

ResultsPlus

Principal Moderators' Report June 2010

GCE History 6HI04

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code UA024105

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

GCE HISTORY 6HI04

PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

JUNE 2010

This Report is, by its very nature, a general report derived from the experiences of the moderating team this summer. Centres are reminded that every centre has its own individual report written by the person who moderated their coursework. This can be accessed via www.edexcelonline.co.uk and all examinations officers in schools and colleges will have the necessary login and password details. These individual reports should be read in conjunction with this Report, which necessarily gives the wider picture.

Edexcel's new Specification was offered for examination at AS level for the first time in 2009, and 2010 is thus the first year in which candidates can sit the A-level component. In January a relatively small number of candidates (about three thousand) submitted coursework and so this summer was the first time almost the whole cohort submitted work for moderation. Over 17,700 candidates were entered for this component, researching depth and breadth enquiries that were marked by their teachers, a sample of which was submitted for moderation. Moderation was carried out by four teams of moderators, working to team leaders who were, in turn, working to the principal moderator. Moderators found much to interest and impress, not only in the candidates' work but also in the ways in which their teachers had prepared and mentored their students and in the careful application of the mark schemes. Where adjustments to marks were recommended, and so regression of the whole centre was likely to occur, it is important to note that such work was always escalated to a senior moderator. Thus every centre where this happened had the judgement of their original moderator confirmed by a second moderation of the work by either a team leader or the principal moderator.

It was disappointing to see that problems that were identified and reported on in January were still appearing in the June submissions. Centres are urged to familiarise themselves, not only with the Principal Moderator's report but also with the GCE History Specification, Edexcel's publication 'Getting Started' and with the advice and guidance provided on Edexcel's website. An INSET programme will be offered in the autumn term and this should be invaluable for centres needing further guidance.

Administration

Centres are urged to access Edexcel's website, where a checklist can be found regarding materials that must be sent to their moderator. The majority of centres completed all aspects of the administration of this Unit without any problems. There were, however, a minority of centres that found aspects of the administration troublesome.

The most common omission from the submission package sent to moderators was that of a photocopy of the coursework programme. This needs to be done even if a centre is following an Edexcel-designed programme and is particularly important where a centre is following a programme they have designed themselves. The moderator needs to know that all such programmes have been approved by Edexcel. In a handful of cases this approval had not been given and so candidates

were following an unapproved course, and centres finding themselves in this position are urged to submit their centre-designed programme to Edexcel immediately.

In one instance a centre was following an Edexcel-designed coursework programme that was a forbidden combination with one of the papers previously taken by the candidates. Forbidden combinations are clearly stated at the bottom of every Edexcel-designed programme and centres are urged to check this before they embark on teaching the course they have selected.

The Individual Candidate Authentication sheets proved problematic for some centres. Most commonly, they were not fully completed by all candidates. It is essential that the candidate signs them as well as the teacher; that an accurate word count is given, that marks are shown by assessment objective as well as in total, and that the enquiry titles are recorded accurately. Some centres used an older version of the form. The updated one can be downloaded from Edexcel's website or photocopied from 'Getting Started'.

A small minority of centres had problems with the OPTEMS forms. The top copy must be sent to Edexcel, otherwise the centre's marks will not be inputted. The second copy should be sent to the moderator and the third copy retained by the centre. A small minority of centres did not appreciate that the sample was pre-determined and that the OPTEMS (or computer-generated equivalent) indicated this and had to be supplemented (if necessary) by the coursework of the highest and lowest scoring candidates. Centres are reminded that, as well as shading in the lozenges indicating the marks awarded, it is also necessary to write the equivalent number in the boxes provided.

The Use of Resource Record Sheets

The Resource Records form a specific purpose and must be used by all students when following both enquiries. It was evident that some centres and their students used them as an alternative, or extended, bibliography. A small minority did not submit them at all. Most students used the Resource Records appropriately, noting each resource accessed and commenting on its usefulness for their enquiry, and clearly had used their Resource Record sheet over a period of time. However, many teachers did not use them as Edexcel intended, and simply signed off the Resource Records at the end of the programme of study. The Resource Records serve to validate each student's work as his/her own. Therefore it is essential that the teacher(s) access these records at regular intervals, initialling the students' entries and, if necessary, adding comments of their own. In this way the teacher can see at a glance how the enquiries are progressing and can advise the students accordingly as part of their on-going mentoring of their students. For example, a moderator noted with concern that students in one centre she was moderating expressed concerns via their Resource Record sheets that they were having difficulties with a key text and were also finding alternative material in relation to their enquiries which resulted in a change of enquiry quite late into the research process. Had the Resource Record sheets been monitored regularly, the centre could have used them as a means of providing guidance as to where further resources could have been located and avoided the potential disruption to the student's coursework.

Word limit

Only a small number of candidates had problems with the word limit and about half of these were dealt with appropriately by the teacher-examiner(s) concerned, who stopped marking once 4,000 words had been reached. Other teacher-examiners

ignored the word limit even though a word count in excess of 4,000 was clearly written by the student on the Individual Candidate Authentication sheet. Centres are reminded that work exceeding the limit should be returned to the student(s) concerned for editing. If, for some reason, this is impossible, then marking must stop once 4,000 words has been reached. Almost inevitably this will mean that the conclusion to the Part B enquiry will not be fully assessed and the candidate's mark will be affected. It is a Specification requirement that a word count is given at the end of every page, and this should make it relatively easy for students to keep a running tally so that they do not exceed 4,000 words.

The Enquiry Titles

There was clear engagement by most of the candidates with the enquiries they had followed, and titles were, for the most part, appropriate.

Part A

Moderators found a variety of enquiry titles here, deriving from three approaches adopted by centres. Some centres set the same enquiry title for all their students; some allowed students to select their enquiries from a limited range provided by the teacher concerned, whilst others allowed their students to set their own enquiries. Whilst all three approaches are acceptable to Edexcel, in general, moderators found that candidates selecting their own enquiries and their own source material wrote with greater enthusiasm and engagement.

Whilst most titles were appropriate, centres are reminded that their students need to select and identify a range of contemporary sources in the process of conducting their Part A enquiry. For some, particularly those selecting a well-known figure or event, this can be an overwhelming task, and it is suggested that centres consider advising their students to limit the extent of their enquiries either by time or by topic. The time span for 'short-term significance' has been defined by Edexcel as being not more than 20% of the coursework programme (which would usually be twenty years) but can be considerably less. Candidates trying to assess the short-term significance of a major historical figure such as Hitler, Mussolini, or Martin Luther King, would be well advised to focus on a specific aspect of these individuals' careers. One centre's candidates, for example, tried to assess the short-term significance of Stalin without any limitation as to dates or specific aspects of his regime and although a couple of them judiciously narrowed the focus to concentrate on the impact of collectivisation, others ended writing a more or less traditional account of Soviet history in the 1930s which lacked the sharp focus required of a Part A enquiry.

A small number of students attempted to turn their Part A enquiries into a comparison of a range of factors by using the question stem '*To what extent ...*' and centres are reminded that the Part A enquiry should work as a depth study looking at the difference made, the change brought about, by an individual or event in the short term. A comparison of factors is more appropriate for the Part B enquiries.

Part B

Most centres elected to set the same Part B enquiry to all their students. They generally followed the published enquiry stems and focused securely on change over time in two main ways. One way was to select a particular factor as being the main driver behind the process of change and compare this, through explanation and analysis, with other potential factors that could be seen to drive change. Such enquiries have a causal focus, concentrating on the factors that brought about

change and deciding on their relative significance. The other main approach was to select a specific event as a turning point and, by going through a similar process of comparison with other potential turning points, reach a balanced and supported judgement as to which was the key turning point. Such enquiries focus on patterns of change by spotlighting key moments of change in the chronology and deciding on their relative significance. Centres are reminded that a Part B enquiry must span the whole timeframe of the coursework programme and, whilst this may be extended without seeking approval from Edexcel, it may not be truncated.

A range of Part A and Part B question stems are provided in the coursework programmes published in 'Getting Started' and there is advice there, too, for centres wishing to move away from these as to how an appropriate focus can be maintained. Centres are reminded that it is their responsibility to approve the enquiries being followed by their students. Whilst Edexcel, therefore, does not have any procedures for approving enquiry titles, it is always possible to seek advice on them through Edexcel's 'Ask the Expert' service.

The Selection of Source Material

Part A

The Part A enquiry is the only place in the A2 part of GCE History where AO2a is assessed. The selection of appropriate contemporary source material is therefore essential. Centres and their students should bear this in mind when determining their Part A enquiries. Too much, and selection will be daunting; too little, and it will be difficult to select appropriately. Between four and six sources should be used to raise issues, inform and drive the enquiries, and their evaluation should enable supported judgements to be reached. The use of the word 'contemporary' is advisable. All primary sources are contemporary sources. But not all contemporary sources are primary sources. They may be contemporary to the period being studied, but they are not created by individuals intimately connected with the particular event or series of events being investigated by the enquiry, but they may still be used and evaluated by students. This may seem to be a somewhat pedantic distinction to make, but it is critical to the selection of source material, particularly when following coursework programmes where primary source material is not readily available.

Centres varied in the ways in which they encouraged and enabled their students to select source material. Some clearly expected their students to undertake a fair amount of independent research, finding their own range of contemporary sources from which 4-6 were selected for use, interrogation and evaluation. Many centres produced a source booklet for their students to use. Whilst this is permissible, centres must provide sufficient source material in such booklets to enable their students to make a genuine choice. Centres are reminded that 'select' is a criterion within AO2, and that this means if teachers have done the selecting, it is unlikely that their students will be able to score more highly than Level 2 on this objective, where the use but not the selection of source material is rewarded. There were however, centres that had produced resource booklets for their students consisting of upwards of thirty sources of all varieties, allowing their students to select from them if necessary, but at the same time encouraging them to conduct their own researches, adding sources to the resource bank to be drawn on by all students as required. This would seem to be excellent practice. Although not a Specification requirement, moderators found it helpful where candidates included in an Appendix the sources that they had used, and, if the students were working from a source booklet, this was included with the submission.

