of London, but his later volumes covering the rest of London revealed that almost one third of the capital's population lived in poverty. York was a relatively prosperous small town, but even there, poverty was deep-rooted with a similar percentage of the population living in poverty
- Rowntree identified primary and secondary poverty
- Rowntree identified a cycle of poverty.

**Municipal socialism:**

- by the end of the century, some Liberal-controlled local authorities had become involved in programmes of social welfare. The shocked reaction to the reports on poverty was a pressure for further reform
- in Birmingham particularly, but also in other large industrial cities, local authorities had taken the lead in providing social welfare schemes. These served as an example for further reforms
- Joseph Chamberlain was mayor of Birmingham between 1873 and 1875. Under his leadership gas and water supplies came under public ownership. He also oversaw the clearing of slums and the development of parks
- Glasgow's local authority also supported Municipal Socialism and controlled the water supply and provided gas street lighting to improve people's lives.



**Fears over national security:**

- the government became alarmed when almost 25% of the volunteers to fight in the Boer War were rejected because they were physically unfit to serve in the armed forces
- there was concern whether Britain could survive a war or protect its empire against a far stronger enemy in the future if the nation's 'fighting stock' of young men was so unhealthy
- link between national security concerns and national efficiency concerns; financial or economic security
- by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Britain was facing serious competition from new industrial nations such as Germany. It was believed that if the health and educational standards of Britain's workers got worse, then Britain's position as a strong industrial power would be threatened.

**Rise of Labour:**

- by 1906, the newly formed Labour Party was competing for the same votes as the Liberals. It can be argued that the reforms happened for the very selfish reason of retaining working-class vote
- the Liberals recognised the electoral threat of the Labour Representation Committee (Labour Party from 1906) and in 1903 negotiated a Liberal-Labour electoral pact which allowed Labour to run unopposed by the Liberals in seats where there was a large working-class vote. By 1910, Labour had 42 seats.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**16. Context:**

Attitudes towards poverty in the 19th century were laissez-faire. Although the Liberals had not been elected on a social reform manifesto in 1906, the overwhelming evidence regarding the scale of poverty, as well as developing concerns about the health of the nation. As an Empire Britain could ill afford to let her economic lead slip, this led to a series of limited social reforms that were introduced by the Liberal Party.

**The young:**

- children were thought to be the victims of poverty and unable to escape through their own efforts. In this way they were ‘the deserving poor’
- the Education (Provision of School Meals) Act 1906 allowed local authorities to raise money to pay for school meals but the law did not force local authorities to provide school meals
- medical inspections after 1907 for children were made compulsory but no treatment of illnesses or infections found was provided until 1912
- the Children’s Act (The Children’s Charter) 1908 banned children under 16 from smoking, drinking alcohol, or begging. New juvenile courts were set up for children accused of committing crimes, as were borstals for children convicted of breaking the law
- probation officers were employed to help former offenders in an attempt to avoid re-offending
- the time taken to enforce all the legislation meant the Children’s Charter only helped improve conditions for some children during the period.

**The old:**

- Rowntree had identified old age as the time when most people dropped below his poverty line. Old age was inescapable and so was clearly associated with the problem of poverty
- Old Age Pensions Act (1908) gave people over 70 up to 5 shillings a week. Once a person over 70 had income above 12 shillings a week, their entitlement to a pension stopped. Married couples were given 7 shillings and 6 pence
- the level of benefit was low. Few of the elderly poor would live till their 70th birthday. Many of the old were excluded from claiming pensions because they failed to meet the qualification rules
- by 1914 one million people were receiving a pension.

**The sick:**

- illness was seen as both a cause and consequence of poverty
- the National Insurance Act Part 1, 1911 applied to workers earning less than £160 a year. Each insured worker got 9 pence in contributions from an outlay of 4 pence – ‘ninepence for fourpence’. As a result, workers would be paid 10s a week for the first thirteen weeks
- only the insured worker got free medical treatment from a doctor. Other family members did not benefit from the scheme. The weekly contribution was in effect a wage cut which might simply have made poverty worse in many families.

**The unemployed:**

- unemployment was a cause of poverty
- the National Insurance Act Part 2, 1911 only covered unemployment for some workers in some industries and like Part 1 of the Act, required contributions from workers, employers and the government. For most workers, no unemployment insurance scheme existed
- only some trades were involved, e.g., shipbuilding, mechanical engineering, construction and iron founding.

**The employed:**

- Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906 covered a further six million workers who could now claim compensation for injuries and diseases which were the result of working conditions
- Trade Boards Act, 1909 tried to protect workers in the sweated trades like tailoring and lace making by setting up trade boards to fix minimum wages
- both the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1908 and the Shops Act, 1911 improved conditions.

**Any other relevant factors.**

17. **Context:**

Government in Ireland in the late 19th century had created a number of politically experienced leaders. This, coupled with land reform, gave political nationalism an economic base from which to demand self-government. There was also an increasingly radical edge to this, albeit at the margins, through James Connolly and the Irish Socialist Republican Party. Tension was exacerbated by the reaction from the Protestant dominated north of Ireland.

**Role of John Redmond and the Nationalist Party (this includes the 1910 elections):**

- Redmond claimed that the Home Rule Bill would lead to greater unity and strength in the Union, ending suspicion and disaffection in Ireland, and between Britain and Ireland. It would show Britain was willing to treat Ireland equally, as part of the empire
- Redmond's Party was consistently strong throughout Southern Ireland, where there was strong support for Home Rule
- in 1908 Campbell-Bannerman had been replaced as Prime Minister by Asquith, who in 1909 had declared that he was a supporter of Home Rule
- 1910 the Liberals needed the help of the Irish Nationalists to run the country as they would not have a majority otherwise; they passed the Third Home Rule Bill
- with the support of John Redmond, leader of the Nationalists, a Bill was passed to reduce the power of the House of Lords, which was dominated by Conservatives, from being able to block a Bill to only being able to hold up the passing of a Bill for two years. As a result, the Home Rule Bill for Ireland, which was previously blocked by the House of Lords, could now be passed.

**Other factors:**

**Irish Cultural Revival (Gaelic League/Gaelic Athletic Association):**

- in 1883 the Gaelic League was set up whose aim it was to revive and preserve the Irish language and Gaelic literature
- there was a growth in the Gaelic League to over 400 branches by the turn of the century; new publications such as the Gaelic Journal appeared; there were also examples of writers creating the sense of nationhood e.g., Alice Milligan, Lady Gregory, Patrick Pearse, WB Yeats
- in 1884 the Gaelic Athletic Association was set up 'for the preservation and cultivation of our national pastimes.' Games like Gaelic football and hurling became very popular.

**Re-emergence of Irish Republicanism (Irish Republican Brotherhood/Sinn Féin):**

- Sinn Féin was founded by Arthur Griffith in 1905 to boycott all things British and to press for the Irish to set up their own parliament in Ireland, which Griffith thought would cause the British Government in Ireland to collapse
- The IRB was revived with Thomas Clarke recruiting young men in Dublin for the movement. Both these groups wanted an Ireland separate from Britain and both willing to use force
- many Sinn Féin members, including Griffiths, went on to join the Irish Volunteers at the outbreak of WWI. IRB influence in Ulster increased with the formation of 'Dungannon Clubs' in 1905/1906.

**Differing economic and religious features:**

- Ulster was mainly Protestant and feared that a government led by Dublin would see the imposition of laws on Ireland based on the Catholic faith; Protestants were opposed to this
- Ulster people were worried they would lose the economic benefits they enjoyed from being part of the British Empire, such as the linen industry and the shipbuilding industry
- it was only in Ulster that Ireland had an industrial economy, thus these concerns weren't shared in the same way by people in the southern provinces of Ireland, which were more agrarian based.

**Responses of Unionists and Nationalists to the Home Rule Bill:**

- the roles of Carson and Craig: Sir Edward Carson's theatrical political performances caught the public imagination and brought the case of the Unionists to the nation. At the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant in Belfast at Town Hall, to the world's press, 250,000 Ulstermen pledged themselves to use 'all means necessary' to defeat Home Rule
- in 1912, during the Third Home Rule crisis, the Ulster Unionist Council (UUC) decided to establish a paramilitary body the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF)
- Curragh Mutiny: British officers stationed in Ireland declared they would not use force against the Unionists
- the Irish Volunteer Force (IVF) was set up as a reaction. Members from the Gaelic League, the Gaelic Athletic Association, Sinn Féin and the IRB all joined hoping to use the IVF for their own purposes. By May 1914 it had 80,000 members
- in 1913, a third private army was set up, the Irish Citizen Army, under the leadership of James Connolly and James Larkin. It had two clear aims – to gain independence for Ireland and set up a socialist republic, for working class of all religions to join up with to improve their lives.

**Any other relevant points.**

**18. Context:**

The radicalisation of Irish politics engendered during the First World War, led to conflict between the British State and Irish nationalists. Attempts to solve the problem of who was to govern in Ireland led to the 1920 Government of Ireland Act, which effectively created two governments, one in Belfast and one in Dublin. This gave only very limited devolved power which was unacceptable to the Irish nationalists.

**Irish attitudes to British rule after World War I:**

- the aftermath of the Easter Rising, and the anti-conscription campaign, led to a decline in support for the Nationalist Party and a huge growth in support for Sinn Féin (Sinn Féin membership reached 112,000). In the 1918 General Election, Sinn Féin won 73 seats, compared to winning none in 1910, 34 representatives were in prison, 1 had been deported, 2 were ill and 7 were absent on Sinn Féin business, so there were only 25 present when they held their first public meeting in January 1919. This meant control of the nationalist movement largely moved to the IRB and the IVF
- the IRA was prepared to wage an armed struggle against the British. At Croke Park, where there was a Gaelic football match taking place, the Black and Tans fired into the crowd, killing 12 people and injuring 60
- Unionists had made a huge blood sacrifice in the First World War (e.g., on the Somme) and naturally expected this to be reflected in any post-war settlement in Ireland.

**Other factors:****Role of the Dáil (Declaration of Independence):**

- Republicans led by Sinn Féin, who did not attend Westminster, met at the Mansion House in Dublin and declared themselves 'Dáil Éireann'
- De Valera was made the President of Ireland, Arthur Griffith Vice President and Michael Collins Minister of Finance
- most local councils in Ireland, except in Ulster, recognised the rule of the new assembly
- by 1921, 1,000 Sinn Féin law courts had been set up and Collins raised £350,000 as many people paid their taxes to the Minister of Finance, Collins, rather than the British Government
- the Dáil failed to meet very regularly but worked using couriers carrying communications between those in hiding. Law and order was maintained though, as the Dáil relied on 'alternative' courts, presided over by a priest or lawyer and backed up by the IRA. This system won the support of the Irish communities as well as the established Irish legal system
- the Dáil had won the support of masses, the Catholic Church and professional classes in Ireland. The Dáil wrested power away from Britain to a considerable extent due to the military wing of the Dáil.

**Position of Ulster Unionists:**

- 1918 election, Unionists won 22 seats, an increase in 5, making partition increasingly likely
- influence of Carson; Unionists were the most significant Irish voice at Westminster; Unionists argued successfully for the 6 counties to be given a separate parliament, causing much friction
- Unionists had made a huge blood sacrifice in the First World War (e.g., on the Somme) and naturally expected this to be reflected in any post-war settlement in Ireland.

**Policies and actions of the British government:**

- the Government of Ireland Act. The Act was intended to establish separate Home Rule institutions within two new subdivisions of Ireland: the six north-eastern counties were to form Northern Ireland, while the larger part of the country was to form Southern Ireland
- the British aim between 1918 and 1921 was to reduce Ireland to obedience within the United Kingdom. The Dáil was declared illegal by the British authorities and in doing this the British government relied increasingly on military force, introducing special powers of arrest and imprisonment
- RIC members were instructed to challenge civilians from ambush and shoot them if they did not obey the RIC officers. RIC officers were encouraged to shoot those suspected of being a threat, sometimes innocent people were killed. RIC officers were protected by their superiors
- the Black and Tans were responsible for violence, theft, drunken rampages, attacks on villages such as the burning of Balbriggan, village creameries being burnt down and houses destroyed. In 1920, the Lord Mayor of Cork, Tomás Mac Curtain was shot dead by RIC men
- the violence led to a drift to extremism, culminating in the sacking of Cork city by the Black and Tans.

**IRA tactics and policies:**

- the IRA campaign used guerrilla tactics against a militarily stronger foe, e.g., attacks on agencies of law and order, RIC, magistrates and police barracks, ambush, assassination, the disappearance of opponents, the sabotage of enemy communications and the intimidation of local communities into not supporting the British forces, attacks on British troops and G-men (detectives concentrating on IRA atrocities), the attempted assassination of Lord French (Viceroy)
- British forces found these increasingly frustrating to contend with, and this ramped up the violence and bitterness on both sides.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**19. Context:**

The Irish Civil War was a direct consequence of the Anglo-Irish Treaty which was itself the result of the Irish War of Independence. Those who had signed the Treaty, headed by Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith formed a Provisional Government to oversee the handover of power from the British to the new Irish state. However, what brought about the civil war was the split in ranks of the IRA.

**Role of the British government:**

- in July 1921, a truce was arranged between the British and Irish Republican forces. Negotiations were opened and ended in the signing of the Treaty on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1921
- the Treaty gave the 26 southern counties of Ireland a considerable degree of independence, the same within the British commonwealth as Australia and Canada
- under this agreement, Ireland became a Dominion of the British Empire, rather than being completely independent of Britain. Under Dominion status, the new Irish State had three important things to adhere to: the elected representatives of the people were to take an oath of allegiance to the British Crown; the Crown was to be represented by a Governor General; appeals in certain legal cases could be taken to the Privy Council in London
- this aspect of the Treaty was repugnant to many Irish people, not just Republicans
- the British military garrison was to be withdrawn and the RIC police disbanded.

**Other factors:**

**Anglo-Irish Treaty:**

- Ireland was to be the 'Irish Free State', governing itself, making its own laws but remaining in the Empire
- a Governor General was to represent the king: Britain was to remove its forces but keep the use of its naval bases
- trade relations were settled
- Lloyd George threatened the Irish delegation with war if they did not sign.

**Divisions in the republican movement:**

- the Treaty was hotly debated in the Dáil. Collins and much of the IRA supported the Treaty, as Ireland now had an elected government. De Valera opposed it and felt it should be resisted even if it meant Civil War. They represented the two wings of the Republican movement
- also influential were the widows and other relatives of those who had died; they were vocal in their opposition to the Treaty
- the Treaty was particularly disappointing to left-wing Republicans who had hopes of establishing a socialist republic
- the Treaty was accepted by 64 votes to 57 by the Dáil Éireann on 7<sup>th</sup> January 1922
- Collins and De Valera tried to reach a compromise to avoid war, but none was reached. Some of the IRA units supported the Treaty, whilst others opposed it
- some of the anti-Treaty IRA took over some important buildings in Dublin e.g., Four Courts
- this division, crystallised by the murder of Sir Henry Wilson (security adviser for the Northern Ireland government), forced Michael Collins to call on the official IRA to suppress the 'Irregular IRA'.

**Role of Collins:**

- Collins negotiated the Treaty with Churchill but was pressured to sign it under a threat of escalation of the conflict
- Collins defended the Treaty as he claimed it gave Ireland 'freedom to achieve freedom'
- Collins and Griffiths started informal negotiations with the British side and hammered out the details of the treaty
- he claimed Ireland had its own elected government, so Britain was no longer the enemy
- he recognised that the war was unwinnable, both for the IRA and the UK government.

**Role of De Valera:**

- De Valera refused to accept the terms of the Treaty as they were in 'violent conflict with the wishes of the majority of the nation'. De Valera claimed that the Treaty meant partition of Ireland and abandonment of sovereignty. De Valera felt he should have been consulted before the Treaty was signed
- De Valera voted against the Treaty and resigned as President to be replaced by Griffith and Collins became Head of the Irish Free Government.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**20. Context:**

By the early 1960s Northern Ireland was relatively stable. In 1964 a peaceful civil rights campaign started to end discrimination against Catholics in Northern Ireland. From the autumn of 1968 onwards, a wide range of activists marched behind the civil rights banner, adopting civil disobedience in an attempt to secure their goals. The growing crisis led to a growth in tension and an outbreak of violence by 1969 and the beginning of 'The Troubles.'

**Role of the IRA:**

- rioting and disorder in 1966 was followed by the murders of two Catholics and a Protestant by a 'loyalist' terror group called the Ulster Volunteer Force, who were immediately banned by O'Neill
- peaceful civil rights marches descended into violence in October 1968 when marchers in Derry defied the Royal Ulster Constabulary and were dispersed with heavy-handed tactics. The RUC response only served to inflame further the Catholic community and foster the establishment of the Provisional IRA by 1970 as the IRA split into Official and Provisional factions
- the Provisional IRA's strategy was to use force to cause the collapse of the Northern Ireland administration and to inflict casualties on the British forces such that the British government be forced by public opinion to withdraw from Ireland
- PIRA were seen to defend Catholic areas from Loyalist attacks in the summer of 1970.

**Other factors:**

**Unionist political ascendancy in Northern Ireland:**

- population of Northern Ireland divided: two-thirds Protestant and one-third Catholic: it was the minority who were discriminated against in employment and housing
- in 1963, the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, Viscount Brookeborough, stepped down after 20 years in office. His long tenure was a product of the Ulster Unionist domination of politics in Northern Ireland since partition in 1921
- before 1969 local elections not held on a 'one person, one vote' basis: gerrymandering used to secure unionist majorities on local councils. Local government electoral boundaries favoured unionist candidates, even in mainly Catholic areas like Derry/Londonderry. Also, right to vote in local elections restricted to ratepayers, favouring Protestants, with those holding or renting properties in more than one ward receiving more than one vote, up to a maximum of six. This bias preserved by unequal allocation of council houses to Protestant families
- challenges as Prime Minister O'Neill expressed desire to improve community relations in Northern Ireland and create a better relationship with the government in Dublin, hoping that this would address the sense of alienation felt by Catholics towards the political system in Northern Ireland
- post-war Britain's Labour government introduced the welfare state to Northern Ireland, and it was implemented with few concessions to traditional sectarian divisions. Catholic children in the 1950s and 1960s shared in the benefits of further and higher education for the first time. This exposed them to a world of new ideas and created a generation unwilling to tolerate the status quo
- many Catholics impatient with pace of reform and remained unconvinced of Prime Minister O'Neill's sincerity. Founding of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA) in 1967. NICRA did not challenge partition, though membership mainly Catholic. Instead, it called for the end to seven 'injustices', ranging from council house allocations to the 'weighted' voting system.

**Cultural and political differences between communities:**

- the Catholic minority politically marginalised since the 1920s but retained its distinct identity through its own institutions such as the Catholic Church, separate Catholic schools, and various cultural associations, as well as the hostility of the Protestant majority
- Catholic political representatives in parliament refused to recognise partition and this only increased the community's sense of alienation and difference from the Unionist majority in Northern Ireland
- Nationalists on average 10-12 in NI Parliament compared to average 40 Unionists. In Westminster 10-12 Unionists to 2 Nationalists
- as the Republic's constitution laid claim to the whole island of Ireland, O'Neill's meeting with his Dublin counterpart, Seán Lemass, in 1965, provoked attacks from within unionism, e.g., the Rev. Ian Paisley
- violence erupted between the two communities, in 1966 following the twin 50th anniversaries of the Battle of the Somme and the Easter Rising. Both events were key cultural touchstones for the Protestant and Catholic communities.

**Economic issues:**

- Northern Ireland was left relatively prosperous by World War Two, with the boom continuing into the 1950s. But by the 1960s, as elsewhere in Britain, these industries were in decline e.g., Harland and Wolff profitable 'til early 60s, but government required help in 1966. Largely Protestant workforce protected as a result
- Catholic areas received less government investment than their Protestant neighbours. Catholics were more likely to be unemployed or in low-paid jobs than Protestants in N. Ireland. Catholic applicants also routinely excluded from public service appointments
- the incomes of mainly Protestant landowners were supported by the British system of 'deficiency payments' which gave Northern Ireland farmers an advantage over farmers from the Irish Republic
- Brookeborough's failure to address the worsening economic situation saw him forced to resign as Prime Minister. His successor, Terence O'Neill set out to reform the economy. His social and economic policies saw growing discontent and divisions within his Unionist party.

**Issue of Civil Rights:**

- from the autumn of 1968 onwards, a wide range of activists marched behind the civil rights banner, adopting civil disobedience in an attempt to secure their goals. Housing activists, socialists, nationalists, unionists, republicans, students, trade unionists and political representatives came together across Northern Ireland to demand civil rights for Catholics in Northern Ireland
- the demand for basic civil rights from the Northern Ireland government was an effort to move the traditional fault-lines away from the familiar Catholic-Protestant, nationalist-unionist divides by demanding basic rights for all citizens of Britain
- civil rights encouraged by television coverage of civil rights protest in USA and student protests in Europe. Also, by widening TV ownership: 1954, 10,000 licences, by 1962 there were 200,000 leading to increased Catholic awareness of the issues that affected them
- as the civil rights campaign gained momentum, so too did unionist opposition. Sectarian tension rose: was difficult to control, and civil disobedience descended into occasions of civil disorder. Peaceful civil rights marches descended into violence in October 1968 when marchers in Derry defied the Royal Ulster Constabulary and were dispersed with heavy-handed tactics
- many Catholics impatient with pace of reform and remained unconvinced of Prime Minister O'Neill's sincerity. Founding of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA) in 1967. NICRA did not challenge partition, though membership mainly Catholic. Instead, it called for the end to seven 'injustices', ranging from council house allocations to the 'weighted' voting system.

**Any other relevant factors.**

## SECTION 2 – EUROPEAN AND WORLD

### PART A – The crusades, 1071–1204

#### 21. Context:

In 1095 Pope Urban II called on thousands of knights to unite against the infidel. Pope Urban II's famous speech at the Council of Clermont also made detailed reference to the violence committed by Christians against fellow Christians. A crusade would also increase the papacy's political status in Europe. The Pope would be seen as a great leader, above princes and emperors.

#### Ongoing struggle between church and state:

- popes now actually challenged kings and demanded the right to appoint priests, bishops and cardinals as they saw fit. This led to the development of the Investiture Contest, a prolonged war between Pope Gregory VII and the German Emperor, Henry IV. A low point was reached in 1080 when Henry appointed a separate Pope and attacked Rome with his armies the following year. This power struggle had damaged the reputation of the papacy and directly affected Urban, possibly influencing his decision
- a crusade would increase the papacy's political status in Europe. The Pope would be seen as a great leader, above princes and emperors
- it is believed the Investiture Contest may have delayed the calling of a crusade
- there may have been a crusade to drive back the Seljuk as early as the mid-1070s but Gregory's struggle against the German Emperor meant he was too weak to see it through.

#### Other factors:

#### Threat to Byzantium:

- the Seljuk Turks had been threatening the Empire for decades. The Byzantines had been defeated by the Turks in 1071 at the Battle of Manzikert in eastern Anatolia. Between 1077 and 1092 the Byzantines had been driven out of the eastern regions of Anatolia, and the Turks were now encroaching further west towards the Byzantine capital of Constantinople
- there was fear in Europe that if Byzantium was allowed to fall then the expansion of this new aggressive Islamic group into central Europe would be inevitable
- the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius, was seen as a bulwark against this eventuality and his letter asking for help was taken very seriously
- the threat to Byzantium was perhaps exaggerated by the Emperor Alexius who had negotiated a treaty with Kilij Arslan in 1092 and was hiring more and more mercenaries from Europe to protect the Empire.

