

Flying Start 2018

History

Contents:

- Introduction to the course
- General Reading
- Specific Reading Task
- Book List
- Wider reading

Introduction to the course:

Welcome to History. Over the two years of History you will be studying the following subject areas:

- The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1660
- Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992
- Italy 1896-1943
- Topic based essay (coursework) – your choice!

You will

- Develop your interest in and enthusiasm for history and an understanding of its significance
- Build on your understanding of the past through experiencing a broad and balanced course of study
- Improve as an effective and independent learner and as a critical and reflective thinker with a curious and enquiring mind
- Organise and communicate your historical knowledge and understanding in different ways, arguing a case and reaching substantiated judgements.

History is a challenging and rewarding subject. We hope to ignite and engage your passions and interests. You will study the history of more than one country and state in addition to the study of British history. Undertake a thematic study, covering an extended period of history of approximately 100 years. Finally you will explore a topic in history that you have an interest in through the coursework element.

During Year 12 we will be looking at the following topics:

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1660:

- James I and Parliament
- James I and religion
- Charles I 1625-1640
- Charles I and the victory of Parliament
- The failure to achieve a settlement 1646-1649
- Commonwealth and Protectorate
- The Restoration of Charles II

Italy 1896-1943

- Italy 1896–1915
- Italy 1915–1925
- Fascist Italy 1925–1943
- Foreign Policy of Mussolini 1922–1943

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1992 (Continuing into Year 13):

- African American Civil Rights
- Native American Rights
- Women's Rights
- Trade Union and Labour Rights

General Reading

Wider reading plays an essential role in success in A-level History. In addition to reading the two short articles in preparation for the course, you may wish to enjoy any of the suggested material to help you with your studies – whether novels, non-fiction, or films.

1. Find a place and a time to read:

Reading for History will involve writing and will require quiet. To this end you will need a pen or pencil, a notepad and somewhere to read. Set yourself an amount of time aside – perhaps an hour.

2. Read and write:

Don't just read the chapter straight through. Make some notes.

New words:

Whilst you are reading identify the words that are new to you, write them down, look them up and make a note of the meanings. Talk to your family or friends about the words – discuss what they mean and how they work.

New ideas:

What ideas or concepts is the writer trying to tell you about? Try to summarise the concepts that the author is trying to explain. Talk to your family or friends about these concepts – discuss what they mean and how they work.

Identify arguments:

The author will be deploying arguments to persuade you. Usually arguments are indicated by the use of some key words like 'therefore', 'because', 'if then'. Try to summarise each argument – jot down the conclusion and then try and identify the premises that it is based on. Talk to your family or friends about the arguments – discuss what they mean and how they work.

Summarise:

Once you have read a paragraph, section or chapter, stop. Now try to summarise what you have read in your own words. Use bullet points or mind maps, make it clear and simple and then talk to your family or friends about what you have read – discuss what the author was trying to say and how they went about it. What do you think of the argument – was it clear? Does it make sense? Can you think of examples that support or contradict the case the author is making?

Each time you do some historical reading you will improve your retention, comprehension and speed but to do this you must practise. You will probably annotate the books you are reading (please only do this if they are your books) and you will fill notebooks with ideas and insights that you will want to keep and look back over in years to come.

Specific Reading Task

To prepare you for the start of the History course you have two articles to read.

Book review of the *The Pursuit of Italy* by David Gilmour, taken from the Economist, Feb 24th 2011.

- What was the *Risorgimento* and when did it take place?
- What were the two key weaknesses of the *Risorgimento*?
- What do you think Prince Metternich of Austria meant when he said that 'Italy was only a geographical expression'?

John Morrill: Stuart Britain (p.28-31)

- What were James's strengths as a monarch? What were his weaknesses?
- What did James want to achieve as king?
- How successful did James achieve these aims?

Book List

Course textbooks for September:

- Access to History: The Early Stuarts and the English Revolution - (published September 2015) – Katherine Brice and Michael Lynch
- Access to History: Italy - The Rise of Fascism 1896-1946 (Fourth Edition) – Mark Robson (published July 2015)
- Access to History: Civil Rights in the USA 1865 – 1992 – Nicolas Fellowes and Mike Wells (published July 2016)