Many candidates used secondary sources in their responses to the Part A enquiry. Whilst this is acceptable, it must be emphasised that the evaluation of such material is not required. Secondary source material may be used to challenge or support the judgements reached from an evaluation of contemporary source material, or to drive the explanation forward. It must be noted that secondary material should never dominate the use of contemporary material, and that it is only the contemporary sources that should be interrogated and evaluated. This is particularly important if a centre resource pack is being compiled. Too much secondary source material may well unintentionally lead students in the wrong direction. Centres following twentieth century coursework programmes sometimes, understandably, have problems in distinguishing between a contemporary source and a secondary source because in a very real sense all sources produced in that century are contemporary. It would seem sensible, therefore, to designate as secondary all those sources written by historians.

Part B

The selection of source material for use in the Part B enquiries was less problematical. Many students were used to accessing a range of books and articles in the course of their AS and A level work, and put this to good effect when researching for their enquiries. This was shown by an impressive use of footnotes and extensive bibliographies, although students should be warned that moderators cross-referencing between bibliographies and resource records did not always find congruity. Bibliographies only impress if evidence can be found that the books and articles therein are actually used!

Candidates used a range of ways to indicate the secondary sources to which they were referring. Some used footnotes and systems commonly found in academic works, others used a system of numbers that related to an attached bibliography, and some simply referred to the sources in the text as they wrote. Edexcel has no view on which 'system' should be used. It must be clear and not over-taxing for the students: the mechanics of any enquiry are less important than the research itself. Centres are reminded that the Specification requires students to demonstrate 'evidence of wider reading' and that source evaluation is not required,

The Assessment of Coursework

All centres clearly appreciated that the Part A enquiry had to be marked using both the AO1 and AO2 mark schemes, and that the Part B enquiry had to be marked using the extended AO1 mark scheme. The AO1 mark schemes are identical, except in that the mark scheme to be used in assessing the Part B enquiry has a Level 5 and that for the Part A enquiry does not.

Assessment of AO1

Centres experienced few difficulties in applying the AO1 mark schemes. Generally, the AO1 assessment of the Part A enquiries was accurate. Some centres, however, were overly generous at the Level 4 / Level 5 boundary. Centres are reminded that marks within Level 5 should only be given for **sustained** analysis which **directly** explores the process of change, demonstrating an **explicit** understanding of the issues raised by the enquiry, evaluating **arguments** and, where appropriate, interpretations.

Assessment of AO2

It was here that many centres misapplied the AO2 mark scheme. Where moderators recommended adjustments to a centre's marking, it was usually because of

generosity here. Too often marks were given at Levels 3 and 4 where there was little or no evaluation of the source material, interrogation of the evidence so derived and no weight given to its status when reaching a judgement. Moderators found time and time again that candidates inserting a sentence or two from an appropriate source at an appropriate point in their enquiry were rewarded at the higher levels.

Centres are reminded that:

- (i) Level 4 (11-12 marks) can only be given to responses where the source material is **interrogated** confidently and critically in order to identify issues and make and support judgements. The interpretation and evaluation of the evidence must take account of the nature of the sources. It must be clear that the student has shown that s/he understands the need to explore the implications of the evidence so derived in the light of its historical context. Furthermore, the status of the evidence should be taken into account when reaching substantiated conclusions. Students must show that they have **selected** a wide range of sources with discrimination, and that they have integrated their evidence into a structured and sustained argument.
- (ii) Level 3 (7-10 marks) should be given to responses where the source material is **interpreted** with confidence and related to its historical context and an understanding must be shown of the need to interpret sources in their historical context. Conclusions should be based on cross-referencing between sources, using them in combination, and when reaching judgements using the sources, consideration should be given to the weight the evidence can bear. Students must show that they have **selected** a range of sources sufficient to develop the issues of the enquiry that have been established.
- (iii) Level 2 (4-6 marks) should be given to responses where the source material is **interpreted** beyond its surface features, and where, in the process of drawing inferences and making judgements, the material is related to its historical context. Concepts such as utility and reliability should be addressed, as well as some understanding of the importance of the sources' origin and purpose. Students must show that they have **identified** a range of source material, sufficient to answer the question.
- (iv) Level 1 (1-3 marks) should be given to those responses where the source material is understood and is used to provide **information** relating to the topic. Any source evaluation will be stereotypical and the students are likely to take the sources singly and paraphrase the content to illustrate comment. Students must show that they have **identified** material relevant to the topic.

It is not expected that candidates will display the level of skill in all aspects of a specific level. Weakness in one area will be off-set by strengths in another. What should be looked for is 'best fit'. Centres are urged to become familiar with the nuances of the AO2 mark scheme as well as the AO1 mark schemes. These are to be found on pages 96-102 of the Specification.

The use of annotations

Centres are reminded that annotations on their students' work greatly help the moderation process. They illustrate to the moderator how the teacher-examiner has interpreted the mark schemes and applied them to the students' enquiries. An enquiry covered in ticks and with the comment '*Mainly L3 with touches of L4 so go to L4*' isn't at all helpful. Indications in the margins of the text of the enquiries as to where specific AO levels are perceived, together with summative comments at the end of each enquiry are the ideal. This excellent practice is followed by many centres and is greatly appreciated.

Internal moderation

There is only one entry code for this coursework component. This means that, no matter how many teaching sets, nor how many coursework programmes are followed, all candidates from one centre will be entered as a single cohort. It is therefore essential, and is a Specification requirement, that centres operate a system of internal moderation, so that the marks submitted from the entire cohort are displaying a consistent standard. Internal moderation should occur, too, when there is more than one teacher-examiner assessing work from a centre. Where internal moderation occurs, it is essential that this is made clear on the candidates' work. Any changes made to the marks as a result of internal moderation should be explained.

Conclusion

Centres are to be congratulated on the successful implementation of this new coursework unit. Moderators saw some impressive submissions and much to praise in the dedication and commitment of students and their teachers. This excellent start provides a firm foundation on which to build.

Exemplification material

The following material is provided in exemplification of the points made in this Report:

**GCE History
Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet**

Confidential: Edexcel and QCA use only

This authentication must be attached to the front of the candidate's work at the time it is submitted for assessment

Centre Number			
Candidate Number			
Candidate Name (In capitals, surname followed by forenames)			
Coursework Programme Title (If Edexcel designed please provide reference code from specification.)			
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX CW36: THE USA THE MAKING OF A NATION 1815-1917			
Assignment Title			
Part A: WHAT WERE THE SHORT TERM CONSEQUENCES OF JOHN BROWN'S RAID?			
Part B: TO WHAT EXTENT WAS THE EXISTENCE AND LEGACY OF SLAVERY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CHANGING LEVELS OF UNITY WITHIN AMERICA 1815-1917?			
Content (please tick box to acknowledge that content is attached to assignment.)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Record			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix PART A SOURCES			
Examined Units Give details of all Units (title and option code) making up the AS and A2. <small>Please Note Where Unit 4 is a centre-designed coursework programme, one copy of the centre's Coursework Approval Form must be included with the work when submitted for assessment.</small>			
Unit 1: WARS OF THE ROSES AND HEARY III A6 + A7			
Unit 2: CROWN, PARLIAMENT AND AUTHORITY IN ENGLAND 1588-1629 A2			
Unit 3: PROTESTS, CRISIS AND REBELLION IN ENGLAND A1 1536-1588			
Word Count			
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX ¹⁹¹¹ 3259 + 2337 - 3546 1585 + 2415 = 4.000			
Mark for Part A: AO1 (mark out of 13)	Mark for Part A: AO2 (mark out of 12)	Mark for Part B: AO1 (mark out of 25)	Total Mark: Part A and B (final mark out of 50)
11	12	21	44
Statement by candidate I declare that I have produced the assignment attached without external assistance, apart from any which is acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment and is recorded. I also declare that the word count given above is correct. I am aware of the penalties that will be imposed for exceeding the word limit (4000 words) by any.			
Signature: _____ Date: 1 st May 2010			
Statement by teacher I declare that the candidate's activities have been kept under regular supervision and that to the best of my knowledge no assistance has been given apart from that which is acceptable under the scheme of assessment and has been identified and recorded.			
Signature: _____ Date: 7/May/2010			

What were the short term consequences of John Brown's raid?

Many historians have attributed the short term consequence of John Brown's raid on Harpers Ferry as being the spark of the civil war. There is certainly a huge amount of evidence to suggest that the raid was indeed a catalyst to the Civil War as its short term consequences took tensions between the North and South to an unprecedented new high. Undoubtedly the greatest consequence of the raid was the image created of Brown after his execution. Brown was portrayed as a martyr for the abolition cause in the manner with which he went to his death. Some of the North did indeed support Brown and saw him as commendable for what he had done yet even more importantly was the paranoia and over reaction of the South towards Brown as he was associated with the Republican party which in turn created huge fear in the South about the party's aims.

The way John Brown was portrayed as a martyr was one of the most important short term consequences of the raid as this image established a platform from which many other serious consequences sprang. It was Brown's demeanor and character in which he was tried and executed which won him his image. Brown stated his case in 1859 with all the composure and dignity which gained him so much support. He said:

'Now if it is necessary that I should forfeit my life for the furtherance of the ends of justice and mingle my blood further with the blood of my children... I say let it be done.'

