

1 Medicine Through Time

1.3: Prehistoric times

Exam practice (page 16)

1. Briefly describe the methods used by people in prehistoric times to treat illness. [5]

1. Prehistoric people used mainly common sense methods to treat day to day illness. They would make wooden splints for broken bones or use mud to stop those bones from moving. Herbs were a very important part of their treatments and they used many different herbs, which grew near to where they lived, to treat illness. An example of this is willow, which they probably used as a painkiller. If an illness did not improve then they would use supernatural methods because they believed that the loss of a spirit could make people ill. The supernatural treatments they used included using chanting to make a bad spirit leave a body or, as a last resort, trephining, which meant cutting the head open to let out the evil spirit.

1.4: Ancient Egypt

Exam practice (page 21)

1. Briefly describe the main features of Egyptian medicine. [5]

2. Briefly describe how the Egyptians tried to stay healthy. [5]

3. Explain how factors outside medicine helped the Egyptians make progress in medicine.

1. Egyptian medicine used common sense and herbal remedies, such as honey, as an antiseptic. They also believed in supernatural cures and would go to the temples to be healed or to make offerings to the gods if they could not get better. Doctors were also priests and so medical care was closely connected to the gods. They believed that Gods, such as Sekhmet, sent epidemics or Gods, such as Bes, looked after pregnant women. Egyptians believed that the body was like the River Nile and that illness was caused by blockages in channels in the body. They learnt about the inside of bodies because they embalmed bodies both to prepare them for the afterlife and to prevent them from rotting.

2. The Egyptians used charms to protect from evil spirits, they would purge themselves if they were ill to try to unblock their channels. They kept themselves clean as well, shaving their bodies and washing their eating and drinking utensils. They also took other precautions, like using toilets, or sleeping under mosquito nets.

3. Egypt was one of the first places where not everyone needed to hunt in order to survive. This meant that people could be otherwise employed as priests and doctors to look after the sick. Religion was very important to medicine and many doctors were also priests. Embalming bodies helped them to find out more about anatomy. Skilled craftsmen could also produce new tools and equipment, which doctors could use to carry out operations.

Communication was a vital factor for progress. The development of a written language, pens and papyrus meant that the Egyptians could record their treatments and the discoveries they made about the body. This meant that ideas spread to other doctors in Egypt. Trade with other countries meant that these ideas spread further and the arrival of different herbs into Egypt also helped the progression of medicine.

1.5 Ancient Greece

Exam practice (page 25)

1. Briefly describe the work of Hippocrates. [5]
2. Explain why the Greeks were able to make so much progress in medicine. [7]
3. Explain why the Greeks used both natural and supernatural approaches to medicine. [7]

1. Hippocrates is called the Father of Medicine. He was a Greek doctor who developed the Theory of the Four Humours, which was the idea that humours in the body (blood, phlegm, yellow bile and black bile) had to balance. Hippocrates used clinical observation, which meant observing the patients and writing the treatments and symptoms down, and he wrote many of his ideas down in books. His followers built on these works which are called the Hippocratic Collection, which were the basis of medical education until the Renaissance.

2. The Greeks were able to make so much progress because of the idea of clinical observation. This meant that doctors made a detailed record of what their patients' symptoms were, which treatments they had used and how effective the treatment was. By sharing these ideas doctors could get to effective cures more quickly.

The Greeks also had Alexandria which was a centre of learning and education for doctors who were very important to Greek medicine. The Hippocratic Collection was held there and doctors could train using these works.

3. The Greeks used both natural approaches to medicine, such as the four humours, and supernatural ones, such as their belief in the god Asclepius.

They were able to use both methods at the same time because they believed that they were both important parts of life.

The Greeks would go to an Asclepion if they were ill. There, they would rest, eat carefully, exercise and sleep, all of which are treatments that we know to be very effective.

Meanwhile they believed that the god would make them better. The two approaches can therefore coexist.

Hippocrates' Four Humours were at the core of natural approaches. Treatments focused on the whole body, diet, exercise and lifestyle. However, although these treatments could be very effective, we now know the theory of the Four Humours to be incorrect and therefore other treatments, such as bleeding, were of little use. Neither supernatural nor natural approaches were one hundred per cent effective and so the Greeks used a combination of the two as treatment.

1.6 Ancient Rome

Exam practice (page 29)

1. Explain why Galen is important in the history of medicine. [7]
2. 'The Romans are more important than the Greeks in the history of medicine.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

1. The main reason why the Greek doctor in Rome, Claudius Galen, was so important was his work on anatomy. He wrote books about how the body worked based on his dissection of animals especially pigs. He also wrote about the theory of opposites, which built on Hippocrates' Four Humours. These books were backed by the Catholic Church as they fitted into their idea of man at the centre of the universe. This meant that Galen's books were used in medical training until the Renaissance.

2. The Greeks were important because they developed natural ideas about illness, such as the Four Humours. These ideas were written down in books which were used in medical training until the Renaissance. This meant that the ideas of Greek doctors were very influential for a long time. Hippocrates' idea of clinical observation and his Oath are still used today because noting down symptoms and treatments is a very effective way of finding treatments that work. Additionally, if a doctor's examination is confidential, people are more likely to be honest about their symptoms.

The Romans were important in the history of medicine mainly because of public health. They came up with the idea of bad air and tried to prevent disease by eliminating bad smells. They did this by providing clean water and removing waste through aqueducts and sewers. The idea of bad air was used and developed into the theory of miasma, which was later replaced by the Germ Theory in the 19th century. However, after the collapse of the Empire, standards of public health did not meet Roman standards until the beginning of the 20th century.

In conclusion I believe that the Greeks are more important. Roman practical ideas about public health did not last beyond the collapse of the Empire and, although their theories of bad air did and were used until the 19th century, Greek theories of natural medicine, for example the Four Humours, were popular until the Renaissance and formed the basis of medical training for many years. Some are still in use today.

1.7 The Middle Ages (1): The impact of war and religion

Exam practice (page 33)

1. Explain why religious beliefs were used to explain illness in the Middle Ages. [7]

1. Religion was the most important factor in life during the Middle Ages. The Church controlled most aspects of life and therefore Religious beliefs were incorporated into medical theories and treatments.

Most people went to church and it was the centre of their lives. They could not explain many natural phenomena and they used God and religion to do so. Therefore when terrible diseases, such as the plague, came to England, people believed it had come as a punishment from God and the Church supported this view as well.

Additionally, the Church controlled the training of doctors after 1100. Leaders of the Church believed that the work of Hippocrates and Galen supported the Christian view of the world and therefore translations of their works were taught in universities, on the Church's orders. The books had been translated by monks and so they had a religious slant and fitted in with that which the church taught.

