



## History at Turton

We study History to know where we come from, create our identity and share the collective memory that defines us. No (wo) man is an island and everyone is shaped by the world around them. History is over 2000 years of mistakes and progress, lessons learned and forgotten. Through the acquisition of historical knowledge we gain emancipation, and thus endeavour to avoid repeating mistakes, so the world can flourish.

Name:	Form:	Teacher:

In this booklet you will find all of your homework for Year 8 History.



Week 1	Due date:
<p>The Battle of Bosworth</p> <p>The Battle of Bosworth was fought on August 22<sup>nd</sup> 1485. Henry Tudor had marched with his force from Milford Haven in Wales where he had landed with about 2000 men. The Battle of Bosworth is one of England's defining battles as it ended the reign of Richard III and led to Henry Tudor becoming Henry VII, the first of the Tudor monarchs, a dynasty that lasted to 1603 and included the reign of two of England's most famous monarchs – Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth I.</p> <p>To launch his campaign against Richard III, Henry needed money. This he got from Charles VIII of France who hoped that a conflict in England would suitably distract any attention away from his wish to take Brittany. Henry sailed from Harfleur on August 1<sup>st</sup> with a force of between 400 and 500 loyal followers and about 1500 French soldiers. The force landed at Milford Haven on August 7<sup>th</sup> and marched north along the Cardigan coastline before turning inland towards the Cambrian Mountains and then the River Severn which he followed to the English border.</p> <p>By August 12<sup>th</sup>, Henry had won the support of the most influential landowner in South Wales – Rhys ap Thomas – who had been promised the Lieutenancy of Wales if Henry won. However, regardless of his support in Wales, Henry needed more support in England. He turned to his step-father Lord Stanley and his brother Sir William Stanley. They owned large areas of land in north Wales and in the Border region. Both men secretly gave money to Henry – Lord Stanley's eldest son was being held prisoner by Richard III as an insurance of good behaviour. The uncle of the Earl of Shrewsbury, Gilbert Thomas, also gave his support to Henry along with 500 men.</p> <p>Richard III was at Nottingham Castle when he learned about Henry's invasion. He did nothing as he assumed that the major landowners of Wales would see Henry as a threat and group their forces together and attack him. When he realised that he had made a mistake, Richard marched his forces to Leicester. The two armies fought two-and-a-half miles south of Market Bosworth.</p> <p>Henry had a force of about 5000 men while Richard's army probably was nearer 12,000. However, 4,000 of these soldiers belonged to the Stanley family and no one was sure if the Stanley's could be trusted. It is thought that Richard did not trust Lord Stanley as he had a reputation of fighting for whoever he felt was going to be the most generous in victory. For Richard it was to be a shrewd judgement of character – and one that led to his death.</p> <p>The fighting began early in the morning of August 22<sup>nd</sup>. The two Stanley armies stayed away from the actual fighting at this stage so that the contest was literally a battle between Richard's and Henry's forces. Richard held the crest of Ambien Hill with Henry at the bottom in more marshy land. When Henry's men charged up the hill, they sustained heavy casualties. However, Henry had recruited long bow men while in Wales and these inflicted equally severe wounds on the forces of Richard as being at the top of a hill did not protect them from a deluge of long bow arrows.</p> <p>Though there are no contemporary accounts of the battle, it is generally accepted that it lasted about two to three hours. Casualties on both sides were heavy. What turned the battle seems to have been a decision made by Richard III to target Henry himself. Henry was seen making a move to where Lord Stanley was almost certainly with the intent to urge Stanley to use his forces on Henry's side. With some trusted men Richard charged at Henry. He nearly succeeded in getting to Henry, and Tudor's standard bearer, William Brandon, who was very near his leader, was killed. However, Henry's bodyguards closed ranks and the future king was saved.</p> <p>For the duration of the battle, the forces of the Stanley family had stood by the sides – therefore fulfilling what Richard believed – but at this critical moment the army of Sir William Stanley attacked Richard, seemingly coming to the aid of Henry. Richard was killed and his forces broke up and fled. Lord Stanley picked up the slain Richard's crown and placed it on Henry's head. Richard's naked body was put over a mule and taken to Leicester to be buried.</p> <p>The defeat of Richard ended the reign of the Plantagenet's and introduced the reign of the Tudors. By marrying Elizabeth of York, Henry unified both houses of Lancaster and York.</p>	

Summarise the events at Bosworth

What was the key turning point in this battle?

### Richard III dig: DNA confirms bones are king's

A skeleton found beneath a Leicester car park has been confirmed as that of English king Richard III. Experts from the University of Leicester said DNA from the bones matched that of descendants of the monarch's family. Lead archaeologist Richard Buckley, from the University of Leicester, told a press conference to applause: "Beyond reasonable doubt it's Richard." Richard, killed in battle in 1485, will be reinterred in Leicester Cathedral.

Mr Buckley said the bones had been subjected to "rigorous academic study" and had been carbon dated to a period from 1455-1540. Dr Jo Appleby, an osteo-archaeologist from the university's School of Archaeology and Ancient History, revealed the bones were of a man in his late 20s or early 30s. Richard was 32 when he died. His skeleton had suffered 10 injuries, including eight to the skull, at around the time of death. Two of the skull wounds were potentially fatal. One was a "slice" removing a flap of bone, the other was caused by bladed weapon which went through and hit the opposite side of the skull - a depth of more than 10cm (4ins).

#### 'Humiliation injuries'

Dr Appleby said: "Both of these injuries would have caused an almost instant loss of consciousness and death would have followed quickly afterwards. "In the case of the larger wound, if the blade had penetrated 7cm into the brain, which we cannot determine from the bones, death would have been instantaneous." Other wounds included slashes or stabs to the face and the side of the head. There was also evidence of "humiliation" injuries, including a pelvic wound likely to have been caused by an upward thrust of a weapon, through the buttock. Richard III was portrayed as deformed by some Tudor historians and indeed the skeleton's spine is badly curved, a condition known as scoliosis. However, there was no trace of a withered arm or other abnormalities described in the more extreme characterisations of the king.

#### Missing princes

Without the scoliosis, which experts believe developed during teenage years, he would have been about 5ft 8ins (1.7m) tall, but the curvature would have made him appear "considerably" shorter. Dr Appleby said: "The analysis of the skeleton proved that it was an adult male but was an unusually slender, almost feminine, build for a man. "Taken as a whole, the skeletal evidence provides a highly convincing case for identification as Richard III." Richard was a royal prince until the death of his brother Edward IV in 1483. Appointed as protector of his nephew, Edward V, Richard instead assumed the reins of power. Edward and his brother Richard, known as the Princes in the Tower, disappeared soon after. Rumours circulated they had been murdered on the orders of their uncle. Challenged by Henry Tudor, Richard was killed at Bosworth in 1485 after only two years on the throne.

#### DNA trail

He was given a hurried burial beneath the church of Greyfriars in the centre of Leicester. Mr Buckley said the grave was clumsily cut, with sloping sides and too short for the body, forcing the head forward. "There was no evidence of a coffin or shroud which would have left the bones in a more compact position. "Unusually, the arms are crossed and this could be an indication the body was buried with the wrists still tied," he added. Greyfriars church was demolished during the Reformation in the 16th Century and over the following centuries its exact location was forgotten. However, a team of enthusiasts and historians managed to trace the likely area - and, crucially, after painstaking genealogical research, they found a 17th-generation descendant of Richard's sister with whose DNA they could compare any remains. Joy Ibsen, from Canada, died several years ago but her son, Michael, who now works in London, provided a sample. The researchers were fortunate as, while the DNA they were looking for was in all Joy Ibsen's offspring, it is only handed down through the female line and her only daughter has no children. The line was about to stop.

#### Tomb plans

But the University of Leicester's experts had other problems.

Dr Turi King, project geneticist, said there had been concern DNA in the bones would be too degraded: "The question was could we get a sample of DNA to work with, and I am extremely pleased to tell you that we could."

She added: "There is a DNA match between the maternal DNA of the descendants of the family of Richard III and the skeletal remains we found at the Greyfriars dig."

"In short, the DNA evidence points to these being the remains of Richard III."

In August 2012, an excavation began in a city council car park - the only open space remaining in the likely area - which quickly identified buildings connected to the church.

The bones were found in the first days of the dig and were eventually excavated under forensic conditions.

Details of the reburial ceremony have yet to be released, but Philippa Langley from the Richard III Society said plans for a tomb were well advanced.

She said of the discovery of Richard's skeleton: "I'm totally thrilled, I'm overwhelmed to be honest, it's been a long hard journey. I mean today as we stand it's been nearly four years."

