

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
NATIONAL RESEARCH TOMSK STATE UNIVERSITY

**David Gillespie, Svetlana Gural,
Vladimir Smokotin, Marina Korneeva**

**MODERN BRITAIN:
NEW REALITIES
AND CHALLENGES 2000-2020**

Textbook

Tomsk
TSU Press
2021

UDC 378.016:811.111(410)

LBC 74.268.1Англ

G47

Gillespie David, Gural Svetlana,
G47 Smokotin Vladimir, Korneeva Marina

Modern Britain: New Realities and Challenges 2000-2020 :
Textbook. – Tomsk : TSU Press, 2021. – 248 p.

ISBN 978-5-94621-980-8

This textbook presents authentic English-language materials covering the major incidents and facts in British society since 2000. We begin with several important events that have had a lasting impact on the evolution of the British state, such as the Magna Carta, the creation of Parliament, and the establishment and expansion of the British Empire, and the retreat from it.

Subsequent chapters provide discussion materials on contemporary topical issues, such as the 2016 referendum on the UK's withdrawal from the European Union ('Brexit'), political and social history since 1945, and the 2020 coronavirus pandemic, with its heavy toll on human life and the reputation of the British political establishment.

The book ends with a text speculating on the United Kingdom as viewed from a foreign perspective as a failed state that has succumbed to nationalism, social division and consequent economic decline. The book includes extensive background notes and suggestions for group and individual study. This textbook is intended for students in higher educational institutions studying English language, life and society, and for the general reader interested in modern Britain.

UDC 378.016:811.111(410)

LBC 74.268.1Англ

Reviewers:

D. Sc. (Education), Professor *O. G. Polyakov*

D. Sc. (Education), Professor *K. E. Bezukladnikov*

ISBN 978-5-94621-980-8

© Tomsk State University, 2021

© Gillespie David, Gural Svetlana,

Smokotin Vladimir, Korneeva Marina, 2021

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
UNIT I: THE BRITISH ROYAL FAMILY: CHALLENGES AND MODERNITY	6
UNIT II. BRITISH POLITICAL HISTORY 1945-2020: THE END OF EMPIRE	55
UNIT III. BREXIT 2016-2020: THREE PRIME MINISTERS IN FIVE YEARS	129
UNIT IV. BRITISH SOCIAL HISTORY 1945-2020: WORKERS' RIGHTS, ZERO HOUR CONTRACTS AND THE GIG ECONOMY	148
UNIT V: CORONAVIRUS AND THE FUTURE OF AN ISOLATIONIST BRITAIN	172
CONCLUSION: IS THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 2020 A STATE IN DECLINE?	183
INDEPENDENT WORK: HOME READING AND RESEARCH ASSIGNMENTS	189

INTRODUCTION: BRITISH IDENTITY: WHAT IS IT?

The following definitions of ‘identity’ are relevant to the orientation of subsequent chapters.

- ‘Historically, British identity is a relatively recent construct and was gradually superimposed on earlier national identities of English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish.’ (UK Government website)

- ‘Although the term “Britishness” came into political and academic prominence only in the late 20th century, its origins lie in the formation of the Kingdom of Great Britain in 1707.’ (Wikipedia). This is a reference to the Acts of Union between England, Scotland and Wales of 1707, creating ‘Great Britain’.

- There are 10 generally accepted rules of “Britishness”: the rule of law; sovereignty of the Crown in Parliament; the pluralist state; personal freedom; private property; institutions; the family; history; the English-speaking world; the British character.

BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS OF THE 2011 CENSUS

In 2011 the census carried out among the population of the UK revealed the ethnic make-up of the UK population as follows:

• Total	56,075,912	100%	+7.8% since 2001
• White	45,209,395	86%	+1.4% since 2001
• Mixed	1,244, 400	2.2%	+85.2% since 2001
• Indian	1,412,958	2.5%	+36.3% since 2001
• Pakistani	1,124,511	2%	+57.3% since 2001

• Bangladeshi	447,201	0.5%	+59.2% since 2001
• Black African	989,626	1.8%	+106.3% since 2001
• Black Caribbean	594,825	1.1%	+5.5% since 2001
• Other ethnicities	2,072,994	3.7%	+164.4% since 2001

UNIT I. THE BRITISH ROYAL FAMILY IN THE MODERN ERA

A. From the History of English and British Monarchy

Discussion Questions:

The roots of Great Britain's monarchy can be traced to the period of the Anglo-Saxon invasion and settlement in Britain in the 5th century following the end of the Roman rule. But long before the British Isles experienced a series of Germanic invasions, starting with the invasion by Angles, Saxons and Jutes, they were inhabited by Celtic tribes.

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about the culture and religious beliefs of the Celtic tribes that inhabited the British Isles before the Roman invasion in the 1st century?
2. What legacy was left by the Romans when they left their Province of Britain in the early 5th century?
3. Where did the Germanic peoples of Angles, Saxons and Jutes that invaded the island of Great Britain come from, and what were their cultural and religious traditions?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read Texts I through VI dedicated to the evolution of monarchy in Great Britain from early Anglo-Saxon kings to modern Britain. As you are reading, note down the following:

- 1) the first Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and the rise of the Kingdom of Wessex as the centre of unification in the 9th-10th centuries;
- 2) the Norman Conquest and its consequences for the English monarchy;
- 3) the first steps towards democracy and individual rights under the Plantagenets;

- 4) the emergence and growth of the British Empire starting from the reign of the Tudors;
- 5) the revolutionary upheavals under the Stuarts that put England and Scotland on the road to constitutional monarchy;
- 6) the expansion of the British Empire into the largest empire in the world in the 19th century;
- 7) the collapse of the British Empire in the 20th century.

Text I

The Origins of Monarchy in Great Britain: the Heptarchy of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms and the Kingdom of England

The history of the monarchy in Great Britain covers a period of almost 1200 years, and the list of its monarchs makes up 61 **sovereigns**. The roots of monarchical rule can be traced to the times of Germanic invasions after the last Roman legions left **the Province of Britain** and returned to Rome. **The Anglo-Saxon invasion** and settlement in Britain in the 5th century, following the end of the Roman rule by 410 AD, led to the emergence of the first seven kingdoms of Anglo-Saxon England, which eventually unified into the Kingdom of England in the early 10th century. The Heptarchy of the petty kingdoms included East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Mercia, Northumbria, Sussex and Wessex. As the main kingdoms in Anglo-Saxon England, one should single out East Anglia, Mercia, Northumbria and Wessex. In fact, the number of kingdoms and the balance of power between them were constantly changing due to incessant warfare and to invasions by **Vikings**, taking under their control parts of Anglo-Saxon lands. Viking raids began in England in the late 8th century. A large Viking army, known from Anglo-Saxon chronicles as “the Great Heathen Army”, invaded England in 865 AD. The Army was a coalition of mostly Danish Vikings, and the campaign of invasion aimed at occupying and conquering all English Kingdoms lasted for 14 years. The Danish army eventually took under their control all the English Kingdoms except the Kingdom of Wessex ruled

by **King Alfred**. The part of England that came under Danish sway in the period of 865-954 AD is known in history as ‘The Danelaw’.

The unification of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms came in 829 AD, when Egbert of Wessex brought most of them under his rule. However, Egbert’s control of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was not complete, and, therefore, modern historians give credit for forming the Kingdom of England to Athelstan, who in 927 AD defeated the Norse warrior-kings of Southern Northumbria, the last remaining stronghold of resistance to his rule over the whole of England. King Alfred’s role in defending his kingdom against the Danish invaders as well as his reputation as a learned and merciful man who contributed to improving his people’s quality of life resulted in his going down in history as Alfred the Great. Surprisingly, the only other king in English history to be given the epithet ‘Great’ was the Danish **King Cnut**, who ascended the throne of the English Kingdom in 1016, and from 1018 to 1035 he ruled as the king of the North Sea Empire, which eventually included also Denmark, Norway and Southern Sweden. However, the North Sea Empire proved to be short-lived as Cnut the Great’s heirs died within a few years after his death, and the English throne returned to the Anglo-Saxon kings.

The Scandinavian invasion and occupation of the English kingdoms have left an enduring impact on the resulting hybrid culture and new English national identity. The most important legacy of the Norse settlers can be found in the English language. Contact of English with **Old Norse**, two branches of Germanic languages, launched the process of language change, as the result of which English morphed from a highly inflective language with a free word order into an analytical language with extreme reduction in the inflective forms and strict word order. The most notable grammatical changes were the collapse of all grammatical cases into genitive and common, and the loss of most old patterns of conjugation of verbs. Also, English, through its contact with Old Norse, borrowed about 400 words, including numerous fauna terms (names of animals and birds), natural and topographical terms, Norse

Mythology terms etc. Unlike later borrowings from French, Scandinavian borrowings abound in words expressing all kinds of negativity. Examples of negative terms include: angry, grief, sorrow, awkward, clumsy, dumbfounded, dirty, ill, rotten, ugly, weak, wrong etc. In the words of the Danish linguist Otto Jespersen about the importance of Scandinavian borrowings in everyday speech in the English language: “An Englishman cannot *thrive* or be *ill* or *die* without Scandinavian words; they are to the language what *bread* and *eggs* are to the *daily fare*”.

The rule of Anglo-Saxon kings of Wessex over the Kingdom of England was restored with **Edward the Confessor**, who ascended the throne in 1042. King Edward’s piety and support for the church led to his canonization by Pope Alexander III, and he is revered as Saint Edward both by the Church of England and the Catholic Church in England and Wales.

*adapted from Ben Johnson,
“Kings and Queens of England & Britain”*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Monarchy: the form of government in the United Kingdom, where the reigning monarch is the head of state.

Sovereign: the reigning monarch and head of state.

Province of Britain: part of the Roman Empire between 43 and 410AD, comprising England and Wales.

Anglo-Saxon Invasion of Britain: the arrival and colonization by the tribes of Angles, Saxons and Jutes from north-western Europe from about 449AD.

Vikings: Norsemen from Scandinavia who raided English and Scottish lands between about 793 and 850 AD.

Alfred the Great: lived 849-899 AD, king of the Anglo-Saxons 886-899 AD, defeated the Vikings and encouraged peaceful coexistence between Vikings and Saxons and thus the establishment of modern 'England'.

Cnut the Great: only one of two monarchs to be so titled, king of England 1016-1035, united the thrones of England, Denmark, Norway and Sweden.

Old Norse: the language of Old Scandinavia spoken in parts of northern and eastern England colonized by the Vikings in the 9 to 11th centuries AD.

Edward the Confessor: King of England 1042-1066, penultimate Anglo-Saxon king of England and known to be very pious, thus the nickname.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What made it possible for Angles, Saxons and Jutes to settle in Britain and establish the first Anglo-Saxon kingdoms?
2. What was the outcome of the invasion of Danish Vikings in the 9th century?
3. When did the unification of Anglo-Saxon kingdoms begin, and who became the first king of the Kingdom of England in the 10th century?
4. How did the Scandinavian invasion of the English kingdom affect the English national identity?
5. Why was the last Anglo-Saxon king Edward canonized by the Roman Pope?

Text II

The Norman Conquest and the profound political, social and cultural changes in the Kingdom of England (1066-1154)

The history of the Kingdom of England from **the Norman Conquest** of 1066 to the unification of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland into the Kingdom of Great Britain is conventionally described in periods named after successive ruling dynasties, that is, Norman (1066–1154), Plantagenet (1154–1485), Tudor (1485–1603) and Stuart (1603–1707). However, the changing dynasties were just the background against which profound changes were taking place, transforming the very nature of the English monarchy from absolute to constitutional and laying the foundations of the largest empire in history, “the empire on which the sun never sets”. It was during this period that important changes to the constitutional law were made, starting with the signing in 1215 of the **Magna Carta**, the formation of the first parliament in 1264 under Henry III, and **the Glorious Revolution** of 1688, which turned England into the “cradle of democracy”.

The fortunes of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of England ruled by the Wessex dynasty changed dramatically in 1066 with the death of Edward the Confessor, who died childless. The new king, Harold II’s right to the throne was challenged by a number of **pretenders**, the most notable of whom was the Duke of Normandy, William. Normandy, the most northern-western part of France, received its name from the Scandinavian settlers (Northmen), whose right to the territory was confirmed by treaty in the 10th century between King Charles III of France and the first ruler of Normandy, Rollo. As an ethnic group, Normans emerged as the result of contact between Norse Viking settlers and indigenous Franks and Gallo-Romans. William invaded England with a large fleet in September 1066 and defeated and killed Harold at the battle of Hastings on October 14, 1066. Following his victory, it took William some ten years consolidating his power by way

of ruthless suppression of resistance to his rule. During this time, William had to construct numerous **motte-and-bailey castles** to provide defence against frequent revolts. Motte-and-bailey castle design was characterized by a raised area of ground, called a motte, and a walled courtyard, or bailey, surrounded by a protective ditch and palisade. A key part of the design was a fortified tower called the ‘keep’ used as a refuge of last resort. With the Norman invasion of England, motte-and-bailey castles spread from Normandy to England, Wales and Scotland, where they became a familiar landscape feature.

The Norman conquest of England brought about profound political, administrative, social and cultural changes in England and throughout the British Isles. The most radical change was the replacement of the English elite with Norman aristocracy. William divided the country into about 180 **fiefs**, which he granted to his Norman followers in a system of land tenure and military service. Under this system, all the land in England belonged to the king, and the landowners held their properties directly from the king in return for their services. The Norman invasion also led to a total replacement of English people from high governmental and ecclesiastical office.

The Norman Conquest affected the English language as it launched a process of cardinal changes in its vocabulary. By the time of the Norman invasion, the period of Old English was drawing to a close, and **Middle English** (1150-1500), while continuing to develop from a syntactical into analytical form, suddenly experienced the impact of **Norman French** on its lexicon and idiomaticity. The impact on English by Old Norse was the result of interaction of two closely related languages, which led to the loss of inflections, creating a means of communication comprehensible for both Anglo-Saxons and the Norse. The relations between Old Norman French and **Old English**, however, were relations between the language of elite and the common language of the masses. English was practically not used as a written language: almost all written texts of the period are in French or Latin.

The domination of Norman French led to its gradual transformation into Anglo-French, and the evolution of English into a new form, mutually comprehensible both to English and Norman French speakers through unprecedented replacement (up to 75 percent) of its vocabulary of English words with borrowings from other languages, mostly from French, Latin and Greek.

*adapted from Ben Johnson,
“Kings and Queens of England & Britain”*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Norman Conquest: the invasion and colonization of England from 1066 by knights from France, led by William the Conqueror, Duke of Normandy.

Magna Carta: a charter of liberties agreed by King John in 1215, establishing the concept of ‘free men’ and restricting the power of the monarch.

Glorious Revolution: the deposition in 1688 of the Catholic King James II by his Protestant daughter, who became Mary II, and her husband William of Orange, so-called because it was achieved bloodlessly.

Pretender (to the throne): one who claims to be a legitimate heir to the throne, generally through ancestry.

Motte-and-bailey castle: formidable castles built on raised ground (motte) surrounded by a walled courtyard (bailey), introduced in England by the Normans following their invasion and conquest.

Fief: the central component of feudalism, whereby property was granted by a landlord or authority in exchange for allegiance and/or service.

Old English: based on Anglo-Saxon, the earliest form of English practiced from the fifth to eleventh centuries.

Middle English: the language practiced for 300 years from the mid-twelfth to mid-fifteenth centuries with changes in Old English grammar and pronunciation and the introduction of words from French and Latin.

Norman French: the language of the northern French which became adopted in England as Anglo-Norman after 1066, where it became dominant for the next 200 years.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Name the ruling dynasties of the Kingdom of England from the Norman Conquest to the formation of the Kingdom of Great Britain in 1707.
2. What battle led to the defeat of the last Anglo-Saxon king, Harold II and the coronation of the Duke of Normandy, William?
3. Who were Normans as an ethnic group, and from where did they come to Northern France?
4. What was the most radical change caused by the Norman Conquest of England?
5. How did the Norman Conquest affect the English language?

Text III

Laying down the foundations of democracy in the Kingdom of England under the Plantagenet kings (1154-1485)

The House of Normandy, which ruled the Kingdom of England after the Battle of Hastings, lasted until the House of Plantagenet came to power in 1154. The change to the line of Plantagenet kings came as a result of a dispute between the heirs to the English throne after the death of Henry I in 1135, whose daughter, Matilda, was married to Geoffrey Plantagenet, the Duke of Normandy. The Royal Council considered Matilda unfit to rule, and offered the throne to Stephen, a grandson of William I. A civil war, known in history as ‘the Anarchy’,

ensued when Matilda invaded England in 1139, which ended in compromise of the Treaty of Westminster: Matilda's son, Henry Plantagenet, would succeed to the throne when Stephen died. The rule of the House of Plantagenet began in 1154 with Henry II and lasted until 1485 with the end of **the Wars of the Roses**, when King Richard III died in battle.

Under the Plantagenets, England went through a series of catastrophic events, and was involved in lasting military conflicts, both on the continent and in the country itself. In the period of 1315-1317, during the rule of Edward II, Northern Europe, including the British Isles, was struck by the Great Famine caused by crop failures and devastating murrains. The deadliest pandemic in human history in Europe, the Black Death, from 1347 to 1351, under the reign of Edward III, killed more than a half of the kingdom's population. The two great military conflicts during the reign of Plantagenets were the Hundred Years' War of 1337-1453 and the Wars of the Roses (1455-1487). The Hundred Years' War was waged between the House of Plantagenet under Edward III and the French House of Valois over the right to rule the kingdom.

Eventually, the English lost almost all their land possessions in France, but were in no position to restart hostilities due to lack of resources and political instability at home. The Wars of the Roses for the possession of the English throne were fought between the two **cadet branches** of the Plantagenets – the House of Lancaster and the House of York, whose heraldic symbols were the red and white roses correspondingly. The Plantagenet line came to an end with the death of Richard III of the House of York at the Battle of Bosworth Field in Leicestershire in 1485. By that time, the male lines of both branches of the Plantagenets had been wiped out. With Henry Tudor, crowned as Henry VII, the House of Tudor united the two warring Houses by marrying Elizabeth of York. As a symbol of reunification the Tudor's **heraldic symbol** represented both the red and white roses.

The large-scale crises that shook the Kingdom of England to its foundation during the rule of Plantagenets also included challenges to

the very institute of absolute monarchy. The resolution of those crises resulted in laying down the foundations of democracy. The first grave crisis in the political history of the Plantagenets that put in question **the divine right of kings** to rule without the consent of the governed, were a series of events in 1215 which led to the outbreak of the First Barons' War. King John (1199-1216), as his predecessors, ruled with 'force and will', often without taking council of the leading members of the realm, considering himself to be above the law. It led to a confrontation between the king and the army of the rebel barons, as the result of which King John agreed to sign the first royal charter of rights, the Magna Carta Libertatum. **The Magna Carta** was agreed to by King John and the barons on June 15, 1215 at Runnymede, near Windsor, and it promised the protection for the barons from illegal imprisonment, access to swift justice and limitations on feudal payments to the Crown. The implementation of the Magna Carta caused some difficulties, which led to the First Barons' War. Despite the fact that the Magna Carta failed initially, it became part of English political life and was renewed by each new monarch in time. Even though the original Magna Carta extended some individual rights to the elite rather than to ordinary people, it remained a powerful, iconic document which even now is regarded as an important symbol of liberty – the “foundation of the freedom of the individual against the arbitrary authority of the despot” (**Lord Denning**).

The second political crisis during the Plantagenets reign that led to the formation of the first Parliament as a form of a legislative assembly of elected representatives, took place under Henry III in the course of the Second Barons' War. The term 'parliament' appeared in England yet in 1230s to describe gatherings of the royal court for agreeing on the raising of the royal taxes. The notion of parliament as a counterweight to the executive power, however, can be traced to the English parliament held from January 20th, 1265 until mid-March of the same year. The first parliament is known as Simon de Montfort's Parliament after the baron's rebel leader, who, following his victory

over Henry III at the Battle of Lewes, summoned representatives from not only the barons and the knights of the shires, but also **burgesses** from the major towns. The idea of inviting both knights and burgesses to parliaments continued, until, by the 14th century, it had become the norm as the House of Commons. At present, Montfort's 1265 parliament is regarded as a landmark in the development of parliament as an institution during the medieval period.

*adapted from Ben Johnson,
"Kings and Queens of England & Britain"*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Wars of the Roses: a series of bloody battles for the throne of England between the Houses of York (white rose) and Lancaster (red rose) between 1455 and 1485, eventually ended with the crowning of Henry VII and the establishment of the Tudor dynasty.

Cadet branch: in history and heraldry, the branch of a family descended not from the eldest son or heir but the youngest, in use in England since 1634.

Heraldic symbol: a coat of arms for a family or dynasty containing symbols that embody the holder's strengths and virtues.

Divine Right of Kings: the doctrine of monarchical absolutism which insisted that kings derived their authority from God and were therefore not subject to human laws.

Magna Carta: a charter of liberties agreed by King John in 1215, establishing the concept of 'free men' and restricting the power of the monarch.

Lord Denning (Alfred Thompson Denning, Baron Denning): the British judge (years of life: 23 January 1899 – 5 March 1999) since 1944. In 1962 he became Master of the Rolls in the Court of Appeal, a position he held for 20 years until his retirement. In the words of Margaret

Thatcher, he was “probably the greatest English judge in modern times”.

Burgesses: inhabitants or freemen of a town or borough with citizenship rights

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What events brought about the end of the House of Normandy and the ascension to the throne of the House of Plantagenet in 1154?
2. Describe the series of catastrophic events under the Plantagenets.
3. Which cadet branch of the Plantagenets won in the Wars of the Roses, and why did the end of the war lead to the change of dynasties?
4. What events led to the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215?
5. How was the first Parliament as a form of a legislative assembly of elected representatives established under the Plantagenets?

Text IV

The English Reformation and the origins of the British empire under the Tudors (1485–1603)

The reign of the Tudor dynasty coincided with the cultural and artistic movement, **Renaissance**, which originated in Italy in the late 14th century. The dominant art forms of the English Renaissance were literature and music, unlike the Italian Renaissance, where visual arts were more prominent. The chief figure of the English Renaissance in literature, William Shakespeare, the author of some 39 plays and 154 sonnets, has eventually won recognition as the world’s greatest dramatist and poet.

But the most important development under the Tudors was **the English Reformation** of the 16th century, when the Church of England broke from the authority of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church.

Unlike the Protestant Reformation in western and central Europe, the process of the English Reformation was initially caused not by a theological dispute, but began rather as a political affair. The English Church renounced papal authority when in 1527 the Roman Pope refused Henry VIII's request to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Henry needed a son as a male heir to avoid the risk of civil war over disputed succession, as his marriage to Catherine had not produced surviving male heirs, and there was no established precedent for a woman on the throne. The Pope's refusal to annul his marriage led to an open confrontation and to Henry's declaring himself in the Act of Supremacy of 1534 "the only Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England". A break with the Roman Pope eventually led to theological differences: the **liturgy** was now performed in English, and in 1549, the Book of Common Prayer by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, was published. The process of reforming the Church of England launched by Henry VIII continued after his death and under the succeeding dynasties, sometimes taking on violent forms. The last Tudor monarch, Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603), made a number of religious and political arrangements, known as **the Elizabethan Religious Settlement**, that were important to the development of Anglicanism as a distinct Christian tradition. The Elizabethan Settlement did not put an end to religious disputes, but it served as guidelines for the English Church in presenting itself both as Catholic and reformed.

The Tudor reign (1485-1603) was also the period when the foundations of British Empire were laid, starting with overseas exploration and following with the founding of the first permanent settlements. Overseas exploration began with the voyage of **John Cabot** in 1497 to the coast of North America. In fact, Henry VII commissioned Cabot to lead an expedition in order to discover a route to Asia via the North Atlantic, and Cabot, like Christopher Columbus, mistakenly believed he had reached Asia when he made landfall on the coast of Newfoundland.

During the reign of Elizabeth I, attempts at overseas exploration and founding first settlements intensified. Humphrey Gilbert received a patent in 1578 to explore the North American coast with the aim of eventually founding a colony there. In 1583, he reached the island of Newfoundland and claimed its harbor for England. His exploration was continued by Walter Raleigh, who founded the Roanoke Colony, the first permanent English settlement in North America. There were two attempts to found the colony: the first attempt of 1585 failed due to lack of supplies. The second attempt to found the first colony in America went down in history as the ‘lost colony’ due to the unexplained disappearance of its population.

While the first attempts to establish overseas colonies in the Americas proved to be unsuccessful, England’s first overseas colony under the Tudors was founded in Ireland. The process of confiscating lands in Ireland and granting them to colonists from England began under Henry VIII, and continued afterwards. The policy of settling Ireland with Protestant planters from England and Scotland during the Tudor conquest of Ireland was intended to develop Ireland as a peaceful and reliable possession, without risk of rebellion or foreign invasion.

adapted from Ben Johnson, “Kings and Queens of England & Britain”

BACKGROUND NOTES

Renaissance: the period in European history in the 15th and 16th century marking the transition from the Middle Ages to the modern age, marked by the decline of feudalism, the rise of commerce and the revival of Classical scholarship.

English Reformation: the process in the 16th century begun by Henry VIII to break away from the Catholic Church, with the dissolution of the monasteries, abolition of the Mass and the establishment of the monarch as head of the Protestant Church of England.

Liturgy: religious worship that is designed to establish a relationship with a divine agency and other participants in the liturgy.

Elizabethan Religious Settlement: the name given to the political and religious approach of Queen Elizabeth I intended to heal the divisions between Catholics and Protestants in society, including a revised prayer book.

John Cabot: real name Giovanni Cabotto (c. 1450- c. 1500), Italian navigator who in 1497 explored the coast of North America as commissioned by King Henry VII.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What were the dominant Renaissance art forms in England compared to the country of origin of the Renaissance movement, Italy?
2. In which way did the English Reformation differ from the Protestant Reformation in western and central Europe?
3. What was the nature of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement?
4. How were the foundations of the British Empire laid during the Tudor reign of 1485 to 1603?

Text V

The Civil War and the Glorious Revolution: the Kingdoms of England and Scotland under the Stuarts on the road to constitutional monarchy (1603-1714)

During the reign of the House of Stuarts (1603-1714), the absolute monarchy as a political system was put to the test, with the main upheavals including the violent overthrow and execution of Charles I in 1649, establishing a republic, the return of the Stuarts in 1660 as the result of the restoration, and, finally, the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The ascension to the English throne in 1603 of the King of Scotland James VI as James I, took the form of the union of the Scottish and English crowns. In fact, the Kingdoms of Scotland and England

remained individual sovereign states, though both ruled by one king in **personal union**. James had strong claims to the English throne as a great-great-grandson of Henry VII, whose daughter, Margaret Tudor, was married to the King of Scotland, James IV.

When James VI-I ascended the English throne, he inherited the Catholics-Protestants power struggle, which led to the political instability in his three realms (England, Scotland and Ireland).

The extent of animosity between the religious factions of Christianity in the British Isles became clear already during the Second session of the First Parliament of King James, on 5 November 1605, when **the Gunpowder Plot** to blow up the House of Lords during the State Opening of Parliament was foiled. The conspirators, a group of 13 English Catholics headed by Robert Catesby, planned to assassinate the king and to stage a revolt in order to install James's nine-year-old daughter Elizabeth as the Catholic head of state. The thwarting of the Gunpowder Plot has become part of national culture, and commemorating the event has developed into the annual celebration on the 5 November of the Bonfire Night (otherwise known as **Guy Fawkes Day**) with bonfires, fireworks and burning Guy Fawkes effigy. After the Gunpowder Plot a ritual has been established to search the Houses of Parliament before the **State Opening** in November for hidden explosives. This practice continues even nowadays.

James I's relations with the English Parliament were strained from the start, and he never reconciled himself to its independent stance in all matters, and, particularly, finance. Both the King and Parliament held different views about their relationship. The King assumed that he had **the divine right to rule** by the Grace of God and was not accountable to Parliament. On the contrary, Parliament regarded their relationship with the King as a partnership, and believed that their rights were equal to those of the King. The tone for Parliament's work was set by the First Parliament (1604-1610), which failed to allow James to unite his two kingdoms, and rescue him from his mounting debts. At the fifth session held in 1610, the King's patience had run out, and he dissolved

Parliament at the end of the year. The 2nd Parliament (1614) fared even worse: James dissolved Parliament after two months and two days, arrested four members of Parliament, and sent them to the Tower of London for disrespectful behavior.

Under the next Stuart monarch, King Charles I (1625-1649), the stand-off between the King and Parliament over the manner of England's governance eventually led to the Civil War of 1642-1651, in the course of which the Royalists were defeated, and Parliament declared the end of monarchy and the establishment of a Commonwealth (republic). Charles I, whose unpopular policies brought about the Civil War, was, like his father, a proponent of the concept of the divine right of kings, but, while James was ready for a compromise and consensus with his subjects, Charles was intransigent, and rejected any compromise, including a constitutional reform. The English Civil War was a series of Civil Wars, with the first Civil War (1642-1645) caused by Parliament claiming control over local militia without **royal assent**. Charles declared Parliament in rebellion and began raising an army. In 1645, Parliament formed the New Model Army under the command of Fairfax and Cromwell. The New Model Army was the first professional army built on a national basis, replacing the old county associations. It took to the field in April 1645, and at the decisive Battle of Naseby in June 1645 it routed the main Royalist force, after which it continued to wipe out the last pockets of Royalist resistance, effectively bringing the war to an end within a year. In January 1649, Charles was tried by the High Court of Justice, which was actually an **ad hoc** tribunal set up by the **Rump Parliament**, and was convicted and executed for **High Treason**. After the trial and execution of Charles I, the Rump Parliament abolished the monarchy and the House of Lords, and declared England to be a Commonwealth on 19 May 1649. Constitutionally, the Civil War established the precedent that an English monarch cannot rule without the consent of the governed. The republican government of the Commonwealth ruled England and later Scotland and Wales from 1649 to 1653, when Oliver

Cromwell established the Protectorate and declared himself to be the Lord Protector (in fact, a military dictator). After Cromwell's death, a period of instability, bordering on anarchy, followed, which ended with the restoration of monarchy under Charles II in 1660.

The failure of the republican movement in England and Scotland to put an end to monarchy and replace it with a republican form of government, however, did not mean that the country returned to absolute monarchy. The Civil War set England and Scotland on course towards a parliamentary form of government. An important document, limiting the executive power in arresting citizens and conducting a criminal investigation, was an Act of Parliament in England, known as the 'Habeas Corpus Act 1679', which defined and strengthened the ancient prerogative writ of *habeas corpus*. The writ required a court to examine the lawfulness of a prisoner's detention in order to prevent unlawful or arbitrary imprisonment.

The next important event under the Stuarts that contributed to the constitutional reforms in England and Scotland was the Glorious Revolution (1688-1689) that led to the deposition of King James II (1685-1688), and his replacement by his daughter Mary II and Mary's husband, William III of Orange. Even though the cause of the conflict was of religious nature (an attempt by James II to reintroduce Roman Catholicism), the outcome of the conflict's resolution had a profound impact on the constitutional law of the country. The Glorious Revolution established the primacy of Parliament over the Crown, which was highlighted in the Bill of Rights 1689. The Bill of Rights laid down limits on the powers of the monarch and set out the rights of Parliament, including requirements of regular convocation, free elections, and freedom of speech in Parliament. It also set out certain rights of individuals including the prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment.

In 1707, during the reign of the last Stuart Monarch, Queen Anne (1702-1714), the Kingdoms of England and Scotland united to form the Kingdom of Great Britain following the Treaty of Union in 1706,

ratified by the Acts of Union 1707. Before becoming a **unitary state** governed by a single parliament and government in Westminster, the Kingdoms of England and Scotland had been in personal union since 1603, when James VI and I became the King of three realms (England, Scotland and Ireland).

adapted from Ben Johnson, “Kings and Queens of England & Britain”

BACKGROUND NOTES

Personal union: the combination of two or more states with the same monarch but retaining separate laws and boundaries.

Gunpowder Plot: a failed attempt to assassinate King James I on 5 November 1605 in the House of Lords by English Catholics in order to restore Catholic rule to England.

Guy Fawkes: also known as Guido Fawkes, the most famous of the conspirators in the Gunpowder Plot whose name is now given to Bonfire Night celebrated every year in the UK on 5 November.

State Opening of Parliament: an event which formally marks the beginning of the parliamentary session, opened by the Monarch. It was here that the Gunpowder Plot conspirators hoped to kill King James I in 1605.

Royal Assent: regarded today as a formality, the monarch's approval of an Act of Parliament. It was last refused in 1708 when Queen Anne refused to pass the Scottish Militia Bill for fear that the Scottish militia may become disloyal in the event of a French invasion.

ad hoc: Latin phrase meaning 'for a particular purpose or meaning'.

Rump Parliament: in 1648, the name given to the remaining 75 members of Parliament after Oliver Cromwell's army had expelled 121 members who were against the trial of King Charles I. King Charles I was executed on 30 January 1649.

High Treason: the most serious crime in 18th century England, treason against the Crown, whose most famous offenders were the American revolutionaries who declared their independence from the British Crown.

Unitary state: a state governed by a single central government, an example being the United Kingdom despite some powers being delegated to local assemblies in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, though they cannot refuse to enact a law by Parliament.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What were the reasons for the political instability in the three realms during the reign of James VI-I?
2. Who were the conspirators in the Gunpowder Plot to blow up the House of Lords in November 1605?
3. How did King James and Parliament's views about their relationship differ?
4. What were the results of the Civil War of 1642-1651?
5. How did the Civil War set England and Scotland on course towards a parliamentary form of government?
6. What were the causes of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689, and what were its outcomes?

Text VI

The expansion of the British Empire into the largest empire in history under the House of Hanover (1714-1901)

With the death of Queen Anne, the line of the House of Stuart Protestant monarchs ended and the dynasty of the House of Hanover began with George I (1714-1727), who was Anne's closest living Protestant relative under **the Act of Settlement 1701**. George I ruled Great Britain in personal union with the Duchy and Electorate of

Brunswick-Lüneburg (Hanover) in **the Holy Roman Empire**. During his reign, a transition began in Great Britain to the modern system of cabinet government, with the prime minister wielding actual political power. The dynasty of Hanover ruled over the Kingdom of Great Britain, and from 1801, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, until the death of Queen Victoria in 1901, and provided six British monarchs.

It was during the Hanoverian dynasty that most of the power of the largest empire in history, the British Empire, was laid down. The dominance of the British Empire began with the victory in the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), a global conflict, which included colonial rivalries between Britain and France, particularly in North America. The war ended with the Treaty of Paris 1763, according to which Great Britain gained most of the French colony of **New France** in North America, Spanish Florida, and other territories around the world. Great Britain's victories in its rivalry with France were to a large extent due to the superiority of the British navy, which made it difficult for the French navy to provide significant supplies and support to overseas colonies. Another area of expansion for the growing empire was the Indian subcontinent, where **the East India Company**, initially formed in the mid-16th century to trade in the Indian Ocean region, eventually seized control of large parts of the Indian subcontinent, parts of South East Asia and elsewhere. The company traded in basic commodities, including cotton, silk, salt, spices, tea, and opium. It received a Royal Charter from Queen Elizabeth I in 1600, and gradually it extended its operations from trade to the building of an empire in India. During the 18th and the first half of the 19th century, the company gradually came to control most of the Indian subcontinent either directly or indirectly by means of local rulers, enforcing its control through its private armies, which were composed mostly of native Indian **sepoys**. The company rule in India was replaced in 1858 with direct control by the British Crown of the Indian subcontinent in the form of the British Raj, following the Indian Rebellion of 1857, otherwise known as the '**Sepoy**

Mutiny'. Sepoys, infantry privates native to India, made up to ninety-six percent of the East India Company's army of 300,000 men, and played a crucial role in maintaining law and order in the territories of the Mughal Empire in India under the Company's control. In the Sepoy Mutiny, a number of sepoy regiments in Bengal rebelled against the British in Meerut in Northern India, and moved to Delhi, where they staged massacres of British officers and European settlers. The rebellion spread to other territories and in some cases led to atrocities that caused a very negative reaction in Great Britain itself, which, in its turn, led to retaliation against captured rebelled soldiers and local civilians. Following the suppression of the Indian rebellion, the East India Company was dissolved in 1858, and a new British government department, the India Office, was set up to carry out governance functions in India. In 1877, Queen Victoria took the title of Empress of India in addition to her title of Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

A great expansion of the British Empire took place during the Victorian era. Queen Victoria reigned from 1837 to 1901, which was longer than any of her predecessors, and her reign was a period of industrial, cultural, political, scientific and military change within the United Kingdom. After the loss of the thirteen colonies in America as the result of the American War of Independence (1775-1783), the British Empire continued its expansion in Asia, the Pacific and later Africa.

Ireland, as part of the Empire, was under English control since the latter part of the 16th century, but the conquest was achieved by the turn of the 17th century. In 1798, a republican rebellion, inspired and led by the Society of United Irishmen, broke out against British rule. The uprising was quickly suppressed by much more powerful British forces, but in order to remove the danger of more conflicts with Irish nationalists, the British government brought about a Union of Great Britain and Ireland by the Act of Union 1800. On January 1801, Great Britain and Ireland were formally united as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

A major turning point in world history was the Industrial Revolution that began in Great Britain in the period from about 1760 and continued in the first three decades of the 19th century. During this period, a transition took place from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, the increasing use of steam power and the rise of the mechanized factory system. As the country of origin of the Industrial revolution, Great Britain was also the first to introduce such technological innovations in textile production as the **flying shuttle**, the **spinning jenny** and the **power loom**. Great Britain was leading in innovations in the iron industry, spurred by James Watt inventing new models of steam engines. Great Britain was also among the countries where the Second Industrial Revolution, which started in the 1870s, began and was characterized by the construction of railroads, large-scale iron and steel production, widespread use of the telegraph, and the beginning of electrification. The United Kingdom was also the first to experience the major effect of the Industrial Revolution, that is, a steady rise in the standard of living for the general population.

*adapted from Ben Johnson,
“Kings and Queens of England & Britain”*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Act of Settlement 1701: a bill that ensured the succession of the British Crown would exclude a Roman Catholic and pass to a Protestant, leading to the accession of King George I and the House of Hanover. The bill was amended in 2011 to allow Catholics to ascend to the throne.

Holy Roman Empire: name given to the countries of western and central Europe from 800 to 1806 and created by Charlemagne to ensure the rule of the Roman Pope across these countries.

New France: the area in North America and Canada colonized by France from 1534 and ending with the cessation of New France to Spain and Great Britain under the Treaty of Paris in 1763.

East India Company: a company established by Royal Charter in 1600 for trading with India and Southeast Asia, subsequently an agent of British political influence in India and expansion into China in the 19th century.

Sepoy: the name given to an Indian soldier armed with a musket employed by the British East India Company.

Sepoy Mutiny: an unsuccessful rebellion against British rule in India in 1857-1859 begun by Sepoy troops in the service of the British East India Company.

Flying shuttle: a key innovation in the weaving industry during the Industrial Revolution (from about 1733) allowing for the mechanization of weaving and which dominated the weaving industry until the mid-twentieth century.

Spinning jenny: invented in 1764, one of the key developments of the Industrial Revolution which reduced the work needed to operate it, greatly increased productivity and led to the mass production of cotton in factories.

Power loom: a steam-powered loom first developed in 1784 that allowed textiles to be developed much quicker than by human hands, thus leading to mass unemployment among skilled weavers.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. How did the House of Hanover come to reign in Great Britain after the death of Queen Anne?
2. When did the British Empire come to dominate in the world?

3. How did the East India Company carry out its control on the Indian Subcontinent?
4. Why did the Sepoy Mutiny in India lead to changes in the governance of the British colony?
5. What changes took place in Great Britain during the Industrial Revolution?

Text VII

Monarchy in the 20th and 21st centuries: the upheavals of the two world wars and the end of the British Empire (1901 – present)

In 1901, Queen Victoria died, bringing an end to the House of Hanover. She was succeeded by her eldest son Edward VII of the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, who was the longest serving **heir apparent** in British history until surpassed by Prince Charles on 20 April 2011. Edward has been recognized as the first truly constitutional British sovereign and the last sovereign to wield effective political power.

The House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, however, was short-lived, and included only the reign of Edward VII (1901-1911) and the first seven years of his son, King George V. In 1917, the name of the Royal House was changed to Windsor (from ‘Windsor Castle’) because of anti-German sentiment in the United Kingdom during World War I. The House of Windsor has had historically four British Monarchs: George V, Edward VIII, George VI, and the present reigning monarch, Elizabeth II.

In the 20th century, two world wars and profound political and social changes brought about the end of the British Empire. The process of decolonization began in Ireland, where, as the result of the Irish War of Independence, British rule came to an end in 1922 with the establishment of the Irish Free State as a self-governing Dominion of

the **British Commonwealth of Nations**. Part of Ireland, Northern Ireland stayed in the United Kingdom, which since 1921 is called ‘the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland’. In 1926, King George V and his prime ministers of the realms issued the Balfour Declaration, which recognized the Dominions of the Empire as “autonomous Communities within the British Empire”, and **the 1931 Statute of Westminster** confirmed their full legislative independence. After the Second World War, most of the British colonies and territories became independent, and the British Commonwealth of Nations, as the British Empire’s status was established by the Balfour Declaration, was replaced by the London Declaration of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers’ Conference (1949) with the **Commonwealth of Nations** as a free association of independent member-states.

At present, Queen Elizabeth II is the Head of the Commonwealth of 54 member-states, and in this position she is the Head of State of 16 member-states (the Commonwealth realms) and 33 republics, while five other member-states have different monarchs. The 54 member-states have no legal obligations to one another, but are connected through their use of the English language, historical ties and shared values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law. The Commonwealth nations have developed a shared Commonwealth culture, which is based on common sports, such as cricket, soccer, rugby and netball. The other examples of a shared Commonwealth culture include driving on the left, the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy, **common law**, widespread use of the English language, designation of English as an official language with British pronunciation norms, military and naval ranks, a substantial body of Commonwealth literature in English, etc.

By now, the constitutional form of monarchy in Great Britain has been fully developed, and, though the ultimate executive authority over the government is still formally the monarch’s royal prerogative, these powers may only be used according to laws enacted by Parliament. The monarch is Head of State, and Head of the British Armed Forces, and,

as Head of State, the monarch appoints the Prime Minister following a change of government, but all these functions are formal. The monarch is Head of the Church of England – a position that all British monarchs have held since Henry VIII’s ‘Act of Supremacy of 1534’. The monarch and their immediate family undertake various official, ceremonial, diplomatic and representational duties. Thus, the current monarch, Queen Elizabeth II, has the sole right of conferring titles of honour on deserving people in public recognition of their merit, service or bravery. The most awarded honour is the Order of Chivalry Reward introduced by George V in 1917 as the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, which nowadays is also used to reward contributions to the arts and sciences, work with charitable and welfare organizations and public service outside the civil service. The Order comprises five classes, the most senior two of which make the recipient either a knight if male or dame if female. The five classes are: 1) GBE (Knight Grand Cross or Dame Grand Cross of the Order of the British Empire), 2) KBE or DBE (Knight Commander or Dame Commander), 3) CBE (Commander), 4) OBE (Officer), 5) MBE (Member of the Order of the British Empire). The senior two ranks of Knight or Dame Grand Cross, and Knight or Dame Commander entitle their members to use the title of *Sir* for men and *Dame* for women before their forename. The order is limited to 300 Knight and Dames Grand Cross, 845 Knights and Dames Commander, and 8,960 Commanders. The Order of the British Empire has the highest number of members of the British Orders of Chivalry, with over 100, 000 living members worldwide. Currently the sovereign of the UK is Elizabeth II, and the recipients collect their awards from the Queen or another member of the royal family at an **investiture ceremony**. Honours recipients are announced twice a year (in the New Year’s Honours List and on the Queen’s Official Birthday). The honours are awarded on the advice of the Cabinet Office, who deal with all nominations.

Alongside awarding honours, the British Sovereign under a constitutional monarchy, performs another exclusive function – the

throne speech at **the State Opening of Parliament**. The speech is written nowadays by the sitting cabinet, and outlines the legislative programme for the new parliamentary session. The ceremony now is held annually in May in the Parliament's upper chamber (the House of Lords), with members of both houses in attendance.

*adapted from Ben Johnson,
"Kings and Queens of England & Britain"*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Heir apparent: the person (male or female) who is first in the order of succession to the throne of a country with a monarchy.

British Commonwealth of Nations: established in 1931, a free association of countries mainly of the former British Empire that has no constitution or formal laws, but is committed to the furtherance of humanitarian values, with the British monarch as its symbolic head.

1931 Statute of Westminster: an act of Parliament that provided for the legislative independence of countries of the British Empire from Great Britain, though retaining allegiance to the Crown, thereby paving the way for the creation of the Commonwealth.

Common Law: the basis of legislation in the United Kingdom, where laws derive from legal precedents and not written statutes.

Investiture ceremony: the ceremonial installation of high officials such as judges and heads of state, often accompanied by the symbols of their office.

State Opening of Parliament: an event which formally marks the beginning of the parliamentary session, opened by the Monarch.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Why was the name of the Royal House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha changed to Windsor during World War I?

2. Where did the process of decolonization of the British Empire begin in the 20th century?

3. What is the difference between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the Commonwealth of Nations declared in 1949?

