THE RISE OF THE PRIME MINISTER IN GREAT BRITAIN:
William Pitt to Theresa May

by Roshan R. Varghese, 2017 CTI Fellow
David W. Butler High School

This Curriculum Unit is recommended for:
World History (Honors and Standard): Grade 9
American History I (Honors and Standard): Grade 11
American History II (Honors and Standard): Grade 12

Keywords: World History            American History I    American History II
prime minister            president            F. Roosevelt/W. Churchill
constitutional monarchy    limited government    R. Reagan/M. Thatcher
Magna Carta            U.S. Constitution    G.W. Bush/T. Blair

Teaching Standards: See Appendix 1 for teaching standards addressed in this Unit.

Synopsis: A series of powerful men and women have helped shape history by using their power and influence to rule over various groups of people, to conquer and control vast lands, and to create and sustain powerful empires and nations. In the case of the United States of America, that power base has often been consolidated through the role of the presidency, even despite the constitutional frameworks of checks and balances, limited government and checks and separation of powers. Despite what it has evolved in the aftermath of World War II, the Founding Fathers had always intended for the executive leadership to work hand-in-hand with the legislative and judicial branches for the betterment of the American people. The American form of the presidency was a derivative of the system created by Great Britain with its position of prime minister. Since its founding, the role of the prime minister has been added to, subtracted from, minimized, maximized and evolved from humble beginnings to what observers now see as, greater, in terms of both importance and projection, than the reigning monarch of the British Empire. Since the writing of the Magna Carta in the 13th Century, the monarchy has seen its influence increase and diminish based on the charismatic and tenacious desire of the respective monarch and the particular domestic and/or foreign challenge (i.e. war, economic hardship, etc.) facing Great Britain.

I plan to teach this Curriculum Unit during the coming academic year to approximately 200 students in American History I, II and World History, Honors and Standard level courses.

I give permission for Charlotte Teachers Institute to publish my Curriculum Unit in print and online. I understand that I will be credited as the author of my work.
THE RISE OF THE PRIME MINISTER IN GREAT BRITAIN:
William Pitt to Theresa May

Roshan R. Varghese

Introduction/Rationale

A series of powerful men and women have helped shape history by using their power and influence to rule over various groups of people, to conquer and control vast lands, and to create and sustain powerful empires and nations. In the case of the United States of America, that power base has often been consolidated through the role of the presidency, even despite the constitutional frameworks of checks and balances, limited government and checks and separation of powers. Despite what it has evolved in the aftermath of World War II, the Founding Fathers had always intended for the executive leadership to work hand-in-hand with the legislative and judicial branches for the betterment of the American people. The American form of the presidency was a derivative of the system created by Great Britain with its position of prime minister. Since its founding, the role of the prime minister has been added to, subtracted from, minimized, maximized and evolved from humble beginnings to what observers now see as, greater, in terms of both importance and projection, than the reigning monarch of the British Empire. Since the writing of the Magna Carta in the 13th Century, the monarchy has seen its influence increase and diminish based on the charismatic and tenacious desire of the respective monarch and the particular domestic and/or foreign challenge (i.e. war, economic hardship, etc.) facing Great Britain.

“To some, history is a matter of chance, to others it is fashioned by heroes and villains, and to others it is buried in geography, economics, even anthropology. There are many ways of telling a nation’s story, with a current fashion for the personal and controversial. There are histories social, cultural, ‘popular’ and, in England’s case, imperial. But a short history can only be selective, and the selection will be mostly devoted to politics. A nation is a political entity and its birth and development form a narrative of those who deployed power within it, be the monarchs, soldiers, politicians, the mob in the street or, more recently, the mass of voters. I regard history as more than a straight chronology but as links in a chain of cause and effect. It is this chain that holds the secret of how England came to be where it is today.”1

Teaching Objectives

In correlation with the Common Core Standards (adopted by the state of North Carolina in 2010, to be fully implemented and operational within all of the state’s classrooms by 2013) and the North Carolina Standard Course of Study for American History I and American History II (formerly, united together as United States History) and World History, this Curriculum Unit will individually meet the needs of honors, standard and inclusion students, based upon their instructional needs using a series of differentiation techniques. Since North Carolina has just recently adapted the Essential Standards for Common Core within the last few years, the ability
to fully connect the specific content to the required Essential Standard is much more difficult than it was to the previous Competency Goal and Objective, according to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

As defined by the state of the North Carolina, the purpose of the Common Core Standards is to strengthen academic standards for students, as they were developed by national experts with access to best practices and research from across the nation. Despite the uniformness amongst states that Common Core has brought, it has been highly speculated within North Carolina, that the state will choose to withdraw its participation within the consortium as early as 2015, so please be mindful that these Essential Standards may not still exist if you use this Curriculum Unit. Please reference www.NCPublicSchools.org for updated information, regarding to the state’s curriculum for these specific disciplines.

Below are the Common Core Essential Standards via the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for American History I (http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/curriculum/socialstudies/scos/american-history-1.pdf), American History II (http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/curriculum/socialstudies/scos/american-history-2.pdf) and World History (http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/curriculum/socialstudies/scos/world-history.pdf) that would effectively correspond to the content discussed within this particular unit:

As part of Essential Standard AH.1.H.2 of American History I, the student will be able to analyze key political, economic and social turning points in American History using historical thinking. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze key political, economic and social turning points from colonization through Reconstruction in terms of causes and effects (e.g., conflicts, legislation, elections, innovations, leadership, movements. Supreme Court decisions, etc.), as part of clarifying objectives AH1.H.2.1 and AH1.H.2.2.

As part of Essential Standard AH1.H.4 of American History I, the student will be able to analyze how conflict and compromise have shaped politics, economics and culture in the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the political issues and conflicts that impacted the United States through Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., American Revolution, Constitutional Convention, Bill of Rights, development of political parties, nullification, slavery, states’ rights, Civil War), as part of clarifying objective AH1.H.4.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH1.H.4.2, the student will be able to analyze the economic issues and conflicts that impacted the United States through Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., mercantilism, Revolutionary era taxation, National Bank, taxes, tariffs, territorial expansion, Economic “Panics”, Civil War).