"It's the culmination of a lot of hard work. I think, as someone said to me earlier, it's just the end of the beginning."

"We're going to completely reassess Richard III, we're going to completely look at all the sources again, and hopefully there's going to be a new beginning for Richard as well."

What two things have you learnt from this article?

What one thing do you want to know more about?

Week 3	Due date:
--------	-----------

Read through article below taken from BBC Bitesize about Henry VIII

Henry VIII became king in 1509. His father had left him lots of money. He was a glamorous 'Renaissance Prince' and wanted to be the greatest king England ever had.

He went to war with France in 1513 and built more warships. In 1536 he united Wales with England, and in 1541 he declared himself King of Ireland.

Henry VIII is most famous for divorcing his first wife, Catherine of Aragon, because she could not give him a male heir, and then marrying five times more!

#### **Henry VIII and religion**

In 1534 Henry said that he, not the Pope, was the Head of the Church in England. Although Henry remained a Catholic to the end of his life, this was the beginning of the Church of England. In 1536 Henry used his new power to begin to close down the monasteries and take their land and money. This made many people unhappy, and there was a rebellion, called the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536. Henry put it down brutally.

#### **A harsh and brutal king?**

In 1539 a new law gave Henry power to make any law he pleased. Towards the end of his reign Henry became increasingly brutal, executed his enemies and burned Protestants at the stake.

In the past, historians said that Henry was the start of a 'new monarchy' and that he made 'a revolution in government'. Modern historians say that this is too simple. Henry was very powerful, but in many ways he ruled like a medieval king, surrounded and influenced by his nobles.

From your knowledge about Henry VIII, do you think he was a successful king? Why?

Week 4	Due date:
--------	-----------

#### Consequences of Henry VIII's reign

Henry's reign was a time of tyranny and executions, but there were changes which can be seen as the start of modern England:

- The dissolution of the monasteries caused suffering for ordinary people as these had been places for the poor to seek relief. In the short term this caused the rebellion known as the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536). In the long term it led to the **Poor Laws** which, 400 years later, led unintentionally to the welfare state - the modern system that helps citizens financially.
- Henry VIII used Parliament to pass his laws, which helped to establish the authority of Parliament.
- The power of the gentry rose, and the power of the nobles declined.
- Although Henry VIII remained a Catholic, the **break with Rome** eventually turned England into a Protestant country.
- Henry built more warships. Some historians regard this as the start of the **Royal Navy**.
- The **Act in Restraint of Appeals** turned out to be the most important act in the history of England. It said that this realm of England is an Empire ie that England was a sovereign state, subject only to its own government. **It was therefore the legal beginning of the English nation.**
- England remained completely legally independent until 1953, when the government signed up to the European Court of Human Rights.

From your knowledge about Henry VIII, do you think he was a successful king? Why?

Interpretations of Henry VIII's reign

### Traditionalist interpretations

The 'Whig' historians of the 1800s saw the Tudors as the beginning of a 'new monarchy'. According to **A F Pollard** (1902), Henry encouraged the gentry and 'the coming force of nationality'. This being the idea that England was a separate and independent country. In 1953 **Geoffrey Elton** developed this into the idea that there was a 'revolution in Tudor government', by which Henry transformed the government by creating an efficient civil service.

These interpretations portrayed Henry's reign as the beginning of the English Protestant parliamentary nation-state.

### Modern approaches

Modern historians doubt that Henry's reign was the foundation of modern England. Typical is **David Starkey** (1986), who says that Henry's England was 'a personal monarchy', dominated by the unstable personality of the king. Historians nowadays think that politics in Tudor times was dominated by 'factions' – quarrelling groups of nobles, all vying for the king's support.

Modern film-makers have made films like *Anne of the Thousand Days* (1969) and the TV series *The Tudors* (2007) but the nature of Henry's government is the last thing they are interested in. They concentrate on the personality of the king and the relationship between Henry and his different wives.

If these interpretations are true, Henry VIII was much more 'the last medieval king' running the country for himself than he was 'the first modern monarch' managing the country for the people too.

Which interpretation do you agree the most with and why?



### A summary of Elizabeth I

“The main reason for the initial failure at the Battle of the Somme was the fact that the French were not able to take part”. How far do you agree with this statement?

Elizabeth came to power in 1558, inheriting problems with religion, poverty and foreign policy. Historians in the 1970s thought that, when Elizabeth came to the throne, the country was about to collapse. Elizabeth restored the stability and the status of the monarchy:

- She solved the religious tensions by following a 'middle way' which allowed Catholics and Puritans to keep their private beliefs as long as they went to the Church of England in public. However, she hunted, tortured and executed Catholic priests who came into England to undermine her power.
- She survived plots and rebellions, and executed Mary Queen of Scots in 1587 because she saw her as a threat to her throne.
- At the time women were seen as weak and inappropriate leaders of a nation. To combat this perception she tried to use her unmarried status as a way of strengthening her political control in England and abroad.
- Elizabeth encouraged the 'Gloriana' myth, and commissioned portraits which presented her as pure and powerful. Her reign was a time of art, music and literature.
- She defeated the Spanish **Armada** - a vast fleet of warships from the then world super power. By defeating Spain, England was on the way to being a world power by her death and one which had set up its first colony.

### The darker side of Elizabeth I

Elizabeth I is regarded by many as one of England's greatest monarchs, whose reign laid the foundations of England's greatness. But is this true?

- She could be as 'bloody' as Mary and executed many more people for religion than her father, **Henry VIII**. She established a network of spies and informers to ensure her safety.
- Far from encouraging Parliament, she bullied and controlled it, ran the government as she wished and even arrested an MP when he complained.
- The King of Spain raised a huge fleet of ships to invade England. It was known as the Armada. That the Armada was largely destroyed and failed to invade England was a triumph for Elizabeth – but it was also a very lucky escape.

From your knowledge about Elizabeth I, do you think she was a successful queen? Why?

Interpretations of Elizabeth I's reign

### Parliament

Generally Elizabeth's good reputation continued into the 20th century. J E Neale (1934) portrayed her as a skilful politician, brilliantly managing Parliament and the nobles at court.

### What lay beneath Elizabeth I's royal persona?

Recent books have tried to reveal Elizabeth as a person.

The historian **Carole Levine** (1994) has claimed how Elizabeth's rule was dominated by the fact that she was a woman in a man's world. And **David Starkey** (2001) has presented an Elizabeth moulded by her difficult childhood and personal faith.

Elizabeth was a master of public relations. That is shaping her own public image. The Protestants of the time portrayed Elizabeth as a saviour, sent by God. This was reinforced by the propaganda portraits Elizabeth commissioned, which included many symbols of power and purity.

Some later historians questioned this interpretation of Elizabeth – they interpreted her as dithering and stubborn, or as a tyrant and bully.

Some modern historians, however, have begun to suggest that the 'Gloriana' image of Elizabeth was a manufactured myth, which even people at the time had tired of by the end of her reign.

religion was banned from many aspects of society.

From 1918 to 1920, Russia experienced a civil war between the Bolsheviks (also called the Red Army) and the anti-Bolsheviks (the White Army). The Bolsheviks won and the new country was called the USSR (United Soviet Socialist Republic).

Which interpretation do you agree the most with and why?

From the moment that Charles I raised his standard at Nottingham in August 1642, ordinary people throughout the land were forced to choose which side they were on. In the majority of cases this choice was made for them as they simply joined the army and they reached their city or town first. Support remained much the same throughout 1642 and 1643, but during 1644 and 1645 people began to change sides.

**For the King**Cavaliers

The supporters of the King were called Cavaliers because many of them fought on horseback. The term comes from French 'chevalier' meaning 'horse'. Cavaliers had long hair and wore fancy clothes.

The gentry of the Northern and Western areas were Royalists and supported the King. At the start of war Charles had better horsemen. Charles also used soldiers from Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Most of the Royalists were conservative Protestants or Catholic.

**For Parliament**Roundheads

Parliamentarians were nicknamed 'roundheads' because they cut their hair very short. They also wore very plain and simple clothes.

The merchants and traders of the South-East and London supported Parliament. This gave Parliament much more money than the King. Parliament also controlled the Navy. Many of the supporters were puritan.

