1867

by the Prussians. In the Upper House or Bundesrat she had 17 out
of 48 seats, in the lower House or Reichstag she had 237 out of 297
seats. Althous Bismarck as before.

In 1870 the Spanish Crown became vacant and the Hohenzollerns
(Prince Crown family) put Prince Leopold up as candidate. The French
objected as they feared Prussian encirclement. Under diplomatic pressure
Leopold dropped the candidacy, but this was not enough for France.
Napoleon wanted a guarantee that he wouldn't stand for the throne
again and a humiliating public apology from Prussia. He put these views
forward in the "Ems Telegram" and sent it to Bismarck. Bismarck was
angered and edited when published the telegram to more public feeling.
He had shown the telegram to the French Ambassador and on 19th July
1870, the Franco-Prussian War erupted. Despite France using her finest
generals - MacMahon and Bazaine - she suffered a terrible defeat at
both Sedan and Metz.

which France now under Bismarck's power, territories in other
parts of Europe and Prussian dominance, the Second German Empire was
proclaimed at Versailles. What had started as an attempt to preserve the
Prussian military supremacy had resulted in a united Germany. Indeed Bismarck
had certainly improved rather than planned the new Germany.

Too brief. You wasted time writing a long unnecessary
introduction, 10-12 lines would have been enough. Ideally
your answer should have been about 3/4 page long
showing whether or not you thought Bismarck had
planned German unification. What was his intention
when he became Prussian Chancellor in 1862?
Did he plan the war against Denmark?
Austria? If he did what was
his objective? If he did not how far did he improve?
What did he help to achieve through the NC?
Excerpts from the Diary of Dr. Moritz Busch

1. What picture emerges from these excerpts of Dr. Busch and his relationship with Bismarck? How does this affect your treatment of them as historical source material?

From these extracts we see that Dr. Busch is a firm and loyal supporter of Bismarck’s. Indeed, we could say that in his role as publicist, Dr. Busch was Bismarck’s ‘right-hand man’ so to speak. Evidence of these claims can be seen in the way Dr. Busch offers advice, congratulations, and service to Bismarck.

I would treat the extracts as quite a valuable source historically speaking, but I would take into account that Dr. Busch was a firm supporter of Bismarck and would distort facts to put Bismarck in a favourable position.

2. What do these extracts tell us about Bismarck’s attitude to his political opponents and to the press?

The extracts tell us that Bismarck was fully aware of his opponents’ views, and that his main aim was to counter those views with his own arguments, put forward by his publicist, Dr. Busch. Like all politicians, Bismarck had the attitude that his opponents posed a serious threat to his ambition and career, therefore he had to strike jokes against them at every opportunity.
How valid is the judgement that Bismarck improvised rather than planned the Unification of Germany?

This is a very valid judgement as Bismarck only set out to increase Prussia's influence, power and frontiers; but in controlling situations which arose from his actions, he managed to forge a united Germany and the Second Reich.

Following the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, the 39 states which comprised modern day Germany had five main obstacles standing in their way towards unification. Austrian influence, particularly in the South, the exhaustion after the Napoleonic struggle, the split between anti- and pro-Austrian leaders, the lack of a popular unification movement and the clash of opinions between Republicans and Royalists.

There was though a "Diet", a kind of parliament, based in Frankfurt, at which all the states were represented. In 1818 the "Diet" in an attempt to curb British sales of goods on the Continent, introduced an economic alliance known as the Zollverein or Customs Union. By 1826 the Zollverein had become dominated by Prussia. All was running well until the late 1840s.

In 1847-'48 famine hit Germany as it did the rest of Europe. With an economic depression as well, hunger became widespread as food supplies dwindled. Riots broke out nationally and in Berlin troops were deployed in an attempt to restore order. Riots led to revolt and Austria intervened. In 1850 Austria crushed aggression and at Olmütz, rescued its influence in German affairs. The German, or more so the Prussian, had let the chance of unification slip by, when the trouble would have served as an excellent focal point for a war.

In 1851 Bismarck appeared on the scene as Prussian representative to the Frankfurt Diet. Later in 1858, William became the Prussian monarch and set about military reform, so that Prussia could never again suffer humiliation at the hands of Austria. In his plans
THE CAREER OF HITLER

The question most often asked about Hitler is whether or not he would have come to power without the occurrence of the economic crisis from 1929 onwards. Hitler himself said that he had been chosen by the people to restore Germany to its proper place in international affairs. On the other hand, while he did gain some support in the early 1920s, once prosperity returned to Germany after 1924, the Nazi Party was almost completely eclipsed. So were these factors in Germany's history after 1918 which helped Hitler, or was it that people turned to extremes to find an answer for the depression?

Hitler was born in Austria on 20th April 1889. Some historians have looked to Hitler's rather unhappy childhood for an explanation for his political attitudes. When he was only 7 years old in 1905 he had to leave school because of a lung complaint. That year he visited Germany where he became interested in art. Two years later he applied to enter an art college in Vienna but his application was turned down. He continued to see himself as an artist and was determined to be accepted as one. Rather than take a menial job he became a painter. He depended on charity for both food and lodgings. At that time Vienna was the focal point of the Austria and was full of immigrants from other areas. Czechs, Poles, Slavs, Italcians, but the most distinctive were the Jews from Eastern Europe.

They looked different and were culturally different. Initially everyone, it was the poor Jews that Hitler disliked not so much the Rothschild type but the Marx type. In the summer of 1913 he left Vienna and went to Munich where he also lived in poverty. At the outbreak of the war in 1914 he volunteered for the Bavarian Army and reached the rank of corporal. In August 1918 he was awarded the Iron Cross for helping to capture 45 enemy soldiers. In October he was badly gassed and was in hospital for several days. During his time in hospital the war ended. When he was discharged from hospital he rejoined his regiment in Munich and when the war was declared he continued so
work for the Army or a civilian employee. He became connected with part of the Army which was looking for a political party that it could use. The German Army never accepted the Treaty of Versailles and from 1919 it began to try to find ways of getting around the Treaty, the method was known as the Dreyfus affair.

They came across a small group called the German Workers Party. Hitler became leader within a short period and the name was changed to the National Socialist Movement. The party wanted to recreate a Greater Germany, that meant taking over Austria and the other German-speaking areas which had been lost at Versailles. Only Germans of true German descent would be citizens of this new Germany that excluded Jews. They also wanted the nationalisation of major industries.

In 1920 there was an attempted coup by the Army. This was successful in Bavaria but in Berlin the Russian generals gave away Hitler went to Berlin to influence then unsuccessfully the National Socialists began to consider a separate movement for Bavaria. The Army joined the party and later tluring. A paramilitary was set up directed mainly against the Communists. In 1921 the Reparation Commission increased the German debt to 6.6 billion. This was possibly the greatest reason that the Allies could have demanded and it immediately caused concern in Germany.

In 1922 the Germans made an agreement with Russia at Rapallo, and this lessened the chances of the Allies reducing the amount owed by the Germans. The German attempt to pay off the debt caused the collapse of the Mark. The Germans fell behind in repayments and in Jan 1923, France and Belgium occupied the Ruhr. There was conflict between German civilians and the occupying armies. The collapse of the Mark affected other currencies and in 1924, the French realised that the Mark could also be in danger and became more conciliatory. The Americans then introduced the Dawes Plan which helped to revive the German economy.

Hitler welcomed this crisis. He stated that German credit would
collapse and that Nazis could participate in a new gov. On 23rd Nov 1923 Hitler tried to take over control of the Bavarian state. He was supported by General Ludendorff a WW1 hero. The Nazis detained the State Gov during a war memorial service. The police arrived and the Nazis did not resist. This was known as the Munich Putsch. In 1924 Hitler, Röhm and Ludendorff were put on trial. Hitler was imprisoned for a few months and after his release Hitler was heard of again for several years.

In 1925 the Locarno Treaties were signed guaranteeing Germany's western frontiers. This has been described as the second peace settlement. However, there was no mention of Germany's eastern frontiers and there were the most reservations. Just before the treaties were signed the Guardian printed an article about the secret agreements between the German Army and Russia. But the story was ignored by the Western powers. In 1926 Germany joined the League of Nations. After the war there was an atmosphere of optimism in Europe. The world economy was improving, the League of Nations appeared to be getting stronger and the Kellogg Pact of 1928 renouncing wars of aggression was signed by dozens of countries. The whole scene was to change within a couple of years.

During these years Hitler worked as a journalist and he was a prophet of doom. He clung to the hope that circumstances would change to favour the Nazis. In May 1924 the Nazis had 32 seats in parliament. But after the Munich elections of 1928, they were reduced to 12 seats. He saw the growing strength of the USA and wondered if they had ideas about an alliance between Britain, Germany and Italy? Was also thought it might be possible for Germany, Britain and the USA to cooperate? New Politics.

The Wall Street Crash in 1929 produced a second economic crisis in Germany in less than 70 years. By 1930 there were 3m unemployed. As the economy declined the prestige of the Nazis rose. In the elections of September 1930 the Nazis gained a quarter of the seats in the Reichstag. This began to look for change through parliament not through revolution. The Communists also
increased more strength, although they did not have as many years as the Nazis.

President Hindenburg gave the govt. emergency powers to try to improve the economy. None of the other political leaders took Hitler all that seriously at that time, but the economic situation worsened and by 1932 there were 6m unemployed. Hitler stood in the presidential election but was easily defeated by Hindenburg, with the Communist candidate coming last. Further elections made the Nazis the single biggest party. They did not have a majority, but they could not be ignored. Hindenburg offered Hitler a place in the government, but he declined. He said he wanted to be made Chancellor or nothing. - Demand Power

There was another general election in Nov 1932 and the Nazi vote went down. Hitler was then more willing to compromise. He was in a position where he could make it difficult for any other party to hold office for long. Early Jan 1933 he joined with the Communists in parliament to defeat the govt. This was at the same time that both groups were fighting in the streets. Hitler was then the only leader who had not been given the chance to form a govt. and at the end of Jan. Hindenburg ordered him to become Chancellor - 30th Jan 1933

He immediately began to use the power of the State to spread Nazi propaganda. The Opposition was intimidated. Further election were due in March but were preceded by the Reichstag fire and that gave Hitler the excuse to bring in further restrictions. In the elections the Nazis got 41% of the vote and had an overall majority in parliament. The constitution was suspended with very little opposition in parliament and the way was open for the Nazis to take over legally. All other political parties were banned. Trade unions dissolved and strikes forbidden. Detention camps were set up for opponents. But Hitler was afraid that the revolution would go too far and that he would lose support from influential people. So on the 30th June 1934 Röhm and many of his followers, as well as other political opponents were murdered. This
**Wehrmacht** Hitler's Army

"PANZERKAMPFWAGEN" (Armoured fighting vehicle)

= PANZER
This is the Mark III tank (mounting a 37mm. gun) mass-produced by Hitler

**Luftwaffe** Hitler's Air Force

JUNKERS JU 87
Forked wing dive-bomber or "Stuka" which could carry a 1,000lb bomb