As part of Essential Standard AH1.H.5 of American History I, the student will be able to understand how tensions between freedom, equality and power have shaped the political, economic and social development of the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to summarize how the philosophical, ideological and/or religious views on freedom and equality contributed to the development of American political and economic systems through Reconstruction (e.g., natural rights, First Great Awakening, Declaration of Independence, transcendentalism, suffrage, abolition, “slavery as a peculiar institution”, etc.), as
part of clarifying objective AH1.H.5.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH1.H.5.2, the student will be able to explain how judicial, legislative and executive actions have affected the distribution of power between levels of government from colonization through Reconstruction (e.g., the Marshall Court, Jacksonian era, nullification, secession, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.4 of American History II, the student will be able to analyze how conflict and compromise have shaped politics, economics and culture in the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the political issues and conflicts that impacted the United States since Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., Populism, Progressivism, working conditions and labor unrest, New Deal, Wilmington race riots, eugenics, Civil Rights Movement, anti-war protests, Watergate, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.4.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.4.2, the student will be able to analyze the economic issues and conflicts that impacted the United States since Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., currency policy, industrialization, urbanization, laissez-faire, labor unrest, New Deal, Great Society, supply-side economics, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.5 of American History II, the student will be able to understand how tensions between freedom, equality and power have shaped the political, economic and social development of the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to summarize how the philosophical, ideological and/or religious views on freedom and equality contributed to the development of American political and economic systems since Reconstruction (e.g., “separate but equal”, Social Darwinism, social gospel, civil service system, suffrage, Harlem Renaissance, the Warren Court, Great Society programs, American Indian Movement, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.5.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.5.2, the student will be able to explain how judicial, legislative and executive actions have affected the distribution of power between levels of government since Reconstruction (e.g., New Deal, Great Society, Civil Rights, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.6 of American History II, the student will be able to understand how and why the role of the United States in the world has changed over time. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain how national economic and political interests helped set the direction of United States foreign policy since Reconstruction (e.g., new markets, isolationism, neutrality, containment, homeland security, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.6.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.6.2, the student will be able to explain the reasons for United States involvement in global wars and the influence each involvement had on international affairs (e.g., Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Cold War, Korea, Vietnam, Gulf War, Iraqi War, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.7 of American History II, the student will be able to understand the impact of war on American politics, economics, society and culture. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on American politics since Reconstruction (e.g., spheres of influence, isolationist practices, containment policies, first and second Red Scare movements, patriotism, terrorist policies, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.7.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.7.2, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on the American economy since Reconstruction (e.g., mobilizing for war, war industries, rationing, women in the workforce, lend-lease policy, World War II
farming gains, GI Bill, etc.). With clarifying objective AH2.H.7.3, the student will also be able to explain the impact of wars on American society and culture since Reconstruction (e.g., relocation of Japanese Americans, American propaganda, first and second Red Scare movement, McCarthyism, baby boom, Civil Rights Movement, protest movements, ethnic, patriotism, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.3 of World History, the student will be able to understand how conflict and innovation influenced political, religious, economic and social changes in medieval civilizations. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain how religious and secular struggles for authority impacted the structure of government and society in Europe, Asia, and Africa (e.g., Cluniac Reforms, common law, Magna Carta, conflicts between popes and emperors, Crusades, religious schisms, Hundred Years’ War, etc.), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.3.2. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.3.3, the student will be able to analyze how innovations in agriculture, trade and business impacted the economic and social development of various medieval societies (e.g., Feudalism, Agricultural Revolutions, Commercial Revolution and development of a banking system, manorial system, growth of towns, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.7 of World History, the student will be able to understand how national, regional, and ethnic interests have contributed to conflict among groups and nations in modern era. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to evaluate key turning points of the modern era in terms of their lasting impact (e.g., conflicts, documents, policies, movements, etc.), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.7.1. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.7.3, the student will be able to analyze economic and political rivalries, ethnic and regional conflicts, and nationalism and imperialism as underlying causes of war (e.g., WWI, Russian Revolution, WWII).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.8 of World History, the student will be able to analyze global interdependence and shifts in power in terms of political, economic, social and environmental changes and conflicts since the last half of the twentieth century. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the “new” balance of power and the search for peace and stability in terms of how each has influenced global interactions since the last half of the twentieth century (e.g., post WWII, Post Cold War, 1990s Globalization, New World Order, global achievements and innovations), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.8.3. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.8.6, the student will be able to explain how liberal democracy, private enterprise and human rights movements have reshaped political, economic and social life in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, the Soviet Union and the United States (e.g., U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, end of Cold War, apartheid, perestroika, glasnost, etc.).

Demographic Background

David W. Butler High School is one of the thirty-two high schools within the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System, but the only one located within the town limits of Matthews. Opened in 1997, Butler High School was named in honor of David Watkins Butler, an outstanding mathematics teacher at West Charlotte High School who tragically lost his life in a house fire while attempting to save his family. During the 2011-12 school year, Butler High
School was designated as a "School of Distinction with High Growth" and one of only seventy-two schools in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools to meet all of the AMO targets. The school also met twenty out of the twenty goals for the 2011-12 academic year fulfilling all of the federal guidelines for the No Child Left Behind Act. From 2014-2016, David W. Butler High School was recognized by U.S. News and World Report as the #1 high school in CMS and the 5th highest rating in North Carolina. The graduation rate was at 91.6% in 2014-15, 92.7% in 2015-16, and 93.1 in 2016-17, reflecting a 1.5% growth in the last 2 calendar years, and 3.5% higher than the graduation rate among all Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools.\(^3\)

Out of the current student enrollment of 2133 at David W. Butler High School, the racial/ethnic breakdown is, as follows: 37% white, 30% African-American, 22% Hispanic and 5% Asian, with 51% of the student population male and 49% female. 10% of students are assisted through the Exceptional Children (EC) department, 7% are assisted through the English as a Second Language (ESL) department by being classified as having limited English proficiency (LEP), and 8% of students meet the requirements to be classified as academically gifted (AIG). 25 students at Butler High School are also federally-classified as McKinney Vento, meaning that they currently do not possess a residence and are homeless. Of those numbers, 43% and rising, subscribe to free/reduced lunch requirements, due to economic hardships and disadvantages, and are classified by Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools as economically disadvantaged.\(^4\)

Why share this information? By examining the demographic background of the entire school population, it will give a glimpse of the breakdown within our own individual classrooms. Unlike most, if not all, schools with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, David W. Butler High shows a tremendous amount of diversity amongst its student body. Since the end of the Swann era (the legendary Supreme Court case, *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 1971* was overturned in 2001), most CMS schools are predominately white or predominately African-American. Examples include Providence and Ardrey Kell High Schools (suburban), which are at least 97% white, while schools like West Charlotte High School (urban) are decidedly African-American (98%+). For Butler to be nearly a 50/50 split between whites and non-whites is eerily similar to how all schools with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools looked like in the *Swann v. CMS* era between 1971 and 2001.