The Church provided hospitals in monasteries. It was a religious duty to care for the sick and people would go to their infirmaries if they could not be treated at home.

Case study: The Black Death in England (page 35)**1. Study Source A. What does it tell you about what people in the Middle Ages believed about the Black Death? [6]**

1. This source tells me much about what people believed about the Black Death. Firstly it shows that they believed that the disease was spread through clothing because they are burning clothes in the picture. This means that they must have thought that the Roman idea of bad air was what was making their friends and family die and so they thought that if they burnt the clothes it would break up the bad air.

It also shows that they must have been very afraid of the Black Death. Poor people could not afford many clothes in the Middle Ages and so it would be a big sacrifice to burn clothes rather than pass them onto someone who was alive.

1.8 The Middle Ages (2): Surgery, living conditions and caring for the ill**Case study: Public health in the Middle Ages (page 39)****1. Does Source A prove that people in the Middle Ages believed in natural causes of disease? [9]**

1. Source A proves that people believed in natural causes of disease because the King is ordering the mayor to clean up the town. By ordering a clean-up, we can see he believed that the disease was spread through bad air, a natural cause. We also know that people burned the clothes of the people who had died of the Black Death, which tells us that many people thought that the disease had a natural cause.

However, if you look at other sources, for example Source B, you can see that, although people like the King believed in natural causes, they also thought that the plague had a religious cause as they are looking to be blessed by a priest in order to get rid of the Black Death. We know that other people, known as flagellants, beat themselves during the plague. They did this because they believed that if they had punished themselves, God did not need to do so by giving them the Black Death. This shows us that many people did not believe that the Black Death had a natural cause.

Exam practice (page 40)

- 1. Briefly describe the part played by monasteries in medicine in the Middle Ages. [5]**
- 2. 'Religion had more impact than government did on medicine in the Middle Ages.' How far do you agree with this statement? [8]**

1. Monasteries provided medical care for their monks and for the people who lived near them during the Middle Ages. It was a religious duty to care for the sick and patients would come to the monastery's infirmary when they could not be treated at home. Monasteries also tended to have good sanitation, which helped to stop diseases spreading. However, the monks often looked after their own people and, when diseases like the Black Death came, monks would not treat people who they thought would spread the Black Death by infecting the air.

2. Religion had a great effect on medicine in the Middle Ages; the Church trained doctors, cared for the sick and translated the books that doctors used to treat their patients. People

believed that diseases came from God and would use the Church for help if they were ill and needed help. The church sometimes held back medical progress as well. Because of the belief in afterlife, dissection was forbidden. This meant that the incorrect ideas of Galen were able to survive.

Government did not have the same effect on medicine in the Middle Ages. The Kings and mayors were religious themselves and, on the whole, believed the same as their subjects. They did, however, have some impact and that which they did do may have had a greater impact upon the Black Death than the Church's actions. Kings and mayors worked to clean up towns like London after the Black Death to try to stop such an outbreak from spreading. This was because they believed in bad air and so they wanted to make a clean environment in order to prevent disease. As a result of government orders, London was cleaner after the plague. This meant fewer rats and, as a result, a reduced risk of the plague. Local governments often set up courts (like the Assize of Nuisance) which dealt with complaints about hygiene and sanitation.

Therefore, the Church did have more impact on the day to day treatment and support of people in the Middle Ages. However, it was the government who did more during the Black Death to make effective improvements, unlike the Church who stopped treating victims in monasteries and taught that the plague was from God, neither of which would have been very effective.

1.9 The medical Renaissance

Exam practice (page 44)

1. Explain why Harvey is important in the history of medicine. [7]
2. Explain why Paré was able to make advances in medicine. [7]
3. 'Vesalius is more important than Harvey in the history of medicine.' How far do you agree with this statement? [8]

1. Harvey is important in the history of medicine because he proved that the heart was a pump.

This is important for two reasons. Firstly, he proved his theory with experiments, which meant that he was able to argue and to show that he was correct. He got detailed diagrams drawn of his experiments which he published in a book, which was designed to help train doctors.

Secondly, this showed that there was a finite amount of blood in the body and that it was not made. Therefore, people could not have too much or too little blood which disproved the theory of the Four Humours. However, this did not prevent the use of blood letting as a treatment, so his importance was limited.

2. Paré was able to make his advances because he was an individual genius who was happy to experiment and to take risks. When he ran out of oil, he realised that he had to do something and remembered that the Romans had used ointments to treat similar wounds. He therefore used his own ointment, which took nerve and confidence in his ability. This is evident by his relief the next day when his patients were improving.

The Renaissance helped with this too because Paré was working at a time when many other people like Vesalius were taking a risk and challenging old ideas; this meant that Paré was not alone.

Additionally, it was wartime so there were people who needed these sorts of treatments and he could prove that his theories worked on real people.

3. Vesalius was important in the history of medicine because he proved Galen wrong in his work on anatomy. He did this by dissecting humans, observing what he saw, making detailed diagrams and publishing his work in a book. This meant that for the first time the work of ancient doctors, like Galen, was proved wrong and that the Church had to accept that their other ideas may not be correct.

Harvey was important because he proved that the heart was a pump. He did this by experimenting on people, making careful drawings and teaching other doctors about his findings. When people knew that the heart was a pump they finally had to agree that the theory of the Four Humours could not work because blood was not made but pumped around the body and so there could not be too much blood.

It is difficult to say which is more important in the history of medicine. At the time, both Vesalius and Harvey made little impact on the day to day treatment of illness and it took time for their ideas to be accepted. In the long term, I think that it was Vesalius who is the more important because it was he who started people thinking that the ancient ideas were not always correct by proving Galen wrong. Harvey built on this and was able to prove it by experimenting.

Case study: Quack doctors (page 47)

1. Which source is more useful for finding out about the reputation of quack doctors, Source A or Source B? [8]

1. Source A is useful because it shows us that people ridiculed quack doctors. It is from a folk play and folk plays were made to make fun of people. It shows the mad claims that quacks made. For example, for a lot of money he would cure a dead person or would pull eleven pins out of someone who only had nine pins in the first place.

Source B is useful because it reiterates the fact that people did not think highly of quacks. It emphasises that quacks were only in it for the money and that their remedies were useless.

Both sources are useful because they show the general attitudes of people at the time towards quack doctors by making fun of them and making them out to be terrible money grabbers. However, neither sources provide information about the sorts of cures quacks really offered or why people actually used them and we know that many people did use quacks either because they were cheaper or because their treatments worked.

Overall, Source A is more useful because it is not written by a doctor and so shows what ordinary people thought about quack doctors. We know that doctors did not like quacks because ordinary people would visit quack doctors, who were cheaper than an ordinary doctor, and so Source B, being written by someone who has lost out on business because of a quack, is not as useful or as reliable as it could be.

