

## Was the Harrying of the North 1069-71 a genocide?

Use 2 colours to code each box

### KEY

- Yes it was a genocide
- No it was not a genocide

<p>When he became King William did not intend on treating the English this way. He did allow some Anglo-Saxons earls for example Edwin and Morcar to keep their earldoms. It was only AFTER betrayal that William had to take a different approach.</p>	<p>Chronicler Symeon of Durham recorded the events he said 'It was horrible to observe, in houses, streets and roads, human corpses rotting...For no one survived to cover them with earth (bury them), all having perished (died) by the sword and starvation, or left the land of their fathers because of hunger.</p>	<p>Thus the whole region north of the Humber stripped of everything used that could be used to support life.  <b>Orderic Vitalis (a Norman chronicler)</b></p>
<p>The land was deprived of anyone to farm it for nine years... There was no village inhabited (lived in) between York and Durham. <b>Chronicler Symeon of Durham</b></p>	<p>William is reported to have regretted his decision to lay waste to the North for the rest of his life. This makes us think he was acting out of fury and frustration rather than cool strategic thinking. But, if he regretted it he obviously did have some care for the people, which makes us think he did it for a reason.</p>	<p>King William... himself combed forests and hills, determined to hunt out the enemy hidden there. He killed many people, destroyed the camps of others, harried the land and burned homes to ashes.  <b>Orderic Vitalis (a Norman chronicler)</b></p>
<p>Nowhere else had had William shown such cruelty. He made no effort to restrain his fury and punished the innocent as much as the guilty. <b>Orderic Vitalis (a Norman chronicler)</b></p>	<p>The chroniclers may have amplified and exaggerated the atrocity stories.  <b>Professor Palliser.</b></p>	<p>Richard Muir a historian writes of the Harrying of the North as 'the most fearful genocide in the History of England'.</p>
<p>Some historians say that Williams army would not have been large enough to destroy every village inhabited between York and Durham and that the Scots also raided the north, so could be partly responsible for the destruction. Historians such as Professor Palliser say that chroniclers exaggerated the destruction.</p>	<p>At the height of his anger William ordered that all the corn and cattle, all the farming implements and every sort of provisions and food be collected in piles and set on fire until it was all burnt. Thus was the whole region north of the Humber stripped of everything that could be used to support life. As a result a terrible famine (starvation - no food) fell on humble (ordinary) defenceless (people who could protect themselves) people so that more than 100,000 Christian people of both sexes, you and old perished of hunger. <b>Orderic Vitalis (a Norman chronicler)</b></p>	<p>I have often praised William but I cannot commend him for this act, which killed the innocent as well as the guilty through slow starvation and famine. I would rather pity the sorrows of the wretched people (the people who suffered in the north) than attempt the hopeless task of defending the man (William) guilty of such a wholesale massacre (killing). I believe that such barbarous (brutal) homicide (murder) should not pass unpunished. <b>Orderic Vitalis (a Norman chronicler)</b></p>

**Challenge:** Find more of your own evidence to support your case! Go back through the causes and impacts - can you find further evidence to show the Harrying of the North was/wasn't a genocide?

Use the same colours.

Write up your view in your book using the structure below.

- ***I believe that the Harrying of the North was/was not a genocide.***
- ***A genocide is when...*** (use definition)
- ***Evidence to support my argument includes...*** (pick best 2 pieces of evidence)
- ***This shows that...*** (explain)
- ***My argument is stronger because....*** (compare)