PAST to PRESENT

The Journal of the Teesdale History Research Group

Volume 2, Issue 2, Spring 2018

Teesdale GCSE Syllabus

A special issue linked to the Teesdale Lecture Series 2018

Foreword
Dr Simon Henderson

This issue of the journal was developed after the GCSE Revision Lecture Series which took place in February. The articles focus, in some way, on events and issues connected to the Edexcel syllabus followed by students at Teesdale School. Whilst the fundamental and pragmatic purpose of studying the modules is to ensure that exam questions can be answered, the ultimate aim in the pursuit of history is to learn about ourselves. The past informs and challenges us as we navigate the future. So here are four key messages for the present and beyond each drawn from one of the modules of GCSE study.

The struggle for gender equality is about more than the work of remarkable females. When Elizabeth I ascended the throne in 1558 she was a woman in a man's world. Her questionable legitimacy, the foreign and domestic threats that faced the nation she led, and the continued religious and political fallout of the Reformation, were compounded by the fact that she was a woman – and a young twenty-five year old one at that. Elizabeth fought against stereotypes and patriarchy in order to assert her considerable talent. Yet the focus on exceptional women in history – Elizabeth is one of the most prominent examples - reflects what Allison Heisch termed an 'honorary male' approach. One that promotes the persistence of a patriarchal paradigm rather than challenging it. When Elizabeth declared at Tilbury in July of 1588, "I know I have the body of a weak, feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too," she was rallying the troops as the the Spanish Armada approached but she was also downplaying her own femininity. History teaches us that women who have been celebrated are seen as remarkable and different and often embodying distinctly male characteristics. So in the age of the TIME'S UP campaign we must ensure that it is not just remarkable women who are recognised, not just the Hollywood actresses and professional sportswomen. The struggle for gender equality is a struggle for all women (and men) and #MeToo must mean just that. A recognition of the essential contributions made by scores of ordinary women in the past will empower their present day sisters to demand meaningful change.

We should never forget or ignore the voices of those who stand up against tyranny. Speaking in response to the Nazi Party's Enabling Act of March 1933 Otto Wels argued, "In this historic hour, we German Social Democrats solemnly pledge ourselves to the principles of humanity and justice, of freedom and socialism. No Enabling Act gives you the power to destroy ideas that are eternal and indestructible." Wels urged others in the Reichstag to vote with his Social Democrats against the legislation that would give Hitler the legal authority to trample the rule of law and democracy under the jackboot of fascism. He fled Germany two months later as the Nazi's grip on power tightened. Wels was not a great orator and his speech in opposition to the Enabling Act was not a masterpiece of rhetoric but he stood up against tyranny when others did not. We must remain alert today against any who would seek to discredit those who have the courage to speak truth to power and protect democracy and the rule of law.

Editors—Miss Laura Turner & Dr Simon Henderson- Email—simon.henderson@teesdaleschool.co.uk

We must recognise the dangers of a pursuit of progress at any cost. "The evil, Sir, is enormous; the inevitable suffering incalculable. Do not stain the fair fame of the country… Nations of dependent Indians, against their will, under colour of law, are driven from their homes into the wilderness." These were the words of Massachusetts Congressman Edward Everett during the debate on Indian removal in 1830. The policy of moving Indians further west away from the advance of white settlers and out of land that could be exploited by white business interests began a process that led to the eventual destruction of Native American culture and the direct and indirect genocide of thousands upon thousands of Indian peoples. The concept of Manifest Destiny fuelled the belief that white people had a god given right to conquer the whole of the North American continent. From the 1850s onwards the indigenous peoples of the Great Plains were pushed onto reservations, the buffalo herds that they relied upon to continue their nomadic way of life were slaughtered and scores of men, women and children were killed by the U.S. military. The emergence of the United States as an economic superpower was made possible by the rapid expansion of the nation during the nineteenth century. The exploitation of the rich natural resources available because of the conquest of the West fuelled this progress but it came at a terrible human cost. As scientific evidence for the environmental damage done by the development of modern society grows we must temper progress with the impact that it has on humanity and the planet we inhabit.

Failure is often the preface to many inspiring achievements. In the early 1900s the sexually transmitted infection syphilis was posing a similarly significant public health problem to that of HIV in the late twentieth century. Paul Ehrlich assembled a team of scientists to try and find a chemical compound that could be used to kill the syphilis bacteria. His researchers included Sahachiro Hata who had found a way of producing syphilis infection in laboratory rabbits. Hata, Ehrlich and their colleagues experimented with hundreds of synthesised organoarsenic compounds to try and find a 'magic bullet' that would kill the syphilis bacteria without poisoning the patient. It took six hundred and five different attempts that failed before Salvarsan 606 was discovered. This breakthrough came in the autumn of 1909 and by the middle of 1910 the drug was being used effectively to cure patients in the early to mid-stages of the syphilis infection. There were quite literally hundreds of failures before the eventual success that laid the foundations for the promise of modern medicine.