	STUARTS	ITALY	US CIVIL RIGHTS
Books	<p>The King's Assassin by Benjamin Wooley (2017) – the gripping story of the rise and fall of the Duke of Buckingham, the favourite of both James I and Charles I.</p> <p>The English Civil Wars by Blair Worden (2010) – an excellent brief overview of the civil wars.</p> <p>Charles I and the people of England by David Cressy – one of the leading historians of the period gives new insight into the lives of ordinary people in England during Charles's reign</p>	<p>Mussolini by Denis Mack Smith (1994) – a comprehensive biography of the fascist leader by one of England's leading historians of Italy.</p> <p>The Pursuit of Italy by David Gilmour (2012) – a history of the Italy in a wonderfully readable style, which explains in depth the regional variation that made nationalism weaker in Italy than other countries.</p>	<p>Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality 1890-2000 – Adam Fairclough (2002) – a very accessible overview of the struggle for civil rights.</p> <p>America's Women: 400 Years of Dolls, Drudges, Helpmates, and Heroines by Gail Collins (2007) – a race through the key female personalities who have helped shape American history</p> <p>Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee – Dee Brown (1970) – not only a horrifying survey of US-Indian relations, but a key text in the Native American civil rights movement.</p>
Novels	<p>The King's Daughter by Christine Dickason (2010) – life at the court of King James through the eyes of his daughter Elizabeth.</p> <p>The Last Roundhead by Jemahl Evans (2015) – the fast-paced and enjoyable story of the charmed life of a civil war soldier.</p>	<p>The Garden of the Finzi-Continis by Giorgio Bassani (1962) – a novel focusing on the relationships between the members of the Finzi-Gontini family in Ferrara during the rise of Mussolini and the Second World War.</p> <p>The Italian Wife by Kate Furnivall (2015) – a recent novel set in the 1930s, following a family living in one of Mussolini's new towns on the Pontine Marshes.</p>	<p>Homegoing by Yaa Gyasi – a highly – praised recent novel following the descendants of two West African sisters. One is traded as a slave, the other marries a British soldier.</p> <p>Haymarket by Martin Duberman (2005) – a novel set during the infamous Haymarket workers' protest in 1886, giving a flavour in life during the Gilded Age</p> <p>Little Women by Mary Louise Alcott – this famous 19th century novel gives a flavour of the restricted lives of middle-class American women at the end of the civil war.</p>
Films	<p>The Devil's Whore (2008) – Channel 4's award-winning drama set during the civil war</p> <p>Cromwell (dir. Ken Hughes, 1970) – the life and times of Cromwell, with some liberties taken with the historical facts.</p> <p>To Kill A King (dir. Mike Barker 2003) – tells the story of the relationship between Cromwell and his general Thomas Fairfax. Entertaining but historically flawed.</p>	<p>1900 (dir. Bernardo Bertolucci, 1976) – a huge epic starring Robert De Niro and Gerard Depardieu, chronicling their friendship over the first half of the 20th century, as they witness and participate in the conflicts between fascism and communism.</p> <p>The Garden of the Finzi-Continis (dir. Vittorio de Sica) – a film version of the novel.</p>	<p>Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee (dir. Yves Simoneau 2007) a recent television movie of Ken Burn's book, showing the bleak history of the native Americans in the latter 19th century.</p> <p>Selma (dir Ava DuVernay 2015) – the story of Martin Luther King's struggle to get the Voting Act passed.</p> <p>Mississippi Burning (dir. Alan Parker 1988) – two FBI agents fight injustice and racism after three civil rights activists go missing in the 1960s.</p> <p>Malcolm X (dir. Spike Lee 1993) – a hard-hitting biography of the civil rights activist.</p>

BOOK REVIEW - The Pursuit of Italy: A History of a Land, its Regions and their Peoples. By David Gilmour. *Allen Lane*; 447 pages

The Economist, Feb 24th 2011

As Italy prepares to celebrate the 150th anniversary of its unification next month, some Italians are asking themselves whether it did more harm than good.



THE tourists who flood into Rome's forum, Florence's Uffizi gallery or St Mark's Square in Venice might be surprised to learn that Italy is one of the youngest countries in Europe. It was unified only in 1861, and not until ten years later did Rome take over from Florence as Italy's capital. This youthfulness may help to explain the country's fragility, which is being tested anew under the messily embarrassing rule of Silvio Berlusconi.

David Gilmour's splendid book tells the story of Italy from Roman times. He canters through the early years, with a few diversions to explore the importance of city-states in medieval days or the glorious offshoot that was Venice. But the heart of his book is its account of the unification, or *Risorgimento*, and of Italy's subsequent chequered history.

His broad themes can be summed up in two famous quotations about Italy. One is Prince Metternich of Austria's dismissive 1847 observation that Italy was just "a geographical expression". The other is the comment made in 1861 by Massimo d'Azeglio, a pioneer of unification, that "we have made Italy; now we must make Italians."

Like most foreign visitors who experience Italy's culture, buildings, physical beauty, food and climate, Mr Gilmour, a British historian and journalist, is a passionate fan. That makes his skewering of Italy's myths more striking. Giuseppe Verdi, he insists, may have been a great opera composer but he was neither a great patriot nor a nationalist. The men who unified Italy, notably Camillo Cavour, Giuseppe Garibaldi (pictured) and Giuseppe Mazzini, as well as Azeglio, were patriots (at least for Piedmont), but by no means heroes. Mazzini was a dreamily unsuccessful revolutionary, Garibaldi an unscrupulous adventurer whose invasion of Sicily in 1860 was illegal and Cavour an old cynic who never travelled south of Pisa.