**Fear of Islamic expansion:**

- founded by the Prophet Muhammad, the Islamic religion had exploded onto the world in the late 7th century, advancing across the Christian principalities of North Africa, through Spain and into southern France, where it had been halted in the 8th century and pushed back into Spain
- Pope Urban used the fear of Islamic expansion in his famous speech at Clermont in 1095. He pointed to the successful Reconquista in Spain. El Cid had only captured Valencia from the Moors in 1094
- he pointed to the threat of the Turks to Byzantium, a topic that was already talked about across Europe. He claimed that the loss of Anatolia had 'devastated the Kingdom of God'
- Urban detailed claims of Turkish activities such as torture, human sacrifice and desecration.

**Threat to Mediterranean trade:**

- the development of trade within the Mediterranean Sea had been in the hands of ambitious cities in Italy, notably Venice, but also Pisa and Genoa. By 1095 Venice had bound its future to Byzantium
- their preferential trade agreements with Constantinople for silk, spices and other luxury goods meant that they were keen to see Byzantium saved from the expansion of the Turks.

**Papal desire to channel the aggressive nature of feudal society:**

- Urban's appeal specifically targeted the nobility of France and northern Europe in an attempt to divert the violence of the warring European kingdoms. The nobility were regularly drawn into wars with their neighbours to take extra land or to settle disputes between rivals
- in Medieval Europe the knight was a feature of the feudal system. These highly trained warriors were, by definition, killers. However, the Church considered killing a sin. The desire to divert this aggression in a useful way motivated Urban. The prospect of a just war where participation ensured the pardoning of sins was attractive to many knights as it gave them a purpose and ensured salvation
- the Church was determined to reverse what it perceived as the breakdown of society in many parts of Western Europe. The culture of violence disturbed the entire local society: peasants became foot soldiers and farming and trade were disrupted. As a man of God, Urban II saw a crusade as an opportunity to avoid the evils of war in Europe
- the Church had already successfully introduced the Peace of God movement which attempted to stop the violence. Attempts included forbidding fighting on certain days of the week and sparing churches and non-combatants in any conflict. Urban saw the Crusade as a way to channel this aggression out of Europe and into the Middle East which would be of benefit to Christianity.

**The emergence of a knightly class – the idea of chivalry:**

- medieval society saw the development of heavily armoured and skilled warrior knights
- the Church did not really approve of knights as their training and focus as killers went against the teachings of Christ (thou shalt not kill)
- going on Crusade was an opportunity to use the skills of the knightly class in a productive way that would benefit Christianity and offer the knights the chance to have their sins forgiven as they were doing god's work in reclaiming Jerusalem for Christianity.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**22. Context:**

Despite many hardships, the First Crusade was a unique and overwhelming success. The constant fighting in 12<sup>th</sup> century Europe had well prepared the organised and disciplined knightly classes for warfare. The military power of the Crusader knights was very much to their advantage and assisted them in their victories.

**Military power of the Crusader knights:**

- the First Crusade had been unexpected by local Muslim leaders. Those who witnessed the ineptitude of the People's Crusade expected Christian knights to be as weak in combat. However, the Christian knights were often ferocious fighters, used to long campaigns in Europe, whereas the knights of the east were gentlemen of culture and education
- the mounted tactics of the knights were relatively unknown in the east and the sight of the largest concentration of knights in history assembled on the field was an awesome sight. This full-frontal charge of the knights contrasted with the tactics deployed by the Islamic forces. Their hit-and-run horse archers were not prepared for this aggressive style
- it was the strategic skill of Bohemond of Taranto and the discipline that he had instilled in his men which saved the crusaders from a ferocious Turkish attack near Dorylaeum
- Crusading knights used aggressive combat tactics and used heavy armour and barding for their horses. The constant fighting of the 12<sup>th</sup> century had well prepared the organised and disciplined knightly classes for warfare. Many, such as Raymond of Toulouse, had combat experience against the Moors in Spain.

**Other Factors**

**Divisions among the Islamic states:**

- the division in the Islamic faith was between the Sunni and the Shia, a split dating back to the death of the prophet Muhammad (AD 632)
- by the 1070s, the Sunni controlled Asia Minor and Syria, under the leadership of the caliph of Baghdad while the Shia ruled Egypt under a caliph based in Cairo. The two groups hated each other more than they hated the crusaders and were known to form alliances with the crusaders in order to make gains on their fellow Muslim enemy
- at the time of the First Crusade, there was a lack of stable leadership in Anatolia due to the death of several leaders from both the Sunni and the Shia branches of Islam. A series of petty rulers fought for leadership
- as a result, the Islamic response to the First Crusade was slow in getting under way. Not only were the Islamic leaders more willing to fight among themselves than join forces against the common enemy, many did not even realise that the crusaders were a common enemy. Kilij Arslan, e.g., expected the 'Princes Crusade' to be no more of a concern than Peter the Hermit's followers; he was off raiding his Muslim neighbours when Nicaea came under attack
- further evidence of division among the Islamic states was when Kerbogha's army abandoned him at the battle of Antioch in 1098. Many had feared that his victory would allow him to gain a semblance of authority over the other Seljuk Turkish leaders. There was tension in his army as the Turks mistrusted the Arab-speaking Muslims and the different tribes of nomads. The lack of unity was clear among the divisions of Ridwan of Aleppo and Duqaq of Damascus. Infighting among the Turkish leaders led to Kerbogha being abandoned at the battle's critical moment

- the fundamental division of Muslims between the Fatimids and the Seljuk is shown by the Egyptians' seizure of Jerusalem. The Egyptian Army used siege engines to reduce the walls of Jerusalem in a siege that lasted 6 weeks. This not only damaged the defences of the city but reduced the number of defenders available. The Fatimids sent embassies to the crusaders offering them Jerusalem in exchange for an alliance against the Seljuk.

**Misunderstanding of the Crusaders' intent:**

- Muslims misunderstood the threat of the western knights. Many saw this as another expedition from Byzantium and thought them soldiers of Alexius. Such raids had occurred before; however, this was different
- the Christians had an ideological motivation not yet encountered by the Islamic leaders
- for the Muslims the First Crusade was not seen as a holy war, at least not at the outset. To the Muslims, unifying to face the Christians was a more dangerous idea than the crusaders themselves.

**Aid from Byzantium:**

- the First Crusade was the only crusade to have significant support from Constantinople. Even though Alexius' army did not participate in the crusade itself, they did cause problems, diverting a lot of Muslim resources
- Alexius also provided much needed supplies at the sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem.

**Religious zeal of the Crusaders:**

- without their belief in what they accepted as God's Will; the First Crusade would have disintegrated long before it reached Jerusalem. The sheer determination of the Crusaders helped them through incredible hardships during their passage through the Taurus Mountains and at the sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem
- because they believed God would help them, the Crusaders attempted the impossible, where most armies would have surrendered. Visions during the siege of Antioch and the discovery of the Holy Lance were much needed boosts to morale. The Lance had become a mystical weapon to be wielded on Christ's behalf. The fact that the Crusading army was now in possession of such a relic caused the majority of the Crusaders to believe in their own invincibility. The miracle perceived by the Crusaders lifted their spirits and brought them victory over Kerbogha's army at Antioch and gave them the energy and confidence for the next stage of their Crusade – Jerusalem
- another vision came to the rescue of the Crusaders at Jerusalem. Peter Desiderous announced he had received a vision from Bishop Adhemar saying the city would fall to them if they would fast and walk on barefoot in procession around the city. God's Hand was even clearer when the Crusaders fought their way across the city wall on 15 July 1099, the date that Adhemar, in vision, had foretold as the day by which the Christian army would capture Jerusalem
- despite Nicaea falling to the Byzantine emperor through negotiation and the skill of Bohemond of Taranto who saved the Crusaders at their first real battle at Dorylaeum, many Crusaders considered their success as part of God's plan.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**23. Context:**

In July 1187, the Muslim leader, Saladin wiped out the Crusader army at the Battle of Hattin, in Syria. Weeks later the Holy City of Jerusalem surrendered to the Islamic forces. Contributing to the fall of Jerusalem was the unification of the Islamic states under Saladin, in addition to a continual shortage of men and a lack of support from the West, as well as the divisions among the Crusaders after the death of Baldwin.

**Unification of Islamic states under Saladin:**

- in 1171 Saladin secured his control over Egypt
- Saladin then began to establish his control over Syria through patient diplomacy. Following Nur-ad-Din's death, Saladin wrote to Nur-ad-Din's son, al-Salih, expressing his loyalty. Saladin gained further legitimacy by marrying Nur-ad-Din's widow. In the first years of Saladin's rule, he established his authority over other Muslims in the name of al-Salih
- Saladin began to unite the Muslim Near East by occupying Damascus
- by 1174, several of Syria's warlords had switched their support to Saladin
- in 1183, Saladin finally brought Aleppo under his control
- Saladin had managed to successfully unite the Muslims of Syria and Egypt behind his leadership. This effectively surrounded Jerusalem and left them with a very weak military position
- after years of fighting Muslims as a precondition of waging jihad and after a severe illness in 1185–1186, Saladin became more determined to recapture Jerusalem and successfully used the idea of a religious war against the Christians to hold the separate Islamic groups together
- by way of balance, Saladin himself had his critics within the Muslim ranks, saying he was more interested in maintaining his position than defeating the Christians. It was seen by many that his stance on the Kingdom of Jerusalem was weak. After Guy assumed the throne and Reynald continued his attacks the pressure on Saladin to respond grew. This encouraged him to act aggressively.

**Other factors:**

**Death of Baldwin IV:**

- Baldwin IV was king of Jerusalem from 1174 until his death in 1185. He had to deal with the growing threat of Muslim re-conquest of the Holy Land by Saladin
- Baldwin was a brave knight and effective leader. He used a variety of military and diplomatic initiatives to hold Saladin at bay. He had relatively successful military operations against the forces of Saladin, with a notable victory at the Battle of Montgisard
- Baldwin was a leper. He died in March 1185, taking his strategy towards Saladin with him. He was replaced for a short time by his nephew, Baldwin V with Raymond of Tripoli as Regent
- Baldwin IV was succeeded by his sickly nine-year-old nephew Baldwin V, 'the Child King'. Baldwin V died within a year, and the kingdom spiralled into a bitter, factional, succession crisis
- Queen Sybil further inflamed the situation when she crowned her new husband, Guy de Lusignan, who became the last king of Jerusalem. Saladin's invasion of Galilee came in 1187, two years after Baldwin IV's death, resulting in the Fall of Jerusalem and the contraction of the kingdom to a foothold around the port of Tyre.

**Divisions amongst the Crusaders:**

- two factions had struggled for power within Baldwin IV's court, those of Guy de Lusignan and Baldwin's close advisor Raymond III of Tripoli. In 1180 Guy married Sibylla, Baldwin's sister. Guy tended to favour an aggressive policy
- the activities of Reynald of Chatillon helped to destabilise the fragile peace treaty between Baldwin IV and Saladin
- the Knights Templar, unlike the Hospitallers, were firmly in the camp of the hawks (warmongers). They wanted nothing more than to carry on with the crusading ideal and rid the Holy Lands of Muslims. Treaties and compromise were unacceptable to them.

**Lack of resources of the Christian states:**

- there was a lack of support from the Byzantine Empire. The Crusader states had been strengthened by a closer relationship with the Byzantine Empire during the reign of Manuel I. In 1180, the Byzantine Emperor died and the new Emperor Andronicus I showed little interest in supporting the Latin rulers of the Near East. After 1184, Saladin made a treaty with Byzantium, leaving the Holy City without Byzantine support
- European monarchs showed similar disinterest in the Crusader states. In 1184 three of the most important men in the Crusader states – the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the masters of the Hospitallers and Templars – were sent to Europe seeking support, but neither Philip II of France nor Henry II of England felt able to lead a new Crusade to the Holy Land
- the Crusaders sought to redress their military inferiority by constructing powerful fortifications. However, without the army to protect the kingdom even the massive fortifications could not withstand Saladin's forces
- even the combined armies of the Crusader States were not strong enough to successfully win a war, especially in the long run. It is arguable that it was inevitable for the Crusader States to fall to a united Islamic state.

**Christian defeat at Hattin:**

- King Guy led the armies of Jerusalem to save Count Tiberius's wife as Saladin's forces had surrounded her castle. Tiberius himself had few worries about the safety of his wife. His fortress could have withstood a siege. Saladin's forces lacked the required siege engines to make a successful attack. Additionally, Saladin could not keep his disparate forces in the field for any length of time. Tiberius' advice to Guy was to hold his forces back to protect Jerusalem
- however, figures such as Reynald had persuaded Guy that to leave the Countess of Tripoli besieged would be un-chivalric and that Guy would lose support if he did not ride out
- the army could find little water to sustain them in the desert. Their only option was to make for Hattin and the oasis there. This was an obvious trap; Saladin surrounded them with burning brushwood and dry grass. Trapped on the Horns of Hattin the Christian army suffered badly from the sun and lack of water
- eventually they were forced to attack before they lacked the strength to do so. The Christian horses were too weak for a prolonged struggle and their infantry was surrounded by Saladin's horse archers and cut off
- Saladin ordered the slaughter of all members of the militant orders, but Guy and many of his followers were allowed to surrender and enter captivity.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**24. Context:**

The Third Crusade is viewed as the greatest-ever crusade in Europe to be launched against the Muslim East. Both heroic military leadership and diplomatic negotiations were features of the Third Crusade. Despite defeating Saladin in battle and forcing Saladin to a peace treaty, Richard ultimately failed to recapture Jerusalem.

**Richard's military role:**

- despite Muslims and Christians having fought an on-off battle over Acre over 2 years, Richard's leadership and expertise broke the deadlock and forced the surrender of Acre after 5 weeks of bombardment, mining and repeated assaults
- Richard's arrival in June 1191 with money and the advantage of western military technology in the form of enormous siege engines which terrified opponents, enabled him to seize control of the battle and to intensify the bombardment
- Richard switched tactics at Acre after the destruction of his war machines. He offered his soldiers four gold coins for every stone they could remove from the base of one of the towers, putting so much effort on the one point that a breach in the wall was created
- further evidence of Richard's leadership skills at Acre were shown when, despite falling ill with 'arnaldia', he ordered himself to be carried to the walls in a silken quilt and there, protected by a screen, fired his crossbow at the city which further inspired his troops
- the capture of Acre was a major boost for the crusaders and brought the unimpeded rise of Saladin to a halt
- Richard demonstrated firm, if brutal, leadership in August 1191 when he took the decision to massacre the 2,700 Muslim prisoners taken at Acre when Saladin failed to meet the ransom payment. Richard knew feeding and guarding the prisoners would be a considerable burden and suspecting that Saladin was deliberately using delaying tactics to pin him down, Richard resolved the situation quickly and effectively in order to carry on his momentum and capitalise on his victory at Acre
- Richard demonstrated that he was a great military strategist on the march from Acre down the coast to Jaffa. Under Richard's leadership, the crusader army of 12,000 men set out along the coast in immaculate formation. Inland were the foot soldiers with their vital role of protecting the heavy cavalry. The cavalry were lined up with the Templars at the front and the Hospitallers at the back – the strongest men to protect the most vulnerable parts of the march. Between the cavalry and the sea was the baggage train – the weakest, slowest and most difficult part to defend. Finally, out to sea was the crusader fleet to provide the well-defended columns with essential supplies
- Richard's military leadership was crucial to the survival of the crusaders on the march to Jaffa. Forced to face terrible conditions, Richard allowed the soldiers rest days and prevented fights over the meat of dead horses. Despite the constant attacks, Richard showed discipline as he kept his troops marching even as they were being attacked by arrows. Richard was insistent that no crusader should respond and break formation, denying Saladin the chance to defeat the crusader forces. Richard wanted to charge on his own terms, discipline which showed him to be a military genius
- at the battle of Arsuf, Richard reacted immediately to the breaking of the crusader ranks and personally led the attack which eventually defeated the Muslims. Richard turned his whole army on the Muslims and fought off two fierce Muslim counter-attacks. Led by Richard, the crusaders charged into Saladin's army forcing them to retreat. Richard's planning and attention to detail allowed his personal bravery to stand out. The victory of Richard's army over Saladin's forces at the Battle of Arsuf, and the success of the crusaders in reaching Jaffa, was an important turning point in the Third Crusade, breaching Saladin's success
- at the battle of Jaffa, Richard displayed inspired military leadership and personal bravery. When he heard that Saladin had stormed the port of Jaffa in July 1192, he responded by rushing south from Acre with a tiny force of only 55 knights and crossbowmen at the head of a seaborne counter-attack. Despite being heavily outnumbered, Richard ordered his men to attack and was one of the first to wade ashore

- at the head of his small army. The surprise of his attack turned the battle around and gave the crusaders an improbable and dramatic victory. The Muslim troops were overawed by Richard's courage and nerve. Richard's highly disciplined and organised army had again proved too much for Saladin's men and they retreated
- Richard's ability as a military tactician was shown by his caution on the march to Jerusalem. To ensure his advance on Jerusalem could be properly sustained, Richard carefully rebuilt several fortresses along the route
- Richard also demonstrated his strategic competence when he withdrew twice from Jerusalem, realising that once recaptured, Jerusalem would be impossible to defend due to insufficient manpower and the possibility that their supply lines to the coast could be cut off by the Muslims. Despite his personal desire to march on Jerusalem, Richard was a general and his military sense told him that his depleted force of 12,000 men and lack of resources couldn't hold Jerusalem against Saladin's vast army drawn from across the Muslim world
- that Richard was a strong military strategist was also demonstrated on his journey to the Holy Land when he captured Cyprus and sold part of it to the Templars. Richard recognised the long-term importance of Cyprus as a base for crusading armies to use when supplying and reinforcing expeditions to the Holy Land
- Richard also realised that Egypt was the key to Saladin's wealth and resources. Ever the military strategist, Richard wanted to take the mighty fortress of Ascalon which would threaten Saladin's communications with Egypt. Richard was aware that in order to keep Jerusalem after it was captured, Egypt would need to be conquered first. The crusader army was not interested and wanted to proceed to Jerusalem
- although the Third Crusade failed in its aim of the recovery of Jerusalem, Richard's leadership played a crucial role in providing the crusaders with a firm hold on the coastline which would provide a series of bridgeheads for future crusades. Compared to the situation in 1187, the position of the crusaders had been transformed
- Richard also failed to draw Saladin into battle and inflict a decisive defeat. He failed to comprehensively defeat Saladin.

**Other factors:**

**Richard's use of diplomacy:**

- during the siege of Acre and despite his illness, Richard opened negotiations with Saladin showing his willingness to use diplomacy
- that Richard was skilled in the art of diplomacy was shown in his negotiations with Saladin's brother, Al-Adil. A bond was forged between them and Richard even offered his sister Joan to be one of Al-Adil's wives as part of a deal to divide Palestine between the crusaders and the Muslims. Richard's connection with Al-Adil was enough of an incentive for Saladin to agree to a truce with Richard
- Richard negotiated a 5-year truce over Jerusalem
- Richard showed poor diplomacy towards his allies. After the victory at Acre, Richard's men pulled down the banner of Count Leopold of Austria, claiming his status did not entitle him to fly his colours alongside the king of England, even though Leopold had been fighting at Acre for almost 2-years. This resulted in Leopold leaving Outremer in a rage, taking his German knights with him (18 months later he imprisoned Richard after the king was captured returning through Austria)
- Richard also failed to show subtlety in his dealings with King Philip. Richard's inability to share the spoils taken during this attack on Cyprus with Philip helped persuade the ill king of France that he was needed at home. The one thing Richard had wished to do was keep Philip with him on the crusade; now he had to worry about French incursions into his Angevin Empire.

### Saladin's military role:

- Saladin counter-attacked at Acre. Saladin's troops launched fierce attacks on the crusaders at given signals from the Muslim defenders and launched volley after volley of Greek fire, putting Richard on the defensive as all three of his giant siege towers went up in flames. Saladin also sent a huge supply ship with 650 fighting men in an attempt to break into Acre's harbour. After destroying several English vessels, it scuttled itself rather than have its cargo fall into Christian hands
- on the march south to Jaffa, Saladin's army unleashed a relentless series of forays and inflicted constant bombardment, tempting the Christians to break ranks. Saladin's skilled horsemen made lightning strikes on the crusaders showering the men and their horses with arrows and crossbow bolts. The crusaders lost many horses and the crusaders themselves resembled pincushions with as many as 10 arrows or crossbow bolts protruding from their chain mail
- Saladin massed his forces from Egypt and across Syria and launched an intense bombardment on the crusaders which tested the crusader knights' discipline and patience not to react to the absolute limits
- at the Battle of Arsuf, despite the devastating impact of the crusader charge, Saladin's own elite Mamluk units rallied and offered fierce resistance
- to prevent the crusaders taking Ascalon, Saladin made the decision to pull down Ascalon's walls and sacrifice the city
- while the crusaders remained in Jaffa and strengthened its fortifications, Saladin took the opportunity to destroy the networks of crusader castles and fortifications between Jaffa and Jerusalem
- in October 1191 as the crusaders set out from Jaffa and began the work of rebuilding the crusader forts along the route to Jerusalem, they were repeatedly attacked by Saladin's troops
- at the end of July 1192 Saladin decided to take advantage of the crusaders' retreat from Jerusalem by launching a lightning attack on Jaffa in an attempt to break the Christian stranglehold on the coast. In just 4 days the Muslim sappers and stone throwers destroyed sections of Jaffa's walls which left only a small Christian garrison trapped in the citadel. Saladin's forces blocked help coming from overland which meant that relief could only arrive by sea
- arguably Saladin's greatest military achievement was to gather and hold together (despite divisions) a broad coalition of Muslims in the face of setbacks at Acre, Arsuf and Jaffa. Although the consensus is that Saladin was not a great battlefield general (it could be argued that his triumph at Hattin was down more to the mistakes of the crusaders than his own skill), Saladin was still able to inspire his troops and fight back. Saladin's continued resistance had ensured that Jerusalem remained in Muslim hands
- Saladin found it increasingly difficult to keep his large army in the field for the whole year round. In contrast to the crusading army, many of his men were needed back on their farms or were only expected to provide a certain number of days' service
- Saladin's authority was ignored when the garrison at Acre struck a deal with Conrad of Montferrat to surrender. Saladin lost control of his men at Jaffa
- the stalemate at Jaffa showed that Saladin was incapable of driving the crusaders out of southern Palestine.

**Saladin's use of diplomacy:**

- during the siege of Acre and alongside the military skirmishes as the crusaders set out on their march to Jerusalem, Saladin and Richard were engaged in diplomacy. Both sides were willing to find areas of agreement at the same time as engaging in brutal combat
- following Richard's victory at Jaffa, Saladin knew he could not maintain such a level of military struggle indefinitely. He recognised the need to make a truce with Richard. On 2 September 1192, the Treaty of Jaffa was agreed which partitioned Palestine in return for a 3-year truce. While Saladin was to retain control of Jerusalem, the crusaders were allowed to keep the conquests of Acre and Jaffa and the coastal strip between the two towns. Christian pilgrims were also allowed access to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem
- Saladin faced increasing discontent from his Muslim allies
- Saladin negotiated a 5-year truce over Jerusalem despite his strong position.

**Rivalry between the Crusader leaders:**

- against advice, Richard backed Guy de Lusignan to become King of Jerusalem, against the popular Conrad of Montferrat, perhaps because he was the favourite of King Philip. This continued support of Guy resulted in a compromise that nobody liked
- the assassination of Conrad was suggested by some to be Richard's fault. The result was the withdrawal of the support of Conrad's forces and those of the Duke of Burgundy's remaining French knights.