Elizabeth I and Now

Scarlett Jones

If I have learned anything from the reign of Queen Elizabeth the first, it is that nobody has to conform to the goals that society has set, that if you want to achieve a goal, nobody can stand in your way and that if you see something in the world which needs changing, it is your duty as a citizen of this planet to try. She dedicated her entire life to this country and to making it the place that she wanted it to be and thought it should be. She has changed the perspective of many people on the traditional roles of women and that has shown me that there is nothing on this planet that can't be improved. When I look around me now there is so much in this world we have to be thankful for and there is so much that we can still change. Some things in this world appear to be changed, yet aren't quite—like the law on fox hunting: which I highly doubt has allowed anyone to be prosecuted as it has a loophole that they can show jump their horses straight through. If it were up to me then all animal hunting would be stopped, but as a vegetarian of nearly 14 years, I think my opinion is slightly biased on this topic. Right now when I look at this world it sometimes scares me a bit. What job will I choose? Will I get good enough grades? Will I ever make the changes I want to happen in the world? My answer is clear and simple, I have absolutely no idea. So many people had clear dreams as children and felt they had to abandon them as adults. We are at the age where people don't know whether to say shoot for the stars or be a bit more realistic. Queen Elizabeth was never allowed a choice over her future except whether to marry, which is a choice many people worldwide do not have the chance to make.

She probably had dreams as a child too of who she wanted to become and I'll never know if she ever made them come true, but she spent most of her adult life defending her right to live alone and showing people that she was dependent on nobody. Right now I can go to school where I get a free education, drink water from a tap and sleep in a house. For millions of people worldwide I am living their dream. For everyone who says they aren't good enough or they will never do anything with their lives, look in the mirror and see that you are good enough and you can change the world. For everyone who wants to save lives go and save them and for everyone

who wants to create a fair and just world go and become the next world leader because it is all possible. Your life is for you and only you will have to live with your choices. So go and find your childhood fairy wings or your cowboy hat or the elephant trunk you made because you thought that you could grow one later. Maybe you can't become a dinosaur, but you owe it to yourself to be happy (and maybe be a dinosaur). So while you stare out the windows and doodle in your book maybe try to listen for a second, you might just learn how to find your dinosaur again. So thankyou Queen Elizabeth the first. We all owe it to you to try. We all owe it to ourselves.

Elizabeth I—Strong and Stable or Increasingly Insecure?

Miss Rebecca Theaker

Elizabeth was a mere two years and eight months when her mother was beheaded on the 19th of May 1536. I can honestly say that I cannot remember the events in my life when I was this age, and I doubt that Elizabeth herself would vividly recall her mother's execution. However, this life changing event set the wheels in motion for arguably the reign of the most well-known female monarch. As a social historian I have numerous questions regarding the research and the teaching of Elizabeth I. Why do historians both praise and chastise Elizabeth regarding her gender challenged reign? Why now has our GCSE syllabus been shaped to include her in the education of our young historians? Is it because Elizabeth ticks the box for yet another example of a remarkable female who was 'strong and stable' and this is how society wants her to be remembered? Now, especially in the light of the Me Too movement, I feel it is crucial for key historical figures to be studied and analysed appropriately and not re-written to fit the cookie-cutter outline of what society thinks a 'strong and stable' female should be.

Before Henry VIII executed his second wife, Elizabeth's mother Anne Boleyn, he planned the beheading down to a t. Through the centuries, historians have debated the use of a sword for her execution and not the typical axe. Many have argued that Henry made this decision based on the fact that Anne had spent many years in France and this was the chosen method there for the death of a noble. Or that Henry did in fact care so deeply for Anne that he wanted her to go out with dignity and not hacked at like a pig on a butchers table. Actually the use of the sword rather than the axe is redundant. Henry did not make the decision for Anne but instead he was thinking of himself.

Elizabeth's grandfather, Henry VII had claimed that his Welsh bloodline had directly connected the Tudors to the mythical tales of King Arthur; he named his first son Arthur to further cement this. Although Arthur would never be crowned, Henry still played on the tale and lived up to the heroic, marshal and all-man myth. The term masculine is an understatement when describing Henry VIII. He was everything a woman was not in early Renaissance England. Men wanted to be him and women wanted to be with him. In 1526, Henry's dynasty and his virility was threatened when his wife Catherine of Aragon became menopausal and he had fallen painstakingly in love with Anne Boleyn. Anne was the opposite of Catherine, young, well-travelled, challenging. She was taught many tricks of the trade whilst in France and used her beauty and wit to entice men. Henry both wanted her and needed her. She had promised him the son he longed for and Henry truly believed she would deliver. So when Elizabeth was born on the 7th of September 1533, this was the start of the end for Anne. When Anne delivered a dead child, which is believed to have been a boy, in 1536 enough was enough. Henry and his advisers wanted Anne gone. This brings me back to the sword.