These figures are only mentioned, in order that one might compare and contrast their own classrooms to the classroom setting that this Curriculum Unit was not only written for, but will be implemented upon. It has been effectively tailored to meet the learning needs and styles of the students involved, with the understanding that it may be adapted and altered accordingly for any educating practitioner for their specific classroom setting.

**Content Knowledge**

American colonial leaders eventually recognized the need for a strong national government, after seeing the weaknesses of the nation’s first form of government, the Articles of Confederation. In February 1787, the Continental Congress approved a Constitutional Convention to revise the Articles, and fix a laundry list of problems, including the Congressional inability to declare war, enter into treaties and coin money. The Constitutional Convention held its first session on May
25, 1787. The fifty-five delegates were experienced statesmen who were familiar with the political theories of Enlightenment philosophers like John Locke, Baron de Montesquieu and Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

Although the delegates shared basic ideas on government, they sometimes disagreed on how to put them into practice. For almost four months, the delegates argued over important questions. Who should be represented in Congress? How many representatives should each state have? The delegates’ deliberations produced not only compromises, but also new approaches to governing. Using the political ideas of the Enlightenment, the delegates created a new system of government, unlike any seen in the modern world.

Like Montesquieu, the delegates distrusted a powerful central government, that could be controlled by one person or group, like in the forms of an absolute monarchy and/or oligarchy. They therefore established three separate branches: legislative, executive and judicial, with a high emphasis on separation of powers. This setup provided a built-in system of checks and balances, with branch checking the actions of the other two. For example, the newly-created role of the presidency, would now receive the power to veto, or override, legislation passed by the Congress. However, the Congress could override a presidential veto with the approval of two-thirds of its members. The newly-created judicial entity, known as the Supreme Court, could now check the laws passed by Congress or actions taken by the President were constitutional or not.

However, the American experiment of limited and separated government was not unique to North America and the European thinkers of the Enlightenment. Rather, these ideas are deeply rooted in the history and governmental structure of Great Britain. Over the centuries, case by case, the rulings of England’s royal judges formed a unified body of law that became known as common law. Today, the principles of English common law are the basis for law in many English-speaking countries, including the United States. The historian Robert Tombs provides this summary of the history of common law:

The Common Law, based on judicial independence and precedent, was now marshalled against the encroachment of Roman law, used in Scotland, which buttressed James’ absolutist pretentions. Using the history of English law as the test of political legitimacy was an “all but universal pursuit of educated men” during the seventeenth century. The Common Law was asserted to be purely and uniquely English, embodying ancient unwritten rights—paradoxically, a new idea. One of James’ most outspoken opponents was the choleric Chief Justice and MP Sir Edward Coke, who, wrote the legal historian F.W. Maitland, “ranged over the nearly the whole field of law, commenting, reporting, arguing, deciding—disorderly, pedantic, masterful.” Coke was dismissed in 1616, later imprisoned in the Tower, and had his papers confiscated in a vain attempt to shut him up. He proclaimed that Common Law was based “on the wisdom of those before us…in many successions of ages, by long and continual experience.” It limited the royal prerogative, insisted Coke and his supporters, and it could even strike down Acts of Parliament. The then largely forgotten Magna Carta was, Coke declared, in its “great weightiness and weightie greatness,” the very “fountaine of all the fundamental lawes of the realm” and a “restitution of the common law.” Thus an idea of ancient English
uniqueness was identified with a tradition of law and political freedom. Coke set out the argument in his Institutes of the Laws of England (which began appearing in 1628) and in a series of controversial judgements, including a decision that the king had no power to legislate by proclamation. Similarly, Parliament’s Petition of Right (1628) asserted that imprisonment without trial by royal order was illegitimate. From this time originates our instinctive belief that law is, or should be, more than a collection of executive orders and directives, and that “law” and “rights” embody intangible and permanent values. “The rule of law” became central to English ideas of freedom and civilization.5

As for the Constitution, it traces back even farther than that. In the 13th Century, King John of England had many problems, some stemming from his very own personality. He was cruel to his subjects and tried to squeeze money out of them consistently. He alienated the Roman Catholic Church and threatened to take away the charters of towns that guaranteed those entities, the ideas of self-government. When King John raised taxes to an all-time high to finance another series of wars, his nobles had had enough and revolted. On June 15, 1215, they forced King John to agree to the most-celebrated document in English history, the Magna Carta (Latin for “Great Charter”). This document, drawn up by English nobles and reluctantly approved by King John, guaranteed certain basic political rights. The nobles wanted to safeguard their own feudal rights and limit the powers of the monarchy. In years to come, English people of all classes, not just the nobility, would to continue to argue that certain clauses in the Magna Carta applied to every citizen, regardless of wealth or stature. Guaranteed rights within the document included no taxation without representation, a jury trial, and the protection of the law.6 The Magna Carta guaranteed what are now considered basic legal rights both in England and in the United States, and would set the state for the writing of the United States Constitution in the 18th Century.

Years after the reign of King John and the signing of the Magna Carta, democracy and the structure of the government continued to evolve inside England. In 1295, King Edward I needed to raise taxes for a war against the French, the Welsh, and the Scots, so he summoned two burgesses (citizens of wealth and property) from every borough and two knights from every county to serve as a parliament, or legislative group. In November of that year, knights, burgesses, bishops, and lords met together at Westminster Abbey in London. This is now called the Model Parliament because its new makeup (commoners, or non-nobles, as well as lords) served as a model for later kings, and would be the foundations of representative democracy in the modern world.7

Over the next century, from 1300 to 1400, the king called the knights and burgesses whenever a new tax was needed. In Parliament, these two groups gradually formed an assembly of their own called the House of Commons. Nobles and bishops met separately as the House of Lords. Under Edward I, Parliament was in part a royal tool that weakened the great lords. As time went by, Parliament became strong. Like the Magna Carta, it provided a check on royal power.8

“Edward was now short of money. He converted his private ‘wardrobe’ into a ‘privy’ chamber, financed by a privy purse and overseen by a privy council composed of the king’s own circle of advisers, circumventing those stipulated under Henry III’s charters. But everything had to be paid for somehow. Edward was aware that his subjects were ‘fearful that the aid and taxes which they had paid to us out of liberality and
goodwill…may in future become a servile obligation for them and their heirs’. He was the first monarch to articulate so clearly the relation between money and consent. Accordingly, in 1295 he summoned a new parliament, to be dubbed the Model Parliament, to vote money for his continual wars. He gathered earls, barons, bishops and abbots to a baronial chamber, and 292 representatives of the commons, including burgesses from seventy boroughs. It was the first bicameral (two houses) parliament, and it was soon needed. Edward as consuming some £250,000 a year on his wars.”