**Kriegsmarine** Hitler's Navy

A revolutionary kind of fighting ship launched in 1936, the "ADIRAL GRAF SPEE"

Max speed 26 knots; 6 11" guns; Range 12,500 miles
The so-called "pocket-battleship" had armour which could resist 8" shells. She outgunned most ships fast enough to catch her and was speedy enough to escape from conventional battleships
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**German Re-Armament Programme**

500,000 troops in the new Wehrmacht
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- **Berlin**
- **Kiel**
- **Wilhelmshaven**
- **Konigsberg**
- **East Prussia**
- **Polish Corridor**
- **Danzig**
- **Poland**
- **Czechoslovakia**
- **Austria**
- **Vienna**
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**Hitler's Germany** 1933 – August, 1938

1936 → Date of Nazi occupation

- ★ German naval base
- Dachau concentration camp opened 1933

1939 → Territory which came under Hitler's control 1933 to August, 1938

1938 → Territory which came under Hitler's control 1933 to August, 1938

1935 plebiscite to return to Germany
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"THE STAR OF DAVID" Hitler's stormtroopers made all Jews wear this conspicuous badge
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"DE-MILITARISED" PALESTINE
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"THE STAR OF DAVID" Hitler's stormtroopers made all Jews wear this conspicuous badge
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Demilitarised Rhineland 1936
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In 1935 plebiscite to return to Germany
GERMANY'S POST-WAR PROBLEMS

INFLATION
Lasted from 1920 to 1924

UNEMPLOYMENT
Reached its height in 1932 with 6 million unemployed

This area was occupied by allied troops after the war

DEMILITARIZED ZONE
Germany was forbidden to either build fortifications or station troops here

Munich

Berlin

Communist Revolution
1918 – 1919

Weimar

Central Party
91 seats

Social Democrats
187 seats

Democratic Liberals
71 seats

German Peoples and National Parties
63 seats

Other Parties
121 seats

Comunists
100 seats

Nazis
196 seats

RELATIVE SIZES OF GERMAN POLITICAL PARTIES IN 1919 AND 1932

Hitler's dreams of expansion — or "Lebensraum" (Room to live in)
Note: all the quotations come from "Mein Kampf", written by Hitler before he came to power

“France is and will remain the implacable enemy of Germany”

“Germany-Austria must be restored to the great German Motherland”

“Only two states remain to us as possible allies in Europe—England and Italy”

“Germany will either become a world power or will not continue to exist at all..... to become a world power it needs that territorial magnitude which gives it the necessary importance today..... This colossal empire in the East is ripe for dissolution”
20th July 1986

To what extent was Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor in January 1933 an inevitable consequence of the failure of the Weimar Republic?

The appointment of Adolf Hitler, leader of the Nazi Party and perhaps history’s most infamous tyrant, as German Chancellor in January 1933, was indeed an inevitable consequence of the Weimar Republic’s failures. From its inauguration in July 1919 up until the Nazi takeover in 1933, the Weimar Republic was constantly plagued with problems from both internal and external sources; and its inability to satisfactorily cope with these problems and provide Germany with a stable, strong government, led inevitably to Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor.

The Weimar Republic’s problems first began with its actual creation. It was flawed by its own constitution which did not provide a truly democratic system of government. The Weimar Republic established two democratically elected houses—the Reichstag and the Länder, which represented the interests of the provinces.

This appears to be a fair enough system, but it was flawed by its proportional representation voting system and by the institution of the Präsident. Proportional representation may have given a more democratic constitution to the people by allowing all political interests to participate in government, but it led to instability. A multitude of minor extremist parties, such as the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP or Nazi Party), were given access to the parliamentary system. This led to inescapable coalitions having to run the Republic which could not deal with crises and led the German people
to look for unity, which they later found in the Nazi Party.

The President also presented a problem constitutionally. The President was popularly elected for a seven-year period, and under Articles 25 and 48 of the Weimar Constitution, could govern by emergency decree when he felt it fitting to do so. A popularly elected President meant that the national head of state could govern the country without support and confidence of his government, and when the state threatened he could use emergency powers to govern as a virtual dictator. With an all-powerful President leading an unstable coalition government that did not support him, the Weimar Republic was constitutionally doomed.

The Weimar Republic was democratically undermined by its own constitution and relied upon the Army to maintain order. It was common knowledge that the civil service, the judiciary, who were used to the pre-war efficiency of Imperial Germany, had little if any sympathy with the Weimar Republic. Similarly the state police forces did not wholly support the Republic and in later years many became silent supporters of the Nazis.

Republik was associated with defeat. The first great problem to hit Weimar Germany was the question of war debt repayments. In 1919 the Treaty of Versailles - the peace settlement of World War One was signed by all aggressive parties in the conflict. Part VIII of the treaty dealt with reparations and Article 231 the famous 'War Guilt Clause' put the blame for the war firmly on Germany's shoulders. The 'Clause' decided to punish Germany for the war and as it could not decide how large an indemnity to impose, a commission was set up to work out a 'bill' for Berlin. The Weimar Republic in a manner of speaking handed the Allies a 'blank cheque', causing a massive loss of confidence in the Republic by the people.

In May 1921, the Reparations Committee fixed Germany's liability at a colossal 132 billion Marks. The Weimar Republic
struggled to meet the bill, and paid managed to scrape together 1 billion Marks by the end of May under threats to occupy the Ruhr and thanks to British bank loans. Over the next three years Weimar Germany struggled with her payments. In 1924 Düsseldorf, Duisburg and Ruhrort were occupied because of repayment default. In 1923 the Republic announced in January could not meet the Allies fiscal demands, and therefore the French and Belgian Armies occupied the Ruhr.

A humiliated Weimar government opted to pay the reparations bill at any cost, as long as it would rid Germany of the debt. It was one of the Republic’s greatest mistakes. The decision economically crippled Germany. The economy was already severely inflated because of the reparations payments, but the Weimar Republic’s plan to meet the debt sent the country spiralling into an economic hyperinflation. By November a staggering 4100, 358, 326, 350, 700, 000, 000 Banknotes had been printed in the space of a few months. The Mark became worthless and prices were ridiculously high; bread cost anything up to one million Marks. In January 1923 one dollar was worth 20,000, Marks, in June the Mark depreciated to 100,000 per dollar and by August one dollar was worth 5 million Marks.

The policy of the Weimar Republic had sent Germany crashing into economic chaos and ruined its confidence with the German people. A people who had to queue at the baker’s shop with suitcases stuffed full of money to buy a loaf; a people who saw prices in shops jump thousands of Marks each day; a people whose savings became worthless overnight, and a people who suddenly became millionaires to discover that a million Mark note could buy a more loaf of bread; could not have any confidence in a government that had created such a situation for them under any circumstances.

The hyperinflationary situation led a desperate people to seek desperate solutions as they gradually lost
10 years later

Confidence in the Republic, political extremism flourished and this was yet another failure of the Weimar Republic to allow political extremists to get a foothold in German politics. In 1923, 3,000 Nazi stormtroopers attempted to seize power in Bavaria, but the crushing of the insurrection by the Army ended political extremism in Weimar Germany temporarily. Hitler was jailed and in April 1924 the inflation problem was dealt with the introduction of the stop-gap currency the Rentenmark and with the Dawes Plan which solved the repayment problems. The Weimar Republic then entered a period of relative prosperity which lasted until 1929 and the Wall Street Crash.

The new plans for Germany's recovery depended upon largely upon short-term loans from the United States of America. Gustav Stresemann and his 'policy of fulfillment' returned Weimar Germany to prosperity and stability. The Weimar Republic's inflationary failures became outweighed by its prosperity successes and the German electorate soon regained a little confidence in the Republic.

Then in 1929, the "Wall Street Crash" of October crippled the USA’s economy and as a result had negative effects on other world economies. In the Weimar Republic the US loans it was so dependent upon were withdrawn and Weimar Germany was once again plunged into economic chaos. The return to full employment in the 1924-29 period suddenly did not soften the blows of full economic depression. As profits and industrial output sharply fell due to the onset of the "Great Depression" of the 1930s, unemployment rose dramatically.

In 1930 the unemployment rate had risen to 3 million and by 1932 there had been a frightening increase to 6 million. The German people despite the return to relative prosperity, still suffered the ravages of the hyperinflation of 1923 and the sudden economic collapse of 1929 worsened the situation. Again the Weimar Republic had failed to guarantee economic stability.
high amongst the priorities of any Western government and the Weimar government had failed to do so. The failure of the Weimar Republic to deal with hyperinflation in 1923 had indirectly brought about economic collapse in 1929.

The underlying failure of the Weimar Republic to counter extremism again became apparent, but this time extremism actually toppled the established government.

The Weimar Republic was constantly threatened by extremists of various political shades. In 1919 the German ‘Spartacists’ attempted to take over Berlin and in March 1920 monarchists attempted to seize power in the ‘Kapp Putsch’. On both occasions the Republic used the Army to crush the revolts, but the political extemists were not dealt with.

The greatest failure of the Weimar Republic was to keep the NSDAP in check. In the early 1920s the NSDAP or Nazi Party emerged as a minor force in German politics. It was an Austrian ex-Army corporal named Hitler who the Nazis soon gathered support. The Nazis were an extremist group and had their own paramilitary forces known as the ‘Brownshirts’ (because of their uniforms) or the abbreviation SA (Sturmabteilung = Stormtroops). Their views were on the ‘Right’ of German politics, but had some common interests with the Nazis. The Nazis were also fervently nationalistic and anti-Semitic.

How much support was there before 1930?

During the early years of the 1920s the Nazis preached their sermons in the beer halls of Bavaria to ex-servicemen and disenchanted artisans. They demanded the downfall of the Weimar Republic; and the aim of restoring Germany’s prosperity and position as a world power and rectifying the ‘Jewish and Communist backed conspiracy’, which had allegedly brought about Germany’s defeat in the war. Meetings tended to be rowdy and the SA both literally and politically evolved into ugly street-fighting between ‘Brownshirts’ and the Nazi political
opponents. The Nazis also held mass rallies of their supporters and attacked Jewish shops, businesses and people.

The Weimar Republic regarded the Nazis as a threat to the safety of an already unstable nation, and although the police acted against them there was no overall operation by the Republic to destroy the National Socialists. The majority of Germans regarded the Nazis as a minor party and did not generally speak out against their views.

But the inflation crisis of 1923 changed the situation drastically. In times of economic crisis people become desperate and extremists who can offer promises and scapegoats to them, rise from the ranks of radical street thugs to desirable leaders. The Nazis offered pledges of a prosperous, mighty Germany, and blamed economic troubles on Jews, Communists and a whole host of other characters that the NSDAP did not like. The Nazis increased their campaign of violence and intimidation and found widespread support especially amongst the middle-classes or "Mittelstand", ruined by hyperinflation. The Weimar Republic was slow in acting against the Nazis.