In 1859 Owen Lovejoy refused to denounce Brown and said: 'When the curtain rose and shocked the nation with this tragedy, John Brown lay there like a wounded lion with his head upon his paws, a saber cut on his brow, bayonet gashes in his side, the blood oozing out.' This image of Brown, as an almost Christ like figure can again be seen as Ralph Waldo Emerson said that Brown would: 'make the gallows as glorious as the cross'. Similarly Theodore Parker pronounced Brown 'not only a martyr... but also a saint'. It is also clear that this view was widespread as Charles Eliot Norton of Harvard wrote on the peculiar events in the Northern states which surrounded the death of Brown which included minute guns fired in salute and the preaching by ministers in commemoration of Brown and who wrote: 'I have seen nothing like it'. More than a thousand miles away in Lawrence, Kansas the editor of the republican also wrote: 'The death of one man has ever produced so profound a sensation'. Although the reliability of this evidence is questionable as these opinions are all given by abolitionists and the editor of the republican who is likely to exaggerate matters, still it makes no difference to the fact that Brown was portrayed as a Christ like martyr. The fact that blood is said to have been spilt for the cause is perhaps the greatest consequence of the raid as it built a base from which many other consequences could develop.

Linked with this is the way black Americans and slaves responded to the Brown's raid. A black perspective of Brown can be seen in 1859 as one unknown black American described him as: 'The notable but unfortunate Brown' and wrote that 'Washington entered the field to fight for the freedom of the American people - not the which man alone, but for both black and white. Nor were there white men alone who fought for this country. The blood of black men flowed as freely as that of white men.' Again, this man is appealing to sacrifice to reinforce his point, which is the resurfacing of the American history and ideals which seem to have been forgotten, for example the American Declaration of Independence which held that: 'All men are created equal' and are 'endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights' including 'life liberty and the pursuit of happiness.' It is clear that one of the short term consequences of Brown's raid was the way in which many black American's supported Brown's raid and began to see it as a

possible banner under which to gain their rights, which indeed they had fought for in the American war of Independence and which their blood had been spilt in search of. The way people believed that Brown had gained the support of the slaves can also be seen as in 1859 Henry David Thoreau described Brown 'with a further grip than ever on his four million slaves.' The reliability of Thoreau is questionable as he was a life long abolitionist, constantly delivering lectures attacking the 'Fugitive slave act' and it would certainly be in his interest to provoke tension and fear in the South with such comments. This was to prove the foreground to Southern paranoia and a platform for yet another serious short term consequence of the raid being the paranoia and terror developed in the South.

One of the consequences of Brown's martyrdom and therefore of his raid, Historian David Reynolds believes was the panic which spread through the South due to the wild rumors which circulated of black uprisings and the idea that abolitionists were marching from the North to aid them. The Southern newspapers reported that maps of seven other Southern states each with additional targets designated on them had been found on Brown's person. Although all these rumors proved false as they were probably due to Yankee fanatics who wanted to stir up trouble, these rumors should not be underestimated in their importance and effect. William Gilmore Simms, a Southerner reacted violently to the John Brown's raid and wrote in 1860:

'I see not a word of your wrath and indignation in any of these letters, at the burning down of towns or poisoning of our fountains, in Texas, by creatures of the same kidney with the vulture Brown!'

Of course there were no burning down of towns or poisoning of fountains as Simms describes but he certainly seems confident about the matter and believes himself to be absolutely justified in his anger, although mistaken this is all that mattered. It is the obvious unreliability and bias which can be seen in this account given by Simms, a Southerner, writing only months after Brown's raid that highlights perfectly the fear and panic stimulated as a result of the raid. These rumors, although only rumors, should not be played down as many did believe the stories and the increase in tension between the North and South was another short term consequence of the raid due to the wild rumors.

Another key consequence of John Brown's raid which fundamentally shifted anger in the South directed to the North to its extreme was the way in which Brown was associated with the Republican party. This can be seen in the way Lincoln, the leader of the Republican Party dismissed Brown's raid in 1860. In his address at Cooper Institute, New York, February 27th 1860 it is clear that Lincoln understands the potential for serious consequence of the Brown raid and the rumors which surrounded it. He said: 'And now, if they would listen - as I suppose they will not - I would address a few words to the southern people' Here it is clear that Lincoln has had the foresight to see that the South would unduly make the connection between Brown, the North and the Republican party. This is not really surprising as, as already mentioned, the editor of 'The Republican' wrote that:

'The Death of no man in America has ever produced so profound a sensation. A deep feeling of sorrowful indignation seems to possess the masses.'

Lincoln goes on to say in defense of his party that: 'John Brown was no republican.' The tension caused by Brown's false link with the republican party was accentuated by the fact that state elections were near at hand: 'When it occurred, some important state elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by

charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections.' The was in which Lincoln refers to an 'us', the north, to the South is evidence enough to suggest that tensions had been mounted between the North and South, it seems that Brown's raid and its short term consequences had clearly and decisively split America in two.

However whilst the short term consequences of Brown's raid did certainly act as a catalyst to the American Civil war, it is important to note that, it was only the spark and that the fuel behind the war was the divisions between east and west and North and South America, rising tensions over economic issues together with the explosive issue of slavery, which Brown, to a huge extent, lit.

Therefore the main short term consequence of John Brown's raid, was the way in which Brown himself became a martyr, as this acted as a platform for many other consequences. This platform enabled a resurfacing of the American ideals within Black Americans and a renewed enthusiasm to fight for their liberty. No matter the truth behind the power of the black Americans or the rumors which covered the South, wheather true or not they created a deep sense of fear in the South about the actions of the North and Republican which in turn massively increased tensions between the North and South.

Word Count - 1585

~~Times Quote - 326~~

~~Final Count - 1459~~

23/25

A01 - L4

11/13

A02 - L4

12/12

Sources for part A

John Brown States his Case, 1859

William Lloyd Garrison Justifies John Brown's Actions, 1859

Owen Lovejoy Refuses to Denounce Brown, 1859

A Black Perspective on John Brown, 1859

William Gilmore Simms Offers a Southern Reaction to the Breakdown of Order, 1860

Henry David Thoreau Endorses Brown's Moral Character, 1859

The Republican Lincoln Dismisses Brown's Raid, 1860

21/25 ✓

To what extent was the existence and legacy of Slavery responsible for the changing levels of unity within America between 1815-1917?

'Slavery was the most important single cause of the rift between North and South and the ensuing Civil War, which continued to affect the social relations of the sections... for another century.'¹ Between 1815 and 1917 America witnessed a turbulence in its degree of unity, which was primarily due to the existence and legacy of slavery. It is important to note that America reached a pinnacle of disunity between 1861 and 1865, at the heart of the Civil war, then witnessed a gradual return to mutuality up to 1917 with the reconstruction of the South. This essay will firstly be studying the other possible reasons for disunity in America besides slavery, then the reasons why disunity was in fact primarily due to slavery.

However, firstly it is important to guard against using hindsight to naturally conclude that there was a huge amount of disunity within America, seeing it as a land ridden with extreme differences and hurtling towards a bloody civil war. In fact there was some amount of mutuality within America before the Civil war which stemmed back to the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 which held that: 'All men are created equal' and are 'endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights' including 'life liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'² There was also unity experienced during the American War of Independence against a common enemy.

Again to challenge this question, an argument put forward by David Reynolds's is that far from Slavery, the practice of owning slaves, and its legacy being the cause of disunity, it was actually an embedded racism within American which caused so much disunity:

'Instead of slave and free, the great divide in American society became the one between white and black.'³

This idea is supported by the rising numbers involved in the Ku Klux Klan which can be seen to rise dramatically from its first Klan in 1865-1870's from 550,000 members, to the second Klan from 1915-1944 which reached its peak in 1924 with 6,000,000 members.⁴ This idea poses a threat to the claim that it was slavery which caused disunity within America by actually claiming that the real cause, although closely linked, was not slavery but racism.

Nevertheless it is clear that slavery was the cause of disunity within America, however this claim is not without its limitations. These limitations can be seen in the other reasons for disunity besides slavery. In the first half of the nineteenth century the western expansion of America, the largest migration in history, shook the foundations of the country created by the previous generation, which in turn created cause for disunity within America for a number of reasons including religious and moral differences. The cause and also consequence of this mass migration and panic was the surge of evangelical revivals in the 1820's and 1830's which triggered controversial matters of religion. Religion also served as a dividing line between the two political parties. Whilst Democrats wanted to minimize government interference, the Whigs proposed 'Christian liberty', freedom and obedience to God's law.

¹ White, John Willett, Ralph, 'Slavery in America'

² Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books pp. 66

³ Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books pp. 218

⁴ Farmer, Alan 'The American Civil War: Causes, course and consequence 1803-77

An example of religion causing disunity before the civil war can be seen in May 1844 when religion sparked off a full scale riot in Philadelphia where Protestants led a campaign to 'save the bible in the schools.'⁵ One rally, in Kensington led to a firefight between the Catholics and Irish agitators. After the Catholics were defeated in their march into Kensington they resorted to arson, burning down two Catholic churches and a convent. It was later proclaimed that 'Another St Bartholomew's' day had begun in the streets of Philadelphia. Although such newspaper reports may have been exaggerated it is clear that religion did play a part in disuniting America.⁶

Linked with religion and this migration, another argument put forward by Reynolds is that disunity was also experienced in America because of the brutal disposition of the Native Americans, a consequence of the migration. Such brutal removal of the Indians caused 'moral outrage amongst evangelical Protestants in the North'. This brutalisation spilt America through its morality and caused disunity in the sense of a loss of ideals which had so filled America previously. Indeed in Congress, leading spokesman for moral reforms, Senator Theodore Frelinghuysen asked 'Why the need for land? What about the sanctity of treaties? And what above all about basic American principles?' In 1820 about 125,000 Indians had lived east of Mississippi and by the mid 1840's there were only 30,000.⁸ The gold miners of South Dakota offered 200 dollars per scalp, of the Indians and some of the natives never even heard the order demanding their move to the reservations.⁹ It seems that such extensive and harsh treatment towards the native Americans caused a rift in America as she engaged in a war which successfully condemned all the rights and privileges which the American people's ancestors had fought for, in the American War of Independence. The same effect of disunity was also seen in the Mexican War of 1846-1848 which was seen as a territorial expansion of the United States which was clearly one of the main concerns of President Polk. It was these wars, fought for improper reasons, which also contributed to the disunity within America between 1815-1917.