In time, the power of the monarchy increased again in the age of absolutism. England was no exception to the rule, as Henry VIII and the subsequent members of Tudor dynasty reasserted that all power and control came from who sat on the throne. However, the English people soured to many of the later members of the dynasty, and initiated an overthrow of the monarchy, in what is known as the Glorious Revolution. However, the creation of a monarchy-free state was not the solution either. Therefore, at their coronation in 1689, King William and Queen Mary of the House of Orange vowed to recognize Parliament as their partner in governing, in return for the subsequent restoration of the role of the monarchy. England had become not an absolute monarchy again but rather a constitutional monarchy, where laws limited the ruler’s power and representative democracy still existed. To make clear the limits of royal power, Parliament drafted the English Bill of Rights in 1689. This document listed many things that a ruler could not do: 1) no suspending of Parliament’s laws; 2) no levying of taxes without a specific grant from Parliament; 3) no interfering with freedom of speech in Parliament; and 4) no penalizing a citizen who petitions the king about grievances. King William and Queen Mary consented to these and other limits on their royal power, in return for their legitimacy as the monarchs of the Empire.

“Whatever the political alliances or concessions required to maximize the unity and commitment of England in that struggle, they would be made. Hence, religious toleration was necessary to maintain a broad anti-French coalition, and William insisted on it. He accepted a Bill of Rights (1689), which enshrined right of petition, free debate in Parliament, freedom of election, trial by jury, the right to bear arms and frequency of Parliament, and it forbade extra-legal royal action. A Mutiny Act (1689) made the existence of the army dependent on parliamentary consent. A Triennial Act (1694) required general elections every three years. In short, once again, but now more explicitly than ever, the Crown was made subject to law, and its powers, still extensive, were defined by agreement with the nation. This time, there was no going back on the deal, which sketched out a constitution for England. Parliament had placed itself at the centre of the state. But what made these changes effective was Parliament’s ancient control of taxation. The pressing need created by war to have a parliament that would sanction ever-increasing taxation and debt changed it from a periodic event, called when the king needed it, to a permanent institution, which has met every year since 1689.”

After the writing of the English Bill of Rights, no British monarch has been able to rule without the consent of Parliament. At the same time, Parliament has been able to rule without the consent of the monarch. If the two disagreed, government would in essence, come to a standstill. During the 1700s, this potential problem was remedied by the development of a group of government ministers or officials, called the cabinet. These ministers acted in the ruler’s name,
but in reality represented the majority in Parliament. Therefore, they became the link between the monarch and the majority party in Parliament. Over time, the cabinet became the center of power and policymaking. Under the cabinet system, the leader of the majority party in Parliament heads the cabinet and is called the prime minister. This system of government continues today. When the United States created its form of government, they created the role of the presidency, with a similar functionality to that of the British prime minister, not as part of the cabinet, but rather the individual to which the rest of the cabinet would respond and act. Various challenges, including an uprising in 1715, enhanced the cabinet’s position relative to other institutions:

“The king’s lack of English and his frequent absences from London conferred independence and status on the cabinet. Meetings were chaired by senior ministers, of whom Lord Stanhope emerged as the ‘first’, alongside a rough-hewn Norfolk landowner, Robert Walpole, as chancellor of the exchequer. They faced an immediate challenge in the form of a revolt sparked by the Old Pretender, James Stuart, in Scotland in 1715. The Duke of Argyll, on behalf of the government, halted the insurgents before they moved south of Stirling and James no sooner landed on Scottish soil than he had to flee back to France. The so-called ’15 rebellion’ was over before it had begun.”

The first major prime minister in British history was William Pitt the Elder, who helped lead the country to victory against England’s fiercest rivals, France, in the Seven Years’ War, or as it is called in the United States, the French and Indian War. However, William Pitt’s son was able to grow the position of the prime minister in ways that his father could not have foreseen. In November 1806, Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte of France set up a naval blockade, or a forcible closing of ports, to prevent all trade and communications between Great Britain and other European nations. Napoleon called this policy the Continental System because it was supposed to make continental Europe more self-sufficient, while also, destroying Great Britain’s commercial and industrial economic might. Napoleon’s blockade, however, was not nearly effective enough. Aided by the British, smugglers managed to bring cargo from Great Britain into Europe, and lessened the influence of France over its continental neighbors. While the blockade did weaken British trade overall, it did not eliminate it. In addition, under the leadership of William Pitt the Younger, Great Britain responded with its own naval blockade. Moreover, because the British had a stronger navy, they were better able than the French to make the blockade work, increasing Prime Minister Pitt’s influence in not only British politics, but globally. Simon Jenkins tells the story in his book A Short History of England: The Glorious Story of a Rowdy Nation:

“This was a European conflict from which not Walpole or either of the Pitts could have stood aloof. French soldiers were now roaming the continent carrying all before them. The revolutionary Directory in Paris kept them abroad for fear what they might do if they returned home. By 1797 a young Corsican officer, Napoleon Bonaparte, campaigning in Italy, was delivering his masters so many triumphs that the French minister, Talleyrand, feared a military coup if he returned. He duly sent Napoleon to Egypt, to attack British interests in the Mediterranean.

Pitt galvanized himself for a resumed conflict with France much as his father had done for the Seven Years War. ‘We must anew commence the salvation of Europe,’ he said,
He took the opportunity, like many governments under guise of national security, to impose a raft of curbs on habeas corpus, ‘seditious meetings’ and ‘treasonable practices’, evincing complaints from Fox of ‘Pitt’s Terror’. The charismatic Captain Horatio Nelson was sent to the Mediterranean where, in August 1798, he found Napoleon’s fleet moored off the delta of the Nile. Nelson daringly steered his ships to its landward side and almost wiped it out with his guns. Only four French ships survived out of seventeen. Nelson’s Nile victory was the talk of Europe. He had by now lost an arm and an eye, and his celebrity was as widespread as his affair with Emma Hamilton was scandalous. Napoleon fled back to France where, in 1799, he staged the coup that Burke had predicted, and Talleyrand feared. Pitt’s response was to introduce Britain’s first income tax, two pence in the pound, rising to two shillings for incomes over £200.16

With the successes of William Pitt the Elder and Younger, the influence of the position of prime minister should have continued to grow for future occupiers of the job. However, with the powerful reign of Queen Victoria, during nearly the entire 19th Century, the monarchy reinserted its influence in all things related to the sovereignty of the British Empire. Nevertheless, with Victoria’s death and the fall of the Hanoverian dynasty, along with the disastrous effects of the Great War (World War I), the monarchy’s influence ebbed in Great Britain again. The early members of the Windsor dynasty ceded much power to Parliament, and thus the role of Prime Minister accelerated again, as the world spiraled closer and closer to another global conflict.