Group Activities:

In groups of two to three students discuss the evolution of British national identity from the times of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms to the emergence and growth of the British Empire, to the collapse of the British Empire in the 20th century and to the present. What were the major factors that brought about changes in the national identity of Britons over the ages?

As a preliminary stage, students may collect some related information, using reference books, public media, including internet resources, etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussion in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual Work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about some aspects of British national identity and their origin.

B.

The British Monarchy Today: The Crisis of the British Monarchy and its Future

Discussion Questions:

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about the role and duties of the present Queen of Great Britain and Northern Ireland?

2. Why has Queen Elizabeth been reducing her public duties and giving them over to Prince Charles?

3. What are the recent scandals in the Royal Family that have resulted in the British Royal Crisis?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read three texts about the state of the British monarchy at present. As you read, note down the following:

1. the strict neutrality of the reigning monarch with respect to political matters,
2. the changing attitudes to monarchy as an institution in British society,
3. the unprecedented media attention that the Royals face at present.

Text VIII

Queen Elizabeth II: her role in the British political system, duties and legal privileges

The British Monarchy is the constitutional monarchy of the United Kingdom. The present constitutional monarch is Queen Elizabeth II, who ascended the throne in 1952, and is at present the longest reigning monarch in the history of Great Britain. Formally, she is Head of State, but the real power is in the hands of the Head of Government, that is the Prime Minister as the leader of the party or a coalition of parties that holds the largest number of seats in the Parliament's House of Commons. The Monarch's functions are limited to bestowing honours and appointing the Prime Minister, and the Royal Family undertakes various representational, diplomatic and charitable duties. The Monarch is also Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. Since Henry VIII's **Act of Supremacy of 1534**, the British monarch is Head of the Church of England.

Monarchy has always been seen as bedrock of stability and continuity in British life, with its lineage stretching back to Alfred the Great. However, monarchy as an institution has been shown to be in conflict with the concept of the Royal Family, where the British public has been encouraged to view its members as somehow better and greater than the **hoi polloi**, existing above the fray of everyday life in an exclusive reality

whose members should not be exposed to ‘ordinary’ problems. Such complacency was decisively rocked with the acrimonious divorce of Princess Diana and Prince Charles, the heir to the throne, and the subsequent death in 1997 in a car crash of Princess Diana. Recent revelations (October 2019) of the private life of Elizabeth II’s second son, Andrew, have raised questions about the suitability of the Royal Family as the ruling class, its status as a role model and whether it is, indeed, an anachronism in the twenty-first century.

As Head of State the Queen has to remain strictly neutral with respect to political matters. By **convention**, the Queen does not vote or stand for election; however, Her Majesty does have important ceremonial and formal roles in relation to the government of the UK.

After the general election, the Queen accepts the resignation of the outgoing Prime Minister (PM) and then instructs the new Prime Minister to form a government in her name. Once a PM is in office, the Queen meets with him/her weekly and offers counsel. She reads **the Queen’s Speech** to open Parliament, even though the speech is written by the government, and her powers are usually exercised on the advice of the PM.

The formal phrase 'Queen in Parliament' or 'Crown in Parliament' is used to describe the British legislature, which consists of the Sovereign, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The Queen's duties include opening each new session of Parliament, granting Royal Assent to legislation, and approving Orders and Proclamations through the Privy Council. The Queen also has a special relationship with the Prime Minister, retaining the right to appoint and also meeting with him or her on a regular basis.

In addition to playing a specific role in the UK Parliament based in London, the Queen has formal roles with relation to the devolved assemblies of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The Queen has an important formal and ceremonial relationship with Parliament. Of the three different elements describing the

British legislature (the Sovereign, the House of Lords and the House of Commons), the Commons, a majority of whom normally supports the elected Government of the day, has the dominant political power.

The Queen's role in Parliament is:

- Assenting to Bills passed by Parliament, on the advice of Ministers;
- Giving audiences to Ministers, at which Her Majesty may be consulted, encourage and warn;
- Summoning new Parliaments and, on the advice of her Government, appointing the date of its first meeting;
- Opening and closing (proroguing) each session of Parliament

The role of the Sovereign in the enactment of legislation is today purely formal, although the Queen has the right 'to be consulted, to encourage and to warn' her ministers via regular audiences with the Prime Minister.

The Sovereign's assent is required to all bills passed by Parliament in order for them to become law. **Royal Assent** (consenting to a measure becoming law) has not been refused since 1708.

Queen Elizabeth II's formal duties are largely representational, such as embarking on goodwill visits abroad and hosting foreign heads of state. The monarch's main role, according to the official royal website (royal.uk), is to serve as a vital part of Britain's "national identity, unity and pride".

But the Queen does have a few unique legal privileges. She retains the right to claim ownership of any unmarked mute swan swimming in open waters. She also claims dominion over all whales, sturgeons and dolphins in the waters around England and Wales, does not need a passport to travel abroad, and can drive without a license.

BACKGROUND NOTES

Act of Supremacy of 1534: Act of Parliament which enabled King Henry VIII to be proclaimed the head of the Church of England and thereby cutting ecclesiastical links with Rome.

hoi polloi: from the Greek, meaning 'the masses' or 'the people'; in modern usage it has a pejorative connotation.

Convention: a custom or tradition that has not been enshrined in law.

Queen's Speech to Open Parliament: the monarch's constitutional obligation to begin the process of government at the start of each parliamentary session,

Royal Assent: regarded today as a formality, the monarch's approval of an Act of Parliament. It was last refused in 1708 when Queen Anne refused to pass the Scottish Militia Bill for fear that the Scottish militia may become disloyal in the event of a French invasion.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Who holds the real power in the constitutional monarchy of the United Kingdom?
2. What are the main functions of the present constitutional monarch of Great Britain?
3. Why is monarchy as an institution in conflict with the concept of the Royal Family?
4. What are the other roles of the Queen in relation to the government of the U.K.?
5. What is the Queen's role in Parliament?
6. What are Queen Elizabeth II's formal duties?
7. What are the Queen's unique legal privileges?

Text IX

British monarchy in transition: Is it time for ‘King Charles’?

As of 2020, rumours are spreading throughout the British **media** that the ousting of Prince Andrew, Duke of York, from his royal status began with the call from Prince Charles, his older brother and heir to the throne, to their 93-year-old mother, the Queen. “He has to leave” – he allegedly told her and she responded by issuing the order.

As with so many things related to the British royals, the conversation has no official confirmation but that hasn’t stopped a new wave of speculation ranging from ‘it’s time to put an end to the useless monarchy’ to ‘it’s a purge and Charles is behind it’ to ‘it’s time for the Queen to retire and finally give Prince Charles his chance.’

“Future historians may conclude that Prince Andrew’s defining achievement was to give the nation a new verb,” concluded Jamie Doward in *The Guardian*, referring to the word “de-royaled”, coined by historian Robert Lacey who advises the Netflix series *The Crown* and who compares Andrew’s rejection with the **abdication** of Edward VIII in 1936 – a member of the royal family being effectively removed due to public pressure.

“Following a tumultuous week when his car-crash interview shook the House of Windsor so vigorously it seemed its palaces were in a danger of losing their **crenellations**,” writes Doward, “the Duke of York now finds himself banished from duties. His fate is the 21st-century equivalent of that which befell the difficult minor royals of previous eras who were locked up in asylums, away from the public gaze.”

As we know, the British monarchy has overcome many major crises that have foretold changes.

In this case, the circumstances foretelling the future seem clear. First, of course, is Andrew’s scandal, which once again has shown the fractious nature of the monarchy’s popularity and the **Achilles heels** of some of its members. As the investigation of the paedophile sex ring run by Jeffrey Epstein, the American financier, had shown, Prince Andrew was among those who availed themselves of Epstein’s services.

The Prince Andrew / Jeffrey Epstein scandal also revived the controversies over other sordid relationships and shadowy financial deals in which his Royal Highness was embroiled after his retirement from the Royal Navy in 2001.

In a column calling for the abolishment of the monarchy, commentator Suzanne Moore writes: “Here is Prince Andrew essentially dethroned, his sin being not his inhumanity, but giving an interview about his inhumanity... Andrew wasn’t just a **bad apple**, he comes from an orchard that produces them.”

Then there is the recent media storm caused by another television interview when Prince Harry and Meghan Markle, the Duke and the Duchess of Sussex, spoke of their personal difficulties in dealing with the **tabloids’** interference in their lives and fake news about them, and during which Harry confirmed rumours of rifts with his brother Prince William.

But foremost is the reality that the Queen is 93, and even if surrounded by the best of advisers – and there are many royal experts who doubt their competence – she should not have to deal with ugly scandals such as watching her favorite son accused of pedophilia and of having consorted with convicted criminals like Epstein.

The question on many British lips: Is the monarchy becoming feeble like the Queen?

“The royals are like most families,” a royal source told *The Guardian*. “You need a head of the family to step in – somebody tough and stern – who sorts it all out, but they don’t have anyone at the moment. It’s all sliding again. The Queen is just tired. It needs a stronger hand at the helm.”

Transition seems to be the word. The British monarchy has entered a period that could be called ‘transition in progress’ that contributes to its fragility and that unavoidably entails serious discussions about **succession** – and soon.

For a number of royal commentators and experts, Prince Charles’s intervention in the removal of his brother from all royal duties has shown that “Charles can run the firm”.

“If it wasn’t Prince Charles who actually pulled the trigger to sack wayward brother Andrew in the wake of the Epstein scandal, he certainly loaded the gun,” the *Sun* mused. “And the axing of her favorite son signaled what could be the Queen’s last major act of a reign that is fast coming to a close with typical quiet dignity.”

Citing different “royal sources”, the British media is predicting that Queen Elizabeth, with Charles at the helm of the plans, is preparing to retire on her 95th birthday, the same age at which her husband, Prince Philip, withdrew from public life.

At her advanced age, understandably, Queen Elizabeth has been reducing her official appearances at events and official ceremonies and practically is not travelling abroad anymore. Most of those public duties have been taken up by Charles.

In 2018, she completed 283 engagements, down from 332 in 2016, while Charles undertook 507.

All the indications, according to the French Magazine *Le Point*, are that it’s the time for “**Borgia** at the Windsor: The Fall of Andrew, the coronation of Charles.”

The magazine cites historian Sir Anthony Holden who says that the sidelining of Andrew is intended to protect the Queen: “In the end, it is a family problem, not institutional, which concerns only the eighth in the order of succession, a very unpopular personality to the public. The monarchy is still strong.”

In that frame, the ousting of Andrew is part of a bigger effort orchestrated by Charles, to slim down the monarchy, about which he has made no secret.

“The 59-year-old Prince Andrew is the latest victim of the vast **purge** orchestrated by his elder brother to refocus the royal family on its core,” *Le Point* writes. “The Royals officially assigned to represent the Queen should be reduced to a minimum: Charles, William, Harry, their wives and their descendants”.

Court life (as portrayed in the *The Crown*) leaves no room for feelings. “Under his courteous and phlegmatic exterior, the heir to the

throne knows how to be brutal in the name of reason of state and the everlasting rule of power,” *Le Point* adds.

Has the time for King Charles arrived? Quite likely. He is already being dubbed the ‘Shadow King’ for his handling of the furore over the Prince Andrew scandal.

adapted from Cecilia Rodriguez (Forbes magazine)

BACKGROUND NOTES

Media: the usual term for ‘mass media’, the means for transmitting information to the population.

Abdication: the act whereby a reigning monarch relinquishes the throne voluntarily, most recently when King Edward VIII withdrew from royal duties in 1936.

Crenellations: the ridges on castle walls allowing weapons such as arrows to be fired in a defensive action against aggressors.

Achilles heel: the weak point in an otherwise powerful entity, so-called because of the fatal wound in that part of the body suffered by the apparently invincible Achilles during the Trojan War.

Bad apple: a person in a group whose actions may negatively affect all the others.

Tabloids: newspapers in a small and comfortable format that usually contain some sensational or risqué content.

Purge (in politics): the removal of a number of people in powerful positions regarded as opponents or enemies, often with lethal consequences for the victims,

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Comprehension questions:

1. How did the ousting of Prince Andrew from his royal status begin according to the British media?
2. What new verb appeared in the English language with Prince Andrew's rejection?
3. What period did the British monarchy enter following a series of scandals in the Royal Family?
4. Why does Queen Elizabeth have to reduce her engagements connected with her public duties?

Text X

“Megxit”: A British Royal Crisis

On January 8th, 2020, Great Britain woke up to the news that Prince Harry, Duke of Sussex, and Meghan Markle had made the decision to step down as senior members of the royal family, only one day after the couple's first post-holiday public appearance. Shocking not only the British public but also the royal family themselves, who learned of the couple's decision through their public announcement, Harry and Meghan promised to “work to become financially independent” from the family. In details hastened out in negotiations with the Queen over the following ten days, the Sussexes lost the right to use their royal title and were informed they would be unable to officially represent the Queen in any capacity. In exchange, the couple would be granted “complete and absolute” freedom from having future commercial deals scrutinized by **Buckingham Palace**. In addition they would be excluded from the Queen's **Sovereign Wealth Fund**. The rapid departure has raised numerous questions over the future of the royal family, including whether the royals require modernizing and indeed where they stand in the face of an increasingly diverse and democratic Britain.

To say that the British public and press were left reeling in the aftermath of what was popularly coined as “**Megxit**” is an understatement. “It is unique, mostly because to be royalty is to live the

royal life. It's not a choice," explained Lidia Plaza, a Ph.D student at Yale specializing in early modern British history.

Just over a year and a half earlier, the couple had married in a lavish ceremony at **Windsor Castle** watched by up to 1.9 billion worldwide. Together with Prince William and Kate Middleton, the "**Fab Four**" were expected to inject the royals with a much-needed dose of youth and diversity. This plan now appeared to be in tatters.

In the aftermath of the couple's shocking move, the British press expressed their incredulity, with headlines describing it as 'petulant,' 'rogue,' and an 'atrocious lapse of judgement.' The decision not to inform other royals of their decision was particularly surprising. "They probably didn't want to be talked out of it," explained Plaza. "I imagine the decision was very much a long time coming."

Modern day Britain has never seen royals in senior positions making an active decision to relinquish their duties. The closest situation that could relate to it was Edward VIII's choice to abdicate, which was precipitated by a constitutional crisis (the King was legally the Head of the Church of England, which at that time did not allow divorced women to remarry if their former spouse was alive).

The aftermath of the announcement left many questioning what contributed to the couple's dramatic decision. Prince Harry has always been highly critical of tabloids. Indeed, he appeared to put the blame for the split at the media's doorstep stating that the media was a "powerful force" that forced him to take a decisive action to protect his family. This time the focus of his anger has been on the British press's treatment of Meghan Markle. Some royal experts agree that the way the media has been treating Meghan is very disrespectful. Meghan has had significant confrontations with the British media. Last October, it was revealed she was taking legal action against *The Mail on Sunday* and its parent company, Associated Newspapers, for publishing a private letter to her estranged father. In mid-November, she filed another lawsuit against *The Mail* for making up 'untrue' stories to portray her in a negative light.

Meghan Markle's background has long been a point of contention in the media. She and Wallis Simpson, the woman Edward VIII abdicated to marry, share striking similarities: both are divorced American women, traits that the royals themselves would until recently have looked upon unfavorably. It was not until 2002 that the Church of England, of which the Queen serves as the head, allowed divorced people to remarry under certain conditions. Some royal experts argue that much of the press's hounding of Meghan was racially biased, and displayed a certain hostility to her as a Black woman.

The media's unflattering comparisons between Meghan and Kate Middleton clearly show that Meghan was getting media attention that was so much more vitriolic than other women in these positions received. In recent years, Kate has often been perceived as a model English princess, the epitome of modesty and charm. It has been noted that there is correlation between the press's and public's hostility to Meghan and the rise of nationalism in the wake of key political decisions like Brexit. Since the key vote in 2016, the number of **hate crimes** in Britain has risen by over 40 percent in an increasingly polarized political climate, with the rise of nationalist groups such as the Brexit Party fueling anti-foreign sentiment in parts of the country.

In Great Britain, the perception of the royal family has long been one of high class and moderation, a glamorous yet noble reminder of Britain's glory days. While Meghan undoubtedly endured an unprecedented level of negative media attention, she received much criticism for breaking royal protocol in a number of ways. Whether she was hosting an unexpected **baby shower**, ignoring royal dress code rules by wearing clothes deemed inappropriate, or even closing her own car door, Meghan broke numerous long standing royal traditions, no matter how insignificant.

Regardless of Meghan's personality conflicting with the Royals, there is little doubt that her and Harry's sudden departure from the family raises questions about the relevance the British monarchy holds in a modern day society. It could certainly mean a weakening of the

monarchy and it could force the royal establishment to undergo a renaissance. As an inherently unmeritocratic institution, the Royals already face questions about their **birthright privileges**, matters that are being pressed further home by the departure of a foreigner who many believe was never truly accepted as a member of the family. It has been observed that the Royal family's conservative values never matched her beliefs or origins.

Worsening matters, in today's age, the Royals face unprecedented media attention. Life was not always like this for the royal family. There was in fact no coverage of the Royals' everyday life until the late 1940s. Now, they are under close scrutiny at all times. It is argued that it is this that could force the greatest pressure on the Royals when their every decision, down to their favorite brands and their choice of breakfast foods, is closely monitored. These questions all come in the face of perhaps the most significant threat to the Royals, that being their future in the aftermath of the Queen's death.

While the Royals clearly seem to have enough support from the British public and political system to remain a powerful force, Meghan and Harry's departure has undoubtedly left them in somewhat of an impasse. For many the marriage of the two was representative of a modernized British family, a step forward that increased both diversity in the family as well as introducing a forward thinker who promised to use her position of privilege to help those most in need. Meghan and Harry's departure has forced a rethink of what modernizing should mean for the Royals.

Indeed, while modernization has been a byword for the Royals for decades, the question of how that would manifest itself remains a mystery. For some, modernization means to become more in touch with the values of a liberal democratic Britain, including breaking away from traditional customs promoting royal elitism, promoting socially progressive policies and accepting people from different social and cultural backgrounds. Diana was the first modern royal who championed such causes, leading campaigns against landmines and

homelessness and raising awareness for AIDS. Her son Prince William and his spouse Kate Middleton engaged extensively in charity work and numerous mental health causes. It seemed for a time that Harry and Meghan followed in Kate and William's footsteps.

Ultimately, "Megxit" is a decision that creates more questions than answers. The move raises significant queries about the media's right to intrude into private life and the British press and the public's hostile and often racist portrayal of Meghan Markle. Above all, it has forced a discussion of what the Royals stand for in the modern day. While undoubtedly an institution still adored by millions and one that maintains significant political and economic power, the question of what a progressive modern Royal family looks like remains in the balance. For many, that image was Harry and Meghan, a prince who had followed after his mother in campaigning for social causes and a Duchess who would bring much needed diversity and a platform for change. Until the Royals can prove they can modernize effectively, and until the British public and press have shown they can accept these changes, the future of the institution remains a pressing question.

adapted from Ignacio Diaz Pascual (The Politic, 2020)

BACKGROUND NOTES

Megxit: the decision announced in January 2020 by the Duke and Duchess of Sussex (Prince Harry and Meghan Markle) to remove themselves from royal duties, popularly perceived as initiated by Meghan.

Buckingham Palace: since 1837 the official residence of the British monarch and the administrative headquarters of the monarchy.

Palace of Westminster: also known as the Houses of Parliament, the place where the House of Lords and House of Commons meet to agree and set the laws of the land.

Fab Four: nickname given to the Beatles, the four-man Liverpool-based pop group that dominated pop music from 1960 until their dissolution in 1971.

Sovereign Wealth Fund: a state-owned investment fund that invests in or manages projects that are intended for the public good (the private business equivalent would be venture capital).

Hate crime: a crime perpetrated through motives of racial, religious or sexual antagonism.

Baby shower: a party organized to celebrate the imminent birth of a baby.

Birthright privileges: the privileges and/or inheritance conferred upon a first-born son.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What did Prince Harry and Meghan Markle's decision to step down as senior members of the royal family mean for their status as royals?

2. Who were the Fab Four that were to rejuvenate British Monarchy?

3. Why was Prince Harry angry with the media?

4. What negative phenomena followed the Brexit political decision in the U.K.?

5. What could Megxit mean for the state of monarchy as an institution in Great Britain?

6. How is modernization of the monarchy as an institution understood in British society?

Text XI

The Future of the British Monarchy

1992 was the most recent nadir for the Royal family. Elizabeth II described it as her **annus horribilis**. A fire at her residence of Windsor Castle, two divorces and a separation (that of Charles, Prince of Wales and his long-suffering wife Diana), meant that Britain's Royal family seemed more like a soap opera than a regal and ruling dynasty. Since then their popularity has recovered, though not without the occasional setback. 1997 saw the death of Diana, in a car crash in Paris, which refocused the Queen's attention on the need for the monarchy to evolve to meet the modern demands of the British public. Accused of being aloof and arrogant, a more emotional bond with her subjects needed to be fostered. This was achieved by 2010 when over 36 million people in the UK watched the wedding of Prince William to Kate Middleton, and the young couple were feted all over the country. Evolution was not a foreign concept to the British Crown, though. The 20th century saw many countries switch from rule by a king, or emperor, to a republican system. Two cousins of George V were deposed during or in the aftermath of the First World War. The monarchies of Greece, Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, and Italy were abolished around the same period. Yet, the British one survived.

Survival has always been the priority for the British Crown. Apart from a brief flirtation in the 17th century, when Charles I made the fatal mistake of going against Parliament and asserting his divine right to rule, the UK, and before it the Kingdom of England, has always been ruled by a King or Queen. Since the Glorious Revolution, a **coup d'état** which replaced the Catholic James II with his Protestant daughter Mary and her husband William III, the crown has slowly given up its power to Parliament. Indeed, Parliament has a record of inviting foreign rulers to take over the throne in Westminster when appropriate and using the little power and influence those **potentates** have to further cement the power of the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The Bill of

Rights, after the Glorious Revolution greatly reduced the **Royal Prerogative**, and the last monarch to withhold **royal assent** for a Parliamentary Bill was Queen Anne. When she died without issue, her third cousin, George III, was invited to take the throne, even though there were potentially other claimants. William IV was the last monarch to dissolve Parliament arbitrarily. Queen Victoria was disappointed that she could not appoint the Prime Minister herself, instead having to bow to the wishes of Parliament, and the royal family morphed into a British ‘model’ family, and the monarch became a popular figurehead.

As the 20th century dawned, and the **Victorian era** gave way to the **Edwardian**, the royal family began to adapt to mass media and look to grow its popularity among the millions of regular British citizens. In 1917 George V, as his cousin Nicholas II was removed from power in a popular uprising, changed the family name from the distinctly German Saxe-Coburg and Gotha to the more Albion Windsor. It was his son, George VI, whose actions during the Second World War, staying in Buckingham Palace as bombs rained on London, keeping to the same rationing regime as their subjects and the loss of his brother, the Duke of Kent, while he was on active service, made the nation see him as a point of unity. The crowds celebrating the Victory in Europe Day called for the King, a signal of his popularity.

Crowned in 1953, Elizabeth II has been the longest reigning British monarch. Over sixty years there have obviously been waxings and wanings in popularity. Nowadays the Queen, far removed from partisan bickering in Parliament, is celebrated as a unifying figure, and a symbol of the UK. Even though some question whether the monarchy is anachronistic or not, there is no substantial campaign in favour of making the UK a republic.

However, there have been proposals mooted that when once it comes time for Charles to take the throne, it would be a good time to ditch the old-fashioned system of constitutional monarchy. Part of this is the argument that the Royal Family costs the British public too much, and should be abolished on these grounds. This, however, does not

stand up. The profits from the Crown Estates flow directly into the Treasury, and as well as the money from **the royal warrants**, bring in over 500 million pounds a year. The total cost of the monarchy, including the sovereign grant, security costs, and the fees owed by the use of state buildings, amounted to only 292 million pounds. Even without the intangible benefits the Royal Family brings to the UK economy and tourism, estimated at over 1 billion pounds, the crown provides more to the public purse than it costs. The amount needed to switch from a constitutional monarchy to a republic, such as the funding of a President, updating legislation, issuing a new currency, etc., would be substantial. As such, the utilitarian and pragmatic arguments all favour keeping the monarchy.

More idealistic arguments still stand up to some scrutiny. The fact is that the British people are not sovereign. Sovereignty is vested in Parliament, made up of the House of Lords, the House of Commons, and the Crown-in-Parliament. British citizens are subjects of the Crown, which goes against most modern democracies, which see power and the right to rule being enmeshed in the citizenry. They exercise that power through a constitution, which outlines how a state is to be ruled. However, there is no practical difference between that understanding of the role of the people and that of the UK system. There is seemingly no appetite for such a change among the British population, and the very nature of them willingly continuing with the current constitutional model, shows that the current system is only a bit of political theatre. The royal family is firmly ensconced in its position.

Despite the recent 'royal fatigue', two-thirds of the country were not interested in the wedding of Prince Harry to Meghan Markle, brought about by a media saturated with coverage of the Windsor family. The monarchy will survive. It will survive for the foreseeable future. It plays to large a part in British constitutional life, apart from its role in society. For much of the world, the Queen and the royal family are Britain. It has adapted to newspapers, radio, and television, and will do the same for the internet. It is a conservative and methodical institution,

changing not too hastily but only after due consideration, but still, the Queen sends the occasional tweet. The monarchy has survived the upheavals of the 20th century, and countless upheavals in the preceding centuries, by constantly evolving. The 21st century monarchy will be different from that which went before, but it will continue to do what it has always done: survive.

*adapted from Fergus McKeown,
“The Future of the British Monarchy”*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Annus horribilis (Lat.): the phrase used by Queen Elizabeth II to designate 1992, which witnessed the disastrous fire at Windsor Castle and various well-publicized and lurid scandals involving her children.

coup d'état: the removal of an existing government from power, usually by an armed force and through violent means.

Potentate: a monarch or ruler, usually with despotic tendencies.

Royal Prerogative: the powers, rights, privileges and immunities afforded to the monarch by Parliament.

Royal Assent: regarded today as a formality, the monarch's approval of an Act of Parliament. It was last denied in 1708 when Queen Anne refused to pass the Scottish Militia Bill for fear that the Scottish militia may become disloyal in the event of a French invasion.

Victorian era: the period when Victoria was Queen from 1837 to 1901, a reign associated with industrial might, scientific discovery, imperial power and cultural greatness.

Edwardian era: the reign of Victoria's son Edward VII from 1901 to 1910, which saw a flowering of the arts and the rise of 'consumerism'.

Royal Warrants: since the 15th century, the system whereby those who supply services of goods to the royal court are appointed (for instance, the wine company Berry Bros and Rudd have supplied the royal wine cellars for more than two centuries).

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Why was 1992 Elizabeth II's annus horribilis?
2. When did the British monarchy start gradually giving up its power to Parliament?
3. When did the Royal Family begin to adapt to mass media in search of public support for constitutional monarchy?
4. How did the actions of the Royals during the Second World War increase their popularity?
5. Why doesn't the argument that the royal family costs the British public too much stand up to scrutiny?
6. How do British citizens exercise their power if according to the constitution they are not sovereign but subjects of the Crown?
7. Why will the British monarchy survive despite the changes of modernity?

Group Activities:

In groups of two to three students discuss the relevance of the monarchy as a system of government in our times.

Is not the Queen's role in political life in the 21st century an anachronism?

Does monarchy have the advantage over other systems of government in that it offers stability and continuity in an unpredictable world?

As a preliminary stage, students may collect some related information, using reference books, public media, including internet resources, etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussion in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about the relevance of the monarchy as an institution in the 21st century and whether it would be better to replace it with a republican form of government.

UNIT II: BRITISH POLITICAL HISTORY

1945-2020: THE END OF EMPIRE

Introductory Discussion:

The end of the Second World War saw three victors: the USA, which in the post-war world expanded its financial muscle throughout the world, the USSR which became a global power, especially with the creation of ‘buffer’ states in Eastern Europe, and the UK, which was financially bankrupt after 6 years of war. The following years saw states in Africa and Asia (India, Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya) become independent and the erosion of British imperial status, never more clearly demonstrated than in the Suez crisis of 1956.

Look through the British political history timeline in the period of 1945-2020, and note down the following:

1. the most important developments that transformed the country’s political, economic and cultural life;
2. the events that eventually led to the collapse of the British colonial system and creation of the Commonwealth of Nations;
3. the changing attitudes of the British people and the ruling elite towards the membership of the European Union.

Timeline:

- 1945: Defeat for Winston Churchill’s Conservative Government in the General Election; landslide (ie overwhelming) victory for Clement Attlee’s Labour Party
- 1946: Nationalization of British Rail
- 1946-1951: Nationalization of the coal industry
- 1947: Independence of India and partition
- 1947: Creation of the National Health Service, and establishment of the Welfare State (overseen by Sir William Beveridge)
- 1948-1951: Rebellion against British rule in Kenya and Malaya

- 1951: Return of Winston Churchill as Conservative Prime Minister
- 1952: Death of King George VI
- 1953: Accession to the throne of Queen Elizabeth II
- 1955: Retirement of Winston Churchill, succeeded by Anthony Eden
- 1956: Suez crisis, end of Great Britain's status as a superpower
- 1957: resignation of Eden; Harold Macmillan becomes Prime Minister
- 1957: Independence of Ghana and Malaya (followed by Nigeria 1960, Kenya 1963)
- 1964: General Election won by Harold Wilson's Labour Party
- 1968: Enoch Powell, Shadow Minister for Defence, gives 'Rivers of Blood' speech attacking mass immigration into the UK
- 1970: Election of Conservative government under Edward Heath
- 1973; Accession to the Common Market (the European Economic Community, EEC)
- Early 1970s: industrial unrest and strikes, introduction of the three-day week, 1973; power shortages and black-outs
- 1974: Election of a Labour Government under Harold Wilson
- 1975: positive referendum on UK's continuing EEC membership
- 1975: Inflation at 24%
- 1978-79: the 'Winter of Discontent' under Labour Prime Minister James Callaghan (Harold Wilson had resigned in 1976)
- 1979: election of Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government
- 1982: the Falklands War
- 1983: election of Mrs Thatcher's second Conservative government
- 1984-85: the Miners' Strike, ending in defeat for the miners
- 1987: election of Mrs Thatcher's third Conservative government
- 1990: resignation of Mrs Thatcher as Prime Minister; replaced by John Major
- 1990: 'first' Gulf War to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi occupation
- 1992: election of Conservative government under John Major
- 1997: election of Labour government under Tony Blair
- 1997: death of Princess Diana

- 2001: Al-Qaeda attack on Twin Towers, New York
- 2003: US and UK forces invade Iraq ('second' Gulf War) to enact 'regime change' against Saddam Hussain
- 2007: Tony Blair resigns; replaced by Gordon Brown
- 2008 Global financial crisis
- 2010: General Election; no party with overall majority in the House of Commons, coalition government between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats
- 2015: General Election: David Cameron's Conservatives win majority in House of Commons
- 2016: Referendum on continued membership of European Union shows majority in the UK in favour of leaving the European Union; resignation of David Cameron
- 2016: Theresa May assumes position of Prime Minister
- 2017-2019: UK government and EU work out and agree EU Withdrawal Bill (about 500 pages)
- 2019: Parliament rejects UK government's EU Withdrawal Bill
- June 2019: Theresa May resigns as Prime Minister
- July 2019: Boris Johnson elected by Conservative Party members as leader of the Conservative Party and *ipso facto* Prime Minister
- August 2019: Boris Johnson 'prorogues' (ie suspends) Parliament
- September 2019: UK Supreme Court rules that Boris Johnson's 'prorogation' of Parliament was 'unlawful'
- October 2019: General Election called for 12 December 2019
- 12 December 2019: Conservative government under Boris Johnson returned to power with large majority in the House of Commons
- 31 January 2020: the UK leaves the European Union
- March 2020: Coronavirus declared a 'pandemic' by the World Health Organization
- May 2020: number of deaths from coronavirus in the UK exceeds 40,000, with infection rates of over 300,000 (See Unit 5)
- December 2020: end of transition period for the UK's departure from the EU.

A. Postwar Britain: The Decline of the Colonial System (1945-1990)

Discussion Questions:

The signs of decline of the British Empire were evident even before the end of the Second World War. Following the war, the economic and financial situation in Great Britain was deplorable, and it made its government focus on the country's internal problems rather than attempt to fight the anticolonial movements overseas in order to save the remains of the British Empire.

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about the British Empire at the peak of its power?
2. How did the relations between Great Britain and its former colonies and dependencies change after decolonization?
3. What were the causes of the British race riots in the 1980s?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read four texts about the political history of Great Britain in the period of 1945-1951. As you read, note down the following:

1. the political and economic policies of the two major parties in Great Britain,
2. the process of decolonization and the demise of the British Empire,
3. racial discrimination and race riots in the 1980s,
4. the peace process in Northern Ireland,
5. Thatcherism as a political phenomenon.

Text I

Radical reforms of the postwar Labour government: Nationalizing major industries and utilities (1945-1951)

Labour rejoiced at its political triumph, the first independent parliamentary majority in the party's history, but it faced grave

problems. The war had stripped Britain of virtually all its foreign financial resources, and the country had built up “sterling credits”—debts owed to other countries that would have to be paid in foreign currencies—amounting to several billion pounds. Moreover, the economy was in disarray. Some industries, such as aircraft manufacture, were far larger than were now needed, while others, such as railways and coal mines, were desperately short of new equipment and in bad repair. With nothing to export, Britain had no way to pay for imports or even for food. To make matters worse, within a few weeks of the surrender of Japan, on September 2, 1945, U.S. President Harry S. Truman, as he was required to do by law, ended **lend-lease**, upon which Britain had depended for its necessities as well as its arms. **John Maynard Keynes**, as his last service to Great Britain, had to negotiate a \$3.75 billion loan from the United States and a smaller one from Canada. In international terms, Britain was bankrupt.

Labour, nonetheless, set about enacting the measures that in some cases had been its program since the beginning of the century. Nationalization of railroads and coal mines, which were in any case so run down that any government would have had to bring them under state control, and of the Bank of England began immediately. In addition, road transport, docks and harbours, and the production of electrical power were nationalized. There was little debate. The Conservatives could hardly argue that any of these industries, barring electric power, was flourishing or that they could have done much differently.

More debate came over Labour’s social welfare legislation, which created the “**welfare state**.” Labour enacted a comprehensive program of national insurance, based upon the Beveridge Report (prepared by economist **William Beveridge** and advocating state action to control unemployment, along with the introduction of free health insurance and contributory social insurance) but differing from it in important ways. It regularized the de facto nationalization of public assistance, the old **Poor Law**, in the National Assistance Act of 1946, and in its most

controversial move it established the gigantic framework of the **National Health Service**, which provided free comprehensive medical care for every citizen, rich or poor. The pugnacious temper of the minister of health, Aneurin Bevan, and the insistence of radical elements in the Labour Party upon the nationalization of all hospitals provoked the only serious debate accompanying the enactment of this immense legislative program, most of which went into force within two years of Labour's accession to office. Bevan emerged at this time as an important figure on the Labour left and would remain its leader until his death in 1960.

Labour's record in its first 18 months of office was distinguished. In terms of sheer legislative bulk, the government accomplished more than any other government in the 20th century save perhaps Asquith's pre-World War I administration or the administration of **Margaret Thatcher** (1979–90). Yet by 1947 it had been overtaken by the economic crisis, which had not abated. The loan from the United States that was supposed to last four years was nearly gone. Imports were cut to the bone. Bread, never rationed during the war, had to be controlled. Britain had to withdraw support from Greece and Turkey, reversing a policy more than a century old, and call upon the United States to take its place. Thus, at Britain's initiative, **the Truman Doctrine** came into existence.

Relief came with U.S. Secretary of State George C. Marshall's announcement that the United States would undertake a massive program of financial aid to the European continent. Any country in the Eastern or Western bloc was entitled to take part. Although the Soviet Union immediately denounced the Marshall Plan as the beginning of a division between the East and the West, all western European countries, including Britain, hastened to participate. It can be argued that **the Marshall Plan** and the Truman Doctrine represent the permanent involvement of the United States in Europe.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Winston Churchill: British politician (1874-1965) who as Prime Minister (1940-1945) led the country to victory in the Second World War against Nazi Germany; lost the 1945 General Election to Labour led by H. H. Asquith but was returned as Prime Minister in the General Election of 1951.

Lend-lease: Military and humanitarian aid provided by the USA to various countries including Great Britain and the Soviet Union during the Second World War.

John Maynard Keynes: British economist (1883-1946) and one of the most influential economic thinkers of the 20th century, who advocated more state intervention during times of recession.

Welfare state: concept of government instituted in the United Kingdom after the Second World War which provides for free education, health and in many cases housing.

The Poor Laws: a series of laws dating from the 16th century designed to provide relief (and sometimes punishment) to the destitute, beggars and vagrants.

National Health Service: the publicly-funded healthcare system of the United Kingdom established in 1948, providing free healthcare to the population at the point of delivery.

Margaret Thatcher: British Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990, who oversaw a radical restructuring of British industry, including the privatization of nationalized sectors.

Truman Doctrine: the policy of US President Harry S. Truman to contain and oppose Soviet actions in the world, first stated in 1947 and forming the ideological basis of the Cold War for the next 40 years.

Marshall Plan: Economic Recovery Plan for post-war Europe as initiated by the US Secretary of State George Marshall in 1948, paid for by the United States.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What problems did the Labour party face on winning the parliamentary election in 1945?
2. Why was there little opposition to Labour's nationalization policies from the Conservatives?
3. What were the most important elements of Labour's welfare state programme?
4. How did the Truman doctrine come into existence and why?

Text II

Withdrawal from the Empire in the process of decolonization

Britain, not entirely by coincidence, was also beginning its withdrawal from the Empire. Most insistent in its demand for self-government was India. The Indian independence movement had come of age during World War I and had gained momentum with the **Massacre of Amritsar** of 1919. The All-India Congress Party, headed by **Mohandas K. Gandhi**, evoked sympathy throughout the world with its **policy of nonviolent resistance**, forcing Baldwin's government in the late 1920s to seek compromise. The eventual solution, embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935, provided responsible government for the Indian provinces, the Indianization of the civil service, and an Indian parliament, but it made clear that the Westminster Parliament would continue to legislate for the subcontinent. The act pleased no one, neither the Indians, the Labour Party, which considered it a weak compromise, nor a substantial section of the Conservative Party headed by Churchill, which thought it went too far. Agitation in India continued.

Further British compromise became inevitable when the Japanese in the spring of 1942 swept through Burma to the eastern borders of India while also organizing in Singapore a large Indian National Army and issuing appeals to Asian nationalism. During the war, Churchill reluctantly offered increasing installments of independence amounting to dominion status in return for all-out Indian support for the conflict. These offers were rejected by both the Muslim minority and the Hindu majority.

The election of a Labour government at the end of World War II coincided with the rise of sectarian strife within India. The new administration determined with unduly urgent haste that Britain would have to leave India. This decision was announced on June 3, 1947, and British administration in India ended 10 weeks later, on August 15. Burma (now Myanmar) and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) received independence by early 1948. Britain, in effect, had no choice but to withdraw from colonial territories it no longer had the military and economic power to control.

The same circumstances that dictated the withdrawal from India required, at almost the same time, the termination of the mandate in Trans-Jordan, the evacuation of all of Egypt except the Suez Canal territory, and in 1948 the withdrawal from Palestine, which coincided with the proclamation of the State of Israel. It has been argued that the orderly and dignified ending of the British Empire, beginning in the 1940s and stretching into the 1960s, was Britain's greatest international achievement. However, like the notion of national unity during World War II, this interpretation can also be seen largely as a myth produced by politicians and the press at the time and perpetuated since. The ending of empire was calculated upon the basis of Britain's interests rather than those of its colonies. National interest was framed in terms of the postwar situation—that is, of an economically exhausted, dependent Britain, now increasingly caught up in the international politics of the **Cold War**. What later became known as “decolonization” was very often shortsighted, self-interested, and not

infrequently bloody, as was especially the case in Malaysia (where the politics of anticommunism played a central role) and in Kenya.

The last years of Attlee's administration were troubled by economic stringency and inflation. The pound was sharply devalued in 1949, and a general election on February 23, 1950, reduced Labour's majority over the Conservative and Liberal parties to only five seats. Attlee himself was in poor health, and Ernest Bevin, formerly the most politically powerful man in the cabinet, had died. More radical members of the party, led by Aneurin Bevan, were growing impatient with the increasingly moderate temper of the leadership. On October 25, 1951, a second general election in a House of Commons not yet two years old returned the Conservatives under Churchill to power with a majority of 17 seats.

The Conservatives remained in power for the next 13 years, from October 1951 until October 1964, first under Churchill—who presided over the **accession of the new monarch**, Queen Elizabeth II, on February 6, 1952, but was forced to resign on account of age and health on April 5, 1955—and then under Churchill's longtime lieutenant and foreign secretary, Anthony Eden. Eden resigned in January 1957, partly because of ill health but chiefly because of his failed attempt to roll back the retreat from empire by a reoccupation of the **Suez Canal Zone** after the nationalization of the canal by the Egyptian president, Gamal Abdel Nasser, in the summer of 1956. This belated experiment in imperial adventure drew broad criticism from the United States, the British dominions, and indeed within Britain itself. Although it was cut short in December 1956, when UN emergency units supplanted British (and French) troops, the Suez intervention divided British politics as few foreign issues have done since. Eden was succeeded by his chancellor of the Exchequer, Harold Macmillan. Macmillan remained in office until October 1963, when he too retired because of ill health, to be succeeded by Sir Alec Douglas-Home, then foreign secretary. In this period of single-party government, the themes were economic change and the continued retreat from colonialism.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Massacre of Amritsar: Infamous event when British and Gurkha soldiers killed almost 400 unarmed demonstrators, subsequently a major stimulus for calls for Indian independence.

All-India Congress Party and the policy of non-violent resistance: founded in 1885, under the leadership of Mohandas Gandhi and his politics of non-violent resistance to oppression, from the 1920s it became the main platform for Indian independence from Great Britain, which was achieved in 1947.

Mohandas K. Gandhi: Known for his ascetic lifestyle, the leading figure in the struggle for Indian independence (lived 1869-1948). He was assassinated by a Hindu fundamentalist.

Cold War: the period between approximately the late 1940s and late 1980s characterized by political and military confrontation between the USSR and NATO and their proxy allies.

Accession of the new monarch: the occasion when a new monarch succeeds to the throne on the death of the preceding King or Queen.

Suez Canal Zone: the location of British army garrisons on the Suez Canal in Egypt between 1945 and 1956.

British dominions: before 1939, the status of British Commonwealth countries Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Republic of Ireland and Newfoundland, legally autonomous but bound by allegiance to the British Crown.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Where in the world was the movement for independence from the British rule particularly strong?
2. Why did Britain have to withdraw from India, Burma and other countries fighting for independence?

3. Why is the ending of the British Empire as Britain's greatest international achievement a myth?

4. How did the British attempt to reoccupy the Suez Canal Zone in 1956 end?

Text III

The rise of the trade unions as a formidable political power (1964-1979)

Labour interlude (1964–70)

The long Conservative tenure came to an end on October 16, 1964, with the appointment of a Labour administration headed by Harold Wilson, who had been Labour leader only a little more than a year and a half—since the death of the widely admired Hugh Gaitskell. Gaitskell and prominent Conservative R.A. Butler had been the principal figures in the politics of moderation known as “Butskellism” (derived by combining their last names), a slightly left-of-centre consensus predicated on the recognition of the power of **trade unionism**, the importance of addressing the needs of the working class, and the necessity of collaboration between social classes. Although Wilson was thought to be a Labour radical and had attracted a substantial party following on this account, he was in fact a moderate. His government inherited the problems that had accumulated during the long period of Conservative prosperity: poor labour productivity, a shaky pound, and trade union unrest. His prescription for improvement included not only a widely heralded economic development plan, to be pursued with the introduction of the most modern technology, but also stern and unpopular controls on imports, the devaluation of the pound, wage restraint, and an attempt, in the event these measures proved unsuccessful, to reduce the power of the trade unions. Eventually the Wilson government became unpopular and was kept in power primarily by weakness and division in the Conservative Party. Finally, in 1968,

Wilson was confronted with an outbreak of **civil rights** agitation in Northern Ireland that quickly degenerated into armed violence.

The return of the Conservatives (1970–74)

The Conservatives returned in a general election on June 18, 1970, with a majority of 32. The new prime minister, Edward Heath, set three goals: to take Britain into the **European Economic Community** (EEC; ultimately succeeded by the **European Union** [EU]), to restore economic growth, and to break the power of the trade unions. In his short term in office he succeeded only in negotiating Britain's entry into the EEC, in 1973. In fact, Heath was defeated by the trade unions, which simply boycotted his industrial legislation, and by the **Arab oil embargo**, which began in 1973 and which made a national coal miners' strike in the winter of 1973–74 particularly effective. Heath used the strongest weapon available to a prime minister—a general election, on February 28, 1974—to settle the issue of who governed Britain. The election, held when factories were in operation only three days a week and civilian Britain was periodically reduced to candlelight, was a repudiation of the policy of confrontation with organized labour.