Explain the key differences between the Cavaliers and the Roundheads

Week 9	Due date:
<p><b><u>English Civil War</u></b></p> <p>Charles left London 1642 to find support against Parliament. England split into two sides. Cavaliers and Roundheads. Cavaliers supported Charles I and Roundheads supported Parliament. The pictures below show some famous Roundheads and Cavaliers.</p> <p><b>1. Battle of Edgehill: 23 October 1642</b></p> <p>This was the first battle of the <u>Civil War</u> and if the royalists had been a little more disciplined it could have been the last. After <u>Charles</u> fled London he made his way north to raise an army. The country quickly began to divide between the conservative north which largely proclaimed for the King and the south which veered towards Parliament.</p> <p>The two sides met at Edgehill, not far from London. The Parliamentarians were commanded by the Earl of Essex who had been ordered to halt Charles' march on London. The Royalists on the other hand, were led by <u>Prince Rupert</u>, nephew to the King and veteran of the 30 Years War.</p> <p><b>2. Battle of Newbury: 20 September 1643</b></p> <p>After Edgehill the Royalists began asserting their control, taking much of Yorkshire and winning a string of victories in the West. By now the Earl of Essex was leading the only Parliamentarian army in the field, but he was in trouble.</p> <p>After marching to relieve a siege at Gloucester he found it difficult to maintain his supply lines. He began making preparations for a retreat back to London. Charles moved to stop him and blocked his path at Newbury.</p> <p>The first day saw heavy fighting between the two sides with no clear winner. That night, as both sides rested, Charles made the decision to withdraw against the advice of his commanders.</p> <p>The next morning Essex, to his surprise and relief, discovered that the Royalists had left the field and his route to London was clear. He arrived back to jubilant crowds. Charles had missed his chance to destroy the Parliamentarians and from then on his cause began to suffer.</p> <p><b>3. Battle of Marston Moor: 2 July 1644</b></p> <p>Marston Moor was the largest battle of the Civil War and marked a major turning point. In 1644 York was being besieged by parliamentarian and Scottish troops. Charles ordered Rupert to relieve the siege and he headed North with the full force of his much-feared cavalry.</p> <p>But there was a new opponent on the scene. Oliver Cromwell, an MP, had risen quickly through the ranks and his Ironside cavalymen were developing a reputation to rival Rupert's.</p> <p>Early on it seemed as if the royalists held the upper hand as Rupert's cavalry charges inflicted heavy losses. However, Cromwell led his cavalry behind royalist lines and attacked from the rear. Although the Royalists put up a brave fight they were unable to defeat the numerically superior force of Scots and Parliamentarians.</p> <p>The victory handed York and the north to the Parliamentarians. It popped the myth of Rupert's invincibility and almost destroyed the Royalist army in the north.</p> <p>What was the key turning point of the Civil War and why?</p>	

Week 10	Due date:
<p><b>Civil War Soldiers</b></p> <p>Muskets were an early type of gun. They were very long and had to be placed on a stand to fire them. More often than not, the muskets for which musketeers are named were slow, inaccurate, and more often used for their sharp blunt ends in melee combat. The technology for firearms, were many times, as dangerous to the person using the weapon as the target they were intended to hit!</p> <p>Where did these problems come from? Musketry was a very volatile art of war. If a soldier did not follow the loading procedures for these weapons carefully quite often the gunpowder might ignite before the musket was even fired injuring the soldier or those around him. Even the best trained musketeers could rarely fire more than once a minute. The accuracy of the musket rarely exceeded 50. Also the most commonly used musket was the matchlock which presented an extra disadvantage during battle as the light would give away the position of the person firing the weapon.</p> <p>The favoured unit in an English Civil War army was the cavalry. The leading reason for the popularity of cavalry during the wars? The lands of England during that time were open and suitable for the movement of large units of soldiers on horseback. The Cavalry could move quickly and change the position of attack more easily than other units. Cavalrymen usually carried pistols and swords. Yet, as in most other areas of the military units during this time, the sword often became the main weapon due to the inefficient nature of the firearms of the time. Cavalrymen tended to be more heavily grouped in battle than they would be in later times. It was difficult, especially for the Royalist Army, to find not only a man trained to handle horses, but also knew how to fight.</p> <p>Cannon's were used to fire a large shot at the enemy. They had a longer range than muskets and could inflict heavy damage on an enemy. Cannon however were large and bulky to begin with, were very slow firing and, understandably, the misfires were many times more dangerous than a misfire of a musket. Cannon fire could rarely be completed more than one time every three minutes.</p> <p>List the advantages and disadvantages of each weapon.</p>	

Week 11	Due date:
<p>Life during the English Civil War</p> <p>Source 3 <i>A description of how Royalist soldiers behaved when they captured Birmingham.</i></p> <p>They ran into every house cursing and damning, threatening and terrifying the poor women most terribly. They fell to plundering all the town, picking purses and pockets searching in holes and corners and every other place they could suspect for money or goods. They beastly assaulted many women and boasted about it afterwards.</p> <p>Source 4 <i>Rules made by the Clubmen of Dorset.</i></p> <p>We belong to an Association to preserve ourselves from plunder and violence.</p> <p>Until we receive answers from the King and Parliament:</p> <p>The Constable of each town shall set a constant watch of two every night.</p> <p>All soldiers who are caught plundering shall be disarmed and returned to their army.</p> <p>Any person assembling soldiers for the King or Parliament will not be give our protection.</p> <p>Source 5 From a modern history text book.</p> <p>In each county between a third and two thirds of the gentry seem to have taken no active part in the war.</p> <p>Most of the ordinary people took no part either. Many of those listed as supporters of one side or the other were forced to assist one group.</p>	
1) Look at source 3. What do you think plundering means?	
2) Look at source 4. The Clubmen were a group of men from villages in Dorset who were armed with clubs. What things do you think their rules were designed to stop?	
3) Which side in the civil war were the Clubmen on?	
4) Using all the sentences write at least a paragraph describing how the majority of people in Britain felt about the civil war.	

Week 12	Due date:
<p><b>The Execution of Charles I</b></p> <p>On 30 January 1649, King Charles I was beheaded outside Banqueting House in Whitehall. The assembled crowd is reported to have groaned as the axe came down. Although the monarchy was later restored in 1660, the execution of Charles I destroyed the idea of an all-powerful and unquestionable monarch.</p> <p>Disagreements between Charles I and Parliament had been simmering for several years. Charles had been exercising too much power, such as raising taxes unreasonably and imprisoning without trial those who did not pay up. Civil war broke out in 1642 and although Charles's Royalist army had the upper hand at first, his advantage did not last for long. By May 1646, Charles surrendered. Parliament claimed the King 'had a wicked design totally to subvert the ancient and fundamental laws and liberties of this nation' and that he had 'levied and maintained a civil war in the land'. It was decided (after the Royalists had been removed from Parliament and the opinion of the House of Lords ignored) that he would be executed.</p>	
<p>Who is more to blame for the breakdown in relations; Charles or Parliament?</p>	

Week 13	Due date:
<p><b>England without a King</b></p> <p>Oliver Cromwell had been an MP before the civil war and during the war he had been the leading general on Parliament's side.</p> <p>No one knew how to run the country now the king was dead, there were arguments between MPs, and between MPs and the army.</p> <p>Both parliament and the MPs knew a strong leader was needed to hold the country together and Oliver</p> <p>Cromwell was made ruler for life, But was given the title Protector instead of King.</p> <p><u>Living in England</u></p> <p>Many of the supporters of Parliament were very strong Protestants (called Puritans). They passed strict laws to make sure people lived very plain lives.</p> <p>The rules said that people could not sing or dance on a Sunday, the only thing people were meant to do was go to church. The puritans also closed down some theatres and public houses and in some places they even banned Christmas! However not all their rules were followed.</p> <p><u>War</u></p> <p>As a result of the civil war, Britain had a well trained and experienced Army. Cromwell used this to attack the Spanish empire. While he failed to capture Spain's American colonies they did manage to capture the island of Jamaica.</p> <p>However, the war meant that people had to keep paying for a large army, so taxes were very high, even higher than when Charles I had been king</p> <p>The Death of Cromwell</p> <p>When Oliver Cromwell died in September 1658, his son Richard took over as protector. However, he did not really want the job, and people did not respect him like they had his father.</p>	
1) Why was a Protector needed?	
2) Why do you think Oliver Cromwell refused to be called king?	



**Why do people interpret Cromwell in very different ways?**

Ever since Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector of England there have been different interpretations of him. In the nineteenth century historians considered Cromwell to be a great reformer and a man of principle. In modern times many historians use examples from his actions in Ireland to say Cromwell was an inhuman monster. Using this worksheet you will investigate the different interpretations of Oliver Cromwell.

Between 1649 and 1658 Cromwell had more power than anyone else in Britain. In 1649 he took the New Model Army to Ireland. During the English Civil War Cromwell had heard terrible stories from Protestants in Ireland. He heard that Catholics committed horrible cruelties such as cutting off people's hands and feet and beating women's brains with poles. There were many such stories.