**Any other relevant factors.**

25. **Context:**

By 1763, Britain had ruled the 13 American colonies for over a century. The harmony with Britain which colonists had once held had become indifference during Whig Ascendancy of the mid-1700s. The ascendancy of George III in 1760 was to bring about further change in the relationship between Britain and America. When the Seven Years War ended in 1763, the King strengthened Britain's control over the colonies. Factors contributing to colonial resentment included British neglect of the colonies, resentment towards the old colonial system, the Navigation Acts, the role of George III, and political differences between the colonies and Britain.

**British neglect of the colonies:**

- during the Whig Ascendancy from 1727–1760, colonist Assemblies had assumed the powers which should have been exercised by Governors, such as the settlement in new territories acquired during that time including the Ohio Valley and Louisiana. Although they objected Parliament's attempt to reverse this after the Royal Proclamation of 1763, they were politically impotent and could not prevent it
- in addition, individual colonists and land companies expanding west into the Michigan area unwittingly violated agreements between Britain and Native American Indians such as the 1761 Treaty of Detroit
- therefore, quarrels arose as it appeared that the British government, and in particular Secretary of State William Pitt, was ignoring colonist aspirations to explore new regions in the continent
- one school of thought suggests that Britain's policies highlighted the status of the colonies as lands to be fought over with imperial powers like France and Spain who viewed America as potential possessions, and that British legislation-maintained colonist security under the Union Jack
- however, colonists such as planter and lawyer Patrick Henry of Virginia believed by 1763 that, whilst the right of the king to the colonies was indisputable, the right of the British Parliament to make laws for them was highly contentious.

**Other factors:**

**Resentment towards the old colonial system:**

- the 13 colonies in North America had been used by Britain for almost two centuries as a source of revenue and convenient market
- valuable raw materials such as timber or cotton or fur were plundered from the continent and then used to manufacture goods which were then sold in Europe and around the world. This meant that the profits from North American goods were being made by British trading companies, which was resented by those colonists whose labour produced the raw materials to make goods such as fur-trimmed hats or rifles
- in addition, colonists in the more populated New England and middle colonies objected to being used as a dumping ground for British goods
- poverty led to minor rebellions by tenant farmers against their landlords throughout the 1740s, including the Land Riots in New Jersey and the Hudson River Valley Revolt in New York
- elsewhere, wealthy southern plantation owners, who considered themselves the aristocracy of the continent, objected to members of British Government attempting to control them through trading restrictions on sugar, cotton and molasses
- also, the Proclamation Line drawn up by Parliament in 1763 led to frontiersmen feeling frustrated at British attempts to prevent them from settling beyond the Appalachian Mountains
- some historians would point out that being part of the British Empire meant British Army protection for the colonists against the threat of the French and Indians; the British had fought the Seven Years' War which prevented the colonies being ruled by France. Despite this advantage, colonists greatly resented the efforts of Britain to restrict their movements and economic development.

**Navigation Acts:**

- the Navigation Acts stated that colonists in any parts of the British Empire could only sell their goods to British merchants, they could only import goods from British traders, and they could only use British shipping in the transportation of goods in and out of the colonies
- this meant that colonist merchants were being denied access to European markets for their produce such as tobacco or whale products, reducing their potential income and creating opposition to this aspect of British rule
- moreover, although colonists had ignored the Acts during the Whig Ascendancy, the laws were re-enforced by Prime Minister Grenville after the Seven Years' War ended in 1763
- this caused deep resentment, since the presence of the Royal Navy, patrolling the eastern seaboard for rogue Dutch, French or Spanish ships, restricted the trading ability of the colonists who felt their enterprising spirit was being penalised
- it could, however, be argued that the Navigation Acts gave the colonists a guaranteed market for their goods. Generally though, the Navigation Acts were disliked by those wishing to trade freely with European merchants.

**Role of George III:**

- George III increased the number of British soldiers posted to the colonies after the Seven Years' War ended in 1763
- one function of the king's Proclamation of 1763 was to protect the colonies from future threats posed by foreign powers. However, all colonies and even some larger towns and cities within the colonies had their own militia already, and felt that the British Army in fact posed a threat to the colonists' freedom to defend themselves
- in addition, George III ensured there was a highly visible Royal Navy attendance on the Atlantic coast, whose job it was to patrol for smugglers importing from Holland, France or Spain, and to ensure compliance with the Navigation Acts
- this measure, to support the Revenue Bill proposed in Parliament 1763 was seen as equivalent to foreign invasion by many colonists who had acted in an independent spirit during Whig Ascendancy
- on the other hand, it can be debated that George III was aiming to guarantee the protection of the colonies by maintaining British military presence, and that together with Parliament, he was planning a sensible economic strategy to raise money from the colonists to pay for their own security
- however, cynics in America argued that the king was merely working to ensure continued revenue for Britain, whose national debt had grown from £75 million to £145 million between 1756 and 1763.



**Political differences between the colonies and Britain:**

- the colonies were more enlightened politically than Britain, as each had its own elected assembly which had passed local laws and raised local taxes since the 1630s
- Britain appointed a governor for each colony, but the governor was paid by the colony, which ensured a slight element of control for colonists over whoever was in the post
- lack of representation for the colonists in the British Parliament which sought to control their lives, however, frustrated many
- in addition, radical proposals in the colonies were rejected by the British authorities, e.g., the abolition of slavery, favoured by the Massachusetts Assembly led by lawyer James Otis and brewer Samuel Adams, but was continually vetoed in the early 1760s by the British Governor Hutchinson
- nevertheless, some understood that the British Empire provided an order to the existence of the colonies, and Britain acted out the role of mother country in a protective manner. This did not stop many colonists from wishing to have a greater say in their own daily lives.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**26. Context:**

In the 1760s and 1770s, the 13 colonies in America witnessed resentment from colonists towards Britain. Several crises including the Stamp Act in 1765, the Boston Massacre in 1770 and the Tea Act in 1773 created a momentum of hostility. The colonists' last hope of compromise, the Olive Branch Petition, was rejected by Britain in 1775 and the Continental Congress declared independence in 1776, leading to a 5-year war which the colonists won. British people disagreed over the conflict in the colonies, with some favouring war, others urging reconciliation and others speaking up for the rights of the colonists themselves. Factors to be considered within British opinion include the views of the Earl of Chatham, George III, the British Parliament, Edmund Burke and Thomas Paine.

**Earl of Chatham:**

- as William Pitt, he had been Secretary of State during the Seven Years' War, and became regarded as architect of the Empire in America
- Pitt had been in favour of trade restrictions on the colonists
- he also considered a strong British military presence in America
- nevertheless, he condemned the Stamp Act as unfair, and although he supported later Parliamentary legislation for the colonies he disagreed with taxation
- he was ennobled as the Earl of Chatham when he became Prime Minister in 1766, and proclaimed himself a friend of America
- however, he seemed to object only to taxation, and pushed through the Quartering Act of 1765, which forced the colonies to pay for supplies and billets for British troops. This was opposed, particularly by the New York Assembly
- after he resigned amidst domestic political manoeuvrings in 1768, Chatham became increasingly aware of the colonists' plight in his final years, speaking against harsh measures towards America in the 1770s, and repeatedly cautioning the government about the impending crisis as war approached
- however, his warnings fell on deaf ears, as Parliament ignored his pleas for conciliation and his assertion that America could not be beaten if war broke out.

**Other factors:**

**George III:**

- the king re-imposed British authority on America soon after ascending the throne in 1760
- when the Seven Years' War ended in 1763 he ordered the strict application of the Navigation Acts. This led to colonists immediately resenting Parliament, who enforced the king's will by sending the army and navy to America
- popular in Britain, he brought about the dismissal or resignations of successive Prime Ministers in the 1760s, in part due to his desire to see firmer policies enforced on the colonies
- he supported Parliament's right to tax America, which created more radical opinions in the colonies against British policy.

**British Parliament:**

- the Proclamation Act in 1763, Stamp Act in 1765, Declaratory Act in 1766, Tea Act in 1773 and Coercive Acts in 1774 enforced British authority over the colonies

- repeated speeches by significant figures such as Lord Sandwich displayed a disregarded for warnings of the impending crisis, and seriously underestimated colonists' forces. This showed that most Lords and MPs endorsed the views of the king
- several ministries between 1763 and 1776 sought to control America through the military enforcement of policy
- Prime Ministers were supported in the House of Lords in their assertions of Parliament's absolute sovereignty over the American colonies as in all parts of the British Empire. This led them to view taxation as fair and lenient
- in the House of Commons, country gentlemen MPs favoured taxation in the colonies, as it allowed cuts in taxation in Britain. Many viewed the developing American situation as one to be resolved purely in terms of what was best for Britain, which demonstrates Parliamentary opinion against the colonists' interests
- Lord Grenville was Prime Minister 1763–1765 and favoured British merchants in the colonies. His Currency Act of 1764 protected debts owed to British traders. He imposed the Stamp Act, though privately feared it could not be enforced
- Lord Rockingham was Prime Minister 1765–1766 and was inclined to be lenient towards America
- however, after he repealed the Stamp Act he passed the Declaratory Act, proclaiming British Parliamentary supremacy over America
- the Duke of Grafton was Prime Minister 1768–1770 and believed in the removal of duties in America but stood firm on the notion of British supreme authority. Despite his opposition to taxation, he insisted that duties on tea remain
- Lord North was Prime Minister from 1770 until 1782. He believed Parliament should enforce British interests and supremacy in the colonies. He was supported by the British landed classes if he did not attack their interests and had the confidence of George III. North oversaw the Coercive Acts and Quebec Act. He led Britain through the war and spent a fortune on military supplies in America and the West Indies, believing the war could be won
- John Wilkes was first elected as an MP in 1757. In 1764 Parliament declared Wilkes an outlaw. On his return to Britain in 1768 Parliament refused to allow him to take his seat. He was seen as radical among other things. He was recognised by American radicals as honest and freedom-loving, fighting against the tyranny of Crown and Parliament. He favoured 'rights and privileges of freeborn subjects in a land of liberty', and spoke out against British policy in the House of Commons
- British cotton industrialists and mill owners included some MPs who favoured the Navigation Acts as they guaranteed a supply of raw materials from the colonies. However, as the crisis approached war, they merely wanted a speedy resolution in order to allow trade to continue. Cotton mill workers – workers wanted trade to be maintained in order to preserve jobs, and so favoured any moves by the British government which would resolve the crisis.

#### **Edmund Burke:**

- as a new MP in 1765, Burke spoke against the Stamp Act in the House of Commons, having studied the American situation and taken the colonists' demands seriously
- he made speeches citing the common bond of 'Englishness' which existed between Britain and America and urging Parliament to 'loosen the reins' on colonists or lose America for good. This shows Burke's insight into colonist feeling about rule by Parliament
- he opposed the Quebec Act 1774 as both impractical and ill-timed, stating that it appeared to be punitive because it was being passed simultaneously with the Coercive Acts
- he proposed a Motion of Conciliation from Britain to the 1<sup>st</sup> Continental Congress in November 1774, but was heavily defeated in the House of Commons. Burke's actions demonstrate an awareness of the need to maintain good relations with America

- Burke's believed George III's actions to have accelerated colonists' moves towards independence, but his views were dismissed as alarmist by many Parliamentarians in the pre-war years
- during the war, in 1777 in Parliament, Burke predicted a colonist victory based on his knowledge of their rebellious spirit and Britain's impotence to crush their determination
- one school of thought is that Burke was an imperialist who merely sought to maintain the colonies within the British Empire by compromising with their political demands. However, it is certain that Burke was viewed as a sympathetic figure by many colonists who applauded his common sense and humanist approach to their plight.

**Thomas Paine:**

- Paine had attacked the notion of hierarchical monarchy in debating clubs in London and in revolutionary pamphlets in the 1770s. His views were radical for his time, and people in Britain read his work out of fascination rather than because they agreed with him. This suggests Paine's opinions on the monarchy were out of step with his contemporaries
- Paine had met Benjamin Franklin in London and he assisted Paine to settle in Philadelphia in October 1774
- Paine believed he could further the cause of American independence, and made republican speeches and met with notable colonists, although his revolutionary ideas were regarded as too radical for many, including Franklin, who favoured compromise with Britain. Paine, therefore, was very much against the stem of British opinion on the situation
- on 10 January 1776 Paine published 'Common Sense', a propagandist pamphlet in favour of American independence which sold 100,000 copies in the colonies, and more than that in Britain and France
- during the war, his writings continued to encourage colonists to keep fighting as Britain would one day recognise America's independence. The popularity of his work demonstrates the willingness of colonists to expose themselves to his radical views.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**27. Context:**

After the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Britain and the 13 American colonies went to war for five years on land and another two at sea. Amongst the countries which became involved in the conflict (directly or indirectly) were France, Holland, Spain, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, Austria, Prussia and Turkey. British troops surrendered at Yorktown in 1781, and Britain recognised American independence in 1783.

**Franco-American Alliance:**

- France entered the war and took the conflict to Europe
- Britain was forced to re-assign its military resources to defend itself and the Empire
- French contribution to the colonists' cause took many forms – men, ammunition, training, supplies, and uniforms, fighting Britain around the world
- however, France was not persuaded until February 1778 to make its alliance with America, by which time the Continental Army was already starting to make progress in the war in the colonies.

**Dutch intervention:**

- the Dutch went to war with Britain in November 1780
- Britain's navy was stretched even further and it became increasingly difficult to focus on the war in the colonies
- European nations were now competing for parts of Britain's empire around the world
- Dutch forces in Ceylon attacked British interests in India
- however, the war between Britain and the colonists on land was not directly affected by Dutch involvement.

**Spanish intervention:**

- Spain declared war on Britain in June 1779
- Britain was forced to pull troops and naval forces back from the American continent
- the Spanish Armada now threatened British shores as well as challenging the Royal Navy around the world
- Spanish troops came from Mexico to the Mississippi area to challenge the British Army.

**League of Armed Neutrality:**

- this grouping of Russia, Sweden and Denmark gave extra cause for concern to Britain, as they were willing to fire on any Royal Navy ships which interfered with their merchant fleets
- however, the League was not actively involved in the war, merely endeavouring to protect its own shipping
- Portugal, Austria, Prussia and Turkey all later joined.

**Control of the seas:**

- the battle for control of the sea drew massively on the resources of all countries involved and significantly drained Britain's finances
- however, the war at sea continued after the surrender at Yorktown, and the British recognised the Treaty of Versailles despite regaining control of the sea, suggesting the war on land was more significant to the outcome for the colonists.

**German mercenaries:**

- Britain used over 7,000 of these in the colonies
- Prussian soldiers represented the only continental European involvement in the war on Britain's side.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**28. Context:**

The American War of Independence took place between 1776 and 1781, between Britain and its 13 colonies of North America. For many colonists, this was a revolutionary conflict fought by people fighting for freedom against a Mother Country that imposed tyranny, wielded monarchical power as a political weapon and created a real the threat of enslavement. The war was fought not only on American soil, but also at sea, and across the world once other European Powers became involved. The war ended on land in 1781 and the Treaty of Versailles formally ended hostilities in 1783, when Britain officially recognised the United States of America. The main reasons for the colonists' victory were the role of George Washington, British military inefficiency, the importance of French entry, control of the seas and the role of local knowledge and people.

**Role of local knowledge and people:**

- the main theatre of the land war was on American soil, with the main battles being fought out in Massachusetts, the Middle Colonies and Virginia. Even if the British gained ground, the revolutionary forces knew the terrain well enough to find ways of re-occupying lost territory
- key colonist victories such as the Battle of Princeton on 3 January 1777, the Battle of King Mountain on 7 October 1780, and the Battle of Yorktown between September and October 1781 were in no small part due to colonist forces' ability to utilise local geography to advantage
- British forces constantly found themselves having to react to the movement of the Continental Army
- furthermore, as witnessed in British victories such as the Battle of New York City between August and October 1776, the Battle of Fort Ticonderoga on 6 July 1777, and the Battle of Brandywine on 25 August 1777, colonist troops had intimate knowledge of the surrounding areas and were able to avoid capture, and so withdrew to safety in order to fight another day
- on occasions, such as during the Saratoga campaign, local people burned their crops rather than let them fall into British hands. The distance between Britain and the colonies already meant that supplies were slow in arriving at the front.

**Other factors:**

**Role of George Washington:**

- Washington was aware that the British forces would hold the advantage in open battle, so he fought using guerrilla warfare effectively, e.g., at the significant crossing of the Delaware River in December 1776
- this was part of a surprise raid on British posts which resulted in Washington's small bands of men crossing the river back to their positions in Pennsylvania with captured supplies and arms. Guerrilla warfare, therefore, was an effective weapon in Washington's armoury
- in addition, Washington taught his troops to fire accurately from distance on those occasions when they were engaged in open battle, particularly in the fight to control the New Jersey area in the first half of the war
- during the attack on Princeton in January 1777 and the Battle of Monmouth in June 1778, Washington's forces successfully drove the British from the battlefield
- Washington's 'scorched earth' campaign during the summer of 1779 was aimed at Iroquois settlements in New York in revenge for their co-operation with the British early in the war
- this policy deterred further collaboration between Native Americans and the British Army. Although brutal, this strategy increased colonists' chances of winning the war on land

- moreover, Washington had experience of serving with British Army during the Seven Years' War and had been a leading figure in the British capture of Pittsburgh in 1758. He was aware of British military practice and the weaknesses in the chains of communication between London and North America
- he was a self-made Virginian who had become a successful tobacco planter in the 1760s and involved himself in local politics as a member of the Virginia legislature
- as a military hero from the Seven Years' War, his appointment as Commander of the Continental Army in 1775 gave heart to many
- Washington's business and political reputation were key features of his authority during the war
- his personal qualities included the ability to give speeches to his troops, emphasising the incentive of independence if they won the war. Washington was aware of the political aspect of the conflict, and turned military defeats, of which he suffered many, into opportunities to inspire his forces to fight on
- Washington's leadership at Valley Forge during the winter of 1777-1778 saw him preserve the morale of his 10,000-strong army in terrible conditions, particularly by his allowing soldiers' families, known as Camp Followers, to remain with the troops
- his appointment of celebrated Prussian drill sergeant Baron Friedrich von Steuben to maintain discipline meant firearms skills stayed of a high quality
- his promotion of Nathanael Greene through the ranks from Private to Quartermaster-General meant regular food for the soldiers as well as adequate supplies of ammunition and uniforms, including boots
- the trust he showed in the French General Lafayette led to Congress commissioning Lafayette into the Continental Army before the French entered the war, allowing him an important role in strategic planning.

**British military inefficiency:**

- on several occasions British generals did not act appropriately to instructions, such as when Lord George Germain, the British Secretary of State for America, hatched a plan to separate the New England colonies from the others in mid-1777. This involved General Howe moving his forces north from New York, but Howe misinterpreted his orders and moved south during August, rendering the plan futile
- meanwhile, General Burgoyne, commander of British forces in Canada, had received orders to march south into the Hudson valley towards Ticonderoga in early 1777. Burgoyne, however, was left isolated in the Hudson valley after capturing Ticonderoga because Howe had gone south and General Clinton was too slow to move north in place of Howe, and so, confronted by large American forces, Burgoyne was forced to surrender his men and equipment at Saratoga in October 1777
- furthermore, changes in personnel hindered operations, as politicians such as Lord North and Lord Germain promoted or appointed officers frequently, causing inconsistency and lack of stability at command level
- petty jealousies amongst military leaders also obstructed progress, so that even after military campaigns had been waged successfully or battles had been won, there was no co-operation, leading to the British losing land gained, particularly after French entry in 1778.



**Importance of French entry:**

- the Franco-American Treaty of Alliance was signed by Franklin and Louis XVI at Versailles in February 1778. This formalised French recognition of the United States, the first international acknowledgement of American independence
- from this period onward, the French guaranteed the colonists abundant military support in the form of troops sent to fight on land and a naval contribution on the eastern seaboard, around Britain and across the world
- in addition, France provided the Continental Army with ammunition, uniforms, expertise, training and supplies
- importantly, the forces under the command of Count Rochambeau who landed at Rhode Island in 1780 hampered the British Army's attempts to dislodge colonist strongholds in Virginia throughout 1780 and 1781
- Rochambeau's co-operation with the colonist General Lafayette and the clear lines of communication he established between himself and de Grasse led to the trapping of Cornwallis at Yorktown and the French navy's arrival in Chesapeake Bay.

**Control of the seas:**

- the strength of French navy meant Britain had to spread its forces worldwide, particularly as France attacked British colonies in the Caribbean Sea and Indian Ocean. In addition, there were attempts to raid Portsmouth and Plymouth in order to land soldiers on the British mainland
- Admiral d'Orvilliers claimed he defeated the Royal Navy in the Battle of Ushant in the English Channel in July 1778, in part weakening British defences in preparation for further attacks on the south coast of England
- Admiral de Grasse successfully deceived British fleets in the Atlantic to arrive at Chesapeake Bay in September 1781 prior to the Yorktown surrender
- the unsuccessful command of Admiral Howe led to him leaving his post, and a 1779 parliamentary investigation into his conduct proved inconclusive
- the entry of France into the conflict encouraged Spain and Holland to follow suit
- French action against the Royal Navy gave these European Powers confidence to attack British interests in India and the southern colonies
- Spain entered the war in 1779, intent on mounting an attack on the British mainland
- Dutch entry into war came in December 1780, providing another threat of invasion
- these European Powers stretched British resources even further and made British less effective in its overall military effort
- the Armed League of Neutrality was formed in August 1780. The involvement of Russia, Denmark and Sweden in an agreement to fire on the Royal Navy, if provoked, placed extra pressure on Britain
- the war at sea was a vital feature of Britain's weaknesses. British concentration was diverted from maintaining control of the colonies on land towards keeping control of maritime access to its wider Empire. Ultimately, with the surrender at Yorktown, it was loss of control of the sea which led to the eventual British defeat.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**29. Context:**

In France, the Ancien Régime was the old order, which came to an end with the French Revolution of 1789. The king was at the centre of the Ancien Régime, governing through Councils and Ministries. Taxes and laws were set by royal edict. The absolute monarchy ruled in provinces through Intendants, and in towns through Parlements. The Ancien Régime consisted of three estates. Factors contributing to the threat to security included grievances held by the Third Estate, financial issues, taxation and corruption, the role of the royal family and the position of the clergy and nobility.

**Grievances held by the Third Estate:**

- the Third Estate was liable for compulsory military service
- the peasantry were liable for forced labour on public roads and buildings – this service was called the corvée
- the peasantry had to pay to use their landlords' ovens to bake bread
- the peasantry would be likely willing to support change when it came
- poor pay and high food prices
- during times of poor harvests and bad winters, the Third Estate resented the lack of help from the First and Second Estates
- the bourgeoisie had to pay the taille if they did not want to do military service
- the bourgeoisie desired political power but The Estates General, the collective group of representatives from each of the three estates, had not been called since 1614
- resented the extravagant lifestyle of the Second Estate
- the bourgeoisie were educated and were aware of the criticisms made of the Ancien Régime by the French philosophical movement of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

**Other factors**

**Financial issues**

- financial problems were arguably the biggest threat to the Ancien Régime
- created in part by France's involvement in wars – most recently the American War of Independence – brought France to bankruptcy
- by the 1780s, the Treasury deficit was estimated at 112,000,000 livres
- failure to reform – several finance ministers suggested changes to the taxation system but were thwarted by the privileged classes
- Turgot, Controller-General 1774–1776 was dismissed after suggesting physiocratic reform and the abolition of town guilds
- Necker, 1776–1781, reduced court expenses, cut the number of tax-farmers, but had to borrow heavily to finance the war in America. Disclosure of court expenditure brought about his dismissal
- Calonne, 1783–1787, floated loans and spent freely, and attempted to persuade nobles to accept a land tax but resigned when they refused this
- Brienne, 1787–1788, tried to impose taxes on the privileged classes but the Parlements refused to confirm this and he resigned.