Labour back in power (1974–79)

Despite losing by more than 200,000 votes to the Conservatives, Labour and Wilson returned as a **minority government** and promptly made peace by granting the miners' demands. Wilson's policies were confirmed on October 10, 1974, in a second election, when his tiny majority, based upon cooperation from the Scottish National Party and the Plaid Cymru (Welsh Nationalist Party) as well as the Liberals, was increased to an almost workable margin of 20. The Labour government faced severe economic challenges—including post-World War II record levels of unemployment and inflation—yet Wilson was able to renegotiate British membership in the EEC, which was confirmed in a referendum in June 1975. However, neither Wilson nor James Callaghan, who succeeded him on April 5, 1976, was able to come to

terms with the **labour unions**, which were as willing to embarrass a Labour government as a Conservative one. Labour's parliamentary position was precarious, and the party lost its governing majority through a series of by-election defeats and defections. Labour survived through what became known as the "Lib-Lab Pact," an agreement between Callaghan and **Liberal Party** leader David Steel, which lasted until August 1978. Union unrest, induced by rapidly increasing prices, made the late 1970s a period of almost endless industrial conflict, culminating at the end of 1978 in the "Winter of Discontent," a series of bitter disputes, which the government seemed unable to control and which angered the voters. Meanwhile, Labour's slender majority in the House of Commons eroded with the defection of the Liberal and nationalist parties following the defeat of referenda in Wales and Scotland that would have created devolved assemblies. On March 28, 1979, Callaghan was forced from office after losing **a vote of confidence** in the House of Commons by a single vote (310–311), the first such dismissal of a Prime Minister since Ramsay MacDonald.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica 2020

BACKGROUND NOTES

Trade Unionism: in capitalist countries, the organization of workers into unions in order to campaign for their rights with their employers, with strike action being their ultimate sanction.

Civil rights: the rights of individuals to receive equal treatment and not be subject to harassment or discrimination in education, employment, housing and other public spheres.

European Economic Community (EEC): otherwise known as the Common Market, the tariff-free trading zone set up in 1957 by France, West Germany, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg.

European Union (EU): established in 1993 under the Maastricht Treaty, the social and economic union of 27 European countries ensuring the free movement of people, goods, services and capital within countries of the Union.

Arab oil embargo: cessation of oil supplies to the USA, Portugal, Netherlands, Rhodesia and South Africa in 1973 by Arab oil-producing states of the Middle East in protest of those countries' support for Israel during the Yom-Kippur War with Egypt. The result was a quadrupling in the price of oil across the world.

Minority government: in a parliamentary system, a party or coalition that does not have a majority of seats and that can only produce legislation with the support of other parties.

Labour unions: the US equivalent of UK trade unions, organized associations of workers that negotiate for better working conditions, higher pay, social benefits.

Liberal Party: successors to the Whigs who had opposed Tory policies from the 17th to the 19th centuries, a party that lost its voters to Labour in the 20th century and almost disappeared as a parliamentary presence in the late 20th century until it merged with disaffected Labour supporters to create the Liberal-Democratic Party.

Vote of confidence: a statement or action that demonstrates support for a person or group, usually the serving government in Parliament.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What were Harold Wilson's policies to solve the problems his administration faced in 1964?
2. Why was the Wilson government kept in power despite its unpopularity?
3. What were Edward Heath's three goals when he headed the Conservative government in 1970?
4. How did the Labour party return back to power in 1974 despite losing to the Conservatives in election?
5. In what way did the labour unions show their power in the period of 1964-1979?
6. Which of the two major parties made an initiative to join the European Economic Community in the 1970s?
7. Why is 1978-1979 called the "Winter of Discontent" in British history?

Text IV

Margaret Thatcher and Thatcherism: a realignment towards neoliberal policies in the United Kingdom (1979-1990)

In the subsequent election, in May 1979, the Conservatives under the leadership of **Margaret Thatcher** were swept into power with the largest electoral swing since 1945, securing a 43-seat majority. After an extremely shaky start to her administration, Thatcher achieved popularity by sending the armed forces in the spring of 1982 to expel an Argentine force from the Falkland Islands. The event went down in history as the **Falklands War**, and its successful outcome bolstered the Conservative government, and ensured Thatcher's triumphant reelection in June 1983. Her party captured nearly 400 seats in the House of Commons and a 144-seat majority. The opposition Labour Party suffered its worst performance since 1918, winning only 27.6 percent of the vote—only 2.2 percent more than an alliance of the Liberals and the Social Democratic Party, a party formed by Labour defectors.

Riding this wave of success, the Thatcher government proceeded with a thoroughgoing privatization of the economy, most notably the railway system. Like the accompanying **deindustrialization** of what had been a manufacturing Britain, this transformation of the transportation infrastructure had immense consequences, resulting in a public transport system that was widely perceived as chaotic and inefficient, as well as in a great increase in private automobile use and in road building. Thatcher's advocacy of what eventually became known as **neoliberalism** was in fact part of a similar international response to changes in the global economy driven by the United States during the presidency of Ronald Reagan (predicated on the free market and supply-side economics), with whom Thatcher formed a strong personal alliance. Deindustrialization and privatization began to change the face of Britain, one fairly immediate outcome being mass unemployment.

Racial discrimination and the 1981 England riots

Partly in response to this development but also prompted by long-simmering tensions, a series of disturbances broke out in British cities in 1981, particularly in Liverpool and London, when an endemically unprivileged young black urban population turned its sense of alienation from much of British society against the police. Since the Notting Hill race riots of 1958 in London, the integration of the immigrant West Indian community into British society had been a major problem. This problem worsened with the arrival, beginning in the 1960s, of South Asian immigrants from East Africa and the Indian subcontinent, who, like the Caribbean population, were highly concentrated in particular areas of the country and of cities. Elements in the Conservative Party, led by **Enoch Powell**, were not averse to creating political capital out of this situation, though Powell's English patriotism was more complex than most Conservative gut reactions. His liberal economics, along with the advocacy of the free market by **Keith Joseph**, was very influential on the party, especially on Thatcher. Despite promises to alleviate the urban poverty of immigrant communities, little was done in the 1980s, and in the 1990s the exclusion of blacks and to a lesser extent South Asians from an equal share in the benefits of British society continued to be a critical problem, one which politicians confronted reluctantly and to limited effect. This was evident earlier in the very limited nature of the Race Relations Act of 1965, itself fiercely opposed by the Conservatives. A subsequent amendment, in 1968, outlawed discrimination in areas such as employment and the provision of goods, services and housing. However, it was not until **the Race Relations Act of 1976** that any real change was evident. This act made both direct and indirect discrimination an offence and provided legal redress for those discriminated against through employment tribunals and the courts. Yet another amendment to the act, in 2001, included public bodies, particularly local authorities and the police, whose role in black communities continued to be a considerable source of tension. This

unease was compounded by endemic inequality and deprivation in ethnic (especially Asian) communities. In 2001 the result was a wave of public disturbances across the north of England, in which disaffected youth once again played a leading role. In Britain, in the aftermath of the **September 11 attacks** on the United States, the advent of the so-called “war on terror” served to deepen existing divisions by giving “racial” tensions a new form, that of “Islamophobia.”

The “Troubles” in Northern Ireland

A considerable degree of reluctance also characterized the other great problem of the Thatcher administrations, namely the conflict in Northern Ireland. Since 1945 successive British governments failed to address discrimination against Catholics in Northern Ireland. The international civil rights current of the late 1960s triggered a new and intensive wave of protest in Northern Ireland, which was met by a continuing reluctance to reform and by police overreaction. Into this increasingly explosive situation stepped the **Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA)**, which had separated from the long-established “Official” IRA in 1969 and which gained support after 13 Roman Catholic civil rights demonstrators were killed by British troops in Londonderry on January 30, 1972, an event that became known as Bloody Sunday. The IRA mounted an increasingly violent campaign against the British Army in Ulster, taking their activity to the British mainland with increasing effect in the 1970s. The so-called “Troubles” ensued for the better part of three decades, with the British Army and the IRA fighting to a vicious draw in the end. The Troubles also took the form of sectarian strife in Northern Ireland, polarizing the Protestant and Catholic communities, each of which had its own paramilitary organizations. The IRA “hunger strikers” of the early 1980s failed to move Thatcher, a resistance that probably ultimately harmed her by producing great sympathy for the Republican cause in Northern Ireland. Nor did she appear to be moved by the bombing at the Conservative Party conference in Brighton in 1984, an attempt on her own life that

resulted in the deaths of several of her friends and colleagues within the party. Nonetheless, even at this parlous time, unofficial and secret contacts were being established with the IRA. These led to the very long and tortuous process of negotiation that eventually became known as the “peace process.”

“**Thatcherism**”

Despite being unable to resolve the Irish problem, Thatcher succeeded in 1987 in winning an unprecedented third general election, and in January 1988 she surpassed **Herbert Henry Asquith** (generally known as H.H. Asquith) as the longest continually serving Prime Minister since Lord Liverpool (1812–27). Thatcher’s electoral success came from her extraordinary capacity for leadership and the development of “**Thatcherism.**” Responding to widespread disillusionment with the Labour government and the state, Thatcher was able to tap into, and give leadership to, a politics of freedom and choice that expressed the desires of many people in the 1980s. In the wake of the debacle that the 1970s had been for the political left and trade union movement, Thatcherism’s variant of contemporary free-market neoliberalism gained increasing momentum. It effectively ended the postwar accommodation sometimes referred to as the **corporate state**, through which government, the unions, and business enabled a form of state-managed capitalism to develop. In its movement away from that accord, Britain foreshadowed developments in central and eastern Europe after the demise of communism there in 1989.

Thatcher’s premiership, however, did not survive her third term. She alienated even fellow Conservatives with her insistence on replacing local property taxes with a uniform **poll tax** and with her unwillingness to fully integrate the pound into a common European currency. By the end of 1989, voter discontent was manifest in by-elections, and in November 1990 Thatcher faced serious opposition for the first time in the Conservative party’s annual vote for selection of a leader. When she

did not receive the required majority, she withdrew, and **John Major**, the Chancellor of the **Exchequer** since October 1989, was chosen on November 27. Thatcher resigned as Prime Minister the following day and was replaced by Major.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica 2020

BACKGROUND NOTES

Margaret Thatcher: British Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990, who oversaw a radical restructuring of British industry with resulting deep social divisions.

Falklands War: Anglo-Argentinian military conflict in 1982 following Argentina's annexation of the Falkland Islands; resounding victory for the United Kingdom's armed forces and vindication of Margaret Thatcher's aggressive position.

Deindustrialization: the process of social and economic change brought about by the disappearance of industry in a country or community.

Neoliberalism: associated with the leadership of Margaret Thatcher, the process whereby free market capitalism is favoured over state intervention in the economy, and state-sponsored support and welfare programmes are reduced or discontinued.

Enoch Powell: (1912-1998) classical scholar and Conservative politician who gained notoriety for his 'rivers of blood' speech in 1968 opposing mass immigration from Commonwealth countries.

Sir Keith Joseph: (1918-1994), regarded as one of the architects of Thatcherism, Conservative politician who advocated free market economics and removing government controls from industry.

Race Relations Act of 1976: replacing the 1968 Race Relations Act, it made discrimination unlawful in the fields of employment, education and the provision of goods, facilities and services, as well as property transactions, on the basis of colour or race.

September 11 attacks: coordinated terrorist attacks by Osama bin-Laden's Al-Qaeda on the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon near Washington, resulting in the deaths of almost 3000 civilians. In its aftermath President George W. Bush declared a 'war on terror', which defined US foreign policy for the rest of his presidency. It remains the deadliest terrorist attack in human history.

Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA): also known as 'the Provos', formed in 1969 by young Republicans through the frustration felt towards the Official IRA's inability to defend Catholic communities in Northern Ireland from Protestant violence and discrimination (and subsequently British army violence and discrimination).

H.H. Asquith: (1852-1928), the last Prime Minister to lead a majority Liberal government, 1908-1916, and author of social policies that led to the creation of the welfare state.

Thatcherism: the policies of Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister which reflected a belief in the free market and the privatization of state-owned industries and amenities such as gas, electricity and water.

Corporate state: a form of right-wing political culture that sees the state as the dominant actor in economic and social affairs, retaining control over workers and business.

Poll Tax: introduced in England and Wales in 1990, it set a single rate local tax on every adult regardless of their housing needs, thus forcing those in low-level accommodation to pay the same as those in more expensive homes. Proposed and fiercely advocated by Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister, it led to riots in major cities and the resignation of Mrs Thatcher as Prime Minister in December 1990. It was abolished by her successor John Major in 1991.

John Major: (b. 1943) Conservative politician and government minister who succeeded Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister on her resignation in 1990, and remained Prime Minister until 1997.

Exchequer: the accounting office of central government responsible for ensuring government income in the form of taxation and other revenues.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. How did Margaret Thatcher achieve popularity in 1982, which led to her party's victory in the 1983 Parliamentary election?
2. What processes launched by Thatcher's government were the result of her neoliberalism?
3. What were the causes of riots in England in the 1980s?
4. How did the conflict in Northern Ireland between the Protestant and Catholic communities eventually result in the British Army fighting the IRA militants?
5. How can Margaret Thatcher's electoral success in 1987 be explained?
6. What were the main features of Thatcherism as a type of British conservative ideology?

B

The Period of 'New Labour': the repeal of Clause IV and endorsement of a market economy (1990-2010)

Discussion Questions:

Since the 1920s the two major parties in the UK political system have been the Conservative Party and the Labour Party. The Labour Party as a centre-left political party is an alliance of social democrats, democratic socialists and trade unionists. It was founded in 1900, and by the 1920s it overtook the Liberal Party to become the main opposition to the Conservative Party. Traditionally, the Labour Party came to be associated with Socialist ideology.

Note down the following points:

1. What were the two major parties in Great Britain before the emergence of the Labour party?
2. What do you know about the Labour party's socialist programme adopted in 1918?

3. Why did the leaders of the Labour party start in the 1990s a quest for the “third way”, that is, revising socialist goals?

Reading exercises:

You are going to read four texts about the policies of the two major parties of the United Kingdom in the period of 1990-2010.

As you read, note down the following:

1. the reasons for the fall in popularity of the Conservative leader, John Major, in the early 1990s,
2. the gradual transformation of the Labour Party when it was out of power in the 1990s,
3. the Labour Party’s “third way”,
4. the Labour Party’s policies in relation to the European Union,
5. the establishment of the National Assembly for Wales and the Scottish Parliament,
6. the evolution of the British monarchy,
7. attempts by the Conservative leadership in the 2000s to steer the party back to the political centre.

Text I

Despite having presided over the country’s longest recession since the 1930s and owing partly to the Labour Party’s overconfidence, the Conservatives won their fourth consecutive election in April 1992, albeit with a diminished majority of 21 in Parliament. That they did so was largely a result of the ongoing conflict within Labour as it continued to undergo “modernization.” As the recession lingered, the popularity of Major—and of the Conservatives—plummeted, and the party fared poorly in by-elections and in local elections. Major’s economic policies were questioned after the “**Black Wednesday**” fiasco of September 16, 1992, when he was forced to withdraw Britain from **the European exchange-rate mechanism** and devalue the pound. Despite having pledged not to increase taxes during the 1992 campaign,

Major supported a series of increases to restore Britain's financial equilibrium. When he sought to secure passage of **the Treaty on European Union in 1993**, his grip on power was challenged. Twenty-three Conservatives voted against a government resolution on the treaty, causing the government's defeat and compelling Major to call a vote of confidence to pass the treaty.

Tory troubles mounted with scandals in local governments, particularly in Westminster in 1994, and thereafter Major was seemingly unable to shake off the growing reputation of his government not only for economic mismanagement but also for corruption and moral hypocrisy. A seemingly unending series of financial and sexual scandals took their toll, and paper offensives like Major's "**Citizens Charter**," attempting to stop the growing rot of concern about the efficiency and responsibility of privatized industry by laying down citizens' rights, made little impact.

As criticism of his leadership mounted within the Conservative Party, Major resigned as party leader in June 1995. In the ensuing leadership election, Major solidified his position—though 89 Conservative members of Parliament voted for his opponent and 22 others abstained or spoiled their ballots. Major's government was also severely criticized for its handling of the crisis involving "**mad cow disease**," in which it was discovered that large numbers of cattle in the human food supply in Britain were infected with **bovine spongiform encephalopathy**. Facing a rejuvenated Labour Party under the leadership of **Tony Blair**, the Conservatives suffered a crushing defeat in the general election of 1997, winning only 165 seats, their fewest since 1906. Labour's 419 seats and its 179-seat majority were its largest in British history.

The Blair government (1997–2007): fight for control of Labour

During its years out of power, the Labour Party had undergone a gradual transformation as it attempted to distance itself from the power of the unions on the one hand and the power of the membership on the

other, in the guise of the traditional role of the Labour Party Conference. This process had been started before 1992 by Neil Kinnock, who led the party from 1983 to 1992, and it was continued by his successors, first John Smith and then Blair. The need for fundamental reappraisal had been urged as early as 1981, with the founding of the Social Democratic Party, when prominent Labour Party politicians, led by Roy Jenkins, seceded from the party in an attempt to “break the mould” of British politics. Divisions not only between the right and left in the party but also within the left of the party itself added to the chaos that was the British left in the 1980s; the insistence of the radical leftist and former Labour minister Tony Benn on running against the former Labour chancellor Denis Healey in the party election for deputy leadership in 1981 effectively split the radical democratic left and disabled the possibility of an early riposte to Thatcher. It also, ironically enough, contributed to what became known as “**New Labour**,” rather than a more left-wing variant of labourism eventually replacing the Conservatives.

‘New Labour’, the repeal of Clause IV, and the “third way”

The understanding that the party would have to rethink the market (not only in economic but in social terms), embracing it in a way foreign to many of the unions and the traditional Labour left, grew increasingly after 1992, until, after the Labour victory of 1997, there was a clearly marked path for New Labour. The most symbolically important marker of the change from old to New Labour was the repeal of **the Labour party’s Clause IV**, engineered by Blair in 1995. The replacement of old Clause IV, which had committed the party to the “common ownership of the means of production,” ended almost 80 years of dedication to that goal. The new path of the party was to be a middle one, in the phraseology of New Labour, a “third way,” supposedly embracing both social justice and the market.

Not only in rhetoric but also in reality, New Labour was to be different from the old version There was also to be increasing attention

to the importance of the media, an attention that **the Tories** had developed into something of a fine art under Thatcher, with her press secretary Bernard Ingham. Given the increasing role of the media in the presentation of politics and indeed the almost wholesale integration of political substance and political style through the media, this mastery of **the art of “spin”** was to become a political necessity. Therefore, art for art’s sake (spin for spin’s sake) was to become a feature of Labour government after 1997. This approach was ultimately to rebound upon the party and, indeed, upon the political process in general during the next decade with the emergence of widespread disillusionment with politics in British society, especially among young people.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

“Black Wednesday”: the name given to Wednesday 16 September 1992 when the United Kingdom government was forced to remove pound sterling from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism as the currency collapsed amid speculation on international markets.

European Exchange Rate Mechanism: otherwise known as the ERM, the mechanism used to manage a country’s currency exchange rate in relation to other countries, and central to the introduction of the Euro in 2002.

Treaty on European Union in 1993: established under the Maastricht Treaty, the social and economic union of 27 European countries ensuring the free movement of people, goods, services and capital within countries of the Union.

Citizens’ Charter: introduced by Prime Minister John Major in 1991, it set out to improve public services in the UK through increased transparency and accountability. It was terminated in 2010.

Mad cow disease: a neurodegenerative disease among cattle that devastated the UK meat industry in 1992-1993, resulting in the slaughter of 4.4 million cattle (scientific name bovine spongiform encephalopathy).

Tony Blair: Labour Prime Minister 1997-2007, architect of 'New Labour' that was designed to return the party to power after 18 years of Conservative government; with George W. Bush instigated the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and the subsequent Iraq War.

New Labour: the term given to the period of government by the Labour Party under Tony Blair and Gordon Brown between 1997 and 2010 founded on the 'third way' that proposed a realignment of right-wing and left-wing economic platforms on the basis of 'social justice'.

Labour Party's Clause IV: seen as solid confirmation of the Party's commitment to socialism, a clause dating from 1918 in the Party's constitution committing it to the nationalization of industry.

Tories: founded in the 17th century as a traditionalist party opposing the Whigs and supporting the monarchy, Empire and the moral authority of the Church of England, from 1834 it became the Conservative Party.

Art of "spin": a form of political propaganda that provides a biased interpretation of an event in order to influence public opinion.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Why did the Conservatives win the fourth consecutive election in 1992 despite the failure of their economic policies?
2. What transformation did the Labour party undergo in the 1990s in an attempt to free itself from the power of the trade unions?
3. What was the goal of the Labour party as declared in Clause IV?
4. How did the Labour party's policy change in relation to the media during the New Labour period?

Text II

Navigating the European monetary system and the EU Social Chapter of 1997

Labour's landslide victory in 1997, which undoubtedly benefited from the inspirational leadership Blair seemed to offer, nevertheless may have been less the result of an unbounded belief in New Labour than of the discrediting of the Conservative Party. It is certain that Blair was helped into power by the parlous state into which the Conservative Party had fallen under Major after 1992. Promising that "we ran for office as New Labour, and we shall govern as New Labour," the Blair government in fact began in a rather conservative fashion, by accepting existing government spending limitations. Nonetheless, the difficult and what came to be the increasingly troubled task of combining aspects of Thatcherism with the idea of a "**social market**" gathered momentum. Certainly, through much of Blair's tenure a buoyant economy, well managed by Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown, did a great deal to ease the passage of New Labour and **the third way**. In his first major initiative and one of his boldest moves, Blair, abetted by Brown, granted the **Bank of England** the power to determine interest rate policy without government consultation. This was a major move in the disengagement of financial markets from the state.

Blair's government was also more and more taken up with the question of whether Britain should stay in or remain outside the **European monetary union**. At stake were fundamental ideas about British sovereignty and whether, in a progressively globalized world in which some claimed that the individual nation-state was becoming unviable, sovereignty in its existing forms could remain intact. For the Conservative Party, ever more hostile to the EU, this question was central to its attempts to fight back against the Labour Party. Blair's government did sign the Treaty on European Union's Social Chapter—which sought to harmonize European social policies on issues such as working conditions, equality in the workplace, and worker health and

safety—despite Major’s earlier negotiation of an “opt out” mechanism to placate the treaty’s Conservative opponents. However, the Labour Party’s implementation of the Social Chapter was at best halfhearted, and its goal became to influence as much as possible the EU itself to moderate the operations of the chapter. As with financial deregulation, the emphasis in labour affairs was on the market.

The Good Friday Agreement

Conspicuous progress was also made in solving the problem of Northern Ireland. Under Major, in 1994, the IRA declared a cease-fire, the Protestant paramilitaries followed suit soon after, and talks between the British government, the Irish government, and **Sinn Féin** began. The IRA cease-fire secured a long and involved series of negotiations, in which the **Good Friday Agreement** (Belfast Agreement) of 1998 seemed to have at last brought peace to Northern Ireland. Unionist suspicion and concern about fundamental reforms to the traditional power structure of the province meant, however, that the implementation of the agreement became a tortuous business. Indeed, it took almost another decade to arrive at what looked like a final resolution, when in 2007 the **Northern Ireland Assembly** was restored on the basis of power sharing between what had erstwhile been bitter enemies, Sinn Féin and the Ian Paisley-led Democratic Unionist Party.

London’s local government, House of Lords reform, Scottish and Welsh devolution

In May 1998 voters in London overwhelmingly approved the government’s plan for a new assembly for the city and for its first directly elected mayor, resulting in the capital’s first citywide government since the abolition of the Greater London Council by Thatcher in 1986. However, the precedent of an elected mayor in London was not subsequently followed by similar action in other major British cities.

In the late 1990s the Labour government also carried out several other constitutional reforms. The House of Lords, previously dominated

by **hereditary peers** (nobles), was reconstituted as an assembly composed primarily of appointive life peers, with only limited representation of hereditary peers. Nonetheless, the striking contradiction of an unelected legislative assembly in a country that prided itself on its traditions of liberal democracy was apparent.

Following referenda in Wales and Scotland, **the National Assembly for Wales** and **the Scottish Parliament** were established in 1999 and granted powers previously reserved for the central government. Yet, with the exception of political devolution to the component states of the United Kingdom, the Labour Party remained reluctant to reform the constitution, so that at the beginning of the 21st century it was still the revered mysteries of the uncodified British constitution by which the British were governed.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Social market: a socio-economic model that combines free market capitalism with a commitment to a welfare state.

“Third way”: a political philosophy at the heart of New Labour that sought to re-evaluate left-wing and right-wing politics within an ‘ethical socialism’ that would regulate a capitalist economy through greater emphasis on social welfare.

Bank of England: founded in 1694, it is the UK’s central bank, not offering consumer banking services but acting as regulator of the UK’s financial sector.

European Monetary Union: launched in 1992, the coordination of economic and fiscal policies among all EU states intended to create monetary union, which came about in 2002 with the establishment of the Euro as the currency of most EU states,

Sinn Féin: an Irish republican party active in the Irish Republic and Northern Ireland that seeks the reunification of the Irish State; in the

1970s and 1980s it was regarded by the British political establishment as the political mouthpiece of the IRA.

Good Friday Agreement: an agreement reached on 10 April 1998 between the British and Irish governments on the future governance of Northern Ireland involving a devolved government of power-sharing between Unionists and Nationalists, which brought about an end to the violence and ‘the troubles’ of the preceding 30 years.

Northern Ireland Assembly: the devolved legislative body for Northern Ireland created under the 1998 Good Friday Agreement.

Devolution (for Scotland and Wales): following referenda in 1997, voters elected for a Scottish Parliament and a National Assembly for Wales, which gave those countries a degree of self-government though still under the overall authority of the Westminster Parliament.

Hereditary peers: a male member of the House of Lords whose tenure is because a parent was a member; until 1999 there were 666 hereditary peers in the House of Lords, but following legislation as of 2020 there are now 92.

Scottish Parliament: the devolved basis of government for Scotland, situated in Edinburgh, agreed in 1997 and set up in 1999, when powers were passed on to it from Westminster.

National Assembly for Wales: since May 2020 the Welsh Parliament, established in 1999 with devolved law-making and taxation powers transferred from Westminster.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What contributed to the success of the passage of New Labour and the “third way”?
2. What fundamental ideas were at stake for British politicians in taking the decision about joining the European Monetary Union?

3. Why did the Labour government under Tony Blair find it difficult to implement the Treaty on European Union's Social Chapter?

4. What was the result of the Good Friday Agreement and why did it take almost a decade to implement it?

5. Name the main constitutional reforms by the Labour government in the 1990s. Did these reforms lead to a codification of the British Constitution?

Text III

Millennium issues in the UK: the transformation of the British monarchy, the Millennium Dome and the Conservative Party's internal struggle

The 1990s were a period of transition and controversy for the monarchy. In 1992, during what **Queen Elizabeth II** referred to as the Royal Family's "annus horribilis," **Charles, Prince of Wales**, heir to the British throne, and his wife, Diana, princess of Wales, separated, as did Elizabeth's son Andrew, Duke of York, and his wife, Sarah, Duchess of York. Moreover, Elizabeth's daughter, Anne, got divorced, and a fire gutted the royal residence of **Windsor Castle**. After details of extramarital affairs by Charles and Diana surfaced and the couple divorced, observers openly questioned Charles's fitness to succeed his mother as sovereign, and public support for the monarchy ebbed.

The immensely popular Diana (dubbed the "People's Princess") died in an automobile accident in Paris in 1997, prompting an outpouring of grief, or at least hysteria, throughout the world. The British Royal family came under scrutiny for its handling of the matter—especially the Queen's reluctance, because of tradition, to allow the national flag to fly at half-staff over **Buckingham Palace**. With the Queen celebrating her 50th wedding anniversary, the Queen Mother, Elizabeth, celebrating her 100th birthday, and Charles working hard to improve his public image, the fortunes of the monarchy improved by the end of the 1990s. Nevertheless, the established

institutions of the British state had been called into question in an unprecedented way. If the popularity of the monarchy survived, it was largely the result of the Queen's persona; the Royal Family as a whole—itsself the idealized media creation of late Victorian times—frequently had become an object of ridicule. The transformation of the monarchy was indeed emblematic of the very unevenly progressing severance of the British from the long-lived institutions and culture of the 19th century.

To celebrate the new millennium, the monumental **Millennium Dome**, the largest structure of its kind in the world, and the Millennium Bridge were opened in London. It was perhaps symbolic of the contradictions of this modernity that the Dome was dogged by controversy regarding its cost and design and the bridge by the fiasco of its opening, when it was found to move alarmingly above the waters of the Thames when in public use.

The battle for the soul of the Conservative Party

In June 2001 Blair's government was reelected with a 167-seat majority in the House of Commons—the largest majority ever won by a second-term British government. With the question of European integration continuing to be of great significance in British politics, the new Labour administration chose not to adopt the common European currency, the Euro, partly because of a fear of popular response. However, it was on the Conservative side that Britain's relationship with Europe was most urgently a party issue. It continued to divide a party riven by differences, a party that looked more and more like the Labour Party of the 1980s and early '90s. Indeed, there is a direct parallel between the recent histories of the two parties: the traditional left of the Labour Party corresponded to the traditional right of the Conservative Party, as both fought hard to stem the tide of party modernization. The battle for the soul of the Conservative Party was joined with growing fervour with the election of **David Cameron** in December 2005 as its modernizing leader. His subsequent attempt to

steer the party back to the political centre, and away from the old order of the **Thatcherite legacy**, was every bit as difficult as the redirection undertaken by Labour modernizers. In addition to Europe and economic policy, the issue of increased levels of immigration into Britain after 2000 further divided the Conservatives.

Indeed, Britain as a whole became divided on this issue. Large bodies of opinion, stirred up by **xenophobia** in the popular press, responded with fear and anxiety to increased levels of immigration from central and eastern Europe that were a consequence of European integration. In a more globalized and war-ridden world, the burgeoning flow of asylum seekers into Britain added to this climate, as did the “war on terror.” Asian Muslims, many of them long-standing British citizens and British-born, were nonetheless frequently lumped with immigrants and asylum seekers as part of an undifferentiated external threat to Britishness.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Millennium celebrations: celebration of the new millennium on the night of 31 December 1999 through to 1 January 2000, marked by a firework display watched by over 2 million people in London.

Millennium Dome: opened on 31 December 1999 as a symbol of what Prime Minister Tony Blair called the UK’s ‘triumph of confidence over cynicism’, and intended as a major exhibition centre, it never justified its financial investment and since 2005 has been named ‘The O2’, managed by the telecommunications company O2 and used as a sports and entertainment venue.

Queen Elizabeth II: (b. 1926) Monarch and Head of State of the United Kingdom since 1953.

Charles, Prince of Wales: (b. 1948) eldest son of Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, heir to the throne of the United Kingdom.

Windsor Castle: built following the Norman invasion of England in 1066, one of the royal residences just outside of London, and a popular tourist attraction.

Buckingham Palace: residence of the Queen and Royal Family in central London since 1837 and the administrative centre of the Monarchy.

David Cameron: Conservative politician and Prime Minister of the coalition government of 2010-2015, then the Conservative government that won the 2015 General Election; initiated the Brexit Referendum of 2016, resigned immediately afterwards.

Xenophobia: fear and hatred of foreign influences on native culture and/or way of life.

Thatcherism: the policies of Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister which reflected a belief in the free market and the privatization of state-owned industries and amenities such as gas, electricity and water.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Why did Queen Elizabeth II refer to 1992 as the royal family's "annus horribilis"?
2. When did the fortunes of the monarchy improve in the 1990s?
3. What were the contradictions in creating the Millennium Dome and the Millennium Bridge?
4. How was David Cameron trying to change the course of the Conservative Party?
5. What processes led to the rise of xenophobia in British society in the 2000s?

Text IV

British response to the September 11 attacks and the alleged Iraqi threat

Following the **September 11 attacks** on the United States in 2001, global **terrorism** dominated the political agenda in Britain, and Blair closely allied himself with the administration of U.S. President **George W. Bush**. Britain contributed troops to the military effort to oust Afghanistan's **Taliban** regime, which was charged with harbouring **Osama bin Laden**, who had founded al-Qaeda, the terrorist organization linked to the September 11 attacks. Although Blair received strong support for his antiterrorist strategy from the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats in the House of Commons, a small minority of Labour members of Parliament opposed military action. The Blair government also faced a slowing economy and a widespread perception that public services such as health, education, and transportation had not improved. Although large amounts of public money had been spent, particularly on the health service, much of this went into elaborating the new and highly evolved structures of management that came to characterize Labour administration of the state. However, it was the subject of **the Iraq War**, and Britain's support for the U.S. position on it, that did most to undermine the standing of Blair.

The deadliest terrorist attack on British soil

On 7 July 2005 four terrorists separately detonated three homemade bombs in quick succession aboard London Underground trains and a fourth on a double-decker bus in Tavistock Square. Apart from the bombers, 52 people of 18 nationalities were killed and more than 700 were injured in the attacks, making it England's deadliest since World War II, as well as the country's first Islamist suicide attack. The 7/7 attacks, as the incident is often referred to, led to public criticism of the traditional immigration practices and to multiculturalism policies.

Weapons of mass destruction and the Iraq War

From late 2002, politics in Britain was dominated by Blair's decision to support military action to oust from power the Iraqi government of **Saddam Hussein**, which was alleged to either possess or be developing **weapons of mass destruction (WMD)** that might either be used against Iraq's neighbours or find their way into the hands of international terrorists. Notwithstanding widespread and enormous public protests against war, the resignation of several government ministers, and the support of some one-third of the parliamentary Labour Party for a motion opposing the government's policy, Blair remained steadfast in his conviction that Saddam was an imminent threat that had to be removed.

Following the ousting of Saddam, however, British and American intelligence was found to have been faulty. When no WMD were found, critics of the government charged that it had distorted ("sexed up") intelligence to solidify its claims against the Iraqis. Nevertheless, in May 2005 Blair won another term as prime minister—albeit with a significantly reduced parliamentary majority—as Labour won its third consecutive general election for the first time in the party's history. The fallout from the Iraq War—initially the controversy over the decision to go to war in the first place and then the protracted involvement in a conflict that began to look more and more like a civil war—sapped public and political support for Blair. But, ever the consummate politician, he held on for two years after his reelection despite the friction between himself and his appointed successor, Gordon Brown, who became the new prime minister in June 2007.

The Gordon Brown government (2007–10)

Brown's hold on power was threatened in spring 2009. With the British economy already shaken by the spreading worldwide recession engendered by the financial crisis of late 2008, a scandal broke involving many dozens of members of Parliament who had extravagantly abused their government expense accounts, including

members of Brown's cabinet. The scandal and the troubled economy contributed to anemic performances by the Labour Party in local elections in Britain and in those for **the European Parliament**. Brown responded with a thorough reshuffle of his cabinet and withstood a challenge to his leadership from within the party in early June by promising to change his leadership style.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

September 11 attacks: coordinated terrorist attacks by Osama bin-Laden's Al-Qaeda on the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon near Washington, resulting in the deaths of almost 3000 civilians. In its aftermath President George W. Bush declared a 'war on terror', which defined US foreign policy for the rest of his presidency. It remains the deadliest terrorist attack in human history.

George W. Bush: born in 1946, 43rd President of the United States (2001-2009) and the son of George H. W. Bush, 41st President of the United States (1989-1993); best known for his 'war on terror' following the September 11 attacks.

Taliban: a Sunni Islamist Fundamentalist political and military organization that from 1996 to 2001 controlled large parts of Afghanistan.

Osama bin Laden: born in Saudi Arabia, founder of Al-Qaeda, responsible for many multi-casualty terrorist attacks worldwide, including the September 11 attacks; killed in Pakistan in 2011 by US Navy Seals.

Iraq War: the invasion of Iraq in March 2003 by mainly US and UK forces to depose Saddam Hussein, whom both countries (erroneously, as it turned out) suspected of developing weapons of mass destruction and harboring ties with Al-Qaeda; against a background of huge worldwide protests against the invasion, the defeat of Iraq's army took just over a month.

Saddam Hussein: President of Iraq from 1979 till 2003, deposed by the Anglo-American invasion of 2003, then tried by an Iraq court for crimes against humanity and executed in 2006.

Weapons of mass destruction (WMD): the rationale behind the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the purported existence in Iraq of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons that could be deployed on Western targets; after the invasion none were found.

European Parliament: the European Union's legislative body, directly elected by voters from all EU countries every five years; first established in 1952, it now has 705 members, and is based on Strasbourg, Brussels and Luxembourg.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. How did the Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair collaborate with the US President George W. Bush following the September 11 attacks?
2. Which of Tony Blair's actions undermined his standing as the Labour leader?
3. How did the Iraq War end for Saddam Hussein and for Tony Blair?
4. Why was Gordon Brown's hold on power threatened in 2009?

C

Emergence of Euroscepticism and growing support for 'Brexit'

Discussion questions:

The period of 2010-2020 was a time of intensive political struggle, in which not only the two dominant British parties, that is, Conservatives and Labour, were involved, but a number of other parties, whose influence in the country could be decisive in changing the political scene. As a result of demographic changes due to the mass influx of immigrants, the population changed from predominantly white, ethnically British and Christian to a population remarkable for its

demographic and cultural diversity. Response to these multicultural changes, seen by some politicians as a threat to British identity, turned into a matter of political struggle, which contributed to the changes in the major parties' platforms and in the rise of smaller parties.

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about the multicultural changes in Great Britain as a result of mass immigration after the Second World War?

2. How did British identity change due to the traditional multicultural policies of the British governments?

3. What is the effect of the failure of some immigration groups to integrate into British society on the changes in political attitudes of the British population?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read four texts about the main political events in Great Britain in the period of 2010-2020. As you read, note down the following:

1. the rise and fall of the Liberal Democrats, starting with their success in the general election of 2010,

2. British intervention in Libya, resulting in the ousting of Muammar al-Qaddafi's regime,

3. the 2011 England riots and a shift in British society's political mindset to the right,

4. the rise of the right-wing United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), whose platform was based on Euroscepticism.

Text I

The Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition: political and economic policies and intervention in Libya (2010–15)

The U.K. general election of 2010

The popularity of Gordon Brown, the leader of the Labour party since 2007, and that of his party continued to wane as **a general election**,

called for May 6, 2010, approached. The campaign brought a novelty to the British general election campaign—televised debates between the leaders of the three main parties: Brown of the Labour Party, **David Cameron** of the Conservative Party, and Nick Clegg of **the Liberal Democrats**. Clegg’s outstanding performance in the first debate resulted in a surge in the pre-election polls for the Liberal Democrats—who passed Labour to challenge the Conservative lead and to create both unprecedentedly high expectations for the Liberal Democrats and doubt as to whether any party would be able to secure enough seats to form a majority government.

The Liberal Democrats actually obtained fewer seats in 2010 than in the 2005 election. The Conservatives finished as the largest party, winning 306 seats, but they finished 20 seats shy of a majority. The resulting “**hung parliament**” ironically placed the Liberal Democrats as potentially holding the balance of power. Labour finished with 258 seats, a fall of 91 seats over the 2005 election. When negotiations to form a Liberal Democratic–Labour coalition failed, the Liberal Democrats joined the Conservatives in a **coalition government** led by Cameron, who became Prime Minister on May 11, and Clegg, who became Deputy Prime Minister.

First-past-the-post referendum

In October the government announced a five-year austerity plan aimed at reducing the country’s massive deficit, which had been fueled by **bank bailouts** and stimulus spending in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and resultant recession. The plan incorporated some of the British government’s deepest spending cuts since World War II, including reductions to **welfare entitlements** and the dismissal of up to 500,000 public-sector employees, as well as phasing in a pension eligibility age increase from 65 to 66 four years earlier than had been planned. In December Parliament voted to raise the ceiling on university tuition from the existing cap of £3,290 (about \$5,200) to £9,000 (about \$14,000), prompting a series of demonstrations and causing dissension in the coalition government.

The Liberal Democrats had campaigned against the tuition hike during the general election, and some Liberal Democrat MPs continued to oppose it when it came to a vote. The rift in the coalition widened following Conservative opposition to the Liberal-Democrat-supported referendum on a proposal to replace the country's **first-past-the-post election** method with **the alternative vote**. The vote on the referendum, which was soundly rejected by the British public, was taken as part of local elections in May 2011, in which the Conservatives' share of English council constituencies increased moderately but that of the Liberal Democrats plummeted, to the benefit of Labour. Although there were some calls for Clegg to step down, support for him among Liberal Democrats generally remained strong.

The election also resulted in a sweeping victory for **the Scottish National Party**, which secured the first majority government in the history of the Scottish Parliament, emboldening First Minister Alex Salmond to announce that he would seek to hold a referendum on independence.

Intervention in Libya

As the outbreak of popular uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa known as **the Arab Spring** unfolded in early 2011, the revolt in Libya and Libyan ruler **Muammar al-Qaddafi's** brutal repression of it became a particular focus of British attention. Although Cameron was criticized for the less-than-efficient removal of British nationals from Libya and for a botched effort by British special forces to contact the anti-Qaddafi rebels, he remained adamant in his criticism of Qaddafi and in his call for foreign intervention to protect the rebels from the Qaddafi regime's superior forces, most notably with the enforcement of **a no-fly zone**. Cameron and French President Nicolas Sarkozy were instrumental in steering the UN Security Council to authorize military action on March 17. Beginning March 19, a coalition of U.S. and European forces with warplanes and cruise missiles attacked targets in Libya in an effort to disable Libya's air force and air defense systems

so that the UN-authorized no-fly zone could be imposed. On March 27 NATO officially took command of military operations in Libya previously directed by the United States, France, and the United Kingdom.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

General Election: an election held every five years throughout the UK on one day to establish the succeeding government and the composition of the House of Commons; it was last held in December 2019.

Liberal Democrats: founded in 1988 as a merger between the Liberal and Social Democratic Parties, it occupies the middle ground between the right-wing Conservative Party and left-wing Labour Party; it was in a coalition government with the Conservative Party 2010-2015.

“Hung Parliament”: the result of a General Election where no one party has an overall majority.

Coalition government: a government comprised of various political parties thereby denying any one party predominance over policy, usually the result of a hung Parliament’, as following the UK General Election in 2010.

David Cameron: Conservative Prime Minister of the coalition government of 2010-2015, then the Conservative government that won the 2015 General Election; resigned after the EU Referendum a year later.

Bank bailout: the provision of financial aid by the government to a corporation or a bank in danger of insolvency; in the financial crisis of 2008 the UK government provided £500 billion in loans to British banks, including Lloyds and Royal Bank of Scotland.

Welfare entitlements: the system of social benefits and subsidies available by the state to those in need including assistance for unemployment, housing, disability, and others.

First-past-the-post election: also known as the 'winner-takes-all', a political system such as the UK's where the candidate winning the largest number of votes wins the constituency, and where the party with the largest number of successful candidates forms the next government.

Alternative vote: proposed by the Liberal Democrats during the 2010-2015 coalition government, an alternative to the first-past-the-post system where voters would vote not for one candidate but several, placing them in order of preference. It was decisively rejected in a national referendum in 2011.

Arab Spring: a series of pro-democracy uprisings beginning in the spring of 2011 in Morocco, Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Bahrain and Syria, resulting in regime change in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia, but not necessarily democratic change.

Muammar al-Qaddafi: assumed control of Libya after a coup in 1969 that ousted King Idris and was the dictatorial leader of that country until his death in 2011 during the Arab Spring; he was suspected in the West of supporting and funding terrorist anti-Western activities, including the bombing of an American airliner over the Scottish village of Lockerbie in 1988 when 270 people died.

No-fly zone: an air exclusion zone set up by a military power or powers to prevent the free movement of aircraft, such as that exercised by NATO over Libya in 2011 to stop the aerial bombardment of Libyan civilians by the Libyan state.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What novelty was brought to the British general election campaign of 2010?

2. Which party held the balance of power in the 2010 election?
3. What allowed Alex Salmond, the leader of the Scottish National Party (SNP) to announce that he would hold a referendum on the independence of Scotland?
4. What was the goal of the UN Security Council's authorized military action in 2011 against Libya's air force?

Text II

The 2011 England riots, subsequent spread of anti-immigration sentiments and rise of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP)

On the night of August 6, 2011, a different sort of firestorm broke out when a protest against the killing of a young man by police earlier in the week erupted in widespread rioting in the North London area of Tottenham. In the succeeding days, riots, looting, and arson, mostly by young people, escalated wildly and became the worst rioting that the capital had seen in decades. **The 2011 England riots** spread not only to other areas of **Greater London** but also to other British cities including Liverpool, Birmingham, and Bristol. Largely as a result of the increased deployment of police, however, the riots abated quickly. The legal authorities then used video footage to arrest looters.

The riots generated significant debate among political, social and academic figures about the causes and context in which they happened. Attributions for the rioters' behaviour include social factors such as racial tension, class tension, economic decline, and the unemployment that decline had brought. A report published by the Ministry of Justice in 2012 revealed a high proportion of black people involved in the riots compared to the overall demographics of the United Kingdom. The report also noted that the rioters were disproportionately male (89%) and young (53% were aged 20 or under).

Although the United Kingdom remained outside of the Euro zone, it was anything but unaffected by the events of **the European sovereign**

debt crisis triggered by Greece's financial collapse in 2009. Because many of Britain's principal trading partners were Euro-zone members, their economic woes impacted on the already sluggish economy of a Britain struggling to reduce its deficit and combat unemployment.

Cameron created controversy in December 2011 when he effectively vetoed changes to **the Lisbon Treaty** (negotiated at an EU summit) that would have increased economic integration among the EU countries and imposed sanctions on members that surpassed an agreed-upon deficit limit. His actions strained the Conservatives' coalition partnership with the Liberal Democrats and were criticized by Deputy Prime Minister Clegg, who called them "bad for Britain," as well by French President Sarkozy, who said there were now two Europes—one that wanted "more solidarity between its members and more regulation" and another that was "attached only to the logic of the single market."