On the 9th November 1923 Adolf Hitler, national hero General Erich von Ludendorff and 3,000 Nazi stormtroopers launched an uprising in Bavaria. Members of the state government were celebrating with their friends and families when Hitler, von Ludendorff and a unit of Brownshirts, seized the beer-hall they were celebrating in. Other Nazi groups rose in support, but troops and police were brought in to deal with the trouble. 16 Nazis were killed and Hitler and von Ludendorff arrested. Hitler was due to serve a five year jail sentence, but instead served a pitiful nine-months.

At last the Weimar Republic had acted against political extremism, but their actions had in the long run little effect. The return of prospering during the Siemens era, no than the actions of the Weimar Republic forced the Nazis
to take a backseat in German politics from 1923 up until the Wall Street Crash of 1929.

With the onset of the Great Depression, the financially ruined "Mittelstand", the swollen ranks of the unemployed, the alienated youth and disenchanted Conservatives in Germany were once again looking to political extremism for hope. As the Republic fell into economic chaos Hitler and the Nazis emerged as the popular party. The Nazis, just as they had done in 1923, promised the restoration of prosperity and power to Germany, and to a nation ruined by successive economic collapses the Nazis became desirable leaders. The return to prosperity and power was also the byword of other German political parties of the time, but the Nazis were different. The massed ranks, the ranks of well disciplined SA shocktroops, the unified party and the monoclitic "Führer" or leader, gave the impression that the Nazis had an definite aim, but unlike the other parties were able to achieve it.

In the 1928 elections the Nazis did poorly, gaining a mere 12 out of 449 seats in the Reichstag. Two years later following economic collapse, the 1930 elections saw 6.5 million voters return 107 Nazi seats. As the crisis worsened membership of the Nazi Party grew - 5 million by the end of 1931. As unemployment reached 6 million in 1932, elections were made the Nazis the largest party in the Reichstag polling 144 million votes and 230 seats.

In the Summer of 1932 Hitler was offered the post of vice-chancellor, but he refused demanding to be made fully fledged Chancellor. In December General von Schleicher formed a cabinet and persuaded President Hindenburg to make Hitler the Chancellor of the Weimar Republic. On the 30th January 1933 Adolf Hitler became German Chancellor and the greatest reign of terror in history began, ending in a world war and Hitler's suicide in an underground bunker in a war devastated Berlin.
Once again the Weimar Republic had failed to provide Germany with a strong and stable government. The Republic had failed to keep extremists out of power and thus plunged Germany into a totalitarian dictatorship which became synonymous with evil, fear and death.

The failures of the Weimar Republic to tackle the question of war reparations, to cope with the problems of hyper-inflation to deal with the economic crisis of 1929, and its failure to smash the violent political extremism undoubtedly led to the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor in 1933. The Weimar Republic had failed to provide stability and thus, when the people looked elsewhere for a stable leader, Adolf Hitler monopolised the situation and indirectly placed himself in Germany’s highest political post after President.

Sources used:-

Adolf Hitler the Making of a Dictator
- Lt Col. Eddy Bauer

Did you consult another source, apart from Brann, or Wood?

Edging e.g. 1923.

The question asks about two separate issues; the career of Hitler and the progress of the Weimar Republic. Was it inevitable that one should succeed while the other failed?
France 1848 - 1871

1. Result of the revolution in February 1848 and subsequent events in France. Condition of France at the end of 1848.

2. The personality of Louis Napoleon - the Napoleon Legend - Louis Napoleon's early life - growth of Bonapartism in France in 1830's and 1840's.

3. Part played by Bonapartists in the revolution of 1848. Napoleon's attitude to republicanism and socialism.

4. (a) Internal policies 1849 - 51
   (b) Foreign policy 1849-51

5. The founding of the Second Empire 1852 - coup or a popular move?

6. The Conservative Empire 1852 - 1860 (a) Domestic affairs - how Napoleon dealt with the problems facing France in this period (b) French Foreign Policy in those years.

7. Reasons for the change to liberalism.

8. The Liberal Empire 1860 - 1870
   (a) what the change entailed - changes later in the 1860's - the growing opposition to the regime and the reforms of 1868 to 1870 - reasons for changes
   (b) Foreign Policy - Napoleon and Italy
       Napoleon and Russia
       Napoleon and Mexico
       Napoleon and Britain
       NAPOLEON AND BISMARCK

9. Evaluate Louis Napoleon's career as President and Emperor
   Was France a better place in 1871 than in 1851? Did Louis Napoleon make any difference to the rate of change in France during his terms of office?

TEXTS

Europe since Napoleon see index Napoleon III and pp 395 - 7
Europe 1815 - 1945 see index Napoleon III and pp 239 - 242
History of France.
1. Attitude of Alexander I to Napoleon and his philosophies, and the philosophies of the French revolutionaries.


3. The 'Holy Alliance'. The Russian part in this.

4. Russian attitudes to the Congress system 1815-22 and participation in international affairs during that period.


7. Nicholas I. How he differed from his predecessor. Attitude to domestic policies during his reign.

8. Russian Foreign Policy under Nicholas I. How did Nicholas' F.P. differ from Alexander I? What were Russia's relations with other European powers during those 30 years? Why did Nicholas' policies start to go wrong during the 1850's?

9. What was the significance of the Crimean War for Russia in the long term?

TEXTS:

Europe since Napoleon pp. 73 96-7 135-7 157-9
Europe 1815 – 1945 pp. 29 45 69-70
Europe 19th & 20th c. – Lipson. pp. 81-85
TO ALEXANDER II

I hand over to you my command, but unfortunately not in such order as I should wish.

BISMARCK - God doesn't look to P. for its liberalism, but to its power.
- P. must gather + consolidate her strength in readiness for the favourable moment.
- The great decision of time ... made ... by iron & blood.

(Speech to the Landtag 1862)

NAPOLEON III - When one is at the head of the state, there are two things one must do: satisfy the interests of the most numerous classes & attach oneself to the upper classes.
- The only sovereign whom I recognize in France - the people.

MUSSOLINI - Fascism attacks the whole complex of democratic ideologies.
- The struggle against liberal, democratic, Socialist, Masonic, democratic doctrines.
- The keystone of Fascist doctrine is the concept of the State ... before which individuals + groups are relative.
- The tendency to Empire ... is the manifestation of vitality.

(La Dottrina del Fascismo, 1932)
The Fascists in Europe

1. Inter-war yrs.
2. Diff. varieties of F.
4. Mood towards Socialism - nat. socialism 1860's term
5. WWI - emphasized nationalism
6. Fascists tried to bring classes together of Marx and class conflict
7. Poland, Hungary, Romania under fascism
8. Violence + aggression accepted as methods to change. Charismatic +
   dynamic - Fascist use of violence - Think WWI
9. * NATIONALISM - the most important growth factor. Mussolini "Battle of
   the Grain" self-sufficiency - FASCISTS - NATIONALISTS linked with Con.
   COMM. - INTERNATIONALISTS political in Europe
10. Fascism opposed - class struggle (weaken state), internationalism + Bolshevism, the
    liberal regimes, minority states
11. Socialists - "aliens" (Jews esp. in Chem mainly) in states identified as enemies,
    Portugal Fascism used Socialism in their Empire
12. Why Natio/Fascism in power?
   1. Economic distress + political chaos
   2. Appeal to pub - law & order support, productive supp, on the side
      of the small man, disciplined + unified "Ein Reich, Ein Volks, Ein Führer" 1934 Nazi
      Congress, Monolithic party.
Comment on the statement that Mr. was a politician without a programme.

FASCIST PHILOSOPHY - B. Mussolini, ‘Dittatura del Fascismo’ 1932.

"Fascism attacks the whole complex of democratic ideologies."

"The keynote of Fascist doctrine is the concept of the State... before which individuals and groups are relative."

"The tendency to Empire... is the manifestation of virility."

"The struggle against liberal, democratic, socialist, Marxist, democratic doctrine."

Comment - Mussolini’s ‘Ditattura del Fascismo’ 1932.
HITLER - Never in my life have I been so well disposed and inwardly contented as in these days (talking of the Great Depression).

STALIN - We are fifty to a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must cover this stretch in ten years.

- Socialism in one country.

LENIN - Soviets plus electrification equals Communism.
Chartism - a success or failure?

By the demise of Chartism in 1848, not one of the Six Points had been achieved and in this respect it could be argued that it was a failure, but equally by 1848 almost all of the Six Points had been introduced, and in this respect, Chartism could be argued to have been successful.

Perhaps Chartism did not achieve its aims, but it was successful in other areas of society in England of the 1840s. The working class discontent forced the upper classes into at least pondering the 'Condition of England' question. Social surveys were initiated as a result, and Disraeli himself highlighted the links between Chartism and social ill in 'Sybil or the Two Nations'. Not only this, but Chartism gave the labouring classes a sense of hope, hope that a reformed parliament could bring about social change and a settlement of conditions. They also gave the workers a sense of pride in a common identity. Chartism became the movement for 'justice for us, working class, the discontented hands' to quote O'Connor. In this respect it was a successful movement.

But in another sense it was a failure, not achieving any of its goals. One failure was in its organisation. O'Connor held no power at the top of the Chartist movement, fending off rivals to safeguard his own position. But we must be careful not to be influenced by historians of the time, this coloured their view to show Chartism in a bad light, emotion replaced reason. O'Connor was described by one as an 'unreliable leader, who had probably never done an honest day's work in his life'.

The other failure was not as much a result of the Chartist ambitions but of the stiff opposition to them. The revolts in France of 1830 and 1848 succeeded through governments giving way to the insurgents' demands. Indeed, the passage of the Reform Act and repeal of the Corn Laws were results of governments wishing to remain supreme over extra-parliamentary activity, by conceding some
ground to reformers. But with Chartism, there was a unanimous
declam on the part of the government and propertyed classes
to resist any Chartist demands and preserve the existing constitution at all
costs. Not only did they have the will to do this but the
power as well. The Army was small but professional and under
command of General Napier, Chartist insurrection in the North was
declared. He disposed his 6000 troops strategically and treated Chartist
leaders to military displays to show them that they could find
in times of crisis. Behind the military stood an army of middle
property owners, willing to fight when called upon. The Home
Secretary was inundated with requests for arms by middle class
militias and 170,000 special constables were enlisted for the Kemmering
Cannon demonstration in 1848.

When Chartism came to its 'popular end' in 1848, it could
be argued that it had failed as it saw itself a giant task
and was unequal to match it. But this would be looking at
the invincible, David taunting Goliath, a dangerous thing for the
historian to do. A more realistic approach would be to say that
Chartism was bullied off by an improvement in wages, social condi
and the unemployment situation. Agitation could only succeed in a
time of distress and when prospering remained popular support wasn't.
As Cobden said had said, it was very difficult to agitate a fellow
on a full stomach.