On November 5, 1937, Chancellor Adolf Hitler of Germany announced to his advisors his plans to absorb Austria and Czechoslovakia into the Third Reich, or German Empire. The Treaty of Versailles, signed at the conclusion of the Great War, prohibited an Anschluss, or union between Austria and Germany. However, Hitler knew that many ethnic Germans lived in Austria, and subsequently, many Austrians supported unity with Germany. In March 1938, Hitler sent his army into Austria and annexed it. Great Britain and France ignored their pledge to protect the sovereignty of an independent Austrian state.

Adolf Hitler next turned to the nation of Czechoslovakia. About three million German-speaking people lived in the western border regions of Czechoslovakia called the Sudetenland. Hitler wanted to expand Germany’s borders where a large majority of the population was ethnically German. This heavily fortified area formed the Czech’s main defense against Germany. The Anschluss with Austria had raised up pro-Nazi feelings among Sudeten Germans. In September 1938, Hitler demanded that the Sudetenland be given, without resistance, to Germany. The Czech government refused and asked France and Great Britain for help. With war looking inevitable again on the European continent, Italian Prime Minister Benito Mussolini proposed a meeting of Germany, France, Great Britain, and Italy in Munich, Germany. The Munich Conference was held on September 29, 1938. The Czechs, despite the primary issue being their sovereignty, were not invited. British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain believed that he could preserve peace by giving in to the demands of Hitler. Great Britain and France agreed that Germany could take the Sudetenland, in exchange for Germany pledging to respect Czechoslovakia’s new borders. When Prime Minister Chamberlain returned to London, he told cheering crowds, “I believe it is peace for our time.” Chamberlain had his critics and for good reason, as less than six months after the Munich Conference, Germany took all of Czechoslovakia. Soon after, Italy seized Albania. Then Hitler demanded that Poland return the
former German port of Danzig. The Polish government refused and turned to Great Britain and France for aid. However, appeasement had convinced Hitler that neither nation would risk war, only emboldening his own momentum, and furthering sinking the beliefs of Neville Chamberlain to curtail him.17

With the start of Second World War, Germany went on the front foot, quickly and effectively. With the fall of France, less than year into the conflict, Great Britain stood alone against the immense strength of Nazi Germany. Winston Churchill, the new British prime minister with Chamberlain’s failure, had already declared that his nation would never give in. In a rousing speech, he proclaimed, “We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets…we shall never surrender.” For many beleaguered British citizens, Churchill’s resolve inspired them to battle on, even as Germany prepared for an invasion of Great Britain. Chancellor Adolf Hitler’s plan was to knock out the British Royal Air Force (RAF) and then to land more than 250,000 German soldiers on the coasts of England.

In the summer of 1940, the Luftwaffe, Germany’s air force, began bombing inside Great Britain. At first, the German planes targeted British airfields and aircraft factories. Then, on September 7, 1940, they began focusing on the cities, especially the capital city of London, to break British morale. Despite the destruction and loss of life, the British, with consistent and constant encouragement of Prime Minister Churchill via the radio, did not waver. The RAF, although badly outnumbered, began to hit back hard, launching refreshed attacks against their powerful enemy. To avoid the RAF’s attacks, the Germans gave up on daylight raids in October 1940 in favor of night bombing. At sunset, the wail of sirens filled the air as Londoners and those living in other large metropolitan areas, flocked to the subways, which served as air-raid shelters. Some rode out the bombing raids at home in smaller air-raid shelters or basements.

The Battle of Britain, as it is called, continued until May 10, 1941, and the British people held firm, spurred on by Churchill’s powerful persona and words. Stunned by the British resistance, Hitler decided to call off his attacks of the British Isles. Instead, he turned his focus towards the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe, giving a fresh reprise for the Allied Powers, and the war-ravaged British people. Because of the Battle of Britain, the name of Winston Churchill (“The Lion of England”) became synonymous with the personal strength inside every Brit, making him universally loved, respected, and setting the stage for the prime ministers of the future to have the same effect on British society.18 The British politician Boris Johnson provides a lively account of Churchill’s role:

“If Hitler had won control of the skies and the seas, there is little doubt that he would have gone for it. He had assembled 1,918 barges off the coast of Holland, and if he had been able to convey his force across the Channel, it is hard to see how Britain could have fought on for long. The army had been routed at Dunkirk; there were no fortifications or fall back positions.

The country had not been successfully invaded for 900 years—and so London was not only the biggest and most sprawling city in Europe (a great fat cow, as Churchill called the capital). It was also the least defended: the only surviving walls and battlements were made by the Romans, and they weren’t in great shape.
Hitler had a giant strategic imperative in attacking Britain: he had to knock out Britain before he went east, and took on Russia. Even in July 1940, the whole shape and dynamics of the war were clear to Winston Churchill—just as he had foreseen the shape of the First World War as well.

‘Hitler must invade or fail. If he fails, he is bound to go east, and fail he will,’ he said at Chequers on 14 July. He saw, with his unerring and pellucid understanding of the big picture, that if Britain could survive, if Britain could hang on—then Hitler would lose, because not even the Nazi war machine could fight on two fronts at once.