The 2012 London Olympics and the emergence of UKIP

Britain was the centre of world pomp and pageantry in 2012 not just because of the festive celebration of the 60th anniversary of Elizabeth II's ascent to the throne but because of London's hosting of the Summer Olympic Games, which, despite initial concerns about inadequate security, were widely regarded as a smashing success.

In spring 2013 the government announced that **GDP** had grown slightly in the first quarter of the year, thus preventing a slide back into a recession that would have been the third to afflict Britain in five years. Nevertheless, in local elections in parts of England and Wales in May, voters showed their dissatisfaction with the nature of the economic recovery by turning away from Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, who together lost 459 seats on English local councils. Labour made significant gains (picking up some 291 seats), but the big story of the election was the tremendous jump in representation by the **United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP)**, which advocated withdrawal from the EU. By gaining 139 seats, UKIP made one of the most impressive showings by a fourth party in recent British electoral

history. Such support for a party whose political position since its establishment in the 1990s was far right-wing and whose ideology was based on Euroscepticism British nationalism and rejection of multiculturalism, testified to British society's shift to the right.

A Royal baby, rejection of Syrian intervention, GCHQ regulation

On July 22, 2013, with much of the world's media on "royal baby watch," **Catherine, Duchess of Cambridge**, gave birth to a boy, George, who became third in the line of succession to the British throne.

In late August, Cameron was dealt a stunning blow by Parliament's rejection of his proposed response to events in the Syrian Civil War. Amid reports that hundreds of Syrians had been killed earlier in the month in an alleged chemical attack by the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, Cameron asked the House of Commons to endorse in principle British military intervention in Syria. Although approval had been widely expected, MPs rejected the proposed involvement by a vote of 285 to 272—largely, it seemed, as a result of the fear of a rush to judgment regarding the cause of and responsibility for the Syrian deaths and a lack of faith in the certainty of intelligence reports in light of British involvement in the Iraq War.

In October 2013 an impassioned debate arose in the press and in Parliament over whether there was a need for greater regulation of surveillance practices of the **Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ)** in the wake of revelations that the agency had far greater eavesdropping capabilities than had previously been acknowledged publicly. Cameron and others condemned the news leaks (originating with former U.S. CIA and National Security Agency employee **Edward Snowden**) that had led to the revelations and claimed that the activities of the GCHQ were lawful and necessary for national security. The relationship of the government to the press had also been strained by the repercussions of a scandal in 2011 that involved press hacking of private phone calls, led to a public inquiry

guided by Lord Justice Sir Brian Leveson, and resulted in the establishment of a new press **watchdog system** (also in October 2013).

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

2011 England riots: widely known as the London riots, although similar incidents occurred in other cities, a series of riots in August 2011 involving looting and arson and the deployment of thousands of police officers, with at least five people killed; provoked by the police killing of a young black man suspected of gang links.

Greater London: a metropolitan county in south-east England comprising both Inner London and Outer London with a population of over 8 million under the 2011 national census.

European Sovereign Debt Crisis: beginning in 2008 with the collapse of Iceland's banking system, in 2009 countries such as Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy announced that they were unable to repay or refinance their government debt without third-party assistance such as the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Lisbon Treaty: 2009 treaty that changed the title of European Community to European Union and for the first time asserted the primacy of Union law over national legislation in certain fields; it also provided in Article 50 a formal procedure for any member state to withdraw from the EU.

GDP: Gross Domestic Product, the total monetary value of a country's manufactured goods or services within a specified time (usually a calendar year); it is generally regarded as an indicator of a country's economic health.

United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP): established in 1991, a populist right-wing Eurosceptic party focused on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, and credited with forcing the 2016 Referendum that sanctioned the withdrawal ('Brexit').

Catherine, Duchess of Cambridge: Catherine Middleton (b. 1982), wife of Prince William, who is the elder son of Prince Charles, heir to the British throne.

Government Communication Headquarters (GCHQ): the intelligence organization based in Cheltenham responsible for overseeing intelligence gathering and the security of the United Kingdom.

Watchdog system: a system of public oversight when an individual or group monitor the activities of another entity (such as an individual, corporation, non-profit group, or governmental organization) on behalf of the public to ensure that entity does not behave illegally or unethically (for example, consumer watchdog, government watchdog).

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What form did the protests against the killing of a young man by police in London take in August, 2011?
2. How were the causes for the 2011 England riots explained?
3. Who were the protesters and why did the 2011 England riots lead to anti-immigration sentiments in British society?
4. Why did the UK become the centre of world pomp and pageantry in 2012?
5. How did the WikiLeaks founder, Julian Assange, avoid arrest in 2012?
6. What caused the huge jump in representation by the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in 2013?

Text III

British Euroscepticism and the Scottish independence referendum

The British political landscape was shaken again in May 2014, when UKIP not only made more dramatic gains in local council

elections (increasing its representation by more than 150 seats) but also finished first in elections for the European Parliament, becoming the first party other than Labour or the Conservatives in more than 100 years to triumph in a British national election. Capitalizing upon a growing wave of **Euroskepticism** that had a similar impact on elections to the European Parliament elsewhere (most notably in France, Denmark, and Hungary), the anti-EU UKIP won 27 percent of the vote and 24 seats (a gain of 11 seats) to 20 seats for Labour (a gain of 7) and 19 seats for the Conservatives (a loss of 7). The biggest loser in the election was the generally pro-EU Liberal Democratic Party, which fell from 11 seats to a single representative.

Scottish independence referendum

On September 18, 2014, a referendum was held in Scotland on independence from the United Kingdom. **The Scottish independence referendum**, which had been agreed to by Cameron in 2012, asked a single simple question: “Should Scotland be an independent country?” Vigorous campaigns had been conducted on both sides of the question, with former prime minister Brown playing a prominent role in opposition to the referendum and proposing a plan that called for codification of the purpose of the United Kingdom, for recognition of **the Scottish Parliament** as permanent and indissoluble, and for increased income taxing powers for the Scottish government. Although opinion polls had long indicated that a solid majority of Scots opposed independence, as the day of voting approached, the “yes” side had gained tremendous momentum, and **polling** indicated that the outcome was very much in question, with the “no” side holding a slight edge. With the vote just days off, Cameron, Clegg, and Labour Party leader Ed Miliband had jointly published in the newspaper *Daily Record* a “vow” to increase powers for Scotland’s government if the referendum was rejected. On the day of the vote, some 85 percent of registered voters went to the polls and convincingly defeated the referendum, with about 55 percent voting “no” and about 45 percent

voting “yes.” Following the result, Cameron promised to move swiftly to redeem his promise to devolve more powers to Scotland.

Economic recovery

The U.K.’s economy grew by about 3 percent in 2014. By the end of the year, it had reversed the decline that it suffered during the recession that started in 2008. Unemployment, which had peaked at 8.5 percent in 2011, fell to 6 percent in the second half of 2014. However, wages continued to rise more slowly than inflation. The combination of low pay rises and the expansion of low-wage jobs meant that tax revenues during the year were lower than expected. That shortfall contributed to a rise in the government’s net deficit, which toward the end of 2014 was running about 10 percent higher than during the same period a year earlier.

On September 26, 2014, MPs voted 524–43 to approve British participation in the U.S.-led air strikes against **the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL, also called ISIS)** insurgents in Iraq. Cameron made clear that the action would be limited to Iraq and that Britain would not attack ISIL in Syria. Furthermore, he emphasized that Britain would not send troops to take part in a ground war.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Euroscepticism: political hostility to membership of the European Union, especially among Conservative MPs, expressed especially from the mid-1990s onwards and resulting in the 2016 Brexit referendum which endorsed the UK’s withdrawal from the EU.

Scottish independence referendum: a referendum in 2014 initiated by the Scottish National Party calling for Scottish independence from the United Kingdom, which resulted in a decisive vote of 55.3% saying ‘no’ to independence.

Scottish Parliament: the devolved basis of government for Scotland, situated in Edinburgh, agreed in 1997 and set up in 1999, when powers were passed on to it from Westminster.

Opinion polling: surveys of public opinion to establish voting intentions before a referendum or General Election.

Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL, also called ISIS): militant Islamist group that in 2014 and 2015 invaded and occupied large areas of Iraq and Syria. Referring to itself as a 'caliphate', it claimed religious and political authority over all Muslims worldwide. Between 2014 and 2019 its power and influence were consistently weakened by its battles with forces from Syria, Iraq, the USA and Russia.

Lord Chancellor: one of the most ancient offices of state, and the highest ranking of the Great Officers of State (nominally outranking the Prime Minister) who is appointed by the Sovereign as advised by the Prime Minister to be head of the Ministry of Justice and thus to ensure the efficient working and independence of the courts.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What gains did UKIP make in 2014 local council elections and in elections for the European Parliament?
2. Why did the UKIP make dramatic gains in the 2014 elections?
3. What were the results of the 2014 Scottish independence referendum?
4. What was the level of the British participation in the military action against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant in 2014?

Text IV

The U.K. general election of 2015: Britain's continued membership in the EU as the key issue

Opinion polling right up to the day before voting indicated that the May 2015 U.K. general election might be the closest in recent memory, as a single percentage point separated the Conservative and Labour parties in most polls. Immigration, the government's austerity policies,

the future of **the National Health Service**, and Britain's continued membership in the EU were among the key issues in the campaign. Attempting to address Eurosceptics in his own party and the challenge of UKIP, Cameron promised to renegotiate the terms of British participation in the EU and to put continued EU membership to a national referendum (**the "Brexit Referendum"**) by the end of 2017 if he were reelected. The Conservatives also intimated that if Labour were to win with less than a majority, it would likely form a coalition with the Scottish National Party (SNP) that would drive the government's agenda with its desire for independence.

When the votes were counted, Cameron and the Conservatives defied the pollsters by capturing 331 seats (a gain of 24 over their showing in 2010), enough to form a majority government without the participation of the Liberal Democrats, whose fortunes plummeted as their party's representation fell from 57 seats to 8, prompting Clegg's resignation. Labour leader Miliband stepped down too, after his party won only 232 seats (down 26 from 2010), and watched the SNP blow away Labour's traditional dominance of elections in Scotland for the U.K. Parliament by increasing its representation in Westminster from 6 seats to 56. Although it captured some 13 percent of the total vote, UKIP won only one seat—a consequence of Britain's **winner-take-all election rules**—and **Nigel Farage**, who failed to be elected in his constituency, joined the list of resigning party leaders.

The "Brexit" referendum

On December 2, 2015, in the wake of the attacks by Islamist terrorists in Paris on November 13, the House of Commons authorized air strikes by the British military on ISIL targets in Syria. The vote on the measure came after some 10 hours of debate. Labour leader **Jeremy Corbyn** freed members of his party to vote according to their conscience, and dozens of them broke ranks to join the Conservatives and others in voting for authorization, which passed by 397–223.

At a summit meeting of the leaders of the member countries of the EU in Brussels in February 2016, **the European Council** announced

agreement on reforms to British membership that had been requested by Cameron in an attempt to forestall British withdrawal (“Brexit”) from the EU. Although Cameron did not get everything that he had asked for in the proposal that he submitted to Donald Tusk, the president of the European Council, in November 2015, he won enough concessions to move forward on his promise of a referendum on continued British membership. In the face of considerable support within his own party for Brexit, Cameron nevertheless announced that he would campaign for remaining in the EU and scheduled the referendum for June 23, 2016.

Cameron was joined in the “Remain” effort by Corbyn. The “Leave” campaign was headed by former London mayor **Boris Johnson**, whom many saw as a rival for Cameron’s leadership of the Conservative Party, and Michael Gove, **Lord Chancellor** and secretary of state for justice in Cameron’s cabinet. Opinion polling indicated that the two sides were fairly evenly divided as the referendum approached, but in the event 52 percent of voters opted to leave the EU, making the United Kingdom the first country to ever do so. Cameron announced his intention to resign as prime minister by the time of the Conservative Party conference in October 2016 to allow his successor to negotiate the U.K. withdrawal under the terms of Article 50 of **the Lisbon Treaty**, which, when triggered, would open a two-year window for the exit process.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Opinion polling: surveys of public opinion to establish voting intentions before a referendum or General Election.

National Health Service (NHS): the publicly-funded healthcare system of the United Kingdom established in 1948, providing free healthcare to the population at the point of delivery.

“Brexit Referendum”: referendum in June 2016 that resulted in the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union effective on 31 December 2020.

Winner-take-all election rules: also known as the ‘first past the post’ metaphor taken from horse-racing, a political system such as the UK’s where the candidate winning the largest number of votes wins the constituency, and where the party with the largest number of successful candidates forms the next government.

Nigel Farage: former banker who became the leader of the UKIP party and then Brexit Party who actively campaigned for the withdrawal of the UK from the EU for over 20 years.

Jeremy Corbyn: Leader of the Labour Party from 2016 to 2020, who lost the 2019 General Election to Boris Johnson in a disastrous result for the Labour Party; resigned in April 2020.

Boris Johnson: former journalist and Mayor of London who was Theresa May’s Foreign Secretary 2016-2019, then became Prime Minister in 2019.

European Council: the body that defines the overall political directions and priorities of the European Union, made up of the heads of state or government of all the EU member states as well as the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What did opinion polling show right up to the day before voting in the May 2015 United Kingdom General Election?
2. What were the key issues in the electoral campaign of the 2015 election?
3. Why did UKIP win only one seat in spite of taking some 13 percent of the total vote?
4. Who, among the major politicians, joined in the “Remain” and “Leave” campaigns before the Brexit Referendum of June 13, 2016?

D

Political struggle in the United Kingdom over Brexit (2016-2019)

Discussion Questions:

The UK's membership in the European Union was the focus of the 2016 referendum. Even though the majority of those who cast the votes in the referendum voted for leaving the European Union, the future of Great Britain as a member-country of the EU remained uncertain, and the withdrawal process resulted in intense political struggle.

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about the use of referenda in Great Britain and other Common Law countries?
2. What was the official position of the leadership of the two major parties of the United Kingdom about the Brexit referendum's question about EU membership?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read four texts about the intense political struggle following the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom over the withdrawal from the European Union.

As you read, note down the following:

1. the disarray in both major British political parties following the publication of the Brexit referendum results,
2. Theresa May's efforts to bring the Brexit process to completion,
3. the immigration policies issues in connection with the Manchester arena bombing and London Bridge attacks,
4. the futility of Theresa May's struggle to complete the Brexit process, and the Brexit policies of Boris Johnson.

Text I

Struggle for political leadership following the Brexit referendum; Theresa May tries to bring about a Brexit 'deal'

Resignation of Cameron and the rise of Theresa May

Only days after the Brexit vote, the political drama surrounding Boris Johnson's pursuit of the Conservative leadership assumed what many

observers identified as Shakespearean proportions, as **Michael Gove** removed his prominent support for Johnson's candidacy, saying that Johnson was "not capable of...leading the party and the country in the way that I would have hoped." In rapid fashion, a wounded Johnson removed himself from consideration. Gove then threw his hat into the small ring of leadership candidates that was then winnowed by successive votes by parliamentary Conservatives in early July to Home Secretary **Theresa May** and Energy Minister Andrea Leadsom, whose names were put to a vote by all party members with results due in September. Almost before that process started, Leadsom unexpectedly withdrew her name from consideration, and on July 11 the Conservative Party's **1922 Committee**, which had been steering the leadership contest, declared May the new party leader "with immediate effect." On July 13 Cameron formally resigned, and May became the second woman in British history to serve as prime minister.

Meanwhile, Labour underwent its own leadership controversy as prominent party members, including **Tony Blair**, took **Jeremy Corbyn** to task for not mounting a more vigorous effort on behalf of the "Remain" campaign. No sooner had Blair made his criticism than he found himself in the crosshairs, with the release on July 5 of the so-called **Chilcot Report**, the findings of a seven-year inquiry into Britain's involvement in the Iraq War, which was scathing in its condemnation of Blair's handling of the war from the initial decision to join the United States in invading Iraq to the Blair government's failure to plan and prepare for the postwar aftermath in Iraq. Nonetheless, a challenge was mounted to Corbyn's leadership of the party that eventually resulted in a head-to-head contest between Corbyn and Owen Smith, the former shadow secretary for work and pensions. In an online vote of party faithful in September, Corbyn held on to the leadership by capturing some 62 percent of the vote against about 38 percent for Smith.

Triggering Article 50

In the meantime, May, who had opposed Brexit but came into office promising to see it to completion, led her government in cautious

movement toward triggering **Article 50**. Her efforts experienced a setback in January 2017, however, when the Supreme Court upheld a November 2016 High Court ruling that prevented the prime minister from triggering Article 50 without first having gained approval from Parliament to do so. In February 2017 the House of Commons granted May that approval by a 498–114 vote, but the House of Lords created another roadblock in early March by adding a pair of amendments to the bill authorizing May to invoke Article 50. One guaranteed that EU passport holders residing in Britain would be permitted to remain, and the other sought a greater role for Parliament in the negotiations. Both amendments were overturned by the House of Commons later in March, and, before the end of the month, May formally submitted a letter to European Council President Donald Tusk requesting the opening of the two-year window for talks on the details of British separation from the EU.

Against this backdrop, the Scottish Assembly backed First Minister Nicola Sturgeon’s call for a new referendum on independence for Scotland to be held before spring 2019 (the majority of Scottish voters had opposed leaving the EU in the Brexit referendum).

The Manchester arena bombing and London bridge attacks

In mid-April 2017 May called for a snap parliamentary election, saying that its results would provide stability and certainty for Britain during its Brexit negotiations and transition out of the EU. To hold an election ahead of the 2020 date mandated by **the Fixed-Term Parliaments Act 2011**, May needed to win two-thirds majority approval in the House of Commons. Corbyn welcomed a return to the polls, despite opinion polling that predicted big gains for the Conservatives, and, by a vote of 522 to 13 (with **SNP** members abstaining), the House of Commons approved a snap election for June 8.

The election campaign was temporarily suspended after 22 people were killed and dozens injured in a terrorist attack on the night of May 22 at a 21,000-capacity arena in Manchester following a concert by

U.S. singer Ariana Grande. The attacker who detonated the homemade bomb that wrought the destruction also was killed in the blast. ISIL claimed responsibility for the attack, in which many of those who perished or were injured were children—teenaged and younger fans of the American pop star. It was the deadliest terrorist attack in Britain since the **London bombings of 2005**, in which more than 50 people were killed, and it followed an attack on Westminster Bridge in London on March 22 in which an attacker mowed down pedestrians with a car and then continued his assault on foot with a knife, taking five lives and injuring some 50 people before he was killed outside the Houses of Parliament by a security officer.

On June 3, five days before voters were to go to the polls, yet another terrorist attack unfolded in London. This time it occurred on **London Bridge**, where three attackers ran down victims with a vehicle before leaving it to menace others in nearby Borough Market with knives. Eight people were killed before police arrived, only eight minutes after the start of the incident, and shot and killed the attackers.

The snap election campaign

In addition to using the campaign to sell her version of “**hard Brexit**,” May sought to frame the election as a choice between her “strong and stable” leadership and that of Corbyn, who was characterized as an unreliable out-of-touch leftist extremist. However, Corbyn, once thought by many observers to be unelectable, proved to be an inspiring campaigner whose message of hope, compassion, and inclusiveness energized a new generation of Labour voters. May, on the other hand, often appeared uncomfortable, stiff, and uncertain on the campaign trail. One element of her manifesto—a proposal to pay for in-home social care of the elderly with government sales of their homes after their deaths, a plan loudly condemned by many as a “dementia tax”—brought widespread outrage that prompted her to quickly alter the proposal. Rather than appearing “strong and stable,” May, in the eyes of some observers, looked to be “weak and wobbly.”

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Michael Gove: Senior Conservative politician and leadership contender in 2016, also a leading Brexiteer; since February 2020 Minister for the Cabinet Office, essentially the role of Deputy Prime Minister.

Theresa May: Conservative Prime Minister 2016-2019 who failed to win Parliamentary approval for her EU Withdrawal Bill following the 2016 referendum; resigned in June 2019.

1922 Committee: Parliamentary Group of Conservative MPs in the House of Commons, founded not in 1922 but 1923 and with influence over Conservative government policy and governance.

Tony Blair: Labour Prime Minister 1997-2007, architect of 'New Labour' that was designed to return the party to power after 18 years of Conservative government; with George W. Bush instigated the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and the subsequent Iraq War.

Jeremy Corbyn: Leader of the Labour Party from 2016 to 2020, who lost the 2019 General Election to Boris Johnson in a disastrous result for the Labour Party; resigned in April 2020.

Chilcot report: British public inquiry into its involvement in the Iraq War, announced in 2009 and reporting in 2016 that the grounds for invading Iraq in 2003 were not legitimate politically, and based on intelligence inaccurately interpreted.

Article 50: Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union states that 'any member state may decide to withdraw from the Union in accordance with its own constitutional requirements'.

Fixed-Term Parliaments Act 2011: an act that stipulates that a General Election must be held every five years, unless Parliament decides it can be held earlier.

Scottish National Party (SNP): founded in 1934, since the 2019 UK General Election the largest political party in Scotland and the third largest (after Conservative and Labour) in the UK.

London bombings of 2005: the worst single terrorist atrocity in England when 4 Islamist fundamentalists killed 52 people on 7 July on London public transport.

London Bridge: a bridge spanning the Thames in Central London that was the scene of terrorist attacks in 2017 and 2019.

Hard Brexit: the name given to the future relationship of the EU and the UK after Brexit without any trade or tariff deals between the two.

Snap election: a General Election called earlier than scheduled, usually because of unpredictable or shifting political circumstances.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. How was Boris Johnson removed from contesting the Conservative leadership after the Brexit vote?

2. Why was the Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn taken to task in connection with the results of the Brexit referendum?

3. What obstacles did Theresa May run into in trying to invoke Article 50?

4. How did Theresa May seek to frame the snap election campaign over 2017?

Text II

The 2017 General Election and Brexit disagreements

When voters had their say on June 8, 2017, they handed the Conservatives a major setback. Rather than securing a **mandate**, May

watched her party's legislative majority disappear as it lost at least 12 seats in the House of Commons to fall to 318 seats while Labour gained at least 29 seats to surpass 260 seats in total. Both parties garnered more than 40 percent of the popular vote each in an election that witnessed a return to dominance by the two major parties. Led by Tim Farron, the Liberal Democrats, who had fared badly in the 2015 election, sought to reverse their fortunes by advocating another referendum on Brexit, and, while this proposal did not resonate for many voters, the party still gained four seats to reach a total of 12. Support for UKIP largely evaporated. Having nearly realized the goal of Brexit, many of those who had supported UKIP in previous elections were expected to vote for the Conservatives, but, in the event, it appeared that they instead were swayed by Corbyn's vision. The Conservatives did, however, make big gains in Scotland, where the Scottish National Party fell from 56 seats to 35, in what was widely interpreted as a rebuke to Sturgeon and the SNP's call for another referendum on Scottish independence.

Arguably the election's biggest winner was Northern Ireland's **Democratic Unionist Party (DUP)**. Having increased its representation in the House of Commons from 8 to 10 seats, it found itself in the role of kingmaker when May enlisted its support to cling to power by forming a **minority government** (rather than seeking a formal coalition arrangement). With the support of the DUP on key votes, the Conservatives would be able to just barely surpass the 326-vote bar for a legislative majority.

The central task for May's government remained arriving at a cohesive approach for its Brexit negotiations with the EU. That task was a daunting one, however, because wide disagreement persisted even within the Conservative Party, not just on a myriad of details related to the British proposal for separation but also on the broader issues involved.

The Grenfell Tower fire, novichok in Salisbury, Syrian air strikes

In June 2017 Brexit was pushed off the front pages by one of the worst disasters in recent British history: a fire in a multistorey **public**

housing residence (Grenfell Tower) in London claimed the lives of 72 individuals, many of whom were recent immigrants. The incident prompted a period of national **soul-searching** after it was revealed that months before the fire the building's low-income residents had raised concerns about fire safety and complained that they were being treated like second-class citizens.

In March 2018 British national outrage was focused on Russia when a former Russian intelligence officer, who had acted as double agent for Britain, and his daughter were found unconscious in Salisbury, England. It was determined that the pair had been victims of “novichok,” a complex nerve agent that had been developed by the Soviets. Although the Russian government denied having any involvement with the attack and British investigators were unable to prove that the nerve agent originated in Russia, the May government responded by expelling some two dozen Russian intelligence operatives who had been working in Britain under diplomatic cover.

In April Britain joined France and the United States in launching air strikes against targets in Syria after it was revealed that the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad had again used chemical weapons on its own people. Corbyn was critical of May for having ordered the strike without first consulting Parliament, but she countered that the action had to be undertaken without seeking parliamentary approval in order to protect the operation's integrity. May also said that the strike was intended to prevent further suffering, and she characterized the decision as both right and legal.

A Royal Wedding, the Chequers plan, Boris Johnson's resignation

In May 2018 Britain and much of the world stopped for a day to witness the royal wedding of Prince Harry to Meghan Markle—a divorced American actress, daughter of an African American mother and a white father—whose informal approachability and personal warmth recalled the much beloved “People's Princess” Diana. The newlywed couple's union reflected the changing social landscape of an increasingly

multicultural Britain. Moreover, they seemed determined to modernize the monarchy and to connect it with the lives of everyday Britons.

In early July May summoned her cabinet to the prime minister's country retreat, **Chequers**, determined to forge a consensus on the nuts and bolts of the government's Brexit plan. Despite forceful opposition by the cabinet's "hard" Brexiters, by the end of the marathon meeting a consensus seemed to have emerged around May's "softer" approach, grounded in policies aimed at preserving economic ties with the EU. Just two days later, however, the government's apparent harmony was disrupted by the resignation of Britain's chief Brexit negotiator, David Davis, who complained that May's plan gave up too much, too easily. The next day Johnson left his post as foreign secretary, writing in his letter of resignation that the dream of Brexit was dying, "suffocated by needless self-doubt." May was suddenly confronted with the possibility of a **vote of confidence** on her leadership.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Mandate: the authority given to a political party to perform actions in the service of governance, usually as a result of a referendum or General Election.

Democratic Unionist Party (DUP): founded in 1971 by the Protestant Reverend Ian Paisley during the Troubles, a party fiercely devoted to continued membership of the United Kingdom and opposed to a united Ireland,

Minority government: in a parliamentary system, a party or coalition that does not have a majority of seats and that can only produce legislation with the support of other parties.

Grenfell Tower fire: the worst UK residential fire since the Second World War, in 2017 the 24-storey Grenfell Tower in West London was engulfed in flame due to faulty insulation; 72 people died, and as of mid-2020 criminal responsibility is still being determined.

Public housing: also known as social housing, rental accommodation provided by local councils (ie the state) to those unable to find living accommodation in the private sector.

Soul-searching: considered inner reflection on personal motives or desires with regard to a particular course of action.

Chequers: the official country residence of the Prime Minister since 1921, located in Buckinghamshire, about 40 miles outside of London.

Vote of confidence: a statement or action that demonstrates support for a person or group, usually the serving government in Parliament.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Why were the results of the 2017 U.K. general election disappointing for Theresa May?

2. How did the Conservatives manage to surpass the 326-vote bar for a legislative majority after losing 12 seats in the general election?

3. What did the royal wedding in 2018 of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle seem to demonstrate?

4. How did Theresa May's Chequers plan start losing the support of her Cabinet?

Text III

The EU deal, Parliament's opposition to May's Brexit plan

On November 25 the leaders of the EU's 27 other member countries formally agreed to the terms of a withdrawal deal that May claimed "delivered for the British people" and set the United Kingdom "on course for a prosperous future." Under the plan Britain was to pay some \$50 billion to the EU to satisfy its long-term financial obligations. Britain's departure from the EU was to come in March 2019, but,

according to the agreement, the U.K. would continue to abide by EU rules and regulations until at least December 2020 while negotiations continued on the details of the long-term relationship between the EU and the U.K.

The agreement, which was set to be debated and voted upon by the House of Commons in December, still faced strong opposition in Parliament, not only from Labour, the Liberal Democrats, the SNP, **Plaid Cymru**, and the DUP but also from dozens of Conservatives. At the same time, the call for holding another referendum on Brexit was growing louder, though May remained adamant that the will of the British people had already been expressed. A major sticking point for many of those who opposed the agreement was the so-called **Northern Ireland backstop plan**. Formulated to help maintain an open border between Northern Ireland and EU member Ireland after Brexit, the “backstop” stipulated that a legally binding customs arrangement between the EU and Northern Ireland would go into effect if the U.K. and the EU could not reach a long-term agreement by December 2020. Opponents of the backstop argued that it set up the potential for regulatory barriers between Northern Ireland and the rest of the U.K., effectively establishing a customs border down the Irish Sea.

Objections to the Irish backstop and a challenge to May’s leadership

The issue grew more heated in the first week of December after the government was forced to publish in full Attorney General Geoffrey Cox’s legal advice for the government on the Brexit agreement, which had initially been reported to Parliament in overview only. According to Cox, without agreement between Britain and the EU, the terms of the backstop plan could endure “indefinitely,” with the U.K. legally blocked from terminating the agreement without EU approval. This contentious issue was front and centre as the House of Commons began five days of debate leading up to a vote on the Brexit agreement that was scheduled for December 11. Facing the likelihood of a humiliating

rejection of the agreement by the House of Commons, May dramatically interrupted the debate after three days, on December 10, and postponed the vote, pledging to seek new assurances from the EU regarding the backstop. The opposition responded by threatening to hold a vote of confidence and to call for an early election.

A challenge to May's leadership was quickly mounted within the Conservative Party, and, after more than the required 15 percent of the parliamentary party (48 of 317 MPs) requested a vote on her leadership of the party, a secret ballot vote was held on December 12, 2018. May received the votes of 200 MPs, more than the 159 votes she needed to survive as leader. Although, according to Conservative Party rules, she could not be challenged as leader for another year, it remained to be seen whether May would still face pressure to relinquish power.

Parliamentary rejection of May's plan, May's survival of a confidence vote, and the Independent Group of breakaway MPs

Responding to May in a joint letter, **European Council** President Donald Tusk and **European Commission** President Jean-Claude Juncker indicated that, if the backstop had to be invoked, they would strive to limit its application to the "shortest possible period." However, this pledge satisfied few of the agreement's critics. When debate on the agreement resumed on January 9, Corbyn argued not only for rejection of the agreement but also for an early general election. On January 15 the agreement was overwhelmingly rejected by a vote of 432–202 (the worst defeat for a government initiative in modern British parliamentary history), and Corbyn tabled a vote of confidence in the government, which May survived the next day, 325–306, having held onto the support of the DUP and many Conservatives who had deserted her in the agreement vote.

The longer the issue of Brexit remained unsettled, the more it became the **fulcrum** on which British politics turned. Political **pundits** began to note that opinions on May's proposed version of Brexit and Brexit in general cut across ideological lines. Both Labour and the

Conservative Party were riven by internecine conflict over Brexit. In February eight MPs withdrew from the Labour Party, citing their disappointment in Corbyn's leadership on the issue as well as concerns over alleged anti-Semitism within the party, a criticism that was at least partly tied to Corbyn's sympathy for Palestinian concerns. Only days after their departure, three moderate Tories left the Conservative Party, protesting that it had been hijacked by **the European Research Group**, a faction of right-wing hard-line Brexiters whom the departing MPs accused of acting as a party within the party. Joining together as the Independent Group, these breakaway MPs from both parties began taking steps toward formally constituting a new political party. Meanwhile, in early March, Tom Watson, the deputy leader of the Labour Party, convened a meeting of Labour MPs and members of the House of Lords—many of whom felt that Corbyn had taken the party too far leftward—to consider an alternative vision for the party.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Plaid Cymru [plaid kamri]: the Parliamentary Party representing independence (or at least various forms of autonomy) for Wales.

Northern Ireland backstop plan: now defunct, part of the EU Withdrawal Agreement proposed by Theresa May's government to maintain an open border (ie one with no customs or tariff controls) between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic. With the Agreement rejected in 2019, the backstop was abandoned.

European Council: the body that defines the overall political directions and priorities of the European Union, made up of the heads of state or government of all the EU member states as well as the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission.

European Commission: the EU's politically independent executive branch responsible for drawing up legislative proposals and for implementing decisions of the European Parliament and Council of Europe.

Fulcrum: something that is central or essential to the functioning of an activity or situation.

Political pundit: someone who is an expert (or claims to be) in political analysis and offers opinion or commentary to mass media outlets.

European Research Group: a group of Conservative MPs in the House of Commons functioning from the mid-1990s opposed to membership of the European Union and actively agitating for the UK's withdrawal.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What was the major objection for those who opposed the EU agreement of November 25, 2018?
2. How was Theresa May's leadership of the Conservative Party challenged in December, 2018?
3. What were the results of voting in Parliament on January 15, 2019 on the EU agreement?
4. How did Corbyn's leadership of the Labour Party come under attack within his own party?

Text IV

The futility of Theresa May's soft Brexit plan, the ascent of Boris Johnson with his version to complete the Brexit Process

Against this backdrop, Mrs May continued negotiations with European leaders in an effort to win concessions that would garner wider support within Parliament than the terms of her earlier, shunned Brexit plan did. On the eve of a scheduled meaningful vote in the House of Commons on her revised plan, Mrs May secured new promises of cooperation on **the backstop plan** from EU leaders. A "joint legally binding instrument" was agreed to under which Britain could initiate a "formal dispute" with the EU if the EU were to attempt to keep Britain bound to

the backstop plan indefinitely. A “joint statement” was also issued that committed the U.K. and the EU to arriving at a replacement for the backstop plan by December 2020. Finally, the U.K. put forth a “unilateral declaration” stressing that there was nothing to prevent Britain from abandoning the backstop if negotiations on an alternative arrangement with the EU were to collapse without the prospect of resolution.

In advance of the vote in Parliament, **Attorney General Cox** issued his opinion that while the new assurances reduced the risk of the U.K.’s being indefinitely confined by the backstop agreement, they did not fundamentally change the agreement’s legal status. In the vote on March 12, the House of Commons once again rejected May’s plan, though by a smaller margin than its earlier defeat, 391–242. The next day the House of Commons voted 312–308 against leaving the EU without a deal in place. On March 14, by just two votes, Mrs May survived a vote that would have taken control of Brexit away from her and handed it to Parliament. In a letter to EU leaders on March 20, she requested that the date of Britain’s departure from the EU be delayed until June 30. In response the EU announced its willingness to extend the Brexit deadline until May 22 but only if Parliament had accepted Mrs May’s withdrawal plan by the week of March 24.

“Indicative votes,” Mrs May’s pledge to resign, a third defeat

Hundreds of thousands of demonstrators took to the streets of London on March 23 to demand that another referendum on Brexit be held. On March 25 the House of Commons voted 329–302 to usurp control of Parliament’s agenda from the government in order to hold “**indicative votes**” on alternative proposals to Mrs May’s plan. Eight of those proposals were put to a vote on March 27, but none was able to gain the support of the majority, though a plan to seek to create a “permanent and comprehensive U.K.-wide **customs union** with the EU” came close, falling short by just six votes.

Also on March 27, Mrs May pledged to resign as party leader and prime minister if the House of Commons were to approve her plan, a

gambit that won support from some “hard Brexit” opponents of the plan. On March 29, owing to an antique procedural rule invoked by Speaker of the House John Bercow, only the withdrawal agreement portion of May’s plan was voted upon by the House of Commons (excluded was the “political declaration” that addressed what the U.K. and EU expected of their long-term relationship). Although the vote was closer than the previous two (286 in support, 344 in opposition), the plan once again went down in defeat. The U.K. now had until April 12 to decide whether it would leave the EU without an agreement on that day or request a longer delay that would require it to participate in elections for the European Parliament. May asked the EU to push back the deadline for Brexit until June 30, and on April 11 the European Council announced that it was granting the U.K. a “flexible extension” until October 31.

Shortly thereafter, in response to the Conservative Party’s seeming inability to position the country to leave the EU, **Nigel Farage** launched the **Brexit Party**. It proved to be a big winner in the elections for the European Parliament in May, capturing about 31 percent of the vote. The next closest finisher was the Liberal Democrats, with about 20 percent of the vote, while Labour claimed some 14 percent and the Conservatives only about 9 percent.

Having failed to garner sufficient support from Conservatives for her exit plan, Theresa May entered discussions with Labour leaders on a possible compromise, but these too proved fruitless. When May responded to that disappointment by proposing a new version of the plan that included a temporary customs relationship with the EU and a pledge to hold a parliamentary vote on whether to stage another referendum on Brexit, her cabinet revolted. Isolated as never before, the Prime Minister announced on May 24 that she would step down as leader of the Conservative Party on June 7 but would remain as **caretaker premier** until her party had chosen her successor.

Boris Johnson’s ascent, the December 2019 snap election, and ‘Get Brexit Done’

After a series of votes by the parliamentary Conservative Party winnowed a list of 10 candidates to 2, Boris Johnson and Jeremy Hunt stood in an election in which all of the party's roughly 160,000 members were eligible to vote. Johnson took some 66 percent of that vote to assume the leadership. He officially replaced Theresa May as Prime Minister on July 24. Although he had promised to take the United Kingdom out of the EU without an exit agreement if the deal May had negotiated was not changed to his liking, Johnson faced widespread opposition (even within his own party) to his advocacy of a no-deal Brexit. Political maneuvering by the new Prime Minister (including proroguing Parliament just weeks before October 31, the revised departure deadline) was met with forceful legislative countermeasures by those opposed to leaving the EU without an agreement in place. A vote of the House of Commons in early September forced Johnson to request a delay of the British withdrawal from the EU until January 31, 2020, even though on October 22 the House approved, in principle, the agreement that Johnson had negotiated, replacing the backstop with a plan to keep Northern Ireland aligned with the EU for at least four years from the end of the transition period.

Johnson repeatedly tried and failed to call a **snap election** that he hoped would secure a mandate for his vision of Brexit. Because the election would fall outside the five-year term stipulated by **the Fixed Terms of Parliament Act**, it required approval by two-thirds of the House of Commons to be held, meaning that it needed support from the opposition, which was denied. After a no-deal Brexit was blocked, however, Corbyn was willing to let voters once again decide the fate of Brexit, and an election was scheduled for 12 December 2019. The Conservatives entered the election with the slogan 'Get Brexit Done'. Pre-election opinion polling indicated a likely win for the Conservatives, but when the results were in they had recorded its most decisive victory since 1987, adding 47 seats to secure a solid Parliamentary party of 365 and a huge majority of 80 seats. The stage

was set for the realization of Johnson's version of Brexit, which was to take place at 11:00 pm London time on 31 January 2020, when the United Kingdom formally would withdraw from the European Union.

adapted from Encyclopædia Britannica

BACKGROUND NOTES

Backstop: part of the EU Withdrawal Agreement proposed by Theresa May's government to maintain an open border (ie one with no customs or tariff controls) between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic. With the Agreement rejected in 2019, the backstop was abandoned.

Attorney General: main legal advisor to the Crown and UK government, with supervisory powers over criminal cases.

Indicative votes: votes by MPs on non-binding resolutions intended to test the options of the House of Commons on a particular major issue.

Customs union: a trading bloc of several countries with no or few tariff restrictions between the countries in the bloc.

Brexit Party: a political party set up in January 2019 by Brexiteer Nigel Farage explicitly to campaign for the departure of the United Kingdom from the European Union; in the 2019 European Parliament election it gained more votes than any other UK party.

Caretaker premier: a Prime Minister who agrees to the post on a temporary basis until a more permanent replacement is found.

Snap election: a General Election called earlier than scheduled, usually because of unpredictable or shifting political circumstances.

Fixed Terms of Parliament Act 2011: an act that stipulates that a General Election must be held every five years, unless Parliament decides it can be held earlier.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What were the promises of cooperation on the backstop plan that Theresa May received from EU leaders?
2. How did the House of Commons try to achieve agreement with the EU when all attempts of the government to do so had failed?
3. What was Theresa May's condition to resign as leader and Prime Minister published on March 27?
4. What made Nigel Farage, a prominent Eurosceptic in the U.K. since the early 1990s, launch the Brexit Party?

Group Activities:

In groups of two to three students discuss the critical moments of the British political history in the period of 1945-2020.

What do you think have been the major crises in British political history since 1945?

What do you think have been the most important positive contributions to British society since 1945?

As a preliminary stage, students may look for additional information, using reference books, public media, including Internet resources, etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussion in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual Work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about the decline of the British colonial system after the Second World War as one of the major crises in British political history since 1945.

UNIT III. BREXIT: THREE PRIME MINISTERS IN FIVE YEARS

Introductory Discussion:

It is no exaggeration to say that the EU referendum of 2016 caused a political earthquake in the United Kingdom, as a result of which there have been three Prime Ministers in five years: David Cameron, Theresa May and Boris Johnson. A parliamentary term usually lasts five years with one prime minister, but from 2016 to 2020 there have been three, all either the victims or beneficiaries of Brexit. Fault lines in the UK's constitutional structure have been exposed, whereby Scotland may vote (again) for independence from the United Kingdom, in order to remain a member of the European Union, and for this first time in 100 years there is serious discussion of the possibility of a united Ireland. The political dimension of the alignment of the English white working class and capitalist business has still to be assessed, with its urgent implications for what has hitherto been accepted as 'British identity'.

A. Look through the 2016 Brexit Referendum results and answer the following questions:

1. What were the results of the Brexit Referendum in percentages?
2. Which parts of the United Kingdom voted for leaving the European Union?
3. Which parts of the United Kingdom voted to remain in the European Union?
4. How were the results of the Brexit Referendum influenced by the age of the voters?

Results of the June 2016 referendum on membership of the European Union:

- Total turnout: 71.8%

- Vote Leave: 51.9%
- Vote Remain: 48.1%
- England voted for Brexit 53.4% to 46.6%
- Wales voted for Brexit 52.5% to 47.5%
- Scotland voted to remain 62% to 38%
- Northern Ireland voted to remain 55.8% to 44.2%

Age profile of those voting:

- Turnout age 18-24: 36%
- Turnout age 25-34: 58%
- Turnout age 35-44: 72%
- Turnout age 45-54: 75%
- Turnout age 55-64: 81%
- Turnout age 65+: 83%
- Aged 18-24: 27% voted to leave, 73% to remain
- Aged 25-34: 38% voted to leave 62%, to remain
- Aged 35-44: 48% voted to leave 52%. to remain
- Aged 45-54: 56% voted to leave 44%, to remain
- Aged 55-64: 57% voted to leave 43%, to remain
- Aged 65+: 60% voted to leave 40%, to remain

B. Compare two sequences of events connected with the Brexit process and answer the following questions:

1. What had been in your opinion the most likely scenarios if the UK Parliament would have voted against the agreement?
2. When did the UK and the EU negotiators draw up the UK's Withdrawal Agreement?
3. Why did the UK fail to complete the withdrawal process on 29 March 2019?
4. What were Prime Minister Boris Johnson's Brexit policies?
5. How did Boris Johnson receive support for his Brexit policies through calling an early General Election in 2019?
6. What were the main terms of the UK-EU agreement on January-December 2020?

Sequence of events determined by Brexit (what *might* have happened):

- 29 March 2019: the UK was officially due to leave the European Union; but:
- 11 December 2018: the UK Parliament had voted against the UK withdrawal agreement;
- If the UK Parliament had voted in favour of the agreement, the European Parliament would have voted (probably early 2019) (BUT see below);
- If the UK Parliament voted against the agreement, possible scenarios were:
 - resignation or removal of the Prime Minister (Theresa May resigned in June 2019);
 - vote of no confidence in the government (it wasn't proposed);
 - general election (it was declared in December 2019);
 - withdrawal from European Union with no-deal (ie no trade agreements with 27 countries);
 - second referendum (autumn 2019 or afterward).

Sequence of events determined by Brexit (ie what *did* happen):

- June 2016: resignation of David Cameron as Prime Minister; replaced by Theresa May;
- 2017: General Election called by Theresa May; government's majority in the House of Commons severely reduced;
- March 2017: Theresa May wrote formally to the EU to confirm that the UK will leave the EU on 29 March 2019;
- 2017-2019: UK and EU negotiators drew up the UK's Withdrawal Agreement (about 500 pages);
 - January-March 2019: UK Parliament 3 times voted against Prime Minister's Withdrawal from the EU Agreement, agreed with EU leaders;
 - 29 March 2019: no Brexit. UK government and EU agreed to extend withdrawal to 12 April 2019;
 - 12 April 2019: no Brexit. EU offered 'flexible' withdrawal extension ('flexextension') until 31 October 2019;

- 23 May 2019: elections to the European Parliament; large gains made by the British anti-EU Brexit Party;
- 4 June 2019: resignation of Prime Minister Theresa May;
- 26 July 2019: appointment of Boris Johnson as Prime Minister;
- September 2019: the Prime Minister asked the Queen to ‘prorogue’ Parliament (until October 2019);
- September 2019: Parliament passed law to prevent no-deal Brexit (just before ‘prorogation’);
- September 2019: UK Supreme Court ruled that the prorogation was ‘unlawful’.
- September 2019: the PM accused of having lied to the Queen; refuses to resign;
- September 2019: the PM called Remainers ‘traitors’ and accused them of ‘betrayal’;
- September 2019: the PM called attempts to stop no-deal ‘the surrender bill’;
- September 2019: the PM threatened to call a General Election based on ‘the People vs Parliament’.
- October 2019: the UK Parliament approved withdrawal agreement with EU; Northern Ireland to remain in EU customs territory; customs border between UK and Northern Ireland;
- October 2019: Boris Johnson called General Election for 12 December 2019;
- October 2019: no departure of the UK from the EU; UK withdrawal from EU delayed until 31 January 2020;
- 12 December 2019: UK General Election; Conservatives under Boris Johnson won large majority in House of Commons under ‘Get Brexit Done’;
- 31 January 2020: the United Kingdom officially left the European Union;
- January-December 2020: ‘transition’ or ‘implementation’ period to determine the UK’s future trading relationship with the European Union; if no agreement is reached, the UK to leave the EU trading bloc on 31 December on World Trade Organization terms

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read four texts about the main issues brought about by the UK leaving the European Union.

