



National  
Qualifications  
2025

---

**2025 History**

**British, European and World History**

**Higher**

**Question Paper Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2025

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, eg, *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 (eg, 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 (eg, political, social, economic, or religious – although they do not need to use this terminology), or aspects within a factor (eg, 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, eg, *while they were successful in that way, they were limited in this way . . .*
- Establishing contradictions or inconsistencies between factors, eg, *while there were political motives for doing this, the economic factors were against doing this.*
- Establishing similarities and consistencies between factors, eg, *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, eg, *this factor led to that factor.*

OR

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

- Exploring different interpretations of these factors, eg, *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, eg:

- The extent to which the factor is supported by the evidence, eg, *this evidence shows that X was a very significant area of impact.*
- The relative importance of factors, eg, *this evidence shows that X was a more significant area of impact than Y.*
- Counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations, eg, *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, eg, *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, eg, *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	0 marks	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	
<b>Historical context</b>	<b>3</b>	Candidates make one or two factual points but these are not relevant.	Candidates establish at least one point of relevant background to the issue or identify key factors or a line of argument.	Candidates establish at least one point of relevant background to the issue and identify key factors or connect these to the line of argument.	Candidates establish at least two points of relevant background to the issue and identify key factors and connect these to the line of argument in response to the issue.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>3</b>	Candidates make no overall judgement on the issue.	Candidates make a summary of points made.	Candidates make an overall judgement between the different factors in relation to the issue.	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.	
		<b>0 marks</b>	<b>6 marks</b>			
<b>Use of knowledge</b>	<b>6</b>	Candidates use no evidence to support their conclusion.	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 (for example, explain, analyse).</li> </ul>			
<b>Analysis</b>	<b>6</b>	Candidates provide a narrative response.	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.			
		<b>0 marks</b>	<b>4 marks</b>			
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>4</b>	Candidates make no relevant evaluative comments on factors.	Award <b>1 mark</b> where candidates make an isolated evaluative comment on an individual factor that recognises the issue.	Award <b>2 marks</b> where candidates make isolated evaluative comments on different factors that recognise the issue.	Award <b>3 marks</b> where candidates connect their evaluative comments to build a line of argument that recognises the issue.	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.

## Marking instructions for each question

### SECTION 1 – British

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

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Context:</b> 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 king:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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</li><li>• 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)</li><li>• in return the king expected loyalty and military service from his vassals</li><li>• kings could expect military service from both his temporal and spiritual lords. For example, 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.</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> <p><b>Role and importance of the peasant classes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• peasants became more important through the feudal period as their labour was in demand, especially after the Black Death</li></ul>
-----------	---

- peasantry could also have political importance, for example the Peasants Revolt of 1381
- 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.

**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.

**Role of the clergy:**

- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

2.

**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.

**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), for example, 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.

**Other factors:**

**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, for example, 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.

**Cost of warfare:**

- 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, for example, 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. For example, 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
- 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
- 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, for example, 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. For example, 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, for example, all his sons had some education.

**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, for example, use of the Seneschal's court – use of same legal procedure and interpretation of laws.

**Any other relevant factors.**

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

**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
- John was able to exert his military strength against the nobility and the French
- relations worsened throughout his reign, ending with Magna Carta and rebellion of many barons.

**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.

4. **Context:**

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 20 years. Factors contributing towards James's problems included the Divine Right of Kings as well as economic, political, legal and religious issues.

**Divine Right of Kings:**

- 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
- the English Parliament had increased its power during the 16<sup>th</sup> century in return for increasing supplies for various monarchs
- 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
- 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
- James continued to exert the Divine Right of Kings in Scotland which led to some Highland clans resisting his use of force to maintain order there.

**Other factors:**

**Political issues:**

- 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
- 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
- the House of Commons opposed James so much that the stability of the nation was affected
- 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
- James attempted to curtail parliamentary freedom of speech by imprisoning outspoken MPs in the Tower of London when Parliament was dissolved.

**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 19-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.**

**5. Context:**

The English Civil War formally ended in January 1649, with Oliver Cromwell approving the execution of Charles I, which horrified many and led to accusations of regicide from Royalists. The Council of State subsequently abolished the monarchy and declared a Republic, or Commonwealth. Cromwell ruled during the Interregnum. He attempted constitutional rule through the Council of State, the Barebones Parliament, and the First and Second Protectorate Parliaments, with no monarchical check on their powers. Cromwell's attempts to find an alternative form of government were undermined by foreign issues which used up energy and resources. However, the way that Cromwell ruled, the power of the army, the role of Parliament and unpopular legislation also created difficulties for the Cromwell regime.

**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.

**Other factors:**

**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
- Cromwell approved the execution of Charles I in 1649, which horrified many and led to accusations of regicide from Royalists
- 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.

**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.

**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
- 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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**6. Context:**

Following the death of Charles II, his brother James II ruled from 1685, but his attempts at absolutism led to the Revolution of 1688–1689. A major reason for the Revolution Settlement was the conflict that resulted from the fact that James was a Catholic. However, other factors contributing towards the Revolution Settlement were the roles of Charles II and James II in addition to political issues and the role of Parliament.

**Religious issues:**

- James II issued the First Declaration of Indulgence in April 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 May 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 1673, 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 continue using the Prayer Book approved by the Stuarts. There were hostile divisions between Episcopalians and Presbyterians.

**Other factors:**

**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.

**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, 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.

**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
- 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 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 March 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.**

## PART C – The trade in enslaved African people

### 7. Context:

The trade in enslaved Africans reached a peak in the later 18<sup>th</sup> century and this was in part due to an expansion in British overseas colonies following war with France and Spain. However, there were other factors also important in the development of the trade such as the expansion of sugar production in the Caribbean, the need for labour on plantations, as well as racist and religious attitudes.

#### 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 enslavement could be used to exploit the richness of the land
- profits from 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 enslaved labour was necessary to exploit these gains.

#### Other factors:

##### Importance of Caribbean colonies:

- the trade in enslaved African people 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
- Caribbean colonies were an important source of valuable exports to European neighbours
- financial, commercial, legal and insurance institutions emerged to support the activities of the traders in enslaved African people
- Lloyds of London was founded to serve the interests of the companies in trading in enslaved African people
- traders in enslaved Africans became bankers and many new businesses were financed by profits made from trading in enslaved Africans
- as a result of the trade in enslaved people with Africa and the Caribbean colonies, canals were built to allow access from places like Stoke and Manchester to the port of Liverpool
- because of the trade in enslaved people with Africa and the Caribbean colonies, Bristol expanded greatly, with over 2000 ships registered as leaving for Africa and the Caribbean colonies during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, even more so in Liverpool
- as a result of profits from Caribbean 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 the Indigenous Peoples due to lack of resistance to diseases brought by Europeans and ill-treatment at the hands of colonists created a labour shortage in the Caribbean colonies
- there was a decline in the number of Indigenous Peoples who were first used as a source of labour in the Caribbean colonies 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 Caribbean colonies as forced labour

- transportation to the Caribbean colonies to serve in forced labour was an alternative to hanging. Harsh British laws at the time meant there were over 300 capital crimes, for example, 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 trade in enslaved Africans was abolished, for example, 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 trade in enslaved African people
- 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 enslavement 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 enslavement 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-enslavement
- many believed that Africans benefited from enslavement as they became Christian, resulting in the spread of 'civilisation'. However, this did not necessarily mean that enslaved Africans 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 trade in enslaved Africans, 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.**

**8. Context:**

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

**Sellers of enslaved Africans 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 other Africans to European factors who collected the enslaved people on the coast. In the areas where enslavement was not practised, such as among the Xhosa people of southern Africa, European ‘slave ship’ captains were unable to buy African captives
- European ‘factories’, or forts, were developed on the coast to control the trade. These ‘factories’ or forts held enslaved people in brutal conditions until the arrival of ‘slave ships’.

**Development of enslaved African-based states and economies:**

- Africans could be taken into enslavement as punishment for a crime, as payment for a family debt, or 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 trade in enslaved Africans, 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. The mass importation of guns for enslaved people affected the balance of power between kingdoms
- as the trade in enslaved Africans developed, more African societies were exposed to 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 European powers.

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

- African sellers of enslaved people 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', or forts, 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 trade was generally the business of rulers or wealthy and powerful merchants, concerned with their own interests, rather than those of the continent. At that time, identity and loyalty were based on kinship or membership of a specific African kingdom or society
- states based on enslavement, 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.**

**9. Context:**

The early progress of the abolitionist campaign was slow owing to a range of vested interests. In particular, the importance of the trade to the British economy was vital. However, by the 1790s the abolitionists were winning the moral argument.

**Enslaved Africans' fight for freedom in St Domingue:**

- pro-enslavement groups pointed to this rebellion as an example of what would happen if enslaved people were to gain their freedom. The revolt began in 1791 and continued until 1804. An independent country calling itself Haiti was set up under the leadership of Toussaint L'Ouverture. It is estimated that as many as 200,000 people died. The general fear of a revolt by enslaved people was increased as a result
- unsuccessful attempts by colonial French troops to regain control shocked the British Government. There were fears that the rebellion could spread to neighbouring British islands such as Jamaica. Any attempts to abolish the trade were thwarted because it was claimed that the Caribbean colonies could become unsafe and unstable
- the British were humiliated when their attempts to regain control of Haiti were also unsuccessful
- such violence as reported from St. Domingue played into the hands of the pro-enslavement lobby, confirming their warnings of anarchy if enslaved people became free after abolition.

**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
- sympathy for the French Revolution disappeared with the execution of Louis XVI. Wealthy people reacted with horror to the idea that similar society upheaval could happen in Britain. Many wealthy people associated abolitionism with the dangerous radicalism in France
- the abolitionist cause was associated with revolutionary ideas, for example, the abolitionist campaigner Thomas Clarkson openly supported the French Revolution
- general fears about law and order led to laws limiting the right of assembly and protest. Even abolition campaigners like William Wilberforce supported these laws. As a result of these laws the growth of abolition societies was limited
- after 1799, Britain became involved in the Napoleonic Wars leading to a decrease in support for abolition
- supporters of the trade in enslaved Africans argued that it was necessary to pay for Britain's involvement in the French Revolutionary wars; it seemed unpatriotic not to support the trade
- radicals used similar tactics as abolitionists to win public support – associations, petitions, cheap publications, public lectures, public meetings, pressure on Parliament. This linked abolitionism with political radicalism in peoples' minds during the French Revolutionary wars
- 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.