**Taxation and corruption:**

- unfair nature of the system
- privileged orders of the First and Second Estates were exempt from many taxes
- the Church received the tithe from peasants who lived on its lands – one tenth of their produce
- the nobility could tax the peasantry for hunting, shooting and fishing on their land
- cumbersome administration – tax collected by the Farmers General, who had a vested interest in collecting as much as they could
- the Third Estate (peasantry, urban workers and bourgeoisie) had to pay indirect taxes such as the gabelle (on salt), aides (on luxury goods) and douanes (on imports)
- the Third Estate paid direct taxes such as the capitation (to local government) and the vingtieme (to central government)
- absolutist monarchy meant many resented a lack of political representation
- much of the functioning of central and local government was carried out with favour shown to individuals
- court advisors were concerned with protecting their position rather than contradicting the king or warning him against bad decisions.

**Role of the royal family:**

- Louis XVI was viewed as a wasteful monarch, creating an excess of expenditure
- Louis XVI was seen as weak and indecisive, surrounded by incompetent sycophants
- Louis XVI never called the Estates General (before 1789)
- Marie-Antoinette was despised by many in the population for her Austrian nationality
- Marie-Antoinette was unwilling to improve her political knowledge
- monarchy perceived as being ignorant of the lifestyles of the peasantry
- decadence of the court.

**Position of the clergy and nobility:**

- the clergy was split into the upper and lower clergy, the latter identifying more closely with the Third Estate. The Church hierarchy was resented by the lower clergy
- parish priests often sided with the peasants in their locality, but the upper clergy viewed peasants with contempt and merely as a source of taxation
- the Church owned a large amount of land and paid relatively little taxation. The upper clergy were concerned to protect their privileges
- like the clergy, the upper nobility was concerned to protect their privileged status, particularly access to posts at court and in the army, and their exemptions from taxation
- natural supporters of the monarchy, they saw a threat from the rise of the bourgeoisie
- there were also tensions between the traditional nobility (of the sword) and the newly ennobled nobility (of the robe)
- the 'old' sought to hold onto their control of key positions of the State, the Army and the Church, much to the annoyance of the 'new'.

**Any other relevant factor.**

**30. Context:**

The French Revolution of 1789 brought about the downfall of the Ancien Régime, the collapse of absolutism and ultimately in 1792 the end of the French monarchy. The constitution was established in 1791 and was an attempt to retain the French monarchy with limited powers and according representation to royalists, Jacobins and Girondists. Factors contributing to the failure of the constitution included the role of Louis XVI, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, the role of the National Assembly, the activities of the émigrés, and the outbreak of war.

**Role of Louis XVI:**

- the King never called the Estates General (before 1789)
- flight to Varennes had already stirred anti-royalist feelings
- Louis was from the start unsupportive of the principle of constitutional monarchy
- he dismissed Controller-General (Finance Minister) Calonne in the face of opposition from the nobility to the major tax reforms needed to save France from bankruptcy
- even in the weeks before the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the King seemed to be preparing for a counter-revolution through the build-up of troops at Versailles
- after the Declaration of the Rights of Man in August 1789, Louis failed to openly endorse its principles
- there was considerable suspicion about the King, which made the achievement of a constitutional monarchy unlikely
- even before his veto on decrees against 'refractory' clergy and émigrés in December Louis' actions during 1791 had done the monarchy immeasurable harm
- his lukewarm support for the reforms of the Constituent Assembly had generated popular hostility in Paris from the spring of 1791 onwards
- the King was likely to seek support from European allies to increase his powers
- even before the outbreak of revolution in July 1789, Louis had shown himself incapable of making the strong decisions necessary to save the monarchy
- the King was viewed as a wasteful monarch, creating an excess of court expenditure
- monarchy perceived as being ignorant of the lifestyles of the peasantry
- Marie-Antoinette was despised by many in the population for her Austrian nationality
- queen was unwilling to improve her political knowledge.

**Other factors:****Civil Constitution of the Clergy:**

- the Civil Constitution of the Clergy made clergymen state employees which Roman Catholic priests objected to
- new diocese districts were created which were based on administrative Departments, reducing the number of bishops from over 130 to 83
- the government's actions against the Church were unpopular with the peasantry who understood these issues more than they did the more complex political questions of the day
- the fact that the king did not approve of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy but eventually had to agree to it illustrated the weakness of the monarchy
- the election of priests from now on meant that the Church – and Pope Pius VI – lost power within France, furthering Papal support for Austria
- senior members of the Catholic Church longed for the rebirth of the Ancien Régime, which had prevented Protestants from holding public office.

**Role of the National Assembly:**

- the fact that the President of the National Constituent Assembly (which the National Assembly evolved to become) was a Protestant (Jean-Paul Rabaut Saint Etienne) infuriated the Catholic Church and created opposition to the monarchy
- the constitution still accorded the King a power-sharing arrangement with the Legislative Assembly
- limitations on the power of the monarch would never be accepted by Louis
- within 6 months of the first meeting of the Legislative Assembly in October 1791 (after the National Constituent Assembly was dissolved) the king had been exercising his veto in a manner unacceptable to the Girondists and Jacobins
- the Legislative Assembly was ridden with factions, and in its 12-month existence, having 23 different Presidents did not make for the easy passage of reforms
- disagreements between the Feuillants and Jacobins over the trustworthiness of a Constitutional monarchy led to shifts from measures that supported the king's constitutional powers to the adoption of extreme revolutionary policies
- the economy had been damaged by events of the Revolution (and was already in crisis before 1789) and both the National Constituent Assembly and the Legislative Assembly were unable to control the situation
- inflation was spiraling, making the constitutional monarchy unpopular in the provinces
- in towns and cities increased bread prices were unpopular amongst industrial workers in urban areas
- continued heavy taxation of the poorest sections of society who saw the Revolution as benefitting them in no way whatsoever
- the financial benefits of the Revolution were perceived as being enjoyed by the wealthy and bourgeoisie.

**Activities of the émigrés:**

- the so-called First Class of émigrés, as categorised by the Legislative Assembly, actively organised support for counter-revolutionary measures
- emigres from the nobility wished for a restoration of the monarchy and a reversal of the achievements of the Revolution, and this created disquiet within France
- First Class emigres sought support from governments such as that in Britain, and recruited soldiers from other European countries where monarchs encouraged volunteering

- the Assembly declared that these emigres' actions were punishable by execution
- Second Class emigres were threatened with being stripped of their French nationality as well as their earnings (many were soldiers or elected and appointed local authority officials) if they did not return from abroad
- Second Class emigres were involved in establishing forces such as the Armee des Princes, the Legion des Pyrenees and the Armee de Bourbon, adding to the sense of insecurity within France under the constitutional monarchy
- Third Class emigres, although not perceived as a major threat to the Revolution, still supported First and Second Class emigres through serving in the households of the French nobility or senior French military figures around Europe
- despite there being little hostility towards Third Class emigres from the Assembly, their activities still helped perpetuate émigré activity around the continent which destabilised the constitutional monarchy.

**Outbreak of war:**

- the Revolution was radicalised to the point where the position of the monarchy became impossible because of the king's identification with the enemy- Austria
- partly, as was said above, this was Louis' own fault, but it should be remembered that France declared war on Austria in April 1792
- however, radical anti-monarchists believed that a successful war against Austria would bring them increased support at home and prove a decisive blow to the monarchy
- war only created a need for increased taxation which made the constitutional monarchy even more unpopular in the provinces
- the revolutionary government had to recruit heavily from the provinces which again made them unpopular with ordinary French people
- the final overthrow of the monarchy in August 1792 had become inevitable under the pressures exerted by the war.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**31. Context:**

The 'Reign of Terror' was a period of bloody violence that took place during the French Revolution, 1793–1794. During this time, Maximilien de Robespierre, a French lawyer and politician, became one of the best known and most influential figures in the French Revolution. It is generally believed that the growing threat of counter-revolution after the execution of Louis XVI was a key factor in the imposition of the Terror.

**Outbreak of war:**

- European powers were horrified by the Revolution and the treatment of the Royal Family. The declaration of Pillnitz threatened consequences if the French royal family were harmed
- France declared war on Austria and Prussia in the spring of 1792. Prussia and Austria invaded, but were stopped at the Battle of Valmy
- the Revolution was radicalised to the point where the position of the monarchy became impossible because of the king's identification with the enemy
- partly, as was said above, this was Louis' own fault but it should be remembered that France declared war on Austria in April 1792
- however, radical anti-monarchists believed that a successful war against Austria would bring them increased support at home and prove a decisive blow to the monarchy
- the final overthrow of the monarchy in August 1792 had become inevitable under the pressures exerted by the war
- the external dangers France faced radicalised the revolution
- war was the occasion for a witch hunt for 'enemies within'
- the war led to the concept of the 'nation in crisis'
- this had to be enforced, violently if necessary
- the Terror was a means of controlling public conduct at a time when war made France vulnerable.

**Other factors:**

**Threat of counter-revolution:**

- the Convention's major concerns at the start of 1793 were two-fold: – to eliminate counter-revolutionary activity which intensified, particularly in the provinces, after Louis' execution (21<sup>st</sup> January 1793); – to execute the war against the Republic's émigré and foreign opponents as ruthlessly and as effectively as possible. At this point the Convention was still controlled by the relatively moderate Girondins
- however, the Convention sanctioned a range of counter-revolutionary legislation: – the creation of the Committee of Public Safety – the Committee of General Security – revolutionary tribunals to try opponents of the Republic and impose the death penalty if required – surveillance committees established in local areas to identify counterrevolutionary activity
- thus, most agree that most of the essential institutions of the Terror were in place before the Jacobins – and Robespierre – came to power. The moderates in the Convention had set up the structure of the Terror by the spring of 1793.

**Political rivalries:**

- the Girondins came from the right-wing of the Jacobins and were defenders of the rights of man and popular sovereignty against a centralised state governed from Paris. They played a central role in the fall of the monarchy. Faced by the rise of The Mountain, the Girondins showed increasingly royalist tendencies and were overthrown by the Montagnard insurrection in 1793 and their leaders were guillotined
- the Mountain or the Montagnards were from the left-wing and sought to establish a radical-democratic republic. From June 1793 until July 1794, the Montagnards dominated French politics
- Society of Jacobins would become increasingly dominated by Maximilien Robespierre, particularly from July 1793 until July 1794, where he used it as his powerbase for the Reign of Terror.

**Role of Robespierre:**

- Robespierre believed that the ‘general will’ of the sovereign people both created and sanctioned policy-making within the nation. The will of the people could only prevail within a republic
- any individual who sought to oppose this was, by implication, guilty of treason against the nation itself. In such circumstances death – the ultimate weapon of Terror – was entirely appropriate
- hence Robespierre’s belief that ‘terror is virtue’ – that to create and maintain a ‘virtuous’ nation which enshrined the revolutionary principles of liberty and equality, it was necessary to expunge any counter-revolutionary activity violently
- Robespierre became a member of the Committee in July 1793 and came to control its operations. Until his own execution in July 1794, the Committee became the main instrument for the application of terror in defence of Robespierre’s ideal of a ‘Republic of Virtue’. During this period Robespierre sanctioned the use of terror against: – the monarchy and émigré opponents of the Republic, e.g., Marie Antoinette executed - provincial counter-revolutionaries, particularly in the Vendée – Hebertists, whose anti-Christian stance Robespierre found both distasteful and dangerous – Dantonists who challenged the authority of Robespierre and who were therefore (since Robespierre’s government represented the ‘general will’) guilty of treason
- with the imposition of the infamous Law of 22<sup>nd</sup> Prairial (June 1794), Robespierre was given virtually unlimited powers to eliminate opponents of his Republic of Virtue and during the period of the Great Terror in June and July 1794, over 1,500 were executed
- had Robespierre lived beyond Thermidor, there is no doubt the death toll would have risen even higher. However, while Robespierre must bear responsibility for the intensification of the Terror during 1793-94, the use of Terror as an instrument of state policy was by no means confined to Robespierre.



**Committee of Public Safety:**

- in the weeks after the execution of the king, the internal and external wars in France continued to grow. The Girondin-led National Convention started to panic
- in an effort to restore peace and order, the convention created the Committee of Public Safety on 6<sup>th</sup> April 1793, to maintain order within France and protect the country from external threats
- many of the killings were carried out under the orders of Robespierre, who dominated the draconian Committee of Public Safety, until his own execution in 1794
- pressure from mass demonstrations in Paris intimidated the Convention into adopting terror as 'the order of the day'
- Terror was perceived as a legitimate method of government control. This was more to do with the exigencies of the foreign and civil wars which were threatening the Republic at this point than with Robespierre's philosophising over the nature of the Republic and the role of Terror within it.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**32. Context:**

The French Revolution of 1789 brought the end of the Ancien Régime which had lasted for three centuries before then. After a failure to establish a constitutional monarchy between 1789 and 1792, the monarchy was abolished, and the king and queen were later executed. The period of Terror then took place until 1795, at the end of which the new Directory was created, but this was brought to an end with the creation of the Consulate by Napoleon Bonaparte and others in 1799. The Consulate became a dictatorship which resulted in Napoleon's coronation as Emperor in 1804.

**Role of Bonaparte:**

- following participation in warfare in Europe and the Middle East, Bonaparte returned in October 1799
- public perception was of Bonaparte as a hero, someone who could restore France to its former glory after years of revolutionary chaos and confusion
- Bonaparte himself had political ambitions and planned to support Sieyes in the dissolution of the Directory and then seize power himself
- Bonaparte cited the Coup of Fructidor to the Council of Five Hundred as evidence of their own culpability in the imminent downfall of the Directory
- Bonaparte led the army in deposing the Directory in November 1799
- Bonaparte's use of the military gave him greater authority in later dealings with Sieyes.

**Other factors:**

**Constitution of 1795:**

- policy-makers framed a new constitution which sought to reconcile the bitterness of the preceding years by imposing checks and balances against the emergence of one dominant individual, group or faction. In so doing, many historians argue that the new constitution was a recipe for instability in the years which followed
- a bicameral legislature was established wherein each chamber counter-balanced the power of the other. By so doing it inhibited strong and decisive government
- to ensure continuity, the new Convention was to include two-thirds of the outgoing deputies from the old. This enraged sections of the political right who felt that the forces of left-wing radicalism still prevailed in government
- the resulting mass protests in October 1795 were put down by the army under Bonaparte. The principle of using extra-parliamentary forces to control the State had been established with Bonaparte right at the heart of it. It was to prove a dangerous precedent
- annual elections worked against consistent and continuous policymaking
- so did the appointment of an Executive -the Directory – one of whose members rotated on an annual basis
- again, the counterbalance between the legislature and the executive may have been commendable but it was to prove inherently unstable in practice.

**Political instability:**

- in the late summer of 1794 France was emerging from 2-years of increasing radicalisation in the wake of a revolution whose leaders had mixed motivations
- growing bitterness between opposing factions within the country, particularly as the Terror developed and leading figures became divided as revolutionaries and counterrevolutionaries, with an atmosphere of distrust and fear across the nation
- the Jacobins, under Robespierre, had been overthrown and a 'White Terror' was soon to sweep the country in revenge for the excesses of the radical left during the Terror
- France had been torn apart by civil war, with suspicions existing within communities in both urban and rural areas
- the country was threatened by foreign armies egged on by émigré nobles seeking to overthrow the Revolution
- France was riven by religious conflict occasioned by the State's opposition to the primacy of the Catholic Church.

**Increasing intervention of the army in politics:**

- even before the 1795 constitution was ratified, the army had been used to quell sans-culottes insurgents who sought to invade the Convention and to repel an émigré invasion at Quiberon
- Napoleon's use of a 'whiff of grapeshot' to put down the disturbances in October merely underlined the parlous nature of politics at the time
- the army was deployed in May 1796 to put down the left-wing Babeuf Conspiracy
- the Directory reacted with the Coup of Fructidor in September 1797 when the first 'free' Convention elections returned a royalist majority.

**Role of Sieyes:**

- Abbe Sieyes, a clergyman and champion of the Third estate during the revolution, was afraid that France would descend into anarchy as a result of the on-going political conflict, and deemed the 1795 constitution unworkable
- Sieyes had always objected to privilege and patronage- he had voted in favour of the execution of the king in January 1793 and wanted to avoid their continuation under a different guise once the revolution settled
- Sieyes enlisted the aid of Bonaparte in mounting a coup against the constitution
- the Convention, the Directory and the legislative councils had run their course and few, if any, mourned their passing.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**33. Context:**

Nationalism was the idea that people with a common culture, language and history should have the right to rule themselves. Although nationalist hopes were ignored in the Treaty of Vienna in 1815, support for nationalism grew during the period from 1815 to 1850 partly due to economic factors.

**Economic factors:**

- middle-class businessmen called for a more united market to enable them to compete with foreign countries. They complained that tax burdens were holding back economic development
- Prussian economic expansion – drift in power away from Austria and towards Prussia as the latter began to build on rich resources such as coal and iron deposits
- Prussia's gain of territory on the River Rhine after 1815 meant it had good reason to reach an agreement with neighbours to ensure relatively free travel of goods and people between its lands in the East and the West
- Prussia created a large free-trade area within Prussia itself
- railway and road development – post-1830s the development of railways/roads ended the isolation of German states from each other. This enabled the transport and exploitation of German natural resources. Economic cooperation between German states encouraged those seeking a political solution to the issue of German unity
- Zollverein – the 'mighty lever' of German unification. By 1836, 25 of the 39 German states had joined this economic free-trade area (Austria excluded)
- members of the Union voluntarily restricted their sovereignty (even if only for selfish interests) to allow for economic gain through joining the Prussian-led Customs Union
- German nationalists in the late 1830s saw it as a step towards a wider political union.

**Other factors:****Cultural factors:**

- main unifying force was language – 25 million Germans spoke the same language and shared the same culture and literature
- writers and thinkers (e.g., Heine, Fichte, Goethe, Brothers Grimm, Schiller and Hegel) encouraged the growth of a German consciousness
- shared pride in the German impact on classical music
- post-1815 nationalist feelings first expressed in universities
- growth of Burschenschaften pre-1815 dedicated to driving French from German soil – zealous but lacking a clear idea of how best to accomplish the task
- the Hambacherfest and student demonstrations – little was accomplished by the students
- early 19<sup>th</sup> century was a time of great change in all European states and it has been suggested that the political changes of the time can be partly explained by an understanding of the cultural developments of the time.

**Military weakness:**

- the Napoleonic Wars led to a realisation that, individually, the German states were weak
- French troops had marched across Germany for over 20-years, and had humiliated Prussia, the strongest 'German' state at Jena and Auerstadt. Germany had been carved up by Napoleon, the North Sea coast being incorporated into France itself, and the Confederation of the Rhine set up as a puppet state. Divided, the German states could not defend their territorial integrity
- Germany had been used as a recruiting ground by Napoleon: Germans had died to protect France. Even the enlarged post-Vienna states would be powerless, with the exception of Prussia, to prevent this happening again.

**Effects of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars:**

- ideas of the French Revolution (liberty, equality and fairness) appealed to the middle classes in the German states
- impact of Napoleonic Wars – many Germans argued that Napoleon/France had been able to conquer German states pre-1815 due to their division as separate, autonomous territories. German princes had stirred national feeling to help raise armies to drive out the French, aiding the sense of a common German identity with common goals
- prior to the Napoleonic Wars there were over 400 semi-independent German states within the Holy Roman Empire. Napoleon reorganised the states into larger states and then formed the most important of these into the Confederation of the Rhine. Although the victorious powers replaced this with the German Confederation in 1815, the latter resembled Napoleon's reorganised 39 states which was a small step towards a modern unified German state.

**Role of the Liberals:**

- 1848 revolutions in Germany raised National consciousness greatly even though they failed
- many Liberals were middle-class and were also receptive to nationalist ideas.

**Any other relevant factors.**

34.

**Context:**

Between 1815 and 1850 there was a growth in German nationalism across the German confederation made up of 39 separate states with their own rulers and systems of government. As well as a variety of internal divisions ranging from religious to political, there were other outside influences such as resentment of Austria.

**Religious differences:**

- religion – northern German states were mostly Protestant and southern states mainly Catholic
- the Protestant north looked to Prussia for help and protection while the Catholic south looked to Austria
- Catholics numbered about only a third of the national population across the German states.

**Other factors:**

**Divisions among the nationalists:**

- nationalists were divided over which territory should be included in any united Germany; grossdeutsch and kleindeutsch arguments
- failure of the Frankfurt Parliament – lack of clear aims and without an armed force to enforce its decisions; lack of decisive leadership; divisions among the ‘revolutionaries’ regarding aims and objectives.

**Austrian strength:**

- the states within ‘Germany’ had been part of the moribund Holy Roman Empire, traditionally ruled by the Emperor of Austria
- post-1815 the chairmanship of the ‘Bund’ was given to Austria on a permanent basis, partly as Austria was considered to be the major German power
- Metternich opposed liberalism and nationalism. He used diplomacy and threats of force, e.g., Karlsbad Decrees and the Six Articles. He made use of the police state, repression and press censorship
- Austria controlled the administration and management of the Empire, stamping authority on the Bund
- Treaty of Olmutz, 1850, signalled the triumph of Austria and humiliation of Prussia which showed that Austrian military strength was an important obstacle. Although Austrian military strength was in decline, this was not apparent until the 1860s.

**German princes:**

- the leaders of the German states obstructed unification and were protective of their individual power and position. They wanted to maintain the status quo which would safeguard this for them
- particularism of the various German states – autonomous and parochial in many ways
- self-interest among German rulers led to opposition to the actions at Frankfurt.

**Indifference of the masses:**

- popular apathy – most Germans had little desire to see a united Germany; nationalism affected mainly the educated and business classes
- lack of consciousness between political boundaries and ethnic or linguistic ones
- however politically based literature and propaganda also reached the masses, helping to bond their ideals and strengthen their resolve for both reform and unification.

**Economic differences:**

- the smaller states of the west had more advanced economies than the Prussian heartlands
- even within Prussia there were significant social differences between the industrially-advanced territories on the Rhine and the largely agricultural areas in the east, which were dominated by the Junkers (although less so than in the 18th century), who were adversely affected by the agricultural depression of the 1820s
- Austria failed to join the Zollverein and created a separate customs union.

**Resentment towards Prussia:**

- smaller states, particularly in the south, resented the economic and political predominance of Prussia
- there was a reluctance to accept unification within the Prussian state, which had a significant non-German population and contained a large conservative/reactionary landed class.

**Attitudes of foreign states:**

- France had been able to dominate central Europe for centuries due to its lack of unity. Although most of Germany had been united by Napoleon into the Confederation of the Rhine, it was not in French
- interests for Germany to be united, particularly as that would present a barrier to France achieving a frontier on the Rhine.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**35. Context:**

On 18<sup>th</sup> January 1871, in the Hall of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles, Bismarck had the honour of proclaiming the birth of the German Empire. In the minds of both Germans and the French, the founding of the empire would be associated with a military triumph for Germany and a humiliating defeat for France. A factor leading to the unification of Germany was the decline of Austria.