Anne challenged everything that Henry found most encapsulating about himself. What he had originally found enticing about her he now despised. He found her intelligence threatening and felt she was rising above her station. He called her experience 'whorish' and even went as far as to claim that she had used witchcraft against him, as this could surely be the only reason he fell in love with such an outspoken women. Word reached Henry that Anne had claimed he was 'talentless' in the bedroom and this seemed to be the final straw. He started his affair with wife number 3, Jane Seymour and Anne's demise was being planned. Henry's use of a sword screams his overbearing need to express his masculinity and the myth of Arthur. Anne had joked that her slender neck would not be difficult to cut, even placing her hands around it as if to clarify to herself that her death would be quick and pain free. And it was, one single blow did the job.

From this day Elizabeth's life would never be the same. She was disgraced, a royal bastard and declared illegitimate. She was housed away from Henry and his new wife and brought up motherless. Although she was in contact with her two siblings she was not overly close with either of them.

When Elizabeth was four her governess retired and was replaced by Kat Ashley, a woman who Elizabeth grew a deep love for and was by no shadow of a doubt the only mother like figure in her life. In addition Henry's 5th wife Catherine Howard took a shine to the young princess and regularly asked for Elizabeth (who was 8 years old at the time) to join her and Henry at the royal household. However, when it was discovered that Catherine had committed adultery, just like Elizabeth's mother, she was condemned to death and executed. The impact upon her cannot be measured, but it is significant that Robert Dudley, her childhood friend and confident when she later became Queen, said many years later that when she was 8 years old, Elizabeth told him that she would never marry. Katherine Parr, Henry VIII's 6th wife and widow, did not stay single long after the King's death. Within only months of his passing she married Thomas Seymour. Elizabeth went to live with the Queen dowager and her new husband, and a new era of trouble began for her. Seymour took an unhealthy interest in his new stepdaughter, who had now just turned fourteen. Seymour took advantage of the situation, and began to visit Elizabeth's bedchamber early in the mornings. Another time, he teased Elizabeth in the garden, and cut open her dress. The altercation was scandalous, and Elizabeth had to justify her actions and insist that her purity reminded intact. By just fourteen, Elizabeth had encountered more death, drama and disgrace than most will ever experience in a lifetime.

All of the above brings me back to the questions that were first posed at the beginning of this article. Historians both praise and chastise Elizabeth's reign as she did make mistakes and she cannot be viewed with rose tinted glasses due to her awful upbringing, however, it is crucial to understand that she had one job but she was actually playing two roles. Starkey stated that Elizabeth was a 'royal hermaphrodite' and I could not agree with him more. Our GCSE syllabus includes Elizabeth in the education of our young historians to bolster the crucial '40% British History target' introduced by Michael Gove but I think it should and could mean more than that. Elizabeth actually does not tick the box for an example of a remarkable female who was 'strong and stable', this is just how society wants her to be remembered. A fiery red head who died a virgin, a magnificent martyr for the feminist cause! Really Elizabeth was desperately insecure, especially as she grew older. She worried about her appearance, she compared herself to other females and she was acutely aware of her pock-marked face. She flirted, took part in boisterous activities and was erratically stubborn when it pleased her. Could the aforementioned not be used to describe numerous females you know today? The Me Too movement has once again got the world talking about women, in particular women and sex. A rather poorly constructed Channel 4 programme recently stated that in a recent study of young males they found that men consider a woman with a deep voice to be most attractive as they think they will be strong and trusting. Three images flashed on to the screen. Boudicca, Elizabeth I and Margaret Thatcher. Is this really what we wish to associate with gender, attraction and sexuality? History and gender is inextricably linked and it should not be measured by how attractive males found their female counterparts. Instead I feel it is crucial for key historical figures to be analysed based on what they thought of themselves, their own insecurities, their history and their upbringing and how this shaped their lives. History, gender and feminism isn't about bra burning, taking a vow of chastity or refusing to shave our legs. It is about how we view ourselves and each other meaning that eventually we can mould our own cookie-cutter outline of what a 'strong and stable' female is in the 21st century.

Sir Francis Drake and the Birth of the British Empire

Will Wood

Tavistock, a bygone town in West Devon, welcomed a man into the world in c.1540 who would change the course of English, British and world history forever. Sir Francis Drake, from relatively humble beginnings, became a leading English-hired privateer and a favourite of Elizabeth I due to his daring raids in the New World against the Spanish over the course of the 16th century. Drake rose to prominence during a period of increasing religious and commercial tensions between England and Spain. However, his role in instigating the beginning of the largest empire in history - our empire - cannot be overstated. This is for two intertwined reasons - his role in establishing English naval confidence and supremacy, and his adventurous voyages in the Americas which laid the foundations for the Atlantic slave trade and the triangular trade system, which formed the basis of the "first" British Empire.

The creation of the "empire on which the sun never sets" (ironically, a phrase first applied to the Spanish Empire) has been, justly, attributed to various individuals - Francis Drake is one who has been perhaps underrepresented.