Case study: Inoculation, Jenner and the development of vaccination (page 49)

1. How similar are Sources A and B as evidence of the success of vaccination? [9]

1. Source A and B are similar because they both say how wonderful the smallpox vaccination is. Source A says that Jenner felt it was a bit like having a dream come true and Source B raves about Jenner saying that he has virtually saved the world because of the discovery of the smallpox vaccine.

They differ because they are talking about different times; I think that in Source A, Jenner is talking about the original discovery and the work that he did with James Phipps. He talks about destiny and is looking ahead, therefore it is different from Source B because it shows that Jenner knew what effects his vaccination would have before it had even happened whereas Thomas Jefferson knows what has happened: the vaccination has been approved and used in Britain and the US and so he knows that it has been successful. He knows that Jenner and the vaccine are great based on proof while Jenner shows that he is clever enough to predict the benefits of the vaccine before it has been approved.

1.11 Fighting disease in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries**Case study: The development of penicillin (page 55)****1. Are you surprised by Source A? [9]**

1. I am not surprised by Source A because I know that most people think that Fleming was the person who discovered penicillin and that Florey is less well known. The Fleming Myth that was started by the media in 1942 meant that this has always been the case and this is what Florey is talking about in Source A. This is backed up by Source B, which shows that people must have really glorified Fleming because they have put his image in a church.

On the other hand, I am surprised by Source A because I know that Fleming realised that he was not the only one who deserved praise and said so to other doctors. Also, Florey, Chain and Fleming received the Nobel Prize in 1945 so it cannot just have been Fleming who was considered as the person who was responsible for penicillin.

Case study: The development of hospitals (page 57)**1. How useful is Source A for finding out about Mary Seacole's contribution to improving hospitals in the 19th century? [8]**

1. If we are looking at Seacole's contribution to improving hospitals then Source A does coincide with what I know about Seacole's methods of caring. It shows that Mary Seacole was hands-on and looked after patients' overall well-being, by making sure that they were fed and had comforts, such as alcohol and cigars. This could be misinterpreted by people, such as Nightingale, and this source shows that she was not the sort of person that Nightingale wanted for her nurses and so it is useful in this sense.

I know that Nightingale was famed as the person who improved hospitals in the 19th century and, as such, this source is useful. It tells us the sort of person that Nightingale wanted nurses to be; people who would concern themselves with proper conduct and not necessarily be kind in order to uphold this. However, the source is of limited use because I know that Nightingale wrote this in a letter to her brother-in-law. She might have been resentful of the fact that Seacole was still trying to pursue a career in nursing, in spite of having previously rejected her offers of help. This might make the source unreliable.

Exam practice (page 58)

- 1. Briefly describe the career of Mary Seacole. [5]**
- 2. 'The work of Fleming was the most important factor in the development of penicillin.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [8]**

1. Mary Seacole was born in Jamaica. She worked with her mother, who was a healer, and helped to care for people during a cholera epidemic in Kingston. When she heard about the conditions in the Crimea in 1854 from the Times she realised that her experience of cholera nursing in similar conditions could help. She came to England to try to nurse with Florence Nightingale but was turned down. In the end she funded her trip to the Crimea where she founded the British Hotel, where soldiers could go for help and treatment. She charged for these services in order to provide more active care to soldiers who really needed it. She went onto the battlefield and treated soldiers there. After the end of the war she returned to England but did not manage to carry on her nursing. She went bankrupt and was supported by the Times newspaper and Punch magazine.

2. Fleming was very important in the development of penicillin; he re-discovered it because he was working on substances to kill germs and he left them out, by accident he left some germs and mould flew in the window and killed them. This was penicillium. Fleming kept this sample and wrote about it in a scientific paper. He could not make it into a pure drug and moved on to study different things. Other individuals, especially Howard Florey and Ernst Chain, developed the mould and made it into a pure drug. Heatley managed to turn the drug into a liquid which could then be mass produced until there was enough of the drug to treat over a million soldiers at D-Day.

Other factors were important as well. Florey needed money so that the drug could be mass produced. No-one in England was prepared to fund the development during the Second World War so he went to the US government, who funded the development of the drug. This was because they could see its benefits on soldiers who were injured in the war, into which they had just entered.

Therefore, I think that many factors were important in the development of penicillin, but probably the most important factor was a government that was prepared to fund the development in a time of war.

1.12 Surgery in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries**Case study: Developments in anaesthetics and antiseptics (page 61)****1. Why was Source A published in the 1870s? [8]**

1. Source A is called Operation Madness; it was published in 1870 because operations were getting worse then. We know that this is because anaesthetics had been introduced in the 1850s and we can see that the patient in the picture is under anaesthetic. The source shows the progress of the patients from the ward, to the operating table and then into the coffins. The message is that operations are more dangerous despite the introduction of anaesthetics. After the introduction of anaesthetics, death rates from operations went up. This was because sometimes people were given too much chloroform but mainly because surgeons did more complicated operations, which meant that the other two problems of infection and bleeding worsened and often more patients died. We can see from Source B

that, even after the introduction of carbolic acid in the 1860s, deaths caused by infection did not go down.

Source A was published to tell people that something had to be done about operations because so many people were dying as a result.

Exam practice (page 63)

1. Explain how war has led to changes in medicine. [7]
2. Explain the problem of bleeding during surgery was overcome. [7]
3. 'Simpson is more important than Lister in the history of medicine.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

1. War is one of the most important factors in the development of medicine. This is owing to many different factors.

It is mainly because war means that soldiers need to be kept healthy and so governments invest more money into finding ways to do this.

In Roman times war led to changes because armies needed to be kept healthy and the idea of bad air was devised by the army to make sure that the soldiers did not get ill. They never camped near to marshes that smelt bad. When this worked, the idea was spread to towns and cities in the Empire.

Individuals, during war, often had to make changes under pressure in an emergency situation. This is true of Paré, who ran out of oil and so had to change the way in which he treated gunshot wounds with the materials that he had readily available.

Perhaps the best example is penicillin – Fleming discovered penicillin and later on Florey and Chain began to develop it. It was only after the Americans joined the war and Florey and Chain went to the US that funding was received to help mass produce the drug. This probably would not have happened if the government had not needed to keep the soldiers healthy so that they could win the war; they saw that penicillin could do this.

2. Blood loss was a huge problem with surgery in the 18th and 19th century. Amputations were very common and the methods that the surgeons used meant that lots of blood was lost during operations.