It is also clear that disunity in America, especially between North and South was due to a difference in values. Historian Wyatt Brown claims the South had no wish to industrialise or urbanise. In the South there was a general belief that the old agrarian methods were better than a materialist Northern lifestyle. Therefore here again is another alternate cause for the disunity besides slavery. Linked with this one must look at the economic grievances of the South towards the North.

² Economic grievances came to a head, before the outbreak of civil war, with the nullification crisis of 1832. In 1828 Congress passed protective tariffs, which were hugely beneficial to the Northern states but massively destructive to Southern trade. The crisis came about with South Carolina's 'Ordinance of Nullification.' This ordinance declared by the power of the state itself that the federal tariff of 1828 was void. With the economic downturn through the 1820's that had particularly affected South Carolina the state declared the tariff void, splitting Congress between Jackson and the vice president J.C Calhoun. Another, modified tariff was suggested and when South Carolina again refuted this, federal military preparations were made to enforce it. In the end South Carolina accepted another more modified tariff but the 'Nullification Crisis' did resemble the readiness of the North to overpower the South in their own interest and thus

⁵ Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books pp. 169

⁶ Feldberg, Michael 'The Philadelphia Riots of 1844: A study of ethnic conflict. pp. 108

⁷ Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books pp. 141

⁸ Ibid pp. 143

⁹ Beaucroft, B.W 'The Making of America, from wilderness to world power' Longman pp. 121

another cause to say that there was disunity in America which did not stem from Slavery but rather a bitter sense of resentment due to a perceived hierarchy.

One could argue that the reconstruction of the South from 1865–1877 was of huge significance to the disunity in America. Republicans in Congress took control of reconstruction policies after the election of 1866 and historians have sometimes referred to this as a time of 'radical reconstruction'. During the reconstruction problems arose in many areas. The new spending on schools and infrastructure, combined with false spending and a collapse in state credit because of huge deficits, forced the states to dramatically increase property tax rates. In places, the rate went up to ten times higher despite the poverty of the ruined region. On top of this the fact former slaves now held political and military power angered many Southern whites. They formed new political parties to contest elections, including the Ku Klux Klan, as already mentioned and supported or tolerated violent activist groups that intimidated both black and white republicans. Therefore there is further evidence to suggest that the cause of disunity after the civil war, from the period 1865–77 was something other than slavery and in this case was the friction caused during the reconstruction of the South.

However, despite these arguments, it is clear that the changing levels of unity within America were certainly, not solely, but largely due to slavery and its legacy. It was slavery which contributed to many key reasons for the outbreak of civil war in 1861, and when slavery was abolished it is plain to see a return to unity. Firstly, another argument put forward by Reynolds is the widespread opposition to slavery's expansion West and the turbulence that it caused. Slavery's expansion, it was feared would destroy free labor and increase Southern influence in Congress. In the 1830's only two new states joined the union, Arkansas in the South and Michigan in the North and thereby the states and senators in Congress were balanced in terms of slave and free. However in the 1840's, as a result of America's vast expansion after the Mexico war further states arose and with more complications than the situation seen a decade before.¹⁰

When Stephen Douglas split the new land gained by the expansion into two territories, Kansas and Nebraska, the end result was one of hostility, ultimately because of slavery. Douglas believed in 'popular sovereignty' as a truly democratic way of deciding the fate of these two new sects. However the North feared both these states would become slave states and therefore it would be easy for the South and pro-slavery senators with a majority, to dominate congress. Indeed congress could not interfere, as this would violate: 'The great and fundamental principle of free government.'¹¹ The Kansas and Nebraska act of 1854 also breached the Missouri Compromise of 1820 which was a reassuring principle for Northerners as it held that slavery would be banned North of the Mason Dixon line, or of the latitude 36° 30'.

Not only did the Kansas and Nebraska act send panic into all those who feared the loss of free labor due to a possible increase in slavery but it also sparked a new party, the Republicans who were dedicated to stopping the spread of slavery and whose banners adorned 'Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Speech'. The Republicans claimed they would 'engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas.'¹² To follow would be a bloody fight over the possession of Kansas as pro-slavery enthusiasts flooded in from Missouri seizing ballot boxes. Free anti-slavery soldiers from New England created an anti slavery assembly and so Kansas descended into anarchy, being dubbed 'bleeding Sumner' and

¹⁰ Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books pp. 155

¹¹ Ibid pp. 176

¹² Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books pp. 177

'bleeding Kansas'. Although these titles are obviously the result of good Republican propaganda they do illustrate how slavery caused divisions in America.

Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin* sold a staggering 300,000 copies in the first year alone and as put forward in an argument by McPherson, disturbed the minds of many in the North, creating a genuine altruistic feeling against slavery. It became the text of abolitionists, appalled by the law enacted in the 'Fugitive Slave Act'¹³ and whilst the Dred Scott case heightened tension to a new level. It is not possible to measure the political influence of '*Uncle Tom's Cabin*', yet few have doubted its power. As Henry Wansworth Longfellow said: 'Never was there such a literary coup de main as this.' Indeed when Lincoln met Beecher Stowe his words were 'So you're the little woman who wrote the book that made this great war.' The book struck a nerve in the South despite being banned there and was certainly, through Slavery, a contributing factor to the American civil war and changing levels of unity.

Yet another contributing factor to the civil war as a result of Slavery was John Brown's raid, which is often thought of as the spark of the Civil War. Despite being a disastrous attempt to free a group of slaves at Harper's Ferry, the raid acted as the catalyst in a series of events which massively progressed disunity in America. Brown was seen as a martyr, as the editor of '*The Republican*' wrote: 'The death of no man in America has ever produced so profound a sensation.' Brown's composure after the trial which proved him guilty moved Theodore Parker so much that he described him as: 'Not a martyr...but also a Saint.'¹⁴ For weeks wild rumors circulated in the South about black uprisings and armed abolitionists marching from the North to enforce the abolition of slavery. According to James M. McPherson John Brown's raid took tension in the South to a new level and is undisputedly, through slavery, one of the causes of the civil war and therefore evidence to support the claim that slavery was responsible for the changing levels of unity within America during 1815-1917.

Lee's surrender at Appomattox in 1865 was a landmark for America. Instead of two rival feuding nations, in the years to follow, America became one, united together to fight in the First World War in April 1917. Reynolds claims that the rapid growth of industrial capitalism created huge social friction and class divisions within America yet, America did not spiral into the political conflicts seen in Europe in the early 20th century and was to a greater extent unified.

Whilst it is ridiculous to look too far back in time with hindsight and claim that an action was the sole cause of a consequence as there are clearly so many factors contributing to every result in history, slavery was the driving force behind the changing levels of disunity within America between 1815 and 1917. It can too easily be seen that slavery infected, and was behind almost every reason for friction in America. In fact, religion, as mentioned, as a friction separate from slavery, was in fact fueled by slavery and the moral distress it caused in America. Similarly, as mentioned there were differences between the North and South besides slavery, yet it is again undisputable that slavery was the key deeply rooted issue which separated them. As John. C. Calhoun said: 'This widely extended discontent is not of recent origin. It commenced with the agitation of the Slavery question.'¹⁵ Where there were problems, there was slavery in almost every case. This is illustrated by the fact that when slavery was abolished after the civil war, America made a gradual return to unity up to 1917. Moreover if we see the heart of the civil war as marking the height of disunity within America between 1815 and 1917, one

¹³ McPherson, James M 'Battle Cry of Freedom The American Civil War pp.38

¹⁴ Ibid pp.209

¹⁵ Grallé. C 'The Works of John C. Calhoun, 'New York, 1854', Vol. IV, pp. 542

must surely focus, not entirely, but strongly on the causes of this pinnacle, and the causes of this was slavery. ✓

Bibliography

Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books
McPherson, James M 'Battle Cry of Freedom The American Civil War
Grallé, C 'The Works of John C. Calhoun, 'New York, 1854', Vol. IV
Beacroft, B.W 'The Making of America, from wilderness to world power' Longman
Feldberg, Michael 'The Philadelphia Riots of 1844: A study of ethnic conflict.
Farmer, Alan 'The American Civil War: Causes, course and consequence 1803-77
White, John Willett, Ralph, 'Slavery in America'
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nullification_Crisis

Word Count

Essay - 2415

Bibliography

Reynolds, David 'America, Empire of Liberty' Penguin books
McPherson, James M 'Battle Cry of Freedom The American Civil War
Farmer, Alan 'The American Civil War: Causes, course and consequence 1803-77
White, John Willett, Ralph, 'Slavery in America'
'Voices through History'

Level 5 21/25

Candidate 1

A high scoring, competent piece of work, just sufficient for the highest grade.

Part A

A wide-ranging and consistently focused enquiry that uses sources effectively within the context of well identified key factors to create a sustained argument. The sources are well selected, appropriate and used together with discrimination and with some good cross-referencing. The reliability of the sources is effectively challenged on a number of occasions

Part B

A well-structured essay. The key issues are examined and alternative arguments given, with an initial challenge to the question. Although always well-related to the enquiry, some paragraphs are a little light on evidence in support of points made. Historian's interpretations are used to drive some arguments. The process of change over time is recognised, although references to the post-civil war period are a little limited.