As you read, note down the following:

1. the perceived resurgence of British exceptionalism that led to the 2016 European Union Referendum,
2. the fundamental freedoms declared in the EU's founding document, the Treaty of Rome,
3. the Labour government's decision in 2004 not to impose restrictions on migrants from the new member states,
4. the government's determination not to extend the Brexit transition period,
5. difficulties in building a reciprocal trade agreement,
6. problems of changing orientation to new trade partners,
7. the possibility of a 'No-Deal Scenario'.

Text I

Brexit Issues: The ending of freedom of movement

In May 2020 Great Britain celebrated the 75th anniversary of VE day. VE stands for Victory in Europe, celebrating the formal acceptance by the Allies of World War II of Nazi Germany's absolute surrender of its armed forces on Tuesday, 8 May 1945, marking the end of World War II in Europe. The Allies comprised the main Allied Powers (Great Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, France and China), and many other countries in the world that joined in a common fight against fascism.

The list of Allies is extensive, and it illustrates that, despite what some in the Conservative government would have us believe, Britain did not win the war alone.

The recent resurgence of **British exceptionalism**, which drove the anti-EU rhetoric and ultimately led to **the 2016 EU Referendum**, has been decimated by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has killed more in this country than any other in Europe. However, it appears that the

United Kingdom will plough ahead with **Brexit**. And one of the main components of leaving the EU is ending **freedom of movement**.

What is freedom of movement?

The EU is built upon four fundamental freedoms:

1. free movement of goods
2. the freedom to establish and provide services
3. free movement of capital
4. free movement of people

These freedoms are articulated in the EU's founding document, **the Treaty of Rome** under Article 3:

"The activities of the Community shall include . . . the elimination, as between the Member States, of **customs duties** and of quantitative restrictions on the import and export of goods . . . ; the abolition, as between the Member States, of obstacles to freedom of movement for persons, services, and capital."

Freedom of movement entitles EU citizens to:

- search for work in another EU country
- work there without requiring a **work permit**
- live in another EU Member State for work
- continue to live there even after their employment ends
- enjoy equal treatment with nationals in access to employment, working conditions, and all other social and tax advantages

Healthcare and access to **public funds** can also be covered; however, individual nations can decide on the extent of these benefits.

It is this latter point which in part led the UK down the path of leaving the EU. And it had nothing to do with migration – rather, a crucial error of judgment by the Labour government in 2004.

Despite protests to the contrary, evidence shows that one third (33%) of Leave voters said the main reason for their decision to exit the EU was because it "offered the best chance for the UK to regain control over immigration and its own borders." To understand why, we must go back to 2004 and decisions made by the then Labour government, led by Tony Blair.

In 2004 the EU welcomed ten new member states – Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia. Before this, EU migration to Britain was on par with levels experienced in the other member States. The poorest nations, Greece, Spain, and Portugal benefiting from generous EU infrastructure funding, did not see large numbers of young people leaving their shores for Britain.

This all changed. The UK was only one of three countries (including Ireland and Sweden), which did not impose restrictions on migrants from the new Member States.

Interestingly, the Coronavirus pandemic of 2020 may have led to a greater appreciation of EU migrants, especially given their contribution to essential services such as healthcare, food manufacturing, care homes, and supermarkets. They are essentially the glue holding the country together at this time.

adapted from Reiss Edwards, “The End of Freedom of Movement”

BACKGROUND NOTES

British exceptionalism: the belief that Great Britain is unique in its history and international power, and that the British have a particular ‘destiny’; the motto ‘keep calm and carry on’ is often used to characterize this attitude.

2016 EU Referendum: the referendum called by Prime Minister David Cameron in 2015 on whether the UK should remain or withdraw from the European Union; the result was a 51-49% decision to withdraw.

Brexit: the term commonly given to the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union.

Freedom of movement: the free movement of people and goods across the borders of all the countries of the European Union, without official regulation or tariffs.

Treaty of Rome: the agreement signed in 1957 by France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, that established the European Economic Community (EEC), creating a common market and customs union between those countries.

Customs duties: national taxes imposed on the import and export of certain goods.

Work permit: the official permission granted by government to work in that country, not required by every country and variable in its restrictions and permissions as applied by various countries.

Public funds: a range of social benefits (housing assistance, child tax credits, disability allowance, etc.) paid for by the state, usually to people on low incomes.

COVID-19 pandemic: also known as coronavirus, the ongoing (summer 2020) respiratory pandemic first identified in late 2019 in China that has caused over 1 million deaths worldwide.

National Health Service: set up in 1948, the umbrella term for various publicly-funded healthcare systems in the UK providing free treatment and care at the point of delivery for everyone, based on clinical need.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What drove the anti-EU rhetoric and eventually led to the 2016 EU Referendum?
2. Name the four basic freedoms on which the EU is built?
3. What does freedom of movement entitle the EU citizens to?
4. What has shown how dependent Great Britain is on EU migrants, especially in the National Health Service?

Text II

Brexit Issues: Immigration

In early April 2020, at the height of **the coronavirus pandemic**, the Government decided to publish an introduction for employers to **the points-based immigration system** which it intends to bring in on 1 January 2021, the day after **the Brexit transition period** ends.

The timing couldn't have been worse. Thousands of people were dying – and still are at the time of writing. Many more have had their hours cut, been furloughed or lost their jobs. People with visas and their employers have been trying to find out what this means for them. **The Home Office** is responding with piecemeal guidance which leaves many questions unanswered.

Why would the Home Office trumpet the future immigration system at a time like this? Couldn't it dedicate resources to sorting out its coronavirus immigration guidance instead? Probably not – publishing the document in April was insensitive but it was likely prepared weeks before so it might not have made a difference.

The bigger question is this: why is the Government determined not to extend the Brexit transition period? We already know that any form of Brexit is going to make the UK poorer for years to come: the Government's own long-term economic analysis says so. This will come on top of a global recession – one which is bound to hit the UK especially hard given how badly the country has been affected by the pandemic. The sensible approach is to agree with the EU to extend the transition period and focus every effort on trying to stop the UK economy being devastated. But the Government will not do this because the cabinet is made up of Brexiters who will not accept any delay, regardless of the consequences.

When the pandemic is over there will be questions about how the Government handled the crisis, but at least it was a disaster which nobody wanted. The end of the transition period is different. The Government could extend it but won't. They own this one.

Employers have to assume that the Brexit transition period is going to end on 31 December 2020 and that the new immigration system will come in on 1 January 2021. What does this mean as far as UK immigration is concerned?

First, from 1 January 2021 it will become much more expensive and complicated to recruit higher-skilled and medium-skilled workers from the EU. This is because EU citizens who are not already living in the UK will need **sponsored work visas**. A **standard five-year Tier 2 visa** already costs around £8,500 in government fees. The cost will increase to nearly £10,000 later this year when **the Immigration Health Surcharge** is increased.

Second, it will become much easier to recruit higher-skilled and medium-skilled workers from outside the EU. The skills threshold and salary threshold for a sponsored work visa will be lowered and the resident labour market test will be abolished.

Finally, it will become much harder to recruit lower-skilled workers from anywhere in the world except the UK and Ireland. There will still be some people from other countries arriving on visas allowing them to do any kind of work – **youth mobility visas** for instance – but not in large numbers. Some employers will not survive this.

*adapted from K. Napley,
“UK immigration – one crisis after another”*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Coronavirus pandemic: also known as COVID-19, the ongoing (autumn 2020) respiratory pandemic first identified in late 2019 in China that has caused over 1 million deaths worldwide.

Points-based immigration system: from 1 January 2021 and the end of free movement within the EU, a set of requirements based on ‘points’ accrued by an individual’s job and professional profile that will qualify for employment in the UK, usually considered to be highly-skilled or in a particular economic sector.

Brexit transition period: the period from 31 January to 31 December 2020 when the UK and EU try to negotiate their economic relationship after the withdrawal of the UK from the EU on 31 December 2020.

Home Office: since 1782, the government ministry responsible for internal security and economic development across the UK.

Sponsored work visas: work visas for non-EU (and from 1 January 2021 non-UK) nationals requiring evidence from an employer regarding skills and salary level.

Standard five-year Tier 2 visa: available for skilled workers sponsored by an employer.

Immigration Health Surcharge: introduced in 2015, a fee payable by non-UK residents for healthcare treatment in the NHS.

Youth mobility visas: for those from some British Commonwealth countries aged 18-30, a visa to work in the UK for up to 2 years, subject to eligibility criteria.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What did the government's long-term economic analysis say about the effect of Brexit on the UK economy?
2. Why might it become much more expensive and complicated to recruit higher-and-medium-skilled workers from the EU after the end of the Brexit transitional period?
3. How does the UK policy change in recruiting higher-skilled and medium-skilled workers from outside the EU with the immigration system in force?

Text III

Brexit Issues: Trading with the European Union after Brexit

As of the 31st of January 2020, the UK is no longer a member of the European Union. Three years of negotiations following the shock result of the 2016 EU Referendum have resulted in little progress. Political wrangling aside, the process of exiting **the trade bloc** after more than 40 years of membership was always likely to be a mammoth task. So where are we now? While it is clear that little progress was being made on building a reciprocal trade agreement, COVID-19 stopped the process in its tracks. While the UK was confident of a successful post-Brexit, COVID-19 and the economic fallout will not help. The British economy has come to a standstill and restarting it will be no mean feat. Factor in Britain losing its closest trading partners and the omens are not good.

While the British public was led to believe that **the Brexit negotiations** would be straightforward, it has not turned out that way – far from it. Political bickering has meant that rather than an easy ride, the trade negotiations turned into a stand-off.

One of the key ideas of the Brexit campaign was that **a trade deal** would be easy as the government felt that it had the upper hand. If you look at the facts, it is easy to see how they came to that conclusion. In 2019, the UK had a £72 billion trade deficit with the EU, this means that the UK is a huge importer of goods from the bloc. It is not a surprise, as the UK relies on EU nations to provide food, goods, and services that are generally cheaper to produce than they would be in the UK. They also provide vital items and services that are not produced in the UK, such as out of season fruit and vegetables. This has meant that the UK has benefitted from its buying power as a large-scale net importer. In a fiscal sense, the UK's financial power does give it leverage.

As well as the financial aspect, there is also merit in the idea that the number of EU citizens residing in the UK gave it **leverage**. With over three million EU citizens in the UK, the country is a hot spot for EU migration, this meant that the rights of those citizens were always key

to a deal. While unlikely (and likely unlawful) to repatriate EU citizens, tightened restrictions could mean a shift in migration moving forward. For many EU countries, they could simply not afford a vast number of citizens returning to their countries of origin. So on this point, you might have to concede that the UK has the upper hand.

So, UK has financial leverage and is home to many EU migrants. While these factors mean that the EU needs to look at a trade deal seriously, there is also the fact that Britain will struggle to trade elsewhere. We have all heard about the US/UK trade deal that is soon to take place, but in all seriousness, the US is too far away to make sense. Looking at items such as food, the cost of importing from the US, and the time necessary to move the goods, makes little sense. There is also another logistical issue: **customs procedures**. While the UK can move goods across the border with no checks from the EU, there is no process in place for this to happen with the US. For British businesses to trade with US counterparts, a whole new ecosystem needs building in a matter of months! A trade deal with the US may make sense for some goods and services in the long-run, but in the short-term, this cannot replace the EU/UK trade that currently exists. On this point, the idea of the UK having an upper hand looks a little shaky.

Thus, It seems that it is far from clear whether the UK has an upper hand in the trade negotiations with the EU. What we must look at now is what happens if there is no deal at the end of the current transition period? The short answer is that we do not know. The UK will be in uncharted territory, as there will be no other deal in place (the UK/US deal may take years to finalize). What we do know is that if the UK has to trade with EU countries on **World Trade Organization** tariffs, the cost of many of our goods and services will rise. There will also be at least a short period of supply chain issues as UK Border Force will strain to keep up with customs entries for goods coming into the UK from the EU. This will cause short term shortages as importers start to work with the new rules.

Another factor that has not been taken into account is the long-term fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic. The UK is going to have an

astronomical cost to absorb after the outbreak, and this will only add to the woes. The economic cost, combined with reduced migration and a weakened ability to trade may mean that the UK might need to accept a trade deal that isn't ideal. As this may mean our politicians lose face, it may also mean that in the end, the UK maintains its close ties with the European Union. While this is an admission that the UK didn't have the upper hand, it ensures economic prosperity across Europe and pulls the UK back from the cliff edge.

adapted from www.lexology.co.uk

BACKGROUND NOTES

Trade bloc: one such as the European Union with tariff-free trade and the unrestricted movement of goods and people across national borders.

Brexit negotiations: since 2016, the efforts by representatives of the UK and the EU to agree the terms and conditions of their future economic relationship.

Trade deal: the projected goal of Brexit negotiations, with the rules of future trade between the EU and UK legally established and enshrined in law.

Leverage: political influence based on assets and political power.

Customs procedures: the rules and regulations in force to monitor and control exports and imports.

World Trade Organization (WTO): established in 1995, the only global organization that regulates the rules of trade between nations, and represents about 98% of world trade; WTO agreements are negotiated by most of the world's trading nations and ratified by their parliaments.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. Why did three years of Brexit negotiations with the EU result in little progress?
2. What were the main negative factors for the British economy during the Brexit process?
3. What advantages does the UK have due to its financial power?
4. Why does a great number of EU citizens residing in the UK give it leverage in Brexit talks?
5. What logistical issues were the result of the UK reorientation from the EU to the US and other markets?
6. Why could the UK' s failure to get the upper hand in Brexit talks prove to be beneficial both for the EU and the UK?

Text IV

Brexit talks with the European Union: the No-Deal Scenario

With the deadline for a Brexit deal rapidly approaching, it appears that the prospect of no deal is becoming a reality. For the last two years we have listened to our politicians talk with a huge amount of certainty about the UK's bright future powered along by a phenomenal **free trade agreement** with the European Union. But as we get towards the deadline, there is still a huge gulf between what the UK wants from its future relationship with the EU and what it is likely to get. **Brexiters** continually scream about what they perceive to be the EU trying to strong arm the UK, but the truth is the UK was never going to get an easy ride.

The so-called nuclear option was always going to be a distinct possibility as an end point of the negotiations between the UK and the EU. For years British politicians have baited and used the EU as the boogeyman and an excellent punch bag for the public's increasing despondency with politics. Now, however, things are going to be a little

more difficult in **Westminster**. If Brexit has done one good thing, it has re-engaged the British people with politics, a move that will doubtlessly help future generations to get a better form of democracy. But in the short term, Brexit, a hard one at least, is going to cause some pain. This potential pain is now, finally, being openly discussed by our politicians. You can't help but fear that these politicians believed their own vitriol and genuinely never believed that we would be facing a no-deal situation.

So what preparations are being made? It's hard to say at this point what is going on behind closed doors, but there has certainly been more and more news about the government's no-deal strategy being debated in meeting rooms across the Palace of Westminster. You can't help but feel these meetings should have taken place a long time ago and perhaps people and businesses would have a lot more faith in the future should the government walk away from the negotiating table without a future deal between Britain and the European Union. But the approach of maintaining a **stiff upper lip** has not worked and the country is now woefully under-prepared for what lies ahead.

Many experts had expected a raft of visa changes to be introduced in order to prevent the harmful effects of an ending of freedom of movement for EU migrants, but so far there has been almost nothing. This is either good news or bad news depending on your circumstances. If you are currently in the UK on one of the **Tiered routes (Tier 1, 2 & 4)**, things are not looking bad for you at all. You may even find that by the end of your current visa, conditions have improved significantly and you are in a better place than you currently are. For those who are EU citizens, there is still a risk, albeit a small one, that you could lose your right to remain in the UK. Certainly, for those who are about to travel to the UK, they may find that their future in the UK is not certain whatsoever.

Can you mitigate the potential damage from the end of freedom of movement? Potentially yes. There are still options for those who are in the UK and are EU citizens. Whatever your current situation, we would think it would be prudent to talk over your situation with an expert. While clearly nothing is set in stone, an expert may be able to find a

way for you to cement your long-term future in the UK now and prevent any future worries. For those who haven't yet travelled to the UK, we would say that you should come sooner rather than later. The next few months are going to be tumultuous, but it's unlikely that the UK will remove people who are here while the UK is still in the EU.

As of May 2020, the establishment of a sea border between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK, and Northern Ireland remaining within **the EU customs zone**, brings the possibility of a reunited Ireland as a state separate from the United Kingdom closer to a distinct reality. With calls following the EU referendum for a second referendum on Scottish independence (following the 2014 referendum) becoming louder and more insistent, the prospect of the disintegration of the United Kingdom as a political and state entity in the following 2-3 years is very real, leaving England and Wales as the remaining **composite political entity**.

BACKGROUND NOTES

Free trade agreement: an arrangement between various nations to reduce or abolish barriers to imports and exports among those nations, with little or no tariffs, quotas or subsidies.

Brexiteers: those who favour the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union (Brexit).

Westminster: district in central London associated with the British government and political establishment, and home to the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Cathedral, Westminster Abbey and Buckingham Palace.

Stiff upper lip: associated, often ironically, with the English national character and its resistance to the display of emotion, especially in a time of crisis.

Tiered routes (Tier 1, 2 & 4): the categorization of the British visa system, where Tier 1 is for people with a high degree of professional

specialization ('high-value immigrants'). Tier 2 is for skilled workers in a job that cannot be filled by a UK worker, and Tier 4 is for adult students aged 16 and over.

EU customs zone: the single territory for customs purposes between the 27 members states of the EU where no customs duties are levied for goods traded between EU countries, though there is a common customs tariff for goods entering the EU from non-EU countries.

Composite political entity: a smaller state or region making up the union of a larger political entity, with a single central government and legal system.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. In which way can the Brexit process be beneficial for Britain?
2. Why is the no-deal scenario undesirable as an outcome of the Brexit talks?
3. How can EU citizens mitigate the potential damage from the end of freedom of movement?
4. Why is there the prospect of the disintegration of the United Kingdom after the Brexit transitional period?

Group Activities

In groups of two to three students shall discuss the evolution of the attitudes of the British people towards membership in the European Union from the 1975 EU Membership Referendum, when more than 67 percent of the people who took part in the Referendum voted in favour of the EU membership, to the 2016 Referendum, when the "Remain" vote dropped to 48.1 percent.

1. Why do you think the English and Welsh decided to vote for Brexit, and the Scottish and Northern Irish voted to remain in the EU?
2. If you analyze the age breakdown of those who voted in the referendum, how far is it true to say that there is a 'generation gap' in British political and social life?

As a preliminary stage, students may collect some related information using reference books, public media, including Internet resources etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussions in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about the reasons that made the British people reject the UK's membership of the EU after 47 years of being one of the member-states.

UNIT IV. BRITISH SOCIAL HISTORY 1945-2020: WORKERS' RIGHTS, ZERO HOUR CONTRACTS AND THE GIG ECONOMY

Discussion Questions:

In the 1960s the United Kingdom made two unsuccessful attempts (vetoed by France) to join the European Union in a search for new import and export markets, culminating in acceptance to the Union in 1973. The UK's EU membership came to an end with the referendum result of 2016, whereby the United Kingdom formally left the European Union on 31 January 2020. Since 2000 workers' rights have been consistently eroded, with the introduction of zero-hour contracts and the rise of the 'gig' economy. The result has been an exponential increase in those in work who cannot earn enough money to feed themselves and their families, the introduction of food banks and the increasing number of those in work who need to claim benefits to augment their meagre income.

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about British trade unions and the Labour Party's activities after the Second World War?
2. How did the Labour Party gradually distance itself from trade unions and eventually renounce Socialist ideology?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read five texts about the history of British workers' fight for their rights in the period of 1945-2020.

As you read, note down the following:

1. the power of trade unions in the first period after the Second World War,
2. the challenge to the legal framework of trade unionism made by Conservative lawyers in the late 1950s,

3. the Donovan commission's report of 1968 on collective bargaining at the work place, and its subsequent restructuring,
4. the Industrial Relations Act of 1971 as a way to prevent unfair industrial practices,
5. the enactment by the Labour governments of 1974-1979 of the Donovan programme,
6. weakening of trade unions under the Conservative governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major (1979-1997),
7. legislation by the Conservative Thatcher governments to impose further restrictions on trade unions.

Text I

Issues: the rise and fall of workers' rights, 1945-1997

During the Second World War, Order 1305 (1940) allowed for the extension of collectively-agreed terms and conditions to workers in comparable jobs and industries. Strikes were illegal but there was an ever-ready system of **conciliation** and **arbitration** to defuse and resolve disputes. Some workers were jailed but the refusal of miners to pay fines after the dispute in 1941 at the Betteshanger colliery, Kent, was a reminder of the limits of the law.

In 1946 the 1945 Labour government repealed **the Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927** but Order 1305 remained. There were no prosecutions of unofficial strikers until the autumn of 1950, when ten gas fitters were sentenced to one month's imprisonment, pending appeal, at which the sentence was reduced to a fine. This was followed by a failed prosecution in an unofficial dock strike in February 1951. The Order was promptly revoked, returning the law to **the Trades Disputes Act (TDA) of 1906**.

Union membership and collective bargaining had expanded significantly during the war, and at its end **sectoral collective bargaining** and **statutory wage boards** embraced 15.5 million workers out of a total of 17.5 million. Trade unions were powerful and respected

bodies. In 1952, in the context of the wartime consensus as to the role of trade unions, **the Court of Appeal** refused to find in favour of an employer in a case of 'secondary' action (nevertheless, the court explained how a union might be liable for secondary action).

CHALLENGES AND CONTROVERSY: 1951-1970

By the early 1950s, many trade unions were undergoing an important shift, as workplace union organization, coordinated by shop stewards, emerged or was strengthened, especially in engineering. **Secondary industrial action**, although always problematic given the sectional and occupational structure of British trade unionism, became an option in a number of workplaces and sectors. Strike action began to increase from 1953. In **the engineering sector**, workers' bargaining power erupted onto the public arena in the form of strikes that were 'unofficial' (that is without the endorsement of the appropriate authoritative union committee) and 'unconstitutional' (that is outside the disputes procedure agreed between the employers' association and trade unions). In the new age of television, in the form of mass meetings, they were visible events too.

The wartime consensus began visibly to erode with the 1957 engineering dispute. The publication of *A Giant's Strength* by a group of Conservative lawyers in 1958 challenged the legal framework underpinning trade unionism. Legislative proposals for the reform of the law on trade unions and industrial action were now publicly touted and privately discussed in government. A year after, judicial restraint further dissolved in *Stratford v Lindley*, followed by other successful cases against secondary action. In that year too, now in opposition, the Conservative Party initiated a review of its industrial relations policy.

It was in this climate that the Labour government (elected in 1964) enacted a short **Trade Disputes Act 1965**, extending immunity in trade disputes to the tort of intimidation and established the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations, with Lord Donovan as chair, and with broad terms of reference to investigate industrial relations. In the same year the **Redundancy Payments Act**

gave employees the right to receive compensation for loss of employment. In 1963 the Contracts of Employment Act had established minimum terms for notice and disputes under both statutes were referred henceforth to **industrial tribunals**, composed of a legally qualified chair and two lay members representative of employers' and workers' interests.

With Hugh Clegg and Otto Kahn-Freund among its members, **the Donovan commission's report**, published in June 1968, offered an intellectual rationale and structure for a new 'system' of **collective laissez-faire** based primarily on collective bargaining at the workplace, company or other relevant organization. This was to be underpinned by a comprehensive legal framework that included redress for unfair dismissal (a dismissal for an invalid reason, for example, one not related to a worker's conduct, performance, qualification or redundancy), a statutory union-recognition procedure, and the continued exclusion of the courts from intervention in industrial disputes. The arguments of the Society of Conservative Lawyers, **the Confederation of British Industry (CBI)** and other employers' associations, plus numerous others, for legal sanctions were rejected.

The Donovan report in June 1968 was largely welcomed by **the Trades Union Congress (TUC)**, but the political climate had changed. In the context of a range of incomes policies, trade union power was now a major political issue, and a series of official and unofficial industrial disputes and a 'fragile' pound sterling intensified hostility. The report had been pre-empted by the Conservative Party which, in April 1968, had issued **Fair Deal at Work** - a reworking of the earlier Conservative evidence given to the Commission.

By now **Barbara Castle** was the Secretary of State at the Department of Employment and Productivity. Her **White Paper**, *In Place of Strife*, while accepting much of the Donovan report, also marked a new departure. It proposed that the Secretary of State:

1. be authorized to impose a 28-day conciliation pause prior to an unconstitutional strike (with the status quo maintained);

2. could require a ballot to be held prior to an official strike which had serious implications for the economy or the public interest;

3. could intervene in union-recognition disputes.

Any workers taking industrial action in defiance of a conciliation pause could be subject to a fine, collected from their pay but without any liability for imprisonment. Compensation for unfair dismissal was to be introduced.

After an angry dispute between the Labour government and the TUC, which spilled over into the Labour Party, these proposals were abandoned. The controversy did much to weaken the Labour government and in May 1970 it was defeated in the general election. At the same time, in response to the Ford women workers' strike in 1968, Barbara Castle pushed through **the Equal Pay Act 1970**, which despite its limitations reduced women's pay inequality.

*Adapted from Paul Smith,
"The Second World War and its Aftermath"*

BACKGROUND NOTES

Conciliation: an alternative dispute resolution process whereby the parties to a dispute use a conciliator, who meets with the parties in an attempt to resolve their differences.

Arbitration: the hearing and determination of a dispute or the settling of differences between parties by a person or persons chosen or agreed to by them.

Trade Disputes and Trade Unions Act of 1927: a British Act of Parliament passed in response to the General Strike of 1926. The Act declared unlawful secondary action and incitement to participate in an unlawful strike and mass picketing.

Sectoral collective bargaining: reaching a collective agreement that covers all workers in a sector of the economy.

Statutory wage boards: boards (decision-making bodies) established by law to investigate wage rates.

Court of Appeal (England and Wales): the highest court within the senior courts in England and Wales and second only to the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom.

Secondary industrial action: an industrial action by a trade union in support of a strike initiated by workers in a separate corporation.

Engineering sector: the sector connected with the design of machines, vehicles, structures, roads, and systems.

Trade Disputes Act 1965: Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom, which supported closed shop practices in industrial relations.

Redundancy (British): layoff (American): the temporary suspension or permanent termination of employment of an employee.

Industrial tribunals: courts of justice in England and Wales and Scotland with jurisdiction to hear disputes between employers and employees over unfair dismissal, redundancy payments and employment discrimination.

Donovan Commission's report: the report issued in 1968 by the Royal Commission on the Trade Unions and Employers' Association chaired by Lord Donovan. The report backed improved collective bargaining.

Collective laissez-faire: the policy of allowing trade unions and employers to collectively bargain without government intervention and oversight.

Confederation of British Industry (CBI): a UK business organization representing 190,000 businesses and having about 1,500 direct members. The CBI works to promote business interests by lobbying and advising governments.

Trades Union Congress (TUC): a national trade union centre, a federation of trade unions in England and Wales, representing the majority of trade unions. Its motto is "Changing the world of work for good".

“Fair Deal at Work” (1968): a Conservative Party study of industrial disputes, which highlighted the danger of trade unions getting too much power in the British economy.

Barbara Castle: British Labour Party politician who was the Member of Parliament for Blackburn from 1945-1979, and Member of the European Parliament for Greater Manchester from 1979-1989.

White Paper: an authoritative report or guide informing about a complex issue in order to help readers understand an issue, solve a problem, or make a decision.

Equal Pay Act 1970: Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom that prohibited any less favourable treatment between men and women in terms of pay and conditions of employment. The Act was based on the Equal Pay Act of 1963 of the United States.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What system was used in Great Britain during the Second World War to resolve labour disputes?
2. How did the power and influence of British trade unions grow during the war?
3. What widespread form did the British strikes take in the engineering sector in early 1950s?
4. How was an intellectual rationale and structure for a collective laissez-faire system developed?
5. In which way did Barbara Castle’s White Paper “In Place of Strife” differ from the Donovan report?
6. What legislation in the 1970s reduced women’s pay inequality?

Text II

Reform of Collective Bargaining under Conservative and Labour Governments

The Conservative Government 1970-1974: A New Framework

The new Conservative government (with **Edward Heath** as Prime Minister) combined a free-market economic policy and a comprehensive and interventionist statutory framework to regulate industrial relations (in practice this meant collective bargaining and trade unions). In the “Fair Deal at Work”, it had a readymade policy, which was quickly implemented as **the Industrial Relations Act (IR Act) 1971**. It was angrily opposed by the Trades Union Congress (TUC) and unions but supported by the Confederation of British Industry (CBI).

The Act embodied conflicting themes: reforms to bring order into **industrial relations**, and others to promote individual rights (for example, to refuse or insist upon union membership). Unions were viewed as 'top-down', authoritative and responsible organizations which were granted tort immunity under defined conditions and in specific circumstances. Action outside these boundaries constituted unfair industrial practices and were liable to **injunctive relief and damages** awarded by a specialist body, **the National Industrial Relations Court (NIRC)**. There was to be a presumption that collective agreements were to be legally binding. The Act also introduced the right not to be unfairly dismissed, with application to an industrial tribunal for remedies and compensation.

The twin themes of the IR Act 1971 left employers and the NIRC faced with enormous problems of managing disputes. Many senior managers did not support the Act from the outset and this view was strengthened once its complexity became apparent and union opposition understood. Moreover, large companies, especially those which were the result of recent mergers, were too embroiled, post-Donovan, in the detailed and lengthy process of renegotiating their

procedural and substantive agreements to invite any further complexity that would inevitably result from recourse to the Act. Small companies were more tempted but few rushed to be first. Unofficial union organizations (e.g. shop steward committees) had no tort immunity, but the refusal of the overwhelming majority of TUC-affiliated unions to register ensured that almost all industrial action became liable to legal challenge. It was its very comprehensiveness in the context of the absence of tort immunity that made the IR Act 1971 so explosive in practice, where any dispute had the potential to end in constitutional confrontation. Its failure eroded confidence in the Conservative government and it lost the election of February 1974 (precipitated by the miners' strike).

Labour governments 1974-1979: the Donovan Programme

The incoming Labour government of 1974 enacted the Donovan programme in five statutes:

1. Trade Union and Labour Relations Act (TULRA) 1974;
2. Trade Union and Labour Relations (Amendment) Act 1976;
3. Employment Protection Act 1975;
4. Sex Discrimination Act 1975;
5. Race Relations Act 1976.

The legislation restored and renewed collective laissez-faire as the motive underpinning the role of the state in the regulation of employment relations. Restoration entailed the re-enactment of unions' **tort immunities** (as previously defined by the Trades Disputes Act (TDA) 1906 in wider language to take account of **the common-law torts** created by the courts in the 1960s, in particular inducement of breach of commercial contract (in secondary action). Renewal comprised a wide-ranging programme of employment protection (against unfair dismissal, discrimination on the basis of sex, race, marital status and pregnancy), a union-recognition procedure, and other collective rights. The Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) was established as a statutory body outside the direct control of the government.

From the very beginning the extension of unions' tort immunity to include inducement of breach of commercial contract was contentious: it was restricted by Lord Denning in the Court of Appeal although his rulings were eventually overturned in 1980 by the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords (the final court). The theme of union power was now a constant complaint, which erupted onto the public agenda during the road haulage dispute, January to February 1979, part of the so-called 'Winter of Discontent'. Demands were made by the CBI and Conservative MPs to limit the number of pickets and to restrict them to their place of work, and to end 'secondary action'. In this atmosphere, **the High Court** ruled against strikers' picketing.

By the late 1970s the Donovan programme for the reform of collective bargaining was all but complete. For the CBI, what was needed was a shift in power to employers, facilitated by new legislation, so as to allow them to negotiate or impose changes in the terms of **the pay-effort bargain** within the new collective-bargaining structures based on separate organizations, including subordinate business units. Official constitutional strikes were now also an issue, especially in the public sector.

BACKGROUND NOTES

Collective bargaining: a process of negotiation between employers and a group of employees with the aim to regulate working salaries, working conditions, benefits and other rights for workers.

Edward Heath (1916-2005): British politician who was Prime Minister from 1970 to 1974 and leader of the Conservative party from 1965 to 1975. He supported joining the EC and led negotiations that culminated in Britain's entry into the EC on 1 January 1973.

Industrial relations (or 'employment relations'): complex interrelations between employers and employees, labour/trade unions, employer organizations and the state.

Industrial Relations Act (IR Act) 1971: Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, whose goal was to stabilize industrial relations by forcing concentration of bargaining power and responsibility in the formal union leadership, using the courts.

Injunctive relief and damages: court orders compelling (mandatory injunction) or prohibiting (prohibitory injunction) specific acts. Injunctive relief includes damages as a remedy to be paid as compensation for loss or injury.

National Industrial Relations Court (NIRC): court established on 1 December 1971.

Tort immunities: exclusion from persecution under the common law jurisdiction for civil wrongs.

Common-law torts: civil wrongs (other than breach of contract) that cause a claimant to suffer loss or harm, resulting in legal liability for the person who commits the tortious act.

High Court (of Justice): Senior Court of England and Wales alongside with the Court of Appeal and the Crown Court. The High Court deals at first instance with highly important civil law cases, and has a supervisory jurisdiction over all subordinate courts and tribunals.

Pay-effort (or 'wage-effort') bargain: the process of determining wages and working conditions by negotiation between workers and employers.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What was the Conservative government under Edward Heath's way to regulate industrial relations?
2. What conflicting themes did the Industrial Relations Act 1971 express?
3. Why was it difficult for employers and the NIRC to implement the Industrial Relations Act of 1971?

4. Name the statutes that were enacted by the Labour government through the Donovan programme.

5. In which way did the five statutes of the Donovan programme enacted by the Labour government of 1974 introduce a programme of employment protection?

6. What were the demands made by the CBI and Conservative MPs to limit the trade unions' power?

7. When was the Donovan programme for the reform of collective bargaining nearly complete, and what changes did it bring into industrial relations?

Text III

Conservative governments under Margaret Thatcher and John Major: Neoliberal agenda and further restrictions on trade union rights (1979-1997)

Within the Conservative Party, after the election of Margaret Thatcher as leader in 1975, 'neoliberal' values, analyses and policies had found a new hearing. Much had been learned from the debacle of **the Industrial Relations (IR) Act 1971**. There was to be no single comprehensive statute and the tension in that Act (see above) was resolved: unions were to be weakened.

Neoliberalism is a unitary perspective, in which a central role is accorded to the state and law in the construction and defence of the free market, whose outcomes represent a dynamic optimization of personal choices and an efficient allocation of social resources. Trade unions and state regulation are subversive of the market and individuals' liberty. Unions are conceived as privileged institutions for which, because of **tort immunity**, the general rules of law do not apply. Thus, neoliberalism provides a readymade rhetoric for employers and governments wishing to implement a radical restructuring of industrial relations. The issue was how to develop a practical strategy to dilute workers' collective power by circumscribing its use.

Elected in May 1979, the new Conservative government was determined, in the aftermath of **the Winter of Discontent**, to re-establish ‘law and order’ at work. However, **the Employment Act 1980**, initiated by James Prior as Secretary of State for Employment, reflected the coalition within the government of the new neoliberal right and ‘traditional’ Conservatives, with Prior adhering to the latter.

The Act maintained a wide liberty to strike but union immunity:

1. **‘Secondary action’** was restricted to the first customer or supplier;
2. Confined to picketing at the worker’s own place of work (and a Code introduced);
3. Withdrawn for industrial action to enforce **the closed shop** (compulsory union membership).

In addition, public funds for union ballots were made available; and the statutory procedures for union recognition and for unilateral arbitration (schedule 11 **Employment Protection Act 1975**) were repealed. Separately, the Fair Wages Resolution of 1946 was also rescinded, and the qualifying period for unfair dismissal was extended.

James Prior was replaced in September 1981 by Norman Tebbit. The pace visibly quickened. In December, Tebbit’s statement to the Commons articulated a neoliberal agenda:

“Our aim has been twofold: first, to safe-guard the liberty of the individual from abuse of industrial power; and secondly, to improve the operation of the labour market by providing a balanced framework of industrial relations law.” The attitude to trade union immunities signalled a clear shift in the government’s rhetoric, challenging the immunity granted by **the Trade Disputes Act (TDA) 1906**:

“The Government do not accept that the breadth of the immunity is any longer necessary in modern conditions to enable trade unions to represent their members effectively. It is unfair and anomalous that while trade union officials may be sued for organizing unlawful industrial action on behalf of a trade union, the union itself can escape

liability altogether. Furthermore, ‘the present statutory definition of **trade dispute** ... is unacceptably wide”.

Thus, **the Employment Act 1982** narrowed the definition of a trade dispute:

1. Unions’ tort immunity was confined to disputes ‘wholly or mainly’ connected to industrial issues and between employers and their workers;

2. Excluded from immunity were disputes between workers and workers, any action to enforce union membership or collective terms, and disputes outside the UK (unless they affected workers in the UK).

BACKGROUND NOTES

Industrial Relations (IR) Act 1971: Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, whose goal was to stabilize industrial relations by forcing concentration of bargaining power and responsibility in the formal union leadership, using the courts. The Act was repealed by the Trade Union and Labour Relations Act 1974 when the Labour party returned to government.

Neoliberalism: 20th-century resurgence of 19th century ideas of economic liberalism and free-market capitalism, associated with policies of economic liberalization, including privatization, deregulation, globalization, free trade, reductions in government spending and increasing the role of the private sector in the economy.

Tort immunity: exclusion from persecution under the common law jurisdiction for a civil wrong.

Winter of Discontent: the crisis in the UK during the coldest winter for 16 years (1978-79), which was characterized by widespread strikes by private and public sector trade unions demanding greater pay rises than the limits imposed by the Labour government to control inflation.

Employment Act 1980: Act of the Parliament of United Kingdom passed under the first term of Margaret Thatcher’s government and relating to

trade unions. The Act restricted the definition of lawful picketing strictly to those who were themselves party to the dispute, and introduced ballots on the existence of closed shops.

Secondary industrial action: industrial action by a trade union in support of a strike initiated by workers in a separate corporation.

Closed shop: a place of work where you have to be a member of a particular trade union.

Employment Protection Act 1975: Act of the Parliament which constituted the Labour party's employment law programme during the era of Social Contract. The Act established the employment tribunal system as a separate entity from the previous, formal court system.

Trade Disputes Act (TDA) 1906: Act of the Parliament that declared that unions could not be sued for damages incurred during a strike.

Liability: a legal responsibility for something.

Trade dispute (or labour dispute): a disagreement between an employer and employees regarding the terms of employment.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What is neoliberalism's approach to the construction and defence of the free market?
2. How did neoliberalism provide employers and Conservative governments with rhetoric to implement a radical restructuring of industrial relations?
3. In which way did the Employment Act 1980 put restrictions on union immunity?
4. What was the neoliberal agenda that was presented by Norman Tebbit to the House of Commons?
5. How was the definition of a trade dispute narrowed in the Employment Act 1982?

Text IV

Conservative legislation on trade unions 1979-1997

The narrowing of **tort immunity** in the Employment Act 1982 was intended to expose unions to the **common law – injunctions, tort action and compensation**. By these measures, trade unions' capacity to intervene in the employment relationship, labour market and society was to be weakened; it was a policy of union exclusion.

From then on legislation followed at regular intervals, casting unions further into the mire of the common law. From this point too, Conservative governments opposed, delayed and then diluted many European Community (EC) legislative initiatives, and unfair dismissal legislation was successively weakened (including the failure to index-link compensation). Nevertheless, legislation on employment protection, originating in the EC and the UK, began to expand and **industrial tribunals** grew in importance.

A new **Green Paper**, Democracy in Unions, argued that failures in democracy and the abuse of members' rights required legislation to impose **ballots** for the election of unions' principal executives committee and political funds, and for industrial action. With respect to the last, workers' collective power was to be diluted by regulating unions' residual tort immunity.

Thus, **the Trade Union Act 1984** required any industrial action initiated by a union to have the support of a majority of union members in the relevant bargaining unit, in a ballot, in order for a union to retain its immunity. The statutory rules for the balloting process and the employer's right to challenge a ballot's validity in court and seek an injunction restraining the action indicated the statute's intent. After the extensive litigation on members' rights during the miners' strike, 1984-5, **the Employment Act 1988** extended a statutory right to any union member to challenge industrial action which did not have the support of a valid ballot (assisted by the newly created post of the Commissioner for the Rights of Trade Union Members).

Legislation returned to focus on unions' tort immunity in the Employment Acts of 1988 and 1990: in summary, all industrial action to enforce union membership and all secondary action were no longer protected, and unions were liable for all industrial action called by any union official (of whatever status) unless it was expressly repudiated (according to a statutory procedure).

But the integration of ballots into unions' strategies of mobilization, as part of the bargaining process, led the Conservative government, in **the Trade Union Reform and Employment Rights Act (TURERA) 1993**, to impose further stringent procedural requirements with which unions must conform in order to retain tort immunity. The rationale expressly switched from articulating workers' consent to industrial action, measured by and conforming to statutory requirements, to delaying the action and giving employers extensive grounds with which mount legal challenges based on procedural irregularities.

Under the Act a union was required:

1. to employ a body approved by the Department of Trade and Industry to supervise a postal ballot of members called upon to take industrial action;
2. to use a specified ballot paper and form of questions;
3. to notify the employer of the ballot, give details of the ballot paper and the workers to be balloted, and the result;
4. to give the employer seven days' notice of the industrial action and categories of worker called upon to take it;
5. Employers, union members, and citizens were entitled to go to court to seek an injunction against any union that did not fully comply with this complex procedure.

In a move replete with symbolism in its rejection of the Donovan report and the legacy of collective laissez-faire, the 1993 Act also abolished **Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS)**'s duty to promote collective bargaining.

The 1993 Act's requirement for a union to specify those workers whom the unions intended to ballot for, and to take, industrial action was quickly

interpreted to mean that, where an employer could not readily identify the relevant members, then a union must provide their names to the employer. In many cases, this would occur where union membership was low or dispersed, and therefore easily open to employers' counter-measures.

The history of the period of 1979-1997 can be summarized as one in which attempts to 'modernize' **collective laissez-faire** – to construct a formal legal framework to facilitate collective bargaining and to build a structure of individual legal rights – were replaced by a determination to reduce the unions' power and to minimize the impact of individual rights.

The upshot of the legal changes introduced, since 1980, by Conservative governments, in the context of a hostile economic environment, was the marginalization and domestication of unions, not least at the workplace. Unions became heavily regulated and industrial action fraught with pitfalls.

Although the managerial prerogative was strengthened, its exercise became regulated by a growing body of **statutory individual employment rights**. Having been denied access to **grievance resolution** through collective organization, workers more and more (both individually and in test cases fought by unions) turned to employment tribunals for redress. The scope and complexity of the law required managers to hand issues to lawyers. This was widely perceived by them as burdensome; hence the demands to restrict access to employment tribunals.

By the time the Conservative government left office in 1997, the incoming 'New Labour' administration had adopted, with minor changes, Conservative legislation on trade unions and industrial action as its own. Statutory individual employment rights have, however, continued to expand, mainly as a result of the UK's membership of the EC.

BACKGROUND NOTES

Common Law: the body of law created by judges and stated in written opinions. The common law arises as precedent. In case of absence of a precedent, judges create a new precedent by making their decisions.

Tort immunity: exclusion from persecution under the common law jurisdiction for a civil wrong.

Injunctions: legal and equitable remedies in the form of a special court orders that compel a party to do or refrain from specific acts.

Tort action and compensation: an action through civil courts to hold a tortfeasor liable in order to obtain a civil remedy, typically compensation for damages or harm.

Industrial tribunals: courts of justice in England and Wales and Scotland with jurisdiction to hear disputes between employers and employees over unfair treatment in industrial relations.

Green Paper: tentative government report and consultation document of policy proposals for debate and discussion on a given issue. In issuing a Green Paper the government remains uncommitted to any decision.

Ballots: devices used to cast votes in an election and may be pieces of paper used in secret voting.

Trade Union Act 1984: law in the United Kingdom that required all trade unions to hold a secret ballot before calling a strike. The Act was repealed in 1992.

Employment Act 1988: United Kingdom statute establishing legal rights of trade union members in relation to their unions whereby union members are entitled to refuse to strike if a ballot has not been held.

Trade Union Reform and Employment Rights Act (TURERA) 1993: United Kingdom labour law that abolished the minimum wages set by sectors through 27 remaining wage councils. Most parts of the law were later transferred to the Employment Rights Act 1996.

Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS): Crown non-departmental public body of the government of the United Kingdom. Its

purpose is to improve organizations and working life through the promotion and facilitation of strong industrial relations practice.