It was not until Karl Landsteiner discovered blood groups in 1901 that surgeons were able to transfuse blood to patients who had lost blood during operations. Landsteiner had discovered that if blood of the same group was transfused it would not clot and kill the patient so blood groups were checked and used carefully. Blood loss was very important during the First and Second World Wars because soldiers needed blood transfusions for their war injuries. The need for blood during the wars led to the development of effective methods of storing blood so that it could be kept for emergencies.

As anaesthetics had been developed surgeons could take their time to develop more careful procedures like ligatures to reduce blood loss.

3. Simpson was important in the history of medicine because he discovered anaesthetics. This meant that people could be put to sleep during operations and so did not suffer the pain. Anaesthetics allowed surgeons to carry out more complicated operations more slowly

and carefully as the patient was still and safe. However, Simpson did not reduce death rates from surgery immediately as there were problems with chloroform, in its dosage and application and also because more complicated operations led to more infection.

Lister was important in the history of medicine because he developed antiseptics. He realised that wounds were becoming infected and used a treatment for sewage – carbolic acid - to spray on wounds, on bandages and on the people carrying out the operations and the tools used. This led to a dramatic drop in deaths after surgery as more and more people realised its effectiveness and used it.

Simpson and Lister were equally important. Pain and infection were both killers in the early 19th century and both men worked hard to develop treatments for them. In fact they both needed each other. Simpson's development did not bring the death rate down until Lister had discovered antiseptics, but just curing infection would not have improved operations without people being asleep during them.

1.13 Public health in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

Case study: The development of public health systems in the nineteenth century (page 66)

1. Why was Source A published in the 1860s? [8]

1. Source A was published to show that water contained many substances that were likely to cause illness, particularly cholera. It was published because by 1854, as is shown in Source B, John Snow had proved that cholera was spread in water and now the person who made the source is trying to persuade people to listen to what Snow was saying and clean up the water.

This had to happen in the 1850s because many people believed in miasma, which is the idea that illness was spread by gases in the air, and so did not listen to what Snow and his supporters were saying about cleaning the water supply.

Exam practice (page 69)

1. Describe how industrialisation affected the health of people in Britain. [5]
2. Explain why the Liberal government of 1906 introduced measures to help the poor. [7]
3. 'The main reason why public health was improved in the nineteenth century was because the working classes got the vote.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [8]

1. Industrialisation or the movement of people to towns to work in the new factories in the 19th century affected people's health in many ways. The most important of these was living conditions. Living conditions changed dramatically as many people moved to towns to get jobs in the factories. Houses were built quickly to accommodate them and many people shared one house. Along with this, the old cess pits that had been used to take away human waste could not cope with the many more people using them. In these conditions diseases spread; typhus, typhoid and cholera spread among healthy people and caused deaths. At the same time, diseases like diphtheria, tetanus and tuberculosis hit people who lived in damp, crowded conditions.

2. The government in 1906 introduced many changes including unemployment pay and sick pay, as well as other measures, to help the young, old and workers in Britain.

There were many reasons why they were introduced. In 1901 two thirds of the volunteers for the army were not fit to fight. Britain needed a strong fighting force to defend itself. The Labour Party, supported by the Trade Unions, was growing stronger and was calling for improved conditions for working people. The Liberals needed working people's votes to get into power. Many politicians believed that reforms and support for the poor was the right thing to do to improve the lives of the people of Britain. Seebohm Rowntree's study of poverty in the early 1900s had alerted politicians to the widespread nature of the problem.

3. In 1867 working people got the vote, which meant that governments had to listen to what they wanted to change or they would not vote for them. Conditions in towns were very bad and working people lived in them, therefore, as they had the vote, politicians had to be seen to be doing something to stop the spread of diseases, such as cholera. They did so by introducing the Public Health Act in 1875, which effectively cleaned up towns and cities.

At the same time, these diseases had not just killed poor people, rich tax payers had died as well or seen members of their families suffer; they realised that they had to do something to change conditions and to stop the spread of disease and so they were prepared to support and to pay for improved conditions.

By 1875 people had come to realise where diseases like cholera really came from. Snow's work on the Broad Street pump meant that he had proved that cholera was spread in water and this, coupled with the Germ Theory, meant that money invested into removing the disease from water was worth doing as it had been proved to be effective.

I believe that the Public Health Acts would have been passed whether the poor had the vote or not. I think that rich people were very frightened about cholera and other diseases that could kill them and, after Snow and then the Germ Theory, they finally realised that they could do something to save their lives and support the act. Poor people getting the vote merely speeded up the inevitable.

2 The American West, 1840–1895

2.1: How did the Plains Indians live on the Great Plains?

Exam practice (page 75)

1. Briefly describe the way of life of the Plains Indians. [5]
2. Explain how the Plains Indians were able to live on the Great Plains. [7]
3. 'The Plains Indians were savages.' Why did white Americans come to this conclusion? [8]

1. The Plains Indians lived on the Plains. They were nomads who hunted the buffalo and depended on it for everything, from clothes to food. They believed in the Great Spirit and got close to the spirit world through dances and visions. Plains Indians lived in tipis so that they could move quickly. These were packed into travois when the band needed to move.

2. The Plains Indians could survive on the Great Plains because they used the buffalo for everything. There was no wood on the Plains and so the buffalo was used for tipis for Indians to live in. Food came from the buffalo, as did clothes. The Plains Indians were nomads. They had to hunt the buffalo and therefore they had to move quickly as they followed the herds. For this reason, their tipis packed into travois which were pulled by their horses. The Plains Indians had to make some harsh choices in order to survive. One of these was exposure. This meant that if an older person could not keep up they would leave the band, resulting in their death but allowing the rest of the band to carry on and survive. Something needs to be said about their organisation and their ability to fight.

3. The Plains Indians lived very differently from white people in the 19th century. This meant that the white people looked upon them as savages.

Some Indian customs were against everything in which white people believed at that time. Indian men who were successful hunters needed more than one woman to prepare the buffalo that they had hunted. It was sensible, therefore, to have more than one wife and so Plains Indians practised polygamy. This did not fit in with the white American ideals which were based mainly on the Bible, which teaches men to have one wife. As well as this, Plains Indians left their old people to die. This was called exposure and was a choice made by those people who were too old or sick to keep up with the band and so stopped and, therefore, died. White Americans thought that this was savage. Another custom which would be against white American beliefs was contact with the spirits. Indians would dance to get close to the spirits, but their dancing involved cutting themselves, in the case of dances like the Sun Dance, as well as fasting, sweating and having visions, not something that white Americans could understand.

As well as this the white Americans could not understand how the Indians used the land. They did not farm it, which was something that all new settlers saw as the only way to survive and the new settlers saw the catching of buffalo and the hunt as something that should be done for leisure.