Whether the stories were true we don't really know - but Cromwell believed them. He was a Puritan, a strong Protestant. Puritans believed it was their duty to punish the Catholics. He went to Ireland determined to do just this!

When Catholic rebels in Drogheda refused to surrender to Cromwell, he ordered his soldiers to kill all the rebel soldiers. Hundreds of them hid in a church, but Cromwell ordered it to be set alight - many were burnt alive, and all the local priests were killed. People began to worry that Britain was sliding into the madness of religious wars.

The son of the dead Charles I soon caused Cromwell trouble, leading a Scottish army against England. Cromwell beat this army but Charles (as Charles I's son was called) escaped and lived abroad for nine years. Cromwell also expected Parliament to improve the country. All MPs (Members of Parliament) who had supported the King were not allowed into Parliament after 1648. There 60 remaining MPs had turned Britain into a republic called the Commonwealth. Yet these MPs were greedy and used taxes to make themselves rich.

In 1653 Cromwell had enough. He took 30 soldiers to the House of Commons and threw the corrupt MPs out. Cromwell ran the country himself for the following five years as Lord Protector. Despite Cromwell trying many different ways of ruling, people became keen to have a King again. They asked into the House of Commons. Cromwell to become the King. Cromwell refused to be king but took extra powers.

Cromwell allowed other Puritans to have a lot of power. All Puritans wanted to end all 'wicked behaviour'. Theatres were closed because Puritans said the devil used them. Dancing around May Poles was banned. Many inns were shut and popular sports of bull and bear baiting were prohibited. Nobody was allowed to work or even play football on Sundays! Even Christmas day was made a day of fasting (no eating allowed). This was strictly enforced with soldiers used to remove meat from ovens in London homes. If caught swearing you would have to pay a fine.

1. Using the first paragraph, explain how historians have changed their opinions of Cromwell. (2 interpretations).
2. Why do you think Cromwell took the New Model Army to Ireland? (2 reasons).
3. What did Cromwell do to the Catholic rebels in Drogheda?
4. In your opinion, should Cromwell have treated the rebels so harshly? (Explain with evidence)
5. Which relation of the King caused trouble for Cromwell? How did he deal with the trouble?
6. Why were some MPs now allowed in Parliament?

Week 15	Due date:
<p><b>The Restoration</b></p> <p>Charles was born on 29 May 1630, the eldest surviving son of Charles I. He was 12 when the Civil War began and two years later was appointed nominal commander-in-chief in western England. With the parliamentary victory he was forced into exile on the continent. He was in the Netherlands when, in 1649, he learnt of his father's execution.</p> <p>In 1650, Charles did a deal with the Scots and was proclaimed king. With a Scottish army he invaded England but was defeated by Cromwell at the Battle of Worcester in 1651. He again escaped into exile and it was not until 1660 that he was invited back to England to reclaim his throne. Although those who had signed Charles I's death warrant were punished, the new king pursued a policy of political tolerance and power-sharing. His desire for religious toleration, due in large part to his own leanings towards Catholicism, were to prove more contentious. He made a number of attempts to formalise toleration of Catholics and Non-conformists but was forced to back down in the face of a strongly hostile parliament.</p> <p>The early years of Charles's reign saw an appalling plague (1665) and the Great Fire in 1666 which led to the substantial rebuilding of the city of London. Between 1665 and 1667 England was at war with the Dutch (the Second Anglo-Dutch War), ending in a Dutch victory. In 1670, Charles signed a secret treaty with Louis XIV of France. He undertook to convert to Catholicism and support the French against the Dutch (Third Anglo-Dutch War 1672-1674), in return for which he would receive subsidies from France, thus enabling him some limited room for manoeuvre with parliament.</p>	
<p>How was Charles I related to Charles II?</p> <p>What was the policy of political tolerance and power sharing?</p> <p>What events took place during Charles II's reign?</p>	

Week 16	Due date:
<p><b>What is the British Empire?</b></p> <p>An 'empire' is a group of countries ruled over by a single monarch or ruling power. An empire doesn't need an 'emperor'. The British Empire consisted of Britain, the 'mother country', and the colonies, countries ruled to some degree by and from Britain.</p> <p>The British began to establish overseas colonies in the 16th century. By 1783, Britain had a large empire with colonies in America and the West Indies. This 'first British Empire' came to an end after the American Revolution.</p> <p>However, in the 19th century, the British built a second worldwide empire, based on British sea-power, made up of India and huge conquests in Africa.</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What is an Empire?</li> <li>2) When did Britain start establishing overseas colonies and where?</li> <li>3) What happened in the 17th century?</li> </ol>	
<p><b>What historians think?</b></p> <p>The 'Whig' historians regarded the Empire as the deserved result of Britain's technological and moral, superiority. They were proud that 'a small kingdom' had amassed such a huge empire. By contrast, some modern historians such as Edward Said (1978) have criticised Britain's 'cultural imperialism. Some historians point to the positive legacy of British rule, with formal systems of government, law and education as well as the development of infrastructure, like railways. However, others argue that this view can overlook the more shameful aspects of Britain's past. These include the extensive use of slavery (in 17th and 18th centuries), the loss of land and culture of the native people (Aborigines in Australia) as well as deaths caused by famine (in India 1943) and violence (in Kenya in the 1950s).</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What do Whig historians think of the Empire?</li> <li>2) What does Edward Said say about the Empire?</li> <li>3) What are the shameful aspects of Britain's past?</li> </ol>	

Week 17	Due date:
<p><b>The First British Empire</b></p> <p>Between 1497 and 1763, English seamen discovered new lands, set up colonies and traded all over the world. In 1497, only five years after Christopher Columbus sailed to the West Indies, the Italian explorer John Cabot, financed by English merchants, discovered new lands in Canada. The first English colonies were formed in north America - in 1585, Sir Walter Raleigh organised a small settlement at Roanoke in Virginia, but it failed and in 1607, Captain John Smith founded a permanent colony at Jamestown in Virginia. The first English colonies were formed in north America - in 1585, Sir Walter Raleigh organised a small settlement at Roanoke in Virginia, but it failed and in 1607, Captain John Smith founded a permanent colony at Jamestown in Virginia. The first successful English colonies in the West Indies were founded in the 1620s. The settlers set up sugar and tobacco plantations and used slave labour. In 1664, the English took over the Dutch colony of New Netherland, which included the state of New Amsterdam. The English renamed this New York. The English also took over New Sweden (which is now called Delaware). Florida became a British colony in 1763.</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) When did seamen discover new lands and set up colonies?</li> <li>2) Where were the first English colonies formed?</li> <li>3) Why was slave labour used?</li> </ol>	



**The American War of Independence 1775-1783**

Because the lands in the Americas were new lands which were settled by British people, the colonies were soon granted some control over their own affairs. Gradually, the British settlers built up a sense of independence and of being American rather than British. They started to resent having to pay tax to the king all the way back in England, across the Atlantic Ocean. They did not feel that they should have to pay taxes which were being spent thousands of miles away. In 1776, thirteen American colonies joined together to form the United States of America and declare themselves independent from Britain. They stopped paying taxes to Britain and no longer recognised Britain as being in charge of them. As a result, Britain sent troops to fight them in a war. France, Spain and the Netherlands took sides with America and eventually Britain gave up at the Battle of Yorktown in 1781. America was no longer ruled by the British King, George III, and instead George Washington was chosen as its first president. The war of independence was significant in the history of the British Empire because it showed that, when a country is given some control over itself, it will eventually want more and more, leading to appeals for complete independence. Britain was to see this happen in many other colonies over the next two centuries.

Questions:

- 1) What started the War of Independence?
  
  
  
  
  
- 2) What did Britain do when the colonies stopped paying taxes?
  
  
  
  
  
- 3) Why was the War of Independence significant?

**Attitudes of Empire**

Britain regarded itself as 'ruler of the waves'. The songs 'Rule Britannia' and 'Land of Hope and Glory' show this. Many British people at the time thought that they were doing the right thing by taking the British government and Christianity to the rest of the world, ending slavery and barbaric traditions and bringing 'civilisation' and an international 'Pax Britannica', or 'British peace'. The British generally felt that the way they lived their lives was the right way. They believed that colonising various countries was a means of helping others to become like Britain and therefore improve. The British Empire had clearly changed in this period. Whilst owning territories around the world still gave Britain space, power and global influence, the Empire was now more than just about discovering new lands and building them up. Most of the world was now known and belonged to someone. Therefore, the British had to colonise established countries with populations and leadership systems of their own. In Africa, it is true that some of these countries were disunited and in some form of chaos, split between various tribes and tribal chiefs rather than united by one common leader. However, the British were now repressing various groups and even entire countries. In Africa, following the 'Scramble', British soldiers controlled many villages that they saw as disruptive and removed many local leaders. The British helped these countries by opening up trade markets with them and developing them more than they had ever been developed before. Nevertheless, these changes were usually for the benefit of Britain, and one of the legacies of the Empire today is the extreme poverty and conflict in many countries previously ruled by Britain.