**GCE History Coursework
Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet**



This authentication must be attached to the front of the candidate's work at the time it is submitted for assessment

Centre Number	
Candidate Number	
Candidate Name (in capitals, surname followed by forenames)	
Coursework Programme Title: (if Edexcel designed please provide reference code from specification.)	CW7 Rebellion and Disorder in Tudor England 1485-1587
Assignment Title	<p>Part A: How significant were the actions of the Duke of Somerset, Northumberland and thus the Crown in alleviating the 'Mid Tudor Crisis' during Edward VI's reign?</p> <p>Part B: Assess the significance of the actions taken by individual monarchs and their advisers in influencing political stability in England in the years 1485-1603.</p>
Content (please tick box to acknowledge that content is attached to assignment.)	<p>Resource Record: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Appendix:</p>
Examined Units Give details of all Units (title and option code) making up the AS and A2.	<p>Unit 1: A World Divided: Communism and Democracy in the 20th century.</p>
<p>Please Note Where Unit 4 is a centre-designed coursework programme, one copy of the centre's Coursework Approval Form must be included with the work when submitted for assessment.</p>	<p>Unit 2: Conflict and Change in 19th and 20th century Britain.</p>
	<p>Unit 3: The US: Challenged and Transformed.</p>

Word Count	3993		
Mark for Part A: AO1 (mark out of 13)	Mark for Part A: AO2 (mark out of 12)	Mark for Part B: AO1 (mark out of 25)	Total Mark: Part A and B (final mark out of 50)
11	5	16	31/50

<p>Statement by candidate I declare that I have produced the assignment attached without external assistance, apart from any which is acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment and is recorded. I also declare that the word count given above is correct. I am aware of the penalties that will be imposed for exceeding the word limit (4000 words) by any amount.</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: 26/4/2010</p>
--

<p>Statement by teacher I declare that the candidate's work has been kept under regular supervision and that to the best of my knowledge no assistance has been identified and recorded.</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: 10/5/10</p>

By signing the above declaration you agree to your coursework being used to support Professional Development, Online Support and Training of both Centre-Assessors and Edexcel Moderators. If you have any concerns regarding this please email historyandlaw@edexcel.com

How significant were the actions of the Duke of Somerset, Northumberland and thus the Crown in alleviating the 'Mid Tudor Crisis' during Edward VI's reign?

The term 'Mid Tudor Crisis' represents a period between 1547 and 1558 where it can be argued that both the crown and society were in imminent danger of collapse in the face of economic difficulties, policy failure and rebellions. Writing in 1973, W. R. D Jones was the first to outline a theory proposing the existence of such a crisis. Jones identified several key factors as causing the crisis and one of these was the economic difficulties of the period.

Protector Somerset had spent over £580,000 on warfare as well as £30,000 a year for the upkeep of the navy. In addition to this, he also transferred some £20,000 of the Crown's assets into private hands in the form of gifts to win political support. All of this extravagant spending was on top of Henry VIII's spending of £2,000,000 on warfare during the previous five years.¹

In addition to the economic difficulties in regards to royal finances, there was also social and economic distress in regards to agriculture. There were shortages of food, caused largely by a rising population since the 1520s, and the inability of primitive agricultural techniques to develop accordingly. These shortages were exacerbated by the bad harvests of 1549-51 which caused widespread famine.

There was also the issue of rebellion. 1549 saw two rebellions, arising partly because of enclosure and dissatisfaction with the economy, which presented a real threat to the state. The first, the Western Rebellion, arose as a response to Somerset's social policies and centred upon conservative religious demands whilst the second, Kett's Rebellion, was centred largely on economic concerns. These uprisings also had the effect of causing and revealing internal faction within the Council, with some opposing Somerset's response and other supporting it.

Another issue to consider was the succession crisis of 1553. Under the terms of the Succession to the Crown Act 1543², Edward's heir was Princess Mary; however this posed a problem for Northumberland's government. Mary was a committed Catholic and would reverse the Protestant religious policies pursued since 1550 and, in the process, sweeping aside those who promoted them. Thus Northumberland concocted a plan to alter the succession, installing Lady Jane Grey as an alternative. He was unsuccessful and after 13 days of holding the throne, Lady Jane Grey was replaced by Mary.

Another area identified as party to the crisis was a weak leadership. At the age of 16, Edward fell seriously ill and was recorded as whispering "I am glad to die" to his tutor John Cheke³, which can be interpreted as showing his physical and mental inability to manage the country. This was a quote taken from Cheke's personal diary which means that, because it was not intended for others to see, it can be taken as having strong factual credibility. Edward was often been portrayed as a sickly boy who, throughout his reign, was the pawn of both the Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Northumberland. Whilst some may see this as a core feature of the 'mid Tudor crisis', others highlight the actions of the protectors in making up for a weak king.

The significance of the crown in alleviating these issues has been left open to debate.

The Duke of Northumberland's actions in respect to the economy were significant for a number of reasons. In contrast to Somerset, who used the 'quick fix' of debasement, Northumberland cut expenditure by ending the war with France and Scotland, and by introducing more effective strategies for the management of royal finances. First he established a team of administrators to institute financial reform, abandoning debasement and introducing a new coin issue in 1552. In

¹ Loades, David, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) (Page 169)

² Succession to the Crown Act 1543 (Citation 35, Henry VIII c.1)

³ Skidmore, Chris, *Edward VI: The Lost King of England*, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007) (Page 257)

In addition, Northumberland proceeded to introduce a Royal Commission which acted as an exchequer and was responsive to governmental needs. It was described by Geoffrey Elton as a 'remarkable achievement, reducing royal debt from £3,000,000 to £180,000 by the end of Edwards reign'.⁴ Elton is widely considered a highly influential historian, specialising in Tudor economics. Therefore we can take his description of the Commission as a fairly accurate assessment of both the Council, and by extension Northumberland's actions.

Had Northumberland failed to introduce monetary provisions, the royal debt would have remained at over £3,000,000, increasing each year with the upkeep of the navy. In addition, by abandoning the idea of debasement, the government would curb inflation, stabilising the value of money and thus saving the economy from a potentially serious downturn. Therefore, we can clearly see the significance of Northumberland's actions in alleviating the economic difficulties of the time.

Unlike Northumberland's intervention within the economy, the Crown did little to alleviate any agricultural issues. During this time the nobility had begun, despite the crown passing legislation against it, encouraging enclosures as it was seen to increase the efficiency of the land in question. One nobleman of the time commented that "nothing is more unprofitable than a farm in tillage in the hands of the servants".⁵ Whilst this was largely true of private land, it is important to consider the obvious vested interest of the nobleman in promoting enclosure. Therefore a source such as this, which justifies enclosure, cannot be blindly relied upon and must be interpreted with care. Problems also arose when land held in common was enclosed. Smallholders were previously able to graze animals and grow crops on this land and so the Crown can, by failing to enforce their own legislation, be seen to intensify the food shortage. The problem was that the ones whose duty it was to enforce the laws – the nobleman, were the main supporters of enclosure. The solution was left to be found by the farmers themselves. The willingness of husbandmen to react quickly, turning to alternative crops and farming methods, was the sole cure to the problem of enclosure and even this did not occur until some time after the Tudor period. Therefore we can clearly see a lack of significant action on the part of the crown in alleviating the agricultural problems of the period.

Somerset's actions in respect to the rebellions had both positive and negative consequences. Both rebellions were dealt with rather leniently with minimal forces being deployed to crush them. In some respects Somerset's actions can be seen as positive insofar as the risings were crushed, re-asserting parliamentary authority with minimal force and cost. This sent out warning messages to any other potential rebels; however Somerset's lenient response did not go without consequence as it paved the way for internal faction, ultimately leading to Somerset's fall by means of a bloodless Coup d'etat.⁶

Therefore, whilst Somerset's actions may have helped to alleviate one aspect of the crisis, it worsened another; internal faction. On the one hand, Somerset can be praised for considering the royal finances whilst effectively silencing the rebels, but on the other he was criticised for following 'his own fantasies'.⁷ Somerset's indictment criticised his slow and weak response to the 'great slaughter and effusion of blood' caused by the rebels.⁸ This view of Somerset's actions, however, must be taken with caution. Whilst the source is strong in that it is contemporary to the time and is taken from the official charges brought against Somerset, it does not offer a neutral account of the events. The Council, wishing to install Northumberland as Protector, are likely to have overplayed

⁴ Elton, Geoffrey, *The Tudor Constitution: documents and commentary*, (Cambridge University Press, 1982) (Page 201)

⁵ P.R.O, *Star Chamber – Strafford Letters*, Sheffield publishing. (Page 8)

⁶ (York v. Somerset) Richard, Duke of York's charges against the Duke of Somerset (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian), C.14

⁷ York v. Somerset

⁸ York v. Somerset

the negative aspects of Somerset's reaction to the rebels, creating the need for us to interpret the source cautiously.

The significance of Northumberland actions in alleviating the succession crisis is mixed. On the one hand, his successful attempt to alter the line of succession showed the country's vulnerability to political disruption. By directly challenging the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, Northumberland was potentially opening a way for future hopefuls to usurp the throne. However on the other hand, his actions revealed that the previously potent topic of religion was no longer important in determining the preferred monarch. People were prepared to accept a Catholic Queen, shown through Mary who eventually assumed her rightful place on the throne. His actions also demonstrated the strength of the Tudor dynasty, shown through the fact that succession was no longer a question between whether or not the monarch should be a Tudor, but was now a question of *which* Tudor.