The white Americans saw the Indians as savages because they did not understand that everything the Indians did was to survive on the Plains and was based on an entirely different set of beliefs.

2.2 Why did people travel to the West? The pioneers and the Mormons

Exam practice (page 79)

1. What can you learn from Source A about attitudes to the Mormons in the 1840s? [5]

1. You can learn a great deal about attitudes towards the Mormons from this picture. It is about the Mormon practice of polygamy, which is having more than one wife, and shows that people thought that it was wrong and that it would result in chaos with wives fighting and too many children. This shows that the person who made this cartoon did not agree with polygamy. This is because it would mean that more Mormons would be born and so become more influential. Mormons were not popular with other white Americans at the time because they were different and told the white American gentiles that their Mormon way was the true one. At the same time, they were becoming more and more powerful because there were increasingly more followers caused by the polygamy shown in the cartoon as well as the Perpetual Emigration Fund, which helped Mormons move together. The cartoon shows the effects of this growth among White Americans did not trust the Mormons which is why this cartoon makes fun of the Mormons as white Americans were afraid of their growing influence and numbers.

Exam practice (page 81)

1. Briefly describe the problems faced by the early settlers on their journey west. [5]

2. Explain why the Mormons went west to settle at Salt Lake. [7]

1. Early Settlers were heading to California and Oregon. They would make their way to places, such as Independence in Missouri, where they would join onto wagon trains to make the rest of the journey. They faced many problems.

They had to have supplies both for the duration of the journey and for when they arrived in their new home, so they had to buy food, seed and livestock and take it all with them.

The journey was very harsh. They had to cross rivers, deserts and the Rocky Mountains or Sierra Nevada, some of which was impassable by wagon. Indeed, if they left too late in the year, they could get stuck in the snow on the mountains. There was no food on the journey and diseases spread; the settlers could be attacked by wild animals or Indians.

2. The Mormons went to settle at Salt Lake because they could no longer live peacefully in the East and because the Salt Lake offered them a new start to practice their beliefs without interference.

The Mormons could no longer live in the East because they were very unpopular. Joseph Smith had founded the religion, which went against much of the teachings of Christianity and therefore disagreed with many people in the East. The Mormons told these gentiles that they were wrong and would go to hell. This did not make them popular. At the same time they made themselves unpopular as well because they were against slavery, supported the Indians and practised polygamy. The Mormons had a bank, which failed, and many

investors who were not Mormons lost money. At the same time Mormons were buying up land in the East and using it to farm, while non-Mormons could not afford it.

The Mormons moved to Salt Lake because they felt that no one else would want it as it is in an inhospitable area with no water and a long way from other settlers and so they would be left alone. It was in Mexico at the time that they moved and so they could live as they wanted, without people persecuting them as they had done in the East. Finally, Young told them that he thought that they could create Zion – God’s Kingdom on Earth.

2.3 Why did people settle in the West? The homesteaders, railroads, and law and order

Exam practice (page 87)

1. Study Source A (on page 82). What can you learn from this source about life in the American West? [5]

2. Briefly describe the work of vigilantes. [5]

3. Did Mormons and homesteaders move west for the same reasons? [8]

1. Above all you can learn that the Americans believed that they were bringing good things to the West.

This source shows you the trains, the schools, the shops and the farms that the settlers brought to the West. It shows that the person who made it did not see a place for Indians in the new West because the Indians are standing and watching from afar. The expansion is portrayed as a good thing because the train is bringing light and order to the West and everyone seems very excited and working hard to achieve great things.

2. Vigilantes were also known as vigilance committees. They were formed to sort out a particular problem of law and order in the towns of the West. They helped solve problems because justice was often a long way away and crimes were committed often. If someone thought that they knew who had committed the crime, a vigilance committee would be formed to find and to punish the culprit. They were very quick to decide what they were going to do and their punishments were harsh. They helped law and order because people were afraid of them. However, they were often unfair and could sometimes execute the person without a fair trial.

3. Mormons moved west mainly because they were persecuted in the east and wanted to live a better life in Salt Lake, where they could practise their religion in peace.

Homesteaders moved west because there were no jobs or opportunities for them in the east. They were persuaded to move to the Plains by train companies and the government who gave them land so that they would have loyal Americans on the Plains.

In some ways, the reasons for going west are the same on a general level; both homesteaders and Mormons wanted a better life for themselves and their families and thought that going west would provide it. However, the specific reasons are different because the Mormons were persecuted in the east whereas the homesteaders were unhappy because they did not have work or land to cultivate. As well as this, the reasons they settled where they did, in the west, are different. The Mormons wanted to be left in

peace while the homesteaders were encouraged by government and the railroad companies to settle.

2.4 What were the consequences of the spread of cattle ranching to the Plains?

Exam practice (page 93)

1. Briefly describe the life of a cowboy. [5]

2. Explain why the open range came to an end. [7]

3. Who was to blame for the Johnson County War – the cattlemen or the sheriffs?

1. Cowboys had many different jobs depending on what time of year it was and what the cattle needed. On the Long Drives, different cowboys had different roles when herding the cattle safely to markets; they would ride at various points among the herd to make sure that they were all safe. Before the Long Drive they would be responsible for rounding up cattle and branding them. When the open range came to an end their jobs changed. They became more like farm hands, looking after the stock and moving the herds from pasture to pasture to allow grass to grow again.

2. The Open Range came to an end for many reasons.

Cattlemen had made so much money up to the 1880s from cattle that they had just bred more and more animals. This meant that they had over-grazed the plains so there was not enough good quality grass on which to feed their cattle. There were too many cattle and so prices fell. The weather in the late 1880s was unusual; drought, followed by extreme heat and cold in the winter of 1887 meant that many cattle, weakened because of poor grass, died. Cattlemen realized that that they had to take more care of their stock.

At the same time homesteaders were being encouraged onto the Plains and they fenced their land with barbed wire which meant that the cattle could not really roam free as they had done on the Plains.

3. The Johnson County War was between the cattlemen and homesteaders of Wyoming.

The cattle barons who had their ranches on the Plains were not happy as more and more homesteaders arrived. The homesteaders wanted to fence their land and did not like the cattle roaming freely over their carefully tended farm land. The Homesteaders accused the cattlemen of taking their land.

The cattlemen accused the homesteaders of rustling their cattle. They regularly caught and hanged homesteaders like Jim Averill and Ella Watson who they said were rustling their cattle; this was not always true.

In 1892 the cattlemen came up with a list of rustlers and set out to kill them. They attacked a ranch but were chased and rounded up by the homesteaders at another ranch nearby. The US cavalry had to come and rescue them. The cattlemen were charged with murder but they were so powerful they bribed the jury. However, although the case was dropped their power in Wyoming was almost gone and the end of the Open Range led to the end of their power in the area altogether.