**The decline of Austria:**

- there was decline in Austrian power and influence during the 1850s in particular, at the same time as there was a growth in Prussian strength
- the Austrian economy was largely agricultural with pockets of industry confined largely to the western regions. Austria was never a member of the Zollverein which held back her economic growth
- Austria was distracted by problems in her large multi-ethnic empire and by commitments in Italy. Defeat in the Italian Independence War of 1859 was a serious blow to Austrian prestige
- Austria was increasingly isolated diplomatically in Europe, especially after failing to support Russia in the Crimean war.

**Other factors:**

**Prussian military strength:**

- German unification was the immediate result of three short wars – against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870–1871)
- the Prussian army made Germany a reality. The fighting capacity of the Prussian army improved immensely in the early 1860s due to the efforts and ability of War Minister General von Roon and General von Moltke, chief of the General Staff
- General von Roon ensured that Prussian forces were increased, better trained and well-armed
- Under Moltke, the General Staff became the brains of the Prussian army, laying plans for mobilisation and military operations. In particular, Prussian military chiefs were quick to see the potential of railways for the rapid movement of troops.

**Prussian economic strength:**

- by the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Prussia was developing into a major industrial power due to a rapidly increasing population, the discovery of raw materials in the Rhine and the Saarland and a good railway network. These developments also enabled Prussia to equip the Prussian army and to mobilise the army at speed
- the emergence of Prussia as a leading economic power is closely connected to the creation of the Zollverein. By 1836, 25 of the 39 German states were members of this Prussian-dominated free-trade area. The smaller German states benefited from the increased trade with Prussia and across the German Confederation. The Zollverein encouraged supporters of German nationalism, who hoped to see economic union lead on to full political unification. On the other hand, some German states supported Austria as they resented Prussian economic dominance
- Prussian economic growth in the 1850s and 1860s out-stripped that of Austria and France.



**Role of Bismarck:**

- Bismarck's aim was to make Prussia the dominant German state
- Bismarck took advantage of increasing Prussian strength and had the diplomatic skills to take advantage of circumstances as they arose
- Bismarck took the initiative, as opposed to Austria, in the war against Denmark in 1864
- Bismarck skilfully manipulated events leading up to the war with Austria in 1866 which included the establishment of friendships with potential allies of Austria beforehand
- Bismarck showed wisdom in the Treaty of Prague in 1866
- Bismarck's manipulated the Ems Telegram to instigate a war with France in 1870
- Bismarck's exploited the weaknesses of European statesmen and rulers, e.g., Napoleon III
- Bismarck used diplomacy to isolate his intended targets
- Napoleon III wanted France to remain Europe's greatest power. He was however no match for Bismarck. His hopes of territorial gain as a result of French neutrality in the Austrian-Prussian War were dashed by Prussia's swift victory. The outcome of the Luxembourg question also deprived France of territorial gain.

**Role of other countries:**

- in the 1860s Britain was increasingly preoccupied with her Empire, particularly India and generally welcomed Prussia's dominant position in central Europe, regarding it as a welcome counter-weight to both France and Russia. Russia was pleased that it had a reliable partner against Austria
- Russia, concerned with reform at home, also showed little interest in central Europe. Its sympathies lay with Prussia. Russia had still not forgiven Austria for its policy during the Crimean War
- Austria, absorbed with the problem of dealing with its various subject nationalities, especially the Hungarians, was not in a position to mount a war of revenge
- Napoleon III overreacted over the Hohenzollern candidature. Viewing Leopold's candidature as totally unacceptable, Napoleon III instructed the French ambassador in Berlin, to go to the spa town at Ems, to put the French case that Leopold's candidacy was a danger to France and to advise William I to stop Leopold leaving for Spain if he wanted to avoid war. Despite the fact that the affair appeared to have been settled in France's favour, Napoleon III overplayed his hand by demanding an official renunciation from William I on behalf of Leopold, which gave Bismarck the opportunity to doctor the Ems Telegram and provoke war
- Napoleon III's military leadership in the Franco-Prussian War was poor and fatal mistakes were made. He allowed himself to be surrounded and captured at Sedan, effectively ending the war.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**36. Context:**

In January 1933, Hitler became chancellor of Germany. There were several reasons why the Nazis were able to achieve power in 1933. The appeal of Hitler and the Nazi Party was clearly important, but it was also in part due to the weaknesses and mistakes of political opponents within the Weimar Republic.

**Weaknesses and mistakes of opponents:**

- splits in the left after suppression of Spartacist Revolt made joint action between the SPD and the KPD in the 1930s very unlikely
- the SPD's identification with the Weimar Republic became increasingly problematic for the party as the economic crisis in Germany deepened
- roles of Kurt von Schleicher the German Chancellor December 1932-January 1933, and Franz von Papen, first as German Chancellor May 1932-December 1932, then as Vice-Chancellor to Hitler, in January 1933
- 1932 political intrigue, Von Papen and Oskar von Hindenburg (the President's son) met secretly and backed Hitler to become Chancellor
- Paul von Hindenburg and von Papen underestimated Hitler. Once Hitler was appointed as Chancellor in 1933, they soon realised they had miscalculated Hitler and his intentions
- weakness and indecision of the President of Germany, Hindenburg. In particular his use of Article 48.

**Other Factors:**

**Weaknesses of the Weimar Republic:**

- 'A Republic without Republicans' – 'a Republic nobody wanted' – there was a lack of popular support for the new form of government after 1918
- 'Peasants in a palace' – commentary on Weimar politicians
- divisions among those groups and individuals who appeared to be supporters of the new form of government, e.g., the socialists
- alliance of the new government and the old imperial army against the Spartacists
- the Constitution/Article 48 ('suicide clause') – arguably Germany was too democratic. 'The world's most perfect democracy – on paper'
- lack of real, outstanding Weimar politicians who could strengthen the Republic, with the exception of Stresemann
- inability (or unwillingness) of the Republic to deal effectively with problems in German society
- lukewarm support from the German Army and the Civil Service.

**Resentment towards the Treaty of Versailles:**

- the Treaty of Versailles: acceptance by Republic of hated terms
- land loss and accepting blame for the War especially hated
- led to growth of criticism; 'November Criminals', 'Stab in the back' myth.

**Economic difficulties:**

- over-reliance on foreign loans left the Weimar economy subject to the fluctuations of the international economy
- 1923 hyperinflation – severe effects on the middle classes, the natural supporters of the Republic; outrage and despair at their ruination
- the 1929 Wall Street Crash led to the Great Depression – arguably without this the Republic might have survived. Germany's dependence on American loans showed how fragile the recovery of the late 1920s was. The pauperisation of millions again reduced Germans to despair
- unemployment rose from 1.6 million in October 1929 to 6.12 million in February 1932. Around 1/3 of the workforce were unemployed
- the Great Depression also polarised politics in Germany – the drift to extremes led to a fear of communism, which grew quickly with the growth of support for the Nazis.

**Appeal of Hitler and the Nazis after 1928:**

- Nazi Party had attractive qualities for the increasingly disillusioned voting population: they were anti-Versailles, anti-communist (the SA took on the Red Front in the streets), promised to restore German pride, give the people jobs
- the Nazis put their message across well with the skillful use of propaganda under the leadership of Josef Goebbels
- propaganda posters with legends such as 'Hitler – our only hope . . .' struck a chord with many
- the SA were used to break up opponents' meetings and give the appearance of discipline and order
- gave scapegoats for the population to blame, from the Jews to the Communists
- Hitler was perceived as a young, dynamic leader, who campaigned using modern methods and was a charismatic speaker
- he offered attractive policies which gave simple targets for blame and tapped into popular prejudice.

**Any other relevant factors.**

37. **Context:**

Between 1815 and 1850, Italy was not a unified country. However, during this period nationalist ideas steadily developed. The idea of a Risorgimento of the Italian nation implied that a reborn, unified Italy might become a great and powerful nation. Such ideas became entwined with a desire for independence from Austria.

**Cultural factors:**

- the Risorgimento was inspired by Italy's past. Poets such as Leopardi glorified and exaggerated past achievements kindling nationalist desires. Poets and novelists like Pellico inspired anti-Austrian feelings amongst intellectuals as did operas such as Verdi's 'Nabucco' and Rossini's 'William Tell'
- there was no national 'Italian' language – regional dialects were like separate languages. Alfieri inspired 'Italian' language based on Tuscan. The poet and novelist Manzoni wrote in 'Italian'. Philosophers spread ideas of nationalism in their books and periodicals
- moderate nationalists such as Gioberti and Balbo advocated the creation of a federal state with the individual rulers remaining but joining together under a president for foreign affairs and trade. Gioberti's 'On the moral and civil primacy of the Italians' advocated the Pope as president whilst Balbo, in his book 'On the hopes of Italy', saw the King of Piedmont/Sardinia in the role.

**Other factors:**

**Economic factors:**

- economic factors were not important directly. Wealth lay in land (landowners were often reactionary) and trade (where the educated bourgeoisie were more receptive to ideas of liberalism and nationalism)
- the election of a new, seemingly reformist Pope, Pius IX, in 1846 inspired feelings of nationalism particularly amongst businessmen and traders as he wished to form a customs union.

**Military weakness:**

- the revolutionary wars led to a realisation that, individually, the Italian states were weak. Italy was fought over by French and Austrian armies during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period
- the fragmentation of Italy in the Vienna Settlement restored Italy's vulnerability to foreign invasion as the kings of Piedmont, Naples and Sicily were restored to their kingdoms. The Pope recovered his states in central Italy and the duchies of Parma, Tuscany and Modena were handed over to members of the Austrian royal families.

**Effects of French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars:**

- 'Italian' intellectuals had initially been inspired by the French Revolution with its national flag, national song, national language, national holiday and emphasis on citizenship
- Napoleon Bonaparte's conquest inspired feelings of nationalism – he reduced the number of states to three; revived the name 'Italy'; brought in single system of weights and measures; improved communications; helped trade, inspiring desire for at least a customs union
- Napoleon's occupation was hated – conscription, taxes, looting of art.

**Resentment of Austria:**

- after the Vienna Settlement in 1815, hatred of foreign control centred on Austria. The Hapsburg Emperor directly controlled Lombardy and Venetia; his relatives controlled Parma, Modena, Tuscany
- the growth of secret societies, particularly the Carbonari (the Charcoal Burners), led to revolts in 1820, 1821, 1831. Also 'Young Italy' and their revolts in the 1830s
- the secret societies had support throughout Italy, mostly drawn from the middle classes – doctors, teachers, lawyers, etc. along with a few army officers
- these groups were patriotic idealists rather than practical politicians: men prepared to risk their lives for their cause. Some wanted an Italian Republic while others looked for constitutional reforms
- Austria had strong ties to the Papacy and had alliances with other rulers
- conscription, censorship, the use of spies and the policy of promotion in the police, civil service and army only for German speakers was resented
- Austrian army presence within towns like Milan and the heavily garrisoned Quadrilateral fortresses ensured that 'Italians' could never forget that they were under foreign control and this inspired growing desire for the creation of a national state.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**38. Context:**

By 1850 the forces of nationalism had grown in Italy. The Revolutions of 1848-1849 showed this, but it also illustrated the tensions within the nationalist movement and the continued strength of the Austrians.

**Political differences within the nationalists:**

- secret societies lacked clear aims, organisation, leadership, resources and operated in regional cells
- the 1848/49 revolutions showed that nationalist leaders did not trust one another (Manin and Charles Albert) or would not work together (Charles Albert and Mazzini)
- there was division between those desiring liberal changes within existing states and those desiring the creation of a national state
- other differences included those who wanted to unite Italy under the leadership of the Piedmontese royal family [who were the only native Italian royal family in the peninsular] and those like Mazzini who wanted a republic
- failure to capitalise on Austrian weakness in 1848.

**Other factors:**

**Economic and cultural differences:**

- geographical difficulties hindered the spread of nationalist ideas across the Italian peninsula
- the north of Italy was relatively well developed industrially compared to the poor and backward south. The north had a developed road and rail network comprising about 75,500 km of roads and over 2,000 km of railways compared to the south which had only about 14,000 km of roads and 180 km of railways. The north had a developing industrial economy compared to the rural south of Italy
- literacy rates were much better in the north than the south of Italy. Illiteracy in the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily reached 87% of the population
- there were different levels of civilisation between the north and south. The Bourbon rulers of the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily were strong supporters of feudalism who feared the spread of ideas and tried to keep the south insulated from the agricultural and industrial revolutions that were having an impact in the north
- attitudes in the north [Piedmont] towards the south were not positive and they saw their southern neighbours as underdeveloped and barbaric.

**Dominant position of Austria:**

- following Vienna Settlement, the Austrian Emperor Francis I had direct control of Lombardy and Venetia. Relatives of the Austrian Hapsburg Emperor controlled Parma, Modena and Tuscany (Central Duchies). Austria had agreements with the other states
- Lombardy and Venetia were strictly controlled – censorship, spies, conscription (8 years), policy to employ German speakers (Austrian) in law, police, army civil service so controlled others (non-Austrian)
- Austrian army was a common sight in major cities and in the Quadrilateral fortress towns on Lombard/Venetian border (Verona, Peschiera, Legnago, and Mantua). The Austrian army was sent in by Metternich to restore order following the Carbonari-inspired revolts in 1820, 1821 and 1831
- Austria had a first-class commander, Radetsky. In 1848 Charles Albert's army won two skirmishes but Radetsky awaited reinforcements then defeated Albert at Custozza forcing an armistice. Radetsky re-took Milan in August
- after Albert's renewal of war Radetsky took just three days to defeat him again (Novara). He then besieged Venetia until the Republic of St Mark surrendered on 22 August 1849. Austrians re-established control across north and central Italy.

**Italian rulers:**

- individual rulers were opposed to nationalism. They feared for their position within a united Italy
- Italian rulers crushed rebellion when they had to. King Ferdinand I of Naples and Sicily had granted a constitution in 1820 but used Austrian help to restore his authority
- Charles Albert of Piedmont granted a constitution in 1821 but fled and the revolution was crushed. Similar events in Parma, Modena and the Papal States
- after a seemingly positive start to his pontificate, he released two thousand political prisoners, Pope Pius IX denounced nationalism in 1848, seeing it as a threat to stability
- in the 1848 revolutions, despite offering some concessions and constitutions the Italian rulers retained the loyalty of their armed forces and reasserted control.

**Indifference of the masses:**

- patriotic literature inspired intellectuals and students but did not reach the vast majority of the population who were illiterate (up to 87% off the population in the south of Italy)
- strong regional identities, particularly between north and south Italy meant that a consistent nationalism across Italy did not emerge. Peasants were more inclined to show loyalty to their local leaders than the idea of a unified Italy.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**39. Context:**

By 1870 Italian unification, the bringing together of the different states of the Italian peninsula under one government, was complete. Piedmont, the independent Italian state, was the natural leader of the unification movement.

**Role of Garibaldi:**

- Garibaldi with just over a thousand volunteers won a series of victories conquering first Sicily and then the Neapolitan mainland
- by September 1860 it looked as if Garibaldi might invade the Papal States. However, at Teano in October 1860 Garibaldi handed over his conquests to the King, Victor Emmanuel II
- Garibaldi's achievements imposed the idea of wider unification on Cavour and hastened the creation of a united Italian state as previously envisaged by Italian nationalists
- in 1866 the King encouraged Garibaldi to make another attempt on Rome but then would not commit to an invasion due to the risk of Italian forces potentially having to fight the French garrison in Rome. Despite his own scheming, Victor Emmanuel managed to prevent a diplomatic crisis.

**Other factors:**

**Rise of Piedmont:**

- Piedmont was the most powerful and liberal of the independent Italian states making her the natural leader of the unification movement
- Piedmont was also the most economically advanced of the Italian states. Development of infrastructure as well as commercial activity such as cotton and silk working led to an increase in trade of 300% in the 1850s. Industry developed around Turin and a railway network was built
- a growing economy meant workers from across Italy came to Piedmont to find work and other states wanted to be part of its success
- the army of Piedmont was advanced by Italian standards
- Napoleon exploited Piedmont's embarrassment over the Orsini Plot to negotiate an alliance with Piedmont in France's favour. Napoleon saw an opportunity to make a move against Austria. In July 1858 Napoleon attended a secret meeting with Cavour at Plombieres in France during which Napoleon and Cavour plotted to provoke a war with Austria
- the French and Piedmontese successfully provoked Austria into war in 1859
- this allowed the Piedmontese to defeat the Papal Army, taking The Marches and Umbria. In 1866 Austria handed Venetia to France who gave it to Italy
- the Piedmontese ruler, Victor Emmanuel II was interested in Piedmontese expansion so there was a political will for unification as an opportunity to win glory for Piedmont. Like Cavour, the King was most interested in Piedmontese expansion. The King was therefore supportive of Cavour and looked for opportunities to win glory for Piedmont and himself. Both Victor Emmanuel and Cavour realised foreign help would be needed to drive the Austrians from Italy. In practice, this meant getting French support
- on 26th October 1860, Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel met at the head of two armies at Teano. A triumphal entry of Naples was stage-managed, and Garibaldi formally handed over his conquests to the King. The King and Cavour had ensured that Garibaldi was politically isolated.



**Role of Cavour:**

- Cavour played a vital role in the modernisation of Piedmont. His reforms brought about economic improvements and led to the development of Piedmont's trading links with other countries. Cavour's reforms to the way that Piedmont raised money in taxation allowed her to increase spending on her army
- Cavour showed great skill as a diplomat and as a political pragmatist. His diplomatic skills especially in the critical years 1859 and 1860 were of fundamental importance in shaping the Italian nation
- Cavour used Italy's involvement in the Crimean War as an opportunity to point out to Britain and France at the Paris Peace talks that Austria had too much power in Italy
- Cavour came to an agreement with Napoleon III at Plombieres in 1858 which secured French support against Austria and he successfully goaded the Austrians to declare war on Piedmont
- when rebellions broke out in Tuscany, Parma, Modena, and Romagna in 1859 Cavour used his diplomatic skills to persuade Napoleon to allow a plebiscite
- Cavour made a secret agreement to help Prussia in the war against Austria 1866. Prussia's war against France gave the Italians the chance to take Rome
- Cavour's diplomacy was also shown during Garibaldi's expedition. Through his actions to stop Garibaldi creating trouble in the Papal States, he unintentionally played a role in promoting the unification of Italy
- Napoleon III did not intervene over Garibaldi's expedition and instead supported Cavour in the background. He made a secret agreement accepting Cavour's proposed invasion of the Papal States to stop Garibaldi reaching Rome.

**Decline of Austria:**

- Austria's position was in decline in economic and military terms, particularly in regard to Prussia. Italy's relative weakness was redressed by her understanding with Prussia
- Austria's diplomatic position also declined in the 1850s, and she was increasingly isolated
- from 1856 Austria could no longer rely on Russian help due to her lack of support during the Crimean War
- Prussia was also beginning to challenge Austria's dominant position across the states of Germany.

**Attitudes and actions of foreign powers:**

- French troops were vital in the War of Liberation of 1859. Due to problems with supplies the Piedmontese army arrived too late to take part in the first major battle of the war, at Magenta on 4th June and although Piedmontese forces fought side by side with the French at Solferino on 24 June French help was crucial to victory. At Villafranca Austria handed Lombardy to France who gave it to Piedmont
- Britain offered moral support since a united Italy would act as a counter balance to Austria in Europe. By 1859 the British government led by Prime Minister Palmerston, was open to the idea of French military strength being used to force Austria out of Italy as long as this led to an enlarged Piedmont and not to an increase in French power. In October 1860 Britain published a diplomatic document stating the British Governments view that the people of Italy should decide her fate, which was intended to stop Austria or French destroying what Garibaldi had achieved in the south
- Britain demonstrated sympathy to Garibaldi's expedition by refusing to take part in a joint naval blockade with France to stop Garibaldi crossing the Straits of Messina. Instead the presence of the British Royal Navy helped Garibaldi's crossing and was crucial for Garibaldi's success
- Britain was the first power to officially recognise the Kingdom of Italy

- in Napoleon III Cavour and Piedmont had a useful ally. Napoleon had shown enthusiasm and support for the notion of Italian liberty by taking part in the uprising in Rome in 1831
- Napoleon III wanted to increase the power of France and to remain popular with the French people. A successful foreign policy which reduced Austrian dominance in Europe was a way of achieving both aims
- the difficulty in removing Austria from its fortified positions and the threat of the Prussians intervening on Austria's side, led Napoleon to negotiate with Austria and sign the Treaty of Villafranca in August 1859 which ended the war
- when Napoleon realised the treaty would not be implemented he realised he had to make concessions to Piedmont to ensure France gained for the sacrifices made in the war. A new deal was negotiated in the Treaty of Turin which saw Piedmont gain the Central Duchies and the northern Papal States. Piedmont and France's alliance in a war against Austria was the first major stage in the creation of a unified kingdom of Italy
- the Italians took Rome in 1870 after the defeat of Napoleon III in the Franco-Prussian War. French troops were withdrawn from Rome which allowed Italian soldiers to capture the city.

**Any other relevant factors.**

40.

**Context:**

Italy achieved unification by 1870. When it entered the First World War the Italians expected great rewards. They were disappointed when it became clear Italy would not benefit from their involvement in the war.

**Resentment of the Peace Settlement:**

- Italy had entered the First World War in 1915. She had not performed well militarily and there was a large loss of life [around 500,000 men were lost] in frustrating campaigns in the Alps and the Carso
- as one of the victors Italy expected that her sacrifice would be recognised in the peace settlement. In 1915 the Treaty of London had promised Italy substantial territorial gains from the Austrian and Ottoman empires
- the peace settlement of 1919–1920 gave Italy Trentino, South Tyrol, Istria, part of Dalmatia and the port of Trieste
- the Italian Prime Minister, Orlando, had expected to gain the port of Fiume, the whole of Dalmatia and some colonial territories. He left the peace conference in disgust
- ‘Mutilated victory’ – Italian nationalists fuelled ideas that Italy had been betrayed by her government.

**Other factors:**

**Weaknesses of Italian governments:**

- parliamentary government was weak in Italy. Political parties did exist, but they acted more as labels for groups of ambitious men who wanted to gain power
- until 1912 only 25% of adult men could vote which led to many Italians feeling alienated from the political system
- government was conducted by very weak coalitions of different factions. This system of coalition building became known as trasformismo
- in the period from 1900 to 1911 there were nine governments with only one lasting more than two years
- bribery and corruption were commonplace
- the growth of Socialist and Nationalist movements before 1914 challenged the old system of government coalitions dominated by the Liberals
- WWI worsened the situation; wartime coalitions were very weak. 1918; universal male suffrage and 1919 Proportional Representation; relied on ‘liberals’ – unstable coalitions
- Giolitti made an electoral pact with Mussolini (1921); fascists gained 35 seats then refused to support the government. Over the next 16 months there were three ineffective coalition governments
- Fascists threatened a ‘March on Rome’ – King refused to agree to martial law; Facta resigned; Mussolini was invited to form coalition. 1924 Acerbo Law.