The book dwells on two other weaknesses in the Italian *Risorgimento*. The first is the lack of enthusiasm of so many Italians. The church was against it—hence the

undignified spectacle of Pope Pius IX scampering out of the Palazzo del Quirinale in 1870. Venice never wanted to join. Most important, although many in Naples and Sicily welcomed the takeover from Turin, this reflected disillusion with their Bourbon monarchs, not enthusiasm for Piedmont's Victor Emmanuel II.

Quite soon after 1861 both northerners and southerners were questioning the wisdom of unification. The snobbery of the north towards supposedly backward Naples was (and still is) striking. Yet Naples was for many years the biggest city in the peninsula; it built the first steamboat, suspension bridge and railway in Italy and, even more surprising, was as late as 1800 more liberal than most of the rest of the country.

The second weakness in the *Risorgimento* was an unabashed desire for military success. This theme was well explored in Christopher Duggan's recent history of Italy, "The Force of Destiny". Despite the influence on Italy's fortunes of wars involving France, Austria and Prussia (the German chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, claimed that Italy sprang from three battles beginning with "S": Solferino, Sadowa and Sedan), unification was achieved with little fighting. That left Italy's leaders thirsting for a war to demonstrate their new country's greatness.

This thirst proved a scourge. Some 6,000 Italians were killed in the disastrous battle of Adowa in Abyssinia in 1896. More than 1m died in the first world war, most through incompetence in a conflict that Italy could easily have sat out. An unslaked desire for military glory propelled Benito Mussolini to power in 1922, making him in a sense another child of the *Risorgimento*. Mussolini at least conquered Ethiopia, but for him and his people the second world war was yet another disaster.

The best bit of modern Italian history had to wait until 1945, when Alcide de Gasperi began the country's post-war boom. Although Italy had problems, including a revival of the Mafia and a merry-go-round of weak governments, 50 years of rapid growth have made it a rich country. Its big concern now is the struggle to stay rich—something that years of economic stagnation under Mr Berlusconi, Italy's longest serving prime minister since the war, makes far harder.

Italy's north-south divide remains gaping, too (though, as the author says, there is a less well known east-west divide either side of the Apennines). Indeed, the country's diversity is a constant feature of Mr Gilmour's book. He notes that in 1861 only one Italian in 40 spoke the language (Victor Emmanuel barely did so). He cites surveys from 1960 finding Sicilians ignorant of Italy. And he quotes northerners whose disdain for the south, or *Mezzogiorno*, leads them to call it Africa or Egypt.

Curiously Italy's uneasy and in some ways incomplete unification is now re-emerging as an issue for Mr Berlusconi alongside his squalid legal cases. His government survives thanks to the support of the Northern League, which wants a far more decentralised Italy—and some of whose voters favour a new country, Padania. Perhaps the celebrations of Italy's 150th birthday will reignite national fervour and revive morale. Sadly, shallow politicking is more likely.

JOHN MORILL - STUART BRITAIN

When, with the wisdom of hindsight, contemporaries looked back at the causes of the 'Great Rebellion', they very rarely went back before the accession of Charles I in 1625. They were probably right.

James I

James I was, in many ways, a highly successful king. This was despite some grave defects of character and judgement. He was the very reverse of Queen Elizabeth. He had a highly articulate, fully developed, and wholly consistent view of the nature of monarchy and of kingly power - and he wholly failed to live up to it. He was a major intellectual, writing theoretical works on government and engaging effectively in debate with leading Catholic polemicists on theological and political issues, as well as turning his mind and his pen to the ancient but still growing threat of witchcraft, and to the recent and menacing introduction of tobacco. He believed that kings derived their authority directly from God and were answerable to God alone for the discharge of that trust. But James also believed that he was in practice constrained by solemn oaths made at his coronation to rule according to the 'laws and customs of the realm'. However absolute kings might be in the abstract, in the actual situation in which he found himself, he accepted that he could only make law and raise taxation in Parliament, and that every one of his actions as king was subject to judicial review. His prerogative, derived though it was from God, was enforceable only under the law. James was, in this respect, as good as his word. He had several disagreements with his Parliaments, or at any rate with groups of members of Parliament, but these differences were mostly unnecessary and of temporary effect. Thus he lectured the Commons in 1621 that their privileges derived from his gift, and this led to a row about their origins. But he was only claiming a right to comment on their use of his gift; he was not claiming, and at no point in relation to any such rights and liberties did he claim, that he had the right to revoke such gifts. It was this tactlessness, this ability to make the right

argument at the wrong moment, that earned him Henry IV of France's sobriquet, 'the wisest fool in Christendom'.