**Importance of the trade in enslaved Africans to the British economy:**

- the trade in enslaved Africans generated finance, being an important source of tax revenue from shipping companies who made massive profits and the developing banking and insurance industries who also profited greatly from their clients
- Caribbean 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 trade in enslaved Africans
- Africa provided an additional market for British manufactured goods, which benefitted not just ports but also manufacturing towns such as Manchester and Stoke shipbuilding benefitted, 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
- lobbyists like the Caribbean colonies lobby conducted a powerful propaganda campaign to counter that of the abolitionists, producing countless letters and articles for newspapers
- pro-enslavement campaigners produced books and plays supporting the trade, for example, in 1788 William Beckford wrote a book on: 'Remarks Upon the Situation of Negroes in Jamaica'; Thomas Bellamy wrote a play in 1789 called 'The Benevolent Planters' telling the story of Black enslaved people separated in Africa, but reunited by their owners
- owners of enslaved people and their supporters argued abolition of the trade was not legal because it would undermine a central tenet of British law; the right to private property. They successfully discouraged the Government from contemplating abolition without compensation because of the massive legal battle that would ensue.

#### **Attitudes of British governments:**

- successive governments were more concerned with maintaining revenue and the rights of property of their wealthiest citizens rather than those of enslaved people who had no political stake or influence in Britain
- wealthy merchants from London, Liverpool and Bristol ensured that their MPs influenced successive governments to help maintain/protect the trade in enslaved Africans. They either bought votes or put pressure on others
- the nature of politics at this time meant that there were not distinct political parties but various interest groups. Parliament was dominated by the West India lobby, which for a long time was the most powerful group in the Commons. The Duke of Clarence, one of George III's sons, was a member of the West India interest group
- governments were often coalitions of different interest groups, often pro-enslavement. This ensured that opposition to the trade did not gather government support
- many absentee plantation owners or merchants held high political office or were MPs themselves, thus influencing the attitude of British governments, for example, William Beckford, owner of an estate in Jamaica, was twice Mayor of London. In the later 18<sup>th</sup> century, over 50 MPs represented the plantations based on enslavement
- MPs used delaying tactics to slow down or prevent legislation, for example, Henry Dundas, the unofficial 'King of Scotland', Secretary of State for War and First Lord of the Admiralty used his position to protect the interests of owners of enslaved people and merchants. In 1792, he effectively 'killed' Wilberforce's Bill banning the trade of enslaved people by proposing a compromise that any abolition would take place over several years, which Dundas knew Wilberforce could not accept
- attitudes of the Government were influenced by direct pressure from merchants involved in enslavement. For example, in 1755 a petition was sent from Bristol urging support for the trade.

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

**10. 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.

**Pressure groups:**

- the Reform League and Reform Union were active in pushing for franchise change
- the Hyde Park demonstration 23 July 1866 organised by the Reform League
- the Suffragists and Suffragettes were influential in gaining the franchise for women
- the Suffragists used peaceful tactics such as writing letters to MPs
- the Suffragettes used militant tactics such as vandalism and hunger strikes.

**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.

**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.

**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
- the growing influence of the Liberal Party in challenging older vested interests. The Liberal Party opposed the power of the old land-owning aristocracy, for example, the secret ballot to assist the electorate to use their ‘political voice’ to promote social reforms
- 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
- 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 vs. people’ and the financing of social reform to help the poor, especially in urban areas
- politicians combined acceptance of changes which they suspected were unavoidable while ensuring that their own party-political interests would be protected.

**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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**11. Context:**

Attitudes towards poverty in the 19<sup>th</sup> 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 the rise of Labour who were a threat to their working class votes.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

## 12. Context:

Attitudes towards poverty in the 19<sup>th</sup> 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), led to a series of limited social reforms aimed at the young, old, sick, unemployed and employed, 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 seen as 'the deserving poor.' Child neglect and abuse were seen as problems associated with poverty
- the 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 were made compulsory for children after 1907, 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 reoffending
- 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 until their 70th birthday. Some 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 can be 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 received 10 shillings a week if they could not go to work because they were too sick
- 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 had been identified as 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. (7 shillings 6 pence for 15 weeks – 2 ½ pence per week from the worker and 2 ½ pence from the government). For most workers, no unemployment insurance scheme existed
- only some trades were involved, for example, shipbuilding, mechanical engineering, construction and iron founding
- Labour Exchanges Act, 1909 was supposed to help the unemployed find employment

**The employed:**

- in 1906 a Workman's Compensation Act covered a further six million workers who could now claim compensation for injuries and diseases which were the result of working conditions
- in 1909 the Trade Boards Act 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 Coal Mines Act, 1911, as well as the Shops Act, 1911, improved conditions for some workers.

**Any other relevant factors.**

13.	<p><b>Context:</b> Government in Ireland in the late 19<sup>th</sup> 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.</p> <p><b>Irish Cultural Revival (Gaelic League/Gaelic Athletic Association):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in 1883 the Gaelic League was set up whose aim it was to revive and preserve the Irish language and Gaelic literature</li> <li>• 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, for example, Alice Milligan, Lady Gregory, Patrick Pearse, WB Yeats</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other factors:</b></p> <p><b>Re-emergence of Irish Republicanism (Irish Republican Brotherhood/Sinn Féin):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differing economic and religious features:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Role of John Redmond and the Nationalist Party (this includes the 1910 elections):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Redmond’s Party was consistently strong throughout Southern Ireland, where there was strong support for Home Rule</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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 2 years. As a result, the Home Rule Bill for Ireland, which was previously blocked by the House of Lords, could now be passed.</li> </ul>
-----	---

**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 factors.**

**14. 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.

**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 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, for example, 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'.

**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
- Government of Ireland Act split Ireland in two, with six counties in the North and 26 in the South. In Northern Ireland, Unionists won 40 of the 52 seats available. A third of the Ulster population was Catholic and wanted to be united with the South
- the 26 counties in the South had a separate Parliament in Dublin. The Council of Ireland was set up. The IRA refused to recognise the new Parliament and kept up its violence. Sectarian violence increased in Ulster; without partition, this could have been much worse
- in the South, the Government of Ireland Act was ignored. Sinn Féin won 124 seats unopposed. Partition was a highly emotive issue, and it alone would have caused discord.

**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 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.

**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 was President of the Irish Republic showing his opposition to any sort of deal whereby Irish status was linked to the British Commonwealth. As President De Valera had instructed his negotiating team to refer back to his cabinet on any question which created difficulties. When the Treaty was signed it had not been referred back to the Irish cabinet
- 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.**

**15. Context:**

By the early 1960s Northern Ireland was relatively stable. However, the Northern Ireland Nationalists were discriminated against in terms of housing, employment and electorally. In 1964 a peaceful civil rights campaign started to end the discrimination against Catholics in Northern Ireland.

**Economic issues:**

- Northern Ireland was left relatively prosperous by World War II, with the boom continuing into the 1950s. But by the 1960s, as elsewhere in Britain, these industries were in decline, for example, Harland and Wolff profitable until the early 1960s, but government helped 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 Northern 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.

**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. 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 was 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 seats in Northern Ireland 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, for example, the Reverend 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.

### **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
- Provisional IRA were seen to defend Catholic areas from Loyalist attacks in the summer of 1970.

### **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 the USA and student protests in Europe. Widening TV ownership; in 1954, 10,000 TV Licences, by 1962 there were 200,000. This led 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 RUC and were dispersed with heavy-handed tactics
- many Catholics were impatient with the 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 was mainly Catholic. Instead, it called for the end to seven 'injustices,' ranging from council house allocation to the 'weighted' voting system.

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

## SECTION 2 – European and World

### PART A – The crusades, 1071–1204

<b>16.</b>	<p><b>Context:</b> In 1095 Pope Urban III called on thousands of knights to unite against the infidel. Pope Urban III's famous speech at Clermont also made detailed reference to the violence committed by Christians against fellow Christians. As a man of God, Urban III viewed a crusade as an opportunity to heal the evils of civil war in Europe and to deflect the violence onto the Muslims in the east.</p> <p><b>Papal desire to channel the aggressive nature of feudal society:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• medieval society saw the development of heavily armoured and skilled warrior knights</li><li>• 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)</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• 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.</li></ul> <p><b>Other factors:</b></p> <p><b>Threat to Byzantium:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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</li><li>• 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</li><li>• the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius, was seen as a bulwark against this eventuality and his letter asking for help was taken very seriously</li><li>• 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.</li></ul> <p><b>Fear of Islamic expansion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• founded by the Prophet Muhammad, the Islamic religion had exploded onto the world in the late 7<sup>th</sup> century, advancing across the Christian principalities of North Africa, through Spain and into Southern France, where it had been halted in the 8<sup>th</sup> century and pushed back into Spain</li></ul>
------------	--

- 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.

**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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**17. 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 divisions among the Crusaders after the death of Baldwin, in addition to a continual shortage of men and a lack of support from the West.

**Divisions among 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.

**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 9-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, 2 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.

**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.

**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.

**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.**

**18. Context:**

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

**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 of France. Richard's inability to share the spoils taken during this attack on Cyprus with Philip helped persuade the ill king 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.

**Other factors:**

**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 2700 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 lined up with the Knights Templar at the front and the Knights Hospitaller 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 counterattacks. 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 counterattack. 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.

**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 entire year. 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**

**19. 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

- 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.