Collective laissez-faire: the policy of allowing trade unions and employers to collectively bargain without government intervention and oversight.

Statutory individual employment rights (or labour rights or workers' rights): legal rights and human rights relating to labour relations between workers and employers. These rights are codified in national and international labour and employment law.

Grievance resolution: achieving a fair settlement in the grievance process, that is in considering a formal complaint raised by an employee towards an employer within the workplace.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What policy did the narrowing of tort immunity in the Employment Act 1982 pursue?

2. How did the Green Paper "Democracy in Unions" explain a need for the use of ballots for the election of unions' principle executive committees and for industrial action?

3. What did the Trade Union Act 1984 require for any industrial action?

4. What was the rationale for the Trade Union Reform and Employment Rights Act (TURERA) 1993?

5. What were trade unions required to do under the TURERA Act 1993?

6. How can the trade relations legislation history of the period of 1979-1997 be summarized?

7. What was the upshot of the legal changes introduced by the Conservative governments since 1980?

8. Why did the British workers have to turn to employment tribunals as the result of Conservative legislation in the period of 1979-1997?

Text V

The ‘gig economy’ and the rights of self-employed contractors

The **gig economy** in the 2000s is a labour market characterized by short-term contracts or **freelance work** rather than permanent jobs. It is very much a product of the **IT revolution** enabling agile working and alternative business models such as Uber or Deliveroo. The gig economy has therefore had a dramatic impact on the traditional workplace, and UK employment law is embracing the challenges that this presents.

The gig economy needs workers. In the past, businesses with fluctuating demands had a core workforce with casual employees or workers filling in the gaps. The term “**casual worker**” includes many different types of arrangements but commonly meant bank staff, seasonal workers, those on zero hours contracts and guaranteed minimum or short-hours contracts. Although a casual worker has fewer rights than an employee, they are entitled to more limited employment protection such as the national minimum wage and paid holidays.

However, the gig economy has rejected this model and prefers to engage individuals as **self-employed contractors**, with the freedom to accept work (the “gig”) or reject it. However, some individuals (and their trade unions) are claiming that they are workers with increased protection. In some cases, self-employed contractors in the gig economy have been able to argue not only that they are workers but that they are employees with full employment protection including the right not to be unfairly dismissed. Many of the cases have concerned couriers, taxi drivers and plumbers. In some of these cases the employer has stipulated the terms of the contract, rates of pay, exercised a significant degree of control, and the individuals appear to the outside world to be integrated within the business. These are classic signs that the relationship goes beyond a “gig”.

Because of concerns that workers were open to exploitation, the government of Theresa May instigated **the Taylor Review** that made a number of recommendations, such as:

- a new right for workers to request a more stable and predictable contract;
- making the permissible gaps in continuous employment longer (from one week to four weeks) so it's easier for **casual staff** to establish continuity of employment;
- banning employers from taking administrative fees or other deductions from **staff tips**;

From 6 April 2020 the following came into force:

- a new right for all workers (not just employees) to a written statement of terms on or before the first day of employment, rather than the current obligation to provide this within two months of the start date;
- a right for agency workers to be provided with a **Key Facts Page**, to include information about the type of contract, the minimum expected rate of pay, how they will be paid and by whom (for example, by an intermediary or umbrella company), any deductions or fees to be made, and an illustrative example of what this might mean for take-home pay;
- lowering the threshold required for a request to set up information and consultation arrangements from 10% to 2% of employees (subject to a minimum of 15 employees); and
- increasing the reference period for determining an average week's pay for holiday purposes from 12 weeks to 52 weeks, so that workers who do not have a regular working pattern throughout the year are not disadvantaged by having to take their holiday at a quiet time of the year when their weekly pay might be lower.

Whilst employment protection in the gig economy remains fluid recent cases show a desire to categorize participants as either workers or employees thereby giving more rights and protection than to the previously "self-employed". There are also tax consequences some of which are not entirely welcomed by the workforce but are likely to benefit the economy.

adapted from www.lexology.co.uk

BACKGROUND NOTES

Gig economy: free market system where employers hire independent contractors for short periods; the word 'gig' derives from the work professional musicians do for a specific period of time.

Freelance work: work undertaken for a specific job or period of time, with no accrued benefits or insurance commitments from the employer.

IT revolution: a metaphor relating to the revolutionary impact of information technologies on all aspects of life from the 1980s onwards.

Casual worker (casual staff): someone employed on a short-term contract, usually at a low skills level and with corresponding pay.

Self-employed contractors: similar to freelancers, staff who engage in short- or medium-term contracts without any benefits or insurance commitments from their employer.

Rest periods: usually period in the morning, lunchtime and afternoon when staff can enjoy some socializing time away from the workplace; for full-time staff these periods are factored into their contracts, but for the self-employed this is not always the case.

Taylor Review: a 2017 review into modern working practices that recommended greater protection for self-employed and casual workers, possibilities for their progression and advancement, and the entitlement of all workers to a 'national living wage'.

Staff tips: discretionary payments to workers in the catering and hospitality industries (typically, taxi drivers, hairdressers, bar staff, waiters), also known as 'gratuities'; the 2019 Conservative government promised to ensure that these payments would be passed on to the employees.

Key Facts Page: from April 2020, a legal requirement for employers to provide part-time or casual staff with 'key information' on their pay, statutory deductions and contractual rights.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. How is a labour market transformed in the conditions of the gig economy?
2. Why are casual workers entitled to more limited employment protection than employees of the core workforce?
3. What is a financial risk for employers in engaging workforce on a self-employed basis?
4. What are the recommendations presented in the Taylor Review which may protect workers from exploitation?

Group Activities:

In groups of two to three students shall discuss the legislative work of the British governments in the sphere of industrial relations in the period of 1945-2020.

In your view, has labour history since 1945 seen an improvement or worsening of workers' rights in the UK?

In your view, is the 'gig' economy an innovative way forward for workers' pay and conditions, or a step backwards?

As a preliminary stage, students may look for additional information using reference books, public media, including Internet resources, etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussions in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about the role of trade unions in the British economy and about the changes that have taken place in the sphere of British industrial relations since the end of the Second World War.

UNIT V: CORONAVIRUS AND THE FUTURE OF AN ISOLATIONIST BRITAIN

Discussion Questions:

As of mid-to-late 2020 it is premature to speculate on the long-term effects on the British economy and way of life (and not to mention the rest of the world) of the coronavirus pandemic that has caused businesses, airports, recreation centres, and many industrial enterprises to lockdown (close indefinitely, with the population instructed to stay at home and not venture outside).

Note the following points:

1. How will the UK be able to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic relying on its own resources outside of the European Union?
2. Will the National Health Service be able to cope with the vastly increased demand on its staff and equipment at a time which has seen hundreds of its European staff leave the UK to return home?

Reading Exercises:

You are going to read two texts about the coronavirus pandemic's impact in the United Kingdom, the possible consequences of the pandemic for the British economy and the social life of the British people after the British withdrawal from the European Union.

As you read, note the following:

1. the negative response of the British public and media to the government's handling of the virus;
2. the Conservative government's response to criticism from the opposition of the inadequacy of governmental measures to fight the spread of the virus,
3. public criticism of government officials breaking the UK's lockdown rules.

Text I

UK Government's response to the coronavirus (COVID-19)

The United Kingdom's initial response on 3 March 2020 was as follows:

1. The most common symptoms of **coronavirus (COVID-19)** are recent onset of a new continuous cough and/or high temperature. If you have these symptoms, however mild, stay at home and do not leave your house for 7 days from when your symptoms started (if you live alone), or 14 days (if you live with someone who has symptoms). You do not need to call **NHS 111** to go into self-isolation. If your symptoms worsen during home isolation or are no better after 7 days, contact the **NHS 111** hotline. If you have no internet access, you should call **NHS 111**. For a medical emergency dial **999**.

2. Wash your hands more often than usual, for 20 seconds using soap and hot water, particularly after coughing, sneezing and blowing your nose, or after being in public areas where other people are doing so. Use hand sanitizer if that's all you have access to.

3. To reduce the spread of germs when you cough or sneeze, cover your mouth and nose with a tissue, or your sleeve (not your hands) if you don't have a tissue, and throw the tissue in a bin immediately. Then wash your hands or use **a hand sanitizing gel**.

4. Clean and disinfect regularly touched objects and surfaces using your regular cleaning products to reduce the risk of passing the infection on to other people.

At the current time and based on our understanding of what is known of COVID-19 and other similar respiratory viruses, it is likely that older people and those with chronic medical conditions may be vulnerable to severe disease. As more information emerges, recommendations may change.

The public and press response to the government's handling of the virus was generally dismissive, often ferociously so. The following is an adapted extract from a report by CNN on 20 April 2020.

British Prime Minister **Boris Johnson** missed five emergency meetings of the COBRA committee in the early stages of the coronavirus pandemic, officials admitted on Sunday, as the UK government faced a barrage of criticism over its response to the spread of the disease.

Government ministers were forced on the defensive after a wide-ranging critique in **the Sunday Times of London** revealed that the UK missed a string of missed opportunities to get on the front foot in late January and throughout February.

Michael Gove, one of the senior Cabinet ministers leading the response to the pandemic, admitted that Johnson had not chaired five meetings of the UK government's **Cobra committee**, a cross-departmental group convened in situations of national emergency.

The opposition Labour Party health spokesman Jon Ashworth said there were "serious questions" to answer about why the Prime Minister had missed the five Cobra meetings in February. "The whole world could see how serious this was becoming and we know that serious mistakes were made," he said in comments posted on Twitter.

Workers in the UK health service are still lacking adequate protective equipment, coronavirus testing is not at the levels needed and hospitals have been given the wrong type of ventilators, Ashworth said.

Gove defended Johnson's efforts. "The idea that the Prime Minister skipped meetings that were vital to our response to the coronavirus, I think is grotesque," Gove told Sophy Ridge on Sky News on Sunday. "The truth is that there were meetings across government, some of which were chaired by the Health Secretary, some by other ministers, but the Prime Minister took all major decisions," said Gove.

"Nobody can say that the Prime Minister wasn't throwing heart and soul into fighting this virus. His leadership has been clear. He's been inspirational at times."

Speaking later on the BBC's The Andrew Marr Show, Gove acknowledged that Johnson had not attended the five Cobra meetings but said this was not unusual since such meetings were usually led by

the relevant **Secretary of State**. Johnson first chaired a Cobra meeting on coronavirus on March 2.

Gove added that the Sunday Times article was using this information "out of context" and "whipped [it] up in order to create a '**j'accuse**' narrative."

The Sunday Times report stated that a number of opportunities to reduce the impact of the pandemic had been missed by the UK government in January, February and March. The government was criticized over shortages of personal protective equipment for frontline health and social care workers and a slow start to testing for the virus.

Stocks of **clinical gowns** to protect health workers from coronavirus in the UK are "drawn down," Gove told the BBC's Andrew Marr, but he defended the government's response. "We had stocks, we built them up for a flu pandemic, they were augmented by the stocks we had for a No Deal Brexit. But it is the case (...) that those stocks are drawn down," he said.

Gove added that "new **PPE [personal protective equipment]** is coming in this weekend from Turkey" on top of 25 million gowns from China "secured" by the British Ambassador in Beijing.

Responding to UK media reports Sunday that a large-scale PPE shipment from Turkey to the UK had been delayed, a spokesperson at the Department of Health and Social Care told CNN: "We are continuing to work to ensure the shipment is delivered as soon as possible." The UK government has a Royal Air Force plane on standby to take off as soon as the shipment is ready.

Shipments of PPE from Turkey require special export permits from the Health Ministry after the country banned exports of such items. On Saturday, the UK's local government Secretary of State Robert Jenrick said "a very large consignment of PPE was due to arrive" the next day from Turkey. He said it "amounts to 84 tons of PPE" and includes 400,000 clinical gowns. Speaking to Sky's Sophy Ridge, Gove said the shipment from Turkey included "tens of thousands of gowns."

NHS Providers – an organization that represents NHS hospitals – warned that there was a "critical" shortage of clinical gowns in the UK.

According to the organization, some hospitals will "run out of fully fluid repellent gowns this weekend" and will be forced to use the "highest possible level of alternative" protective equipment.

A **Downing Street** spokesperson said in a statement Sunday that the government had been "working day and night to battle against coronavirus, delivering a strategy designed at all times to protect our NHS and save lives," and guided by medical and scientific expertise.

"Our response has ensured that the NHS has been given all the support it needs to ensure everyone requiring treatment has received it, as well as providing protection to businesses and reassurance to workers," the statement said. "The Prime Minister has been at the helm of the response to this, providing leadership during this hugely challenging period for the whole nation."

In late March, 2020, the seriousness of the Coronavirus pandemic in the United Kingdom came into focus when Prime Minister Boris Johnson, who had initially resisted harsher measures to curb the virus when it began spreading in Britain, tested positive for the virus, and was eventually transferred to St. Thomas hospital in London for "close monitoring". Shortly afterwards, the heir to the throne, Prince Charles also fell ill with the virus. Britain faced the alarming prospect of having to confront its greatest crisis since World War II with several of its leading figures in quarantine.

As soon as Johnson felt better following treatment in intensive care for Covid-19, he was transferred to his official country retreat, and Michael Gove told Sky that the Prime Minister was "recovering well" and was in "cheerful spirits". Johnson continued to follow the advice of his doctors in order to make sure that he "rests and recovers fully," Gove said.

BACKGROUND NOTES

Coronavirus (COVID-19): the ongoing (summer-winter 2020) respiratory pandemic first identified in late 2019 in China that has caused over 1 million deaths worldwide and led to a global recession; as of autumn 2020, in the UK it has caused more than 40,000 deaths.

NHS (National Health Service): set up in 1948, the umbrella term for various publicly-funded healthcare systems in the UK providing free treatment and care at the point of delivery for everyone, based on clinical need and not the ability to pay.

111 (emergency telephone number): a 24/7 hotline available for medical issues and questions, and immediate medical advice.

999 (emergency telephone number): a 24/7 hotline for the emergency services (health, police, fire) intended to request immediate call-out of the relevant service(s), usually in the case of an accident or terrorist atrocity.

hand sanitizing gel: a gel generally used to decrease the possibility of infections being passed on to the body or to others through the hands, often used in combination with soap and water.

Boris Johnson: Prime Minister of the UK since 2019.

Sunday Times: since 1821 a weekly newspaper considered to be one of the most authoritative broadsheets (as opposed to tabloids) in the UK.

Michael Gove: Conservative MP and government minister at the forefront of the Brexit campaign in 2016, (in)famous for his phrase 'the people of this country have had enough of experts' when asked about the negativity of 'expert' opinion on the UK's prosperity after Brexit.

COBRA Committee: Civil Contingencies Committee which is convened in times of national emergency or national disruption, made up of key agency personnel and usually chaired by the Prime Minister.

Secretary of State (in the UK): a cabinet minister who is in charge of a government department.

A 'j'accuse' narrative: 'J'accuse' was the title of a letter sent to a French newspaper in 1893 by the writer Emile Zola in defence of the imprisoned French army officer Alfred Dreyfus, in which he accused the French state of institutional anti-Semitism.

Clinical gowns: apparel worn by medical professionals as part of Personal Protective Equipment to protect them from infected patients.

PPE (Personal Protective Equipment): equipment that helps protect the user from health or safety risks while performing professional tasks.

Downing Street: a street in London that since 1732 houses (at No. 10) the Prime Minister's official residence and office; it contains over 100 rooms.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What were the recommendations of the UK government issued on 3 March 2020 to people with the most common symptoms of coronavirus?

2. What were the recommendations to British citizens to prevent contracting the coronavirus infection?

3. Why did Boris Johnson and his government face a barrage of criticism in April 2020?

4. What items of personal protective equipment (PPP) were in short supply during the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in the United Kingdom?

5. How did the seriousness of the coronavirus impact in Great Britain become obvious in late March, 2020?

6. How did the recovery of Boris Johnson from his coronavirus infection proceed?

Text II

The 'Dominic Cummings' scandal

The UK prime minister's most senior adviser has come under fire for travelling across the country during the coronavirus lockdown.

Dominic Cummings drove 260 miles (418km) from London to Durham, and took a 60-mile round trip from Durham to a nearby town on his wife's birthday – a trip he says he made to test whether his

eyesight was good enough to drive after contracting coronavirus. Mr Cummings is facing calls to resign, both from opposition politicians and members of the governing Conservative Party, whose leader, Boris Johnson, he advises.

In a highly unusual move for an adviser, Mr Cummings gave a press conference on Monday. He said he believed he acted "reasonably" and within the law. He has so far been backed by Mr Johnson and other senior government ministers. But his actions have raised the question – did one of the government's most senior employees ignore the rules he had helped set for millions of people across the nation?

Mr Cummings is Boris Johnson's chief adviser. He is not a member of parliament and is not elected. Before the current lockdown scandal, he was best known for masterminding the successful **Vote Leave campaign in the 2016 Brexit referendum** with the slogan 'Take Back Control', which saw the UK vote by a narrow majority to leave the European Union. Mr Cummings was played by actor Benedict Cumberbatch in **Brexit: The Uncivil War**, a 2018 drama about the referendum.

Last year, he advised Mr Johnson to call an early election and to fight it on a "Get Brexit Done" ticket. The vote gave the Conservatives their biggest election win since 1987. Mr Cummings has never been a member of the Conservatives and he is seen as a divisive figure within the party. Former Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron once described him as a "career psychopath".

But he is more than just a run-of-the-mill adviser to Mr Johnson – in many ways, his ideas have forged the government's agenda. He has played a key role in advising the government on its coronavirus strategy.

In late March, Mr Cummings drove about 260 miles from his London home with his wife and child to a farm in north-east England owned by his parents. He says that his wife was unwell at the time and that he got sick soon after, with what they believe was coronavirus. Then in mid-April Mr Cummings was spotted with his wife and son in a town a 30-minute drive away from his parents' home. He has said he

made the trip in order to test his eyesight, which he was concerned had been impaired by coronavirus.

The two newspapers that broke the story, the Mirror and the Guardian, also reported that the adviser returned to northern England a second time – a claim Mr Cummings has denied. The reports about Mr Cummings have prompted widespread outrage. The government's message at the time – a message that Mr Cummings reportedly helped to draft – was "Stay Home. Stay Safe".

The British public had been expressly instructed to self-isolate for two weeks after experiencing coronavirus symptoms. Many avoided travelling even at the cost of missing the passing and funerals of loved ones. One of the British government's scientific advisers and Scotland's chief medical officer have both been forced to step down in recent weeks for breaking **UK lockdown rules.**

Both Mr Cummings and Mr Johnson insist that the adviser did not break the rules. In the daily coronavirus briefing on Sunday, Mr Johnson said his chief aide had "followed the instincts of every father" and acted responsibly in making the journey. But his remarks only led to more criticism, with members of the public saying they had ignored their own instincts to be with family members in need because they felt they had to follow the rules. Others questioned whether the prime minister was implying they were not acting as responsible parents in following the rules.

On Monday, Mr Cummings made the highly unusual decision to hold a press conference - normally only elected government officials, not the people behind the scenes, publicly speak to the media. Addressing reporters in the garden of the Prime Minister's house, 10 Downing Street, he gave an account of his movements and said he did not regret his actions. Mr Cummings said he made the trip to his family farm mainly because he needed back-up care for his four-year-old son in case he and his wife were ill. He said it was an "exceptional situation" he believed was covered by the coronavirus regulations. He said he stayed in a separate property with his wife and child and

followed rules on social distancing. The rules instructed those with coronavirus symptoms and others in their household to stay at home, but they also made this **caveat**: "If you have children, keep following this advice to the best of your ability, however, we are aware that not all these measures will be possible." Mr Cummings did not apologise and said he had not considered resigning.

"It really is one rule for him [Boris Johnson] and his elite friends and another for the rest of us," one member of parliament with the opposition Labour Party wrote on Twitter. Junior Minister Douglas Ross became the first person to resign from the government in protest. He said Mr Cummings' interpretation of the government guidance was "not shared by the vast majority of people". Mr Ross said he could not tell people in the community he represents they were wrong to miss funerals.

adapted from BBC New, 26 May 2020

BACKGROUND NOTES

Dominic Cummings: leading ideologue of the Brexit campaign, and the Prime Minister's controversial chief adviser since July 2019; he resigned his post in November 2020.

Vote Leave: campaign in the 2016 Brexit referendum: sponsored largely by businessmen and Conservative politicians, the campaign for the UK's withdrawal from the EU in the 2016 referendum.

Brexit: The Uncivil War: 2018 TV film about the Brexit referendum campaign and the central role of Dominic Cummings, who was played by the *Sherlock* actor Benedict Cumberbatch.

UK lockdown rules: in March 2020, social restrictions including the closure of schools and universities, hospitality and catering venues and shops providing 'non-essential' goods.

Caveat: a warning to consider implications of taking a particular action, or a statement that limits a more general statement.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. How did Dominic Cummings explain his violating the UK coronavirus lockdown rules?
2. What was Cummings best known for before the lockdown travel scandal?
3. What is Cummings' role in the Conservative government of Boris Johnson?
4. How did the British public react to Cummings' violations of the lockdown rules?
5. Why was there such a negative reaction to Cummings' actions even after his press conference?
6. What was the UK government's caveat for people with coronavirus symptoms?

Group Activities:

In groups of two to three students shall discuss the British Conservative government's response to the coronavirus pandemic in the United Kingdom and the impact of the pandemic on the British society.

How far do you agree that the British government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK was driven by its ideology and not concern for the health of the nation?

To what extent do you think that British politics is now dominated and governed not by elected representatives but advisors and management consultants?

As a preliminary stage, students may look for additional information using reference books, public media, including Internet resources, etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussions in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about the spread of coronavirus in Europe and Great Britain, and different national strategies in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic.

CONCLUSION: IS THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 2020 A STATE IN DECLINE?

Discussion Questions:

The decline of Great Britain as a global power after the Second World War was highlighted during the 1956 Suez Crisis, and by the end of the 20th century the British Empire practically came to an end with the transfer of Hong Kong to China in 1997. The collapse of the British Empire has brought about in the United Kingdom a search for a new post-colonial identity. The question of the British national identity has come into focus following the Brexit referendum of 2016.

Note down the following points:

1. What do you know about British national identity at the peak of the British Empire in the period of the 19th century to the mid-20th century?
2. What changes have taken place in the individual and collective identities of British citizens as the result of the decline of the British Empire in the post-war years and the withdrawal from the European Union?

Reading Exercise:

You are going to read a text about a need for the British to face the question of their national identity.

As you read, note down the following:

1. the role of the British media in decontextualizing scandals in the ruling circles of Great Britain;
2. racism as the result of the mentality bred by the legacy of the British Empire;
3. the survival of the class system in modern Britain;
4. acceptance of inequality in Great Britain as a natural law;
5. the need in Great Britain for a period of profound self-reflection.

Text

WE NEED TO PAY VERY CLOSE ATTENTION TO WHAT IS HAPPENING IN BRITAIN NOW

A nation that does not confront its national identity will not be able to move forward

Noise pollution has abated in **lockdown**, but the piercing alarm bells from America and Britain are ringing louder than ever. As other countries look on, we must interrogate how we can prevent falling as far as these two nations. How do we hold on to civility and decency, when they have evaporated elsewhere? What kind of environment gave rise to such **toxicity**? As Donald Trump and Boris Johnson ascended to their country's highest offices, it was tempting to say 'it's over', and in many ways 'it' is: truth, logic, accountability, normality.

The latest Dominic Cummings scandal shows, again, a British political establishment that is obnoxious, its corruption and lies hiding in plain sight. This matters, but the successive scandals hide much more embedded problems. The British media have a role to play in decontextualizing what is important. When all you have is scandals, nothing becomes scandalous, and the likes of Cummings and Johnson are able to deflect and ignore the concept of **culpability**.

The British political media orbit scandal like a swarm, subsuming online hysteria, and meanwhile the hive is left unattended, so God knows what 's happening that's actually real, that's genuinely important. Soon, all you have is a succession of crises, and very little information. It's not that having a cast of increasingly ridiculous and incompetent villains make **the Tories** less capable of playing the media, in fact, it makes them even more equipped to do so. The lower they stoop, the lower the public's bar for their behaviour falls.

Just as Donald Trump has framed contemporary American politics as **reality television**, in Britain political coverage embodies the great British form of **soap opera**. Who's in favour this week? Who screwed up? Who's having an affair? Who's having a fight? All the while,

knowledge and comprehension of systems and processes is lost. There is little context in the episodic churn.

Of course, the latest Cummings scandal is newsworthy, but the ‘shock’ that surrounds it is numbing. How can one be shocked by something Cummings does? He’s Dominic Cummings, Boris Johnson is the Prime Minister. What did they expect? Send in the clowns, and you wake up in a circus.

Britain has never meaningfully confronted its racism, which is colonialism, building an Empire on the back of invading and pillaging and inflicting misery on whatever shores it brutal mercenaries dressed up as representatives of a made-up Crown landed upon. Colonialism is a boomerang: it eventually comes home. If they come for me in the morning, they will come for you in the night, as US anti-racism activist **Angela Davis** memorably put it. The most obvious manifestation of colonialism in Britain is the acceptance and maintenance of class. **The class system** says: we are the kings and you are the peasants, and that will never change. How can a British person be aghast at someone blithely wielding authority without any consequences, when they live in a monarchy, and when one of their political chambers of power is stacked with ‘Lords’ who assume such positions through hereditary birth right?

When was the UK respected around the world, beyond superficial **Anglophilia**, which is primarily an American **construct**? Britain’s ‘former glory’, which Brexiteers are so desperate to restart, is violence. This is not even in the past. The violence of British colonialism is embedded in the fabric of the world, in the horrors of illegal wars, in the consequences of bleeding nations of their resources, and in the couldn’t-give-a-toss attitude to Ireland (including the British province of Northern Ireland). Now Britain turns its truncheon on itself, another phase in the sado-masochism of Tory brutality which has pummeled everyone from miners to refugees.

If one does not confront the basic truths of one’s national identity, one will not be able to move forward. Everything becomes a fiction, a

narrative designed to block any kind of self-examination. There is lots of talk about **gaslighting** these days, but the foundational component of gaslighting begins far from the corridors of power. The British have been gaslighting each other and themselves for generations. This is the personal propaganda cycle that colonialism instigates. It creates a false hierarchy of superiority, ‘exceptionalism’, rooted in fictions about magical personal and national prowess.

Other countries need to pay attention to modern Britain. What has happened is instructive. Accepting plummeting standards in the media, possessing a pathological deference to posh bullies, being ignorant of one’s history, accepting inequality as some kind of natural law, celebrating buffoons and a blithe and arrogant exceptionalism is the real downfall, not Dominic Cummings’ lies.

adapted from The Irish Times, May 2020

(PS By way of confirmation, on 6 June 2020 *The Independent* ran the headline ‘The Brexit Crisis Led to Totally Incompetent Leadership at a Time of Unprecedented Crisis. Now We are Paying for It.’)

BACKGROUND NOTES

Noise pollution: noise in the immediate environment usually caused by machines and transport that impacts on human health, such as high blood pressure, heart disease and stress.

(Coronavirus) lockdown: period from late March to early July, and from November to December 2020, when the UK was subject to severe social restrictions, with the closure of schools, universities, the hospitality industry and shops not providing ‘essential’ goods.

Culpability: responsibility for wrong-doing or failure that may lead to criminal prosecution.

Tories: political and spiritual antecedents of the modern Conservative Party, dating from the late 17th century, and whose name is still associated with Conservatism, support for the monarchy and the Anglican church.

Reality television: TV shows such as 'Big Brother' and 'Love Island' where cameras capture the apparently 'real' interactions, including romances and scandals, between ordinary people in an isolated setting.

Soap opera: TV or radio serial focusing on the lives of people in a particular social setting over a period of time, sometimes even years.

Angela Davis: American activist who in the 1960s championed the cause of black inmates of US jails; arrested in 1970 accused of kidnapping and murder, acquitted of all charges by an all-white jury.

Class system: social structure of the UK, based on hereditary lands and inherited wealth and status, with the monarch at its peak.

Anglophilia: admiration by a foreign national of the English people, its language, its culture and its history.

Construct: an idea or theory containing various concepts, usually subjective and not based on empirical evidence.

Gaslighting: form of psychological pressure intended to control a person or group by making them believe things that are not true and question their own perceptions.

QUESTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Comprehension Questions:

1. What do successive scandals at the level of the British political establishment show?
2. Why can British political coverage be compared to a form of soap opera?
3. What is the most obvious manifestation of colonialism in Britain?
4. How is the violence of British colonialism embedded in the fabric of the world?
5. Where does "gaslighting" as the foundational component of Great Britain begin?

6. Why is it important to confront the basic truths of one's national identity?

7. What has happened to the political establishment in Great Britain?

8. How can the process of rebuilding happen after the collapse of an empire?

Group Activities:

In groups of two to three students shall discuss the consequences of the collapse of the British Empire in the 20th century for the British national identity.

How would you define British national identity in 2020?

As a preliminary stage, students may look for additional information, using reference books, public media, including Internet resources, etc.

At the final stage, students share the results of their findings and discussions in small groups as part of the whole group.

Individual work:

Write a short essay of some 200-250 words about the evolution of British national identity from the peak of the British Empire to the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union, following the Brexit Referendum of 2016.

INDEPENDENT WORK: HOME READING AND RESEARCH ASSIGNMENTS

HOME READING

Home Reading Assignment for Text I:

You are going to read an abridged text from Queen Elizabeth II's "Speech from the Throne", which was delivered during the State Opening of Parliament in October 2019.

As you read, note the following:

1. the UK's exit from the EU as the priority of Her Majesty's government;
2. the main directions of work of Her Majesty's Ministers, including measures for the National Health Service, reforming adult social care in England, addressing violent crime and strengthening public confidence in the criminal justice system, ensuring measures to protect individuals, families and their homes, providing for young people an excellent education and establishing the UK's leadership in scientific capability and space technology.

Answer the following questions:

1. Critically assess the statement that 'the Monarchy's role in political life has no practical purpose and is purely symbolic';
2. Do you agree that Parliament could not function without the Monarch's assent for bills and procedures?

Text I

The Monarch as Head of State

Extract from 'Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech' on the opening of both Houses of Parliament, 14 October 2019 (adapted)

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons, my Government's priority has always been to secure the United Kingdom's departure from the European Union on 31 October. My Government intends to work towards a new partnership with the European Union, based on free trade and friendly cooperation.

My Ministers will work to implement new regimes for fisheries, agriculture and trade, seizing the opportunities that arise from leaving the European Union. An immigration bill, ending free movement, will lay the foundation for a fair, modern and global immigration system. Steps will be taken to provide certainty, stability and new opportunities for the financial services and legal sectors.

My Government's new economic plan will be underpinned by a responsible fiscal strategy, investing in economic growth while maintaining the sustainability of the public finances.

Measures will be brought forward to support and strengthen the National Health Service, its workforce and resources, enabling it to deliver the highest quality care. New laws will be taken forward to help implement the National Health Service's Long-Term Plan in England, and to establish an independent body to investigate serious healthcare incidents.

My Government is committed to addressing violent crime, and to strengthening public confidence in the criminal justice system. New sentencing laws will see that the most serious offenders spend longer in custody to reflect better the severity of their crimes. Measures will be introduced to improve the justice system's response to foreign national offenders. My Government will work to improve safety and security in prisons and to strengthen the rehabilitation of offenders. Proposals will be brought forward to ensure that victims receive the support they need and the justice they deserve.

A new duty will be placed on public service bodies, ensuring they work together to address serious violence. Police officers will be provided with the protections they need to keep the population safe. They will also be awarded the power to arrest individuals who are wanted by trusted international partners.

My Government will bring forward measures to protect individuals, families and their homes. Legislation will transform the approach of the justice system and other agencies to victims of domestic abuse and minimize the impact of divorce, particularly on children. My ministers will continue to develop proposals to improve internet safety, and will bring forward laws to implement new building safety standards.

My Ministers will ensure that all young people have access to an excellent education, unlocking their full potential and preparing them for the world of work.

My Government will take steps to make work fairer, introducing measures that will support those working hard. To help people plan for the future, measures will be brought forward to provide simpler oversight of pensions savings.

To ensure that the benefits of a prospering economy reach every corner of the United Kingdom, my Ministers will bring forward a National Infrastructure Strategy. This will set out a long-term vision to improve the nation's digital, transport and energy infrastructure. New legislation will help accelerate the delivery of fast, reliable and secure broadband networks to millions of homes.

My Ministers remain committed to protecting and improving the environment for future generations. For the first time, environmental principles will be enshrined in law. Measures will be introduced to improve air and water quality, tackle plastic pollution and restore habitats so plants and wildlife can thrive. Legislation will also create new legally binding environmental improvement targets.

The integrity and prosperity of the union that binds the four nations of the United Kingdom is of the utmost importance to my Government.

My Government remains committed to working with all parties in Northern Ireland to support the return of devolved government and to address the legacy of the past.

My Government will continue to invest in our gallant Armed Forces. My Ministers will honour The Armed Forces Covenant and the

NATO commitment to spend at least 2% of national income on defence.

As the United Kingdom leaves the European Union, my Government will ensure that it continues to play a leading role in global affairs defending its interests and promoting its values.

Members of the House of Commons. Estimates for the public services will be laid before you.

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons. Other measures will be laid before you. I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your counsels.

Home Reading Assignment for Text II:

You are going to read part of the text of an interview given by Prince Andrew to Emily Maitlis of the BBC on 16 November 2019.

As you read, note down the following:

1. the highly unusual circumstances of Prince Andrew's interview;
2. the group of "extraordinary" US people that Jeffrey Epstein used to bring together;
3. Prince Andrew's insistence that he was not aware of Jeffrey Epstein's involvement in sex trafficking;
4. Prince Andrew's rambling answers to questions of why he continued contacts with Jeffrey Epstein after the truth about Epstein's criminal activities became public;
5. Prince Andrew's statement on 20 November 2019 about his stepping back from public duties with Her Majesty's permission.

Answer the following questions:

1. Do you agree that the actions of younger generations of the Royal Family have compromised and even endangered the Monarchy as an institution?
2. Prince Andrew said that the Royal Family tries to 'uphold the highest standards and practices': do you think that there is a contradiction here between words and deeds?

Text II

The Royal Family and Public Expectations

Extended extracts from an interview given by Prince Andrew, the Duke of York (the Queen's second son), to the BBC's Emily Maitlis, 16 November 2019, on his relationship with convicted sex offender Jeffrey Epstein, a US financier.

Emily Maitlis, interviewer: Your Royal Highness, we've come to Buckingham Palace in highly unusual circumstances. Normally, we'd be discussing your work, your duty and we'll come on to that but today you've chosen to speak out for the first time. Why have you decided to talk now?

Prince Andrew: Because there is no good time to talk about Mr Epstein and all things associated and we've been talking to Newsnight for about six months about doing something around the work that I was doing and unfortunately we've just not been able to fit it into either your schedule or my schedule until now. And actually it's a very good opportunity and I'm delighted to be able to see you today.

EM: As you say, all of this goes back to your friendship with Jeffrey Epstein, how did you first become friends? How did you meet?

PA: Well I met through his girlfriend back in 1999 who... and I'd known her since she was at university in the UK and it would be, to some extent, a stretch to say that, as it were, we were close friends. I mean we were friends because of other people and I had a lot of opportunity to go to the United States but I didn't have much time with him. I suppose I saw him once or twice a year, perhaps maybe maximum of three times a year and quite often if I was in the United States and doing things and if he wasn't there, he would say "well, why don't you come and use my houses?" so I said "that's very kind, thank you very much indeed". But it would be a considerable stretch to say that he was a very, very close friend. But he had the most extraordinary ability to bring extraordinary people together and that's the bit that I

remember as going to the dinner parties where you would meet academics, politicians, people from the United Nations, I mean it was a cosmopolitan group of what I would describe as US eminents.

EM: You said you weren't very good friends but would you describe him as a good friend, did you trust him?

PA: Yes, I think I probably did but again, I mean I don't go into a friendship looking for the wrong thing, if you understand what I mean. I'm an engaging person, I want to be able to engage, I want to find out, I want to learn and so you have to remember that I was transitioning out of the navy at the time and in the transition I wanted to find out more about what was going on because in the navy it's a pretty isolated business because you're out at sea the whole time and I was going to become the special representative for international trade and investment. So I wanted to know more about what was going on in the international business world and so that was another reason for going there. And the opportunities that I had to go to Wall Street and other places to learn whilst I was there were absolutely vital.

EM: He was your guest as well, in 2000 Epstein was a guest at Windsor Castle and at Sandringham, he was brought right into the heart of the Royal Family at your invitation.

PA: But certainly at my invitation, not at the Royal Family's invitation but remember that it was his girlfriend that was the key element in this. He was the, as it were, plus one, to some extent in that aspect.

EM: Am I right in thinking you threw a birthday party for Epstein's girlfriend, Ghislaine Maxwell at Sandringham?

PA: No, it was a shooting weekend.

EM: A shooting weekend?

PA: Just a straightforward, a straightforward shooting weekend.

EM: We now know that he was and had been procuring young girls for sex trafficking.

PA: We now know that, at the time there was no indication to me or anybody else that that was what he was doing and certainly when I saw

him either in the United States... oh no when I saw him in the United States or when I was staying in his houses in the United States, there was no indication, absolutely no indication. And if there was, you have to remember that at the time I was patron of the NSPCC's Full Stop campaign so I was close up with what was going on in those times about getting rid of abuse to children so I knew what the things were to look for but I never saw them.

EM: In 2008 he was convicted of soliciting and procuring a minor for prostitution, he was jailed, this was your friend, how did you feel about it?

PA: Well I ceased contact with him after I was aware that he was under investigation and that was later in 2006 and I wasn't in touch with him again until 2010. So just it was one of those things that somebody's going through that sort of thing well I'm terribly sorry I can't be... see you.

EM: So, no contact?

PA: No contact.

EM: When he was serving time there was no call, no letter, nothing there?

PA: No, no, no.

EM: He was released in July, within months by December of 2010 you went to stay with him at his New York mansion, why? Why were you staying with a convicted sex offender?

PA: Right, I have always... ever since this has happened and since this has become, as it were, public knowledge that I was there, I've questioned myself as to why did I go and what was I doing and was it the right thing to do? Now, I went there with the sole purpose of saying to him that because he had been convicted, it was inappropriate for us to be seen together. And I had a number of people counsel me in both directions, either to go and see him or not to go and see him and I took the judgement call that because this was serious and I felt that doing it over the telephone was the chicken's way of doing it. I had to go and see him and talk to him. And I went to see him and I was doing a

number of other things in New York at the time and we had an opportunity to go for a walk in the park and that was the conversation coincidentally that was photographed which was when I said to him, I said, "Look, because of what has happened, I don't think it is appropriate that we should remain in contact," and by mutual agreement during that walk in the park we decided that we would part company and I left, I think it was the next day and to this day I never had any contact with him from that day forward.

EM: He threw a party to celebrate his release and you were invited as the guest of honour.

PA: No, I didn't go. Oh, in 2010, there certainly wasn't a party to celebrate his release in December because it was a small dinner party, there were only eight or 10 of us I think at the dinner. If there was a party then I'd know nothing about that.

EM: You were invited to that dinner as a guest of honour.

PA: Well I was there so there was a dinner, I don't think it was quite as you might put it but yeah, OK I was there for... I was there at a dinner, yeah.

EM: I'm just trying to work this out because you said you went to break up the relationship and yet you stayed at that New York mansion several days. I'm wondering how long?

PA: But I was doing a number of other things while I was there.

EM: But you were staying at the house...

PA: Yes.

EM: ... of a convicted sex offender.

PA: It was a convenient place to stay. I mean I've gone through this in my mind so many times. At the end of the day, with a benefit of all the hindsight that one can have, it was definitely the wrong thing to do. But at the time I felt it was the honourable and right thing to do and I admit fully that my judgement was probably coloured by my tendency to be too honourable but that's just the way it is.

EM: Because during that time, those few days, witnesses say they saw many young girls coming and going at the time. There is video

footage of Epstein accompanied by young girls and you were there staying in his house, catching up with friends.

PA: I never... I mean if there were then I wasn't a party to any of that. I never saw them. I mean you have to understand that his house, I described it more as almost as a railway station if you know what I mean in the sense that there were people coming in and out of that house all the time. What they were doing and why they were there I had nothing to do with. So, I'm afraid I can't make any comment on that because I really don't know.

EM: July of this year, Epstein was arrested on charges of sex trafficking and abusing dozens of underage girls. One of the Epstein's accusers, Virginia Roberts...

PA: Yeah.

EM: ... has made allegations against you. She says she met you in 2001, she says she dined with you, danced with you at Tramp Nightclub in London. She went on to have sex with you in a house in Belgravia belonging to Ghislaine Maxwell, your friend. Your response?

PA: I have no recollection of ever meeting this lady, none whatsoever.

EM: You don't remember meeting her?

PA: No.

EM: She says she met you in 2001, she dined with you, she danced with you, you bought her drinks, you were in Tramp Nightclub in London and she went on to have sex with you in a house in Belgravia belonging to Ghislaine Maxwell.

PA: It didn't happen.

EM: Do you remember her?

PA: No, I've no recollection of ever meeting her, I'm almost, in fact I'm convinced that I was never in Tramps with her. There are a number of things that are wrong with that story, one of which is that I don't know where the bar is in Tramps. I don't drink, I don't think I've ever bought a drink in Tramps whenever I was there.

EM: Do you remember dancing at Tramp?

PA: No, that couldn't have happened because the date that's being suggested I was at home with the children.

EM: You know that you were at home with the children, was it a memorable night?

PA: On that particular day that we now understand is the date which is the 10th of March, I was at home, I was with the children and I'd taken Beatrice to a Pizza Express in Woking for a party at I suppose sort of 4:00 or 5:00 in the afternoon. And then because the duchess was away, we have a simple rule in the family that when one is away the other one is there. I was on terminal leave at the time from the Royal Navy so therefore I was at home.

EM: Why would you remember that so specifically? Why would you remember a Pizza Express birthday and being at home?

PA: Because going to Pizza Express in Woking is an unusual thing for me to do, a very unusual thing for me to do. I've never been... I've only been to Woking a couple of times and I remember it weirdly distinctly. As soon as somebody reminded me of it, I went, "Oh yes, I remember that." But I have no recollection of ever meeting or being in the company or the presence.

EM: So, you're absolutely sure that you were at home on the 10th March?

PA: Yeah.

EM: She was very specific about that night, she described dancing with you.

PA: No.

EM: And you profusely sweating and that she went on to have bath possibly.

PA: There's a slight problem with the sweating because I have a peculiar medical condition which is that I don't sweat or I didn't sweat at the time and that was... was it... yes, I didn't sweat at the time because I had suffered what I would describe as an overdose of adrenalin in the Falkland's War when I was shot at and I simply... it was almost impossible for me to sweat. And it's only because I have

done a number of things in the recent past that I am starting to be able to do that again. So I'm afraid to say that there's a medical condition that says that I didn't do it so therefore...

EM: Because she was very specific, she described the dance that you had together in Tramp. She described meeting you, she was a 17-year-old girl meeting a senior member of the Royal Family.

PA: It never happened.

EM: She provided a photo of the two of you together.

PA: Yes, yes.

EM: Your arm was around her waist.

PA: Yes.

EM: You've seen the photo.

PA: I've seen the photograph.

EM: How do you explain that?

PA: I can't because I don't... I have no... again I have absolutely no memory of that photograph ever being taken.

EM: Do you recognize yourself in the photo?

PA: Yes, it's pretty difficult not to recognize yourself.

EM: Your friends suggested that the photo is fake.

PA: I think it's... from the investigations that we've done, you can't prove whether or not that photograph is faked or not because it is a photograph of a photograph of a photograph. So, it's very difficult to be able to prove it but I don't remember that photograph ever being taken.

EM: But it's possible that it was you with your arm around her waist?

PA: That's me but whether that's my hand or whether that's the position I... but I don't... I have simply no recollection of the photograph ever being taken.

EM: The world has now seen the photo that Virginia Roberts provided taken by Epstein we understand in Ghislaine Maxwell's house.

PA: Well here's the problem, I've never seen Epstein with a camera in my life.

EM: I think it was Virginia Roberts's camera, she said a little Kodak one that she lent to Epstein, he took a photo and your arm is round her waist.

PA: Listen, I don't remember, I don't remember that photograph ever being taken. I don't remember going upstairs in the house because that photograph was taken upstairs and I am not entirely convinced that... I mean that is... that is what I would describe as me in that... in that picture but I can't... we can't be certain as to whether or not that's my hand on her whatever it is, left... left side.

EM: You think that...

PA: Because I have no recollection of that photograph ever being taken.

EM: So why would somebody have put in another hand? You think it is next to her in the photo.

PA: Oh, it's definitely me, I mean that's a picture of me, it's not a picture of... I don't believe it's a picture of me in London because when I would go out to... when I go out in London, I wear a suit and a tie. That's what I would describe as... those are my travelling clothes if I'm going to go... if I'm going overseas. There's a... I've got plenty of photographs of me dressed in those sorts of... that sort of kit but not there.

EM: Just to clarify sorry, you think that photo has been faked?

PA: Nobody can prove whether or not that photograph has been doctored but I don't recollect that photograph ever being taken.

PA: I'm terribly sorry but if I, as a member of the Royal Family, and I have a photograph taken and I take very, very few photographs, I am not one to, as it were, hug and public displays of affection are not something that I do. So that's the best explanation I can give you and I'm afraid to say that I don't believe that photograph was taken in the way that has been suggested.