Questions:

- 1) Why did British people think they were doing the right thing?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 2) Did the British Empire make a positive or negative impact on its colonies and why?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 3) What was the British Empire known for?

**Consumers and slaves**

Slave-owning planters, and merchants who dealt in slaves and slave produce, were among the richest people in 18th-century Britain. Profits from these activities helped to endow All Souls College, Oxford, with a splendid library, to build a score of banks, including Barclays, and to finance the experiments of James Watt, inventor of the first really efficient steam engine.

Liverpool merchant bankers, heavily involved in the slave-based trades, extended vital credit to the early cotton manufacturers of its Lancashire hinterland. West Indian planters built stately homes - some, ridiculously extravagant dwellings such as William Beckford's Fonthill - and furthered the modernisation of British agriculture by 'improving' their estates. Others invested in canals. And, of course, many spent their ill-gotten gains on gambling, prize fights and riotous living. The plantations were themselves by-products of a new economic system. Plantation slavery thrived thanks to a consumer revolution that took place in Britain and the Netherlands in the 17th century. In these countries, consumer markets widened as farmers and manufacturers hired wage workers as the best way to expand output and sales.

The fact that farmers had to pay rent, and that labourers needed a job if they were to feed their families, was the germ of a new economic system - what we now call capitalism.

Many different types of people now needed money in their pocket or purse. They no longer produced the food they ate or the clothes they wore. The better-off bought fine wines or oriental silks. But even the day labourer could buy tobacco and sugar. Merchants met this new demand by setting up slave plantations in Virginia and the Caribbean. While there was a growing taste for exotic stimulants and luxuries, consumers had little idea of the terrible human cost involved in their production.

But those directly engaged in the Atlantic slave trade or plantations certainly knew of the terrible loss of life and the unrelenting toil of slavery. Planters and merchants brought Africans partly because they were better than white people at surviving in the tropics, and partly because they could deprive their African captives of any rights.

White servants were badly treated too, but there were limits when abuse exposed them to legal action and personal censure from their neighbours. Non-slaving colonists sometimes objected to the growing power of slave-owners, but it was fatally easy to let the Africans do all the harshest work. The planters soon discovered that they could play on white fears to construct a thoroughly commercial and racial version of an old institution - slavery.

Questions:

- 1) How did Liverpool merchants benefit?
- 2) How did individuals contribute towards the slave trade?
- 3) What was the Atlantic Slave Trade?



**The Atlantic boom**

British capitalism was a cause rather than a consequence of slave plantation development. But the fit between slave plantation growth and industrial advance in Britain was to be impressive and sustained. The plantation colonies supplied the mother country with a growing stream of popular luxuries - dyestuffs, sugar, tobacco, then later coffee and chocolate as well - and cotton, a crucial industrial input.

The availability of such treats drew consumers into greater participation in market exchanges and greater reliance on wages, salaries and fees. Baiting the hook of wage dependence, new consumer goods helped to motivate what some historians call the 'industrious revolution', the longer hours and tight labour control associated with industrialism.

The slave plantations themselves anticipated the intense organisation of labour, with coerced slave gangs working under the eye and whip of the slave driver. On all slave plantations hours of work were very long, but on the sugar estates the mills were kept going 24-hours-a-day, with enslaved people working at night as well, in 18-hour shifts.

The slave plantation colonies of the Americas not only supplied premium commodities, but were a captive market for metal tools, textiles and provisions. Indeed, the British empire of the early and mid-18th century became a zone of thriving trade in which the ability of New England and Newfoundland to sell provisions to the West Indies, and to participate in the Africa trade, also boosted their ability to buy English manufactures.

The boom in Atlantic produce also underpinned a huge programme of commercial ship-building and maintenance, with about a third of the English mercantile fleet being built in the North American colonies.

Questions:

- 1) What did a boom in Atlantic produce create?
- 2) What did the plantation colonies supply Britain with?
- 3) What were the conditions like on the plantations?

**What has the British empire left behind?**

The British empire has had a huge impact on the world. The majority of former colonies still keep their ties with Britain through the Commonwealth. Today, North America and Australia are very similar to Europe in a lot of ways. Many countries around the world now have multicultural populations. Parliamentary democracy, the English language and the Christian religion can be found in many countries. These are just a few of the ways in which the British empire has had a lasting effect on world history. There is no doubt that Britain was powerful. It used its wealth, its armies and its navy to defeat rival European countries and to conquer local peoples to establish its empire. However, the empire did not just rely on force. In most of the empire Britain relied heavily on local people to make it work. The empire was a very sophisticated network of nations and peoples, linked by trade, by political systems and sometimes held together by force. The British empire brought many changes to many people and many countries. Some of these changes involved innovations in medical care, education and railways. The British empire fought to abolish slavery in the 1800s, but it profited from slavery in the 1700s. For many peoples the British empire meant loss of lands, discrimination and prejudice. There will never be an answer to this question that everyone will agree on.

Questions:

- 1) What impact did the British Empire have on the world?
- 2) How has the Empire impacted colonies today?
- 3) What did the empire rely on to work?

**Peterloo**

Around 50,000 people arrived at St Peter's Fields from all around Manchester. Henry Hunt (a radical speaker) was due to make a speech calling for the reform of Parliament. Manchester at this time had no police force, so the army were sent to prevent any disturbances. When Hunt began to speak the army attempted to arrest him, and attacked anybody who got in their way. Eleven people were killed and 400 were injured. The government congratulated the army and those involved in keeping order in Manchester. Henry Hunt was sentenced to over two years in prison. The government banned meetings of more than 50 people at any one time. Tax on newspapers was increased so that working-class people could not afford to read them and they would be less likely to publish negative things about the government. The massacre paved the way for parliamentary democracy and particularly the Great Reform Act of 1832, which got rid of "rotten" boroughs such as Old Sarum and created new parliamentary seats, particularly in the industrial towns of the north of England. It also led to the establishment two years later of the Manchester Guardian by John Edward Taylor, a 28-year-old English journalist who was present at the massacre and saw how the "establishment" media sought to discredit the protesters.

Questions:

- 1) What was the role of Henry Hunt?
- 2) What was the Great Reform Act of 1832?
- 3) Why was tax increased?

**What did the protesters want?**

They wanted political reform. At that point, only the richest landowners could vote and large swathes of the country were not adequately represented in Westminster. Manchester and Salford, which then had a population of 150,000, had no dedicated MP, yet Oxford and Cambridge Universities had their own representation in parliament dating back to 1603. So did Old Sarum, a field in Salisbury, which had no resident electorate. At the time of Peterloo, the extension of the vote to all men, let alone women, was actively opposed by many who thought it should be restricted to those of influence and means. On 16 August 1819, up to 60,000 working class people from the towns and villages of what is now Greater Manchester marched to St Peter's Field in central Manchester to demand political representation at a time when only wealthy landowners could vote. Their peaceful protest turned bloody when Manchester magistrates ordered a private militia paid for by rich locals to storm the crowd with sabres. An estimated 18 people died and more than 650 were injured in the chaos.

Questions:

- 1) Why did the people want a political reform?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- 2) Why did the peaceful protest turn bloody?

**How close was Britain to a revolution?**

No violent political revolution has occurred in Britain since the civil wars of 1642-51. Yet in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries virtually every other state in Europe has experienced at least one forcible overthrow of government and its replacement by another, from the French Revolution of 1789 to the Russian Revolution of 1917. Why was Britain different?

The fall of the Bastille prison in Paris on 14th July 1789 is a key event in European history. It symbolised the beginning of a revolution in France, leading to the overthrow of the old regime and the execution of King Louis XVI, his wife and many leading members of the French aristocracy. Within a few years, as the new order struggled to assert itself, Napoleon Bonaparte emerged in France as one of the most extraordinary military and political leaders in history. Britain, however, seemed impervious to revolutionary change. Though every other aspect of British life in the 19th century was transformed by industrial, social and cultural development, the country's rulers seemed somehow to avoid the mistakes of their continental counterparts. When Britain was at the peak of its imperial power at the end of the 19th century, historians charted the country's rise to greatness over the preceding hundred years or so. They were inclined to stress British genius for avoiding fundamental conflict between classes and social groups, and the country's ability to manage evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, political change.