#### **Navigation Acts:**

##### **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. For example, the abolition of enslavement, 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.**

<b>20.</b>	<p><b>Context:</b>  After the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Britain and the 13 American colonies went to war for 5 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.</p> <p><b>Franco-American Alliance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• France entered the war and took the conflict to Europe</li> <li>• Britain was forced to re-assign its military resources to defend itself and the Empire</li> <li>• French contribution to the colonists' cause took many forms – men, ammunition, training, supplies, and uniforms, fighting Britain around the world</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dutch intervention:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Dutch went to war with Britain in November 1780</li> <li>• Britain's navy was stretched even further and it became increasingly difficult to focus on the war in the colonies</li> <li>• European nations were now competing for parts of Britain's empire around the world</li> <li>• Dutch forces in Ceylon attacked British interests in India</li> <li>• however, the war between Britain and the colonists on land was not directly affected by Dutch involvement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Spanish intervention:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spain declared war on Britain in June 1779</li> <li>• Britain was forced to pull troops and naval forces back from the American continent</li> <li>• the Spanish Armada now threatened British shores as well as challenging the Royal Navy around the world</li> <li>• Spanish troops came from Mexico to the Mississippi area to challenge the British Army.</li> </ul> <p><b>League of Armed Neutrality:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• however, the League was not actively involved in the war, merely endeavouring to protect its own shipping</li> <li>• Portugal, Austria, Prussia and Turkey all later joined.</li> </ul> <p><b>Control of the seas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the battle for control of the sea drew massively on the resources of all countries involved and significantly drained Britain's finances</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Any other relevant factors.</b></p>
------------	--

**21. Context:**

The American War of Independence took place between 1776 and 1781, between Britain and its thirteen 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 Paris 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 George Washington:**

- Washington was aware that the British forces would hold the advantage in open battle, so he fought using guerrilla warfare effectively, for example, 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.

**Other factors:****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
- 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.

**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 defeated the Royal Navy in the Battle of Ushant in the English Channel in July 1778, 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
- French action against the Royal Navy gave Spain and Holland the 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 seas which led to the eventual British defeat.

**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 their 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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**22. Context:**

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century France was one of the richest, most powerful countries in the world. The system of absolutist government functioned well when presided over by a strong, active ruler. On the surface the regime appeared to be stable. The king was at the centre governing through consultation with his council of ministers and advisers. Laws and taxes were set by royal edict. The monarch ruled in provinces through Intendants, and in towns through *Parlements*. But appearances were deceptive. For many years before it was swept away in the dramatic events of 1789, the security of the *Ancien Régime* had been under threat from within because of deep-rooted problems and tensions among which taxation and corruption were perhaps the most serious. Other financial problems also threatened the regime as did the shortcomings of Louis XVI and the royal family, the privileged position of the clergy and the nobility, and the grievances of the Third Estate.

**Role of the royal family:**

- when Louis XVI came to the throne in 1774, he was fully aware of the financial crisis that threatened the security of the regime and took action to try to get the crisis resolved. But in an absolutist system, in which so much of government revolved around the monarch personally, the monarch had to be strong and decisive whereas Louis was hesitant and indecisive
- Louis struggled to exert his authority over with powerful factions in his court
- at critical points, Louis failed to back his ministers when faced with protests against their reform initiatives
- in 1770 Louis married Marie Antoinette and as problems for government became more difficult and more serious for the regime he increasingly sought advice from her and her circle, which weakened his position further
- in times of crisis, Marie Antoinette's lifestyle and her Austrian background became a problem for the regime because they were portrayed negatively undermining confidence in monarchy generally and Louis XVI's judgement in particular
- Louis's decision not to call a meeting of the Estates-General in 1786 to approve Calonne's reforms was an error of judgement that helped deepen the political crisis for the regime
- the king was increasingly seen as out of touch, incompetent and unable to govern effectively.

**Other factors:****Financial issues:**

- France's involvement in wars including the American War of Independence, increased taxes and the national debt and brought the country to the brink of bankruptcy. By 1786 the Treasury deficit was estimated at 112 million
- in 1774 Louis XVI had appointed Turgot as Controller-General. Turgot attempted to reform taxation and trade guilds. His reforms provoked so much protest, not least from the *Parlements* (the high courts of appeal that registered edicts handed down by the Crown), that Louis withdrew his support and Turgot resigned in 1776
- there then followed a decade of financial crisis which a succession of finance ministers including Necker, Calonne and Brienne sought to resolve through reform and restructuring to no avail
- at the root of the problems was taxes and the system of taxation, which was leaving the Crown without the income it needed to govern effectively.

**Taxation and corruption:**

- the taxation system, upon which the Crown depended for most of its revenue, was chaotic, inefficient and corrupt
- taxes were collected via tax-farming by the Farmers-General. They paid the state and agreed sum and everything above this they kept for themselves. A consequence of this system was that the government never received enough money from taxes to fund expenditure and that the government had to borrow money in order to function

- borrowing money was expensive and the state ending up having to service huge amounts of debt, which undermined the security of the Crown
- taxes were collected by officials who had bought the right to hold their positions and so could not be dismissed. Their positions could be inherited too. Corruption and wastage were rife. This venality was another reason why the Crown was not getting adequate income
- taxpayers resented the fact that much of the tax they paid never went into the treasury but went instead to the tax farmers
- a system of exemptions also meant that the Crown did not receive nearly as much as it could have from taxation and, furthermore, exemptions caused deep resentment among those who were not exempt
- exemptions were confined to the most privileged orders in the estate system, the First Estate (the clergy) and the Second Estate (the nobility), so in effect almost all the revenue from taxation came from the Third Estate (made up mainly of the peasantry but also including urban workers and the bourgeoisie)
- the burden of direct and indirect taxation on the Third Estate was a source of deep resentment, as was the fact that the Church operated the tithe and the nobility exacted a variety of feudal dues mainly from the peasants
- the nobility could also tax the peasantry for hunting, shooting and fishing on their land
- direct taxes such as the land tax (*Taille*) and the poll tax (*Capitation*) were disliked by the Third Estate and indirect taxes almost more so because indirect taxes were levied on food and drink (*Aidas*) on salt (*Gabelle*) and on goods entering towns (*Octrois*)
- the Estates system did not allow for social mobility this created an increasing amount of frustration among the Third Estate, especially but not exclusively among the rising bourgeoisie. Middle merchants, businessmen and professionals but also wealthy peasant farmers, were excluded from government yet paid a lot of tax, a situation that increasingly, they viewed not only as unjust but also unsustainable
- in the provinces the King's government was carried out by the intendants appointed by, and answerable to, the Crown and responsible for policing, justice, finance, public works, trade and industry. Their great power made them highly unpopular, as did the fact that they often put their own and the Crown's interest before those of the people they governed.

#### **Position of the clergy and nobility:**

- the Church was a pillar of the *Ancien Régime* but by the later 18<sup>th</sup> century it was increasingly becoming viewed by critics in the Third Estate as corrupt, too close to the monarchy and to the nobility, and more concerned with its own wealth and power than with the lives of the people
- the higher positions in the Church were occupied by the sons of the nobility and commanded high incomes, in stark contrast to the parish priests who were often poor
- the Church was the biggest single landowner in France and enormously wealthy. The wealth of the Church came from the land it owned and from the tithes paid to it
- tithes were meant to pay for the operations of the Church at parish level; they were supposed to provide for parish priests, poor relief and the maintenance of buildings. But in fact, much of Church revenue from tithes was used to fund comfortable lifestyles for the higher clergy. This was resented by people in the Third Estate, but also by the lower clergy who were closest to the Third Estate in background and experience
- parish priests often sided with the peasants in their localities, while the higher clergy viewed peasants with contempt and merely as a source of taxation
- the Church was exempt from taxation even though income from its property was 100 million livres a year. The Church agreed an annual payment to the state (*don gratuit*), which was less than 5% of its income and much less than it could afford to pay
- the Second Estate were another pillar of the *Ancien Régime* and as such they were keen to protect their privileges and position
- natural supporters of the monarchy, the nobles saw the rise of the bourgeoisie as a threat
- there were tensions between the traditional or court nobility (*noblesse de l'épée*) and the legal and administrative nobles (*noblesse de la robe*). The ancient, landed families sought to keep control of key positions in the State, the Army and the Church much to the annoyance of the more recently ennobled families

- nobles enjoyed a range of privileges the most important of which was their exemption from taxes. They were exempt from the land tax but also from indirect taxes such as the salt tax. Even when they did pay tax, they nearly always managed to pay less than they were supposed to pay
- nobles tax exemptions and tax manipulation contributed a lot to their wealth and power as did the feudal dues they received from the peasantry. Consequently, nobles were highly reluctant to support changes that would affect their privileged position and so increasingly they were deeply resented by people in the Third Estate.

**Grievances held by the Third Estate:**

- the people of the Third Estate had many reasons to feel aggrieved and by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century their grievances had become a serious threat to the stability and sustainability of the regime
- although there were extremes of wealth within the Third Estate, which included everyone from the poorest serf to the wealthiest merchant or professional, there was also increasing resentment of the regime across the Third Estate as a whole albeit for different reasons
- the bourgeoisie, growing in numbers and in wealth, wanted to be included in government and the political system not simply as a reflection of their own self-regard but more important as a reflection of the fact that they paid taxes yet were denied political representation
- the bourgeoisie tended to be well educated. They had read the works of, and been influenced by, the *Philosophes* and had followed events in America so were aware of the American colonists rallying cry: ‘no taxation without representation’
- many among the bourgeoisie were annoyed by the fact that the wealthy nobles did not seem to have done much to deserve their wealth but instead were wealthy because of others’ efforts
- people in the Third Estate were liable for compulsory military service. Those bourgeoisie who did not want to do this resented the fact that they had to pay the land tax if they did not want to do it
- within the peasantry, who made up almost 70% of the total French population, there were variations in wealth and status. Most were either labourers or sharecroppers or landless labourers, but some were still serfs, and a small group were large farmers who owned land and employed labourers
- peasants bore the heaviest burden of direct and indirect taxes and were required to pay feudal dues, and this was deeply resented. They were also liable for forced labour on public roads and buildings (*Corvée*)
- by the later 18<sup>th</sup> century taxes were higher than they had ever been, and food prices were higher too. For many, perhaps most, peasants’ life was difficult
- urban workers were also, for the most part, poor. From the 1720s to the early 1780s food prices had gone up by 65% but wages only by 22%. The terrible living and working conditions of urban workers along with the falling standard of living fuelled anger and hostility toward the regime.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**23. Context:**

From April 1792 the revolution moved into a new phase culminating in the 'Reign of Terror'. A lack of reliable figures makes it difficult to know how many people died during the Terror, but certainly tens of thousands were executed and perhaps tens of thousands more died from imprisonment, starvation, military action and repression. The Terror was rooted in the fact that the government faced mounting threats from enemies outside of France and inside to the point where its security and survival looked to be in doubt. The Terror was about saving the Revolution and the government. The Committee of Public Safety, which effectively became the government from 1793, played a crucial role in instigating the Terror to achieve that goal. However, other factors were also important in causing the Terror including the outbreak of war, the growing threat of counter-revolution, political rivalries and the influence of Robespierre.