During the 1570s Drake made a fortune, for himself and later the Crown, raiding in the New World and the East Indies. His fame grew when, during the early to mid-1570s, he captured Spanish ships and raided settlements from the West and East Indies, to the Coast of Central America, to the Pacific Coast of South America, as well as becoming the first Englishman to see the Pacific Ocean. Arguably Drake's *magnum opus* was his circumnavigation of the globe from the 13th of December 1577 to the 26th of September 1580, only the second man in history to do so - and the first Englishman. Drake skirted the coast of North-West Africa before heading across the choppy waters of the Atlantic to South America. The Pacific was reached by 1578 and New Albion was claimed in what historians believe to be California. Drake sailed across the Pacific, manoeuvred through East Asia, rounded the Cape of Good Hope and returned to Plymouth. Through his whole journey, and his previous expeditions, Drake slowly set in motion the British Empire. Drake often focused on capturing Spanish treasure ships, especially those carrying silver, to disrupt the flows of wealth around the Spanish Empire to help Elizabeth's strategic ambitions in the Spanish Netherlands. However, Drake's journeys to the Americas specifically were the most vital, as they had the most immediate influence on the "first" British Empire which began to coalesce around the time of Drake's actions. The basis of this was the triangular trade system, and more specifically the transatlantic slave trade. England exported manufactured goods such as guns and cloth to the West Coast of Africa, picked up African slaves there, and dropped them off in the West Indies and the Caribbean. The cycle was completed by bringing raw materials such as tobacco, cotton and sugar back to England. This was the mechanism by which the prosperity of England, and later Britain, increased and by consequence the Empire. This occurred more informally until the establishment of the Royal African Company in 1672 led to monopolistic, hegemonic control of the slave trade. By the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, Britain had transported 3.5 million Africans in terrible conditions into a life of servitude - a third of the total moved across the Atlantic. Drake sketched out two-thirds of this triangular system for the first time. He was on John Hawkins, thought of as England's first slave trader, trip to West Africa and the Americas in 1563 where slaves were obtained. He brought spices and silver back from the Caribbean to England on various expeditions. However, it seems Drake did not bring manufactured goods to West Africa, as many of his journeys focused upon the Caribbean-England side of the triangle. Drake would have more than filled his pockets in the West Indies, giving himself no reason to head across the Atlantic. Drake's genesis of the triangular trade system helped the fledgling British Empire to flourish by creating a steady flow of income and slaves into England, and the Empire. The future of the British Empire was based upon trade and slavery - began, in part, by Sir Francis Drake.

Francis Drake and Queen Elizabeth I

Perhaps Elizabeth I's greatest moment, the defeat of the Spanish Armada, had more far-reaching consequences than simply warding off the possibility of invasion. The reasons for the failure of the enormous fleet, of some 130 ships, 8000 sailors, 18000 soldiers and 2500 brass and iron guns, are varied, including the weather, Spanish incompetence and inferior tactics in comparison to England's naval advantages. Francis Drake inarguably had a major and active role in the victory. Drake was crucial in the "singeing of the King of Spain's beard," where he and a small fleet destroyed around 30 Spanish ships in the Bay of Cadiz (South-West Spain) over April-May 1587. This set the Armada back by over a year, giving England vital time to prepare and improve a navy that was decidedly un-shipshape. Remarkably, when Drake was further disrupting the Spanish off the coast of Portugal, the capture of the ship Sao Filipe had unintended consequences. The ship was full of papers, evidence and documentation of the remunerative trade in the East Indies. This was used to justify the formation of the East India Company - an organisation synonymous with the "second" British Empire and infamous for its role in the imperialistic advance across the Indian subcontinent.

To the defeat of the Armada, Drake's intervention in 1587 was essential - if the development of the Armada had gone on unchecked, the Armada would likely have sailed within months, and, with the English navy still being improved and upgraded, all would have been lost. Drake's vital role in defeating the Armada by extension meant he was important in establishing naval superiority. Although English Naval power really accelerated in the mid-17th century, the success of repelling the Armada led to the dispelling of any serious possibility of England being defeated at, or invaded by, sea. The second and third Armadas of 1596 and 1597 were much more easily resisted, with the 1596 attempt never even reaching the English Channel due to bad weather. The monopoly of Spain in the East Indies began to be questioned, and self-confidence of privateers and traders alike grew and grew. Stemming from the vanquish of the Armada, English naval, and military, power expanded as the British Empire began to spread across the globe. This culminated in the *Pax Britannica* (Latin for "British Peace") of Britain's commonly acknowledged imperial century of 1815-1914, where, virtually invincible at sea, Britain acted as a global law enforcer and had unusually calm relations with Europe after the bloodshed of the Napoleonic wars. Britain's sea power became the foremost advantage of the Empire over the hundreds of years after Drake's death.