It was thanks to Churchill—and at crucial moments, thanks to him alone—that Britain did hang on. It is clear that there was something utterly magical about his leadership that summer. With his poetic and sometimes Shakespearean diction he made people feel noble, exalted—that what they were doing was better and more important than anything they had done before.”19

In 1981, a fierce anti-Communist took over as president of the United States. Ronald Reagan’s election was a high point in a new period in American politics known as the New Conservative or New Right era. The New Conservatives were opposed not only to communism but also to a variety of social and economic issues ranging from abortion to affirmative action (special treatment for minority members and women) to any increases in taxes. While different in many of his core tenets to its American counterpart, the Conservative Party in Great Britain also saw a new wave of enthusiasm and excitement during the 1980s, due to its shared disgust for communism. The United States, under President Reagan’s leadership, continued to move away from the foreign policy known as détente, in which the rhetoric and actions lessened between the capitalist West and the communist East. Reagan increased defense spending, putting both economic and military pressure on the Soviet Union, to keep up. As evidence of his desire to crush the influence of the Soviets, Reagan announced in 1983, the desire to build the Strategic Defensive Initiative (SDI), a program to protect against enemy missiles. It was never fully put into operational effect but it remained a symbol of anti-communist sentiment within the United States. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who served as the leader of Great Britain from 1979 to 1990, supported President Reagan’s policy of a hardline towards the Soviet Union. Her anti-communist stance was so strong that Soviet reporters nicknamed her the “Iron Lady.” Soon people in Great Britain also began using that nickname for her, and future strong-willed leaders who were willing to stand up to immense adversaries.20 Simon Jenkins described her this way:

“Thatcher’s stamina was extraordinary. She would stay up late over a whisky and rise early after little more than four hours’ sleep, to be groomed by her hairdresser as she listened to the farming news. A private secretary would be present to convey her regular outbursts against ‘over-subsided farmers’ to the duty clerk at the agriculture ministry. By the end of the decade, however, she was visibly tiring. She gloried in the fall of the Berlin wall in November 1989, feeling it vindicated a lifetime’s strident anti-communism. But she was out of touch with the mood of the time in strongly opposing the reunification of Germany. In dealing with colleagues, her egocentric and hectoring style made her
difficult to work with and she retreated, like so many long in office, into a Downing Street cabal.”21

With Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher’s immense exposure on the global stage in the 1980s, the role of the British prime minister had reemerged in the last days of the 20th Century, to hold influential status in global affairs and conflicts. In 2002, the world watched on as analysts from the United Nations once again suspected that President Saddam Hussein of Iraq might be developing weapons of mass destruction (WMD), threatening the stability of the Middle East. U.N. weapons inspectors wanted the ability to inspect Iraqi facilities, but Hussein seemed reluctant to cooperate. United States President George W. Bush argued that Hussein might be close to building powerful weapons to one day, use against the United States or its allies in the region. In March 2003, President Bush ordered American troops to invade Iraq. Troops from Great Britain and other countries supported the attack.

The British Prime Minister Tony Blair was a strong supporter of President Bush’s preemptive invasion, despite the strong unpopularity of the conflict among the British people. After four weeks of fighting, Saddam Hussein’s government fell, leading to victory over Iraq, but the violence inside the country continued. Factions of Iraqis battled one another for power in the new government, as anger spread among the people about the presence of foreign troops. As the deaths, during the insurgency soared, President Bush and Prime Minister Blair held true that the American-British alliance to overthrow the dictatorial regime of Saddam Hussein was worth it, despite the lack of evidence for the suspected WMDs.22

“Despite reservations over the legality of war and the dubious claim that Iraq possessed ‘weapons of mass destruction’, Blair saw it as a modern crusade, arm-in-arm with America against militant Islam. The decision to invade Iraq saw London’s biggest ever anti-war march, of well over a million people on 15 February 2003. Britain’s occupation was to last six years and cost 179 British lives. The British army withdrew in April 2009, by which time Blair had committed it to a lead role in the escalating conflict in southern Afghanistan. The 2006 British-led expedition to assert NATO control over the province of Helmand degenerated into a debacle, with the Americans having to take over operations in the province in 2010. Though Blair won a third election in 2005, it was with the lowest poll share of any government in modern times. Iraq and Afghanistan had not dusted him with the glory of war, as the Falklands had done Thatcher. On 27 June 2007, Blair resigned after ten years in office and gave way to the unopposed succession of his old friend, but increasingly fractious colleague, Gordon Brown.”23

From the times of William Pitt the Elder in the 18th Century to Theresa May now in the 21st Century, the power and influence of the prime minister has ebbed and flowed, often in response to the impact of the monarchy. Some prime ministers have risen to prominence by inserting themselves in the midst of domestic and global crisis. Others have fallen into the background, due to personality and circumstances. However, the ability to more effectively represent the populace, in a manner more connected than the royal family could manage, has provided the British people limited government and a system of representative democracy. With the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights and the English common law, the British have helped to
advance democracy worldwide, including creating the framework for the United States Declaration of Independence, Constitution and Bill Rights.

Strategies and Activities

This particular Curriculum Unit will be broken down to consist of seven days of instruction, followed by the formal assessment for this particular unit on the eighth day. Arguably, it could be compressed into a shorter timeframe, but to provide students enough depth, as well as a thorough review, it is vital to follow the designated pacing suggested. It is suggested that the instructor assign an overarching homework assignment, such as a unit qualifier, that would be due on the date of the formal assessment, as it will provide adequate practice for students as they learn the content throughout the duration of the Curriculum Unit.

The initial day of the Curriculum Unit will focus on the teaching of the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights and the formation of the House of Commons. Students will use graphic organizers to compare and contrast these documents, as well as, create a foldable that outlines the keys aspects of each document. As depicted by the screenshot below, we will use a resource provided by the Constitute Project, to compare the Magna Carta to which we have just spent time learning, to the United States Constitution. The Constitute Project, www.constituteproject.com, is a website that allows users the ability to compare and contrast the constitutions of any two countries from around the world, side by side. As a “Ticket Out the Door” activity, students will do a 3-2-1 on a notecard: they will write down three items they learned, two questions they still have, and one overarching term or phrase that could sum up the entire class period.
For day two of the Curriculum Unit, students will begin with the first warm-up activity of the unit, exploring as a review, the strengths and weaknesses of the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights. This will provide a bridge from the previous class session’s instruction to this class session’s instruction. After the warm-up activity, the instructor will provide Enhanced Direct Instruction on the republicanism movements in the United States and France, and how they affect the British Empire. The instructor will delve into the Seven Years’ War (the French and Indian War) and the Napoleonic Wars, and how the leadership of William Pitt the Elder and Younger helped Great Britain to not only survive these conflicts but also come out victorious. At the conclusion of class, students are informed that in the next class session, day three of the Curriculum Unit, they will be quizzed (informal assessment) on the content they learned during the first two days of the unit.