**Committee of Public Safety:**

- set up in April 1793 at a time of mounting crisis for the Convention, the Committee of Public Safety (CPS) was established to organise the defence of the nation against its enemies at home and abroad, and to supervise and speed up action from ministers whose authority it superseded
- from April to 10 July 1793, the CPS was dominated by Georges Danton and his followers. They pursued a policy of moderation and reconciliation but failed to deal with the precarious military situation. They were replaced in July by men more determined and more radical in the defence of the Revolution, among them Robespierre who joined the committee on 27 July
- under Robespierre's direction, the CPS prepared the ground for, and then implemented, extreme policies
- in October, following the recommendation of the CPS, the constitution of 1793 was suspended, and it was decided to maintain a 'revolutionary government' for as long as necessary
- the Committee now became the main instrument for the application of terror in defence of Robespierre's ideal of a 'Republic of Virtue'
- along with the Committee of General Security, the CPS controlled the official Terror centred in Paris
- from September 1793 to July 1794, the CPS was composed of the same men (with the exception of Herault de Sechelles who was guillotined in April 1794), and it controlled France, dominating the National Convention and relying on the support of the Jacobins (radical democrats)
- the CPS ensured that harsh measures were taken against alleged enemies of the Revolution. For example, it oversaw the 'Great Terror' (10 June – 27 July 1794) during which some 1500 men and women were executed.

**Other factors:**

**Outbreak of war:**

- the outbreak of war in 1792 had decisive and far-reaching consequences: it destroyed the consensus of 1789 and led ultimately to the fall of the monarchy, to civil war and to the Terror
- European powers were horrified by the Revolution and by the way the King and the royal family were treated following the flight to Varennes. The Declaration of Pillnitz (August 1791) threatened consequences if the French royal family were harmed
- France declared war on Austria (20 April 1792) and Prussia declared war on France (13 June 1792)
- the Revolution was radicalised by the war to the point where the position of the monarchy became near impossible because of Louis XVI's relationship with France's enemies
- radical anti-monarchists hoped that a successful war against Austria and Prussia would bring them increased support at home and lead to the end of the monarchy
- the monarchy was finally overthrown (10 August 1792) and Louis was executed (21 January 1793)
- war was the occasion for a hunt for 'enemies within' and led to the idea of the 'nation in crisis' as a mechanism for explaining and excusing extreme policies including the Terror
- pressure from demonstrations in Paris intimidated the Convention into adopting terror as 'the order of the day'.

**Threat of counter-revolution:**

- as the Convention recognised, the revolution was not welcomed by everyone. The Convention's major concerns at the start of 1793 were counter-revolutionary activity (which intensified, particularly in the provinces, after Louis' execution), and effective prosecution of the war against the Republic's émigré and foreign opponents
- counter-revolution was perhaps in the first instance based on hostility among the clergy and the nobles to the treatment of the Catholic Church
- other sections of French society were also fusing together to resist changes they felt were being imposed on them by Paris
- concern about the growth of counter-revolution prompted the Convention to agree to a range of counter-revolutionary measures that included the setting up of the CGS and the CPS, the establishment of revolutionary tribunals to try opponents of the Republic and impose the death penalty, and the establishment of surveillance committees in local areas to identify counter-revolutionary activity
- the Federal Revolt seemed to justify the need for government by terror.

**Political rivalries:**

- political rivalries helped to create a situation where the Terror took on a momentum of its own
- the Terror was a consequence of the struggle between the Montagnards and the Girondins. In the political crisis of June 1793, the Girondins were expelled from the Convention for supporting revolts backed by royalists
- towards the end of 1793 as the government had begun to overcome the challenges threatening the existence of the Republic, steps were taken to reassert central control. On 4 December 1793 the Law of Frimaire set up revolutionary government giving the two main committees the CGS and the CPS full executive powers. The CPS's powers were the more extensive
- new policies from the CPS, while providing strong government, also rejected the principles of 1789. Robespierre justified this by arguing that a dictatorship was necessary until foreign and domestic enemies of the Revolution had been destroyed
- the main challenge to the revolutionary government now came from former supporters, especially Hebertistes on the left and Dantonists on the right
- Robespierre disliked the Hebertistes' political extremism and when Hebert called for a further insurrection in early March 1794 he was arrested with his main supporters. They were executed on 24 March
- Danton supported those who called for an end to the Terror and to the new centralisation imposed in December 1793. This could only happen, Danton argued, if the war was ended (because the war had caused and sustained the Terror). Danton's position was viewed many in the Convention as a way of bringing back the monarchy. Danton and his supporters were arrested on 30 March 1794, and executed on 5 April.

**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
- with the imposition of the infamous Law of 22nd 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 1500 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 1793–1794, the use of Terror as an instrument of state policy was by no means confined to Robespierre

- 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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

24.	<p><b>Context:</b> The French Revolution of 1789 brought the end of the <i>Ancien Régime</i> 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 when it was dissolved by Sieyès and his allies allowing Napoleon to seize power in 1799.</p> <p><b>Role of Sieyès:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbe Sieyès, 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</li> <li>• Sieyès 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</li> <li>• Sieyès enlisted the aid of Bonaparte in mounting a coup against the constitution</li> <li>• the Convention, the Directory and the legislative councils had run their course and few, if any, mourned their passing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other factors:</b></p> <p><b>Constitution of 1795:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• a bi-cameral legislature was established wherein each chamber counter-balanced the power of the other. By so doing it inhibited strong and decisive government</li> <li>• to ensure continuity, the new Convention was to include two-thirds of the outgoing deputies from the old. This enraged sections of the right who felt that the forces of left-wing radicalism still prevailed in government</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• annual elections worked against consistent and continuous policy-making</li> <li>• so did the appointment of an Executive – the Directory – one of whose members rotated on an annual basis</li> <li>• again, the counter-balance between the legislature and the executive may have been commendable but it was to prove inherently unstable in practice.</li> </ul> <p><b>Political instability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• growing bitterness between opposing factions within the country, particularly as the Terror developed and leading figures became divided as revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries, with an atmosphere of distrust and fear across the nation</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• France had been torn apart by civil war, with suspicions existing within communities in both urban and rural areas</li> <li>• the country was threatened by foreign armies encouraged by émigré nobles seeking to overthrow the Revolution</li> <li>• France was riven by religious conflict occasioned by the State’s opposition to the primacy of the Catholic Church.</li> </ul>
-----	---

**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 Bonaparte:**

- following participation in warfare in Europe and the Middle East, Bonaparte returned in October
- 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 Sieyès in the dissolution of the Directory and then seize power himself
- he 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
- his use of the military gave him greater authority in later dealings with Sieyès.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**25. Context:**

Nationalism – the idea that people with a common culture, language and history should have the right to rule themselves – grew in the German states after 1815 in part as a reaction to the effects of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, and the success of France under Napoleon as a nation state. Although the Congress of Vienna sought to curb the growth of nationalism in an attempt to restore the *Ancien Régime*, German nationalism continued to grow not just because of the impact of the French Revolution but also because of profound economic change, cultural change, the perception of German military weakness and the role of Liberals and Liberalism.

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

- following the invasion of the German states in 1806 the key ideas of the French Revolution – liberty, equality and fraternity/solidarity – spread among the German people, appealing especially to the middle classes
- after 1815 it these ideas, liberty in particular, were developed into the political ideology that became known as Liberalism with its emphasis on freedom and rights
- in 1806 Napoleon abolished the Holy Roman Empire, which had consisted of many hundreds of states. He replaced it with the Confederation of the Rhine (consisting of 16 states) and reduced the number of German states overall to 39. This made the German lands much easier to govern
- the states were now placed under the Napoleonic Code, which had the effect of making them more united too
- the victorious powers replaced the Confederation of the Rhine with the German Confederation in 1815. The latter resembled Napoleon’s reorganised 39 states; there was no going back to the Holy Roman Empire
- nationalism also grew among Germans as a direct consequence of the invasion of the German states by the French revolutionary armies. French rule was oppressive. While Germans were inspired by the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity/solidarity, they deeply resented being treated by the French as an uncivilised, uncultured people. Memories of the occupation and the resentment it had generated lay at the root of German nationalism after 1815
- Germans recognised that Napoleon’s military success was in part a consequence of the France’s unity; many argued that France had been able to conquer German states precisely because the German states were divided, separate, autonomous territories
- German rulers had stirred national feeling to help raise armies united by the common goal of driving the French out of the German lands.

**Economic factors:**

- economic change also directly and indirectly contributed to the growth of German nationalism. Population growth together with industrialisation, especially in Prussia, had the effect of drawing the German states closer together through trade and the development of a transport network in the form of the railways
- by 1850 5000km of railway track had been laid across the German states with Berlin (the capital of Prussia) as the hub
- railways enabled goods and people to travel throughout the region breaking down provincial barriers and insularity and bringing states closer together
- railways helped Germans to appreciate their shared language, culture and history
- Prussian industrial development led to a shift in power away from Austria
- Prussia took over land on the Rhine after 1815 spreading its territories across Northern Germany. Given that Prussia’s main territories were in the east, Prussia wanted to reach agreements with neighbouring states to ensure less restricted movement of goods and people between its lands in the East and the West

- in 1818 Prussia created a large free-trade area in Prussia, getting rid of internal taxes on the movement of goods. Thereafter other German states began to join the Prussian free-trade area
- an increasing number of German middle class businessmen wanted a more integrated German market because, they argued, a united Germany would be able to compete much more effectively against Britain and France
- in 1834 Prussia set up the *Zollverein*. This enlarged customs union had 25 of the 39 states in it by 1836. Austria was not allowed to join. In effect member states accepted limits on their sovereignty (even if only for selfish reasons) and the dominance of Prussia in return for access to bigger and better markets
- the economic successes that resulted from co-operation encouraged many German businessmen to support political unification
- not all the members of the *Zollverein* wanted a united Germany, but for many Germans the *Zollverein* was a force for union and a focal point for nationalist sentiment.