On this analysis Britain's transformation was a major force for good. Its commercial and industrial revolutions offered the country's increasing population jobs and greater prosperity. In an age of widespread religious belief, many discerned the hand of God directing the progress of the British nation, first protecting it from invasion and then helping with its commercial and territorial expansion. In 1894, the famous imperial politician, Lord Curzon, could claim that Britain ruled, under God, over 'the greatest empire for good that the world has seen'.

Questions:

- 1) Why was the fall of Bastille Prison so significant?
- 2) Why was Britain's transformation a force for good?
- 3) Why did Britain not experience a revolution?

**The People's Charter**

Chartism was a working-class male suffrage movement for political reform in Britain that existed from 1838 to 1857. It took its name from the People's Charter of 1838 and was a national protest movement, with particular strongholds of support in Northern England, the East Midlands. The People's Charter called for six reforms to make the political system more democratic: A vote for every man twenty-one years of age, of sound mind, and not undergoing punishment for a crime. The secret ballot to protect the elector in the exercise of his vote. No property qualification for Members of Parliament in order to allow the constituencies to return the man of their choice. Payment of Members, enabling tradesmen, working men, or other persons of modest means to leave or interrupt their livelihood to attend to the interests of the nation. Equal constituencies, securing the same amount of representation for the same number of electors, instead of allowing less populous constituencies to have as much or more weight than larger ones. Annual Parliamentary elections, thus presenting the most effectual check to bribery and intimidation, since no purse could buy a constituency under a system of universal manhood suffrage in each twelve-month period.

Questions:

- 1) What was Chartism?
  
- 2) What were the six reforms?

**Success of the reforms**

Although the Chartists gathered enormous support in the form of signatures for their petitions, their demands were rejected by Parliament every time they were presented. By the time Chartism ended in 1858, not a single demand from the People's Charter had become law. Although the Chartists failed to achieve their aims directly, their influence persisted and reformers continued to campaign for the electoral reforms advocated by the People's Charter.

A new Reform Bill was passed in August 1867 that gave the vote to all male heads of households over 21, and all male lodgers paying £10 a year in rent. Further reform arrived with the Ballot Act in 1872, which ensured that votes could be cast in secret – a key demand of the People's Charter. In 1884 the Third Reform Act extended the qualification of the 1867 Act to the countryside so that almost two thirds of men had the vote. Eventually, only one of the Chartists' demands – for annual parliamentary elections – failed to become part of British law. At the time, Chartism may have been judged unsuccessful, but there is no doubt that the movement's campaign for electoral reform played an important role in the development of democracy in the UK.

Questions:

- 1) How successful were the reforms?
- 2) What was the Reform Bill?
- 3) What was the Ballot Act?

**Industrial Revolution**

The Industrial Revolution marked a period of development in the latter half of the 18th century that transformed largely rural, agrarian societies in Europe and America into industrialized, urban ones. Goods that had once been painstakingly crafted by hand started to be produced in mass quantities by machines in factories, thanks to the introduction of new machines and techniques in textiles, iron making and other industries. Fueled by the game-changing use of steam power, the Industrial Revolution began in Britain and spread to the rest of the world, including the United States, by the 1830s and '40s. Modern historians often refer to this period as the First Industrial Revolution, to set it apart from a second period of industrialization that took place from the late 19th to early 20th centuries and saw rapid advances in the steel, electric and automobile industries

Questions:

- 1) What did the industrial revolution signify?
- 2) How were goods produced on a greater scale?
- 3) What do historians say on the topic?



**England: Birthplace of the Industrial Revolution**

Thanks in part to its damp climate, ideal for raising sheep, Britain had a long history of producing textiles like wool, linen and cotton. But prior to the Industrial Revolution, the British textile business was a true “cottage industry,” with the work performed in small workshops or even homes by individual spinners, weavers and dyers. Starting in the mid-18th century, innovations like the flying shuttle, the spinning jenny, the water frame and the power loom made weaving cloth and spinning yarn and thread much easier. Producing cloth became faster and required less time and far less human labor. More efficient, mechanized production meant Britain’s new textile factories could meet the growing demand for cloth both at home and abroad, where the nation’s many overseas colonies provided a captive market for its goods. In addition to textiles, the British iron industry also adopted new innovations. Chief among the new techniques was the smelting of iron ore with coke (a material made by heating coal) instead of the traditional charcoal. This method was both cheaper and produced higher-quality material, enabling Britain’s iron and steel production to expand in response to demand created by the Napoleonic Wars(1803-15) and the later growth of the railroad industry.

Questions:

- 1) Why was Britain the birthplace of the industrial revolution?
- 2) What was the smelting of iron ore with coke?
- 3) How did the Napoleonic Wars help expansion?

The French Revolution was a watershed event in modern European history that began in 1789 and ended in the late 1790s with the ascent of Napoleon Bonaparte. During this period, French citizens razed and redesigned their country's political landscape, uprooting centuries-old institutions such as absolute monarchy and the feudal system. The upheaval was caused by widespread discontent with the French monarchy and the poor economic policies of King Louis XVI, who met his death by guillotine, as did his wife Marie Antoinette. Although it failed to achieve all of its goals and at times degenerated into a chaotic bloodbath, the French Revolution played a critical role in shaping modern nations by showing the world the power inherent in the will of the people. As the 18th century drew to a close, France's costly involvement in the American Revolution, and extravagant spending by King Louis XVI and his predecessor, had left the country on the brink of bankruptcy. Not only were the royal coffers depleted, but two decades of poor harvests, drought, cattle disease and skyrocketing bread prices had kindled unrest among peasants and the urban poor. Many expressed their desperation and resentment toward a regime that imposed heavy taxes – yet failed to provide any relief – by rioting, looting and striking.

In the fall of 1786, Louis XVI's controller general, Charles Alexandre de Calonne, proposed a financial reform package that included a universal land tax from which the privileged classes would no longer be exempt.

Questions:

- 1) What was the French Revolution?
- 2) What impact did France being involved in the American Revolution have?
- 3) Why were the people unhappy?

Week 32	Due date
<p>Read and highlight</p> <p>A summary of the First World War</p> <p><b>Causes</b></p> <p>Historians disagree about what 'caused' the First World War, but most trace it in some degree to the growing power of Germany. The 'balance of power' between the nations of Europe became unstable. This led them to form military alliances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Triple Alliance – Germany, Austria and Italy</li> <li>• The Triple Entente – France, Britain and Russia</li> </ul> <p>After the murder of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914, Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. The countries of Europe found that the alliances they had formed dragged them into war.</p> <p><b>The course of the war</b></p> <p>In August 1914, Germany invaded France through Belgium, using its plan for war – the Schlieffen Plan. The German attack was forced back at the Battle of the Marne in September 1914. Both sides dug defensive trenches and the war ground to a halt.</p> <p>For the next four years, the war on the Western Front consisted of a deadly stalemate. The battles of Verdun and the Somme in 1916 and Passchendaele in 1917 were key events where each side tried to wear the other side down.</p> <p>In 1917, the Americans entered the war. Before they could arrive, the Germans made another attack in March 1918. It was successful at the start, but the Germans failed to break through. They were pushed back in August 1918. Two months later the Germans signed the Armistice.</p>	

Week 33	Due date
<p>Why did War break out?</p> <p>A number of different factors contributed to a situation where the First World War could break out.</p> <p><b>The Threat of Germany</b></p> <p>Germany had been made up of a number of separate states but became a united 'empire' in 1871 by defeating and humiliating France in the Franco-Prussian War. This gave Germany greater strength to develop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After 1900, Germany built up its navy - this frightened the British.</li> <li>• In 1901, Kaiser Wilhelm II demanded an overseas empire for Germany – this frightened Britain and France.</li> <li>• Germany wanted to build a railway through the Balkans to Baghdad – this alarmed the Russians, who said they were the protectors of the Balkans.</li> <li>• Germany's military defence plan – the Schlieffen Plan – involved attacking and defeating France quickly and then turning its armies on Russia.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Balkans</b></p> <p>The Turkish Empire in the Balkans collapsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nationalist interests became clear when the new nation of Serbia clashed with Austria-Hungary.</li> <li>• Austria-Hungary and Russia clashed because they both wanted more power in the Balkans.</li> </ul> <p><b>The System of alliances</b></p> <p>Two opposing groups had grown up by 1914, believing that a 'balance of power' would prevent war:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy (1882).</li> <li>• The Triple Entente of France, Russia and Great Britain (1907).</li> </ul> <p><b>What was the most significant reason for the start of the war?</b></p>	