Despite Edwards's political impotence, the Regency Council was able to show its collective power through the overthrow of Somerset as protector. As Somerset's rule became increasingly autocratic, the council's grievances were shown through William Paget's Letter to Somerset in which he proclaimed that 'the Council mislikes your proceedings'.⁹ This letter, written by a senior member of the Regency Council is a good indicator of how the Council as a whole felt towards the actions and policies of Protector Somerset, thus making this a strong source. The removal of Somerset and the installation of Northumberland was significant - showing that, despite there being no formal head of state, the government was still very much in control. By publicly executing Somerset, the council was able to assert their authority, making up for what was seen as a weak monarch and showing the crown's ultimate political potency.

It is clear that there has been conflicting views on the significance of the government's actions in alleviating or controlling what was perceived as the 'mid Tudor crisis during Edward VI's reign. Although many have pointed to the 'weak' leadership of Edward VI, parliament can undoubtedly be seen to control this situation. This was shown primarily through the regency council, who was, during this time, able to effectively control leadership – replacing Somerset with Northumberland as appropriate. This shows that whilst the monarch may have been weak, the Regency Council ensured that de facto leadership was strong. Another area in which the government's actions were significant was in respect to the economy. Having reduced royal debt from a staggering £3,000,000 to a mere £180,000, it is clear that Northumberland was coping well, bringing the economic position under control. However whilst they were effective in controlling royal economic issues, they were less so in aiding the agricultural economy. By indirectly promoting enclosures, the crown was depriving husbandmen of common land, reducing the agricultural output. This was worsened by population rise as well as bad harvests. Similarly, the misguided 'fantasies' of Somerset during the rebellions can be seen to have caused a huge stir within the government, another factor in the transition from Somerset to Northumberland. Finally, the succession crisis of 1553 raised constitutional if not controversial issues concerning succession. Whilst the actions of Northumberland may have been seen as negative, there is no doubt that they were significant in shaping the future line of succession.

Therefore we can see that whilst the actions of the Duke of Somerset, Northumberland and thus the Crown were significant in some respects, they lacked a positive influence in others. Whilst issues such as royal finances and weak leadership were alleviated, others such as agriculture and rebellion were left, and sometimes worsened by the actions of the Crown.

⁹ Markham, Sir Clements Robert, *'King Edward VI: an appreciation'*, (Great Britain: E. P. Dutton & company, 1908) (Page 148)

Bibliography

Acts

- Succession to the Crown Act 1543 (Citation 35, Henry VIII c.1)

Books

- Elton, Geoffrey, *The Tudor Constitution: documents and commentary*, (Cambridge University Press, 1982) (Page 201)
- Loades, David, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) (Page 169)
- Markham, Sir Clements Robert, *King Edward VI: an appreciation*, (Great Britain: E. P. Dutton & company, 1908) (Page 148)
- P.R.O, *Star Chamber – Strafford Letters*, Sheffield publishing. (Page 8)
- Skidmore, Chris, *Edward VI: The Lost King of England*, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007) (Page 257)

Cases

- (York v. Somerset) Richard, Duke of York's charges against the Duke of Somerset (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian), C.14

Word Count: 1965

Assess the significance of the actions taken by individual monarchs and their advisers in influencing political stability in England in the years 1485-1603.

The Tudor period is largely portrayed as one dominated by the long and secure reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. According to this view the Tudor dynasty brought peace and stability after the turmoil of the fifteenth century. However this idea of a secure and stable monarch is not entirely accurate – each monarch and their advisers had both positive and negative influences upon political stability in the years 1485 to 1603. There were many factors which affected political stability including relationships with the nobility, religion, economics and political and social policy.

Some historians have suggested that, in order to secure his position upon the throne, Henry VII sought to be ruthless towards the nobility due to him seeing them as a threat to his authority.¹ However they have also recognised that Henry needed their support in order to effectively rule England. Noble support of a rebellion was sufficient to turn the tide against the monarch and produce a successful overthrow of the king – something Henry himself had discovered at Bosworth. Moreover, Henry was well aware that some of the nobility had just a good a claim to the throne as he did and so he used a variety of methods to win their support and to ensure political stability. In the first instance, he forced them to keep peace under the threat of land loss if they did not. This was a significant measure as nearly all nobleman saw their land holdings as their prized possessions. In addition, he took a particularly strong line over the numbers who could keep an armed retinue until he was sure of their loyalty and allowing the numbers to grow only when he felt secure. Inevitably Henry faced a rebellion within a year although its failure shows the significance of Henry's actions in regards to controlling the nobility. The source of trouble was the remaining supporters of Richard III who planned to detain Henry whilst also creating a rising in the West. Henry used this as a further opportunity to demonstrate his power by executing the leading rebels. This had the effect of discouraging other potential rebels, again showing the significance of his actions in influencing political stability.

Henry VIII on the other hand favoured his nobility strongly, as we can see from his relationship with Charles Brandon and the Duke of Suffolk. Nevertheless, he pursued a running vendetta against all remaining Yorkists including the Duke of Buckingham – who he executed in 1521. In addition, his paranoia knew few bounds as we can see through his execution of George Boleyn in 1536 for the crime of being Anne Boleyn's brother. Henry's primary means of ensuring political stability in regards to the nobles was by increasing the prestige and power of the monarchy and through the heavy use of Wolsey and Cromwell to exclude nobles from power. Therefore we can see that Henry VIII's actions were, as were his fathers', very significant in influencing political stability.

Another way in which the Tudor monarchs attempted to influence political stability was through their methods of controlling rebellions and uprisings. Henry VII faced two major rebellions which threatened his authority, and both were caused by his need for money and heavy taxation demands. The first challenge was in Yorkshire in 1489 and the second in Cornwall in 1497, both arising as a result of tax rises in lieu of the wars against France and Warbeck. The Yorkshire rebellion was seen as a compromise, with Henry silencing the rebels, but being unable to implement his tax policy. This is significant as Henry recognized that in order to preserve political stability, he needed to cooperate with the people and not simply impose orders from above. The Cornish rebellion, however, was settled through brute force. Henry raised an army of 25,000 and killed around 1000 rebels.² His reaction to this rebellion shows that not only did he want to preserve political stability through cooperation with the subjects of his land, but also by removing any serious threat against his authority.

¹ Christine Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses*, Cambridge University Press (1997), Page 242.

² Nicholas Fellows, *Disorder and Rebellion in Tudor England*, Great Britain (2001)

Henry VIII dealt with rebellion in a very different way to his father. Perhaps the best example of this is the Pilgrimage of Grace where over 25,000 rebels arose against the King due to a combination of religious, political and economic reasons. Rather than raising an army, Henry seemingly gave in to the demands of the rebels, even agreeing upon 24 articles to be discussed in parliament. However after the rebels had dispersed, Henry failed to meet any of their demands. In this way, Henry can be seen to affect political stability in both a positive and negative manner. In the first instance, it can be said that he influenced it positively as he managed to disperse a rebellion using minimal royal finances and by making no compromise. However this can also be viewed as negative as the hollow promises made by Henry would only serve to increase underlying disillusion towards the monarchy. Similarly to Henry VIII, the actions of Protector Somerset under Edward VI's reign are seen to have had mixed effects upon political stability. 1549 saw two rebellions, arising partly because of enclosure and dissatisfaction with the economy - Western and Kett's Rebellion. Both rebellions were dealt with rather leniently with minimal forces being deployed to end them. In some respects this was seen as increasing political stability as the risings were crushed, re-asserting parliamentary authority with minimal force and cost. However Somerset's lenient response paved the way for internal faction as a result of disagreement within the council. Elizabeth I's response to the Oxfordshire rising was significant in influencing political stability as it gave her an opportunity to show royal strength. Despite the small scale of the rising, the crown was fearful because of the controversial background from which it formed. The small numbers of rebels were arrested and tortured. The rebellion provided them with an opportunity to demonstrate the powers of the state, and use them in order to discourage other rebels. Therefore by reducing the chances of unrest, Elizabeth was able to increase political stability.

Another key factor in assessing the significance of royal actions is the economic situation of the time. The economy that Henry VII inherited after the Battle of Bosworth was still recovering from both the Black Death and the War of the Roses. At the centre of Britain's economy was agriculture and so anything which directly instigates population decline, will indirectly affect the economy. Although Henry could do little to improve population levels, he did attempt to increase agricultural output through the trend towards enclosure. This was where land was fenced off and common rights over it were abolished. The use of enclosure for husbandry purposes was the first development towards a more scientific approach to farming – increasing the efficiency and output of the land. John Hales, an enclosure commissioner in the reign of Edward IV, stated in 1548 that where enclosure had been done legally, its benefits outweighed its problems. Therefore it is clear that Henry VII did much to increase political stability through his attempts to improve agricultural output after the population crisis of his reign. However enclosure did also have the side effect of causing instability amongst certain groups of society. The evicted families for example, were very opposed to enclosure as it removed land from them which they were previously able to farm on. Sir Thomas More suggested that the practice of enclosure was responsible for some of the social problems affecting England at the time – most significantly theft or the 'necessity of stealing'.³ Thus we can see that the monarch's actions in regards to enclosures had a mixed effect upon political stability. Whilst improving the agricultural output and thus the economic situation, some instability was caused amongst the families whose land was enclosed.

In addition, there were issues concerning the royal economic position during the reign of Edward VI. Protector Somerset had spent over £630,000 on warfare and the upkeep of the navy on top of Henry VIII's spending of £2,000,000 on warfare during the previous five years⁴, causing royal debt to rise towards record levels. Edwards's advisors, in particular the Duke of Northumberland, were significant in alleviating economic distress and thus increasing political stability. He began by introducing a Royal Commission which reduced royal debt from a staggering £3,000,000 to a more

³ Sir Thomas Moore, *Utopia*, Forgotten Books (1944)

⁴ Loades, David, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996 (Page 169)

manageable £180,000. This helped to reduce the Tudor issue of inflation and so Northumberland can be seen to be significant in influencing political stability during his reign.