The British Empire at its territorial peak in 1921

An important distinction is that the establishment of naval supremacy clearly facilitated the growth of transatlantic trade. Pioneers, explorers and traders began to sail in confidence, knowing they had the best ships, tactics and firepower. Moreover, any serious excursions in Asia, especially India, would have been impossible without maritime strength. Armies would have had to march through Europe and Asia to reach Eastern colonies. Finally, one must be clear that Sir Francis Drake was not a saint. He helped crush the 'dastardly Spaniards' and made our country more successful. However, he was a slave trader and had no qualms about executing difficult colleagues on his voyages. Whatever his disposition, Sir Francis Drake's role in the establishment of the British Empire, and the history of the Empire itself, must be understood. The echoes of our worldwide expansion are felt from Hong Kong to New York, from Zimbabwe to India. We must listen for these.

On Capitalism and Crisis

Cal Baker

"The theory of 'general overproduction' is only an apparition scared up by empty speculation. It is neither theoretically tenable, nor proved by experience. Are we not producing at a fabulous tempo?" ***Emil Lederer, August 1929 (2 months before Wall Street Crash)***

Historians and economists today still fail to agree on exactly what caused the Wall Street Crash of October 1929. Some cite a change in confidence by consumers leading to a rush to sell shares, and others point to overproduction as the main cause of shares dropping in value. Hugh Brogan points out, 'If hindsight fails, how could foresight have succeeded?', and this suggestion seems rational. However, it is this sentiment which I shall criticise in this essay, as while it is true that the Wall Street Crash came very suddenly, Marx eloquently predicted crises of overproduction more than 30 years prior to the Great Depression, and in my opinion, it was the ignorant decisions of Hoover and his cabinet which enabled overproduction to bring the stock market to breaking point.

'Overproduction', or the excess of supply over demand of products offered to the market, was undoubtedly a chief contributor to the economic meltdown of 1929. As the economy boomed throughout the 20s, shares became so inflated that they could never simply be justified by dividends, so shares were merely bought to be sold at a profit; they were bought 'on margin' on the assumption that they could always be sold on. However, due to high overproduction, by the summer of 1929, warehouses became stocked with goods and shareholders began to consider selling their shares. In the case of farmers, having been told to grow as much food as they could in the First World War, they found themselves with more wheat and cotton than they could sell, causing living standards for farmers to plummet. By the Second World War, President Roosevelt was paying farmers not to grow food. As many more shares were being sold, the prices of each share were being driven down and the stock market began to crash. While this explanation shows how rapid

overproduction came to cause the crash, it does not explain why overproduction became such a problem in the first place. In my opinion the answer to this lies in traditional Marxist economic theory which was ignored by the Hoover administration in the seemingly booming economy of the early 20s.

The root of the overproduction problem in 1920s America lies in the disparity between the growth of consumer goods and capital goods. In other words, production and productivity increased while wages and prices remained comparatively stable. In 'Marxist economic theory', Mandel writes that 'The constant reproduction of these conditions of equilibrium [consumer and capital goods] requires a proportional development of the two sectors of production. The periodical occurrence of crises is to be explained only by a periodical break in this proportionality,' suggesting that it is a perfectly natural occurrence in a Capitalist system for crises to emerge as long as the means of production are built up at the expense of consumption. It must be noted, however, that in the 20s wages did rise, but the main benefits of the increase in productivity went to the executives and shareholders in the form of increased profits. In my opinion it was a failure of the Hoover administration to recognise the emerging disparity between the growth of consumer and capital goods, especially considering the appointment of Andrew Mellon, the second richest man in America, as Secretary of the Treasury; a man who 'believed in high tariffs, low taxation… had no time for labour unions, no interest in farmers, no concern for consumers.' Thus it is clear that the Hoover administration had no concern for balancing the aforementioned equilibrium between consumer and capital goods. It therefore seems disingenuous to me to suggest that there was no possibility of the government having the foresight to prevent the Wall Street Crash, and in fact it seems that the actions of the Hoover administration were the cause for overproduction, and thus the subsequent stock market crash.

One must then look to ask why the conditions for overproduction were created if the government knew the dangers of a stock market crash. In Capital Volume 3, published in 1894 – 35 years prior to the Crash – Marx provides an answer which criticises the essence of Capitalism. To Marx, what happens is that 'too great a part of the product is created not for consumption as revenue, but for making more money (accumulation); not to satisfy the personal needs of the owner, but to give them money, abstract social riches and capital, more power over the labour of others'. In other words, commodities are not created for their use, but merely for the accretion of profit. This leads to ignorance by the producers to the demand of the market, and thus overproduction of certain commodities. Therefore, rather than being blameless in the Crash of 1929 as suggested by Brogan at the start of the essay, the government committed a basic error predicted by Marx 35 years earlier; they ignored the equilibrium between consumer and capital goods, and were greedy allowing the overproducing of commodities, which led to the eventual stock market crash in October 1929.