Nov 1874 - Month - Nov Red Guard under Treaty - new pact Committee every two
NED 1924 -Allowed Russia
Stalin - accession to power manoeuvred himself - 'elected'
- Purges - remaining opponents -> 5,000 being sentenced said
Politics against state - Army

Foreign Policy - 'Red in one country' - antagonist Kaiser - Aug 1834 - NPS Aggression
Gained territory due to Britain-Lithuania - did not happen to you of Poland - in face
of it.
Victorian Social Novels

The social novel is a bad description because all novels are social novels, but the term can be used loosely to describe novels dealing with the C of E Question.

The problem with regard to Dickens' novels is that they did not simply deal with social problems. They were rich and more complex than other novels wrote which dealt with similar problems. Other novels belong to a specific period and deal with a specific subject, that is the Age of Romanticism. A period of deep economic and political crises. Mrs Gaskell wrote about factory workers. Others mainly about the poor of the rural areas.

Novelists did not write primarily for the new proletariat but for the conscience and education of the TMC, that is likely some nothingness. Earlier social novels had often been theoretical, but the social problems of the 1840s produced a much more concrete approach.

There was also the result of the Reform Act of 1832 and the development of Chartism. In the 1840s, militarism was one of the major targets. They were no longer sympathetic to militarism and looked for a more humane approach.

Disraeli

His novels tended to be different and he was concerned with showing the emergence of Tory democracy, the Young England Movement and the hopes of post-Reform Britain. He portrayed an alliance between the populace and the aristocracy against the Leviathan industrial class. These question were to be explored were the political, religious and social fabric of England. In "Sybil" Disraeli turned his attention to social question, involved were the aristocracy, the industrialists, the rural poor and the TMC. Disraeli developed his theme of "Two Nations - the Rich and the Poor" in a famous scene in the grounds of Merton Abbey between Lord Melbourne and Mrs. Headley.
There are Two Nations between which there is no intercourse or sympathy.
3rd October 1986

Discuss the view that the role of the political unions in the crisis over the Reform Bill has been exaggerated.

In June 1832, the Great Reform Act was passed giving Britain its first taste of political democracy, albeit a very limited democracy. Prior to 1832 Britain's political system had been far from democratic. Only a handful of people had the vote, mainly from aristocratic and wealthy landowning backgrounds. Members of Parliament were generally corrupt, buying their way to power, and only representative of their patrons rather than their constituents.

There was a growing demand for reform of the political system and this demand often manifested into violence. Mass demonstrations, risings and protests culminated in the massacre of reformers by troops in Manchester in August 1819, at the infamous 'Peterloo' incident.

The following repression of the Reform Movement also fell on Lord Liverpool's anti-reform Tory government, forcing the issue to the fringes of British politics. The hopes of parliamentary reformers began to fade. Then in July 1830, a revolution in France overthrown the Bourbon monarch Charles X and a constitution was granted to the insurgents. The news of the French revolt raised alarm in Parliament and spirits in reformers.

With the example of the French revolution - fought on the issue of parliamentary reform - Britain's Reform Movement was revitalised. The Whigs became definitely pro-reform and attacked the administration with this issue. In November, the Duke of Wellington's Tory Government was defeated on a minor issue and
Why did the Duke become unpopular?

following his resignation, the Whig leader Earl Grey took office

controlling a Whig dominated coalition government. Their aim was to

introduce parliamentary reform. Why?

In 1829, a leading reformer, Thomas Attwood, had

set up the Birmingham Political Union. It was the first

political union to be founded promoting parliamentary reform;

demanding the general extension of the franchise, and the

abolition of property qualifications, for both members and voters.

With the foundation of Attwood's BPU, economic unrest and

growing political excitement (the fall of the Tory government, the

Pancras Riots and a general election), other political unions

began sprouting all over the country. In March 1830, Henry

Hunt, Daniel O'Connell, Richard Carlile and Henry Hetherington

set up the Metropolitan Political Reform Union for Radical Reform

and the National Union of the Working Classes (NUWC) under Lovett

and the National Political Union (NPU) under Doherty, became

active. Many new radical journals kept the preceding pressures, such

as Hetherington's "Poor Man's Guardian" and Cobbe's "The People's

Triumph." The various political unions organised campaigns for reform

and London saw many large demonstrations. In December 1830,

10,000 radical workmen marched in St James Palace.

The demand for reform by the end of 1830 was strong

and the Whig Government pledged to meet it. This decision
to push through reforms caused a political crisis in the period

1831-32.

In March 1831, the Whig Government produced

the "First Reform Bill." The Bill proposed to extend the franchise

to all householders rated at £10 per annum in the boroughs and
to certain householders in the counties. This, it was estimated,

would have increased the electorate to around one million (still

not too democratic in a country of 18 million). It also proposed

the abolition of 168 over-represented constituency seats and the creation of

107 new ones for major cities and counties - for instance, Manchester.
would have gained two seats and Nottingham six. The Bill sparked off a crisis. The Radicals and Reformers demanded further and more extensive reform, whilst the Whigs came up against the Tories in Parliament, who were firmly entrenched in their anti-reform stance.

How urgent is the issue? In the reading of the Bill one of the strongest speakers in favour of it, Lord Macaulay said, "unless the plan proposed be adopted, great and terrible calamities will befall us," pointing out the dangers of revolution in light of the July 19 events in Paris. The Bill was passed in its first and second reading, but defeated in the third. The Whigs were now faced with two options: resign, giving leadership of the coalition government to the Tories, or call a general election. In April they persuaded William IV to dissolve Parliament.

Were the P.V. mid-term? The election was short, feverish and fought on the issue of reform. "The Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill" became the slogan for Reformers during the election. A majority Whig Government was returned with the Tories under Wellington's leadership in opposition.

In June the Whigs introduced the Second Reform Bill which the Commons finally passed. It was deemed certain that parliamentary reform would be introduced and the political unions saw their demands being met. In September Lord John Russell introduced the Bill to the House of Lords, who promptly rejected it in an all-night sitting on the 8th October. The Reformers were enraged and throughout the country there was widespread civil unrest.

In Derby riots smothered upon the gale releasing prisoners. Rioters in Nottingham put the Duke of Newcastle's Castle to the torch. Bristol saw the "liberation of inmates from the gaol and the burning of the town hall and Bishop's Palace. 100,000 demonstrators took to the streets of Birmingham and 74,000 marched in London. It was also rumored that wives and daughters of peers..."
Was this important?

Supporting the Bill would be kidnapped and held hostage by Radicals from the NFW in Scotland. Such was the outrage over the refusal of the Lords to pass the Bill, as they being aristocratic felt threatened by opening up the franchise to the country - that when it was suspected that the Commons might compromise with them; Radical politicians supported by the political unions marched to Lord Grey's home one night, forced him and demanded that he state his position. Why?

The outrage that had gripped the nation in October was demonstrated to the Whig Government that Parliamentary reform had to be carried out. The Whigs had been elected on a plan to reform time and pledge to reform parliament and if they were not to face civil war, they had to introduce reform. The Whigs heeded the warnings of men like Macaulay, who warned that the consequences of blocking reform could be catastrophic. Consequently, a third Reform Bill was introduced in December 1831.

The Commons again passed the Bill with a two-to-one majority. On presentation to the Lords, the Bill was not passed until April and then only by a majority of nine. With the approval of the Bill Clauses were discussed but again the Lords blocked the Bill and amendment. The Whigs were defeated 116 to 101. In May Lord Grey requested that the King create more Whig peers to get the Bill pushed through. The King though refused Grey's demand and once again there was turmoil.

Lord Grey and the Whigs resigned, and the Duke of Wellington in April attempted to form a government. Throughout the country factories shut down, and workers and employers stood idle. The House of Commons was heavily petitioned by the civic political unions and the NFW. The political unions - made up of primarily middle-class people - flexed their financial muscles. "No taxes paid here until the Reform Bill is passed" was the placard's message in Birmingham's ships. In London, Place encouraged his
Suppliers 'to repel the Duke, go for gold', that is to withdraw their savings from the banks to spring masses of the economy. £20,000 was taken out of the Birmingham Savings Bank and a larger sum removed from the Bank of England, to indicate how the political union could act when required to do so. The political unions in the provinces openly planned a violent revolution, informed the King that he would have to abdicate, and stirred up ill-feeling against the Royal Family and the anti-reform lobby. How influential was that?

The Duke of Wellington's ministry began to collapse.

The middle classes' financial intimidation--threats to withhold taxes, cease supplying and business, and to create a run on the banks--plus the organizing of working-class uprisings, forced many Tories to desert Wellington. Other Tories knowing the Duke would was forced into a reform plan, left government on ideological grounds, as they opposed reform and their previous fight against it would have been in vain.

The King brought Grey back to office with the promise of enough created peers to safeguard the Bill's passage. In June, the threat of William IV to draft new peers into the Lords forced the House into passing the Bill which became law on the 16th June 1832. The Great Reform Act--as it became known--did not enfranchise the working man or for and women did not get the vote until 1928 regardless of their background. Parliament remained a branch of the aristocracy and landed gentry, generally speaking, leaving the middle classes disappointed. Despite this, people such as William Cobden and Thomas Attwood, took parliamentary seats alongside their aristocratic counterparts. Democracy, had, as such, been introduced to Britain.

The part the political unions had played in getting the Reform Bill passed, had been a vital one. They had, as local organizations, agitated for reform at both local and national level. The political unions had produced the demand for reform that the Whig Government had met, and when the aristocracy--both as the House of Lords and as the King--attempted to
blocks the Bill, it was the political unions who showed the heart how much support the Bill had by organizing the courage and protest. Indeed, if it was not for the work of the political unions, it would have been likely that the Reform Act would not have been passed in its final form. Therefore, I would say that the work of the political unions has not been exaggerated, if anything, their work appears to me at least to have been underexposed.

Bibliography

I am not convinced by your argument. The BPU had been formed in 1829 and if it was so successful what did it achieve between then and 1831? You have given 12½ lines to the protests made by the PPU, 7½ lines to the violent protests and 9 lines to Macaulay and the French Resolution. Does that mean the last two together are equal in importance to the work of the PPU's?

Why did the Whigs want reform?

How important was the threat to create a number of new Peers?

Did Catholic Emancipation contribute to reform?
Working class opinion in the predominantly rural South. Here the worker laboured individually on the land and to lose his job could threaten his very survival, which discouraged the Southern Chartist from militancy and agitation. Chartism only became really important in the North by and after 1840, because of working conditions. The worker toiled collectively with others either in mill or mine and could present a united front if attacked, plus the advantage of finding work easily in industrial areas if sacked. Consequently, Chartism found its importance in the industrial North rather than the agricultural South.

### Petitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st July 1839</td>
<td>1.28m</td>
<td>235 to 46</td>
<td>3 miles long, stuff by Dorrack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd May 1842</td>
<td>3.3m</td>
<td>287 to 49</td>
<td>6 miles long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd April 1843</td>
<td>5.5m (2m gay)</td>
<td>222 to 17</td>
<td>ridiculed by Parl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"CONDITION of ENGLAND" Question

There are Two Nations between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy. "Bybid", Dorisaki

"The condition of... of the &co's is... rather ominous... are Private."
Carlyle

1780 - 1850 "lito" - skilled workers improved, domestic declined and labour more stationary or declined

DIET - Limited - related to earnings
- Skilled labourer (often in employment) meat, dairy & bacon & cheese in pm
- Loin & eggs could only eat 2 or 3 times a day or Sunday
- Poorly paid bread, cheese, spuds & porridge

RURAL - bread, spuds, broth & tea, and bacon, in poor times milk & cheese
cooking simple with an open-beam fire, (bake, pie & Sale/Mitte for dinner)

Food adulterated (Sulphuric Acid in Beer, colouring in Bread) + CPR 1847 forced many into debt (Track System, Ticket Shops)

WCo did not feel in control of their lives - amount of marriage, Engelio
(talk of slavery (not for wrong)

DRINK 1830 - Beerhouse Act fixed licensing laws
- Pub prospect: 26.7m spent on alcohol in 1830, up to 28.1m by 1850

MICR: 1000 pub & gin shops - Irish cellars dwellers produced 160,000 gallons p.a

Two Friendly Soc met in pubs & WCo paid there - led to drink
& landlord provided fortunes
"HUNGRY FORTIES" - the phrase of Fib Libs in early 1900s
1832-36 - boom year, plentiful crop + harvest
1832 Wheat 600+ → 1835 350+

* 1837 Depreciation (50,000 unrest in MCR alone) - 1842 worse year of 19th century grad. pick up from 1843 (1847 bad harvest + textiles recession) Relief big impact on corn, prices of wheat hit 100s.

1. DISSATISFACTION
   Industrialists → ACLL, anti-aristocrats limit rent control policy
   MDCo → CHARTISM, partial reform (got anti-MC)
   Farmers → pro-Consolid, fell under attack → siege ment. 1842-46.

2. RAILWAYS - reduce reg ups, some aid to electronics, federalism
   many UC hampered in Mod ages for "better times" in social relations etc.

3. DIVISION - Two Nows - in craft nat scheme. skilled/unskilled, HC, agri/indust
   textiles, handicraft/industrial etc.

4. EMPLOYMENT variable: little security for many NC
   some support from coop, TU groups, etc. MICA Oddfellows

DOMESTIC - changed from RB 1780s → 1850s
Social distinctions, a working day of 12 hrs.
Farms gone bust + ships together, women neglected. dom chst + kids co op.
Truth in ind, Factory rate diminished (esp in WRP) not same control on
kids as in Dom system.

In DS spinners could employ type + kids as helpers, but in mills
they had to look outside: fam no power-looms expanded more, more
women + kids drawn into lab. market.

Aus 1835, 1844, 1847 - life kids hogs + separate families.
Chartism - Finlayson

1. Why was Finlayson careful to say that Chartism began 'formally' in 1838?

He was careful to say this as the Chartist movement, in essence, existed before 1838 in loose groupings with various different aims. It was not until these groups came together in 1838 under one organizational form that Chartism formally began.

2. Francisco O’Connor, Henry Meadow, William Lovett, Brontë O'Brien and William Bebras

The Ten Hours Movement, the anti-Poor Law Movement, the political reform movement and indirectly the trade union movement.

3a. The Anti-Poor Law Movement was an essentially working class movement, based primarily in the North of England. Francisco O’Connor was actively involved in it and his Leeds-based ‘Northern Star’ became the movement’s mouthpiece. They attached the Poor Law for the manner in which it attached a stigma to the class paid and its reluctance to give relief. By the late 1830s, many members came to see universal suffrage as a means of elevating the workers from their subordinate position.

The blame for the social and economic ill was put on a number of things by different groups. Primarily the Anti-Corn League blamed protectionism for the depression of the 1830s, as international trade was severely restricted. Others such as the Chartists saw the, what was to them, the ‘unreformed’ Parliament as causing the depression; whilst the Establishment saw the workers political activity as disrupting and causing the collapse of the economy.

5. Which group of people supported the Anti-Poor Law Movement but not Chartism?

This group was the Radical Tories, such as O Crother, who did not favour the Poor-Law as it placed a financial burden...
the working and working-class communities. In its administration at local level and unconstitutional at national level. With Chartism, though, they were not prepared to surrender power to the ruling classes.

The origin of the 'Northern shoe' is found in the Anti-Poverty Movement. The paper was founded in Leeds to act as the organ for the Movement and Francis O'Conner shrewdly used the occasion. Later, O'Conner and his newspaper transferred their energies to Chartism.

Disillusionment with reform in 1832 did lead to redirection of efforts in the trade union movement. This was because a need was sought for more political activity if the working classes were to have a share in power. The middle classes had monopolised the little power that the Establishment was ready to surrender, and consequently, many workers became the workers were discontented.

The cause of trades union in the 1830s contributed tremendously to Chartism. The need for workers' control for political action in order to secure a share in government and improvement in their working and social conditions, could only be met in Chartism.

As the union movement began to collide under pressure from industry and State, the workers drifted into Chartism to find an outlet for their grievances.

In the late 1830s, unionism was deserted by the campaigns of that decade which had brought failure to the general union. With little funds and harsh authorities, there was little action that they could take. Also the serious unemployment of the 1830s made workers favour their livelihoods rather than their principles in the face of struggle.

The Chartists were sometimes labelled as the 'Ideal' and 'Physical force' Chartists. The Chartists had to achieve their goals by their 'Six Points Charter' and improved social conditions, by peaceful and constitutional means if possible. If the authorities and establishment were not willing to meet demands and indeed if they attempted to suppress them, Chartists were willing to use 'physical force' or violent means to secure their aims.
Finlayson distinguishes between the ACLH and Chartism over the one fundamental difference of organisation. The ACLH were better organised at both local and national level, with ample funds to back them. The ACLH could thus present a united front, Chartists alternately were poorly organised. The Chartist movement was a coalition of working class and radical gentry, with extensive regional differentials. In addition to this, their funds were much more limited as they were a primarily working class organisation. This was another distinction between the middle class ACLH and working class Chartism.

Class consciousness in the 1830s says Finlayson, was present but not a cohesive factor in the Chartist era. That is, the artisans and labourers appreciated their position in society in relation to the middle and upper classes, but were not under the impression of being part of a `working class'. Instead, they grouped themselves as the `working classes', separating between skilled and unskilled labourers. "Two nations" bit - us and them.

He describes Chartism as `a manifestation of working class consciousness'.

Both the Chartists and the ACLH saw each other as useful allies in a struggle against an entrenched Establishment, but were each wary of each other's aims. The Chartists saw the ACLH as taking power away from their aristocratic masters, only to use it themselves. Whilst, the ACLH saw the existing middle class Chartists as a threat to their political position and to a lesser extent the stability of the Nation. Hence so many wage earners 1st class + ACC - been repealed.
1. Explain...

"National Convention" refers to the Chartist convention in London in February 1839, which drew up plans for the work of the movement, including the 100,000 signature petition of March. [Red check]

"Sacred month" refers to the ambitious plans for a general strike by Chartists to press their case. The Sacred Month was conceived at the Convention of 1839 by Bentons. [Red check]

"Operatives" were the semi-skilled textile workers whose job it was to operate machinery. [Red check]

"Animus" means the hostile intent of the crowd. [Red check]

"Riot act" was legislation of the late 1700s which empowered magistrates to disperse riotous crowds, with military force if necessary. [Red check] One line content as "considering".

2. What caused the riot? Why was it suppressed so quickly?

The riot was caused by an unplanned attempt by the police to arrest the leaders of the demonstration. The police made the arrests without dispersing the crowd, which would inevitably try to prevent the officers carrying out their duty. This led to clashes between police and the crowd.

It was suppressed so quickly as the magistrates feared for the safety of the property of the town, and realized that the riot could turn into a mob takeover of Bolton considering that an immense influx of persons (had) poured into the town on the previous day. [Red check] "considering that".

3. Which episodes illustrate "moral force" and "physical force" Chartism?

"Moral force" Chartism is illustrated by the fact that the crowd was made up of women with children in their arms,
Young girls and yahoos', and by the fact that the meeting was called off after reporters informed the leaders they were about to be arrested, to avoid clashes. These aspects showed the peaceful intentions of the event.

'Physical force,' Chartist is illustrated by the attacks on the police in the form of stone-throwing and violent breaching. The potency of this 'physical force,' Chartist, is shown through the fact that 'two companies of the 96th Foot' and 'a troop of the 60th Carabiniers were needed to contain the crowd.'

4. Is there any evidence that the authorities locally and nationally were better prepared to deal with demonstrations than at the time of 'Peterloo'?

At a local level, evidence shows that the authorities were not much better at dealing with demonstrations than their counterparts of the early 1820s. In this extract, for instance, we see how an ill-conceived attempt to arrest ringleaders brought rising to Bolton—an uncannily similar, to the events of August 1819 on St Peter's Fields. This type of incident was quite common in Britain, as local authorities used panic, last resort measures against Chartist, such as the Birmingham Bull Ring riot of July 1839.

Nationally, the authorities were much better prepared to deal with demonstrations, as the advance of railways and telegrams enabled troops to be sent to areas of unrest whenever the local authorities requested them and in a relatively short time. This meant risings and riots could be dealt with swiftly, discouraging further attempts.

5. The newspaper emphatically proclaims its impartiality: is there any bias in its report of the Chartist activities?

The report of the Chartist meeting and subsequent events is not so much biased, but tinged with an underlying attitude that Chartist meant trouble. This 'bias' is exemplified a number of
Times in the report.

We see that after going to great lengths to illustrate his impartiality, the reporter goes on to say that individuals ought to be made responsible for the consequences in lines 10-12. The reporter also hints that 'the property of the town' was under threat in lines 14-16 from the Chartists. The crowd are labelled as 'insurgent' and 'virulent...young men' (lines 17-18), and the description of these events of Monday are written in an emotive style. As a piece of writing, the whole piece is praiseworthy, but as what purports to be an unbiased account, it is to be looked at cautiously.

The reporter uses effective imagery by describing what is a political fracas in terms of a military conflict. The Chartists are seen in an almost military capacity in line 25 and tension is created in line 34 with the 'shouting missiles'.

The account of Tuesday again is biased against the Chartists. They are branded as 'the mobs' in line 44 and the description of the stone-throwing takes on a colourful vein - 'shower of stones...in all directions.' The military forces are given a favourable review, saying that their role is 'defensive' and only 'offensive' in dire circumstances. In truth, this type of situation in the 1830s saw the military entirely as an offensive force of the magistracy at the defenders of the Queen's peace. This is the type of bias seen in the report from the Bolton Chronicle, as in favour with the Chartist Movement.

Chartism in Suffolk

1. What evidence is there of dissatisfaction with the 1832 Reform Act?

There is evidence of dissatisfaction in the statement that many of the 'flagrant abuses which had existed before...1832 continued in municipal and local government'. We are also told of an unincorporated council sitting at bury St. Edmunds and the limited franchise, corruption and the patronage system being 'sufficient to excite some
2. Compare the causes of discontent in Suffolk with those of Boston and of the London Democratic Association?