Perhaps the most significant cause of political instability during the Tudor period came as a result of religious conflict. Religion was of little political significance during Henry VII's reign – England was simply a Catholic nation with church services being held in Latin. This was also true of much of Henry VIII's reign until he was refused a divorce from Catherine of Aragon. It was here that the most potent issue of the Tudor period began. Through the Act of Supremacy and Reformation, Henry declared himself the supreme head of a new Church of England. Henry proceeded to dissolve monasteries across the country and services were now held in English. This created huge unrest across the country as Englishmen had been practicing Roman Catholic traditions for centuries prior to this upheaval.

Reformation continued under Edward VI who was raised as a Protestant. Edwards' council began severely persecuting Catholics and proceeded to destroy any trace of Catholicism in England - images and wall paintings were destroyed and stained glass windows smashed. This religious transition was formalised through The Prayer Book of 1549 and the Act of Uniformity. Despite a growing belief that the people should accept the religion of the ruler, religious direction was at the centre of many future rebellions. Therefore the continued Catholic persecution adopted by Edwards's regime was a catalyst in promoting political instability – a clear example of which can be seen through the Western Rebellions of 1549.

Similarly, the actions of Mary I in respect to religion also caused political instability. At a time where the English population was slowly becoming used to Protestantism, Mary reversed the reformation initiated by Henry VIII and reverted the country back to a Catholic one. The extent of political stability can be seen through the refusal of over 300 leading Protestants to change their religion. This resulted in Mary burning all who would not accept catholic beliefs – earning her the moniker 'Bloody Mary'.

Finally, this trend towards instability did not end with Mary – during Elizabeth's reign the national religion was changed once again to Protestantism. This constant upheaval was the source of much disillusion and rebellious tendencies within the population; however Elizabeth did her best to sort out the issue of religion. She sought to allow Protestants and Catholics to coexist and instead of calling herself the 'Head of the Church of England', she used the 'Supreme Governor of the English Church'. Although Elizabeth was inherently protestant, she still allowed many Catholic traditions such as bishops, ordained priests and church decorations. She also produced a prayer book in English, but also allowed a Latin edition to be printed. To help alleviate political instability, Elizabeth persecuted both extreme Protestants and Catholics who attempted to convert people to their religion. Therefore at first, the actions of Elizabeth can be seen to disrupt stability, however when we look more closely, we can see that she resolved the issue of religion – using compromise to ensure stability of her realm.

In conclusion, we can see that political stability in Tudor England was affected by a number of different factors and that it depended upon the actions of individual monarchs and their advisors. For example whilst Henry VII took very significant action in controlling the nobility, Henry VIII took a more lenient stance, both ensuring political stability through their individual methods. This can be seen throughout the Tudor period with issues such as rebellions, economy and religious reformation. Within each of these areas of political influence, each relevant monarch took – to varying degrees, and results - actions to ensure that stability was maintained.

Bibliography

- Christine Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses*, Cambridge University Press (1997), Page 242.
- Nicholas Fellows, *Disorder and Rebellion in Tudor England*, Great Britain (2001)
- Sir Thomas Moore, *Utopia*, Forgotten Books (1944)
- Loades, David, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996 (Page 169)

Candidate 2

A mid-range piece of work, typical of that produced by many candidates

Part A

An enquiry that shows quite a good grasp of the main issues and a fairly confident, if somewhat limited, analysis of them. The structure is coherent although some points are a little contrived. A limited range of contemporary sources, not always the most appropriate, has been used with some minimal attempts at evaluation.

Part B

Broadly analytical in structure, with a creditable attempt to tease out factors from what at times could have become a monarch-by-monarch approach. The paragraph on Tudor economics shows some misunderstanding. Overall, an understanding is shown of the causal factors involved in influencing political stability in England.

**GCE History Coursework
Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet**

This authentication must be attached to the front of the candidate's work at the time it is submitted for assessment

Centre Number	
Candidate Number	
Candidate Name (in capitals, surname followed by forenames)	
Coursework Programme Title: (if Edexcel designed please provide reference code from specification.)	Colonisation and Decolonisation in Africa, c1870 - c1981
Assignment Title	Part A: Short term impact of individual Part B: How far do you agree that World War Two was the key turning point in Britain's relationship with its Empire in Africa, 1870 - 1981?
Content (please tick box to acknowledge that content is attached to assignment.)	Resource Record: Appendix: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Examined Units Give details of all Units (title and option code) making up the AS and A2. Please Note Where Unit 4 is a centre-designed coursework programme, one copy of the centre's Coursework Approval Form must be included with the work when submitted for assessment.	Unit 1: D2: Mao's China, 1949 - 76 and D4: Stalin's Russia, 1925 - 53 or D5: Pursuing Life and Liberty: Equality and the USA, 1945 - 68 Unit 2: The Experience of Warfare in Britain: Crimea, the Boer War and World War I, 1854 - 1929 Unit 3: C2 - The United States, 1917 - 54, Boom, Bust and Recovery or D1 - From Kaiser to Fuhrer: Germany, 1900 - 45

Word Count	3548		
Mark for Part A: AO1 (mark out of 13)	Mark for Part A: AO2 (mark out of 12)	Mark for Part B: AO1 (mark out of 25)	Total Mark: Part A and B (final mark out of 50)
6	4	12 13	22 (23)

Statement by candidate

I declare that I have produced the assignment attached without external assistance, apart from any which is acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment and is recorded.

I also declare that the word count given above is correct. I am aware of the penalties that will be imposed for exceeding the word limit (4000 words) by any amount.

Signature: _____ Date: 4/5/10

Statement by teacher

I declare that the candidate's activities have been kept under regular supervision and that to the best of my knowledge no assistance has been given apart from any which is acceptable under the scheme of assessment and has been identified and recorded.

Signature: _____ Date: 4/5/10

By signing the above declaration you agree to your coursework being used to support Professional Development, Online Support and Training of both Centre-Assessors and Edexcel Moderators. If you have any concerns regarding this please email historyandlaw@edexcel.com

What was the short term significance of Kwame Nkrumah on the decolonisation of Africa in the years 1949- 1959?

The short term significance of Kwame Nkrumah on the de-colonisation of Africa cannot be underestimated. This is because of the vital part he played in the departure of the British Empire from the state of Ghana in 1957. He was responsible for the chain reaction which would affect every single African Nation on the road to self government, and in turn the complete collapse of British Imperialism over the continent. His travels to the USA and England influenced his ideology which he used in his new free state of Ghana and attempted to do the same for the rest of Africa. His involvement in the UGCC when he returned to Africa had large effects on his country and generation, when imprisoned the actions of the CPP coming to power allowed him to become the new Prime Minister (later the future President) of Ghana which would be noticed throughout the world. With everyone watching events taking place in Ghana, Britain's stance upon its territories in Africa loosened Giving African peoples the opportunity for a whole new era of self-determination in Africa to develop.

Nkrumah who was a great advocate of Pan Africanism had a dream of a new Africa which would see the indigenous population take hold of their own destiny. During his travels to the USA where he achieved a masters of Arts in philosophy and in England where he went to set up the fifth Pan-African congress in Manchester, Nkrumah had shown signs of the ideology he was beginning to adopt. (1) "I had known Nkrumah in New York before he came to London to join George Padmore; Padmore was from 1935 the founder and guiding spirit of the African Bureau and today is universally known as the father of African emancipation." This extract being by CLR James, a known Marxist of the time talking about George Padmore another Pan African figure, clearly gives us an understanding of the future Nkrumah and how he intended for his new Ghana to look.

Other actions from Nkrumah's past such as the founding of the "West African National Secretariat" also show that from an earlier period of his life (1945) Nkrumah had thought out his ideology long before he started his political movements within Ghana. All these past actions and organisations are relevant to my argument as it shows even Nkrumah was himself certain of his involvement in de-colonisation of Africa even if we conclude he had little significance at all to do with it.

With the scene set with the ideals of Kwame Nkrumah ready to take on the white government of the gold coast, in 1947 he moved back. Here he became the General Secretary of the United Gold Coast Convention, and this is what brought his presence to the attention of the British. Being a revolutionary organisation the UGCC was blamed for the protests of 1948 over rising living costs; a shooting which saw the death of an ex-serviceman was also blamed upon the organisation and saw that Kwame along with other party officials were arrested unjustly by the colonial government.

Kwame Nkrumah's arrest in 1948 allowed Kwame Nkrumah to become a martyr for the Ghanaian people, it allowed the CPP (Convention People's Party) to demonise colonialism and enhance the chances of their own party winning the upcoming elections. (2) "This measure had the reverse effect on the population of the Gold Coast - 'The Big Six', as they became known, gained popularity from their act, and their efforts resulted in significant changes in the path to independence in the 1951 constitution."

When Kwame was released after the colonial government realised its mistake, Nkrumah was hailed through the Gold Coast being some sort of a figurehead. His leadership came into play as he now had the attention of the country, knowing how to organise himself he travelled around Ghana preaching his mix of Pan African, Marxist ideals. He proclaimed "Self Government Now!"

This preaching began the Party which would have the biggest effect upon British Imperial Rule since India; the CPP. This party forced the British to change their government to include more native peoples in order to try and settle the population. The colonial government set up a new constitution which only allowed the largest land owners of the black population to have voting rights but it was too little too late. The CPP wanted a much wider range of African's to have the vote but the government rejected this idea, Nkrumah ordered the CPP members to disobey the British and this is what caused the Imperial decision to leave the Gold Coast.