Week 34	Due date
<p><b>How were soldiers recruited in World War One?</b>  <b>In August 1914, Lord Kitchener, the Secretary of State for War, realised Britain needed a bigger army.</b></p> <p>He made a direct appeal to the men of Britain. Posters were displayed showing him pointing his finger at anyone passing by.</p> <p>Men felt proud to fight for their country.</p> <p>54 million posters were issued.  8 million letters were sent.  12,000 meetings were held.  20,000 speeches were given by military spokesmen.</p> <p>In the first weekend of the war, 100 men an hour (3,000 a day) signed up to join the armed forces.</p> <p>By the end of 1914 <b>1,186,337 men had enlisted</b> .</p> <p>The Government wanted as many men as possible to join the forces willingly.</p> <p>But in 1916 a law was passed to say men had to join whether they wanted to or not. This was called conscription.</p> <p><b>What were Pals Battalions?</b></p> <p>Lord Derby, a politician, encouraged men to join up with their friends as a way to recruit more soldiers.</p> <p>People who already knew each other would be good for the army. They would keep each others' spirits up. These groups became known as 'Pals Battalions'.</p> <p><b>The Accrington Pals</b></p> <p>One famous Pals Battalion was a group of around 700 men from Lancashire.</p> <p>When the Pals left the small town of Accrington over 15,000 people crowded the streets, waving flags and cheering.</p> <p>1 July 1916 was the first day of a battle near the river Somme. In just 20 minutes, <b>235 of the Accrington Pals were killed</b> and <b>over 350 were wounded</b> .</p> <p>Everyone in Accrington was shocked and sad. In some families all the men died on the same day.</p> <p><b>Why do you think men decided to join up with their pals?</b></p>	

Week 35	Due date
<p>What role did the British Empire play in the war? The war involved people from all over the world.</p> <p>Great Britain, Germany, Russia and Austria-Hungary all ruled empires. Their colonies sent supplies, food and soldiers to help in the war effort.</p> <p><b>The British Empire</b></p> <p>Britain's colonies sent over two and a half million men to fight for Britain during the war.</p> <p><b>India</b> sent the most soldiers. At that time, India included both <b>Pakistan</b> and <b>Bangladesh</b> .</p> <p>Colonies as far away as <b>Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa</b> and <b>Rhodesia</b> (which is now <b>Zimbabwe</b> ) also sent thousands of soldiers.</p> <p>That meant that Britain had soldiers from five different continents:</p> <p>Europe, North America, Australasia, Asia and Africa.</p> <p><b>Independence</b></p> <p>The colonies fought hard to help Britain in the war. But they questioned if they deserved a chance to rule themselves with their own governments.</p> <p>Britain saw how much these colonies helped during the war and decided that some could be given more freedom once the war ended.</p> <p>This was a step towards some countries gaining independence.</p> <p><b>The Royal Family</b></p> <p>The British Empire was ruled by the Royal Family.</p> <p>During the war, the Royal Family changed its surname from 'Saxe-Coburg-Gotha' to 'Windsor', which sounded more British.</p> <p>George V was related to the leaders of Russia, Germany and other European royalty. The name change helped to separate him from them.</p> <p>Other British royals played a part in the war:</p> <p><b>Princess Mary</b> worked as a nurse. For Christmas 1914, she helped arrange for a tin containing tobacco or sweets to be sent to every man in the armed forces.</p> <p><b>Edward, Prince of Wales</b> (later King Edward VIII) served in France as a Staff Officer. He was awarded the Military Cross and in 1918 learned to fly. But he was banned from combat in case he was captured by the German Army.</p> <p><b>Prince Albert</b> (later King George VI) served in the Navy and Army. He was not heir to the throne at the time so was allowed to take part in combat.</p> <p>Many people across the Empire looked to the Royal Family, especially King George V, to inspire them and help them to understand why they were fighting.</p>	

### **How many soldiers from the British Empire served?**

From 'The Statistics of the Military Effort of the British Empire during the Great War 1914-1920':

Britain: 5,000,000

India: 1,440,437

Canada: 628,964

Australia: 412,953

South Africa: 136,070

New Zealand: 128,825

Other colonies: 134,837

Even though most of the fighting happened in Europe, it's clear to see the impact of the war on people all over the world.

### **Why was the Empire key for Britain during the war?**

Week 36	Due date
<p>What was life like in a World War One trench? Read through the article and highlight what life was like for the soldiers.  <b>On the Western Front, the war was fought by soldiers in trenches.</b></p> <p>Trenches were long, narrow ditches dug into the ground where soldiers lived.</p> <p>They were very muddy, uncomfortable and the toilets overflowed. These conditions caused some soldiers to develop medical problems such as trench foot.</p> <p>There were many lines of German trenches on one side and many lines of Allied trenches on the other.</p> <p>In the middle was no man's land, which soldiers crossed to attack the other side.</p> <p><b>A typical day in the trenches</b></p> <p><b>5am</b> 'Stand-to' (short for 'Stand-to-Arms', meaning to be on high-alert for enemy attack) half an hour before daylight  <b>5.30am</b> Rum ration  <b>6am</b> Stand-down half an hour after daylight  <b>7am</b> Breakfast (usually bacon and tea)  <b>After 8am</b> Clean selves and weapons, tidy trench  <b>Noon</b> Dinner  <b>After dinner</b> Sleep and downtime  <b>5pm</b> Tea  <b>6pm</b> Stand-to half an hour before dusk  <b>6.30pm</b> Stand-down half an hour after dusk  <b>6.30pm onwards</b> Work all night with some time for rest (patrols, digging trenches, putting up barbed wire, getting stores)</p> <p>Soldiers only got to sleep in the afternoon during daylight and at night for an hour at a time. During rest time they wrote letters and played card games.</p> <p><b>The Christmas Truce</b></p> <p>During the first Christmas of the war, something unique happened in some parts of the Western front.</p> <p>On Christmas Eve, soldiers from both sides put down their weapons and met in no man's land. They sang carols like 'Silent Night' ('Stille Nacht' in German).</p> <p>Men from both sides gave gifts to each other. The Germans gave sausages to the British and the British gave the Germans chocolates.</p> <p>On Christmas Day, a British soldier kicked a football out of his trench and the Germans joined in. It was reported that Germany won the match 3-2.</p> <p>The British High Command did not agree with the truce. They even suggested the Germans were planning an attack. They were ignored and no guns were fired on Christmas Day 1914.</p> <p>The truce lasted until the New Year in some parts of the Western Front. But it wasn't long before soldiers on both sides returned to life in the trenches.</p>	



Week 37	Due date
<p>What did men do on the front line in World War One?</p> <p><b>Many men who went to war were able to use the skills learned from their jobs at home.</b></p> <p>Men who worked with horses were useful recruits as the Army had thousands of horses. Men who knew how to drive could transport supplies in buses and lorries. Or even drive a tank! Coal miners became 'sappers', experts at tunnels and trenches. The rifle was the soldier's main weapon. Men who knew about rifles were highly valued.</p> <p>Most soldiers in the Army were in the infantry. They were foot soldiers, trained to march and carry all their equipment. A soldier had to be dressed at all times with his rifle ready. When an attack was ordered, lines of infantry soldiers climbed out of the trenches and marched towards the enemy. This was called 'going over the top'. The biggest guns weighed several tons and were hard to move. Artillery guns would fire thousands of shells to flatten enemy defences before the infantry ran forward. This was known as a barrage. Some moved up to become corporals, sergeants and officers. The higher the rank, the more responsibility. Rank was distinguished by stripes and badges worn on the cuff their coat. Their jobs were very dangerous because the tunnels could collapse or the mines they were carrying could explode. Because of their work underground miners were sometimes called 'moles'.</p> <p>Despite the many volunteers who joined the armed forces, there was still a shortage by 1916. A law was passed forcing men to join up, called <b>conscription</b>. By 1918 all men under 51 were being called up. Lots of men did not want to go to war, but they had to go. Many had never left their home town or village before. Soon they were in the thick of battles.</p> <p><b>Do you think it was right that men could be conscripted? Explain your view below.</b></p>	