It is easy to say that the cattlemen were mainly to blame for the Johnson County War. They set out to accuse probably innocent people and sent a group of armed men to kill them. This was always going to cause problems. However, they had lived and worked in Wyoming for many more years than the homesteaders who were threatening their old way of life and so it is possible to understand why the actions of the homesteaders, in fencing their land, would make them angry.

2.5 Why did white Americans and the Plains Indians find it so difficult to reach a peaceful settlement of their differences?

Exam practice (page 100)

1. Why did Indians and white Americans come into conflict? [5]

2. Explain why the Indians were able to win the Battle of the Little Bighorn. [7]

3. How far was the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876 a victory for the Plains Indians? [8]

1. The Plains Indians had always lived on the land. They used it for everything. The white Americans came to see the Plains as an area that they could use and so they were going to come into conflict with the Indians.

White Americans did not understand the way of life and customs of the Plains Indians and so they did not respect them. This meant that they wanted them to change to live in the same way as the whites, by farming the land. As a result of this, when gold was discovered on the Plains or when homesteaders wanted to settle, they did not see the Indians as worthy and thought that they should be moved off the land so that it could be 'properly' used.

2. The Indians won the Battle of Little Big Horn for two reasons; one because they were so angry and had had enough of their treatment by white Americans; the other because the US Army made mistakes and so lost the battle.

The Plains Indians had had enough, they had charismatic leaders like Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse, who had proven that they could defeat the US Army, and had also had visions which said that they would be victorious, which meant that the Indians believed that they would win. They were angry and were not prepared to negotiate with the white Americans so there were far more Indians camped at Little Big Horn than there had ever been before. This surprised the US Army when they arrived and meant that Custer's actions, in splitting his force, were doomed to fail. The Indians had also been well supplied by the US and had the latest repeating rifles which allowed them to shoot effectively.

The US Army also made further mistakes. Custer was determined to make his name at this battle and so he did not follow orders, which told him to wait for the bulk of the forces, and chose to attack the camp with a much smaller force. He then split his men and met a far larger force of Indians than he was expecting.

The combination of all of these factors ensured that the Battle of Little Big Horn was a humiliating defeat for Custer and the US Army.

3. The Battle of Little Big Horn was a great victory for the Plains Indians. They had defeated their enemies and humiliated them. Their celebrations did not last for long. The defeat at

the Battle of Little Big Horn had many consequences, none of which could be seen as victories for the Indians.

The US Army were humiliated; they wanted revenge. The 7th Cavalry was not a large part of the army and there were many soldiers who were ready to hunt down the Indians who had been at the Battle and in the camp. The Indians had split up after their victory and so no longer had the strength in numbers that they had previously had.

News of the defeat arrived in Washington on the centenary of the Declaration of Independence. Even those people in Washington who had wanted to treat the Indians by negotiation felt angry at the treatment of the soldiers at the last stand. They could not argue against those hard liners who saw the solution to the Indian problem through extermination.

The Army began to try different tactics, they started to hunt the buffalo and encourage hunters to wipe out buffalo herds so that the Indians had no food supply.

As winter came in 1876 more and more Indians returned to the reservations. The last vestiges of opposition ended as Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull were arrested by the army.

The Battle of Little Big Horn was a victory in the short term but in some ways it meant that the way of life of the Plains Indians ended even sooner.

3 Germany, c.1919–1945

3.1 Was the Weimar Republic doomed from the start?

Exam practice (page 106)

1. Briefly describe how the Treaty of Versailles restricted German power. [5]
2. Explain why the Weimar Republic had serious problems in the period 1919 to 1923. [7]
3. 'The Weimar Republic was in a healthy state by 1929.' How far do you agree with this statement? [9]

1. The Treaty of Versailles greatly restricted German power. Firstly, it had to disarm. Its army was restricted to 100,000 men at a time when the victorious Allies had been allowed to keep their armed force. This left the new Weimar Republic feeling vulnerable. Secondly, the treaty dealt them a harsh economic blow. Lands rich in industry (like the Saar and Alsace-Lorraine) had to be given up and the Allies demanded crippling reparations payments (for war damages). This greatly weakened the economic power of Germany. Thirdly, the German government was forced to sign the treaty. It was a diktat, and the Germans were left in no doubt that they had lost the war. They had to take the full blame for what had been a world-wide conflict. Germany had been humiliated.

2. The Weimar Republic faced a series of political and economic problems between 1919 and 1923. The new constitution was only drawn up at the end of a revolution during 1919 that threatened to tear the country apart. The new constitution was democratic, but it had several in-built weaknesses. Throughout its entire existence, no party won more than half the votes cast in elections. As a result of proportional representation, this meant that no party won more than half the seats. Governments could only be formed when a number of parties formed a coalition. However, the various political parties in the new government found it very difficult to co-operate, and governments were often divided and ineffective when dealing with the problems they faced.

Extreme right wing and left wing groups often failed to support the new government, and there were a number of armed uprisings to try to overthrow it. These were often only defeated with the help of semi-legal groups or groups who were themselves opposed to democracy.

The Treaty of Versailles had seriously limited Germany's power and it faced a number of economic difficulties up to 1923. The worst of the crises was the hyper-inflation of 1923. It came about when Germany was unable to make its reparations payment and the French invaded the Ruhr. Government attempts to deal with this caused a serious devaluation of the currency. Savings were wiped out and people lost jobs and homes. Many people blamed the government for these problems. Hitler used the chaos to try to seize power by force, and even though he failed, this sent a message out about just how weak and vulnerable the Weimar Republic was.

3. To some extent, I agree that the Weimar Republic was in a healthy state by 1929. Stresemann had stabilised the economy by calling off the strikes in the Ruhr. He also introduced a new currency – the Rentenmark – which helped to bring the hyper-inflation to an end. When Stresemann signed the Dawes Plan in 1924, reparations payments were made

more manageable and the German economy was boosted by American loans. Stresemann also did a lot to mend Germany's reputation abroad by signing international agreements like the Locarno Pact and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Germany became a member of the League of Nations in 1926. Economic revival and greater international acceptance meant that the political situation in Germany became more stable. Extreme parties like the Communists and Nazis were unpopular during this time.

However, it is an exaggeration to say that the problems had been 'overcome'. The economic recovery was fragile as it was based on foreign loans which could be recalled at any time. Many Germans did not like the fact that Stresemann seemed to accept the Treaty of Versailles to gain international recognition. The fact that the Republic was saddled with the Treaty would help cause its eventual downfall. Even the political stability was only temporary. There were too many political parties and too much self-interest for a really stable Germany.