#### **Cultural factors:**

- German nationalism was a consequence of the impact of the Romantic Revolution. Romanticism was a reaction against the ideas of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. It emphasised the importance of responding to the world not only, or even mainly, through reason but also through the senses, with imagination, and in a spirit of awe and wonder at the mystery of life
- Romanticism encouraged emotional connection to landscape and the idea of identities shaped by a sense of place
- Romanticism also encouraged the idea of ethnicity based on shared language, culture and history
- romantic ideas that were taken up and promoted by German academics, writers, musicians and painters
- famous German romantics, whose work fuelled the growth of German nationalism after 1815 included the poet, playwright, scientist and statesmen Johann Goethe, the philosopher Johann Fichte, the poet and playwright Friedrich Schiller, and the philologists and cultural researchers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm
- the Brothers Grimm collected folk tales from across the German states and published them together into a single volume, *Children's and Household Tales*. The tales were translated from regional dialects into High German. To the Brothers Grimm these folk tales represented what they saw as a pure form of national literature
- German composers such as Beethoven spanned the transition from the Classical period in music to the Romantic period
- the artist Caspar David Friedrich's landscapes featured contemplative figures set against huge moons or morning mists or barren trees or gothic ruins – a Romantic German landscape
- given that some 25 million spoke German, the Romantic emphasis on, and celebration of, shared language, culture and history profoundly affected the development of a of German national consciousness
- after 1815 Romanticism strongly influenced academics and students in the universities
- *Burschenschaften* – student fraternities – became centres of nationalist sentiment and organised explicitly nationalist festivals
- the Wartburg Festival of 1817 criticised the existing political system and commemorated the fourth anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig and the 300th anniversary of the Reformation headed by the German 'hero', Martin Luther. As well as rebelling against Rome, Luther translated the whole Bible into German
- the Hambach Festival in 1832, attended by perhaps as many as 30,000 people, drew support from across the German states to celebrate German identity, history and culture
- the *Burschenschaften* lacked specific goals, but they nevertheless provided a platform for, and gave political voice to, nationalist ideas.

**Military weakness:**

- the Napoleonic Wars highlighted the fact that as separate states the German states were militarily weak and so easier for France to conquer
- French troops humiliated the armies even of Prussia, the strongest German state
- military defeats inflicted by Napoleon's armies allowed Napoleon to incorporate the German North Sea coast into France itself, and to set up the Confederation of the Rhine as a puppet state. Germans were forcibly conscripted into the French army too
- divided, the German states had not been able to protect and defend their territorial integrity
- after the defeat of Napoleon by multi-national coalition armies at the Battle of Leipzig in 1813, German states were able to join forces to fight the French. Napoleon's conquest highlighted the fact that, as separate states, the German states relied on foreign help when their independence was threatened by foreign powers. After 1815 this vulnerability bolstered the argument for gaining military strength through German unification.

**Role of the Liberals:**

- after 1815 nationalism and liberalism became closely linked
- Liberals argued that the political reform was needed to increase people's freedom and rights and to diminish the power of unelected heads of state, the army, the secret police and the Church
- many Liberals thought that reform would be more likely to succeed if the German states were united into a single state
- Liberals also argued that free-trade would be much easier and more profitable if the German states were politically united
- Liberals were mainly middle class, and so often were the new generators of wealth. They resented being excluded from government. They wanted constitutional change that would include, among other things, a written constitution, an elected Parliament, freedom of speech and expression, and a united Germany
- throughout the 1830s and 1840s liberalism continued to grow reaching a peak in the 1848 revolution during which the Frankfurt Parliament was set up. The Parliament had elected representatives from across the German states coming to sit in an assembly that, it was hoped, would pass legislation for the whole of a new united Germany
- the 1848 revolution failed to achieve what its middle class liberal leaders hoped for, but the Frankfurt Parliament, and the discussions about unification and a German constitution that took place in it, indicate that nationalism that grown significantly alongside, and because of, the growth of liberalism.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**26. Context:**

Although the 1848 revolution did not lead directly to the formation of a united Germany, support for German nationalism continued to grow on into the 1850s and 1860s. In January 1871 German nationalists' dream of a united Germany became a reality when a new German Empire was proclaimed following the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian war. As minister-president of Prussia, Bismarck played a key role in German unification. But Bismarck was operating within the context of growing Prussian economic strength, growing Prussian military strength, the decline of Austria, and the attitudes and actions of other countries, notably Russia and Britain.

**Role of Bismarck:**

- though Bismarck was not a German nationalist, he wanted to ensure that Prussia was the dominant German state and a powerful state in Europe. He calculated that the best way of achieving these aims, and thus of advancing Prussian interests first and foremost, was through German unification
- Bismarck used a mixture of diplomatic skill, opportunism, provocation and risk-taking to achieve German unification
- in the war against Denmark in 1864, Prussia and Austria fought together but it was Bismarck who had taken the lead in pursuing war, not Austria
- in the run up to war against Austria in 1866, Bismarck ensured that Austria was diplomatically isolated
- following the war with Denmark, Bismarck provoked conflict with Austria by causing disputes with about ruling Schleswig and Holstein, challenging Austria's right to lead the German states in the Bund and then leaving the German Confederation trying to take the North German states with him
- after the defeat of Austria by Prussia Bismarck ensured that the peace terms were not too harsh for Austria. He then set up the North German Confederation under Prussian leadership
- Bismarck forced the south German states into agreeing military alliances with Prussia so that in the event of a future war with France, the South German states would be obliged to fight alongside Prussia
- Bismarck rightly guessed that he would be able to provoke Emperor Napoleon III into declaring war on Prussia. He did this by antagonising France through the Hohenzollern candidature (1869) and then provoking France into declaring war on Prussia by altering the Ems telegram (1870)
- in 1864, 1866 and 1870 Bismarck was prepared to take a calculated risk that the Prussian military would deliver victories.

**Other factors:****Prussian military strength:**

- German unification was the consequence of German military victories, but these victories could not have been achieved without Prussian military might
- Prussian weaponry, Prussian soldiers and Prussian command were at the heart of the defeat of Denmark (1864), Austria (1866–1867) and France (1870–1871)
- the Prussian military was greatly improved during the 1860s as a consequence of reforms presided over by the war minister, General von Roon, and Chief of the General Staff, General von Moltke
- Von Roon oversaw the expansion of the Prussian army and improvements in training and equipment. Von Moltke developed mobilisation plans that, in time of war, effectively gave control of the railways to the Prussian army enabling rapid movement and deployment of troops
- a key military impact of the army reforms was the increase in annual recruitment that made a much larger field army possible
- Von Moltke insisted that the Prussian officer corps be much better trained partly through rigorous war gaming exercises, which meant that Prussian leadership on the field of battle was much improved

- Prussian generals made highly effective use of new technology in transport, communications and in weaponry, which helped to give the Prussian armies an advantage
- military success reflected the fact that the Prussian economy was industrialised, modern and wealth generating so ensuring that Prussia could absorb the enormous costs of war and could ensure that Prussian armies were well equipped, well trained and could be deployed effectively.

#### **Prussian economic strength:**

- by the 1850 and 1860s Prussia was the dominant economic power in mainland Europe eclipsing all other German states including Austria, and increasingly challenging France
- Prussia's economic strength was based on industrialisation and urbanisation that picked up pace after the Napoleonic Wars and was made possible by the Prussia's rich supplies of mineral resources, especially coal and iron ore, but also by huge investment in railways. Railways revolutionised transport and communications and facilitated a rapid expansion of trade
- the *Zollverein* (1834) made trade among the member states easier and cheaper, and railways reduced costs too. Industrialists, entrepreneurs and financiers became immensely wealthy, and in addition standards of living improved among the urban, industrial working classes
- 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
- some German states supported Austria because they resented Prussian economic dominance. Nevertheless, the *Zollverein* encouraged supporters of German nationalism, who hoped that economic union would lead to full political unification
- German workers also benefited from improvements in Prussian education and as a result Prussia developed a highly skilled workforce especially in iron and steelmaking but also in chemicals and engineering
- economic development underpinned Prussia's growing military power. It generated the money, the skills and technical expertise, the investment, the industrial power and the transport infrastructure that needed to build a modern military power.

#### **The decline of Austria:**

- Austrian power and influence declined during the 1850s and at the same time as Prussia was growing in strength economically, politically and militarily
- Prussian military strength has to be set against Austrian military weakness, military weakness that reflected Austria's declining economic and political power
- Austria was less industrialised and developed its railways at a much slower pace than Prussia. Austria remained mainly agricultural, although German states in the South still looked to Austria rather than to Prussia for political leadership
- 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
- in addition, Austria was increasingly isolated internationally, for example, failure to give Russia unequivocal support during the Crimean War (1853–1856) seriously undermined Austria's relationship with Russia.

#### **Role of other countries:**

- in the 1860s Britain was increasingly preoccupied with the Empire, particularly India, and generally welcomed Prussia's dominant position in central Europe, regarding it as a welcome counterweight to both France and Russia
- Russia was pleased that it had a reliable partner against Austria
- 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 after being defeated by Prussia in 1866
- 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

- even though 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. This gave Bismarck the opportunity to doctor the Ems Telegram and provoke war
- Prussia was broadly supportive of Russia's crushing of the Polish Revolt (1863). By contrast Britain and France had criticised Russia's response provoking Russian anger
- Russia was prepared to accept Prussian victory against Austria and Austrian decline in part because Austria had not supported Russia against Britain and France during the Crimean War.

**Any other relevant factors.**

## 27. Context:

The coming to power of the Nazis in 1933 was not the inevitable consequence of the collapse of the Weimar republic that was 'doomed from the start'. However, it was the result of long-term and short-term political and economic factors that together created conditions in which Hitler and the Nazis came to seem like they offered the best chance of stabilising, and indeed restoring Germany, which by 1932 was in an economic and political crisis.