The Suffolk Chartists appear as a loose affiliation of political activists pursuing several different causes. These were dissatisfaction with those reforms already achieved in 1832, militancy. Nonconformists who attacked the privileges of the Established Church, strong opposition to the New Poor Law, and those who aimed at building up a trades-union movement. 

The Boston Chartists did not appear to be pursuing any specific political causes in particular, instead they seemed to be using the Chartist Movement as a vehicle for expressing their anger and resentment at the contemporary economic situation. Furthermore, the prejudiced account from the "Boston Chronicle" does not attach any political motive to the demonstration, other than the labels of insurrection and riot. Therefore, we have no evidence that there was a particular cause behind the activities of the Boston Chartists, although in reality there may well have been.

The London Democratic Association followed a more specific political aim and causes. The LDA aimed at more parliamentary and political reform, in order to bring the protection clause into government, or at least add to their democratic representation.

3. "What was the significance of (i) Ipswich and (ii) Leiston and Peasenhall in the Chartist cause in Suffolk?"

Ipswich was significant as this was Suffolk's principal town, and here population and industrially activity was concentrated. It became the centre for Chartist activity in Suffolk, as it was from Ipswich that the politically conscious core, which led the Movement in the area. 

Peasenhall and Leiston became significant as they were the..."
only other industrial centres in predominantly rural Suffolk. This concentrated population and workers which bred political groupings, in this case Chartism.

4. Why did Chartism not flourish in the country?

Chartism did not flourish in the countryside because of the isolation of the agricultural worker and their overdependence on the land. As the agricultural worker worked individually in the field, as opposed to the collectiveised working conditions of his industrial counterpart, he had no incentive to organise with fellow workers to pursue common goals. As they lived in rural, sparsely populated areas, the agricultural workers were not in regular contact with the urban centres of political activity. Finally, as the labourer depended upon the land not just for work but sustenance as well, he was not in a strong enough position to make demands on the land establishment. If his industrial counterpart made demands and was fired from his place of employment, he could find work just as easily in any other of Industrial England. Many factories in agricultural England though, a labourer advice from the master's estates could ultimately face starvation.

5. Where did workers look for their ‘theopia’ after the failure of Chartism?

After the failure of Chartism in 1848, the workers looked towards Socialism and trades unionism for their ‘theopia’. During the 1850’s and 1860’s, Socialist thought grew in Britain and the trades union movement was revitalised in a new, moderate and more acceptable form-acceptable to the managing classes and conservative country at least. During the 1880’s, there was further expansion of unionism and Socialism (the Fabian Society for example or the Social Democratic Federation). This culminated in the formation of the Independent Labour Party in 1893 and Labour Representation Committee in 1900. In 1922 the Labour Party came to power with Liberal support and between 1929-31, the Labour Party formed a
6. How does your locality fit into the pattern of Chartism, urban or rural?

Chartism - Lovett & O’Connor

1. In what ways do Lovett and O’Connor differ in their views on working class tactics?
   Lovett believed that physical force agitation was “harmful and injurious to the movement”, and that education rather than force was what would bring about change.
   O’Connor alternatively, said physical force agitation was serving a purpose, only if all methods of peaceful persuasion had been exhausted. The Chartists adopted a slogan in this vein “peacefully if we may, forcibly if we must.”

2. Under what circumstances does O’Connor advocate the use of force?
   O’Connor would advocate violence, only when the establishment turns down the demands of a united working class front.

3. How does O’Connor justify the use of violence?
   O’Connor justifies the use of violence only in dire circumstances of mass starvation and in times when
the constitution was being violated - infringing on political freedom or moves towards autocracy.

Chartism & Public Order

1. What tactical problems did they face when the petition was rejected?
   - What to do considering that both forces stood against it - the force of government, the force of history?

2. Action was prevented by the "marble stream of beards and beaks" following the 1839 Convention.

3. The "Chartism instinct" was the instinct of the working class to stand up and fight the establishment's dictate policy. The radical version of history is the resort to violent means by the working class when other peaceful means of change had been denied to them.

4. The "Caging Act" of 1848 was the Security Bill containing emergency powers for use by the government in the event of revolution. It was submitted to the Commons in April.

5. The arrest of Chartists and their encouragement to other Chartists to take up arms, gave weight to conspiracy theory by the government.

6. Chartist Violence was confined to the years 1831-42 and 1848, as there were years of severe economic depression.

Fear of Chartism

1. Chartism arose very real fear as the middle and upper classes saw rebellion as quite feasible by the workers. "Conspiring to murder"?

2. The authorities expressed their attitudes by demanding more direct and overtly military action against provincial Chartist activity.

3. The authorities deliberately fostered fear against the
Chains in order to link the modern men of the country

in 1812.

For mass campaigns against the autocratic

Catholicism.
One of the main jobs of historians is interpreting primary sources.

In your course you have to study documents so that you can develop the techniques of handling primary source material.

The usual system is to look at a document in relation to a series of questions. Briefly these questions are:

2. What person, or group of persons, created the source in the first place, and what basic attitudes, prejudices, biases, would they be likely to have which would affect the nature of the information in the document?
3. How, and for what purpose, did the document come into existence? Who is it aimed at?
4. How far is the author of the source in a position to provide first-hand information on the particular topic upon which the historian is conducting his research?
5. Are there any problems in understanding the document as contemporaries would have understood it? In particular, are there any linguistic or technical difficulties which need explaining?
6. What other references (for example to persons, places, institutions, other documents, historical events, political ideologies, etc.) need to be explained before the document can be fully comprehended?

But these, though very important, are merely preliminary questions. The really important thing is: what does the document tell us, what is its historical significance?

In squeezing out information, and points of historical significance, from any document it's useful to bear in mind a fundamental distinction between 'witting testimony' and 'unwitting testimony'. Witting testimony is the information which the person or group who originally compiled the document intended it to convey. If, say, it's a record of a parliamentary debate, the formal record of what actually happened and was said in the debate is the 'witting testimony'. But the record may also tell us a good deal about the assumptions of the members of parliament taking part in the debate, how they regard each other, how they regarded members of society outside parliament, and so on. The reactions thus revealed are the 'unwitting testimony'. Anyone who consciously keeps a diary will almost certainly have some witting purpose in mind; but without intending he will probably reveal all sorts of things about himself, and about his friends as well. That, again, is the unwitting testimony.

Being more specific: when you are faced, in an exam, with a passage of a document to comment upon, I suggest that you try to do four things:

1. Say what the document is.
2. Set it in its historical context.
3. Comment on specific points in the text (here it's a question of explaining all difficult or technical terms, all references to names, other documents, other historical topics, political ideologies, etc. - indeed, everything that you feel calls for any kind of further comment or explanation).
4. Sum up the document's historical significance (not only at the time it was composed - if any-, but also its significance for the historian of that particular subject).
Between the end of the First World War and the end of October 1922, Italy had seen six short coalition governments in power. During this time, unemployment had risen due to demobilization and inflation was running at an all-time high. The peace settlements of the war had lost locally extensive territory such as Fiume and the people resented this. With an increase in strikes, factory occupations, violent demonstrations and frequent rioting, this period became known as the "Red Two Years". In 1922, the National Bloc, a coalition of the centre-right parties took office against a backdrop of national violence, under the leadership of Benito Mussolini. By 1929, Mussolini had become the unquestionable head of a one-party state. During the period 1922-1929, Mussolini had used repressions, constitutional reforms and had crossed the constitution, especially the Church, failing to consolidate his power so effectively that it took a world war to dislodge him.

In the early 1920s, the economic problems facing Italy such as inflation and unemployment, the rescued war settlements and the fear of a Communist takeover, gave way to political extremes of the right and left. The successive coalition governments found it increasingly difficult to deal with these problems. In 1921 Mussolini's 20-Fascist Party, the Nationalists and many Liberals formed an electoral alliance known as the National Bloc. In October 1922, on the problems worsened, Mussolini arranged an elaborate scheme, in which his armed ranks of Blackshirts marched on the capital. With this "March on Rome", he demanded of Victor Emmanuel that he should be allowed to form a government. Victor Emmanuel fearing further unrest and turbulence, gave way to
Masotini's demands. Masotini was given the task of heading a Coalition government with emergency powers at its disposal, to remedy the problems facing the country. Fascist were a minority in the Cabinet. Once in power, Masotini began a gradual process of constitution.

He set up the Fascist Milicia on taking office, which was made up of Blackshirts to protect the new government. The Milicia guarded government buildings and ministers and were responsible for the safety of Masotini himself. In 1923 Masotini passed the Aetebi law which meant that any party obtaining more than 25% of the votes in an election, would be granted two-thirds of the seats in Parliament. Did he guarantee 25% for the Fascists?

Elections in May 1924 supervised by the Milicia and police gave the Fascists 375 seats, although one-third of the electorate voted against them. In June 1924, the leader of the Socialists, Opposition, Mueeriga, was injured and was found murdered. Masotini condemned this action but later admitted to organizing it. From this point onwards, Masotini began to construct a one-party state based upon fear and propaganda.

A special security force OVAR was set up to deal with dissent and all political opposition was banned. Trade unions and strikes became illegal and all state employees had to become Fascist party members. The press became subject to rigid censorship and military courts were instituted to silence opposition. Masotini had a Ministry of Popular Culture founded to create support for the regime through propaganda in cinema, the press and in schools.

In 1925 the Rector passed one law corporation to represent employees, workers and the state in order to regulate and administer industry and output. In the absence of unemployment such as the Battle for the Osim were introduced. To gain support for his new treaty, "il Fucile" as the new popular name, crossed the old powerful Catholic Church in February 1924.

In 1929 the Church and the Fascist state signed the Lateran Treaty. Under the terms of the Vatican was set up, the Church compensated for land seizure, civil marriage banned and Church marriage encouraged, and Catholicism was made the country's official religion. In return the Church had to recognize and support the regime and accept Masotini as leader.
By 1929, Mussolini was in a strong position. Opposition to his rule was smashed and brutally silenced. The electoral reforms meant that it was difficult to remove him, especially after Socialist deputies left parliament in protest at Matteotti's death. A corporative policy placed massive industrial power into his hands, and attempts to propaganda, pacification (such as the billion-lira investment in the Mezzogiorni creating 3000 new farms) and the influence of the Church over the people, it once had a great deal of support nationally. In this seven-year period Mussolini had consolidated his power so greatly that it was only in 1943 that the Italians removed him from office. Not enough depth. A fairly good 'O-level answer. Not a question I would have myself attested.