His greatest failings, however, were not intellectual but moral and personal. He was an undignified figure, unkempt, uncouth, unsystematic, and fussy. He presided over a court where peculation and the enjoyment of perquisites rapidly obstructed efficient and honest government. Royal poverty made some remuneration of officials from tainted sources unavoidable. But under James (though not under his son) this got out of hand.

The public image of the court was made worse by a series of scandals involving sexual offences and murder. At one point in 1619 a former lord chamberlain, a former lord treasurer, a former secretary of state, and a former captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners all languished in the Tower on charges of a sexual or financial nature. In 1618, the king's latent homosexuality gave way to a passionate affair with a young courtier of minor gentry background, who rose within a few years to become duke of Buckingham, the first non-royal duke to be created for over a century. Buckingham was to take over the reins of government from the ailing James and to hold them for the young and prim Charles I, until his assassination in 1628. Such a poor public image cost the king dear. His lack of fiscal self-restraint both heightened his financial problem and reduced the willingness of the community at large to grant him adequate supply.

James I was a visionary king, and in terms of his own hopes and ambitions he was a failure. His vision was one of unity. He hoped to extend the union of the Crowns of England and Scotland into a fuller union of the kingdoms of Britain. He wanted full union of laws, of parliaments, of churches; he had to settle for a limited economic union, a limited recognition of joint citizenship, and a common flag. The sought-after 'union of hearts and minds' completely eluded him. James's vision was expressed in flexible, gradualist proposals. It was

wrecked by the small-mindedness and negative reflexes of the parliamentary county gentry. He also sought to use the power and authority of his three crowns – England, Scotland, and Ireland – to promote the peace and unity of Christian princes, an aim which produced solid achievements in James's arbitration in the Baltic and in Germany in his early years, but which was discredited in his later years by his inability to prevent the outbreak of the Thirty Years War and the renewed conflict in the Low Countries. Finally, he sought to use his position as head of the 'Catholic and Reformed' Church of England, and as the promoter of co-operation between the Presbyterian Scots and episcopal English Churches, to advance the reunion of Christian Churches. His attempts to arrange an ecumenical council and the response of moderates in all churches, Catholic, orthodox, Lutheran, and Calvinist, to his calls for an end to religious strife were again wrecked by the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. But they had struck a resonant chord in many quarters.

Stuart Britain

James's reign did see, however, the growth of political stability in England, a lessening of religious passions, domestic peace, and the continuing respect of the international community. His 'plantation policy' in Ulster, involving the dispossession of native Irish Catholic landowners and their replacement by thousands of families from England (many of them in and around Londonderry settled by a consortium of Londoners) and (even more) from south-west Scotland, can also be counted a rather heartless short-term success, though its consequences are – all too grimly – still with us. He left large debts, a court with an unsavoury reputation, and a commitment to fight a limited war with Spain without adequate financial means.

He had squabbled with his Parliament and had failed to secure some important measures which he had propounded to them: of these, the Act of Union with Scotland and an elaborate scheme, known as the Great Contract, for rationalizing his revenues were the only ones that mattered. But he had suffered no major defeat at their hands in the

sense that Parliament failed to secure any reduction in royal power and had not enhanced its own participation in government by one jot. Parliament met when the king chose and was dismissed when its usefulness was at an end. Procedural developments were few and had no bearing on parliamentary power. Parliament had sat for less than one month in six during the reign and direct taxation counted for less than one-tenth of the total royal budget. Most members recognized that its very survival as an institution was in serious doubt. No one believed that the disappearance of Parliament gave them the right, let alone the opportunity, to resist the king. James was a Protestant king who ruled under law. He generated distaste in some, but distrust and hatred in few if any, of his subjects. Charles I's succession in 1625 was the most peaceful and secure since 1509, and arguably since 1307.

Charles I

Just as there is a startling contrast between Elizabeth I and James I so there is between James I and Charles I. Where James was an informal, scruffy, approachable man, Charles was glacial, prudish, withdrawn, and shifty. He was a runt, a weakling brought up in the shadow of an accomplished elder brother who died of smallpox when Charles was 12. Charles was short, a stammerer, a man of deep indecision who tried to simplify the world around him by persuading himself that where the king led by example and where order and uniformity were set forth, obedience and peace would follow. He was one of those politicians so confident of the purity of his own motives and actions, so full of rectitude, that he saw no need to explain his actions or justify his conduct to his people. He was an inaccessible king except to his confidants. He was a silent king where James was voluble, a king assertive by deed not word. He was in many ways the icon that James had described in *Basiliikon Doron*.

Government was very differently run. Charles was a chaste king who presided over a chaste court; venality and speculation were stanchd; in