Week 38	Due date
<p><b>Who was Jack Cornwell and what did he do in the war?</b></p> <p><b>Jack Cornwell, known as ‘Jutland Jack’, was a young sailor who died during the Battle of Jutland, the biggest sea battle of World War One.</b></p> <p>For his bravery during the battle, he was awarded a Victoria Cross, Britain’s highest award for acts of outstanding bravery in battle.</p> <p>Jack was one of the youngest people to be awarded a Victoria Cross during the First World War.</p> <p><b>Jack’s childhood</b></p> <p><b>Family</b>  Jack, real name John Travers Cornwell, was born on 8 January 1900 in Leyton in Essex, now known as the London borough of Newham.</p> <p>Jack came from a large family and had five other siblings. He did not come from a rich background.</p> <p>Jack’s father worked as a soldier, a milkman and a tram driver to earn more money.</p> <p><b>Education</b>  When Jack moved to his new home in Little Ilford he attended Walton Road School.</p> <p>In the early 1900s every child between the ages of 5 to 14 was supposed to go to school. Some children aged 12 to 13 left early to go to work.</p> <p>When Jack was 13 he left school to become a delivery boy, where he worked on vans delivering goods for a tea company.</p> <p><b>Boy Scouts</b>  Jack’s love of outdoor adventures began when he became a Scout. He was proud of his badges and was praised for rescuing a girl stuck in a drain.</p> <p><b>Joining the Navy</b></p> <p>Jack didn’t work as a delivery boy for long.</p> <p>In August 1914 the war began and Jack plus thousands of other men left their jobs to volunteer for the Army or the Navy.</p> <p>When Jack first applied to the Navy he was turned away because he was too young.</p> <p>In July 1915 he tried again without his parents’ permission. He gave the names of his boss at work and his old headmaster as references.</p> <p>This time Jack was accepted into the Navy.</p> <p>Jack was sent to Devonport near Plymouth for training as a gun layer or ‘sight setter’.</p> <p>He learned how to aim the guns at a target, plus how to obey orders and work as part of a ship’s crew.</p>	

### **The Battle of Jutland**

After completing his training, Jack joined the crew of HMS Chester on 2 May 1916.

Jack, with around 400 other men, sailed to the North Sea to fight the German ships that approached them.

On 31 May 1916 British sailors spotted German ships off Jutland in Denmark, so the guns opened fire.

The Battle of Jutland had begun.

### **What happened to Jack?**

After firing their guns for hours, Jack's ship came under fire from four German ships.

Big missiles known as 'shells' hit Jack's ship. All of Jack's gun-crew were killed or badly wounded.

Only Jack was left standing. Although he was in pain and with shells still hitting the ship, he stayed by his gun waiting for orders.

When rescuers found him, he was alive but terribly wounded by flying splinters of metal.

Even though it was damaged, the HMS Chester got back home and Jack was taken to hospital in Grimsby.

The doctors sent for his mother. Before she arrived Jack died on 2 June 1916.

### **Why do you think young boys like Jack wanted to fight in the war?**

Week 39	Due date
<p>What did women do on the front line in World War One?</p> <p><b>Women were not allowed to fight as soldiers in World War One. So they found other ways to help on the front line.</b></p> <p>Conditions were dangerous for women travelling to the war zones. They were at risk from enemy fire.</p> <p>After working long hours, they slept on uncomfortable camp beds and had to be up early for duty.</p> <p>Women on the front line were very brave. For many this was the first time they had ever been away from Britain.</p> <p><b>What was the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps?</b></p> <p>By 1917 the Army was running short of men.</p> <p>The War Office realised that some front line jobs which did not involve fighting were being done by men. They decided that women could do these jobs instead.</p> <p><b>Heroic women</b></p> <p>Some women became famous for the way they helped soldiers.</p> <p><b>Marie Curie</b> discovered important chemical elements which meant doctors could use X-ray machines.</p> <p><b>Flora Sandes</b> joined St John's Ambulance service. In the confusion of war she was enrolled in the Serbian army. Flora was the only British woman to officially serve as a soldier in World War One. She became a Sergeant Major.</p> <p><b>Gabrielle Petit</b> from Belgium was one of the first female spies. She gathered information about the Germans for the British Secret Service.</p> <p>Other women became heroes for their work in medical roles.</p> <p><b>Medicine and first aid</b></p> <p>Before war broke out there were only approximately 200 female doctors.</p> <p>A shortage of trained medical staff during World War One gave opportunities for women to take a wide range of crucial roles.</p> <p><b>How did life change for women?</b></p> <p>At first some women saw the front line of war as an adventure. They quickly realised the reality was harder and sadder than the stories they had read.</p> <p>But women learnt new skills and some worked as doctors, mechanics and in other jobs which would have been unthinkable before the war.</p> <p>Like women at home they had tasted independence and didn't want it to end.</p> <p><b>Why was the First World War a key turning point in the role of women?</b></p>	

Week 40	Due date
<p>What was medicine like during World War One?  <b>The war was a time of change for the treatment of injuries and illness.</b></p> <p>Injured and sick soldiers needed to be treated quickly so they could go back to fighting as soon as possible. Casualty stations were set up near battlefields, some by the Red Cross. Female volunteers worked as nurses and drove ambulances. Most worked 14-hour days and sometimes even longer when there were lots of injured soldiers.</p> <p><b>What did soldiers suffer from?</b></p> <p>Soldiers not only took injuries in battle. They also suffered from illnesses and diseases caused by the dreadful conditions in the trenches.</p> <p><b>Triage</b></p> <p>The Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC) was set up to care for British troops. It used a special system called 'triage' where sick soldiers were put into one of three possible groups:</p> <p><b>Slightly injured.</b> Soldiers who did not need much care. They were quickly given treatment wherever they were and then carried on fighting.</p> <p><b>Need hospital.</b> Soldiers who needed to be transported for treatment. They were taken to the nearest hospital base.</p> <p><b>Beyond help.</b> Soldiers who did not have much chance of getting better. They were made comfortable but little treatment was given as others had priority. Newly developed motorised ambulances and trains made it easier to reach and treat injured soldiers.</p> <p><b>Medical advances</b></p> <p><b>X-ray technology</b> helped surgeons to detect where a bullet had penetrated. Many operations were performed during the war thanks to this. Blood was first stored successfully during World War One. Doctors could now give <b>blood transfusions</b> to soldiers. Before, soldiers with burns, tissue damage and contagious diseases would have usually died.</p> <p><b>What was Spanish flu?</b></p> <p>Spanish Influenza (flu) was first reported in March 1918. It was called "the greatest enemy of all" because it infected half the world's population. It became known as Spanish Flu because Spain was one of the first countries to be hit by the disease. Some people thought the outbreak might be caused by poison gas. Today we know it developed in animals and birds then spread to humans. Influenza moved around the world on ships trading goods with other countries. Soldiers lived closely together in camps and trenches which helped the infection to spread. 40-50 million people died from Spanish flu. This was many more people than the war itself.</p> <p><b>Why was war a key factor in improving Medicine?</b></p>	

Week 41	Due date
<p>What were air raids like in World War One? Read and highlight the ways that Britain was impacted by Air Raids.</p> <p><b>Britain was attacked from the sky for the first time, early in 1915.</b></p> <p>No one expected air raids, so when German airships first flew over Britain, the country was unprepared. The bombs were not accurate but they still caused injury and damage. In times to come, whistles would sound the alarm and people learnt to run for cover in the Underground or at home in cellars.</p> <p><b>Zeppelins</b></p> <p>German airships were called Zeppelins. Large bags filled with hydrogen gas enabled them to float. The crew controlled the engines from a compartment underneath. They dropped bombs on factories and military bases. <b>William Leefe Robinson</b> was the first British pilot to shoot down a Zeppelin in September 1916. His bullets set fire to the hydrogen and the airship crashed. William received a Victoria Cross, £3,500 prize money and the rank of Captain. Germany was less interested in using airships once Britain could destroy them.</p> <p><b>Gothas and Giants</b></p> <p>The <b>Gotha</b> bomber could travel a long way and fly higher than British aircrafts. Gotha attacks were devastating. On 13 June 1917 a raid on London killed 162 people, including 18 children when a bomb landed on their school. Later Germany developed an even bigger, more dangerous bomber called The <b>Giant</b> . The success of German air raids was one of the reasons the Royal Air Force was formed in April 1918. Britain needed better aircraft and more trained pilots.</p> <p><b>How did people stay safe?</b></p> <p>The government tried to warn people when an attack was coming and to keep them safe. Streetlights were dimmed so enemy pilots would struggle to see their targets. Whistles blew to raise the alarm. Searchlights helped gunners to spot airships or planes, and shoot them when they were close. Policemen shouted warnings as they cycled round the streets wearing a sign saying "take cover". In London, thousands gathered on Underground platforms, under bridges and railway arches, or even under the stairs at home. In the country, people sheltered in sea caves, forests and fields. When an attack was over, bugles (a type of brass instrument) would be blown to tell everyone it was safe to return to the streets.</p> <p><b>How did life change?</b></p> <p>Until the air raids, the British had worried about their loved ones fighting in the war. Now children, women and older people at home were also in danger.</p> <p>By the end of the war, almost 1,500 British citizens had been killed by the German air raids, and over 3,400 had been injured.</p>	