To conclude, the Wall Street Crash was undoubtedly caused by a myriad of factors, but this cannot excuse the mismanagement of the economy by the Hoover administration and its refusal to acknowledge problems identified decades earlier by Marxist economic theory. If we remove responsibility for the Wall Street Crash from the economic theory that caused it, then we miss an opportunity to avoid future catastrophes, and nothing can be learned from the history of the last 100 years. Worryingly, Marx's critique of Capitalism seems as prophetic now as it ever did after the Global Financial Crisis of 2008. Therefore, I shall end with a proposition: through analysing the history of Capitalism and crisis, we should learn that in the coming years we must bring issues of low wages and workers' rights to the fore - not just to prevent further economic crises, but also to ensure a fairer world for future generations. "If humanity is to have a recognisable future, it cannot be by prolonging the past or the present. If we try to build the third millennium on that basis, we shall fail. And the price of failure, the alternative to a changed society, is darkness." ***Eric Hobsbawm, 'Age of Extremes'***

Nazism and the Power of the Media

Grace Tarpey

In 1920, the year before Hitler became leader of the Nazi Party, membership just reached 2000 people. In the 1932 election, nearly 12 million people voted for them, granting them 196 seats in the Reichstag. In 1939, all other parties had been banned, Hitler could do basically what ever he wanted, his opponents, both social and political, were locked up in labour camps and subjected to terrible conditions, and Jews were being ruthlessly murdered by his personal army. Clearly it took not only a masterful control of propaganda, but also help from external media to allow the Nazis to rise to power and then sustain that power once that they had it.

One event that certainly helped to catapult the Nazis into the limelight was the Munich Putsch, where Hitler and the Nazis marched on Munich in attempt to overthrow the Bavarian government. While they were ultimately unsuccessful in regards to the original goal,

their trials and the publication of Mein Kampf once Hitler was released from prison enlarged the reach of the Nazi message considerably.

The media coverage surrounding Hitler's trial was huge, with newspapers quoting his defence at length. This gave Hitler the opportunity he needed to reach a very large audience with his political message, and this gained the Nazis many more supporters. Of course, it didn't hurt that the judges were fairly biased in his direction to begin with, but his incredible prowess in orating did help to convince not only the court, but also the nation, that his intentions of overthrowing the government were in fact honourable, and it was the politicians who were the traitors, arguing that "there is no such thing as high treason against the traitors of 1918." There is no doubt about the fact that if the trial hadn't got so much coverage by the press, and the judges were not so biased in Hitler's favour, the party would not have gained the momentum it needed to be taken seriously as a political party – or at least not until much later. The publication of Mein Kampf only served to cement this; it was just another opportunity to convince the German populace that his ideas were what truly were best for the country.

Much of the propaganda from the Nazis, portrayed Hitler as a dignified "country gentleman". Photos of his supposed private life showed him smiling at children, talking amongst peers, and admiring the scenery from his beautiful mountain country home. This, coupled with the impassioned speeches he made to rapt crowds convinced Germany, and indeed the rest of the world, that Hitler was a morally upstanding man who was passionate about his country. Furthermore, the reporting of Nazi activities from within the Nazi party was tailored to fit a very specific narrative- one of almost constant successes. The *Völkischer Beobachter,* the Nazi party's newspaper, reported these so-called successes, such as the Nazis' "Struggle for Harburg", in which Nazi speaker Elsbeth Zander drums up support amongst the residents of the city, and used them to show the strength and capabilities of the Nazi party. Propaganda in the 1920s and early 1930s certainly worked to convince people to join the party – both speeches from Hitler himself, and articles from the likes of Joseph Goebbels worked to reinforce and normalise views of antisemitism and anger towards the Weimar government that many people already held, and the tales of constant successes made the party look dependable in the face of a crumbing democracy. Furthermore, even those with less extreme right-wing ideals saw Hitler as a charming conservative gentleman, attracting them towards the party.

The propaganda that the Nazis were pumping out was not only eaten up by the German people, but by the press abroad as well. In the 1930s, he became well known across the western world not for his violent antisemitism and authoritarian regime, but for his love of animals, architecture, and tasteful home décor. Only twelve days before the second world war started, the New York Times published an article describing the day-to-day life of Hitler in his mountain chalet which described its "atmosphere of quiet cheerfulness" and goes on to tell its readers of Hitler's tomato garden and his fondness for chocolate. An article from the British Homes and Gardens magazine published in 1938 similarly neglects to recognise the more deplorable aspects of Adolf Hitler's life in favour of focussing on his classily decorated home. While these, and the many other profiles of a similar nature, most likely did little for Hitler in Germany, they did help to normalise what was happening in Germany for the general population of the other countries, and no doubt encouraged the Nazi movement there.

Once the Nazis did gain control of Germany in 1933, they used newspapers and radio (as well as other forms of propaganda) in particularly masterful ways. Goebbels, the minister for propaganda, quickly moved to take control of the newspapers, limiting their publication to only that which fit the Nazis' narrative. In October 1933, a law was passed that stated all newspapers must be "racially clean" - meaning that Jewish journalists and editors were fired, and Jewish newspaper owners could no longer publish their papers. This allowed the Nazis to make their anti-Semitic message unavoidable. That being said, most Germans would already be fairly susceptible to what the Nazis had to say, as Jewish people were commonly scapegoated for the country's problems. The newspapers that the Nazis took over combined with Nazi newspapers that existed prior to 1933, such as the previously mentioned *Völkischer Beobachter,* were published all over Germany and told the people of the various successes that the Nazis encountered and omitting the news that was not so good. In this way, the Nazis were able to keep the support for the party up, portraying themselves as a much better government than the previous one. The censorship and control of all media was an essential tactic in maintaining control of the population, as it allowed no room for alternative ideas or rebellion and left those who were in support of the Nazis confident that the party was doing good for Germany.