### **Appeal of Mussolini and the Fascists:**

- Mussolini had a key role in selling the fascist message with his powerful oratory. He played on conservative fears of the 'Socialist threat' leading to the rapid growth of the Fascist Party. Mussolini seized his opportunity and kept his nerve to seize power and survive the Matteotti crisis
- they exploited weaknesses of other groups by excellent use of Mussolini's newspaper 'Il Popolo D'Italia'
- the Fasci Italiani di Combattimento began as a movement not a political party and thus attracted a wide variety of support giving them an advantage over narrower rivals
- by 1921 – fascism was anti-communist, anti-trade union, anti-socialist and pro-nationalism and thus became attractive to the middle and upper classes
- fascism became pro-conservative, appealed to family values, supported church and monarchy; promised to work within the accepted political system. This made fascism more respectable and appealing to both the monarchy and the papacy
- Squadristi violence was directed against socialism so it gained the support of elites and middle classes
- violence showed fascism was strong and ruthless. It appealed to many ex-soldiers
- fascists promised strong government. This was attractive after a period of extreme instability
- fascists promised to make Italy respected as a nation and thus appealed to nationalists
- fascist policies were kept deliberately vague to attract support from different groups.

### **Social and economic divisions:**

- WWI imposed serious strain on the Italian economy. The government took huge foreign loans and the national debt was 85 billion lira by 1918. The lira lost half of its value, devastating middle class savers. Inflation was rising; prices in 1918 were four times higher than 1914
- economic problems had an impact on all sections of society: there were no wage rises, food shortages with two million unemployed 1919. Many firms collapsed as military orders ceased. Disillusionment of the middle-classes whose savings were badly damaged by rising inflation. This led to people becoming willing to turn to political extremes in search of a solution
- membership of trade unions and PSI rose – strikes, demonstrations, violence. 1919/20 'Biennio Rosso' in towns – general strike 1920; army mutiny; occupation of factories
- industrialists/middle classes were fearful of revolution. Governments failed to back the police so law and order broke down
- in the countryside, there was seizure of common land - peasant ownership increased.

### **Weaknesses and mistakes of opponents:**

- D'Annunzio's seizure of Fiume was not stopped by the government
- government failed to get martial law to stop fascist threat. Some liberals supported the Acerbo Law
- Socialist General Strike July 1922 – failed. Socialists' split weakened them; refused to join together to oppose fascism
- Liberals fragmented into four factions grouped around former PMs. They were too weak to effectively resist. Hoped to tame fascists
- PPI were divided over attitude to fascism – right wing supported fascism. Aventine Secession backfired; destroyed chance to remove Mussolini.

### **Any other relevant factors.**

41. **Context:**

From 1894 Tsar Nicolas II was the sole ruler of Russia. To rule a vast country composed of many different nationalities, languages and time zones had many challenges. However, in the early days of his rule Nicholas appeared to be secure in power. There were a number of institutions and attitudes that helped secure the Tsar's authority over his Empire.

**Tsar:**

- Tsars believed that they had a divine right to rule Russia, their position and power had been given to them by God
- the Tsarist legal system was designed to support autocracy and Tsarist authority. It was also intended to suppress opposition and increase fear among the population
- a standard punishment for opponents of the Tsar was to be exiled to the remote region of Siberia. Whilst in Siberia they had little chance of threatening Tsarist power
- the Empire did not have an elected parliament and there were no elections for positions in the government
- there were no legal or constitutional methods by which Tsarist power could be challenged. During Nicholas II's reign, the Black Hundreds was formed. This was an extreme nationalist movement that supported the Tsar. They assassinated pro-democratic politicians and intimidated the workers in the towns. The Tsarist regime provided them with financial and moral support.

**Army/Okhrana:**

- the secret police were set up to ensure loyalty to the Tsar and weed out opposition to the Tsar
- the secret police would do this by spying on people in society irrespective of class. They would infiltrate opposition groups to find their key leaders, etc
- large numbers were exiled; however, they were never able to completely eradicate all the ideas/groups opposing the Tsar
- the army was controlled by officers who were mainly upper class and therefore conservative and loyal to the Tsar
- the army tried to ensure that the population and the peasants were loyal to the Tsar
- most of the soldiers came from the peasantry where they were taught to be loyal to the Tsar
- the army was used to crush insurgence and enforce order in the country and loyalty to the Tsar.

**Role of the church:**

- the Russian Orthodox Church helped to ensure that the people, especially the peasants, remained loyal to the Tsar
- the Church preached to the population that the Tsar had been appointed by God and that they should therefore obey the Tsar
- the Church also ensured that the peasants were aware of the Fundamental Laws, which stated that, 'To the emperor of all Russia belongs the Supreme and unlimited power. God himself commands that his supreme power be obeyed out of conscience as well as out of fear.'

**Russification:**

- Russification was an effort to restrict the influence of the national minorities in the Russian Empire by insisting that Russian was the first language
- the law and government of the country were conducted throughout the Russian Empire in the Russian language, which maintained the dominance of Russian culture over that of minority groups
- due to Russification, discrimination of minority peoples became more widespread. There was state intervention in religion and education by the Tsarist government over the minority peoples to ensure Russification
- the Tsarist state treated subjects from minority groups as potential enemies who were inferior.

**Political opposition:**

- opposition groups, e.g., the Social Democrats (supported by industrial workers) and Liberals (who wanted a British style parliament), were not strong or popular enough to affect change successfully
- there were various revolutionary groups like the Social Revolutionaries (supported by peasants seeking land reform). Although these groups were divided and disorganised
- the leaders of political opponents of the Tsar were often in jail or exile in Siberia
- the Pillars of Autocracy strengthened the Tsarist state, making it difficult for opposition groups to challenge it. Although there were some successes including the assassination of Alexander II in 1881.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**42. Context:**

After the 1905 Revolution the Tsar had to strengthen his authority and weaken the threat of any opposition. He attempted to restore authority between 1905 and 1914 by introducing a variety of political and economic reforms as well as using repression.

**Nature of events in 1905:**

- the Revolution of 1905 occurred in part due to the defeat of Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 which led to a wave of political and social unrest across the Russian Empire
- loyalty to the Tsar was weakened by events like Bloody Sunday, though it was not completely eroded
- there were military mutinies, but these were disorganised, and the armed forces remained mostly loyal and were widely used to control the 1905 unrest
- events led to the promise of reform by Tsar Nicholas. He promised the formation of a consultative assembly, religious tolerance, freedom of speech and a reduction in peasant's redemption payments.

**October manifesto and the Duma:**

- the October Manifesto was written by Sergei Witte and Prince Alexis Obolensky It promised reform granting basic civil rights, the formation of political parties and an intention to allow universal suffrage. It was widely welcomed, but Nicholas was never happy with it and only signed it after arguing for three days
- Stolypin believed that the Tsarist system would only survive if there were some political and social reforms which would reduce social bitterness and therefore reduce opposition. Stolypin wanted the middle class' support, so he showed respect for the Duma and tried to work with it rather than against it. He changed the franchise in 1907 which prevented many national minorities, peasants and workers from voting although they did still have a say in the Zemstvos. This allowed him to obtain a more co-operative 3rd Duma which passed his land reforms
- Stolypin's work with the Dumas helped to strengthen the Tsarist state as he helped secure the support of the middle class and Liberals for the Tsarist state. Yet most Russians still had no political voice in Russia.

**Repression:**

- Stolypin was given the job of restoring order after the rural violence, industrial strikes and terrorism during and after the 1905 Revolution. He used radical measures such as military courts which issued death penalties – 'Stolypin's necktie' – as well as sentences of hard labour in Siberia. He used the Okhrana and censorship to silence the Tsar's opponents
- Stolypin also enforced Russification and disenfranchisement to suppress the national minorities. Public order was restored as ringleaders were dealt with severely and this acted as a deterrent, thereby strengthening the Tsarist state. Although there was still discontent in some areas.

**Stolypin's reforms:**

- Stolypin's main plan for restoring order and preventing another revolution was through economic reform, particularly land reforms. He tried to address some of the economic problems facing Russia like food shortages and rural over-population. Stolypin felt that if the peasants and industrial workers were happy then they would be loyal to the Tsar and therefore any revolutions would fail. Stolypin's land reform details such as cancelling redemption payments, Kulaks, freedom from commune, Peasant Loan Bank and more land available. Peasants were encouraged to leave their overcrowded communes and relocate to Siberia or Central Asia
- Stolypin also introduced reforms in education which became compulsory and Stolypin hoped this would allow them to get more highly skilled jobs. He introduced improvements in industrial working conditions and pay and as more factories came under the control of inspectors, there were signs of improving working conditions. As industrial profits increased, the first signs of a more prosperous workforce could be detected
- in 1912 a workers' sickness and accident insurance scheme was introduced. Stolypin's economic reforms tried to strengthen the Tsarist state by improving life and work for the vast majority of the population
- the land reforms did not modernise as much as had been hoped and there was an economic slump, which made life difficult for people and affected their loyalty to the Tsarist state.

**Fundamental Laws:**

- the Russian constitution of 1906 was a major revision of the 1832 Fundamental Laws of the Russian Empire and attempted reform to preserve the Tsarist monarchy
- in theory the constitution allowed for the Tsar to share power with an elected parliament which was made up of an upper house known as the State Council and a lower house called the State Duma
- the Tsar had power in that he appointed half of the State Council. Its power was also increased by the Tsar to be equal to that of the Duma
- Tsar Nicholas II was able to limit the powers of the Duma, e.g., proclaiming that only he had the authority to appoint/dismiss ministers
- the Tsar also had the right to veto legislation and could dismiss the Duma.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**43. Context:**

By February 1917, the people of Russia were weary of failure in war and had grown disillusioned with the leadership of Nicholas II. The working classes lived and worked in poor conditions. In early 1917 they began to organise strikes, demonstrations and protests.

**Role of Tsarina Alexandra:**

- in September 1915, the Tsar left the Tsarina in charge, which was not welcomed in Russia as she was German
- Alexandra was never happy with court life and appeared aloof. She was unpopular with the ruling elite as a result
- her relationship with Rasputin was viewed with suspicion
- his disreputable behaviour tainted the royal family
- his increasing political role led to opposition from within the ruling elite
- Rasputin influenced the choice of Ministers leading to many changes which did not help the war effort
- the Tsarina also failed to tell the Tsar of the extent of protests that had occurred in Petrograd during the previous months
- ministers were appointed due to their compliance rather than competence to run the war effort.

**Other factors:**

**Role of Tsar Nicholas II:**

- Nicholas II struggled to rule such a vast Empire with its varied nationalities. He pursued unpopular policies such as Russification
- concentration of power in the hands of one person: their character mattered
- great difficulties ruling such a vast Empire with its varied nationalities
- difficulties in managing change, especially political change demanded by economic developments
- Nicholas was easily influenced by the Tsarina, Rasputin and his Ministers. At times, the Tsar appeared to be more interested in his family than in issues facing Russia
- he was stubborn as he ignored advice and warnings from Rodzianko and the Progressive Bloc. He failed to understand the severity of events in February 1917
- in September 1915, the Tsar took personal control of the armed forces (Commander-in-chief), which left him personally responsible for any defeats
- by February 1917, the Tsar had lost control of the armed forces as well as the support and loyalty of the Russian people, which contributed to the February 1917 Revolution.

**Discontent among the working class:**

- the growing working class worked and lived in poor conditions, with long hours and poor wages as well as overcrowded accommodation
- there had been a wave of strikes by the workers in Petrograd towards the end of 1916 which the government had suppressed, discontent among the urban workers only got worse. Even a police report in January 1917 shows sympathy with them as it talked of the despair of the workers who are 'reduced to the level of cattle only fit to serve as cannon-fodder'
- due to their poor working and living conditions, the industrial working class were receptive to the new socialist ideas that were around
- real trouble began in the middle of February when stocks of flour and fuel in Petrograd and Moscow fell to their lowest level ever and there were rumours that bread rationing was to be introduced. It was colder than average that winter and people had to queue for hours on end, even all night for a single loaf

- the police reports from the time identify growing anger and frustration among the women who had to spend so much of their time queueing for food
- the working class began to organise a series of strikes and demonstrations in 1917. Many of the working class were hungry as grain was being given to the soldiers and much of it was not reaching the cities as the trains were requisitioned for the use of the army
- there was a lack of food made worse by the transport problems and the loss of agricultural land to the Germans and as a result, in the cities there were long queues and bread riots culminating in International Women's Day protest in Petrograd.

**Peasant discontent:**

- peasant discontent over the land issue increased during the war years. When order began to break down, land seizures by peasants became common
- the war put extra strains on the peasantry with requisitioning of horses and conscription of men. This hit output
- the horror of Russia's huge casualties was felt most among the peasants. This added further misery to their already poor lives.

**Impact of the First World War:**

- the war did not go well for the Russian armed forces and they suffered many defeats (e.g., Tannenberg and Masurian Lakes in 1914; Galicia – 1915). Russia also lost control of Poland in 1915, which was a severe blow to Russian pride
- the Russian army lacked vital resources, including adequate medical care, and this led to high fatality and casualty rates
- there were claims of defeats caused by incompetent officers who refused to cooperate with each other as well as communication difficulties. This led to low morale and desertions
- the Tsar began to lose control and support of the armed forces
- the generals forced his abdication at a railroad siding in the city of Pskov.
- the war was costing 17 million roubles a day and Russia had to get loans from Britain and France
- economic problems such as heavy taxes, high inflation and price rises meant that many were living in poverty
- the people had expected the war to be won by Christmas 1914, so they were war weary by 1917 and suffering from grief, anxiety and low morale. They wanted the war to end but they knew the Tsar would not agree to that and they became so unhappy and frustrated. They protested and went on strike which led to the February Revolution as the army sympathised with them and consequently sided with them against the Tsarist system
- war exacerbated existing economic problems and showed the frailty of the Russian economy in dealing with a modern, industrial conflict.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**44. Context:**

The abdication of the Tsar in February 1917 had led to a largely middle and upper-class provisional government being formed. However, the working class, isolated from political power, was represented by the revolutionary parties. Divided political power was to prove a major issue in 1917.

**Political discontent:**

- the Kronstadt Mutiny, July 1917: Sailors and workers attempted to set up a Soviet-style government at the naval base outside Petrograd. This event triggered the confused political uprising of the July Days
- the July Days were strikes and demonstrations in Petrograd inspired by, but not led by, the Bolsheviks. The uprising was put down by troops loyal to the Provisional Government
- Trotsky was arrested, and Lenin forced to flee to Finland in disgrace. Kerensky was able to brand the Bolsheviks as traitors
- the weakness of the Provisional Government can be seen in the Kornilov Revolt, August 1917, as Kerensky had to ask the Soviets and Red Guards to help defend Petrograd when the Supreme Commander of the Russian army sent troops back to Petrograd after falling out with Kerensky. The Bolsheviks were able to act as protectors of Petrograd. They did not return their weapons to the Provisional Government after the revolt failed.

**Other factors:**

**Dual Power:**

- Dual Power describes the division of authority between the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies after the collapse of the Tsarist government in February 1917
- the Provisional Government held formal authority in the Russian Empire even though it was a self-appointed body made up from the remnants of the Tsarist Duma, which had been elected on a highly restrictive franchise. It was not representative of public opinion
- the Provisional Government was weak and as its name suggests was never intended to be a permanent authority, which undermined its credibility
- acts such as the eight-point programme which included an amnesty for all political offences, freedom of speech and elections for a Constituent Assembly were counter-productive as revolutionaries freed from jail were able to work against the Provisional Government
- the Petrograd Soviet reconvened immediately after the February Revolution. This was an organisation built up from the grass roots as each factory and soldier's unit formed their own mini soviets and sent delegates to the city Soviet. This gave the Petrograd Soviet a popular mandate and political authority
- the Petrograd Soviet issued Order No 1 in March 1917, which stated that soldiers should only obey orders that were acceptable to the Petrograd Soviet
- in September 1917, the Bolsheviks won majorities in both the Petrograd and Moscow soviets with Trotsky becoming chairman of the Petrograd Soviet.

**Decision to continue the war:**

- the Provisional Government decided to continue to pursue victory in the First World War. This was largely due to the social make-up of the Provisional Government – middle and upper classes had supported the fall of the Tsar because they believed it was the only way to achieve victory for Russia in the war
- there was also pressure from Russia's allies to continue and Russia's dependence on foreign loans which would be withdrawn if Russia did not continue to fight
- in April 1917, Paul Miliukov sent a note to Russia's allies assuring them that Russia would continue to fight. Publication of this note led to widespread protests and loss of support for the Provisional Government
- the war continued to go badly with the failure of the July offensive and a disastrous defeat at Tarnopol
- mutiny and desertion increased as military failures continued. Deserters attempted to make their way home even seizing trains which caused massive disruption to the transport network.

**Land Issue:**

- all over Russia peasants were seizing land and wanted the Provisional Government to legitimise this
- the failure of the Provisional Government to recognise the peasants' claims eroded confidence in the Provisional Government
- increasing violence in the countryside against landlords
- food shortages caused discontent, and some peasants were caught up by revolutionary slogans such as 'Peace, Land and Bread'.

**Appeal of Lenin and the Bolsheviks:**

- leadership of Lenin: Lenin's return in April 1917 immediately broke the initial co-operation of the Bolsheviks with the other revolutionary parties after the February Revolution. He called for a second socialist revolution
- Lenin's April Theses quickly became Bolshevik policy with persuasive slogans such as. 'Peace, Land and Bread' and 'All power to the Soviets'
- Lenin foresaw that the Bolsheviks could achieve power through the Soviets: Bolshevik power in the Soviets would be followed by Bolshevik takeover of the state. The Bolsheviks kept attending the Petrograd Soviet when most of the other stopped doing so and this gave them control of the Soviet, which they could then use against the Provisional Government
- in Trotsky, Lenin found an energetic and motivational organiser who laid the plans for the October Revolution.

**Any other relevant factors.**

45. **Context:**

In the 1920s the attitudes of Americans towards immigration began to change. Rather than celebrating America's open-door policy, many Americans feared that their way of life would be undermined by the millions of 'new' immigrants arriving from eastern and central Europe.

**Fear of revolution:**

- attitudes towards immigration changed due to the Red Scare which increased suspicion of immigrants. The Russian Revolution in 1917 had established the first Communist state, which was committed to spreading revolution and destroying capitalism. As many immigrants to the USA came from Russia and Eastern Europe, it was feared that these immigrants would bring communist ideas into the USA
- in 1919 there was a wave of strikes in the USA. Many of the strikers were unskilled and semi-skilled workers and recent immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. People opposed to the strikes linked the strikes with communism as it was believed that revolution was imminent
- the American public's fear of red revolution appeared to be confirmed when the US Attorney General Mitchell Palmer's house in Washington, DC, was blown up and letter bombs were sent to government officials. The Red Scare reached a peak of hysteria when Palmer ordered the arrest of 4000 alleged communists in 33 cities in what became known as the Palmer Raids, conducted between November 1919 and January 1920.

**Other factors:**

**Isolationism:**

- attitudes towards immigration in the 1920s were in some respects a development of existing attitudes towards immigration apparent in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Before the 1920s, the USA's 'open door' policy did not apply to everyone. Before 1900 the USA had reduced Asian immigration. The first significant law to restrict immigration into the USA was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 which banned most Chinese immigration or the immigration of Chinese labourers, a term vague enough to ensure that very few Chinese migrants were able to slip through the net
- the first general Federal Immigration Law in 1882 imposed a head tax of 50 cents on each immigrant admitted and denied entrance into the USA of 'any convict, lunatic, idiot, or any person unable to take care of himself or herself without becoming a public charge'
- the Immigration Restriction League was founded in 1894 to oppose 'undesirable immigrants' from southern and eastern Europe who, it was believed, threatened the American way of life
- the 1913 Alien Land Law prohibited 'aliens ineligible for citizenship' from owning agricultural land or possessing long term leases. This particularly affected Chinese, Indian, Japanese and Korean immigrant farmers
- at the beginning of the First World War, American public opinion was firmly on the side of neutrality and wanted to keep out of foreign problems and concentrate solely on America. When the war ended, most Americans were even more in favour of a return to the USA's traditional policy of isolationism
- despite Woodrow Wilson's support of a League of Nations to sort out future disputes between countries, in November 1919 and March 1920 the US Senate voted against US membership of the League of Nations, refusing to accept the terms of the League of Nations covenant. The USA was determined not to be involved in Europe's problems or become dragged into another European war. The USA was now firmly committed to a policy of isolationism.

**Prejudice and racism:**

- attitudes towards immigration changed due to fears concerning the changing nature of immigration. Up until the 1880s most immigrants to the USA came from northern and western Europe from, e.g., Britain, Germany and Scandinavia. After 1880 most immigrants came from southern and eastern Europe, from countries such as Russia, Poland and Italy. Descendants of the more established immigrants, known as WASPs (White, Anglo-Saxon Protestants) were concerned there would be a flood of new immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe which they believed would threaten their way of life. Some new immigrants continued to wear traditional dress which was not viewed as being 'American'
- many new immigrants were Catholic or Jewish which led to the belief that the arrival of new immigrants would threaten the Protestant religion
- many new immigrants were unfamiliar with democracy. This was viewed as a threat to the American constitution
- 'nativists' who believed immigrants brought new and threatening ideas into the USA, were most prevalent in the mid-western and southern states.

**Social fears:**

- attitudes towards immigration changed due to fears that immigration would lead to competition for housing and jobs. White working-class Americans experienced rising rents due to the high demand for housing
- most new immigrants settled in cities in the north and east of the USA and often congregated with people from their own culture in ghettos. Some Americans felt this was a threat to their way of life
- there were also fears that immigrants would increase the already high crime rates in cities. Such fears were heightened by the existence of organised crime gangs such as the Mafia with its Italian roots. Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were two Italian immigrant anarchists who were convicted of robbery and murder. Their trial linked crime, immigration and 'un-American' political revolutionary ideas in the minds of many Americans
- the activities of Al Capone, the son of Italian immigrants also reinforced the stereotype that all Italian immigrants were in some way linked to crime.

**Economic fears:**

- attitudes towards immigration changed due to increased fears that the jobs of 'Americans' would be threatened. Due to new production methods employers realised they could make huge profits by employing immigrants and paying them low wages. Trade unions believed that anything they did to improve conditions or wages was wrecked by Italian or Polish workers who were prepared to work longer hours for lower wages
- new immigrants were also used as 'strike breakers' as long hours and low wages in the USA were often better than what they were used to. There was huge resentment towards immigrant strike breakers which led to an increase in the desire to stop immigrants coming into the country.

**The effects of the First World War:**

- many immigrants during the First World War had sympathies for their mother country which led to resentment within the USA
- a large part of the US immigrant population was of German or Austrian origin. Many of these immigrants had supported the German side in the war and society was split when the USA joined the war against Germany. Anti-German propaganda containing stories of German atrocities increased dislike and suspicion of immigrants from Germany and the old Austrian Empire
- Irish Americans were suspected of being anti-British
- many citizens felt hostile to anything foreign. During the war, many Americans resented having to become involved in Europe's problems. After the First World War the USA was even more in favour of isolationism. By 1918 the USA wanted to leave Europe behind especially after the November armistice, when ships began to bring the wounded back to the United States from the European Western Front. Many Americans therefore did not want new waves of immigrants bringing 'European' problems to the USA.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**46. Context:**

Although the collapse of the New York Stock Exchange in October 1929 symbolises the start of the US economic crisis which in turn led to a worldwide depression, problems in the American economy went beyond the stock market and began before 1929 with the failure of Republican administrations following a policy of laissez-faire throughout the 1920s.