EM: Why would people not believe that you were there?

PA: I'm sorry, why would?

EM: I'm just trying to understand, there's a photo inside Ghislaine Maxwell's house, Ghislaine herself in the background, why would people not believe that you were there with her that night?

PA: They might well wish to believe it but the photograph is taken upstairs and I don't think I ever went upstairs in Ghislaine's house.

EM: Are you sure of that?

PA: Yeah, because the dining room and everything was on the ground floor, was as you came in... as you came in the hall. So, I don't remember ever going up there. I'm at a loss to explain this particular photograph. If the original was ever produced, then perhaps we might be able to solve it but I can't.

EM: But you can say categorically that you don't recall meeting Virginia Roberts, dining with her?

PA: Yep.

EM: Dancing with her at Tramp?

PA: Yep.

EM: Or going on to have sex with her...

PA: Yes.

EM: ...in a bedroom in a house in Belgravia?

PA: I can absolutely categorically tell you it never happened.

EM: Do you recall any kind of sexual contact with Virginia Roberts then or any other time?

PA: None whatsoever.

EM: For the record, is there any way you could have had sex with that young woman or any young woman trafficked by Jeffrey Epstein in any of his residences?

PA: No and without putting too fine a point on it, if you're a man it is a positive act to have sex with somebody. You have to have to take some sort of positive action and so therefore if you try to forget it's very difficult to try and forget a positive action and I do not remember anything. I can't, I've wracked my brain and thinking oh... when the first allegations, when the allegations came out originally I went well that's a bit strange, I don't remember this and then I've been through it and through it and through it over and over and over again and no, nothing. It just never happened.

EM: Has the episode been damaging to the Royal Family, to Her Majesty the Queen?

PA: I don't believe it's been damaging to the Queen at all, it has to me and it's been a constant drip if you see what I mean in the background that people want to know. If I was in a position to be able to answer all these questions in a way that gave sensible answers other than the ones that I have given that gave closure then I'd love it but I'm afraid I can't. I'm just not in a position to do so because I'm just as much in the dark as many people.

EM: How do you reconnect with the public then now?

PA: Exactly what I'm doing which is to use and to continue to work with Pitch, to continue to work with iDEA and the things that I believe strongly in. I'm not somebody who does things in competition with people oddly. I do things in collaboration with people.

EM: I know we have to bring this to a close because we're running out of time. You've faced questions today on a very, very raw subject. There has never been an interview like this before, I wonder what that tells us about the way the Royal Family now confronts these difficult situations. Has there been a sea change?

PA: I think the problem that I'm... we face in the 21st Century is social media. There is a whole range of things that you face now that you didn't face 25 years ago because it was just the print media. And I think that to some extent there is a... there is a thick skin that you have to have and again I'm not a confrontationist myself. I would prefer to be able to, as it were, resolve things in a way that is sensible. And so choosing to, as it were, get out there and talk about these things, it's almost... it's almost a mental health issue to some extent for me in the sense that it's been nagging at my mind for a great many years. I know that I made the wrong judgement and I made the wrong decision but I made the wrong decision and the wrong judgement I believe fundamentally for the right reasons which is to say to somebody "I'm not going to see you again" and in fact from that day forth, I was never in contact with him. The subsequent allegations are, what I would describe as surprising, shocking and a distraction. But that's... I mean there are all sorts of things that are on the internet and out there in the

public domain that we just sort of go, "Well, yeah," but I'm afraid is... it just never happened.

The public reaction to Prince Andrew's interview was universally derisive. On the day of the interview The Times noted that 'the picture of the Duke of York with his arm around a teenage girl who now accuses him of sexually abusing her stands in stark contrast to his claim that he has no recollection of meeting her', adding that 'it may appear curious that the Prince does not deny having sex with a girl [...] but says that he does not remember her'. The same newspaper also said that the Prince admitted that he had 'damaged the Royal Family by maintaining his friendship with Jeffrey Epstein, even after the billionaire paedophile had been convicted'.

Prince Andrew released the following statement on 20 November 2019:

"It has become clear to me over the last few days that the circumstances relating to my former association with Jeffrey Epstein has become a major disruption to my family's work and the valuable work going on in the many organizations and charities that I am proud to support. Therefore, I have asked Her Majesty if I may step back from public duties for the foreseeable future and she has given her permission. I continue to unequivocally regret my ill-judged association with Jeffrey Epstein. His suicide has left many unanswered questions, particularly for his victims, and I deeply sympathize with everyone who has been affected and wants some form of closure. I can only hope that, in time, they can rebuild their lives. Of course, I am willing to help any appropriate law enforcement agency with their investigations, if required."

On 8 January 2020 Prince Harry and his wife Meghan Markle, the Duke and Duchess of Sussex, announced their decision to 'step back as senior members' of the Royal Family and become financially independent. On 18 January 2020 an announcement was made to confirm that the Duke and Duchess would 'no longer be working members of Britain's royal family' and would not use their 'Royal Highness' titles.

RESEARCH ASSIGNMENTS

Research Assignments for the Lineage of the British Royal Family:

1. Find out whether William the Conqueror (Generation No. 7) had a legitimate claim to the throne of the Kingdom of England.

2. Study the list of the British Royal Family from 849 till present to find out how the present monarch, Queen Elizabeth II, descent from Alfred the Great can be traced.

3. Look through the list of the British Royal Family from King Alfred the Great to Queen Elizabeth and find out how the right of primogeniture and the confession of faith influence the succession to the throne in history.

Lineage of the British Royal Family (849 - Present).

Descendants of Alfred the Great

For those interested in genealogy here is a family tree of the descendants of Alfred the Great who lived 849-899, and from whom many of the royal families of Europe are descended. It shows 37 generations and over 3000 individuals including kings and queens of England, Scotland, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Russia, Hanover, Prussia, Bavaria, Romania, and Yugoslavia.

Generation No. 1

1. **ALFRED THE GREAT, KING OF WESSEX (871-899)** was born 849 in Wantage, England, and died in 899. He married EALSWITH, daughter of EALDORMAN ETHELRED MUCEL. She died in 905. Alfred is the only king of England to be called 'the Great'; he defeated the Viking invaders in 878 and declared himself King of the Anglo-Saxons in 886. He also encouraged primary education for children be conducted in Anglo-Saxon rather than Latin.

Children of ALFRED and EALHSWITH are:

i. **LADY OF MERCIA ETHELFLEDA**, b. 869, d. 918; m. **EALDORMAN ETHELRED OF MERCIA**; d. 910.

- ii. EDWARD (EADWARD) THE ELDER, b. 871, d. 924.
- iii. ETHELWERD, b. 880, d. 922.
- iv. ABBESS ETHELGIVA OF SHAFTESBURY. d. 896
- v. ELFRIDA, d. 929, m. COUNT BALDWIN II OF FLANDERS.

Generation No. 2

2. EDWARD THE ELDER, KING OF WESSEX (899-924) b. 871, d. July 17, 924 at Farndon on Dee. He married (1) ECGWYN. He married (2) ELFLEDA He married (3) EDGIVA. Buried at Winchester.

Children of EDWARD and ECGWYN are:

- i. **ATHELSTAN, KING OF THE ENGLISH (925-940)**, b. 895; d. October 27, 940 at Gloucester. Buried at Malmesbury.
- ii. EDITHA, m. KING OF DENMARK SIHTRIC OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

Children of EDWARD and ELFLEDA are:

- iii. ETHELWERD, d. 924.
- iv. EDWIN.
- v. ELFLEDA.
- vi. EDGIVA, m. KING OF FRANCE CHARLES THE SIMPLE.
- vii. ETHELHILDA.
- viii. EDHILDA, m. COUNT OF PARIS HUGH THE GREAT.
- ix. EADGYTH (EDITH), m. KING OF GERMANY OTTO I THE GREAT.
- xi. ELGIVA, m. DUKE OF BOHEMIA BOLESLAW II.

Children of EDWARD and EDGIVA are:

- xii. **EDMUND, KING OF THE ENGLISH (940-946)**, b. 922, d. (assassinated at Pucklechurh) May 26, 946. Buried at Glastonbury.
 - xiii. **EADRED, KING OF THE ENGLISH (946-955)**, b. 925 d. Nov. 23, 955. Died at Frome. Buried at Winchester.
 - xiv. ELFRED.
 - xv. EDBURH.
 - xvi. EDGIVA, m. KING OF PROVENCE LOUIS.
- 3. ETHELWERD** d. 922.

Children of ETHELWERD are:

- i. ELFWINE, d. 937.
- ii. ETHELWINE, d. 937.

Generation No. 3

4. **EDMUND I** b. 922, d. May 26, 946. He married (1) ELGIVA. He married (2) ETHELFLEDA OF DOMERHAM, daughter of EALDORMAN ALFGAR OF WILTSHIRE. Buried at Glastonbury

Children of EDMUND and ELGIVA are:

- i. **EDWY (EADWIG), KING OF THE ENGLISH (955-959)**, b. 941 d. Oct 1, 959 at Gloucester. m. ELGIVA. Buried at Gloucester
- ii. **EDGAR THE PEACEFUL, KING OF THE ENGLISH (959-975)**, b. 943, d. July 8, 975 at Winchester. Buried at Glastonbury.

Generation No. 4

5. **EDGAR THE PEACEFUL, KING OF THE ENGLISH (959-975)** b. 943, d. 975. He married (1) ETHELFLEDA, daughter of EALDORMAN ORDMAER. He married (2) WULFREDA. He married (3) ELFRIDA, daughter of ORDGAR OF DEVON. Buried at Glastonbury.

Child of EDGAR and ETHELFREDA is:

- i. **EDWARD THE MARTYR, KING OF THE ENGLISH (975-978)** 5 . b. 963, d. (assassinated at Corfe Castle) March 18, 978. Buried at Shaftesbury.

Children of EDGAR and ELFRIDA are:

- ii. EDMUND, d. 970.
- iii. **ETHELRED II THE UNREADY, KING OF THE ENGLISH (978-1016)**, b. 968, d. April 23, 1016 at London. Buried in St Paul's Cathedral.

Generation No. 5

6. **ETHELRED II THE UNREADY, KING OF THE ENGLISH (978-1016)** b. 968, d. April 23, 1016 at London. He married (1) ELFREDA (*ELFGIVA*) 985, daughter of EALDORMAN THORED;

(2) EMMA OF NORMANDY 1002, daughter of RICHARD and GUNNOR (d. 1052). Buried in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Children of ETHELRED and ELFREDA are:

i. **EDMUND II IRONSIDE, KING OF ENGLAND (1016)**, b. 990, d. November 30, 1016 at London. Buried at Glastonbury.

ii. ATHELSTAN.

iii. EGBERT, d. 1005.

iv. EDRED.

v. EDWY, d. 1017.

vi. EDWARD.

vii. EDGAR.

viii. EDITH, m. EALDORMAN EDRIC OF MERCIA STREONA.

ix. ELGIVA, m. UCHTRED.

x. WULFHILDA, m. EALDORMAN ULFCYTEL OF EAST ANGLIA SNYLLING.

xi. (DAUGHTER), m. ATHELSTAN.

Children of ETHELRED and EMMA are:

xii. ALFRED ATHLING, d. 1036.

xiii. **EDWARD THE CONFESSOR, KING OF ENGLAND (1042-1066)** b. 1002, Islip, d. January 5, 1066; m. EDITH (EADGYTH), January 23, 1045; d. January 5, 1066. Buried January 6, 1066, Westminster Abbey.

xiv. EDITH (EALDGYTH) Buried Westminster, Abbey, London. Her brother was **HAROLD II, KING OF ENGLAND**, b. 1022, died in Battle of Hastings October 14, 1066.

EMMA OF NORMANDY married **CNUT (CANUTE), KING OF DENMARK (1014-1035) and ENGLAND (1016-1035)** b. 995, d. November 12, 1035 at Shaftesbury. Buried at Winchester. Nephew of EMMA was **WILLIAM I THE CONQUEROR, DUKE OF NORMANDY AND KING OF ENGLAND (1066-1087)** b. 1027 at Falaise in Normandy, d. September 9, 1087.

Children of CNUT and EMMA

i. **HARTHACNUT, KING OF DENMARK (1035-1042) AND ENGLAND(1040-1042)** b. 1018, d. June 8, 1042 in London. Buried in Winchester.

ii. GUNHILD.

Children of CNUT and ELFIGFU OF NORTHAMPTON9

i. SVEGN

ii. **HAROLD I HAREFOOT, KING OF ENGLAND (1035-1040)** b. 1017, d. March 17, 1040 at Oxford.

Generation No. 6

7. **KING EDMUND II IRONSIDE (1016)** b. 990, d. November 30, 1016 in London. He married EALDGYTH. Buried at Glastonbury.

Children of EDMUND and EALDGYTH are:

i. EDMUND 7, b. 990 m. HEDWIG

ii. EDWARD ATHLING, b. 1016, d. 1057.

Generation No. 7

8. **WILLIAM 1 THE CONQUEROR, DUKE OF NORMANDY AND KING OF ENGLAND (1066-1087)** (nephew of EMMA QUEEN OF DENMARK and illegitimate son of Robert I Duke of Normandy and Arlette daughter of Fulbert a tanner) was born Sept 1028 in Falaise, Normandy, and died September 9, 1087 in Rouen, France from a riding accident. Buried in St Stephens Abbey, Caen, France. He married MATILDA OF FLANDERS in 1052 at Notre Dame d'Eu, Normandy, France. William became King of England by defeating Harold II at the Battle of Hastings in 1066. He changed the course of English history with his invasion of England in 1066. In 1085 William ordered a general survey of every town and village in England, which became known as the Domesday Book. One of the major consequences of William's invasion and rule was the linking, economically and culturally, of England with continental Europe. The language of the nobility was French, with Latin remaining the language of the church.

Children of WILLIAM AND MATILDA are:

- i. ROBERT II (CURTHOSE) Duke of Normandy b.1054 d. Feb 10, 1135.
- ii. RICHARD, DUKE OF BERNAY. b 1055 d. 1081.
- iii. CECILIA b. 1055 d. July 30, 1126.
- iv. **KING WILLIAM II RUFUS (1087-1100)** b. 1056 in Normandy, d. August 2, 1100 of an arrow wound while riding in the New Forest. Buried in Winchester.
- v. ADELICIA, d. 1065 became a nun.
- vi. ADELA, b. 1062, d. March 8, 1138 m Stephen Henry.
- vii. AGATHA, b. 1064, d. August 13, 1090 m. Alan IV of Brittany
- viii. CONSTANCE, b. 1066, d. 1090.
- ix. MATLIDA, d. 1112.
- x. **KING HENRY I BEAUCLARK (1100-1135)** b. Sept 1068, d. Dec 1, 1135.

Generation No. 8

MARGARET died 1093. She married **KING OF SCOTLAND MALCOLM III CANMORE**, son of DUNCAN and SYBIL. He died 1093.

Children of MARGARET and MALCOLM are:

- i. MATILDA (EDITH) OF SCOTLAND 9, b. Dunfermline; d. May 1, 1118, Palace of Westminster.
- ii. MARY OF SCOTLAND.
- iii. **KING OF SCOTLAND EDGAR**, b. Abt. 1074; d. 1107.
- iv. **KING OF SCOTLAND ALEXANDER I THE FIERCE**, b. 1078; d. 1124; m. SYBIL.
- v. KING OF SCOTLAND DAVID I THE SAINT, b. 1080; d. 1153.

Generation No. 9

10. MATILDA (EDITH) OF SCOTLAND was born in Dunfermline, and died May 1, 1118 in Westminster, Palace, London, England. She married **KING HENRY I BEAUCLERC**, August 6,

1100 in Westminster, Abbey, son of WILLIAM and MATILDA. He was born about September 1068 in Selby, Yorkshire, England, and died December 1, 1135 in St Denis-le-, Fermont, Near Gisors.

Children of MATILDA and HENRY are:

i. MATILDA (ADELAIDE), b. Winchester; d. September 10, 1167, Rouen.

ii. DUKE OF NORMANDY WILLIAM, b. August 5, 1103, Winchester; d. November 25, 1120; m. ISABELLA.

In addition, Henry had several illegitimate children including

iii. ROBERT OF GLOUCESTER, d. 1147.

iv. SYBIL, m. KING OF SCOTLAND ALEXANDER I THE FIERCE; b. 1078; d. 1124.

v. RICHARD OF LINCOLN, d. 1120.

Generation No. 10

11. MATILDA was born in Winchester, and died September 10, 1167 in Rouen. She married (1) HOLY ROMAN EMPR HENRY V January 7, 1114 in Mainz. He was born 1086, and died May 23, 1125 in Utrecht. She married (2) COUNT OF ANJOU GEOFFREY V PLANTAGENET May 22, 1127 in Le Mans. He died September 7, 1151 in Chateau-du-Loir.

Children of MATILDA and GEOFFREY PLANTAGENET are:

i. **KING HENRY II CURTMANTLE (1154-1189)**, b. March 25, 1133, Le Mans; d. July 6, 1189, Chinon.

ii. COUNT OF NANTES GEOFFREY VI OF ANJOU, b. 1134; d. 1158.

iii. COUNT OF POITOU WILLIAM, b. 1136; d. 1164.

12. MATILDA OF BOULOGNE was born in Boulogne, and died May 3, 1152 in Hedingham Castle, Essex, England. She married **KING STEPHEN (1135-1154)** in 1125 in Westminster, son of STEPHEN and ADELA. He was born 1096 in Blois, France, and died October 25, 1154 in Dover Castle. Both are buried at Faversham Abbey

Children of MATILDA and STEPHEN are:

- i. COUNT EUSTACE OF BOULONGNE, d. August 10, 1153, Bury St Edmunds; m. CONSTANCE OF TOULOUSE, February 1140.
- ii. BALDWIN, b. 1126; d. December 2, 1135, London.
- iii. MATILDA, b. 1133; d. 1135.
- iv. COUNT WILLIAM OF BOULOGNE, b. 1134; d. October 11, 1159, Toulouse; m. ISABEL DE WARRENNE, 1149.
- v. COUNTESS MARY OF BOULOGNE, b. 1136; d. 1182, St Austrebert; m. COUNT BOULOGNE MATTHEW OF ALSACE, 1160.

Generation No. 11

13. KING HENRY II CURTMANTLE, (1154-1189) was born March 25, 1133 in Le Mans, and died July 6, 1189 in Chinon. He married ELEANOR OF AQUITAINE May 18, 1152 in Bordeaux, France, daughter of DUKE WILLIAM X OF AQUITAINE following her divorce from Louis VII of France. She was born 1122 in Bordeaux/Berlin, and died April 1, 1204 in Fontevraud. Both are buried at Fontevraud Abbey.

Children of HENRY and ELEANOR are:

- i. WILLIAM 12, b. August 17, 1152, Normandy, d. April 1156, Wallingford, Castle, Berkshire.
- ii. HENRY, b. February 28, 1155, Bermondsey, d. June 11, 1183, Martel; m. MARGARET OF FRANCE; d. 1198.
- iii. MATILDA (*MAUD*), b. 1156, London, d. June 28, 1189, Brunswick; m. DUKE OF SAXONY HENRY THE LION, February 1, 1168, Minden, Saxony, Germany; d. 1195.
- iv. **KING RICHARD I COEUR DE LION (1189-1199) AND DUKE OF NORMANDY** b. 1157, Beaumont Palace, Oxford; d. April 6, 1199, Chalus, Limousin; m. BERENGARIA OF NAVARRE; b. 1163; d. 1230. Richard took part in the Third Crusade and is commemorated for his military prowess in romantic ballads and legends. He is buried at Fontevraud Abbey.
- v. DUKE OF BRITTANY GEOFFREY, b. September 23, 1158, d. August 19, 1186, Paris.

vi. ELEANOR, b. October 13, 1162, Domfront, Normandy, d. October 31, 1214, Burgos.

vii. JOAN PLANTAGENET, b. October 1165, Angers, d. September 4, 1199; m. (1) KING OF SICILY WILLIAM II THE GOOD, February 13, 1177, Palermo, Italy; b. 1166, d. November 18, 1189; m. (2) COUNT RAYMOND VI OF TOULOUSE, October 1196, Rouen.

viii. **KING JOHN LACKLAND (1199-1216)** b. December 24, 1167, Beaumont Palace, Oxford, d. October 19, 1216, Newark Castle, Nottinghamshire.

Generation No. 12

14. KING JOHN LACKLAND, (1199-1216) was born December 24, 1167 in Beaumont Palace, Oxford, and died October 19, 1216 in Newark Castle, Nottinghamshire. He married (1) COUNTESS ISABELLA DE CLARE OF GLOUCESTER August 29, 1189 in Marlebridge, daughter of EARL WILLIAM OF GLOUCESTER. She died November 1217. He married (2) ISABELLA OF ANGOULEME August 24, 1200 in Bordeaux, daughter of AYMER TAILLEFER and ALICE. She was born 1188 in Angouleme, and died May 31, 1246 in Fontevraud. KING JOHN LACKLAND is buried at Worcester Cathedral. **Magna Carta**, the English **Great Charter**, charter of English liberties granted by King John on June 15, 1215, under threat of civil war and reissued, with alterations, in 1216, 1217, and 1225. By declaring the sovereign to be subject to the rule of law and documenting the liberties held by “free men,” the Magna Carta provided the foundation for individual rights in Anglo-American jurisprudence. It also serves as the origin of the English Parliament, which became firmly established in 1265 under King Edward I.

Children of JOHN and ISABELLA are:

i. **KING HENRY III (1216-1272)** 13, b. October 1, 1207, Winchester, Castle, d. November 16, 1272, Westminster Palace, London.

ii. EARL OF CORNWALL RICHARD, b. January 5, 1209, Winchester, Castle, England, d. 1272, Newark Castle, Newark, England.

iii. JOAN, b. July 22, 1210, Gloucester, England, d. March 4, 1238, near London, England; m. KING OF SCOTLAND ALEXANDER II; b. 1198, d. 1249.

iv. ISABELLA, b. 1214, Gloucester; d. December 1, 1241, Foggia, m. EMPEROR FREDERICK II OF GERMANY, July 20, Worms.

v. ELEANOR, b. 1215, Gloucester, d. April 13, 1275, Montargis, France.

Generation No. 13

15. KING HENRY III, (1216-1272) was born October 1, 1207 in Winchester, Castle, and died November 16, 1272 in Westminster Palace, London. He married ELEANOR OF PROVENCE January 4, 1236 in Canterbury Cathedral, daughter of COUNT RAYMOND OF PROVENCE. She was born about 1217 in Aix-en-Provence, and died June 24, 1291 in Amesbury, Wiltshire. HENRY III is buried in Westminster Abbey, London. ELEANOR OF PROVENCE is buried in Convent Church, Amesbury.

Children of HENRY and ELEANOR are:

i. **KING EDWARD I LONGSHANKS (1272-1307)**, b. June 17, 1239, Westminster Palace, London, d. July 7, 1307, near Carlisle.

ii. MARGARET, b. September 29, 1240, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. February 26, 1275, Cupar Castle, Fife.

iii. BEATRICE, b. June 25, 1242, Bordeaux, d. March 24, 1275, London; m. EARL OF RICHMOND JOHN OF DREUX, January 22, 1260, St Denis.

iv. EARL EDMUND CROUCHBACK OF LEICESTER, b. January 16, 1245, London, d. June 5, 1296, Bayonne.

v. RICHARD, b. about 1247, d. before 1256.

vi. JOHN, b. about 1250, d. before 1256.

vii. KATHERINE, b. November 25, 1253, Westminster, d. May 3, 1257, Windsor Castle, Berkshire.

viii. WILLIAM, b. about 1256, d. about 1256.

ix. HENRY, b. about 1256, d. about 1257.

Generation No. 14

16. KING EDWARD I LONGSHANKS (1272-1307) was born June 17, 1239 in Westminster, Palace, London, England, and died July 7, 1307 in Near Carlisle. He married (1) ELEANOR OF CASTILE October 1254 in Las Huelgas, daughter of KING OF CASTILE FERDINAND III. She was born about 1244 in Castile, and died November 24, 1290 in Herdeby, near Grantham, Lincolnshire. He married (2) MARGUERITE OF FRANCE September 10, 1299 in Canterbury Cathedral, daughter of PHILIP and MARY. She was born 1279 in Paris, and died February 14, 1317 in Marlborough Castle. EDWARD I and ELEANOR OF CASTILE are buried in Westminster Abbey, London. MARGUERITE OF FRANCE is buried in Grey Friars, Church, London.

Children of EDWARD and ELEANOR are:

i. ELEANOR 15, b. June 17, 1264, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. October 12, 1297, Ghent.

ii. JOAN, b. 1265; d. 1265.

iii. JOHN, b. July 10, 1266, Windsor, Berkshire, d. August 3, 1271, Westminster, London.

iv. HENRY, b. July 13, 1267, Windsor, Berkshire, d. October 14, 1274, Merton, Surrey.

v. JULIAN (*KATHERINE*), b. 1271, Holy Land; d. 1271, Holy Land.

vi. JOAN OF ACRE, b. 1272, Acre, Palestine; d. April 23, 1307, Clare, Suffolk; m. (1) EARL GLOUCESTER GILBERT DE CLARE, April 30, 1290, Westminster, Abbey, London; d. 1295; m. (2) BARON RALPH DE MONTHERMER, January 1297; d. 1305.

vii. EARL OF CHESTER ALFONSO, b. November 24, 1273, Bordeaux, d. August 19, 1284, Windsor Castle, Berkshire.

viii. MARGARET, b. September 11, 1275, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. 1318, Brussels; m. DUKE OF BRABANT JOHN II, July 8, 1290, Westminster Abbey, London.

ix. BERENGARIA, b. 1276, Kennington, d. about 1279.

x. MARY, b. March 11, 1278, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. before July 8, 1332, Amesbury.

xi. ALICE, b. March 12, 1279, Woodstock, d. 1291.

xii. ELIZABETH, b. August 1282, Rhuddlan Castle, d. May 5, 1316; m. (1) COUNT OF HOLLAND JOHN I, January 18, 1297, Ipswich; m. (2) EARL OF HEREFORD HUMPHREY DE BOHUN, November 14, 1302, Westminster.

xiii. **KING EDWARD II (1307-1327)**, b. April 25, 1284, Caernarvon Castle, Wales, d. September 21, 1327, Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire.

xiv. BEATRICE, b. about 1286, Aquitaine.

xv. BLANCHE, b. 1290, d. 1290.

Children of EDWARD and MARGUERITE are:

xvi. EARL OF NORFOLK THOMAS OF BROTHERTON, b. June 1, 1300, Brotherton, Yorkshire, d. August 1338.

xvii. EARL OF KENT EDMUND OF WOODSTOCK, b. August 5, 1301, Woodstock, d. March 19, 1330, Winchester.

xviii. ELEANOR, b. May 4, 1306, Winchester, d. 1311, Amesbury.

Generation No. 15

17. KING EDWARD II (1307-1327) was born April 25, 1284 in Caernarvon, Castle, Wales, and died September 21, 1327 in Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire. He married ISABELLA OF FRANCE January 25, 1308 in Boulogne, daughter of PHILIP and JOAN. She was born 1292 in Paris, and died August 22, 1358 in Castle Rising, Norfolk. KING EDWARD II is buried in Gloucester Cathedral. ISABELLA OF FRANCE is buried in Grey Friars Church, London/

Children of EDWARD and ISABELLA are:

i. **KING EDWARD III (1327-1377)** 16, b. November 13, 1312, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. June 21, 1377, Sheen Palace.

ii. EARL OF CORNWALL JOHN OF ELTHAM, b. August 15, 1316, Eltham Palace, Kent, d. September 14, 1336, Perth.

iii. ELEANOR, b. June 18, 1318, Woodstock, d. April 22, 1355, Deventer; m. DUKE RAINALD II OF GUELDRES, May 1332, Nijmegen.

iv. JOAN OF THE TOWER, b. July 5, 1321, Tower of London, d. September 7, 1362, Hertford; m. KING OF SCOTLAND DAVID II BRUCE, July 17, 1328, Berwick-on-Tweed; b. 1329, d. 1371.

Generation No. 16

18. KING EDWARD III (1327-1377) was born November 13, 1312 in Windsor Castle, Berkshire, England, and died June 21, 1377 in Sheen Palace. He married PHILIPPA OF HAINAULT January 24, 1328 in York Minster, daughter of COUNT WILLIAM OF HAINAULT. She was born June 24, 1311 in Valenciennes, and died August 14, 1369 in Windsor Castle, England. Edward led England into the Hundred Years' War with France. The descendants of his seven sons and five daughters contested the throne for generations, culminating in the Wars of the Roses (1455–85). Both EDWARD III and PHILIPPA OF HAINAULT are buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

Children of EDWARD and PHILIPPA are:

i. PRINCE OF WALES EDWARD, b. June 15, 1330, Woodstock, Oxfordshire, England, d. June 8, 1376, Westminster Palace, London.

ii. ISABELLA, b. June 16, 1332, Woodstock, d. before October 1382, London; m. EARL OF BEDFORD ENGUERRAND VII DE COURCY, July 27, 1365, Windsor, England; d. 1396.

iii. JOAN (JOANNA), b. February 1335, Woodstock, d. September 2, 1348, Bayonne.

iv. WILLIAM OF HATFIELD, b. before February 16, 1337, Hatfield, Herts., d. July 8, 1337.

v. DUKE OF CLARENCE LIONEL OF ANTWERP, b. November 29, 1338, Antwerp, Belgium, d. October 17, 1368, Alba Pompeia, Italy.

vi. DUKE OF LANCASTER. JOHN OF GAUNT, b. March 1340, Ghent, d. February 3, 1399, Leicester Castle.

vii. DUKE OF YORK EDMUND OF LANGLEY, b. June 5, 1341, Kings Langley, Herts., d. August 1, 1402, Kings Langley.

viii. BLANCHE, b. March 1342, Tower of London, d. March 1342, Tower of London.

ix. MARY, b. October 10, 1344, Waltham, Near Winchester; m. DUKE OF BRITTANY JOHN V DE MONTFORT, 1361, Woodstock; d. November 1, 1399.

x. MARGARET, b. July 20, 1346, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, England, d. October 1, 1361; m. EARL OF PEMBROKE JOHN HASTINGS, May 19, 1359, Reading; d. 1375.

xi. WILLIAM OF WINDSOR, b. June 24, 1348, Windsor Castle, d. September 1348.

xii. DUKE OF GLOUCESTER THOMAS OF WOODSTOCK, b. January 7, 1355, Woodstock, d. September 15, 1396, Calais.

19. COUNTESS OF KENT JOAN was born September 29, 1328, and died August 8, 1385 in Wallingford, Castle, Berkshire, England. She married (1) EARL OF KENT THOMAS HOLLAND. She married (2) PRINCE OF WALES EDWARD October 10, 1361 in Windsor, England, son of EDWARD and PHILIPPA. He was born June 15, 1330 in Woodstock, Oxfordshire, England, and died June 8, 1376 in Westminster Palace, London.

Child of JOAN and THOMAS HOLLAND is:

i. MARGARET HOLLAND, d. December 31, 1439.

Children of JOAN and EDWARD are:

ii. EDWARD, b. January 27, 1365, Angouleme, d. 1372, Bordeaux, France.

iii. **KING RICHARD II (1377-1399)**, b. January 6, 1367, Bordeaux, France, d. January 6, 1400, Pontefract Castle; m. (1) ANNE OF BOHEMIA, January 20, 1382, Westminster, Palace, London, England; b. May 11, 1366, Prague, d. June 3, 1394, Sheen Palace; m. (2) ISABELLA OF FRANCE, November 1, 1396, Calais; b. November

9, 1387, Hotel du Louvre, Paris, d. September 13, 1409, Blois. King Richard's attempts to impose a poll tax on the population were unpopular and led to the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, the first great popular rebellion in English history. He and ANNE OF BOHEMIA are buried in Westminster Abbey, London. ISABELLA OF FRANCE is buried at Celestines, Paris.

Generation No. 17

20. DUKE OF LANCASTER JOHN OF GAUNT was born March 1340 in Ghent, and died February 3, 1399 in Leicester Castle. He married (1) **BLANCHE OF LANCASTER** May 13, 1359 in Reading, daughter of **HENRY** and **ISABEL DE BEAUMONT**. She was born 1341, and died September 12, 1369 in Bolingbroke, Castle. He married (1) **QUEEN OF CASTILE CONSTANZA (CONSTANCE)** September 1371 in Roquefort, daughter of **KING PEDRO III OF CASTILE**. She died March 24, 1394 in Leicester, England. He married (3) **CATHERINE SWYNFORD ROET** January 13, 1396 in Lincoln, daughter of **SIR PAYNE OF GUIENNE ROET**. She was born 1350, and died May 10, 1403 in Lincoln.

Children of **JOHN** and **BLANCHE** are:

i. **PHILIPPA OF LANCASTER** 18, b. 1360, d. 1415; m. **KING OF PORTUGAL JOHN I**; b. 1357, d. 1433.

ii. **ELIZABETH**, b. 1364, d. 1426; m. (1) **DUKE OF EXETER JOHN HOLLAND**; m. (2) **LORD FANHOPE JOHN CORNWALL**.

iii. **KING HENRY IV BOLINGBROKE**, b. April 4, 1366, Bolingbroke, Castle, d. March 20, 1413, London.

Generation No. 18

21. KING HENRY IV BOLINGBROKE (1399-1413) was born April 4, 1366 in Bolingbroke, Castle, and died March 20, 1413 in London, England. He married (1) **MARY DE BOHUN** in Arundel Castle, daughter of **EARL OF HEREFORD HUMPHREY DE BOHUN**. She died July 4, 1394 in Peterborough, Castle. He married (2) **JOAN OF NAVARRE** February 7, 1403 in Winchester, Cathedral,

London, England, daughter of KING OF NAVARRE CHARLES II. She was born 1370 in Pamplona, and died July 9, 1437 in Bower, Essex. HENRY IV and JOAN OF NAVARRE are buried in Canterbury Cathedral.

Children of HENRY and MARY DE BOHUN are:

i. **KING HENRY V (1413-1422)**, b. August 9, 1387, Monmouth, d. August 31, 1422, Bois de Vincennes.

ii. DUKE OF CLARENCE THOMAS, b. 1388, Kenilworth, d. March 22, 1421, Beauge; m. MARGARET HOLLAND, 1412; d. December 31, 1439.

iii. DUKE OF BEDFORD JOHN, b. June 20, 1389, d. September 15, 1435, Rouen; m. (1) ANNE OF BURGUNDY, April 17, 1423, Troyes, d. November 14, 1432, Paris, France; m. (2) JACQUETTA OF LUXEMBOURG, April 22, 1433, Therouenne.

iv. DUKE HUMPHREY OF GLOUCESTER, b. September 1390, d. February 23, 1447, Bury St. Edmunds; m. (1) COUNTESS JACQUELINE OF HOLLAND, 1422; m. (2) ELEANOR DE COBHAM, Bef. 1431; d. July 7, 1452, Beaumaris Castle.

v. BLANCHE, b. 1392, Peterborough, Castle, d. May 21, 1409, Germany; m. ELECTOR PALATINE LUDWIG III, July 6, 1402, Cologne, Germany.

vi. PHILIPPA, b. July 4, 1394, Peterborough, Castle, d. January 5, 1430, Convent, of Vadstena; m. KING OF DENMARK ERIC X of POMERANIA, October 26, 1406, Lund.

Generation No. 19

22. KING HENRY V, (1413-1422) was born August 9, 1387 in Monmouth, and died August 31, 1422 in Bois de Vincennes. He married CATHERINE OF VALOIS June 2, 1420 in Troyes, daughter of CHARLES and ISABELLE. She was born October 27, 1401 in Paris, and died January 3, 1437 in Bermondsey, Abbey. One of the most renowned kings in English history, Henry V (1387-1422) led two successful invasions of France, cheering his outnumbered troops to

victory at the 1415 Battle of Agincourt and eventually securing full control of the French throne. His portrayal in three of Shakespeare's histories made him a paragon of English spirit and chivalry. Both he and CATHERINE OF VALOIS are buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

Child of HENRY and CATHERINE is:

i. **HENRY VI, KING OF ENGLAND (1422-1461 & 1470-1471)**, b. December 6, 1421, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. May 21, 1471, Tower of London, London, England.

23. LADY CICELY NEVILLE died 1495. She married **DUKE OF YORK RICHARD PLANTAGENET**, son of **RICHARD PLANTAGENET** and **ANNE MORTIMER**. He died 1460.

Children of **CICELY NEVILLE** and **RICHARD PLANTAGENET** are:

i. **EARL OF RUTLAND EDMUND**, d. 1460.
ii. **DUKE OF CLARENCE GEORGE**.
iii. **ANNE**, d. 1476; m. (1) **DUKE OF EXETER HENRY**; m. (2) **SIR THOMAS ST. LEGER**.
iv. **ELIZABETH**, d. 1503; m. **DUKE OF SUFFOLK JOHN DE LA POLE**.

v. **MARGARET**, m. **DUKE OF BURGUNDY CHARLES THE BOLD**.

vi. **URSULA**.

vii. **EDWARD IV, KING OF ENGLAND (1461-1470 & 1471-1483)**, b. April 28, 1442, Rouen, France, d. April 9, 1483, Westminster Palace, London.

viii. **RICHARD III, KING OF ENGLAND (1483-1485)** b. October 2, 1452, Fotheringay, Castle, d. August 22, 1485, in battle at Bosworth Field.

24. COUNTESS MARGARET OF RICHMOND BEAUFORT died 1509. She married (1) **EARL OF RICHMOND EDMUND TUDOR**, son of **OWEN TUDOR** and **CATHERINE**. He was born 1430, and died 1456. She married (2) **SIR HENRY STAFFORD**. He died 1481. She married (3) **LORD THOMAS STANLEY**. He died 1504.

Child of MARGARET BEAUFORT and EDMUND TUDOR is:

i. **KING HENRY VII (1485-1509)**, b. January 28, 1457, Pembroke Castle, Wales, d. April 21, 1509, Richmond Palace, England.

Generation No. 20

25. KING HENRY VI, (1422-1461 & 1470-1471) was born December 6, 1421 in Windsor Castle, Berkshire, and died May 21, 1471 in the Tower of London. He married MARGARET OF ANJOU April 22, 1445 in Titchfield Abbey, Hants, daughter of COUNT OF ANJOU RENE. She was born March 23, 1429 in Pont-a-Mousson, Lorraine, and died August 25, 1482 in the Chateau de Dampière, near Saumur. HENRY VI is buried at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, Berkshire. MARGARET OF ANJOU is buried at Angers Cathedral.

Child of HENRY and MARGARET is:

i. PRINCE OF WALES EDWARD 21, b. October 13, 1453, Westminster Palace, d. May 4, 1471, Tewkesbury; m. LADY ANNE NEVILLE, August 1470, Amboise; b. June 11, 1456, Warwick Castle, d. March 16, 1485, Westminster Palace.

26. KING EDWARD IV (1461-1470 & 1471-1483) was born April 28, 1442 in Rouen, France, and died April 9, 1483 in Westminster Palace. He married ELIZABETH WOODVILLE May 1, 1464 in Grafton Regis, Northants, daughter of RICHARD WOODVILLE and JACQUETTA. She was born 1437 in Grafton Regis, Northants, and died June 8, 1492 in Bermondsey Abbey. EDWARD IV and ELIZABETH WOODVILLE are both buried at St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

Children of EDWARD and ELIZABETH WOODVILLE are:

i. ELIZABETH OF YORK 21, b. February 11, 1466, Westminster Palace, d. February 11, 1503, Tower of London.

ii. MARY, b. August 1466, Windsor Castle, d. May 23, 1482, Greenwich, England.

iii. CICELY, b. March 20, 1469, d. August 24, 1507, Isle of Wight, England; m. (1) VISCOUNT WELLES JOHN 1ST WELLES,

December 1487; d. February 9, 1499, London, England; m. (2) THOMAS OF ISLE OF WIGHT KYME, January 1504.

iv. **KING EDWARD V (1483)** b. November 4, 1470, Sanctuary, Westminster, England, d. 1483.

v. MARGARET, b. April 10, 1472, d. December 11, 1472.

vi. DUKE OF YORK RICHARD, b. August 17, 1473, Shrewsbury, d. 1483; m. LADY ANNE MOWBRAY, January 15, 1478, St. Stephen's, Chapel, Westminster, d. November 19, 1481, Greenwich, England.

vii. ANNE, b. November 2, 1475, Westminster, Palace, d. November 23, 1511; m. DUKE OF NORFOLK THOMAS HOWARD, February 4, 1495.

viii. DUKE OF BEDFORD GEORGE, b. March 1477, Windsor Castle, d. March 1479, Windsor Castle.

ix. CATHERINE, b. August 14, 1479, Eltham Palace, d. November 15, 1527, Tiverton; m. EARL OF DEVON WILLIAM COURTENAY, October 1495.

x. BRIDGET, b. November 10, 1480, Eltham Palace, d. 1517, Dartford.

27. KING OF ENGLAND RICHARD III was born October 2, 1452 in Fotheringay Castle, and died August 22, 1485 in the Battle of Bosworth Field. He married LADY ANNE NEVILLE July 12, 1472 in Westminster, daughter of RICHARD NEVILLE and ANNE BEAUCHAMP. She was born June 11, 1456 in Warwick Castle, and died March 16, 1485 in Westminster Palace. Richard III served as king of England for only two years, but his reign was one of the most historic and turbulent. He is credited with the responsibility for several murders, including those of his nephews Edward and Richard, and of Henry VI. Shakespeare portrayed him as a tyrannical ruler in his play, *King Richard III*, but modern scholars have pointed to evidence that Richard III was a successful leader. He is buried in Grey Friars Abbey, Leicester, and LADY ANNE NEVILLE is buried in Westminster Abbey.

Child of RICHARD and ANNE NEVILLE is:

i. PRINCE OF WALES EDWARD, b. December 1473, Middleham Castle, Yorkshire, d. April 9, 1484, Middleham Castle.

28. KING HENRY VII, (1485-1509) was born January 28, 1457 in Pembroke Castle, Pembrokeshire, Wales, and died April 21, 1509 in Richmond Palace, England. He married ELIZABETH OF YORK January 18, 1486 in Westminster, daughter of EDWARD and ELIZABETH WOODVILLE. She was born February 11, 1466 in Westminster Palace, and died February 11, 1503 in the Tower of London. Both HENRY VII and ELIZABETH OF YORK are buried in the Henry VII Chapel, Westminster Abbey, London.

Children of HENRY TUDOR and ELIZABETH are:

i. PRINCE OF WALES ARTHUR TUDOR, b. September 20, 1486, St. Swithin's, Priory, Winchester, d. April 2, 1502, Ludlow Castle; m. CATHERINE OF ARAGON, November 14, 1501, St. Paul's Cathedral, London; b. December 15, 1485, Near Madrid, Spain, d. January 7, 1536, Kimbolton Castle, Hunts, England. After Arthur's death she married his brother Henry.

ii. MARGARET TUDOR, b. November 28, 1489, Westminster, Palace, London, England, d. October 18, 1541, Methven Castle.

iii. **KING HENRY VIII (1509-1547)**, b. June 28, 1491, Greenwich Palace, d. January 28, 1547, Whitehall, London.

iv. ELIZABETH TUDOR, b. July 2, 1492, d. September 14, 1495, Eltham Palace, England.

v. MARY TUDOR, b. March 18, 1496, Richmond Palace, d. June 25, 1533, Westhorpe, Suffolk.

vi. EDMUND TUDOR, b. February 21, 1499, Greenwich, Palace, England, d. June 19, 1500, Bishops Hatfield, Herts, England.

vii. KATHERINE TUDOR, b. February 2, 1503, Tower of London, England, d. 1503, England.

Generation No. 21

29. ELIZABETH OF YORK was born February 11, 1466 in Westminster, Palace, London, England, and died February 11, 1503 in

the Tower of London. She married **KING HENRY VII TUDOR** January 18, 1486 in Westminster, son of EDMUND TUDOR and MARGARET BEAUFORT. He was born January 28, 1457 in Pembroke Castle, Pembrokeshire, Wales, and died April 21, 1509 in Richmond Palace, England.

30. KING HENRY VIII (1509-1547) was born June 28, 1491 in Greenwich Palace, England, and died January 28, 1547 in Whitehall, London. He married (1) CATHERINE OF ARAGON June 11, 1509 in Grey Friars Church, Greenwich, daughter of FERDINAND and ISABELLA. She was born December 15, 1485 in Madrid, Spain, and died January 7, 1536 in Kimbolton Castle, Hunts, England. He married (2) ANNE BOLEYN January 25, 1533 in Westminster, daughter of THOMAS BOLEYN and ELIZABETH HOWARD. She was born 1501 in Blickling Hall, Norfolk, England, and died May 19, 1536 in the Tower of London. He married (3) JANE SEYMOUR May 30, 1536 in York Place, England, daughter of JOHN SEYMOUR and MARGERIE WENTWORTH. She was born 1505 in Wolf Hall, Savernake, Wilts, and died October 24, 1537 in Hampton Court, Palace. He married (4) ANNE OF CLEVES January 6, 1540 in Greenwich, England, daughter of JOHN and MARIE. She was born September 22, 1515 in Dusseldorf, and died July 17, 1557 in Chelsea, England. He married (5) CATHERINE HOWARD July 28, 1540 in Hampton Court Palace, daughter of EDMUND HOWARD and JOYCE CULPEPER. She was born 1520 in Lambeth, and died February 13, 1542 in the Tower of London. He married (6) CATHERINE PARR July 12, 1543 in Hampton Court Palace, daughter of THOMAS PARR and MAUD GREEN. She was born 1512 in Kendal Castle, and died September 5, 1548 in Sudeley Castle, Gloucestershire.