For day three of the Curriculum Unit, students will once again begin class instruction with a warm-up activity. This particular warm-up activity focuses on the changing role of the British prime minister in the late 18th Century and 19th Century. Students are expected to state the changes, by referencing the content learned in the previous class session. By reinforcing these concepts through extra practice only enhances comprehension, as repetition is always beneficial. After discussing the warm-up activity, students will take a fifteen-question multiple-choice quiz (informal assessment) on the content for the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights, the House of Commons, the Seven Years’ War and the Napoleonic Wars. After collecting the quizzes, the instructor will guide students in a look into the response of the British leadership to the rise of totalitarian governments in the 1920s and 1930s. They will dig deeper into Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain’s response to Chancellor Adolf Hitler versus that of Prime Minister Winston Churchill who follows him. Students will be exposed to primary source documents (i.e. quotes, political cartoons etc.) from the time, to hone into the differences. Finally, if enough time permits, the instructor may use multiple review pages, via the student academic manual, to assess preparation for the formal assessment, scheduled to be given at the end of the Curriculum Unit. If less time remains than is necessary to use those review sheets, the instructor may just choose to answer any last minute questions concerning the content of the unit, verbally for the entire class to benefit.

For day four of the Curriculum Unit, students will begin with warm-up activity, looking at a primary source article about the Munich Conference and how the British people perceived Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain’s appeasement strategy with Germany. After, the instructor will explain how the effects of World War II will lead to the Cold War, in which the enemy of the Soviet Union replaces the enemies of the Axis Powers. While a brief snapshot of the entire Cold War is given, students will primarily spend the majority of time in the 1980s, as President Ronald Reagan and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher battled against the Soviet Union. It will be explained that through the actions of these two leaders, the Soviet Union will eventually collapse and capitalism will triumph over communism in this ideological conflict. Students will
read copies of President Reagan’s “Tear Down This Wall” speech and quotes from Prime Minister Thatcher about the importance of prevailing in this fight against the Soviets.

On day five of the Curriculum Unit, students will use technology to creatively display the changing face of the United States and Great Britain, in a post-Cold War world. If classroom access, students may use school-issued Chromebooks and create a creative display in Google Slides or similar format. Once completed, they can share that document to the instructor for grading and completion purposes. If Chromebooks are unavailable, the instructor may designate time in the school computer labs and which students may create their displays via Microsoft Publisher or PowerPoint. They may then print the final product out for the instructor for grading and completion purposes. This activity will allow students to explore the topic individually and collectively via research. The end goal is that they would find information and content concerning Prime Ministers John Major, Tony Blair and how the British have played a secondary role to the unilateralism of American hegemonic power. At the end of the class session, the instructor will inform students that an informal assessment (quiz) on the previous three class sessions will be given in the upcoming class session.

On day six of the Curriculum Unit, students will explore the complexities of a divided European Union, specifically under the leadership of British Prime Ministers David Cameron and Theresa May. However, prior to that introduction, students will take a fifteen question multiple-choice quiz (informal assessment) on the British leadership during World War II, the Cold War and the post-Cold War world. Once completed, the instructor through an Enhanced Direct Instruction will explain the current state of Great Britain in present day, heavily focusing on the impact of nationalistic tendencies leading to the Brexit decision. The instructor will explain the framework of how the European Union operates, and why a solid percentage of the British population believes that operational framework violates their national sovereignty. The instructor will emphasize to students the importance of these topics and that they should spend adequate amount of time reviewing this information at home, after this class session, as this would be continued in the following class session.

On the last official day of the Curriculum Unit, day seven, the instructor will begin review of topics and concepts for students, in preparation for their formal assessment on the Curriculum Unit in the following class session. In their academic student manual, various manual pages and graphic organizers will be used as a collective review of information. This will allow for choral response, as well as, individualized input. Lastly, students will be guided through an activity, in which they review many of the prime ministers discussed using body outlines. This will allow them to view individuals like William Pitt the Elder, William Pitt the Younger, Neville Chamberlain, Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair etc. holistically, and see how their internal makeups influence their external decisions. For students that strive on the multiple intelligence guided by visual skills, this activity is highly effective for their ability to understand and apply content. As the class session is ending, the instructor will remind students of their
formal assessment in the next class session, including the submission of their overarching unit qualifier, thus they should prepare accordingly through various study skills.

Day eight of the Curriculum Unit is the formal assessment. It will feature a combination of multiple-choice, short answer and fill-in-blank questions. For honors and advanced placement students, essay questions may be added upon the instructor’s discretion. Students will be expected to have adequately prepared themselves for this formal assessment, based on the previous eleven days’ worth of instruction. Prior to beginning the formal assessment, students will turn in their unit qualifier, which was assigned on day one of the unit and is expected to be turned in at the time of the formal assessment.

Data from this formal assessment, from score analysis to question item analysis, will be used to assess the effectiveness of this Curriculum Unit, from a Common Core perspective. If positive data affirms the effectiveness of the unit, in correspondence with data-driven instruction, then other Curriculum Units could be strengthened what has been previously prepared and utilized. If negative data shows a lack of comprehension and understanding by students, then the Curriculum Unit will be adapted and altered to highlight the Curriculum Unit’s strengths and remedy the Curriculum Unit’s weakness for future growth and development as both as an educator and a practitioner.
Appendix 1: Teaching Objectives and Standards

In correlation with the Common Core Standards (adopted by the state of North Carolina in 2010, to be fully implemented and operational within all of the state’s classrooms by 2013) and the North Carolina Standard Course of Study for American History I and American History II (formerly, united together as United States History) and World History, this Curriculum Unit will individually meet the needs of honors, standard and inclusion students, based upon their instructional needs using a series of differentiation techniques. Since North Carolina has just recently adapted the Essential Standards for Common Core within the last few years, the ability to fully connect the specific content to the required Essential Standard is much more difficult than it was to the previous Competency Goal and Objective, according to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

As defined by the state of the North Carolina, the purpose of the Common Core Standards is to strengthen academic standards for students, as they were developed by national experts with access to best practices and research from across the nation. Despite the uniformness amongst states that Common Core has brought, it has been highly speculated within North Carolina, that the state will choose to withdraw its participation within the consortium as early as 2015, so please be mindful that these Essential Standards may not still exist if you use this Curriculum Unit. Please reference www.NCPublicSchools.org for updated information, regarding to the state’s curriculum for these specific disciplines.

Below are the Common Core Essential Standards via the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for American History I (http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/curriculum/socialstudies/scos/american-history-1.pdf), American History II (http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/curriculum/socialstudies/scos/american-history-2.pdf) and World History (http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/curriculum/socialstudies/scos/world-history.pdf) that would effectively correspond to the content discussed within this particular unit:

As part of Essential Standard AH.1.H.2 of American History I, the student will be able to analyze key political, economic and social turning points in American History using historical thinking. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze key political, economic and social turning points from colonization through Reconstruction in terms of causes and effects (e.g., conflicts, legislation, elections, innovations, leadership, movements. Supreme Court decisions, etc.), as part of clarifying objectives AH1.H.2.1 and AH1.H.2.2.