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

- the messages from Hitler and the Nazis between 1928 and 1933 were exactly the same as they had given out in the early 1920s to no effect. However, in the context of the Great Depression, Nazi propaganda cut through to voters and interest groups
- in the context of economic disaster Hitler's promises had much more appeal than ever before
- Hitler promised to 'smash Versailles', which most Germans agreed with
- Hitler promised to create a *Volksgemeinschaft* (National/Racial community) that would prioritise the needs of 'ethnic Germans' above everyone
- Hitler's virulent anti-Semitism now began to seem like it made sense
- Hitler promised he would destroy the Communists, a message attractive to businessmen and financiers
- Hitler promised the Nazis would act to ensure economic recovery the key feature of this would be getting rid of unemployment
- Hitler gave people hope in a time of despair
- the Nazis became a popular party of protest with a broad range of support
- the Nazi Party became a highly effective campaigning organisation
- the NSDAP's propaganda machine, spearheaded by Joseph Goebbels, was highly organised and successfully honed Hitler's image as 'the coming man', 'the man of destiny', the only man with the 'superhuman' qualities needed to save Germany
- Hitler's speeches, public appearances and his depiction in photos and posters were all carefully choreographed to project the image of him as a man of the people but one blessed with semi-divine powers.

### Other factors:

#### Weaknesses of the Weimar Republic:

- it is wrong to view the Weimar republic as 'doomed from the start' and to view it as merely the prelude to the Nazis. It is also misleading to suggest that the republic was universally unpopular from 1919–1933. Nevertheless, the republic had weaknesses that are part of the broader context within which the rise of the Nazis ought to be set and understood. There was a lack of support among key groups for the new form of government after 1918
- the Constitution/Article 48 ('suicide clause') – arguably Germany was too democratic. 'The world's most perfect democracy – on paper'
- the Weimar constitution and the liberal democratic state was deeply unpopular among Nationalists and Communists
- Nationalists viewed democracy as weak and as a foreign imposition that Germany had to accept because of defeat in WWI
- Communists wanted a revolution as had happened in Russia in 1917. They despised democracy as a bourgeois-capitalist conspiracy to oppress the workers
- many top-ranking civil servants had been appointed under the old *Kaiserreich* and really wanted that system to be restored. The same was true among top ranking judges
- German army officers were even more hostile to the new regime steeped, as they were, in nationalism, anti-Semitism, belief in the superiority of the German people and culture, and fury about the outcome of WWI
- the army officer corps were highly effective in managing to ensure that the 'stab-in-the-back myth' became the generally accepted account of why Germany lost the war: Germany could have won had it not been for the actions of Socialists, Communists and Jews who had signed the armistice (the 'November criminals') and then the Treaty of Versailles (the 'shameful peace')

- Versailles encouraged uprisings of the extreme right in the early 1920s such as the Kapp *Putsch* (March 1920) and the Munich *Putsch* (November 1923) while hatred of liberal democracy prompted the Communists to attempt to bring about a Russian-style revolution (the Spartacist Revolt, January 1919). These uprisings unsettled some people because they gave the impression that democracy was weak
- political assassinations, especially by extreme right-wing groups, made people anxious about living in a democracy
- lack of real, outstanding Weimar politicians who could strengthen the Republic, with the exception of Stresemann
- by the late 1920s there were 30 political parties. This undermined the PR system for elections because it led to fragmentation of the vote and therefore the necessity of forming coalition governments, which often did not last for long. For some people this suggested that the republic was inherently unstable.

#### **Resentment towards the Treaty of Versailles:**

- opponents of Weimar democracy benefited hugely from the fact that the Treaty of Versailles was universally unpopular from the moment it was published
- Germans had expected that there would be a punitive aspect to the treaty, but they were shocked by what they believed was the harshness of the treaty
- the new government went out of its way to stoke this reaction to the treaty, partly to counter nationalist propaganda that the government had accepted the treaty and was therefore weak and partly to gain some leverage to get the Allies to make concessions
- the loss of territory such as the Polish corridor created resentment because it meant that some Germans now found themselves living in a foreign country
- the loss of Alsace-Lorraine was especially galling because these areas had been taken from France at the end of the Franco-Prussian war (1870–1871)
- the military restrictions especially the reduction of the army to 100,000 men were hated because they seemed to be a deliberate attempt to leave Germany weak and vulnerable to attack from hostile power especially France
- reparations, set at 132 billion marks, were viewed as deliberately designed to undermine German post-war economic recovery
- Article 231 of the Treaty, which held Germany responsible for causing the war, was deeply resented because it suggested that the 2 million German dead had died for a dishonourable cause
- led to a growth in criticism; ‘November Criminals’, and the ‘Stab in the back’ myth, discredited the Weimar Government
- the treaty was viewed as a *diktat* because the Germans were given no opportunity to negotiate the terms or to revise them.

#### **Economic difficulties:**

- debt and inflation immediately following the end of the war made recovery difficult, a situation exacerbated by the British naval blockade
- the economic crises of 1923 and then 1929–1933 helped to undermine people’s confidence in the republic and republicanism. In each case, the economic crisis could be directly linked to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles enabling opponents of the republic to construct a narrative that democracy did not work, and that Versailles was a consequence of trusting democrats
- over-reliance on foreign loans left the Weimar economy subject to the fluctuations of the international economy
- the 1923 hyperinflation crisis was sparked by the French-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr following Germany’s defaulting on its reparations’ payments for 1923
- hyperinflation destroyed the value of the mark. This resulted in severe effects on the middle classes, people on pensions or other fixed incomes were ruined. People’s savings became worthless

- though Germany recovered from the hyperinflation crisis and moved to a period of economic stability 1924–1928, these ‘Golden years’ were not without significant economic problems including a high level of government borrowing facilitated by the Dawes plan and high levels of unemployment (1.3 million)
- 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 one third 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.

**Weaknesses and mistakes of opponents:**

- splits in the left after suppression of Spartacist Revolt in 1919 made joint action between the SPD and 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
- Hugenberg’s nationalist party, the NKVD, swung in behind the Nazis
- roles of Kurt von Schleicher German Chancellor June 1932 – January 1933 and Franz von Papen, first as German Chancellor May 1932 – December 1932, then as Vice-Chancellor to Hitler January 1933
- 1932 political intrigue. Von Papen and Oskar von Hindenburg (the President’s son) met secretly and backed Hitler to become Chancellor
- Hindenburg and von Papen underestimated Hitler. Once appointed as Chancellor they soon realised they had miscalculated Hitler and his intentions
- weakness and indecision of the President of Germany Paul von Hindenburg. In particular his misuse of Article 48.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**28. 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 once again become great and powerful. Such ideas became entwined with a desire for independence from Austria.

**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 3; 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 of Italy was hated – conscription of the local population, taxes, looting of Italian art.

**Other factors:****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.

**Economic factors:**

- economic factors were not important directly. Wealth lay in land (landowners were often reactionary) and trade (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.

**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.**

**29. Context:**

By 1870 Italy had unified under the leadership of Piedmont-Sardinia. Despite being militarily weak the Piedmontese political leadership skilfully used diplomacy as well as focused military alliances to force Austria from the Italian peninsula.

**Rise of Piedmont:**

- Piedmont was the most powerful and liberal of the independent Italian states which enabled her to become the leader of the unification movement
- Piedmont was the most economically advanced of the Italian states. It had developed its economic infrastructure as well as commercial activity such as cotton and silk working, which led to an increase in trade of 300% in the 1850s. Industry developed around urban centres such as Turin and a railway network was built
- the growing economy in Piedmont meant it attracted workers from across Italy. Other Italian states wished to share in the economic success of Piedmont
- the Piedmontese army was advanced by Italian standards
- 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. The King was supportive of his chief minister Cavour
- 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 26 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
- the Piedmontese leaders skilfully used the forces of Garibaldi. For example, Garibaldi led the Expedition of the Thousand on behalf of and with the consent of Victor Emmanuel II.

**Other factors:**

**Role of Cavour:**

- Camillo Benso, Count of 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 1859–1860 were of fundamental importance in shaping the Italian nation
- Cavour used Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War as an opportunity to gain favour with Britain and France as well as point out 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
- Cavour became the first prime minister of a unified Italy. When he died in 1861 only Venetia and the Papal States lay outside Italian control.

#### **Role of Garibaldi:**

- Giuseppe Garibaldi was an inspirational Italian general, republican and revolutionary who was committed to Italian unification.
- however, he was also a pragmatist and allied himself with the Piedmontese monarchy to achieve Italian unification
- in 1848, Garibaldi returned to Italy and commanded and fought in military campaigns that eventually led to Italian unification
- when the war of independence broke out in April 1859, he led his Hunters of the Alps in the capture of major cities in Lombardy, including Varese and Como, and reached the frontier of South Tyrol; the war ended with the acquisition of Lombardy
- in 1860, he led the Expedition of the Thousand on behalf of and with the consent of Victor Emmanuel II. The expedition was a success and ended with the annexation of Sicily, Southern Italy, Marche and Umbria to the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia before the creation of a unified Kingdom of Italy on 17 March 1861
- 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
- his last military campaign took place during the Franco-Prussian War as commander of the Army of the Vosges.

#### **Decline of Austria:**

- Austria had dominated Northern Italy since the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. However, her decline as a major European power gave Piedmont the opportunity to unify the Italian states under her political leadership
- the defeat of Austria in the Italian wars of independence show how she had declined militarily. The growing power of Prussia within the German states threatened her domination of central Europe and provided opportunity for the Italians especially with the defeat of Austria in 1866 by Prussia
- Austria was increasingly politically isolated through this period, for example, her traditional ally Russia could not be relied upon as Austria had failed to support Russia 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 4 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.**

**30. Context:**

Italy was a new country formed 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. However, other factors leading to Fascist power include the weaknesses of Italian government, the appeal of Mussolini, as well as social and economic divisions and weakness of opponents.

**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 (approximately 700,000 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 2 years
- bribery and corruption were commonplace in the Italian political system
- 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’ – the 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 Fascio Italiano 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 the 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. 1919–1920 ‘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.**

**31. Context:**

Nicholas II had to manage the Russian Empire through a time of major economic and social change, yet he was determined to maintain an autocratic regime as far as he possibly could. Nicholas faced formidable challenges not least of which was the sheer size of the Russian Empire and the astonishing diversity of its peoples, languages and cultures. Furthermore, before 1905 there was growing political opposition to Tsarism. Nevertheless, Nicholas II continued to be supported by key institutions including the Army, the Okhrana and the Orthodox Church, and he continued to pursue policies, especially Russification, which he thought would not only maintain the regime but also strengthen it.