To conclude, media coverage of the Nazi party, and indeed any political party, was essential in allowing it to grow to the size it did, and become recognised as a serious political contender, as opposed to a radical fringe party. Furthermore, the control of the newspapers post-1933 allowed the Nazis to masterfully

control the population and suffocate ideas that did not fit with the Nazis' message.

Medical Treatment and World War 1

Ben Arundel

The First World War was a stepping stone for medical advancements. The benefits of the War have proved useful for us now and especially in WW2. You could say that if we didn't have the wars we wouldn't have discovered mental illnesses like PTSD. In this essay, I will be giving an explanation of medicine before the 20th century and then talking about surgery, jobs on the front line, technological advancements and finally how it has helped us today.

In the mid-1800s a revolution of medical related breakthroughs happened. In 1861 Louis Pasteur proved the germ theory and, building on his work, people like Robert Koch discovered the bacteria which caused other diseases. The development of anaesthetics such as chloroform, which was discovered by James Simpson in 1847 and antiseptics, which were pioneered by Joseph Lister in 1865, improved the first success rate of surgery and then after 1860 the work of Florence Nightingale began to improve the standards of nursing in Britain. This was interesting as she was a supporter of the miasma theory- this was based on the fact that diseases like cholera and the plague were spread by bad smells. She did not subscribe to Pasteur's new germ theory. So by the end of the century surgery was rapidly improving and that was without the pressure of the war.

The war was a hard time for surgeons but the constant transformation in medical technology made operating a lot easier. On the western front blood loss was a very common pairing with injuries like being shot in the arm or losing a leg by a shell, so when Captain Oswald Robertson—US army doctor—made the first blood bank in 1917 on the western front, life-saving was made a lot easier. Using sodium citrate to prevent the blood from coagulating and becoming unusable, the blood was able to be stored for a lot longer. It was kept on ice for up to 28 days and then transported to casualty clearing stations- which I'll later explain- for use in life saving surgery, where it was needed most. Another asset to the front line was the invention called the Thomas Splint, named after the pioneering Welsh surgeon Hugh Owen Thomas, which secured a broken leg. The statistics show the impact that splints had- at the start of the war 80% of soldiers with a broken femur died but by 1916, 80% of soldiers with this injury survived. Along with this, the patient needed to get to the CCS as fast as possible, meaning that speed o the of surgery was crucial. From January 1915, British military medical machines, moved closer to the front line. Casualty clearing stations were now better equipped and crucially more surgeons were closer to the battlefield. Soldiers with fatal wounds were more likely to survive, due to the revolution of medicine on the western front. In order for soldiers to be able to survive, it was vital for the medics to be able to get them to the hospitals or CCS on time. Therefore when hospitals were bought closer to the front, you were more likely to be treated quicker, than if you were going to a hospital 2 miles away.

To conclude, over 100 years of medical research, pre-war, after, and now has had a massive impact on today. The pressure of the war caused a race for the best and most efficient resources; there was a constant need for everything to be better and the war helped with that. Over the period of war, surgeons had to adapt and improvise to keep patients alive, the discovery of blood types made blood transfusions a lot easier, having stretcher bearers decreased the time in which a soldier could get to a hospital, making all the difference between life and death. As a result of World War One medical treatment improved rapidly and it has helped us now, due to the constant pressure the war emitted on surgeons and technology.

World War One—A Medical Revolution?

Jack Parsons-Munn

During the Victorian period, medical standards in the British Army had been consistently improving. In the late 1850s and early 1860s greater attention was paid to sanitation, personal hygiene and diet. The results were impressive: in British garrisons stationed at home, the death rate fell from 17.5 per 1,000 in 1857, to 4.3 by 1899; as did the number of soldiers going to hospital—from 105 per 1,000 in 1860 to 67 per 1,000 by the end of the century, demonstrating that the medical improvements of the First World War were part of a longer period of medical advances in the British Army. As historian Mark Harrison said, "By the time war broke out in 1914, the status of medicine within the British Army was higher than that at any time previously. By 1916, the British Expeditionary Force was already proud of its achievements in medicine and hygiene. Troops about to go up the line were reminded that the Army enjoyed a state of health unprecedented in any previous conflict and that it was their duty to see that this continued." As this quote suggests however, the First World War was a motivator for significant medical improvements; as well as part of a longer process.