As part of Essential Standard AH1.H.4 of American History I, the student will be able to analyze how conflict and compromise have shaped politics, economics and culture in the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the political issues and conflicts that impacted the United States through Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., American Revolution, Constitutional Convention, Bill of Rights, development of political parties, nullification, slavery, states’ rights, Civil War), as part of clarifying objective AH1.H.4.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH1.H.4.2, the student will be able to analyze the economic issues and conflicts that impacted the United States through Reconstruction and the
compromises that resulted (e.g., mercantilism, Revolutionary era taxation, National Bank, taxes, tariffs, territorial expansion, Economic “Panics”, Civil War).

As part of Essential Standard AH1.H.5 of American History I, the student will be able to understand how tensions between freedom, equality and power have shaped the political, economic and social development of the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to summarize how the philosophical, ideological and/or religious views on freedom and equality contributed to the development of American political and economic systems through Reconstruction (e.g., natural rights, First Great Awakening, Declaration of Independence, transcendentalism, suffrage, abolition, “slavery as a peculiar institution”, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH1.H.5.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH1.H.5.2, the student will be able to explain how judicial, legislative and executive actions have affected the distribution of power between levels of government from colonization through Reconstruction (e.g., the Marshall Court, Jacksonian era, nullification, secession, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.4 of American History II, the student will be able to analyze how conflict and compromise have shaped politics, economics and culture in the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the political issues and conflicts that impacted the United States since Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., Populism, Progressivism, working conditions and labor unrest, New Deal, Wilmington race riots, eugenics, Civil Rights Movement, anti-war protests, Watergate, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.4.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.4.2, the student will be able to analyze the economic issues and conflicts that impacted the United States since Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., currency policy, industrialization, urbanization, laissez-faire, labor unrest, New Deal, Great Society, supply-side economics, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.5 of American History II, the student will be able to understand how tensions between freedom, equality and power have shaped the political, economic and social development of the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to summarize how the philosophical, ideological and/or religious views on freedom and equality contributed to the development of American political and economic systems since Reconstruction (e.g., “separate but equal”, Social Darwinism, social gospel, civil service system, suffrage, Harlem Renaissance, the Warren Court, Great Society programs, American Indian Movement, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.5.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.5.2, the student will be able to explain how judicial, legislative and executive actions have affected the distribution of power between levels of government since Reconstruction (e.g., New Deal, Great Society, Civil Rights, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.6 of American History II, the student will be able to understand how and why the role of the United States in the world has changed over time. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain how national economic and political interests helped set the direction of United States foreign policy since Reconstruction (e.g., new markets, isolationism, neutrality, containment, homeland security, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.6.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.6.2, the student will be able to explain the reasons for United States involvement in global wars and the influence...
each involvement had on international affairs (e.g., Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Cold War, Korea, Vietnam, Gulf War, Iraqi War, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.7 of American History II, the student will be able to understand the impact of war on American politics, economics, society and culture. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on American politics since Reconstruction (e.g., spheres of influence, isolationist practices, containment policies, first and second Red Scare movements, patriotism, terrorist policies, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.7.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.7.2, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on the American economy since Reconstruction (e.g., mobilizing for war, war industries, rationing, women in the workforce, lend-lease policy, World War II farming gains, GI Bill, etc.). With clarifying objective AH2.H.7.3, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on American society and culture since Reconstruction (e.g., relocation of Japanese Americans, American propaganda, first and second Red Scare movement, McCarthyism, baby boom, Civil Rights Movement, protest movements, ethnic, patriotism, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.3 of World History, the student will be able to understand how conflict and innovation influenced political, religious, economic and social changes in medieval civilizations. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain how religious and secular struggles for authority impacted the structure of government and society in Europe, Asia, and Africa (e.g., Cluniac Reforms, common law, Magna Carta, conflicts between popes and emperors, Crusades, religious schisms, Hundred Years’ War, etc.), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.3.2. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.3.3, the student will be able to analyze how innovations in agriculture, trade and business impacted the economic and social development of various medieval societies (e.g., Feudalism, Agricultural Revolutions, Commercial Revolution and development of a banking system, manorial system, growth of towns, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.7 of World History, the student will be able to understand how national, regional, and ethnic interests have contributed to conflict among groups and nations in modern era. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to evaluate key turning points of the modern era in terms of their lasting impact (e.g., conflicts, documents, policies, movements, etc.), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.7.1. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.7.3, the student will be able to analyze economic and political rivalries, ethnic and regional conflicts, and nationalism and imperialism as underlying causes of war (e.g., WWI, Russian Revolution, WWII).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.8 of World History, the student will be able to analyze global interdependence and shifts in power in terms of political, economic, social and environmental changes and conflicts since the last half of the twentieth century. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the “new” balance of power and the search for peace and stability in terms of how each has influenced global interactions since the last half of the twentieth century (e.g., post WWII, Post Cold War, 1990s Globalization, New World Order, global achievements and innovations), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.8.3. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.8.6, the student will be able to explain how liberal
democracy, private enterprise and human rights movements have reshaped political, economic and social life in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, the Soviet Union and the United States (e.g., U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, end of Cold War, apartheid, perestroika, glasnost, etc.).¹
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4 LeGrand, John and Stephanie Ferron. “2016-2017: Opening Staff Meeting”.
7 Ibid. pgs. 88-89.
8 Ibid. pgs. 98-99.
15 Ibid. pgs. 240-247.
18 Ibid. pgs. 348-357.
When I stood in Downing Street as Prime Minister for the first time this summer, I set out my mission to build a country that works for everyone. Everything we do will be driven, not by the interests of the privileged few. Not by those with the loudest voices, the special interests, the greatest wealth or the access to influence. This government’s priorities are those of ordinary, working class people. People for whom life sometimes can be a struggle, but who get on with things without complaint. In theory, the Prime Minister is appointed by the Queen. In practice, the Queen must appoint, and the office therefore belongs to, the individual who has the confidence of the House of Commons, as demonstrated by his or her ability to pass financial legislation... The current Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, relies on such informal support from the small Democratic Unionist Party, as did his predecessor, Theresa May. And who becomes the leader of a political party? After a leadership contest between several Conservative party MPs, Theresa May emerged as the winner, and succeeded Cameron to become our second ever female Prime Minister. There was of course, mutterings from the general population about the PM being unelected despite the fact that we don’t vote for the PM directly.