Henry VIII remains one of the most controversial and much discussed monarchs of England. As king of England from 1509 to 1547, Henry VIII presided over the beginnings of the English Reformation, which was unleashed by his own matrimonial involvements, even though he never abandoned the fundamentals of the

Roman Catholic faith. Though exceptionally well served by a succession of brilliant ministers, Henry turned upon them all; those he elevated, he invariably cast down again. He was attracted to humanist learning and was something of an intellectual himself, but he was responsible for the deaths of the outstanding English humanists of the day. Though six times married, he left a minor heir and a dangerously complicated succession problem. Of his six wives, two joined a large tally of eminent persons executed for alleged treason; yet otherwise his regime observed the law of the land with painful particularity. Formidable in appearance, in memory, and in mind, and fearsome of temper, he yet attracted genuine devotion and knew how to charm people. Monstrously egotistical and surrounded by adulation, he nevertheless kept a reasonable grasp on the possible; forever taking false steps in politics, he emerged essentially unbeaten and superficially successful in nearly everything he attempted to do.

Henry VIII was neither statesman nor prophet, but also was he neither the blood-stained monster of one tradition nor the rowdy bon vivant of another. Though cold, self-centred, ungenerous, forever suspicious of the ways of the world, he could not descend to the second stereotype; despite a ruthlessness fed by self-righteousness, he never took the pleasure in killing required of the first. Simply, he never understood why the life of so well-meaning a man should have been beset by so many unmerited troubles. HENRY VIII is buried in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, England. CATHERINE OF ARAGON is buried at Peterborough Cathedral, England. ANNE BOLEYN is buried in the Chapel Royal, Tower of London. JANE SEYMOUR is buried in St. George's Chapel, Windsor. ANNE OF CLEVES is buried in Westminster Abbey, London. CATHERINE HOWARD is buried in the Chapel Royal, London. CATHERINE PARR is buried in Sudeley Castle.

Children of HENRY TUDOR and CATHERINE are

- i. DAUGHTER TUDOR, b. January 31, 1510; d. January 31, 1510.
- ii. DUKE OF CORNWALL HENRY (1) TUDOR, b. January 1, 1511, Richmond Palace, d. February 22, 1511, Richmond Palace.

iii. DUKE OF CORNWALL HENRY (2) TUDOR, b. November 1513, Richmond Palace, d. November 1513, Richmond Palace.

iv. SON TUDOR, b. December 1514, d. December 1514.

v. QUEEN MARY I (1553-1558), b. February 18, 1516, Greenwich Palace, d. November 17, 1558, St. James Palace; m. KING OF SPAIN PHILIP II, July 25, 1554, Winchester, Cathedral; b. May 21, 1527, Valladolid, d. September 13, 1598, El Escorial, Palace, Madrid. MARY I TUDOR is buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

vi. DAUGHTER TUDOR, b. November 10, 1518, d. November 10, 1518.

Children of HENRY TUDOR and ANNE BOLEYN are:

vii. QUEEN ELIZABETH I (1558-1603), b. September 7, 1533, Greenwich Palace, London, d. March 24, 1603, Richmond Palace, London. Did not marry. **Elizabeth I** (7 September 1533 - 24 March 1603) was Queen of England and Ireland from 17 November 1558 until her death on 24 March 1603. Sometimes called **the Virgin Queen**, **Gloriana** or **Good Queen Bess**, Elizabeth was the last of the five monarchs of the House of Tudor.

Elizabeth was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, his second wife, who was executed two-and-a-half years after Elizabeth's birth. Anne's marriage to Henry VIII was annulled, and Elizabeth was declared illegitimate. Her half-brother, Edward VI, ruled until his death in 1553, bequeathing the crown to Lady Jane Grey and ignoring the claims of his two half-sisters, the Roman Catholic Mary and the younger Elizabeth, in spite of statute law to the contrary. Edward's will was set aside and Mary became queen, deposing Lady Jane Grey. During Mary's reign, Elizabeth was imprisoned for nearly a year on suspicion of supporting Protestant rebels.

In 1558 upon Mary's death, Elizabeth succeeded her half-sister to the throne and set out to rule by good counsel. She depended heavily on a group of trusted advisers, led by William Cecil, 1st Baron Burghley. One of her first actions as Queen was the establishment of an English Protestant Church, of which she became the supreme governor.

This Elizabethan Religious Settlement was to evolve into the Church of England. It was expected that Elizabeth would marry and produce an heir; however, despite numerous courtships, she never did so. She was eventually succeeded by her first cousin twice removed, James VI of Scotland, laying the foundation for the Kingdom of Great Britain. She had earlier been responsible for the imprisonment and execution of James's mother, Mary, Queen of Scots.

Elizabeth established an English church that helped shape a national identity and remains in place today. Those who praised her later as a Protestant heroine overlooked her refusal to drop all practices of Catholic origin from the Church of England. Historians note that in her day, strict Protestants regarded the Acts of Settlement and Uniformity of 1559 as a compromise.

Though Elizabeth followed a largely defensive foreign policy, her reign raised England's status abroad. "She is only a woman, only mistress of half an island," marvelled Pope Sixtus V, "and yet she makes herself feared by Spain, by France, by the Empire, by all". Under Elizabeth, the nation gained a new self-confidence and sense of sovereignty, as Christendom fragmented. Elizabeth was the first Tudor to recognise that a monarch ruled by popular consent. She therefore always worked with parliament and advisers she could trust to tell her the truth—a style of government that her Stuart successors failed to follow. ELIZABETH I TUDOR is buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

viii. SON TUDOR, b. January 29, 1536, Greenwich, d. January 29, 1536, Greenwich.

Child of HENRY TUDOR and JANE SEYMOUR is:

ix. **KING EDWARD VI (1547-1553)** 22, b. October 12, 1537, Hampton Court, Palace, d. July 6, 1553, Greenwich Palace, England. EDWARD VI is buried in Westminster Abbey.

Generation No. 22

31. KING OF SCOTLAND JAMES V was born 1512 in Linlithgow, Scotland, and died 1542. He married (1) MADELEINE OF

FRANCE, daughter of FRANCIS and CLAUDE. She died 1537. He married (2) MARY OF GUISE 1538, daughter of DUKE OF GUISE CLAUDE. She was born 1515, and died 1560.

Child of JAMES and MARY is:

i. QUEEN OF SCOTS MARY STUART, b. December 7, 1542, Linlithgow, Scotland, d. February 8, 1587, England.

32. Children of FRANCES BRANDON and HENRY GREY are:

i. LADY CATHERINE GREY, d. 1568.

ii. LADY MARY GREY, d. 1578; m. THOMAS KEYES; d. 1571.

iii. **LADY JANE GREY** b. October 1537, Bradgate, Leicestershire, d. February 12, 1554, Tower of London; m. LORD GUILDFORD DUDLEY, May 21, 1553, Durham House, London; d. February 12, 1554, Tower of London. LADY JANE GREY was Queen for 9 days. She is buried in the Tower of London, Chapel Royal, London.

Generation No. 23

33. QUEEN OF SCOTS MARY STUART was born December 7, 1542 in Linlithgow, Scotland, and was executed by decapitation at Fotheringay Castle, Northants on February 8, 1587. She married (1) KING OF FRANCE FRANCIS II April 24, 1558 in Paris, France, son of HENRY and CATHERINE DE MEDICI. He was born January 19, 1544 in Fontainebleau, France, and died December 5, 1560 in Orleans, France. She married (2) LORD DARNLEY HENRY STUART July 29, 1565 in Edinburgh, Scotland, son of MATTHEW STUART and MARGARET DOUGLAS. He was born 1545, and died 1567. She married (3) EARL BOTHWELL JAMES HEPBURN about 1567. He died 1576.

Child of MARY STUART and HENRY STUART is:

i. **JAMES I (JAMES VI OF SCOTLAND) KING OF ENGLAND (103-1625)** STUART, b. June 19, 1566, Edinburgh Castle, Scotland, d. March 27, 1625, Theobalds Park, Hertfordshire.

Generation No. 24

34. KING JAMES I (JAMES VI KING OF SCOTLAND) (1603-1625) STUART was born June 19, 1566 in Edinburgh Castle, Scotland, and died March 27, 1625 in Theobalds Park, Hertfordshire. He married ANNE OF DENMARK November 23, 1589 in Oslo, Norway, daughter of FREDERICK and SOPHIA. She was born October 14, 1574 in Skanderborg, Castle, and died March 4, 1619 in Hampton Court Palace. JAMES I STUART: and ANNE OF DENMARK are both buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

Children of JAMES STUART and ANNE are:

i. PRINCE OF WALES HENRY FREDERICK STUART, b. February 19, 1594, Stirling Castle, d. November 6, 1612, St. James Palace, England.

ii. ELIZABETH STUART, b. August 19, 1596, Dunfermline, d. February 13, 1662, Leicester House, London.

iii. MARGARET STUART, b. December 24, 1598, Dalkeith Palace, d. March 1600, Linlithgow.

iv. **KING CHARLES I (1625-1649)**, b. November 19, 1600, Dunfermline, Scotland, executed January 30, 1649, Whitehall Palace, England.

v. DUKE OF KINTYRE ROBERT STUART, b. January 18, 1602, Dunfermline, d. May 27, 1602, Dunfermline.

vi. SON, b. May 1603, Stirling, d. May 1603, Stirling.

vii. MARY STUART, b. April 8, 1605, Greenwich Palace, d. September 16, 1607, Stanwell Park, Middlesex.

viii. SOPHIA STUART, b. June 22, 1606, Greenwich Palace, d. June 23, 1606, Greenwich Palace.

Generation No. 25

35. KING CHARLES I (1625-1649) STUART was born November 19, 1600 in Dunfermline, Scotland, and died January 30, 1649 in Whitehall Palace, England. His authoritarian rule and quarrels with Parliament provoked a civil war that led to his execution. He

married HENRIETTA MARIA OF FRANCE June 13, 1625 in Canterbury, England, daughter of HENRY and MARIE DE' MEDICI. She was born November 26, 1609 in Hotel du Louvre, Paris, and died August 31, 1669 in Colombe, near Paris. CHARLES I STUART is buried in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, England. HENRIETTA MARIA OF FRANCE is buried in St. Denis

Children of CHARLES STUART and HENRIETTA are:

i. DUKE OF CORNWALL CHARLES JAMES STUART, b. May 13, 1629, Greenwich Palace, d. May 13, 1629, Greenwich Palace.

ii. **KING CHARLES II (1660-1685)** STUART, b. May 29, 1630, St. James Palace, London, d. February 6, 1685, Whitehall Palace, England; m. CATHERINE OF BRAGANZA, May 20, 1662, Portsmouth, England; b. November 25, 1638, Vila Vicosa, Lisbon, d. December 31, 1705, Bemposta, Palace, Lisbon. CHARLES II STUART is buried in Westminster Abbey, London. CATHERINE OF BRAGANZA is buried in Belem.

iii. PRINCESS ROYAL MARY STUART, b. November 4, 1631, St. James Palace, London, d. December 24, 1660, Whitehall Palace.

iv. **KING JAMES II (1685-1689)** STUART, b. October 14, 1633, St. James Palace, London, d. September 6, 1701, St. Germain- en-Laye, France.

v. ELIZABETH STUART, b. December 29, 1635, St. James Palace, London, d. September 8, 1650, Carisbrooke, Castle, Isle of Wight, England.

vi. ANNE STUART, b. March 17, 1637, St. James Palace, London, d. November 5, 1640, Richmond Palace, England.

vii. CATHERINE STUART, b. June 29, 1639, Whitehall Palace, d. June 29, 1639, Whitehall Palace.

viii. DUKE HENRY OF GLOUCESTER STUART, b. July 8, 1640, Otlands, Surrey, d. September 13, 1660, Whitehall Palace.

ix. HENRIETTA ANNE STUART, b. June 16, 1644, Bedford House, Exeter, d. June 30, 1670, St. Cloud.

Generation No. 26

36. SOPHIA HANOVER was born 1630, and died 1714. She married DUKE ERNEST AUGUSTUS OF BRUNSWICK. He was born 1629, and died 1698.

Children of SOPHIA HANOVER and ERNEST are:

- i. DUKE OF YORK ERNEST AUGUSTUS.
- ii. FREDERICK AUGUSTUS, d. 1690.
- iii. MAXIMILIAN WILLIAM, d. 1726.
- iv. CHARLES PHILIP, d. 1690.
- v. CHRISTIAN, d. 1703.
- vi. **GEORGE I, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1714-1727)** HANOVER, b. May 28, 1660, Leineschloss, Osnabruck, Hanover, Germany, d. June 11, 1727, Osnabruck.
- vii. SOPHIA CHARLOTTE, b. October 20, 1668, Schloss Iburg, Osnabruck, d. February 1, 1705, Hanover.

37. PRINCESS ROYAL MARY STUART was born November 4, 1631 in St. James Palace, London, England, and died December 24, 1660 in Whitehall Palace, England. She married PRINCE WILLIAM II OF ORANGE. He was born 1626, and died 1650.

Child of MARY STUART and WILLIAM is:

i. **KING WILLIAM III, (1689-1702)** STUART, b. November 14, 1650, The Hague, Netherlands, d. March 19, 1702, Kensington Palace, England; m. **MARY II, QUEEN (1689-1694)** November 4, 1677, St. James Palace; b. April 30, 1662, St. James Palace, d. December 28, 1694, Kensington, Palace, London. WILLIAM III OF ORANGE STUART and MARY II: are both buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

38. **KING JAMES II** STUART was born October 14, 1633 in St. James Palace, London, and died September 6, 1701 in St. Germain-en-Laye, France. He married (1) ANNE HYDE November 24, 1659 in Breda, daughter of EARL OF CLAREDON EDWARD HYDE. She was born March 12, 1638 in Cranbourne Lodge, Near, Windsor, and died March 31, 1671 in St. James Palace, London. He married (2) MARY BEATRICE OF MODENA November 21, 1673 in Dover,

daughter of ALFONSO D'ESTE and LAURA MORTINOZZI. She was born September 25, 1658, and died May 7, 1718 in St. Germain-en-Laye, France. KING JAMES II STUART is buried in St. Germain-en-Laye, France. MARY BEATRICE OF MODENA is buried in the Convent of, Chaillot, France

Children of JAMES STUART and ANNE HYDE are:

i. DUKE CHARLES OF CAMBRIDGE 27, b. October 22, 1660, Worcester House, London, d. May 5, 1661, Whitehall.

ii. **MARY II**, b. April 30, 1662, St. James Palace, London, d. December 28, 1694, Kensington Palace, London; m. **WILLIAM III OF ORANGE STUART**, November 4, 1677, St. James Palace; b. November 14, 1650, The Hague, Netherlands, d. March 19, 1702, Kensington Palace. MARY II is buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

iii. DUKE JAMES OF CAMBRIDGE, b. July 12, 1663, St. James Palace, London, d. May 22, 1667, St. James Palace, London.

iv. **QUEEN ANNE (1702-1714) STUART**, b. February 6, 1665, St. James Palace, London, d. August 1, 1714, Kensington, Palace, London.

v. DUKE OF KENDAL CHARLES, b. July 4, 1666, St. James Palace, London, d. June 20, 1667, Richmond Palace, London.

vi. DUKE EDGAR OF CAMBRIDGE, b. September 14, 1667, St. James Palace, London, d. November 15, 1669, Richmond Palace, London.

vii. HENRIETTA, b. January 13, 1669, Whitehall, England, d. November 15, 1669, St. James Palace, England.

viii. CATHERINE, b. February 9, 1671, Whitehall, England, d. December 5, 1671, St. James Palace, England.

39. GEORGE I, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1714-1727), HANOVER was born May 28, 1660 in Leineschloss, Osnabruck, Hanover, Germany, and died June 11, 1727 in Osnabruck. He married SOPHIA DOROTHEA OF CELLE November 22, 1682 in Celle, daughter of GEORGE and CELLE. She was born September 10, 1666, and died November 13, 1726. GEORGE I HANOVER burial was moved in 1957 to Herrenhausen. SOPHIA DOROTHEA OF CELLE is buried in Celle.

Children of GEORGE HANOVER and SOPHIA are:

i. **GEORGE II, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1727-1760)** HANOVER, b. October 30, 1683, Herrenhausen, Palace, Hannover, Germany, d. October 25, 1760, Kensington, Palace, London.

ii. SOPHIA DOROTHEA HANOVER, b. March 26, 1687, Hanover, d. June 28, 1757, Monbijou Palace, Berlin, Germany.

40. ANNE, QUEEN OF ENGLAND (1702-1714) STUART was born February 6, 1665 in St. James Palace, London, and died August 1, 1714 in Kensington, Palace, London. She married PRINCE GEORGE OF DENMARK July 28, 1683 in Chapel Royal, St. James, England, son of FREDERICK and SOPHIA. He was born April 2, 1653 in Copenhagen, Denmark, and died October 28, 1708 in Kensington, Palace. On 1 May 1707, under the Acts of Union, the kingdoms of England and Scotland united as a single sovereign state known as Great Britain. She continued to reign as Queen of Great Britain and Ireland until her death in 1714. Anne was plagued by ill health throughout her life, and from her thirties, she grew increasingly ill and obese. Despite seventeen pregnancies she died without surviving issue and was the last monarch of the House of Stuart. Under the Act of Settlement 1701, which excluded all Catholics, she was succeeded by her second cousin George I of the House of Hanover. QUEEN ANNE STUART is buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

Children of ANNE STUART and GEORGE are:

i. DAUGHTER, b. May 12, 1684, d. May 12, 1684.

ii. MARY, b. June 2, 1685, Whitehall, England, d. February 8, 1687, Windsor Castle, Berkshire.

iii. ANNE SOPHIA, b. May 12, 1686, Windsor Castle, Berkshire, d. February 2, 1687, Windsor Castle, Berkshire.

iv. SON, b. October 22, 1687, d. October 22, 1687.

v. DUKE WILLIAM OF GLOUCESTER, b. July 24, 1689, Hampton Court, Palace, d. July 30, 1700, Windsor Castle, Berkshire.

vi. MARY, b. October 14, 1690, St. James Palace, London, d. October 14, 1690, St. James Palace, London.

- vii. GEORGE, b. April 17, 1692, Syon House, Brentford, Middlesex, d. April 17, 1692, Syon House, Brentford.
- viii. DAUGHTER, b. March 23, 1693, Berkeley House, England, d. March 23, 1693, Berkeley House, England.
- ix. DAUGHTER, b. February 18, 1696, d. February 18, 1696.
- x. SON, b. September 20, 1696, Windsor, Berkshire, d. September 20, 1696, Windsor.
- xi. SON, b. September 15, 1698, d. September 15, 1698.
- xii. DAUGHTER, b. January 25, 1700, d. January 25, 1700.

Generation No. 28

41. GEORGE II, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1727-1760) HANOVER was born October 30, 1683 in Herrenhausen, Palace, Hannover, Germany, and died October 25, 1760 in Kensington, Palace, London. He married CAROLINE OF ANSBACH August 22, 1705 in Herrenhausen, daughter of MARGRAVE JOHN FREDERICK OF BRANDENBURG. She was born 1683, and died 1737. GEORGE II HANOVER is buried in Westminster Abbey, London.

Children of GEORGE HANOVER and CAROLINE are:

- i. PRINCE OF WALES FREDERICK LOUIS 29 HANOVER, b. January 31, 1701, Hanover, d. March 31, 1751, Leicester House, London.
- ii. PRINCESS ROYAL ANNE HANOVER, b. November 2, 1709, Herrenhausen, d. January 12, 1759, The Hague.
- iii. AMELIA SOPHIA ELEANOR HANOVER, b. July 10, 1711, Herrenhausen, d. October 31, 1786, Cavendish Square, London.
- iv. CAROLINE ELIZABETH HANOVER, b. June 21, 1713, Herrenhausen, d. December 28, 1757, St. James Palace, England.
- v. SON, b. November 20, 1716, St. James Palace, London, d. November 20, 1716, St. James Palace, London.
- vi. GEORGE WILLIAM HANOVER, b. November 13, 1717, St. James Palace, London, d. February 17, 1718, Kensington, Palace, London.

vii. DUKE WILLIAM AUGUSTUS OF CUMBERLAND HANOVER, b. April 26, 1721, Leicester House, d. October 31, 1765, London.

viii. MARY HANOVER, b. March 5, 1723, Leicester House, d. January 14, 1772, Hanau.

ix. LOUISA HANOVER, b. December 18, 1724, Leicester House, London, d. December 19, 1751, Christiansborg, Denmark.

Generation No. 29

42. PRINCE OF WALES FREDERICK LOUIS HANOVER was born January 31, 1701 in Hanover, and died March 31, 1751 in Leicester-House, London. He married **AUGUSTA OF SAXE-GOTHA** May 8, 1736 in Chapel Royal, St. James, daughter of **FREDERICK** and **MAGDALENA**. She was born November 30, 1719 in Gotha, and died February 8, 1772 in Carlton House.

Children of **FREDERICK HANOVER** and **AUGUSTA** are:

i. **AUGUSTA HANOVER**, b. August 12, 1737, St. James Palace, London, d. March 23, 1813, London, England.

ii. **GEORGE III, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1760-1820) HANOVER**, b. June 4, 1738, Norfolk-House, St. James Square, London, d. January 29, 1820, Windsor Castle.

iii. **DUKE OF YORK EDWARD AUGUSTUS HANOVER**, b. March 25, 1739, Norfolk House, d. September 17, 1767, Monaco.

iv. **ELIZABETH CAROLINE HANOVER**, b. January 10, 1741, d. September 4, 1759, Kew Palace.

v. **DUKE EDWARD HENRY OF GLOUCESTER HANOVER**, b. November 25, 1743, Leicester House, d. August 25, 1805, Gloucester House.

vi. **DUKE HENRY FREDERICK OF CUMBERLAND HANOVER**, b. November 7, 1745, Leicester House, d. September 18, 1790, London, England; m. **HON. ANNE HORTON**; d. 1808.

vii. **LOUISA ANNE HANOVER**, b. March 19, 1749, Leicester House, d. May 13, 1768, Carlton House.

viii. FREDERICK WILLIAM HANOVER, b. May 24, 1750, Leicester House, d. December 29, 1765, Leicester House.

ix. CAROLINE MATILDA HANOVER, b. July 22, 1751, Leicester House, d. May 10, 1775, Celle.

Children of MARY HANOVER and FREDERICK are:

i. ELECTOR WILLIAM IX OF HESSE-CASSEL.

ii. LANDGRAVE FREDERICK OF HESSE-CASSEL, b. 1747; d. 1837.

Generation No. 30

43. GEORGE III, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1760-1820) HANOVER was born June 4, 1738 in Norfolk-House, St. James Square, London, and died January 29, 1820 in Windsor Castle. He married (*SOPHIA*) CHARLOTTE, daughter of CHARLES and ELIZABETH ALBERTIN. She was born May 19, 1744 in Mirow, and died November 17, 1818 in Kew Palace. George was the third Hanoverian monarch and the first one to be born in England and to use English as his first language. George III is widely remembered for two things: losing the American colonies and going mad. KING GEORGE III HANOVER and (*SOPHIA*) CHARLOTTE are buried in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle.

Children of GEORGE HANOVER and (*SOPHIA*) are:

i. **GEORGE IV, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1820-1830)** HANOVER, b. August 12, 1762, London, d. June 26, 1830, Windsor Castle.

ii. DUKE OF YORK FREDERICK HANOVER, b. August 16, 1763, St. James Palace, London, d. January 5, 1827, Rutland House, Arlington St., London; m. PRINCESS FREDERICA CHARLOTTE OF PRUSSIA; b. May 7, 1767, Charlottenburg; d. August 6, 1820, Otlands Park, Weybridge, Surrey, England.

iii. **WILLIAM IV HENRY, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1830-1837)** HANOVER, b. August 21, 1765, Buckingham House, London, d. June 20, 1837, Windsor Castle.

iv. PRINCESS ROYAL CHARLOTTE AUGUSTA MATILDA HANOVER, b. September 29, 1766, Buckingham House, St. James Park, London, d. October 6, 1828, Ludwigsburg; m. KING FREDERICK I OF WURTTENBERG, May 18, 1797, Chapel Royal, St James Palace, England; b. 1754, d. 1816.

v. DUKE OF KENT EDWARD AUGUSTUS HANOVER, b. November 2, 1767, Buckingham House, London, d. January 23, 1820, Sidmouth, Devon, England.

vi. AUGUSTA SOPHIA HANOVER, b. November 8, 1768, Buckingham House, d. September 22, 1840, Clarence House, St. James.

vii. ELIZABETH HANOVER, b. May 22, 1770, Buckingham House, d. January 10, 1840, Frankfurt-am-Main; m. LANDGRAVE FREDERICK VI OF HESSE-HOMBURG, April 7, 1818, Buckingham House; b. 1769, d. 1829.

viii. KING OF HANOVER ERNEST AUGUSTUS I HANOVER, b. June 5, 1771, Buckingham House, London, d. November 18, 1851, Herrenhausen.

ix. DUKE OF SUSSEX AUGUSTUS FREDERICK HANOVER, b. January 27, 1773, Buckingham House, d. April 21, 1843, Kensington Palace.

x. DUKE ADOLPHUS OF CAMBRIDGE HANOVER, b. 1774, d. 1850.

xi. MARY HANOVER, b. April 25, 1776, Buckingham House, d. April 30, 1857, Gloucester House, Piccadilly, London; m. DUKE WILLIAM FREDERICK OF GLOUCESTER; b. 1776, d. 1834.

xii. SOPHIA HANOVER, b. November 2, 1777, Buckingham House, d. May 27, 1848, Vicarage Place, Kensington.

xiii. OCTAVIUS HANOVER, b. February 23, 1779, Buckingham House, d. May 3, 1783, Kew Palace.

xiv. ALFRED HANOVER, b. September 22, 1780, Windsor Castle, d. August 20, 1783, Windsor Castle.

xv. AMELIA HANOVER, b. August 7, 1783, Royal Lodge, Windsor, d. November 2, 1810, Augusta Lodge, Windsor.

Generation No. 31

44. GEORGE IV, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1820-1830) HANOVER was born August 12, 1762 in London, England, and died June 26, 1830 in Windsor Castle. He married (1) MARIA ANNE FITZHERBERT 1785. She was born 1756, and died 1837. He married (2) CAROLINE AMELIA OF BRUNSWICK April 8, 1795 in Chapel Royal, St James Palace, England, daughter of CHARLES and AUGUSTA HANOVER. She was born 1768, and died 1821.

45. WILLIAM IV HENRY, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1830-1837) HENRY HANOVER was born August 21, 1765 in Buckingham House, London, and died June 20, 1837 in Windsor Castle. He married PRINCESS ADELAIDE LOUISA THERESA July 11, 1818 in Kew Palace, daughter of GEORGE and LOUISA. She was born August 13, 1792 in Meiningen, and died December 2, 1849 near Stanmore, Middlesex. KING WILLIAM IV and PRINCESS ADELAIDE LOUISA THERESA are both buried in St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

Children of WILLIAM HANOVER and ADELAIDE are:

- i. CHARLOTTE AUGUSTA LOUISA HANOVER, b. 1819, d. March 27, 1819, Furstenhof, Hanover.
- ii. ELIZABETH GEORGIANA ADELAIDE HANOVER, b. December 10, 1820, St. James Palace, d. March 4, 1821, St. James Palace.
- iii. TWIN-BOY 1, b. April 23, 1822, Bushy Park, d. April 23, 1822, Bushy Park.
- iv. TWIN-BOY 2, b. April 23, 1822, Bushy Park, d. April 23, 1822, Bushy Park.

46. DUKE OF KENT EDWARD AUGUSTUS HANOVER was born November 2, 1767 in Buckingham House, London, and died January 23, 1820 in Sidmouth, Devon. He married VICTORIA MARY LOUISA July 11, 1818 in Kew Palace, daughter of FRANCIS and AUGUSTA. She was born August 17, 1786 in Coburg, and died March 16, 1861 in Frogmore House, Windsor, England.

Child of EDWARD HANOVER and VICTORIA is:

i. **VICTORIA, QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1837-1901)** HANOVER, b. May 24, 1819, Kensington Palace, London, d. January 22, 1901, Osborne House, Isle of Wight.

Generation No. 32

47. VICTORIA, QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1837-1901) was born May 24, 1819 in Kensington, Palace, London, and died January 22, 1901 in Osborne House, Isle of Wight, England. She married PRINCE ALBERT AUGUSTUS CHARLES February 10, 1840 in Chapel Royal, St. James Palace, son of ERNEST and LOUISE. He was born August 26, 1819 in Schloss Rosenau, near Coburg, Germany, and died December 14, 1861 in Windsor Castle. Victoria was Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland from 20 June 1837 until her death. She adopted the additional title of Empress of India on 1 May 1876. Known as the Victorian era, her reign of 63 years and seven months was longer than that of any of her predecessors. It was a period of industrial, cultural, political, scientific, and military change within the United Kingdom, and was marked by a great expansion of the British Empire.

Victoria's links with Europe's royal families earned her the nickname "the grandmother of Europe". Of the 42 grandchildren of Victoria and Albert, 34 survived to adulthood. Their living descendants include Elizabeth II; Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh; Harald V of Norway; Carl XVI Gustaf of Sweden; Margrethe II of Denmark; and Felipe VI of Spain. Victoria's youngest son, Leopold, was affected by the blood-clotting disease haemophilia B and at least two of her five daughters, Alice and Beatrice, were carriers. Royal haemophiliacs descended from Victoria included her great-grandsons, Alexei Nikolaevich, Tsarevich of Russia; Alfonso, Prince of Asturias; and Infante Gonzalo of Spain. The presence of the disease in Victoria's descendants, but not in her ancestors, led to modern speculation that her true father was not the Duke of Kent, but a haemophiliac. There is no

documentary evidence of a haemophiliac in connection with Victoria's mother, and as male carriers always suffer the disease, even if such a man had existed he would have been seriously ill. It is more likely that the mutation arose spontaneously because Victoria's father was over 50 at the time of her conception and haemophilia arises more frequently in the children of older fathers. **QUEEN VICTORIA HANOVER** and **PRINCE ALBERT AUGUSTUS CHARLES** are both buried in the Royal Mausoleum, Frogmore, Windsor.

Children of **VICTORIA HANOVER** and **ALBERT** are:

i. **PRINCESS ROYAL VICTORIA ADELAIDE MARY**, b. November 21, 1840, Buckingham Palace, London, d. August 5, 1901, Friedrichshof, Near, Kronberg, Taunus.

ii. **EDWARD VII, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1901-1910) WETTIN**, b. November 9, 1841, Buckingham Palace, d. May 6, 1910, Buckingham Palace.

iii. **PRINCESS ALICE MAUD MARY**, b. April 25, 1843, Buckingham Palace, London, d. December 14, 1878, Darmstadt, Germany.

iv. **PRINCE ALFRED ERNEST ALBERT**, b. August 6, 1844, Windsor Castle, d. July 30, 1900, Schloss Rosenau, near Coburg.

v. **PRINCESS HELENA AUGUSTA VICTORIA**, b. May 25, 1846, Buckingham Palace, d. June 9, 1923, Schomberg House, Pall Mall, London.

vi. **PRINCESS LOUISE CAROLINE ALBERTA**, b. March 18, 1848, Buckingham Palace, d. December 3, 1939, Kensington, Palace, London; m. **DUKE OF ARGYLL JOHN CAMPBELL**, March 21, 1871, St. George's Chapel, Windsor; b. 1845, d. 1914.

vii. **PRINCE ARTHUR WILLIAM PATRICK**, b. May 1, 1850, Buckingham Palace, d. January 16, 1942, Bagshot Park, Surrey.

viii. **PRINCE LEOPOLD GEORGE DUNCAN**, b. April 7, 1853, Buckingham, Palace, d. March 28, 1884, Cannes.

ix. **PRINCESS BEATRICE MARY VICTORIA**, b. April 14, 1857, Buckingham Palace, d. October 26, 1944, Bantridge Park, Balcombe, Sussex.

Generation No. 33

48. EDWARD VII, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, (1901-1910) WETTIN was born November 9, 1841 in Buckingham, Palace, and died May 6, 1910 in Buckingham, Palace. He married PRINCESS ALEXANDRA OF DENMARK "ALIX" March 10, 1863 in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, daughter of CHRISTIAN and LOUISE. She was born December 1, 1844 in Yellow Palace, Copenhagen, Denmark, and died November 20, 1925 in Sandringham, Norfolk, England. KING EDWARD VII WETTIN was buried on May 20, 1910, Windsor.

Children of EDWARD WETTIN and ALEXANDRA are:

i. DUKE ALBERT VICTOR CHRISTIAN, b. January 8, 1864, Frogmore House, Windsor, d. January 14, 1892, Sandringham, Norfolk, England.

ii. **GEORGE V, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1910-1936)** WINDSOR, b. June 3, 1865, Marlborough House, London, d. January 20, 1936, Sandringham, Norfolk, England.

iii. PRINCESS ROYAL LOUISE VICTORIA ALEXANDRA, b. February 20, 1867, Marlborough, House, London, d. January 4, 1931, Portman Square, London.

iv. VICTORIA ALEXANDRA OLGA, b. July 6, 1868, Marlborough, House, London, d. December 3, 1935, Coppins, Iver, Bucks, England.

v. PRINCESS MAUDE CHARLOTTE MARY, b. November 26, 1869, Marlborough, House, London, d. November 20, 1938, London.

vi. JOHN ALEXANDER, b. April 6, 1871; d. April 7, 1871.

v. FREDERICK HAROLD, b. May 12, 1876; d. May 20, 1876.

49. QUEEN MARY OF TECK (MAY) was born May 26, 1867 in Kensington, Palace, London, and died March 24, 1953 in Marlborough House, London. She married **KING GEORGE V WINDSOR** July 6, 1893 in Chapel Royal, St. James Palace, son of EDWARD WETTIN and ALEXANDRA. He was born June 3, 1865 in Marlborough House, London, and died January 20, 1936 in Sandringham, Norfolk, England. QUEEN MARY OF TECK (MAY)

and KING GEORGE V WINDSOR are both buried in Windsor Castle, St. George's Chapel, Berkshire.

Children of MARY and GEORGE WINDSOR are:

i) **DUKE OF WINDSOR EDWARD VIII, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1936)** WINDSOR, b. June 23, 1894, White Lodge, Richmond Park, Surrey, England, d. May 28, 1972, Paris, France; m. BESSIE WALLIS WARFIELD, June 3, 1937, Chateau de Cande, Monts, France; b. 1896, U.S.A., d. April 24, 1986, Paris. In 1936, a constitutional crisis in the British Empire arose when King-Emperor Edward VIII proposed to marry Wallis Simpson, an American socialite who was divorced from her first husband and was pursuing the divorce of her second.

The marriage was opposed by the governments of the United Kingdom and the Dominions of the British Commonwealth. Religious, legal, political, and moral objections were raised. As the British monarch, Edward was the nominal head of the Church of England, which did not then allow divorced people to remarry in church if their ex-spouses were still alive. For this reason, it was widely believed that Edward could not marry Simpson and remain on the throne. Simpson was perceived to be politically and socially unsuitable as a prospective queen consort because of her two failed marriages. It was widely assumed by the Establishment that she was driven by love of money or position rather than love for the King. Despite the opposition, Edward declared that he loved Simpson and intended to marry her as soon as her second divorce was finalized.

The widespread unwillingness to accept Simpson as the King's consort and Edward's refusal to give her up led to his abdication in December 1936. He was succeeded by his brother Albert, who became George VI. Edward was given the title of Duke of Windsor, and styled *Royal Highness*, following his abdication, and he married Simpson the following year. They remained married until his death 35 years later. Both DUKE OF WINDSOR EDWARD VIII WINDSOR and BESSIE WALLIS WARFIELD are buried in Frogmore, Windsor.

ii. **GEORGE VI, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1936-1952)** WINDSOR, b. December 14, 1895, York Cottage, Sandringham, Norfolk, d. February 6, 1952, Sandringham.

iii. **PRINCESS ROYAL MARY WINDSOR**, b. April 25, 1897, York Cottage, Sandringham, Norfolk, d. March 28, 1965, Harewood House, Yorkshire.

iv. **DUKE HENRY WILLIAM FREDERICK WINDSOR**, b. March 31, 1900, York Cottage, Sandringham, d. 1974.

v. **DUKE OF KENT GEORGE EDWARD ALEXANDER WINDSOR**, b. December 20, 1902, York Cottage, Sandringham, d. August 25, 1942, Morven, Scotland.

vi. **PRINCE JOHN CHARLES FRANCIS WINDSOR**, b. July 12, 1905, York Cottage, Sandringham, d. January 18, 1919, Wood Farm, Wolferton, Norfolk.

Generation No. 34

50. GEORGE V, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1910-1936) WINDSOR was born June 3, 1865 in Marlborough House, London, and died January 20, 1936 in Sandringham, Norfolk. He married **QUEEN MARY OF TECK (MAY)** July 6, 1893 in Chapel Royal, St. James Palace, daughter of FRANCIS and MARY. She was born May 26, 1867 in Kensington, Palace, London, and died March 24, 1953 in Marlborough House, London. **GEORGE V WINDSOR** and **QUEEN MARY OF TECK (MAY)** are both buried at Windsor Castle, St. George's Chapel.

Children are listed above under Mary of Teck (May).

51. GEORGE VI, KING OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (1936-1952) WINDSOR was born December 14, 1895 in York Cottage, Sandringham, Norfolk, and died February 6, 1952 in Sandringham. He married **LADY ELIZABETH ANGELA MARGUERITE BOWES-LYON** April 26, 1923, daughter of **CLAUDE BOWES-LYON** and **CECILIA CAVENDISH-BENTIN**. She was born August 4, 1900 in London, and died March 30, 2002 at the Royal Lodge, Windsor. **KING GEORGE VI WINDSOR** is buried in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, England.

Children of GEORGE WINDSOR and ELIZABETH BOWES-LYON are:

i. **ELIZABETH II, QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (1952 -)** ALEXANDRA MARY WINDSOR, b. April 21, 1926, 17 Bruton St., London, W1.

ii. PRINCESS MARGARET ROSE WINDSOR, b. August 21, 1930, Glamis Castle, Angus, Scotland, d. February 9, 2002, King Edward VII hospital, London.

Generation No. 35

52. QUEEN ELIZABETH II ALEXANDRA MARY WINDSOR was born April 21, 1926 at 17 Bruton St., London, W1. She married PRINCE PHILIP MOUNTBATTEN November 20, 1947 in Westminster, Abbey, London, son of ANDREW and ALICE. He was born June 10, 1921 in the Isle of Kerkira, Mon Repos, Corfu, Greece. Queen Elizabeth II of Great Britain is the longest-reigning monarch in British history. She celebrated 65 years on the throne in February 2017 with her Sapphire Jubilee.

Children of ELIZABETH WINDSOR and PHILIP MOUNTBATTEN are:

i. PRINCE CHARLES PHILIP ARTHUR WINDSOR, b. November 14, 1948, Buckingham, Palace.

ii. PRINCESS ANNE ELIZABETH ALICE WINDSOR, b. August 15, 1950, Clarence House, London.

iii. DUKE OF YORK ANDREW ALBERT CHRISTIAN WINDSOR, b. February 19, 1960, Belgian Suite, Buckingham, Palace.

iv. PRINCE EDWARD ANTHONY RICHARD WINDSOR, b. March 10, 1964, Buckingham, Palace.

53. PRINCE PHILIP MOUNTBATTEN was born June 10, 1921 in Isle of Kerkira, Mon Repos, Corfu, Greece. He married **QUEEN OF ENGLAND ELIZABETH II** ALEXANDRA MARY WINDSOR November 20, 1947 in Westminster Abbey, London, daughter of GEORGE WINDSOR and ELIZABETH BOWES-LYON. She was born April 21, 1926 in 17 Bruton St., London W1.

Children are listed above under Elizabeth II Alexandra Mary Windsor.

Generation No. 36

54. PRINCE CHARLES PHILIP ARTHUR WINDSOR was born November 14, 1948 in Buckingham, Palace. He married LADY DIANA FRANCES SPENCER July 29, 1981 in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, daughter of EDWARD SPENCER and FRANCES BURKE ROCHE. She was born July 1, 1961 in Park House, Sandringham, Norfolk, and died August 31, 1997 in Paris, France. They divorced August 28, 1996. CHARLES married CAMILLA ROSEMARY SHAND PARKER BOWLES on April 9, 2005. She was born on July 17, 1947 in London.

Children of CHARLES WINDSOR and DIANA SPENCER are:

i. PRINCE WILLIAM ARTHUR PHILIP 37 WINDSOR, b. June 21, 1982, St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington, London. He married CATHERINE ELIZABETH MIDDLETON on April 29, 2011 at Westminster Abbey, London, daughter of MICHAEL MIDDLETON and CAROLE GOLDSMITH. She was born January 9, 1982, at Royal Berkshire Hospital.

ii. PRINCE HENRY CHARLES ALBERT WINDSOR, b. September 15, 1984, St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington, London.

55. PRINCESS ANNE ELIZABETH ALICE WINDSOR was born August 15, 1950 in Clarence House, St. James, England. She married (1) CAPTAIN MARK ANTHONY PETER PHILLIPS on November 14, 1973 in Westminster Abbey, London, England, son of MAJOR PETER PHILLIPS. He was born September 22, 1948. They divorced April 28, 1992. She married (2) Commander TIMOTHY LAURENCE on December 12, 1992.

Children of ANNE WINDSOR and MARK PHILLIPS are:

i. PETER MARK ANDREW PHILLIPS, b. November 15, 1977, St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington, London. He married AUTUMN PATRICIA KELLY on May 17, 2008, at St George's Chapel, Windsor. She was born May 3, 1978 in Montreal, Canada.

ii. ZARA ANNE ELIZABETH PHILLIPS, b. May 15, 1981, St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington, London. She married MICHAEL JAMES TINDALL on July 30, 2011, at Canongate Kirk, Edinburgh,, Scotland, son of PHILIP TINDALL. He was born October 18, 1978, in Otley, Yorkshire,

56. DUKE OF YORK ANDREW ALBERT CHRISTIAN WINDSOR was born February 19, 1960 in Belgian Suite, Buckingham Palace, England. He married **DUCHESS OF YORK SARAH MARGARET FERGUSON** July 23, 1986 in Westminster Abbey, London, England, daughter of **RONALD FERGUSON** and **SUSAN WRIGHT**. She was born October 15, 1959 in 27 Welbeck St., Marylebone, London. They divorced on May 30, 1996.

Children of **ANDREW WINDSOR** and **SARAH FERGUSON** are:

i. **PRINCESS BEATRICE ELIZABETH MARY WINDSOR**, b. August 8, 1988, Portland Hospital, England.

ii. **PRINCESS EUGENIE VICTORIA HELENA WINDSOR**, b. March 23, 1990, London, England.

57. PRINCE EDWARD ANTHONY RICHARD WINDSOR was born March 10, 1964, at Buckingham Palace, London. He married **SOPHIE RHYS-JONES** June 19, 1999 in St George's Chapel, Windsor. She was born January 20, 1965 in Oxford.

Children of **EDWARD WINDSOR** and **SOPHIE RHYS-JONES** are:

i. **LOUISE ALICE ELIZABETH MARY MOUNTBATTEN-WINDSOR** b. November 8, 2003.

ii. **JAMES ALEXANDER PHILIP THEO MOUNTBATTEN-WINDSOR** b. December 17, 2007.

Generation No. 37

Children of **WILLIAM WINDSOR** and Catherine Middleton are:

i. **PRINCE GEORGE ALEXANDER LOUIS** (b. 22 July 2013).

ii. **PRINCESS CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH DIANA** (b. 2 May 2015).

iii. **PRINCE LOUIS ARTHUR CHARLES** (b. 23 April 2018).

Marriage of PRINCE HENRY WINDSOR to MEGHAN MARKLE,
b. 4 August 1981, USA, 19 May 2018.

Child of HENRY WINDSOR and MEGHAN MARKLE:

i. PRINCE ARCHIE HARRISON MOUNTBATTEN-WINDSOR,
b. 6 May 2019.

Questions:

1. Which Monarch, in your opinion, has had the greatest positive influence on British life?

2. How far do you agree that all reform and change instituted by Kings and/or Queens have been as a reaction to external events and threats, and not Royal initiative?

Educational resource

**David Gillespie, Svetlana Gural,
Vladimir Smokotin, Marina Korneeva**

**MODERN BRITAIN: NEW REALITIES
AND CHALLENGES 2000-2020**

Textbook

This publication has been prepared in the authors' own redaction
Original layout by A. I. Leloiur.
Cover design by L. D. Kritvsova.

Authorized for printing on 08.02.2021. Format 60×84¹/₁₆.
Office equipment paper. Font Times.
No. of printers' sheets 15.3. No. of conventional printers' sheets 14.2.
Printed copies 100. Order no. 4638.

Printed on equipment of TSU Press
Tomsk 634050, Lenin Prospekt 36, tel. 8+(382-2)–52-98-49.
Website: <http://publish.tsu.ru>
E-mail: rio.tsu@mail.ru

ISBN 978-5-94621-980-8



9 785946 219808