3.2 How was Hitler able to come to power in Germany?

Exam practice (page 113)

- 1. Study Source A. How useful is this source for explaining Nazi success in the elections of 1932? [7]**
- 2. Briefly describe how the 1929 Wall Street Crash led to problems in Germany. [7]**
- 3. Explain why the Nazis had little success in elections before 1928. [7]**
- 4. Was the depression in Germany the most important reason why Hitler was able to come to power by the beginning of 1933? [8]**

1. This source is useful because it shows one of the reasons why the Nazis were successful in the elections of 1932. It plays on the fears of German families at that time. It shows a mother standing next to her depressed husband. She is cradling a small child. Her other child is looking at his father. The scene evokes an image of pity. Clearly, the father is unemployed and the survival of his family is at stake. Unemployment was around six million at this time and it was a big issue for many families.

However, the poster does not show the depths of the depression and the extreme conditions in which people lived. Homelessness and hunger also played a part in the increasing Nazi popularity at this time. In addition, the Nazis used other methods to gain support. Hitler went on nationwide tours, addressing large crowds and impressing them with his simple, yet powerful speeches. Meanwhile, the government did not seem to have any answers to the crisis. Successive coalitions were formed, but they failed to cope with the depression. Hitler also played on general fears amongst some sections of the population that the deepening crisis might lead to a communist takeover. He sent the SA out to break up meetings of the communists. When this led to violence, he was able to claim that only he knew how to sort it out.

In conclusion, the source is useful up to a point, but it does not show the variety of factors that played a part in the Nazi successes in 1932.

2. On 29 October, the Wall Street Crash began in the USA. As a result of the dramatic fall in share prices, many American businesses went bankrupt. American banks called in the loans

they had made to Germany after since 1924. Without these loans, German industry could not operate. Moreover, many of these businesses had relied on the American market for their exports and this had now also collapsed. Factories closed and millions of workers lost their jobs. Those in work had to take cuts in wages and go on to short time working. There was a great deal of poverty and hardship as a result of these events.

The economic and social crisis caused a political crisis too. The Social Democratic coalition, which had been so successful in the 1920s, broke up because its members could not agree on how to deal with the depression. Between 1930 and 1932 the Reichstag met less and less frequently and Hindenburg had to rule by Presidential decree. Hitler was able to exploit this crisis in 1933.

3. Hitler was sent to prison in 1923 for his part in the failed Munich Putsch. Whilst he was in prison, the party became disunited and disorganised. Hitler made up his mind that the Nazis must win power by legal means and he set about turning the party into one that was capable of standing and succeeding in elections. However, in December 1924, the party won only 14 seats in the Reichstag. By this time, Stresemann was already having some successes with his economic policies. After the hyper-inflation, a new currency had been launched and loans had been obtained from America. These were used to boost growth in the economy and to create jobs. Many people thought that the Republic had the answer. They enjoyed the surge of art and culture under the Weimar government and regarded the Nazis as an extreme and ineffectual party.

During this period, Hitler concentrated on reorganising the party. He divided Germany into 34 districts. Each district had a leading Nazi in charge and it was their role to increase support for the Nazis in that district. He launched a new version of the Twenty-Five Point Programme and formed the Hitler Youth. By the end of 1926 the party had 50,000 members and it held its first rally at Nuremberg in 1927. It had become a nationally-known party with a strong leader and effective propaganda. Despite all this hard work, most people were still satisfied with the policies of the Weimar government. In the 1928 election, the Nazis won only 12 seats and were only the eighth largest party.

4. Hitler was able to come to power in 1933 for a number of reasons which were linked together. The depression in Germany was only one of those reasons. Other reasons included the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic, Hitler's determination and his use of both propaganda and of terror to achieve his goals.

The Weimar government was weak. Proportional representation meant that successive governments were botched up coalitions that could not agree on the most important measures needed to run the country. When the President increasingly ruled by decree after 1930, this provided a loophole in the democratic process that people like Hitler were later able to exploit. Coupled with this was the fact that the Republic was blamed for signing the hated Treaty of Versailles and the hyper-inflation of 1923. Both these things were never forgotten by the German people. Hitler tried to seize power in 1923, but his armed uprising failed and, for a time, the Nazis became disorganised and unpopular. The Republic managed to find answers to a lot of its economic problems between 1924 and 1929, but the economic recovery was based on loans from America.

The Wall Street Crash of 1929 was a turning point. It plunged Germany into a depression. Unemployment rose to six million by 1932. The government did not seem to have any answers. Politicians started to argue and saw the crisis as the opportunity to further their own ambitions rather than work together for the good of Germany. After 1930, Hindenburg made much more frequent use of rule by decree. Hitler became more popular. He made speeches saying he would end unemployment and rid Germany of the Treaty of Versailles. His speeches were dramatic and often made in the exciting context of Nazi ceremonial rallies. People began to think that Hitler was the answer. In July 1932 the Nazis became the biggest party in the Reichstag and Hitler demanded to be made the Chancellor.

He did not get his wish until January 1933. Weimar politicians like von Papen and von Schleicher thought that they could win the support of Hindenburg. They knew that he did not like Hitler. Von Papen convinced Hindenburg to let Hitler become Chancellor in 1933, thinking that he could control him and make him appear to be a laughing stock. His plan backfired. Hitler's rise had been the result of the combination of the depression, the weaknesses of the Republic and of his own personal qualities. Yet, despite the depression, Hitler could not have come to power without the help of scheming politicians like von Papen. In the end, such politicians brought about the downfall of their own government. Had they worked with each other against Hitler, they might have found answers to the depression, just like they had in 1923 when the hyper-inflation threatened to ruin Germany. It was they, and not the depression, that were chiefly responsible for Hitler's coming to power in 1933.

3.3 The Nazi regime: How effectively did the Nazis control Germany, 1933–1945?

Exam practice (page 119)

1. Briefly describe the activities of the Gestapo and SS. [5]
2. Explain why the Enabling Act of March 1933 was so important in helping Hitler take control in Germany. [7]
3. 'The only way the Nazis controlled Germany was by terror.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer. [8]

1. SS means 'protection squad'. It was an elite force consisting of 50,000 'pure Aryans' who were meant to represent Hitler's master race. They became the main group responsible for terrorising and intimidating the population into obeying Hitler. They had almost unlimited power to arrest people without trial. They could search houses and confiscate property. They ran the concentration camps. Their fighting units rivalled the power of the army.

The Gestapo was the state secret police. It tapped telephones, intercepted mail and spied on people. Anyone, who so much as whispered any opposition to Hitler, could be reported to the Gestapo by an informer and arrested. The Gestapo was a much-feared organisation which could strike at anytime and anywhere.