As Imperial Chancellor of Germany, Bismarck between 1871 and 1890 did indeed fight a "domestic preventive war" in the Reich. However, this was to safeguard Prussian dominance of the "Kleindeutschland" Second Reich set up in January 1871. He aimed to prevent any influence in Germany becoming too powerful that they threatened his rule and the position of the Prussian aristocracy. Bismarck saw two main threats to this new Germany, the Catholic Church and Socialism. In the 1870s and 1880s, Bismarck followed a policy of conflict then compromise with his opponents although failed to prevent their influence from growing.

In 1871 the Pope proclaimed the dogma of Papal Infallibility which meant that whatever the Pope's judgement the Pope as God's representative on Earth—made had to be accepted by Catholics. It was aimed at safeguarding the Catholic Church's authority over other Christian denominations. Bismarck saw it as a threat to the Reich in Berlin. One third of Germany's
population were Catholic, and the territories in France, Lorraine, and Poland were extensively Catholic. He feared the Church might cause unrest in the region. In the 1870s he launched a campaign to smash the Church's influence and power in Germany. This "struggle for civilization" as it seemed to "Kulturkampf" in Bismarck's native tongue was also aimed at the Catholic Center Party, his main political opposition.

In the early 1870s Church influence over schools was removed and the State assumed education with Dr. Falk, a strong anti-clerical placed in post of Minister for Education. In 1873 the May Laws made a characteristic attack on the Church. Under these laws, episcopal authority over priests was removed, civil rather than Church marriage was made compulsory, and German-born priests were allowed to serve and all religious orders, except those caring for the sick, were dissolved. In addition to this, all political sermons were made illegal and the Jesuits were exiled.

The laws were rigidly enforced and by 1877, 1,400 German parishes had lost priests to internment or deportation. Also in that year, two sympathetic bishops in Breslau and Cottbus were arrested. The Kulturkampf, despite its efficient repression of Church activities, was not having its desired effect. The rise of the Philip German Empire at war with Catholic priests was humiliating the country and support for the Centre Party was growing. In election 1873 number of seats rose from 50 to 60.

In 1878 Bismarck was under pressure from Prussian farmers to introduce protective tariffs and the "kaiser-faire" National Liberal Party was against this idea. In order to gain support from the Centre Party and thus win the election of a new, more acceptable Pope, Bismarck ended the Kulturkampf.

The overt war on Bismarck came into what of socialism.

Germany's economic growth had produced an industrial, urban working class and their grievances for better social conditions made them ripe for Socialism. In 1864 the moderate Socialist Ferdinand Lassalle was killed and his "Working Men's Association" was taken over by Marxists. As an aristocrat, landowner and as a politician in the fight of German politics, Bismarck was instinctively opposed to Socialism. The growth of Socialism...
in the industrial centres of Germany, forced them into action. The Anti-
Socialist Laws of 1878 forbade meetings and the printing of literature
of a Socialist nature. These laws became the main weapon against
Socialism and were, like the Prussian army, rigidly enforced. 1400 Socialists
were arrested and 900 deported, yet Socialist growth and support increased.
Bismarck saw how their strength lay in social grievances and attempted to
undermine them with systems of welfare and State socialism. During
the 1880s Bismarck introduced accident and invalid
benefit schemes, reduced the number of working hours for women and children and
introduced pension for the over 65s. Yet Socialist support grew and in
1890 the new monarch dismissed Bismarck. After nineteen years of
struggling to withstand the strength of the Berlin monarchy's power,
Bismarck had to leave politics. His policy had been one of fighting
a domestic war, but this war was the last not to the Austro-Hungarian Empire due to
the actual people of Germany. Once again only held the length of a

**Finger answer:**
1855 4th of June, issued 4th party and
left Borth, retreated.

1864 Reforms: Army - the King's troops
2m - 3m, King's troops
1870, France: 150,000 troops

1854 legal term public, jury older appealed
no longer to be thought of a legal term for
the actual people of Germany. Once again only held the length of a

In 1855 the fall of the Crimean to French and British forces
woke Czar Alexander II to the fact that Russia was no longer a world
power. The failure of this war in the actual society of Russia and during
the 1860s, Czar instituted a series of reforms that brought Russia
into the modern era. The reforms had their problems but they
alleviated the people from some of the worst social conditions known in
Europe.

In 1850 the feudal system of serfdom still existed in Russia.
Under this system the peasant’s right was virtually the property of the
local landowner and he had to tend his fields or even work in his mills
and could be bought or sold like common animals. Over 2,000,000 serfs

were owned by a mere 250,000 nobles and they were treated inhumanely. In 1861 Count Alexander, Prince of Emancipation freed the serf from his master, and allowed him to gain independence, respect and initiative by buying the land he tended. Two-thirds of the land price was met by the state and had to be repaid by the serf over a 49-year period. The serf was legally independent, but practically he was still part of the communal system which held him captive. Was this the creation of a problem?

Redemption payments to the government also had to compensate the landowners who could expect up to 80 rubles for every serf freed. The payments were made communally through the 'mir,' the village community. The 'mir' decided how much the serf had to pay and flogged those who could not keep up repayments. Non-serfs were prevented from living by bureaucratic means, a complex system of passports were required or else. Was this a newly created problem?

The new network of 'mirs' lead to reforms in other aspects of society. In 1864 local government was granted new powers to deal with matters such as public health, and elected assemblies or Zemstva were set up. The Zemstva could also levy taxes and had to support army military units, and were responsible to a regional assembly, the Zemstvo. By 1876 local government in the towns was also being reformed. Was this another legal reform took place in 1864 too, as civil, by-jury and public court hearings were introduced. All judges had to be trained lawyers and this created a growth in the legal profession. The Judiciary and Executive were separated, and the Third Section secret police lost some of its reviewing powers. Was this progress or not?

Following the Crimean War in the Crimean, the Navy was reformed. Conscription was extended to the middle and upper classes, while discipline showed signs of improvement. This gave the Navy confidence in its armed forces. At a Crimean War Germany was becoming a dominant force, and the Navy was reformed profoundly when Turkey was defeated in 1878.

Alfreds reformed his factors, grip on society and the police state. Nicholas had set up was slowly dismantled. In 1870s and 1880s
If we had not created him, why

do you explain the increasing discontent during A. II’s reign

and culminating in his assassination? Could it be traced back to emancipation?

While some of Tzarist enjoyed new freedom and saw political opposition

was repressed. In what form

Czar Alexander’s reforms earned him the title “Czar Liberator”

and brought him acclaim from many statesmen and his subjects. The

reforms, although much needed, did create problems. His emancipation

of the serfs was ironically anomalous, as it freed the peasant from

the bondage of serfdom only to place him under control of the “nar

communes.” In the legal world, the Executive could still interfere with the

Judiciary and the Third section still used “administrative arrest” powers, under

which prisoners could be sent to Siberia without trial.

His reforms though did not create more problems than they solved. Certainly some aspects of the reforms led to discontent, culminating

in Alexander’s assassination. The land problems remained unsatisfactorily

resolved until the Revolution in 1917, yet in other sectors of society the

reforms created solutions rather than problems. **TOO SHORT**

\[ \text{Note to come across one V.R.}

\text{and Mrs. Pratt has been asked.}

\text{July 23.} \]

1848 Rev. News, France plans

1849 France, Italy, Prussia

1852 Czar of Russia

\[ \text{A. S. Netley and his Academy.} \]

[Note: P. P. Pratt, F. 25]

1858 News of Russia

1859 News of Italy

1860 News of France

1861 News of Germany

In 1860 Italy finally became a Nation-State, one of the first

of its kind in Europe. The struggle had been going on since 1850 when

Napoleon’s occupation had ended—leaving Italy as a “geographical enigma”

in Europe. In the north who became an independent State

and Lombardy-Venetia an Austrian satellite. In central Italy, was a

collection of States influence by Napoleonic France and many run by ruling

dictators. In addition, there was the Papal Marches, states under control
what obstacles were there in the way of a united Italy?

of the Pope, finally, in the south was the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, ruled corruptly and poorly by the dynasty of Bourbon from Naples.

There was little attempt to unify the collection of state into one nation, but some secret movements such as the Carbonari or the Republican Young Italy Movement - Mazzini's 65,000 strong organisation had some vague notions of uniting the country.

The revolution of 1848 which swept across Europe brought risings in Venice, Piedmont, Sicily and the Central States. The risings in Italy though had no common goal and were fought on local issues, such as granting a constitution in Sicily or independence for Sicily. Efforts were locally organised and uncoordinated, and foreign support was lacking.

In 1849 the 'Pope Republic' rising actually brought French troops to Rome to crush it. In this climate Italy could never hope to be united.

AUSTRIA

In 1852, Count Camillo Benso di Cavour became Prime Minister in Piedmont and the situation changed. Cavour's aim was to extend Piedmontese influence over northern Italy in order to make economic and political gains. To do this Cavour had to expel Austria from the North and Piedmont was not powerful enough to do this. Therefore, he enlisted support of Napoleon III of France at Plombières in July 1858.

Napoleon III agreed to supply military assistance and 200,000 troops to Piedmont in a war with Austria, providing that a conflict could be justified and that as compensation he would be granted Savoy and Nice.

Finally in 1859 tension grew between Piedmont and Austria, so both sides mobilised their armed forces. News of the Plombières Agreement leaked out and Napoleon III fearing condemnation began to reconsider his offer. Austria seized Napoleon's vacillation to launch a diplomatic then military attack on Sardinia/Piedmont.

The war broke out and Napoleon came down on Piedmont's side, helping them to rout the Austrians first at Magenta then at Solferino. But the 120,000 casualties the French suffered at Solferino and the clamouring words of taking the Quadrilateral's fortresses (which made Napoleon withdraw support in July 1859) at a peace conference at
the Kings

Ni-Volfranca. Cavour, outraged at France's breach, resigned and in his absence the Central States marched themselves to Piedmont.

On returning to office Cavour decided to honour the Plombieres Agreement ceding Savoy and Nice to France. Garibaldi, though, having been born in Nice attempted to disrupt the plans with his Redshirts. Garibaldi, while in Nice, Giuseppe Garibaldi, a Sicilian revolutionary, approached him asking for assistance in expelling the Neapolitans from Sicily.

In May 1860, Garibaldi seizing an opportunity to take over Southern Italy, landed in Sicily with his 10,892 Redshirts 'the Thousand', and with the help of local partisans, the Garibaldins, stormed Enna, overthrowing an army of 25,000 troops. In September he crossed the Serras of Messina with a ram total of around 4000 guerrillas and advacned on Naples. He overwhelmed the Garibaldin at Reggio di Calabria and soon was in the outskirts of Naples. King Francesco II of Bourbon had gathered his family and some loyal troops, and fled to the town of Gaeta. Garibaldi was invited to invade Naples to prevent further bloodshed.

He was now in overall control of the South and planned to invade Rome. To do this would need intervention by Catholic France, America, Cavour sent troops to occupy the Papal Marches and prevent Garibaldi from countering. These plebiscites were held in the Marches vote for incorporation with Piedmont. Garibaldi formally declared his conquest over to Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont and Italy became a unified country, Rome and Avignon being removed outside the new Nocera though.