**The Tsar:**

- Nicholas II believed he had a divine right to rule Russia and guide its peoples, and that belief was not open to question
- since his power came directly from God everyone else was expected to bow before Nicholas's supreme power
- Nicholas was an autocrat; he ruled without constraints on his power and according to his own view of what was right. His power did not rest on the consent of the people
- the Tsar had an imperial council made up of nobles to advise him. There was also a cabinet of ministers who ran government departments, but they were responsible to the Tsar not to a Parliament or a prime minister
- advisers and ministers reported directly to the Tsar and took their instructions from him
- a huge bureaucracy was needed to run the enormous empire. The top ranks were the preserve of the nobles and the lower ranks, who actually had day-to-day contact with the people, were poorly paid and so there was a culture of bribery and corruption
- the Tsarist legal system was designed to support autocracy and to suppress opposition and dissent; a standard punishment for critics of the Tsar was exile to Siberia
- the Tsarist system could be viewed as uncomplicated and so easy to operate, but it was a system that came under increasing pressure as the need for Russia to modernise became more urgent and so depended more and more on the unwavering support of the army, the Okhrana, and the Orthodox Church, and on censorship and oppression
- Nicholas II also attempted to maintain the system by continuing with the policy of Russification.

**Other factors:****Army/Okhrana:**

- the support of the army was crucial to the security of the regime
- officers were drawn from noble backgrounds and soldiers were peasant conscripts
- the army was used to suppress any disturbances or revolts against the regime, and this was usually done with brutal violence
- so long as the army gave unconditional loyalty to the Tsar the regime remained secure, but even before 1905 the army was becoming ill at ease with being used as a police force and morale was suffering among officers and soldiers especially given that most of the soldiers were peasants being asked to put down peasant protests
- one section of the army in particular was fiercely loyal to the Tsar: the Cossacks. They had no qualms about acting against other peoples in the Empire, they formed the best cavalry units in the army and they were usually brutal and ruthless in the defence of the Tsar and Tsarism
- the activities of the army were complimented by those of the Okhrana, the secret police
- the Okhrana operated an extensive police network whose principal task was to root out dissidents and dissent, and to deal with anyone likely to disturb the regime
- the Okhrana ensured that strict censorship was maintained and that there was an effective system of surveillance with agents in most institutions and workplaces
- Okhrana agents infiltrated opposition groups to find key leaders
- however, before 1905 the Okhrana was not able completely to stop opposition to the regime.

**Role of the Church:**

- the Russian Orthodox Church supported and promoted the belief that the Tsar had a divine right to rule and was the agent of God on earth
- the Church upheld the view that there was mystical connection between the Tsar and the people; the Tsar was the ‘Little Father’ of his people (and they his children)
- the Church preached obedience to the Tsar and so to Tsarism
- the Church’s role in maintaining tsarism was extremely important because most Russian peasants belonged to the Orthodox Church and religion influenced all aspects of their lives and culture
- the Church upheld and promoted the Fundamental Laws (1832) especially Article 1 which asserted the Tsar’s divine right to rule, his unconstrained power and the duty of all to obey him
- before 1905 the Church was crucial to the security of the regime, yet even so its position and ideology were drawing criticism from a growing number of political opponents some of whom were avowedly atheist and anti-clerical.

**Russification:**

- Russification – the attempt to limit the influence of non-Russian minorities in the Empire – was an important development in the Tsars’ efforts to maintain the security of the regime
- this policy insisted that non-Russians use the Russian language instead of their own and adopt Russian customs and habits, and Russian Orthodox Christianity
- Russian was imposed throughout the Empire as the language of the law, government and education
- Russian officials were brought in to run regional governments in non-Russian regions
- Russians got the most important jobs across the Empire in government and state sponsored or run industries
- before 1905 these policies designed to discriminate against national minorities were causing increasing hostility to the regime; non-Russians viewed Russification as a fundamental attack on their way of life, and this was especially so in the matter of religion
- in the 19<sup>th</sup> century there were a number of uprisings and protests against the regime but because these occurred in one region at a time the government was able to suppress them.

**Political opposition:**

- although opposition groups before 1905 were not quite strong enough to overthrow the regime, the fact that the revolution of 1905 was so widespread and came so close to toppling the Tsar is indicative of the fact that substantial opposition had been growing, and rapidly, over the years well before 1905
- political opposition fed into, and off, discontent among peasants, industrial workers, the middle classes, national minorities and in the army
- some opponents – Liberals, for example – thought change could be brought about by reform, others – including the Socialist Revolutionaries and Social Democrats – argued that violent revolution was needed to overthrow the Tsarist regime
- political opposition was a growing concern for the regime because it was drawing support from peasants, industrial workers, middle class professionals and among nobles too. The revolutions of 1905 showed that the Tsar and his supporters were right to be concerned about the level and nature of opposition to the regime.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**32. Context:**

During the 1905 revolution Nicholas II came close to losing power, but the continuing loyalty of the army, a lack of combined, co-ordinated opposition, middle class fear of violence and disorder, and brutally repressive measures were enough to save the regime. After 1905 Nicholas II tried to continue ruling as he had always done. The fundamental problems that had caused the 1905 revolution were not resolved. Discontent among the working class was a key factor in bringing about the revolution of February 1917. But discontent among the peasants also continued to grow, exacerbated by the impact of the First World War and the Tsarina's inept interventions in government during the war, and these were crucial factors in the outbreak of another revolution in February 1917 too.

**Discontent among the working class:**

- little had changed for urban workers following the 1905 revolution. Most still lived in acute poverty and in overcrowded, unhealthy accommodation. They worked for long hours and low pay. The war exacerbated these problems
- as the war went on workers faced food and fuel shortages, higher prices and longer hours
- disruption to the supplies of raw materials led to factory closures and unemployment
- workers were now more receptive than ever before to revolutionary groups' propaganda
- workers became increasingly hostile to the Tsarist regime as conditions worsened in the winter of 1916–1917
- by February 1917, in Moscow and Petrograd in particular, acute distress led to strikes that created a volatile situation. Hunger, endless queueing, cold and unemployment radicalised workers
- in Petrograd towards the end of February rumours of bread rationing led to bread riots
- on 23 February, International Women's Day protests attracted thousands of women out onto the streets. Women workers went on strike and persuaded men from the huge Putilov Engineering Works in the Vyborg district of the city to join them.

**Other factors:**

**The role of Tsar Nicholas II:**

- Nicholas struggled to move beyond the old autocratic mindset
- Nicholas appeared to be easily influenced by the Tsarina who encouraged him to stick with autocracy. This meant that Nicholas failed to resolve the problem of nationalities and refused to initiate the political reforms needed in response to economic development
- in 1915, pressurised into reconvening the Dumas, Nicholas failed to take the opportunity this presented to form a government that included progressive elements who wanted to be involved in the war effort and to head-off revolution and anarchy
- the Tsar suspended the Duma and so lost the support of progressives who could have made a positive contribution towards making the government more efficient and more effective in running the war
- in August 1915 the Tsar decided to take control of the army. He went out to army headquarters in Mogilev – 600kms from Petrograd. He was now held responsible for Russian defeats, and he was away from the centre of government for long periods of time, leaving the Tsarina in charge.

**The role of Tsarina Alexandra:**

- the Tsarina's interventions in government caused chronic instability. There were constant changes of ministers. Competent ministers were dismissed (for example, War Minister, Polivanov) and incompetent people were appointed instead often because they were compliant or flattered the Tsarina
- the fact that the Tsarina was German meant she was viewed with suspicion
- Alexandra's (and Nicholas's) relationship with Rasputin caused a scandal that undermined the credibility of the Tsar and tsarism. The murder of Rasputin in December 1916 made the situation worse
- Alexandra had never been at ease among the Russian ruling elite, and they now turned against her and the Tsar.

**Discontent among the peasantry:**

- a small minority of peasants enjoyed rising living standard after 1905, but the bulk of peasants remained impoverished
- Stolypin's land reforms were supposed to tie the peasants closer to the Tsar and to go some way to resolving the question of land distribution, but they had proved to be divisive
- there was resentment that change was not coming about quickly enough, and growth in population had in fact made demand for land even greater in the countryside
- peasant discontent over the land issue increased during the war years. When order began to break down, land seizures by peasants became common
- peasants who had left the land because of Stolypin's reforms resented the fact that they had to go to the towns and cities to become industrial workers
- the demands of the war led to requisitioning (of horses, for example) making life even harder for the peasants
- the bulk of soldiers were conscripts and mainly peasants, which meant that during the war the rural workforce was reduced and so production levels were reduced too.

**Impact of the First World War:**

- the First World War exposed the fact that the rigidity and inefficiency of the Tsarist could not cope with the demands of a huge modern industrial war
- Russia experienced catastrophic defeats at Tannenberg and the Masurian Lakes right at the beginning of the war
- Russian generals assumed that the size of the Russian army would be decisive. In fact, what mattered was training, arms and leadership; the Russian army was deficient in each and all of these key areas
- the army was plagued by shortages, the consequence of the transport network being unable to meet the huge demands placed upon it
- soldiers endured terrible conditions at the front; they lacked food, equipment, ammunition and medical care
- defeats continued into 1915 and beyond. Casualty rates were huge. Morale crumbled
- in 1915 the Tsar decided to go to the front to take command. But Nicholas had little understanding of actual command. Defeats continued only now, as Commander-in-Chief, Nicholas was held directly responsible
- by 1917 the army was in a state of collapse. Officers lost control and soldiers mutinied and deserted in rapidly increasing numbers
- in Petrograd soldiers joined in strikes, encouraged by revolutionary propaganda
- the Tsar lost the support of the army. Nicholas's generals forced him to abdicate in the hope that they could prevent a total collapse of the empire
- the war wrecked the Russian economy. The transport system prioritised military needs so getting grain and other goods to the towns and cities became increasingly difficult leading to shortages of food and fuel
- shortages caused price rises. Inflation soared
- the standard of living in overcrowded towns and cities deteriorated
- by 1916 Petrograd was receiving a third of what it needed in food and fuel
- strikes broke out in 1915 and then in 1916 there were more strikes, more often and increasing in militancy.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**33. Context:**

Following the abdication of the Tsar a Provisional Government was formed to rule Russia until elections for a Constituent Assembly could be held. The Provisional Government faced formidable problems: the issue of redistribution of land, the need for radical reforms, conflicting views about the war, and the difficulty of managing autonomy for national minorities. By late summer 1917 the authority of the Provisional Government was draining away. In a revolution in October the Bolsheviks seized power. The appeal of Lenin and the Bolsheviks was an important reason for their success, but that appeal must be seen in the context of the failures of the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet.