2. The Enabling Act was a big step forward for Hitler in his quest to achieve a dictatorship. He now had the power to pass laws in the Reichstag without debate or consultation. The deputies who sat in the Reichstag had lost any real power that they had to stop Hitler. He

now used the Enabling Act to get rid of his political opponents. In July 1933 the act was used to ban all political parties except the Nazis. Then he banned the trade unions so that the workers were brought under his control. When Hindenburg died, in 1934, Hitler united the positions of Chancellor and President into one new position: the Führer. There was nothing that the Reichstag could do to stop him. Crucially, the army now had to swear an oath of allegiance to him. He was the single most powerful man in Germany yet he had achieved this position by legal means, thanks to the Enabling Act.

3. People living in Nazi Germany were often too scared to speak out against Hitler and the Nazis. Hitler used force to terrorise people into submission. Anyone who disagreed with Nazi policies ran the risk of imprisonment, torture and even death at the hands of the Gestapo and many people were too scared to question Hitler's authority.

However, this was not the only method Hitler used to control the people of Germany. He also developed policies that were popular in order to win public support. In the 1920s, Germany had faced many economic hardships, such as having to pay crippling reparations to the victors of the First World War. Then in the 1930s the worldwide depression caused massive unemployment. In an economy where people were struggling to make ends meet, Hitler provided people with jobs on public works, such as building motorways. This made Hitler popular with the German people and demonstrates that his control was based on more than just terror.

However, in my opinion, terror was the most important instrument of his control. People constantly lived in fear. Spies and informers were everywhere. The SS had powers to arrest people and put them into prison without trial. People lived in blocks that were controlled by a block warden. The warden was encouraged to keep a check on the behaviour and attitudes of the people living in his block. Failing to salute Hitler and even telling anti-Nazi jokes were considered to be offences that were punishable. Then there were the concentration camps. People had seen all kinds of groups shipped off to the concentration camps never to return. They feared it might be their turn next.

3.4 The Nazi regime: What was it like to live in Nazi Germany?

Exam practice (page 126)

- 1. Study Source A (on page 124). What is the message of this poster? [7]**
- 2. Briefly describe how the Nazis reduced unemployment after 1933. [5]**
- 3. Explain why some young people opposed the Nazis. [7]**
- 4. 'Nazi policy towards women was confused.' Explain how far you agree with this statement. [9]**

1. This poster was published to play on peoples' anti-Semitic prejudices. The caricature of the Jew shows him as an evil and violent man. He is holding a whip in his left hand, which shows his liking of force and violence. In his right hand, he is holding a handful of coins. This represents his wealth. People were envious of the fact that many Jews in Germany seemed to be able to avoid the worst effects of economic depression. They, on the other hand, had to suffer from unemployment, poverty and homelessness. Under his left arm is tucked a section of the map of Europe. The part of the map shows the Soviet Union, and it has the

communist symbol of the hammer and sickle stamped on it. Clearly this is meant to portray the idea that the Jews were also communist.

Overall, the poster puts the Jew across as the enemy of the state. It is intended to whip up hatred of the Jews for their (alleged) communist tendencies and their wealth at the expense of the German people as a whole.

2. In 1933, unemployment in Germany had risen to six million. In 1934, Hitler launched what he called the 'New Plan'. This plan dealt with various aspects of the economy and was designed to boost spending and trade. Part of the plan dealt with unemployment. There were a number of measures. Firstly, a number of work creation projects were launched. These projects included schemes to rebuild German cities and, in particular, to set people to work building new motorways and transport networks. All 18–25 year old men had to join the Reich Labour Service (RAD), where they had to do six months hard manual labour. This meant that they were now registered as employed. Jews and political opponents were sacked from certain jobs and they were replaced with unemployed people. In addition, in 1935, the Nazis introduced conscription to the army. It has been estimated that 750,000 men were recruited into the army in this way after 1933. The Nazis also gave help to private firms to create jobs, for example in the housing industry. By July 1938, unemployment had been reduced from six million to 218,000.

3. Although the Hitler Youth movement was very popular with many German youngsters, some objected to the restrictions it placed on them. They did not want the regimented life and the focus on training for the army or motherhood. Instead they were more interested in dancing to American or English songs and listening to jazz music. The Nazis condemned these members of the so-called 'Swing Movement'.

Other problems came from groups like the Edelweiss Pirates. This consisted mainly of 14–17 year olds. Many liked to beat up members of the Hitler Youth and lead what the Nazis believed to be a degenerate lifestyle. During the Second World War they helped to spread Allied propaganda and sometimes helped Allied airmen to escape from Germany. In 1944, one group of Pirates took part in an attack on the Gestapo in which a senior officer was killed. As a result, 12 Pirates were publicly hanged.

Another group consisted of university students in Munich who formed the White Rose movement. They opposed the policies of the Nazi regime and handed out pamphlets appealing to people to support their cause. In 1943, the Nazis arrested and executed the leaders of the White Rose movement.

4. Nazi policies towards women were based on Nazi ideas about the role that women should play within the family and society. However, changing circumstances by the later 1930s led to changes to key policies that had been previously established.

The Nazis believed women and men had different roles in life. A woman's place was in the home, having children and caring for the family. The Nazis were very worried about the declining birth rate. Families were getting smaller because of contraception and because women wanted paid work. If Germany was to become a great power again, its population needed to increase. A campaign was launched to promote motherhood and large families. Special loans were offered to new brides who agreed not to take a job. 800,000 took up the

offer of these loans. To improve fertility, women were encouraged to stop smoking, slim and take up sport. Special classes were set up in mother craft and home craft. Women were encouraged to bring up their children as loyal Nazis who worshipped the Führer and joined the Hitler Youth.

However, by 1937, Germany was rearming. Men were joining the army which meant that the Nazis needed more women to work. They abolished the marriage loans and introduced a compulsory 'duty year' for all women entering the labour market. This usually meant helping on a farm or in a family home in return for bed and board but no pay. More women did get jobs but not as many as the Nazis had hoped. Many women did not like the thought of working in factories where working conditions were poor and pay was low. Despite this reversal of policy, Hitler was worried about the concept of women working. He continued to believe that a woman's place was in the home and that working would harm their chances of giving birth to children. The Nazis continued with policies designed to encourage childbirth. They also set up the 'Lebensborn' programme where specially chosen unmarried women could 'donate a baby to the Führer' by becoming pregnant by 'racially pure' SS men.

Historians argue that Nazi Germany was full of contradiction and chaos. They point to the apparent inconsistencies in policies towards women as a prime example. However, the evidence suggests that Nazi beliefs did not change. They had fixed ideas about the role of women. They only adapted their policies when changing circumstances meant that they had to do so.