This should have been the end of 1860. As a new nation had been formed in Europe, part of the lo had taken so long to form. Shortly, efforts were made and international, coordinated, forces opposing unification, the Austrian Empire or the desire of Bavaria for example.

Too Short.

How much of this narrative is relevant to the question which asked you to explain why attempts had failed.
before 1859/1860?

\[
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11th December 1986

History - British

A) We see evidence that Macaulay supported Wellington, as he sees that any attempt to introduce reform would lead to revolution - a Tory viewpoint. He also supported the exclusion of the lower classes from Parliament. Macaulay's anxiety over the possibility of an anti-aristocratic struggle because of reform is a view that Wellington held, and

b) The new property owners that Macaulay wanted to get into Parliament were the middle-class tradesmen and merchants. Macaulay also wanted to get the more radical middle-classes into Parliament, so that they did not attempt revolutions.

c) They would be opposed to increased taxes as being relatively affluent, it is they who would have to bear the burden of heavier taxation. They would oppose revolution as their business and living standards would collapse if Britain was to become a republic. Finally, they would oppose greater democracy as allowing the working-classes into Parliament would threaten their political power.

d) Cities such as Manchester, Sheffield, Nottingham and Leeds were renamed - that is the growing industrial cities of the North and Midlands. They were unrepresented as prior to the Industrial Revolution, these cities were small towns and as such did not qualify for representation in the Parliament of the 1600s and 1700s.

e) The House of Lords opposed the Bill as they felt threatened by it. The Lords were predominantly aristocratic landlords, and the Bill proposed to introduce the middle-class industrialist
into parliament, which would undermine the landed interest's grip on political power as individuals.

East Grey overcame their opposition in March 1832 when he requested William IV to create enough Whig peers to force passage of the Bill. William threatened to do this forced the Lords into submission.

2. a) Source A tells the historian that by 1840 the British establishment was beginning to recognize the faults and problems in administering a wide-ranging protective tariff.

b) The statistics show us that the Tariff of 1840 did not distribute the burden of taxation fairly enough. For example, 446 articles produced 98.7% of the total revenue, whilst 1,414 articles only produced 1.3% of the revenue. This shows that some articles were overtaxed—47 articles produced £10,000 each—and others were undertaxed—531 articles could only raise £80,000.

c) An historian could be well-qualified in using B3 to support the view that Committee followed Repeal. He could use this to in lined 5-8, the report points out that the tax on food (rice, corn) far exceeds the amount raised by all other taxes. It then goes on to say how administering the Corn Law leads to the loss of revenue and thus, it brings injurious effects upon wages and capital, diminishing production and limiting trade.

c) The mighty evil feel is referring to in B4 in the National Debt, which was constantly growing up until feel's access to office.

e) The Whigs had a bad reputation for finance by 1842 as really knights reform us. The outlines that the Whigs' actions in putting Britain into two wars and by mismanaging Canadian affairs cost the
country "a large amount of... treasure." He also points out that the
Witoto in abandoning unpopular taxes lost revenue and had to
reduce this cost with increased taxation on other items.

Economic Depression, 1860s - 40s

The financial difficulties that the Witoto encountered can
also be explained by their policies of localizationism. The
Witoto spent vast sums during the 1830s on administering their
policies, such as the New Poor Law of 1834.

An historian might use sources B1-5 to justify Pelle's decision
to reduce tariffs and reinstate Income Tax in the following way.
We would use Gally's Elgie speech to outline the Witoto's
financial mismanagement and the need for reform, then support
this with extracts and the sections taken from the 1840 Committee
on Industrial Duties report. Finally, we could use Pelle's speech to outline
the social and economic reasons for reinstating the Income Tax, in order to
cure the financial 'malignant evil'.

Other primary sources which could be useful would be any
personal documents of Pelle (diary or memoirs), other sections of the
Committee's report, more extracts from Pelle's speeches, and
other
other

from Hansard or the press, to give us an insight into the situation
of the day. This would explain Pelle's switch of policy. Documents
appertaining to Corn laws debate might also be useful, letters and
pamphlets for example.

Ref. 1. B35 - (Reagan, W J)
Ref. 2. Gally's Elgie speech
Ref. 3. The Speech of Mr. John
Ref. 4. "The Speech of Mr. John
Ref. 5. "The Speech of Mr. John
Ref. 6. "The Speech of Mr. John"
In 1830, the British electoral and political system had grown unrepresentative and obsolete. Out of a population of some 16 million, a mere 160,000 men had the vote. The majority of members of Parliament represented “pocket boroughs,” where the money of rich patrons rather than the vote of a constituent put them in Westminster. Many large cities, such as Manchester and Sheffield, plus many growing industrial towns, such as Oldham and Bolton, had no parliamentary representation at all. Whilst other areas such as the South-West had more representatives than the rest of the country put together, the parliament of 1830 was dominated by an elite of aristocratic landowners and it was the Tories who enjoyed the biggest share of this parliamentary façade.

The need for reform was highlighted in 1830 when the “July Revolution” in Paris caused anxiety in Britain and the problems encountered when Grey tried to form a government. The popular movement for parliamentary reform was revitalised in this year due to these events, and the pressure divided the Whig and Tory camps irreversibly. There had been divisions over C.E.

The Tories argued that allowing the lower classes to participate in government would lead to constitutional disaster. They saw a Reform Act allowing the middle classes to parliament as the first step to replacing aristocratic rule with rule by no man. Peel said that he was unwilling to open a door that he could see no prospect of being able to close. The Tories said that if the constitutional balance would be upset, as the Lords and Monarchy would lose their power in a reformed parliament, they also argued that the social balance of parliament would be upset. The largely aristocratic Tories argued that fields of coal would replace fields of barley, that is, allow industrialists to take power from the landed gentry, aristocracy, parliament, Church, landed interest.

The Bill gave the vote to only 120,000, “Ladies have gone out of politics,’-Tory. On these grounds the Tories both in the Commons and the Lords put up a never struggle to prevent or at least delay parliamentary reform. Their stubborn stance led to Constitutional Crisis and civil war, the Whig victory.
In May 1831 a General Election fought on the issue of reform, brought Grey's Whig Administration back into office. The Whigs had been elected on a reform platform, their election cry had been 'the Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill!'. The Whigs saw that a Reform Bill was the price to pay for remaining in office and keeping order in the country.

The first Reform Bill of 1831 was introduced by the Whigs upon taking office. The introduction of this bill heralded the start of a constitutional conflict in Britain, which would result in the intervention of the Monarch to sort disorder. The Bill was defeated in committee and in September 1831 a Second Reform Bill was introduced. This Bill was forced by the Commons and consequently introduced into the Lords. The House of Lords was the bastion of the conservative aristocratic rule in Britain and was dominated by the anti-Reform Tory peers.

In an all-night sitting in October, the Lords rejected the Bill causing uproar throughout Britain. By October the Reform movement had become a potent force in politics, and rejection of the Bill caused Reformers to resort to violence. Severe rising erupted in Nottingham, Bristol and London, property was destroyed and many symbols of government—garrets and Bishop's residences—were put to the torch.

The Whig government seeing the danger in submitting to the Tories, introduced a third Reform Bill in December. The Lords amended it in January 1832 much to the disgust of the Whigs. In March it seemed as though the Commons would have to submit to the Lords, but Grey requested William IV to create enough Whig peers to ensure the passage of the Bill. William publicly stated his intention to do this and the Lords—under monarchical threat—gave way. They passed the Bill which became the Reform Act of June 1832.

With following this Act the Commons had symbolically asserted their authority over the Lords and the industrial middle classes were now allowed to participate in parliamentary affairs. The Act finally led to the complete universal suffrage decades later. What the Tories had predicted
in 1830 had come about, indeed "what the Tories said was true."

The passage of the Act was a victory to the Whigs. They had extended parliamentary democracy beyond the Magna Carta and the results of the Civil War, to allow greater interests to participate in politics. Their determination to pass the Act also averted revolution in the country and so what the Whigs did was indeed quite right.

The railways had a tremendous impact on the British economy in the 1830s to 1850 period. In a time of severe economic depression, the growth of the railways provided a boost to national prosperity and productivity. This boost led to the development of Britain's economy and industry, that we became world leaders in economic terms.

The railways provided the economy with a brand new infrastructure which was vitally needed. The railways could speedily transport raw materials—such as cotton—from centers of import—Liverpool, for example—to the industrial areas where they were needed—in cotton land South East Lancashire. This increased the industrial efficiency and output, and where occurred similar effects in agricultural sectors. Items of a perishable nature could be sent long distances to markets thanks to the railways, an example of this is the export of dairy produce from the West Country to London. This had the "knock-on" effect of improving dietary standards throughout the country and:

The economic depression of the 1840s brought unemployment to Britain and the railways alleviated this. A wide variety of jobs created by the growth of the railways was tremendous. From painters to engine drivers, ticket takers to railway guards and from signalmen to porters, hundreds of jobs needed filling. At a time when the
Canals were decaying, railways provided employment for the 'navvies' like the canalsmen. During the 1840s extensive British immigration led to unemployment but was met with a demand for extra navvies.

A whole railway economy grew up. The engineering industry received a welcome boost to trade, to build and maintain the trains. The building industry also benefited as stations and tunnels were required in bulk. Even the steel and coal industries too received more work. Steel was needed for tracks and engine construction whilst coal was needed to power the trains and produce the steel.

Finally, the advent of the railways made Britain more accessible. New communications allowed the industrialist to locate in other regions of the country. The tourist industry began to grow as travel to the towns provided by the railways, allowed more and more people to visit coastal resorts such as Blackpool or Scarborough from the industrial heartlands of north-east Lancashire and south Yorkshire. Administration itself was made simpler, as the government had easier access from London to the rest of Britain. This was exemplified in the Chartist Era when it became necessary to transport troops around the country to maintain order.

The impact of railways on the British economy was in every way for reaching. They grew benefited industry, agriculture, the unemployability of the 1840s, the industrialist, the tourist and government. The economic growth that railways precipitated soon earned Britain the title 'Workshop of the World'.
Sixth Form Guidelines.

The Eastern Question 1815-1841.

1. The Ottoman Empire in the first decades of the 19th.c.-especially the Empire in Europe-attitudes of the other powers to Turkey- the 1814-15 settlements and Turkey.

2. The Greek War of Independence.
   a) Reasons for unrest in 1821-areas of trouble.
   b) Course of the war 1821-1824 and the positions taken by European Powers.
   c) The intervention of Mehemet Ali-reasons for-effect on the war-reaction in the rest of Europe.
   d) More direct intervention by Russia-physical consequences and the policies of Britain Austria etc.
   e) The settlement of 1829.


4. Further intervention by Mehemet Ali 1839-struggle 1839-41-attempt by others to create a settlement.

5. The settlement of 1841-who gained? who lost? why was there peace for a decade?

D. THOMSON 96, 138-140
E. LIPSON "Europe in the 19th.&20th.c."
GRANT&TUPPERLEY ditto.