**Republican government policies in the 1920s:**

- the Republican administrations followed a policy of laissez-faire. Under Harding and Coolidge, the USA enjoyed a period of great prosperity. Most Republicans believed that governments should be involved as little as possible in the day to day running of the economy. If business people were left alone to make their own decisions, it was thought that high profits, more jobs and good wages would be the result. The only role for the government was to help business when requested
- there was a failure to help farmers who also did not benefit from the 1920s boom
- low capital gains tax encouraged share speculation which resulted in the Wall Street Crash
- the Great Depression was also due to the actions, or inactions, of President Hoover. Few politicians realised the seriousness of the economic crisis and believed the economy would eventually recover by itself without the need for federal intervention. It is believed that the Hoover administration took the narrow interests of business groups to be the national interest which turned out to be catastrophic. Republican attempts to bring America out of the Great Depression were described as 'too little too late'.

**Other factors:**

**Overproduction of goods and underconsumption:**

- new mass-production methods and mechanisation meant that the production of consumer goods had expanded enormously creating a consumer boom in the 1920s. Items such as irons, ovens, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, refrigerators, radios and telephones became very popular. The production of automobiles rose from 1.9 million in 1920 to 4.5 million in 1929
- by 1929 those people who had the money to buy consumer goods, even on credit, had already bought them. Cars, radios and other electrical goods had flooded the market, and more were being made than people could buy. The USA was experiencing the serious problem of overproduction. Radios, telephones, washing machines, refrigerators and other goods were piling up in warehouses across the country
- the enormous output of goods required a corresponding increase of consumer buying power (higher wages). However, workers' income in the 1920s did not rise with the increased productivity. The purchasing power of farmers had also declined. Between 1920 and 1932 the total income of farmers dropped by approximately 70%. Many small farmers lived in appalling conditions and many lost their farms due to outstanding debts
- throughout the 1920s business had benefited from low tax policies. The result of this was that the bottom 40% of the population received only 12.5% of the nation's wealth. The economic boom of the 1920s was not a good time for everyone. In 1928 it was estimated that 42% of Americans did not earn enough to buy adequate food, clothing or shelter. Many American people were too poor to afford the new consumer goods
- in contrast, the top 5% of the population owned 33% of the nation's wealth. Only a wealthy minority of the US population could afford the new consumer goods that rolled off factory production lines
- therefore, domestic demand never kept up with production. By the end of the 1920s the market for the new consumer goods was saturated. By 1929 automobile factories had to lay off thousands of workers because of reduced demand.



**Weaknesses of the US banking system:**

- a major problem was the lack of regulation of banks
- the US banking system was made up of hundreds of small, state-based banks. In hundreds of small communities, local people put their money into the banks for safe keeping and a small amount of interest. Banks then used that money to make investments that made some money for the banks. As the economic boom grew, banks invested savers' money in stocks and shares in the hope of making a large profit
- when people began to withdraw their savings, the banks could not cope with the demand as funds had been invested elsewhere. The collapse of one bank often led to a 'run' on other banks, resulting in a banking collapse. By the end of 1932, 20% of the banks that had been operating in 1929 had closed. The normal banking system almost ceased to exist and without an efficient banking system, the economy could not function.

**International economic problems:**

- results of the First World War on European economies
- all European states, except Britain, placed tariffs on imported goods which meant American companies were failing to sell the extra goods they were producing to foreign countries
- US economy could not expand its foreign markets
- US tariff barriers meant that other countries found it difficult to pay back loans, which they had to refinance, becoming increasingly indebted.

**Wall Street Crash:**

- during the 1920s many people were encouraged to buy shares in American companies. As the share prices went up, the demand for shares increased further as people saw the chance to make easy money. The boom of the 1920s however was very fragile and the rise in share prices was based on the confidence that prosperity would continue
- by the late 1920s ordinary people, banks and big businesses were buying shares 'on the margin', paying only a fraction of the full price at the time of purchase, intending to sell on the shares at a profit before the rest of the payment became due. This meant that share buyers were forcing up share prices with money they did not really have
- during the late 1920s, the economic boom started to slow down. There was an atmosphere of uncertainty in October 1929 and some shareholders began to sell their shares, believing that prices were at their peak
- on 21 October prices began to fall. On 24 October 1929, Black Thursday, the Wall Street Crash began. On 29 October 1929, Black Tuesday, the US Stock market collapsed completely. As hardly anyone wanted to buy shares, the shares were sold for very low prices. The share collapse caused panic. Many firms went out of business and thousands of Americans were financially ruined
- the stock market crash played a role in the Great Depression, but its significance was more as a trigger. The Wall Street Crash led to a collapse of credit, and of confidence. It revealed how fragile and unstable the economic boom of the 1920s really was.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**47. Context:**

The Depression was a shattering and demoralising experience. The new Democrat President Franklin D. Roosevelt believed the government should be actively responsible for helping struggling US citizens caught up in the Depression and so introduced the New Deal which aimed to provide Relief, Recovery and Reform. The New Deal had considerable success in achieving its three main aims.

**Role of Roosevelt and 'confidence-building':**

- during his first 100 days as President, Roosevelt set up over 100 government or federal agencies. The agencies became known by their initials and were collectively known as the 'Alphabet Agencies'
- 15 major laws were passed through Congress which met Roosevelt's promise for 'Action and Action Now!'
- Roosevelt's priority was to restore confidence in the US banking system
- Roosevelt gave 'fireside chats': over 30 from March 1933. The fireside chats were brilliant pieces of public relations using the latest mass communication device, the radio
- Roosevelt declared that 'the only thing we have to fear is fear itself' and his fireside chats on the radio, a great novelty, did a great deal to help restore the nation's confidence
- the First New Deal 1933-1934
- the Second New Deal 1935-1937
- the New Deal increased the role of the Federal government in American society and the economy
- the Federal government played a role in strengthening the power of organised labour
- the Federal government also played a role as regulator between business, labour and agriculture
- there were however challenges in the Supreme Court to the Federal government's increased intervention
- there was also opposition from State governments, especially in the South who believed the Federal government was becoming too powerful and was taking away individual states' rights to run their own affairs. Employers groups who formed the Liberty League opposed the New Deal. Some groups believed the New Deal was 'un-American'.

**Banking:**

- a number of confidence-building measures were introduced. The Emergency Banking Relief Act (1933) allowed the closing and checking of banks for four days, to ensure they were well-run and credit-worthy. Only 'sound' banks were allowed to reopen. It was hoped these measures would restore public confidence in the banks and stop people from withdrawing all their savings
- by the end of 1933, many small banks had closed or were merged
- most depositors regained much of their money
- by restoring public confidence with a Federal guarantee in the banks, it was hoped that it would not only dissuade further large withdrawals of funds but that it would actually encourage people to reinvest their savings in the banks once again
- the Banking Act (1935) established the Federal Bank Deposit Insurance Corporation that insured deposits up to \$5,000, and later, \$10,000.

**Agriculture:**

- the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) helped farmers by keeping prices steady and limiting overproduction
- as a result of the attempts to limit overproduction, prices did go up and farmers' incomes doubled between 1933 and 1939
- in the USA 30% of the workforce were employed in agriculture. Increasing their income allowed farm workers to spend more
- the unpopular prohibition was ended to raise revenue and to boost grain production
- the Farm Credit Union (FCA) helped farmers by providing low-interest loans and as a result many farmers did not lose their farms.

**Industry:**

- the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) aimed to build dams and power plants to provide electric power to rural areas along the Tennessee River in seven states
- the Public Works Administration (PWA) also provided work through the building of hospitals, dams, bridges and schools
- the National Labour Relations Act ('Wagner Act') (1935) protected the rights of workers to collectively bargain with employers. Employers were prevented from discriminating against workers who joined trade unions
- the WPA (Works Progress Administration) (1935) launched a programme of public works across America. By 1938 it provided employment for three million men and some women, building roads, schools and tunnels, e.g., the Rural Electrification Act (1936) provided loans to provide electricity to rural areas of America
- the economic effects in terms of relief and recovery have been debated. The New Deal certainly helped in terms of providing basic relief
- Roosevelt's first term in office saw one of the fastest periods of GDP growth in US history. However, a downturn in 1937-38 raised questions about just how successful the policies were
- although it never reached the heights of before the Depression, the New Deal did see a couple of positive results economically. From 1933 to 1939, GDP increased by 60% from \$55 billion to \$85 billion. The amount of consumer products bought increased by 40% while private investment in industry increased five times in just six years
- however, unemployment continued to be a problem, never running at less than 14% of the working population
- the importance of re-armament in reducing unemployment and revitalising the American economy was considerable, particularly after the mini-slump of 1937.

**Society:**

- the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) which aimed to help the poor by setting up soup kitchens and providing money for clothes and school costs
- the Economy Act cut wages of state employees by 15%. It also cut the budgets of government departments by 25%, in order to balance the budget economic prudence was shown by spending the savings on relief programmes
- the Social Security Act (1935) provided a state pension scheme for old people and widows, as well as help for the disabled and poor children
- the Second New Deal introduced reforms to improve living and working conditions for many Americans through legislation
- the WPA (Works Progress Administration) (1935) launched a programme of public works across America. By 1938 it provided employment for three million men and some women, building roads, schools and tunnels.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**48. Context:**

Despite modest progress in black Americans' civil rights, several events highlighted the continuing problem of prejudice and discrimination in post-war America. While these events publicised the full horrors of segregation, they also demonstrated that segregation could be challenged and changed by the emergence of new black leaders which was a significant factor in the development of a more organised mass movement for civil rights after 1945.

**Role of Martin Luther King:**

- Martin Luther King was an inspirational speaker and leader who was prepared to be arrested, criticised and even put his own life at risk for the cause of civil rights
- Martin Luther King believed that non-violent, peaceful civil disobedience was the best weapon in the fight for civil rights. King felt that if a law was wrong then the citizens of a country had both the right and responsibility to protest about it. He believed in endless protests to wear down the resistance of white racists
- Martin Luther King presented a non-threatening image of black protest to the US television audience
- King became president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) formed in 1957 to coordinate the work of the civil rights groups. King became more involved and well known for his use of non-violent civil disobedience in the campaign for civil rights
- King led many demonstrations in the south which encouraged the development of the civil rights movement. During the Montgomery Bus Boycott 1955-56, King's leadership inspired the black population of Montgomery to keep up the pressure for civil rights
- through the effective use of the media, King became famous and publicised the civil rights movement throughout the world
- King urged African Americans to use peaceful methods in the campaign for civil rights. King won international recognition for the civil rights campaign.

**Other factors:**

**Prejudice and discrimination:**

- continuing racial discrimination pushed many black Americans to demand civil rights. The experience of war emphasised freedom, democracy and human rights yet in the USA Jim Crow laws still existed and lynching went unpunished
- the continuing problem of prejudice and discrimination was highlighted when Emmett Till, a 14-year-old black boy from Chicago, was murdered in Mississippi. The Emmett Till case had a big effect on the development of the civil rights movement due to the publicity of the trial. Despite being virtually unrecognisable due to being beaten up so badly, Emmett's mother insisted on showing her son's corpse in an open coffin which shocked both local people and the nation
- the US Supreme Court's 1954 decision to end segregation in schools (Brown versus the Topeka Board of Education) followed by the protest at Little Rock High School, Arkansas in 1957, encouraged civil rights campaigners. The sight of Elizabeth Eckford being bullied and threatened for attending a white school made national and world news headlines
- the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama (over the arrest of Rosa Parks, who refused to give up her seat on a segregated bus) was one of the first successful protests and showed the effectiveness of united peaceful, non-violent protest.

### **Experience of black servicemen in the Second World War:**

- despite the US Army being segregated, black servicemen in Europe had freedoms they had never experienced in America. Even in prisoner of war camps, black airmen were treated as officers regardless of their colour
- as a result, black soldiers, sailors and airmen supported the 'Double-V' campaign: victory against the enemy abroad in the war and victory for civil rights at home in America
- A. Philip Randolph is credited with highlighting the problems faced by black Americans during World War II which planted the seeds that grew into the civil rights movement of the 1950s. A. Philip Randolph was the president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, a mainly black union. The porters, who travelled on long-distance overnight trains, could carry news between black communities in the rural south and those in northern cities during the Second World War. A. Philip Randolph threatened a mass protest march in Washington unless discrimination in defence industry jobs and in the armed forces was ended. In 1941 Randolph and other black leaders met President Roosevelt with three demands: an end to segregation and discrimination in federal government jobs, an end to segregation of the armed forces, and government support for an end to discrimination and segregation in all jobs in the USA
- as the USA was fighting against Hitler's racist policies in Europe and unwilling to highlight the USA's own racism, Roosevelt gave in to some of Randolph's demands and issued Executive Order 8802 which stated that there would be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defence industries and in government on the basis of race, colour or religious beliefs
- Roosevelt also established the Fair Employment Practices Committee to investigate incidents of discrimination
- not all of Randolph's demands were met. Segregation in the armed forces and in jobs in the USA continued
- a positive outcome of the Double-V campaign was the creation of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in 1942 which was the beginning of a mass movement for civil rights. CORE was to play a large part in the civil rights protests of the 1950s.

### **Role of black civil rights organisations:**

- a group of black and white college students created the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) to help coordinate, support and publicise the sit-in campaign. Their first target was segregated lunch counters and their use of non-violent protest in the face of provocation gained the civil rights movement support across the country
- the SNCC joined with young people from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in boycotts, marches and freedom rides. TV news coverage of attacks on the Freedom Riders, e.g., shocked the American public
- the combined actions of these organisations breathed new life into the civil rights movement and ended discrimination in many public places including restaurants, hotels, and theatres. These successes further encouraged the development of the civil rights campaign to demand more.

**Emergence of effective black leaders:**

- the civil rights campaign was inspired by the ideas of the black activist, Malcolm X. He was an articulate, although confrontational speaker, who became a preacher for the Nation of Islam and spoke against King's belief in non-violence. Malcolm X believed non-violence meant being defenceless and stated that black people had to work out their own futures without relying on white help. Malcolm X was one of the first black civil rights activists to draw attention to the problems of crime, and unemployment in the ghettos of American cities
- many young black Americans living in the ghettos were attracted to the more extreme ideas of Stokely Carmichael and 'Black Power' – a direct ideas descendant of Marcus Garvey and his 'Back to Africa' movement. Many black Americans no longer believed that non-violence was the way forward
- the Black Panthers attracted attention and headline news contributing to the civil rights campaign. The Black Panther Party for Self-Defence was founded by Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale. The Black Panthers represented the opposite of Martin Luther King's ideas and supported the anti-white, black separatist ideas of Stokely Carmichael and Malcolm X. The Black Panthers became very popular among young black Americans in the big cities and gained a lot of publicity. On the other hand, even at the height of their popularity, membership was relatively low, losing support as a result of their confrontational tactics
- many civil rights leaders were effective in attracting media coverage and large followings although other leaders and organisations were eclipsed by media focus on the main personalities
- the black radicals attracted support for the civil rights campaign but also divided opinion across the USA.

**Any other relevant factors.**

49. **Context:**

The interwar years saw the rise of fascist political parties in numerous European countries. One facet of fascism was an aggressive nationalism that placed the idea of nation and loyalty to nation at the core of their belief and political system if they got into power. This aggression illustrated in the actions of Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy in the 1930s.

**Weakness of the League of Nations:**

- purpose of the League was to ensure world peace through collective security and disarmament. This the league conspicuously failed to do allowing Fascism to grow unchecked
- the League was divided politically. Its main supporters had their own domestic audiences which dictated their policies, which led to confusion and inconsistency in the international response to aggression
- British policy of appeasement and concerns over their Empire led them to prioritise their own interests rather than back the League
- French political divisions between the left and right led to their inaction and perceived unreliability as an ally
- the USA retreated into isolationism further weakening the League
- there was suspicion of Communist Soviet Russia from the democracies
- the peace treaties created many states in Eastern Europe which were difficult to defend
- determined aggression worked as the League failed to stop the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. Even when the League did act, by putting mild sanctions on Italy they were too little, too late.

**Other factors:**

**The Peace Settlement of 1919:**

- determination to revise/overturn Paris Peace Settlement – German resentment of Article 48 which made Germany accept guilt for starting the war; hatred of the reparations bill of £6 600,000,000; disarmament clauses were also a cause of resentment as the German army was reduced to 100,000 men and was not allowed heavy weaponry; lost territory; in particular in the east to Poland was bitterly resented
- German desire to get revenge for defeat in WWI. Hitler called the Treaty a Diktat; a dictated treaty forced on a helpless Germany
- Italy came into the war on the side of the Allies in 1915. She suffered during the war but hoped to gain land at the expense of Austria-Hungary, in particular the Dalmatian coast. Italian territorial gains were small scale. It was felt that the Italians had suffered and gained little
- Mussolini in Italy promised to make Italy great again and wipe out the embarrassment of the peace treaties when he gained power in 1922.

**Fascist ideology:**

- Fascism was nationalistic in nature; emphasising the importance of loyalty to country [and superiority over others]
- Fascism is often defined by what it dislikes. One fundamental belief was a pathological hatred of communism which led to an anti-Soviet crusade as well as contempt for the 'weak' democracies
- Fascism as seen through Nazism was racist. This belief in the superiority of the 'German/Aryan' people [through a crude Social Darwinism] allowed Nazis to perpetuate the idea of a racial mission to conquer the world and cleanse it of 'weaker' races
- Fascism was militaristic in nature – fascist glorification of war; Prussian/German military traditions/harking back to the glories of the Roman Empire in Italy
- Fascist foreign policies were driven by Hitler's and Mussolini's own belief, but also their personalities and charismatic leadership
- irredentism or the intention to reclaim and reoccupy lost territory, e.g., Hitler's commitment to incorporation of all Germans within Reich
- Fascism between the wars was expansionist. Mussolini's 'Roman' ambitions in the Mediterranean and Africa; Hitler's ambitions for lebensraum or living space in Eastern Europe and Russia.

**Economic difficulties after 1929:**

- in 1929 the US economy crashed leading the world into economic recession. This had a particularly dramatic effect on Germany as unemployment soared to 6 million
- by 1929 Italy fascist economic policy was failing; an aggressive foreign policy was useful in distracting the people at home
- an aggressive foreign policy was also useful in gaining resources for the fascist powers, e.g., Italian invasion of Abyssinia and Hitler's obsession with lebensraum
- Germany also developed policies to use their economic and political power to make the countries of Southern Europe and the Balkans dependent on Germany. Germany would exploit their raw materials and export manufactured goods to them.

**The British policy of appeasement:**

- appeasement was intended to solve genuine foreign policy grievances that had arisen from the 1919 peace treaties, through negotiation
- British public opinion broadly supported the policy of appeasement, though there were voices raised in dissent. Many felt that Germany had genuine grievances which deserved to be settled
- British appeasement to an extent encouraged both Germany and Italy to increase their demands and do so increasingly forcefully. They certainly reinforced fascist belief in the weakness of democracies
- British attempts to keep Mussolini away from Hitler's influence during the Abyssinian crisis resulted in the Hoare-Laval Pact, which produced a popular outcry when the terms were leaked. Mussolini saw that Britain and France were not opposed in principle to gains for Italy in East Africa and he was able to defy sanctions and keep Abyssinia
- Hitler knew of British reservations about some terms of the Versailles Treaty and was able to play on these, increasingly realizing that he would not be stopped, e.g., rearmament, the reoccupation of the Rhineland and then the Anschluss.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**50. Context:**

Appeasement is the policy of making concessions to another power in order to avoid conflict. Historically, the term is frequently associated with the Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. The context to the policy is more long term, but the failure of the League of Nations and collective security in the aftermath of the First World War, known at the time as the war to end all wars, forms the backdrop to the policy in the pre-1939 period.

**Public opinion:**

- fear of another war – recent memories of the scale of losses and horrors of the Great War 1914–1918
- isolationist feelings summed up in Chamberlain’s pre-Munich speech of a quarrel in a faraway country
- evidence of public anti-war feeling – the 1935 Peace Ballot and Oxford University Union debate that ‘This House will in no circumstances fight for King and Country’ both seemed to give evidence of the widespread pacifist attitudes of the British people at the time
- Fulham East by-election showed strength of anti-war feeling
- there was also a degree of sympathy with Germany and the perceived unfairness of the Versailles Treaty. Germany therefore had just grievances that needed to be addressed.

**Other factors:**

**Economic difficulties:**

- economic difficulties – impact of 1929-32 economic crisis and depression on the British economy
- the desire to have a balanced budget hampered the ability to finance an expansion of the armed forces
- reluctance to further damage international trade and commerce
- difficulty of financing any large-scale rearmament.

**Lack of reliable allies:**

- failure of the League of Nations to manage world peace
- lack of trust in the French, who it was felt were unreliable and indeed, the cause of some of the problems with Germany
- US isolationism led to the withdrawal of one of the main world powers from international political affairs
- suspicion of communist Soviet Russia meant that they were never seriously thought of as potential allies against Nazism. The British also knew about the Soviet purge of 40,000 Red Army officers in 1937 so were very sceptical about Soviet offensive capacity in the event of war
- doubts over commitment of Empire and the Dominions in event of war e.g., the South African elder statesman, Jan Smuts, openly feared that Britain might become involved in a war in central Europe that would not be supported by the Dominions
- even as late as 1938 there was no certainty that Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa would have fought beside Britain in the event of war in Europe. Britain was dependent on their manpower to defend the Empire.

**Military weakness:**

- after the Allied victory of 1918 the budget for the armed forces was significantly reduced
- army: conscription ended post-WW1, scaled right down in size. Even after a period of rearmament it comprised a field force of five regular divisions, one of which was mechanised. By the time of the Czech crisis of 1938 Britain could only offer two divisions to the French
- Chamberlain and the military chiefs of staff saw Britain's role in a future European war as one where they would use the navy to blockade and a modern effective air force to attack. There was no need for a large army as their continental allies [the French] had such a large army
- navy: not so run-down but not fully maintained; many obsolete ships. Evidence of expansion and innovation, however. In 1937 HMS Ark Royal, the Royal Navy's first aircraft carrier, was launched
- air force: lack of adequate air defences and fear of aerial bombing. By September 1938 there were only four radar stations in operation in southern England
- however, the air force was expanding by 1936 with heavy bomber designs asked for. By 1938 the focus was on fighter production to face the threat of bombers. Plans were to produce 3754 aircraft between January and July 1939
- there were multiple threats that Britain had to face – Japan in the East, Italy in the Mediterranean and North Africa, Germany in Central Europe
- military priorities meant that British Armed forces were geared to defence of Britain first, her trade routes second, her overseas territories third and the defence of any wartime allies fourth. This had an impact on the development of their military forces in the late 1930s
- warnings of Chiefs-of-Staff
- exaggerated assessments of German military strength, especially bomber strength and capacity to inflict damage on cities in the south of England
- although defence spending was increased in the years after 1934 Britain began rearming much later than Germany
- only in February 1936 did the British cabinet approve programmes for a possible war to be implemented over a three to five-year programme.

**Beliefs of Chamberlain:**

- Chamberlain's took personal control of British foreign policy. He short-circuited the Foreign Office
- over issues like the Czech crisis Chamberlain reflected the views of most British people that the it was '*a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing*'
- Chamberlain believed that problems could be solved rationally, by negotiation
- Chamberlain also recognised that Hitler was not entirely to be trusted. With the Anglo-German declaration after Munich, that the desire of the British and German peoples 'never to go to war with one another again', e.g., he recognised that if Hitler kept to the bargain then all was well and good but if he broke it, he would demonstrate to all the world that he was totally cynical and untrustworthy.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**51. Context:**

Britain's foremost foreign policy aim was the maintenance of peace in Europe. Up to March 1938, this was only partly achieved due to conflicts in Abyssinia and Spain.