**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 was made up mainly of liberals from the former Duma, dominated by the Kadets. At the same time as the Provisional Government was being formed so was the Petrograd Soviet. The Petrograd Soviet was made up of workers and soldiers' representatives and socialist intellectuals, mainly Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries. Its Executive Committee was dominated by Socialist intellectuals
- the Petrograd Soviet's main aim was to protect the interests of workers and soldiers. In early March it passed Order No 1: soldiers would only obey orders from the Provisional Government if the Soviet agreed
- 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
- through its soldier and worker representatives the Soviet controlled the railways, the Petrograd garrison, factories, power supplies and communications enabling it to monitor the activities of the Provisional Government, but it kept its distance from the Provisional Government
- Dual Power made decision-making difficult for the Provisional Government, which in any case was meant to be a temporary administration. To begin with there was a degree of co-operation between the two organisations but as problems mounted the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet diverged more and more. This situation was especially serious for the Provisional Government because it did not have a base of popular support, which soviets certainly did including the Petrograd Soviet
- the weakness of the Provisional Government can be seen in the Kornilov Affair 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.

**Other factors:****Decision to continue the war:**

- the Provisional Government decided to continue the war, and in June the Minister of War, Kerensky, launched a huge offensive
- the June offensive quickly fell apart. Rates of desertion were high, and soldiers mutinied. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers were killed for no gain
- the failure of the offensive plunged the Provisional Government into crisis and led to a popular uprising in Petrograd in July
- the Provisional Government managed to survive but its credibility was seriously undermined
- moderate socialist leaders who were part of the in the Provisional Government lost the support of soldiers and workers.

**Political discontent:**

- economic problems continued (food shortages, rising prices, falling wages, bread queues) giving rise to growing political discontent

- the July Days, an armed uprising of workers and soldiers supported by 20,000 sailors from the Kronstadt naval base and encouraged by the Bolsheviks, had to be suppressed by the Provisional Government
- Bolshevik leaders were arrested, and Lenin went into hiding. Kerensky appointed General Kornilov as Supreme Commander of Russian forces with the idea of bringing trustworthy troops to Petrograd to secure the city from any further threat from the Bolsheviks
- Kornilov decided this was his chance to crush radical socialists, take control of the government and establish military control
- Kerensky now called on the Soviet to defend Petrograd from counter-revolution and he released Bolsheviks, imprisoned following the July Days, and armed them too
- the overall impact of the July Days and the Kornilov affair was the destruction of the credibility of Kerensky, the Provisional Government and the Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary leaders associated with Kerensky and the Provisional Government.

#### **Land issue:**

- the failure of the Provisional Government to organise redistribution of the land in the countryside led to anarchy in the countryside
- encouraged by the Bolsheviks, Peasants had started taking land from April 1917. By summer 1917 they were taking more and more land
- the Provisional Government wanted land redistribution to take place within a framework of law organised by the Constituent Assembly once that had been set up. They also wanted landowners to be compensated. To peasants this all seemed like an attempt to prevent redistribution of land
- the harvest of 1917 failed causing a grain crisis. The Provisional Government sent out requisition brigades into the countryside to seize grain. This increased peasant hostility to the government and led to rising levels of violence in the countryside.

#### **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
- the popularity of the Bolsheviks grew in the summer of 1917 as workers and soldiers became disillusioned with the policies of the Provisional Government
- in August Kerensky called on the Bolsheviks to help him deal with the threat of a military *coup* led by General Kornilov
- the Bolsheviks were now able to claim that they were the true defenders of the February Revolution. As such they benefited from a wave of popular support. They were now elected in large numbers onto the soviets
- on 9 September the Bolsheviks gained overall control of the Petrograd Soviet and on 25 September Trotsky was elected its president. The Bolsheviks took control of the Moscow Soviet too
- even before September support for the Bolsheviks had been growing. For example, in the elections to the Petrograd City Duma in August the Bolsheviks gained 33% of the vote
- the clarity of Bolshevik policies – summed up in the slogan 'Peace, Bread, Land' – as set out by Lenin in his April theses, helped the Bolsheviks to build a broad base of support
- by late summer 1917 Lenin's demand for no cooperation with the Provisional Government had become increasingly appealing to workers and soldiers
- Bolshevik propaganda kept the Bolshevik message fresh in people's minds, undermined the Provisional Government and created the sense of urgent need for radical change
- Lenin led the Bolsheviks with skill and ruthless determination. He could not control everything in the Party, but nevertheless he managed to maintain party discipline and in October convinced the Bolshevik Central Committee to support an armed uprising
- Trotsky was also important. He persuaded Lenin to wait until the meeting of the Second Congress of All-Russian Soviets on 26 October before launching an armed uprising, and he set up and controlled the Military Revolutionary Committee to plan and implement an armed uprising.

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

**34. 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.

**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.

**Other factors:****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.

**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

- 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
- 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, for example, 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.

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

**35. 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 \$5000, 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, for example, 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 1937-1938 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 6 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, for example.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**36. 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 by individual leaders, such as Martin Luther King, and Black civil rights organisations, which was significant in the development of a more organised mass movement for civil rights after 1945.

**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 events at Little Rock High School, Arkansas in 1957, encouraged civil rights campaigners. The Little Rock 9, and in particular 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.

**Other factors:**

**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 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 after WWII
- 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
- Josephine Baker, an American-born French entertainer and civil rights activist, refused to play to segregated troops during WWII.

### **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, for example, 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.

### **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
- he 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
- King presented a non-threatening image of Black protest to the US television audience
- he 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 1955–1956, 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.

### **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. Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale founded the Black Panther Party for Self-Defence. 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
- 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.**

37. **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.

**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 £6.6 billion; 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 WW1. 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.

**Other factors:****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, for example, 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, for example, 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.

**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 small 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.

**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 realising that he would not be stopped, for example, rearmament, the reoccupation of the Rhineland and then the Anschluss.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**38. Context:**

During the interwar years British foreign policy was aimed at maintaining peace in Europe through diplomacy. This made sense in light of the massive damage caused by the Great War across Europe. Up to March 1938 (and later), this was largely achieved. The conflicts that did occur (Abyssinia, Spain) were on the periphery of Europe/the Mediterranean.

**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, although the Germans agreed to build up to 45% of 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.**

**39. 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 Frantiske 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 airforce 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 with regard to 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. For example, 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 made pointed comments 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 meant 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.**

40. **Context:**

The wartime alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union 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 tensions between a Capitalist America and her allies and the Soviet Union rapidly developed.

**The 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 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 the communist triumph in China in 1949 and the Korean War American assets to contain communism would have to be deployed in Asia as well as the West.

**Other factors:**

**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 further increased tensions.

**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: Soviet withdrawal from WWI, involvement of West with anti-Bolshevik Whites
- ideological differences between Communism 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 the Deutsche Mark in West Germany led to the Berlin Blockade 1948–1949
- the disagreement over the status of Germany was illustrative of the broader competing visions of Capitalism and Communism.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**41. Context:**

The Domino Theory was used by American Presidents, starting with Eisenhower to justify American intervention to help the South of Vietnam in their struggles against the Communist North. This can be seen as part of the broader American struggle to contain Communist expansion. American intervention increased over subsequent Presidential administrations until Nixon sought Vietnamisation of the conflict and withdrawal of American forces.

**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: for example, 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 by the mid-1960s
- the role and determination of Le Duan is also of importance in the north's leadership. He was behind the policy of active attacks on American and South Vietnamese forces to demoralise the enemy. Also important in developing 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
- the military support for the North from China and the Soviet Union from 1965 is of great importance. For example, it enabled the development of a sophisticated air defence system which inflicted heavy casualties on American bombers and fighters.

**Other factors:**

**Difficulties faced by US military:**

- terrain did not suit US military strengths of airpower and firepower. This was an army geared to fight the Soviet Union, not a guerrilla war
- difficulties dealing with the jungle conditions and knowing which Vietnamese were the enemy led to stress and confusion
- short commissions for officers and rotation of troops led to loss of expertise in the field
- soldiers were brave, but a minority did not believe in the war. Many were also reluctant conscripts. Many American soldiers became addicted to drugs. As the war developed many examples of 'fragging' where soldiers shot their officers. Also, racial tension between white and Black American soldiers as the war progressed
- 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 – these 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.

**Weaknesses of South Vietnam:**

- corruption and decay of South Vietnamese government, especially in Saigon. A Catholic elite controlled a largely Buddhist population. Lack of political and social cohesion in South Vietnam led to divisions and turmoil which filtered through to their armed forces
- South Vietnamese troops could fight well if well led and motivated, but many generals acted as local warlords. Americans complained they went on 'Search and Avoid' missions rather than engaging with the Vietcong
- the leadership was corrupt. The rule of Diem favoured family members and was unwilling to scale back his anti-Buddhist actions thereby alienating a large proportion of his own population. He was eventually removed by South Vietnamese army officers in 1963 with the full knowledge of the CIA
- his successors were not much better. Even the Americans thought that the leadership of Ky and Thiem was by 'bottom of the barrel individuals.'

**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, for example, South Viet police chief executing a Viet Cong in Saigon during the Tet Offensive of 1968, Mai Lai massacre. Such images damaged American claims to be the 'good guys'
- extent of the opposition is debated. Probably a minority in 1965, growing by the time of crucial Tet offensive in 1968. 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 1960s and early 1970s
- divisions within administrations: for example, LBJ had Rusk advising to continue the struggle in South-East Asia, compared to Senator Fulbright arguing for de-escalation.

**International isolation of the USA:**

- the Vietnam War was a media war which turned much international opinion against the US
- none of America's allies from the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation became involved in the war
- there was support from allies in Asia, such as Australia, South Korea and New Zealand, but this aid became unpopular at home and led to the withdrawal of Australian troops, for example. As a superpower American could ignore this, but it was a propaganda gift for her enemies.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**42. 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.

**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 Willi 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.

**Other factors:**

**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.

**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 (Multiple Independent Re-entry Vehicles) and intermediate missile technology led to SALT 2
- Khrushchev's desire for better relations between the superpowers in the 1950s and 1960s was, in part, about freeing up resources for economic development in the USSR.

**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.

**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.

**Any other relevant factors.**

**[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]**