The First World War was the world's first industrialised war. As The Times remarked in its History of the War (1921), industrialised warfare created a new situation in which the ratio of men killed to those wounded had reduced significantly – the proportion of injured men having increased. It was therefore essential to provide medical attention to this increased number of wounded men and quickly return them to the front line. It was a method of recycling the men that we had available.

During the 19th century, blood transfusions had been largely unsuccessful due to the lack of understanding about blood compatibility. Prior to the war, in 1902 Karl Landsteiner had discovered the four main blood groups (O, A, B and AB). This paved the way for more successful treatments, and was to be essential for the treatment of soldiers in the First World War. The industrial nature of this warfare meant that casualties were presented at Casualty Clearing Stations (CCS), suffering from significant blood loss and shock. The ability to maintain artillery barrages, to kill men in their hundreds with machine guns and the improvement in accuracy and reliability of rifles made soldiers much more vulnerable to injuries. Many soldiers suffering from blood loss and shock died. It was not until 1917 however that Lawrence Bruce Robertson discovered that shock was primarily caused by extensive blood loss. This discovery meant that blood transfusions became a routine procedure in CCSs. Its introduction resulted in a major increase in survival rates.

There was, however, a problem with the supply and storage of the much needed blood. Landsteiner made it possible for blood to be transfused, however, until 1917, blood could not be stored: instead, a live donor had to be on hand. This proved to be impractical when thousands of soldiers required transfusions after major offensives such as at the Battle of the Somme in 1916. Throughout the First World War, scientists were desperately searching for an effective method of blood storage. In 1916 it was found that adding citrate-glucose solution to the blood enabled it to be stored for up to one month. Indeed, the impact that this had was demonstrated at the Battle of Cambrai in 1917, where Oswald Robertson successfully treated men in shock with this now, readily available blood.

The death rate from fractures was high. At the peak of the war, the mortality rate – particularly those of the femur – was 80%. It was therefore vital that a suitable and effective technique was found to reduce the death toll. One of the most important medical advances still used in warzones today was the Thomas Splint. In the 19th century, Robert Jones and his uncle Hugh Thomas invented a splint which kept the leg rigid. During the war, Robert Jones worked in a disabled soldiers' hospital in London, using his invention on his patients. His work was recognised, and so in December 1915, he was sent to Boulogne to instruct medics on how to use it. He revolutionised the way in which injured men were treated, stabilising fractures and thus preventing infection. By 1918, mortality rates from fractures had fallen from 80% to 20%.

Again, the industrialised nature of this warfare meant that men were vulnerable to flying shrapnel, bullets and other metal objects. It was essential to locate and (if possible) remove debris if men were to survive. X-rays had been developed in 1885, and they were essential for locating shrapnel etc. They improved surgical accuracy in turn, increasing survival rates. However, the machines were not without their faults. Tubes would regularly overheat, meaning that the machine could no longer be used until they had cooled down. Methods such as recycling the tubes to maintain safe temperatures allowed the machines to be used at a more constant rate, however although an improvement, it proved to be inefficient during major offensives. Indeed, an American (William Coolidge) had developed a more advanced version of the tubes in 1913, which did not overheat as easily, but they did not become available to the RAMC until 1917.

In conclusion, the First World War was not in itself responsible for these medical developments. These treatments were already in existence. However, the specific challenges that industrialised warfare posed and the need for combatant nations to maintain their respective man powers, meant that there was a need for the acceleration in treatment. Indeed, without the First World War, these advances would eventually have come about, but much more slowly.

The Significance of the NHS—Then and Now

Evie Scott

In Britain, the 20th century saw rapid change in the treatment of illness as class gaps closed post-war and the government began to intervene in public health. Change in the treatment of illness came with the removal of three major problems during surgery- pain, blood loss, and infection- due to medical breakthroughs like the mass-production of

penicillin during WW2 and the development of hospital care in the 1960s using tax money. These changes allowed for more complex procedures (e.g. keyhole surgery and organ transplants) to be performed on more people. However, these developments in science and technology could not have been as widely implemented if not for the support and intervention of the government.

This came in the form of changing public healthcare. The losses of the world wars lead to a closing of class gaps in Britain and a new focus on unity and society, meant that the government's previous laissez-faire (literally 'let do') attitude had dissolved and their role in healthcare became about active and efficient help. Earlier hospitals were places of rest for those who couldn't afford to pay for efficient medical care; but the aforementioned scientific advancements and changes in attitudes meant that the nature of hospitals developed a focus on treatment and cures. This provoked the creation of free healthcare in 1948 with the NHS.

As the largest government intervention in public heath, the formation of the NHS undertook all aspects of public health through scientific advancements, increased funding, and increased focus on curing and prevention- i.e. through social work and vaccination programmes. The NHS provided systemised health care for everyone and changed treatments because it made them accessible, efficient, and effective for all: regardless of class and income.

Free healthcare provides a gateway for the widespread application of medical science; its ethos of providing efficient and effective care for the betterment of society remains, but the landscape in which it operates has changed: so, with growing populations and increasing political pressures, is the NHS still a viable option in dealing with public health?