**Abyssinia:**

- Mussolini's plans for a new Roman Empire in the Adriatic, the Mediterranean and North Africa were a blow to British foreign policy in hoping to convert Mussolini into an ally
- Stresa Front (1935) initially seemed successful in binding Mussolini to the democracies
- Italian invasion of Abyssinia (modern day Ethiopia) in 1935
- Mussolini's Italy had broken the rules of the League of Nations by using aggression and invading one of the only independent African nations and deserved to be punished under League rules
- however, the British and French wanted to keep Mussolini friendly so attempted to contain Italy by offering concessions and land in Africa
- the British Foreign Secretary Sir Samuel Hoare and French Foreign Minister, Pierre Laval, came up with a plan to effectively try to buy off the Italians by offering them some of Abyssinia's land from the south of the country (Abyssinia was not consulted)
- public revulsion to Franco-British connivance at Italian aggression led to Hoare's resignation
- the imposition of limited economic sanctions on Italy alienated Mussolini, thereby driving him closer to Hitler, yet failing to save Abyssinia.

**Rhineland:**

- the Rhineland had been demilitarised as part of the Treaty of Versailles. No military installations were permitted there
- 22,000 German troops marched into the Rhineland on 7 March, 1936
- remilitarisation broke the Peace Treaty of 1919, yet no action was taken by Britain or France due to differing attitudes towards Hitler's actions. France was polarised politically and would not act without British support. Britain denounced the action, but there was also considerable sympathy of Hitler's actions. The Rhineland was part of Germany and why should she not have armed forces there?
- no war occurred as a result of the Rhineland crisis, but the lesson Hitler learned was that the democracies were divided. He took this to mean weakness.

**Naval Agreement:**

- the Anglo German Naval Agreement (1935) successfully limited German naval strength to 35% of British, however, it also allowed for the construction of submarines, up to British strength. This can be seen as a success for British foreign policy in the sense that they felt they were managing Germany's demands. However it can also be seen as weakness as yet again the terms of the Treaty of Versailles had been broken.

**Non-intervention:**

- the Spanish Civil War took place between 1936 and 1939 between forces that defended the democratically elected Republic and forces that opposed it called Nationalists
- the policy of non-intervention was sponsored by Britain and France through the Non-intervention Committee; it also guaranteed that Britain would be on good terms with the victors
- the policy was openly breached by Germany and Italy who sent significant military aid to Franco's Nationalist forces, and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union who sent help to the Republic
- there was also intervention by volunteers of the International Brigades who fought for the Republic, but withdrew towards the end of 1938
- attacks on non-Spanish shipping ended after the British and French navies were ordered to destroy attacking foreign submarines and aircraft
- the Spanish Civil War did not turn into a wider European conflict. In this the policy of non-intervention was successful, but at some cost as the dictators tested the weaponry and tactics that would be so successful in 1940.

**Anschluss of March 1938:**

- the joining together of German speaking Austria and Germany was banned by the Treaty of Versailles
- Anschluss: failure of attempted Nazi coup in 1934 due to Italian opposition, but there was growing German influence over Austria from 1936 when they agreed to consult each other over foreign policy
- the Austrian chancellor Schuschnigg met with Hitler in 1938. Hitler seized the opportunity demanding jobs for Austrian Nazis in the Government
- when Schuschnigg proposed putting this to a vote of the Austrian people Hitler acted, demanding his resignation and replacement with the Austrian Nazi, Seyss-Inquart
- German troops and tanks then rolled into Austria on 12 March 1938
- the invasion itself was chaotic and inefficient from military point of view
- war did not break out as a result of the Anschluss. Britain was sympathetic to German actions to a large extent and the enthusiastic welcome given to the German troops by the Austrians seemed to confirm it was a genuinely popular action
- Hitler gained resources and again had got away with aggressive actions. He now turned his attention to Czechoslovakia.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**52. Context:**

Czechoslovakia contained 3 million German speakers in the Sudetenland. Hitler had demanded that these fellow Germans be returned to the Reich in the face of Czech 'persecution.' The ensuing crisis was managed by the British Prime Minister through a series of meetings with Hitler. This culminated in the Munich Agreement which gave the Sudetenland to Germany. The Czechs were not consulted on this agreement.

**Czechoslovakia:**

- Czechoslovakian defences on their border with Germany were formidable but had been outflanked following the Anschluss between Germany and Austria
- Munich was a betrayal of Czechoslovakia and democracy. The Czechs did not participate in the discussions over their country and were not even consulted over the eventual Munich Agreement. The Czechs were forced to give up significant resources and their border defences when they surrendered the Sudetenland
- the Czech sense of betrayal can be seen in the poem by Frantisek Halas: *'The bell of treason is tolling, Whose hand made it swing? Sweet France, Proud Albion, And we loved them'*
- with the loss of the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia was wide open to further German aggression as happened in March 1939, when the Germans occupied the Czech part of Czechoslovakia.

**Britain:**

- British public opinion was reluctant to risk war over mainly German-speaking Sudetenland. This seemed to be true from public reaction to the agreement. Chamberlain was mobbed on his return and spoke to cheering crowds outside 10 Downing Street. He received gifts and thousands of letters of support and was accorded the rare privilege of being allowed to appear on the balcony of Buckingham Palace with King George VI and Queen Elizabeth
- Britain was militarily unprepared for a wider war. Her Navy was large and Air force growing, but her army was small and not ready for a war on mainland Europe. Britain could not practically intervene on mainland Europe even if she wanted to
- in 1938 there was only one operational squadron of Spitfires and British anti-aircraft defences were woefully weak
- Munich bought another year for rearmament which Britain put to good use, particularly about air defence
- much of the British media was supportive of Chamberlain's actions. There was support from abroad as well with some foreign commentators saying Chamberlain should receive the Nobel Prize for Peace
- public opposition was greater than was reported at the time, e.g., 15,000 demonstrated in Trafalgar Square against the Agreement
- there was political opposition to the Munich Agreement from Labour leader Attlee, Liberal leader Archibald Sinclair and Conservatives like Winston Churchill
- cartoonists such as David Low make pointed comment about Chamberlain and were highly critical of the Munich Agreement.

**Germany:**

- after the success of the Anschluss Hitler's attention was drawn to the Germans living in the Sudetenland territory within Czechoslovakia
- the acquisition of the Sudetenland allowed for the further augmentation of German manpower and resources. Germany now controlled the important Skoda works as well as significant coal deposits and other industries
- furtherance of Hitler's influence and ambitions in Eastern Europe, which only encouraged him in aggressive actions although he did claim it was his last territorial demand in Europe.

**France:**

- French doubts over their treaty commitments to Czechoslovakia through the French-Czechoslovak Mutual Assistance Treaty
- practical difficulties of France being able to help Czechoslovakia given its geographical position
- France wished to avoid war and took its lead from the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain
- to his surprise, the French Premier, Edouard Daladier, was mobbed by enthusiastic supporters of the Munich Agreement on his return.

**International context:**

- failure of League of Nations in earlier crises so there was no alternative to discussion
- US isolationism mean that no help could be expected from the Americans if conflict broke out
- attitudes of Poland and Hungary who were willing to benefit from the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia
- further alienation of Soviet Union from the Allies. The Soviets were very suspicious of British and French motives and saw Appeasement as giving into Germany. The lesson learned by the Soviets was that the western powers could not be trusted. This would have repercussions in 1939 and arguably helped lead to the Nazi Soviet Pact, which was the context to the invasion of Poland.

**Any other relevant factors.**

53. **Context:**

The wartime alliance had always been one of convenience owing to the common enemy of Nazism. America had not recognised the Soviet Communist government's legitimacy until 1933. As the Second World War came to an end the inherent tensions between a Capitalist America and her allies and Communist Russia became all too clear.

**Tensions within the wartime alliance:**

- although they fought together there was tension between the USSR and Western Democracies during the war. The democracies were suspicious of the USSR because of the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939. Stalin was paranoid that the Western Powers would throw their lot in with the Nazis and turn against the Soviet Union. His call for a second front against the Nazis did not happen until 1944. Millions of Russians had died by then
- at the end of the war these tensions resurfaced. Soviet Union felt they had done the bulk of the land fighting and wanted security for the USSR
- Yalta conference: Stalin determined to hang on to land gained and create a series of sympathetic regimes in Eastern Europe. The USA wanted to create a free trade area composed of democratic states. Soviet actions in Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, etc in creating pro-Communist regimes and Allied actions in Western Europe, Greece and further increased tensions.

**Other factors:**

**Arms race:**

- in August 1945 two atomic bombs were dropped on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- one aim of the use of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was to impress the USSR with their technological superiority and make them ready to make concessions in Eastern Europe. America had developed the bombs without telling the Soviets
- in reality Stalin knew about the Manhattan Project and it made him determined to make the Soviet Union a nuclear power as soon as possible leading to the development of the arms race. To Stalin it was another example of why the Western powers were not to be trusted. The Soviet Union needed to be strong
- the Soviet Union developed their own atomic weaponry, detonating their first bomb in 1949. This shocked the world and a nuclear arms race was born
- America and the Soviet Union poured resources into developing their nuclear arsenals in order to show who was the most powerful. It can also be seen as an attempt to prove which system was superior
- in 1952 America detonated a hydrogen bomb. The Soviets exploded a thermonuclear device in 1953 and their own hydrogen bomb in 1955. Each step showed an increase in the power of nuclear weaponry. Beginnings of developing new delivery systems such as the use of rockets.

**Ideological differences:**

- impact of 1917 Bolshevik revolution in Russia on relations with the western powers: withdrawal from WWI, involvement of West with anti-Bolshevik Whites
- ideological differences between Communist and Capitalism. Command economy vs Free Enterprise, one political party vs multi-party democracy
- fears in the West that Communism was on the march led President Truman to the policy of containment: British power was in retreat: WW2 had been expensive, so the British aimed to reduce their world commitments, specifically in Greece where civil war raged between Communists and Royalists. Fear of similar problems in Italy when allied troops left; activities of Mao in China
- Truman acknowledged world dividing into two hostile blocs in his speech to support free peoples and proposals to oppose totalitarian regimes – exemplified by the Marshall Plan. Fulton ‘Iron Curtain’ speech by Churchill
- creation of competing military alliances: NATO and Warsaw Pact further polarised the world. The Soviet Union rejected the Western economic model and set up its own economic bloc: Comecon.

**Disagreements over the future of Germany:**

- the Potsdam Conference illustrated the differences in policy that the allies had over Germany. The allied sectors remained free as compared to the Soviet sector which was stripped of assets as reparations for the damage inflicted by the Germans on Russia
- the Soviet Union was determined to keep Germany weak and divided whereas America wanted to create a stable economic partner
- the economic status of Germany can be further seen with the creation of Bizonia in West Germany as France, Britain and America merged their zones to create one economic bloc. The introduction of Deutsche Mark in West Germany led to the Berlin Blockade in 1948-49
- the disagreement over the status of Germany was illustrative of the broader competing visions of Capitalism and Communism.

**Crisis over Korea:**

- at the end of World War Two Soviet forces had occupied the north of Korea and US forces the south. As both sides withdrew the north developed as a Communist state and the south as a Capitalist one
- Stalin encouraged Communist North Korea to invade Capitalist South. This led to American-led UN intervention on behalf of the South, and resultant Chinese intervention as UN forces neared their border with Korea
- Soviet and American pilots fought each other across Korea. The war ended with stalemate along the 38th parallel and an eventual armistice between the two sides. Both North and South Korea claimed to be victors
- the war illustrated how far the world had been divided into two competing political camps, each determined that their vision of society should prevail. The Cold War had been sealed with a Hot War
- the war can also be seen as a success for the American policy of containment. With both the communist triumph in China in 1949 as well as war in Korea 1950–1953, American assets to contain communism would have to be deployed in Asia as well as the West.

**Any other relevant factors.**



**54. Context:**

Cuba a medium sized island in the Caribbean was only 90 miles from Florida. Historically, the United States felt that Cuba was in its 'sphere of influence'. American business had invested heavily in Cuba, particularly in sugar cultivation. In the years before 1959, Cuba was ruled by a military dictatorship led by General Batista. Batista's government was corrupt and inefficient. It was very unpopular with most Cuban people, but opposition was ruthlessly suppressed. Most Cubans lived in poverty, with low standards of living, and poor education and health services. Batista and his supporters lived in great wealth and luxury.

**Castro's victory in Cuba:**

- Castro had come to power in 1959–1960 after overthrowing the corrupt, American-backed Battista regime in a Communist revolution
- Castro was not liked by the US who objected to his policies which redistributed wealth and took over large sugar plantations controlled by US business interests. Castro increasingly pushed towards the USSR, who, e.g., bought Cuba's sugar crop when the USA did not
- Khrushchev was sympathetic to Castro. Some historians argue that he wanted to use Cuba as a launch pad for revolution in Central America. Missile deployment would provide protection for the revolution
- argument that Bay of Pigs incident forced Castro to start preparing to defend himself against another attack and drew him closer to Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. Castro asked for significant conventional military aid.

**Other factors:**

**US foreign policy:**

- US interests and investments in Cuba had been lost in the revolution
- Cuban exiles in Florida were vocal in their demands for US action against Castro
- background of attempts by the CIA to destabilise Cuba. Kennedy inherited a plan to invade Cuba by exiles in order to overthrow Castro's regime. Bay of Pigs incident, 1961, where 1400 exiles landed and were crushed by Castro's army
- American aggression seemed to be confirmed by the United States practising the invasion of operation Mongoose overseen by Robert Kennedy.

**Khrushchev's domestic position:**

- criticism of Khrushchev at home over cuts in the armed forces, economic failures and the issues surrounding de-Stalinisation. He believed a foreign policy coup would help improve matters for him at home
- foreign policy criticisms at home over the ongoing deadlock over Berlin; shadow of events in Hungary 1956, etc
- rise of China as a rival for leadership of the Communist world led to pressure on Khrushchev from influential circles within USSR to assert Soviet leadership.

**Khrushchev's view of Kennedy:**

- Khrushchev felt that Kennedy was a weak president after the Bay of Pigs where US supported Cuban exiles were easily defeated by Castro's forces
- Khrushchev and Kennedy met only once at the June 1961 summit in Vienna
- the summit was six weeks after the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Kennedy was ill prepared for the summit. The 44-year-old Kennedy admitted to being 'savaged' by an aggressive Khrushchev. Khrushchev told his interpreter that, 'this man is very inexperienced, even immature. Compared to him, Eisenhower is a man of intelligence and vision.' Kennedy was drawn into debates with Khrushchev. He admitted that Soviet forces were equal to those of the US. To Khrushchev, who wanted to be taken seriously on the world stage, this was gold dust
- the Soviets wanted to place nuclear missiles in Cuba because they were trying to balance out the number of nuclear arms between themselves and the United States. Khrushchev totally underestimated Kennedy and the US reaction.

**Arms race:**

- the United States had placed Jupiter missiles in Turkey. Kennedy had originally placed the Jupiter missiles in Turkey in 1961 because the United States had feared the possible nuclear capabilities of the Soviet Union. These missiles became a major threat to the Soviets because they could strike anywhere in the USSR
- in order to defend themselves, and let the United States know what it was like to be surrounded by a deadly threat, the Soviets placed missiles in Cuba. Counter view that the missiles were obsolete
- Khrushchev showed off that the Soviets were producing Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles 'like sausages'. The reality was less convincing. Cuba's proximity to mainland America offered an opportunity to reduce the missile gap between the two superpowers as the Soviets did have a lot of Medium Range Ballistic Missiles.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**55. Context:**

The policy of containment and a belief in the so-called domino theory led to increased American military involvement in Vietnam, in order to stop the growth of communism. The Americans faced a variety of problems that eventually led to their withdrawing from Vietnam.

**Changing public opinion in the USA:**

- public opposition supported by the press was probably the main reason for withdrawal. Vietnam a media war, images showed the public the brutality of war, e.g., South Viet police chief executing a Viet Cong in Saigon during the Tet Offensive of '68, Mai Lai massacre. Such images damaged American claims to be the 'good guys'
- extent of the opposition is debated. Probably a minority in '65, growing by the time of crucial Tet offensive in '68. Oct 1969 largest anti-war protest in US History. Protestors in every major city in America. Opposition of Black Power Groups. Protest could be violent: May 1970 protest at Kent State University, Ohio led to four students being shot
- unpopularity of the draft
- USA was a democracy: public pressure and perception mattered. Nixon noted extent of opposition: withdrawal of 60,000 troops in 1969, policy of Vietnamisation. Economic cost of the war: US deficit of \$1.6 billion in 1965 increased to \$25.3 billion in 1968. Tax increases unpopular. Congress only got involved in limiting money and action in late 60s and early 70s
- divisions within administrations: e.g., LBJ had Rusk advising to continue the struggle in South-East Asia, compared to Senator Fulbright arguing for de-escalation.

**Other factors:**

**Difficulties faced by US military:**

- terrain did not suit US military strengths of airpower and firepower
- difficulties dealing with the conditions and knowing which Vietnamese were the enemy led to stress and confusion. Many Americans were addicted to drugs
- short commissions for officers and rotation of troops led to loss of expertise in the field
- soldiers brave, but a minority did not believe in the war. Many were also reluctant conscripts
- mass bombing had no real effect according to the Jason Study by MIT in 1966, owing to the agricultural nature of North Vietnam and the widespread jungle cover
- tactics on the ground – US technological superiority in heavy weapons negated by the terrain
- widespread use of helicopter gunships – inflicted heavy casualties, but were a blunt weapon. Many civilian deaths which did not help win 'hearts and minds'
- use of defoliants like Agent Orange: US (and their South Vietnamese allies) lost the battle for hearts and minds, despite inflicting c.2,000,000 casualties for the loss of one tenth of those.

**Strengths of North Vietnam:**

- North Vietnam: a hard peasant life bred determined soldiers. Viet Cong enlisted for years unlike American troops who signed up for a year. Belief in their cause of communism also a factor. Great determination: e.g., the Ho Chi Minh trail was kept open despite American bombers continually bombing it
- the North Vietnamese were well-led with an inspirational leader in Ho Chi Minh though he was ageing, his health was failing by the mid-60s
- the role and determination of Le Duan is also of importance. He was behind the policy of active attacks on American and South Vietnamese forces, to demoralise the enemy. Also important in the Tet offensive
- Viet Cong knew the jungle, survived in atrocious conditions, developed effective tactics and were more effective in winning the 'hearts and minds' of civilians than the Americans. Military objectives were realistic: General Giap aimed to break the will of the American Government
- support of Chinese and Soviet aid from 1965 of importance, e.g., their help enabled the Vietnamese to develop a sophisticated air defence system which led to significant American losses.

**Weaknesses of South Vietnam:**

- corruption and decay of South Vietnamese government, especially in Saigon. A Catholic elite controlled the population. Persecution of the Buddhist population was frequent and led to considerable unease from the American supporters of the South.
- America constantly sought greater tolerance from the South Vietnamese government
- the rule of Diem was corrupt; he promoted his family and was unwilling to compromise. His removal and assassination by South Vietnamese Army officers in 1963 was known about by the CIA
- lack of political and social cohesion in South Vietnam led to divisions and turmoil which filtered through to their armed forces. Low morale and corruption
- even the Americans thought the South Vietnam leadership of Ky and Thieu were 'bottom of the barrel individuals'.

**International isolation of the USA:**

- the media war showing the horrors of the Vietnam conflict turned international opinion against the US
- major US allies had had misgivings about US military intervention; Harold Wilson's major achievement in keeping UK out of the war, despite dependence on US support for the British economy
- no NATO countries offered physical military support
- feeling that Vietnam was handing huge propaganda bonuses to the enemies and rivals of the US
- even allies who had supported the USA, such as Australia, reacted to the demands of their own population and began to withdraw their own forces.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**56. Context:**

Once the threat of nuclear confrontation became real both sides in the Cold War sought ways to reduce that risk. There were times of great tension, but a variety of political and technological developments led to a number of important compromises.

**Danger of Mutually Assured Destruction:**

- the development of vast arsenals of nuclear weapons from 1945 by both superpowers as a deterrent to the other side; a military attack by one side on the other would result in horrific retaliation
- so many nuclear weapons were built to ensure that not all were destroyed even after a first strike, and this led to a stalemate known as MAD
- MAD is based on the theory of deterrence. The fact one side has very powerful weaponry will stop the other side from prosecuting war due to the fear of destruction. Even a massive first strike would be insufficient to overwhelm the enemies' nuclear response capability
- in order to ensure the credibility of the threat to each side, both America and the Soviet Union invested massive resources in nuclear weaponry and delivery platforms.

**Other factors:**

**Dangers of military conflict as seen in the Cuban Missile Crisis:**

- by the time of the Cuban Crisis both sides had developed the capability of delivering nuclear weapons from submarines. This further enhanced the deterrence theory, but the reality of the cloud of conflict as seen in Cuba showed how easily human error could cause a war
- the threat of nuclear war seemed very close on the discovery that nuclear missile sites were being built on Cuba in 1962. Before the missile crisis was resolved nuclear war threatened
- the crisis itself saw episodes where nuclear war could have broken out. The Soviets already had tactical nuclear weapons in Cuba in 1962 with authorisation to use them given to the commanders without reference to Moscow. Also, the American destroyer USS Beale dropped depth charges on a Soviet submarine causing the captain to prepare to launch a nuclear torpedo. Thankfully Soviet policy was that it took two of the three commanders of the submarine to decide to launch nuclear weaponry and the other two commanders refused
- the crisis amply illustrated the lack of formal contact between the superpowers to defuse potential conflicts
- introduction of a 'hot-line' between the Kremlin and White House in order to improve communication between the superpowers
- Khrushchev and Kennedy also signed the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the first international agreement on nuclear weapons.

**Economic cost of arms race:**

- in the Soviet Union 15-17% of GDP was devoted to equipping and supporting the military. A similar amount was used to finance military investment
- the Soviet Union did poorly in terms of investing in and producing consumer goods. By reducing their military expenditure, it was hoped that resources could be redirected into consumer goods, particularly food production
- developments in technology raised the costs of the Arms Race throughout the Cold War
- the development of Anti-Ballistic Missile technology and costs of war led to SALT 1, and the ABM Treaty
- limiting MIRV and intermediate missile technology led to SALT 2
- Khrushchev's desire for better relations between the superpowers in the 50s and 60s was, in part, about freeing up resources for economic development in the USSR.

**Development of surveillance technology:**

- American development of surveillance technology (U2 aircraft and satellites) meant that nuclear weapons could be identified, and agreements verified
- example of U2 flight over Cuba where Anderson photographed nuclear sites
- U2 and satellite verification could be used to ensure that proposed action limiting missile development and deployment was happening on the ground
- some historians think Arms Control would never have taken root, but for the ability of the sides to verify what the other was doing.

**Development of détente:**

- policies of co-existence and détente developed to defuse tensions and even encourage trade due to pressures in both of the superpowers
- the Soviet Union were concerned about developing ideological tension, which did break into open conflict, with China and therefore wished to diffuse the possibility of conflict with the USA. They did not want the threat of a war on two fronts
- the USA was concerned with the war in Vietnam and internal issues such as developing racial tension. They sought the aid of the Soviets in helping to end the Vietnam war by putting pressure on the leaders of North Vietnam
- role of others like Willy Brandt in West Germany in defusing tension through their policies of Ostpolitik with the East. Many East European states, such as East Germany, also sought accommodations with the West in order to access Western technology in order to facilitate economic growth
- the European NATO members had considerable influence in developing NATO policy, which advocated strength, but also compromise and engagement as a way of managing relations with the Soviet bloc.

**Any other relevant factors.**

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]