After arresting Nkrumah for encouraging populace disobedience he was sent to jail to serve 3 years, this only enhanced the problems as he became more of a martyr and so the British Empire chose to leave the state and hold an election on 5-10 of February 1951. After a landslide Victory Nkrumah was released and became leader of the new government on the 13th. During a speech by Harold Macmillan during the time; (7) "The government and people of Ghana have set their hands to a great task. We are confident whatever may be the difficulties which will face them they will maintain and develop the principles of tolerance and freedom which are inherent in our parliamentary system. We shall give them all the help we can." This was change which was the first of its kind, Britain had let the first of its colonies go, cracks in the foundation of Imperialism were showing. As my next source shows the success of Nkrumah was new, the achievements were an example of how easily independence could be gained.

(3) "Within two years the CPP had won limited self-rule elections and Nkrumah became "Leader of Government Business" — a de facto prime minister, responsible for internal government and policy."

After the British government had renounced Ghana as a colonial state in the Empire Nkrumah moved on to his role as the President of the Gold Coast, He said in a speech: (4) "For centuries, Europeans dominated the African continent. The white man arrogated to himself the right to rule and to be obeyed by the non-white; his mission, he claimed, was to "civilise" Africa. Under this cloak, the Europeans robbed the continent of vast riches and inflicted unimaginable suffering on the African people" This was a famous first line of a speech which directly told the world the purpose of freedom for the people of Ghana. The gold coast saw itself as being set free from oppression and didn't want to be part of the commonwealth, the world took note and this became significant because it was this speech which drove and inspired other colonial African Nations, not only had Ghandi's India achieved independence now so had the Gold Coast.

Although this was the point in which Nkrumah was seen as a hero, it was his corruption of his own dream and the lack of his leadership which made him significant. Never had an African nation and man become this influential and carried such potential, but Nkrumah failed to use his potential and failed to help his African Nations gain independence. (5) "The next effect of this attention, adulation, and pseudo-success was about what one might expect - it spoiled Nkrumah and con-

sequently Ghana's chances to complete its development and provide at the same time critically needed leadership for less fortunate areas of emerging Africa."

As this source shows Nkrumah's significance could have been so much more, but his failure held African independence back. What took decades could have been halved with Nkrumah as a strong leader, but he failed his own vision.

Of course others believe that this is too strong a judgement of Nkrumah, his later life being seen as a less significant and more flawed part of African Nationalism is challenged by Charles Abugre; (6) Dead politicians are different things to different people. Both their good and their wrong define the goal posts and hence the playing fields upon which the survivors take their positions in society."

Nkrumah over the short term had been influential in changing opinion of Imperial dominance in Africa, but by 1959 the world had began to look differently at the ruler Kwame Nkrumah as this source describes; (7) "Two years of independence have witnessed what seems to be a marked departure from democratic rule towards an authoritarian one-party State". These kind of reports showed a change in the opinion of Nkrumah but it was not so much the man which became idolised in Africa in the years that followed, it was the ideals he pursued during his earlier days which he is remembered for. People seemed to listen to the things he said rather than see the poor decisions he took, in 1961 the influence he still commanded is reflected in his speech; (8) "It is clear that we must find an African solution to our problems, and this can only be found in unity."

Whether he was the first or indeed the last notable African leader which caused change within the ideas of imperialism is not important. He was significant to some degree and this lead to the multi independent states which cover Africa today. If he hadn't done the actions many figures such as Nelson Mandela and Kenyatta (Jomo) wouldn't have had inspiration and the knowledge of possible achievement for their own independence.

To conclude he was significant in the short term to the decolonisation of Africa in some ways for the things he did, but for others the things he didn't achieve, he set the stage for the next half of the 20th century but failed to be the "force for good" he predicted.

A01

 (6) L2

A02

 (4)

How Far do you agree that WW2 was the key turning point in Britain's relationship with its Empire in Africa between 1870 and 1981?

I agree fully that the 2nd World War is the key turning point in Britain's relationship with its Empire in Africa during 1870 and 1981 but it is not the only turning point in the changing of relationship between Britain and its African empire as WW1, the Boer War and the Suez Crisis had their own effects which would deeply influence the connections between the Empire and its Mother country. Only through many other turning points in Britain's history was the 2nd World War able to become a key turning point.

The 2nd World War was a key turning point in Britain's History, one which shook the foundations of its empire in Africa (except the Suez crisis in 1956 which resulted in the breakdown of the British Empire). World War two was an event which took the Empire to near breaking point but victory in 1945 saw the continuation of its African control. During the war the British saw their African colonies fight with bravery for their empire against the Axis forces in Europe and North Africa, after the conflict the colonies still saw themselves very much as a part of the empire, but it was not the war itself that started to change the opinion of African colonies about their mother nation. It was the principals of the war that made it such a key turning point, since the end of the 2nd World War Hitler's 3rd Reich had turned the original theme of imperialism into an ugly thing which other Nations began to see as old fashioned and evil, used to take advantage of others rather than the world police image which had persisted before. Also the fact that India had gained independence shortly after the war (1947) may have sparked more change in African opinion of their Imperial allegiance, this was the first non white state to make any progress in leaving, independence was no longer dream, but an achievable goal which could be reached. For example Kwame Nkrumah in the Gold Coast was one of the first African Nationalists which fought for independence and played a role in the new idea of "Pan Africanism" which was spreading throughout Africa in the 60's. Also economics had a great part to play after the war. America which had done well financially from the European war had gained trading rights with Europe, new trade routes throughout the world and big political influence. They encouraged the African nations in future along with other colonies to seek independence, with Britain, France and other nations being in debt to them they could not put up great opposition to them and the fact that they were already bankrupt made not paying for colonies a useful alternative to keeping empire.

The British Empire's war with the Boer's in 1899 can be seen as a big turning point in Britain's relationship with Africa as this war was upon other European peoples in Africa. (1) The Boer war "was a disastrous (and illegal) attempt to annex Transvaal territory held by the Boers and principal cause of the African war". The Boer's being seen as a group of Dutch Farmers who had only primitive defences by the British were presumed to be no threat, the war which followed however was a bloodbath between the two peoples which was eventually brought to an end on flimsy terms set down by the British. This was in itself not the most significant turning point in Britain's relationship with Africa but the vulnerabilities of the Empire had been shown to its peoples and they began to look at the ideas of "Pax Britannia" (the idea of British as the most worthy race world police who struggled for the peace of all nations) and the idea of British people being racially superior were seen as lies

having just witnessed quite a long, hard, bloody war, waged by the people who thought that they were supposed to be in charge of the world. Perhaps on the other hand this was the key turning point in Britain's relationship with its empire in Africa as the idea behind empire had already been fractured, all other events which lead to the eventual collapse of the British colonies in Africa would stem from this war and the change it forced people to see. World War 2 unlike the Boer war however, did not have the same economic aftermath as the Boer war, with the Boer War although it saw massive losses in life and money didn't have the lasting effect of WW2, the rest of the empire not being effected saw no change in trade routes, if anything the end of the war allowed the empire to open up easier trade routes to the south pacific and Indian ocean. World War two was the opposite, with the costly war crippling the empire's economy and disrupting trade routes it was a spiral towards collapse.

Of course you could argue that Britain did not lose any of its empire in Africa until 1956 (Sudan) and that the Suez crisis which took place in 1956 was much more likely to be the cause of relationship change with Britain seeing as afterward a collapse in colonies is seen almost year to year; Gold Coast 1957, Nigeria 1960, Sierra 1961, Tanzania 1962, Kenya 1963... But again I do not think that one turning point alone could be the cause of the breakdown of relationship with British Empire in Africa as for colonies to gain independence one after the other shows major evidence of damage to the foundations of the empire to begin with. Compared to World War 2 the Suez Crisis was not a war which began with Britain as a world super power, the Suez Crisis was the colonial powers reacting violently to the Nationalisation of the once British controlled canal between Arabian seas and the Mediterranean which unlike World War 2 was a strategic war rather than a defensive one . The fact was that without the canal huge issues concerning trade and colonial control arose for the British which lead to the Israelis, French and British waging war upon Egypt to regain control of the canal. The action which the colonial powers had taken lead to a national outcry against imperial powers deciding to do whatever they wanted at the expense of others, this contributed to the decline of support and rise in opposition against Britain's empire, thus giving momentum to the Pan African ideals and resulting in the collapse of Empire in 1981. Economically the Suez Crisis again weakened Britain like World War 2, but this only increased the speed of which the empire appeared to be crumbling rather than started the decline. This is shown as Britain never again after the Suez Crisis made any international interventions without the political support and approval of the USA, Britain had lost its place as the world power it had boasted 10 years hence. (2) In an account by Alan Lennox Boyd 1956 he states; "Britain may have to begin to have a deliberate policy of shedding some of our colonies". At the end of the conflict where Canada was made the peacekeepers of the Suez Canal political tensions were eased between Egypt, Britain and France, as a consequence though Britain and France had to increase their presence within the Middle east territories and this combined with the Egyptian leader Nasser leading a new movement of "Pan Arabism" helped colonies (including African ones) on their way to independence even quicker. The British was losing their empire and knew it.

World War 1 in 1914-18 saw the first war to involve all the European Empires with colonies in Africa. Britain had the largest amount of colonial territory in Africa at the time amongst the European powers, it enjoyed vast wealth from the trade they offered and controlling them was easy having one of the finest armies in the world. In the 1st World War Britain despite losing wealth and men did see a return from the war in Germany's African colonies, this

must have had an effect upon the colonies as they probably had no allegiance to Britain whatsoever but the allegiance within Britain's previously controlled colonies remained strong. It was Britain's white colonies that seemed to be most affected by the war and saw national identity arise in Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Although they did not gain independence for some time after World War 1, seeds of national identity could have been picked up by African peoples in the British Empire. World War one also saw a change within the British people's opinions. The Empire being quite battered after the World War was still regarded as something that needed to be maintained but it was home affairs people cared more for, Empire had become a back burning policy. World War 2 unlike World War 1 as a turning point in the relationship with Africa saw the ideas that world war one had produced blossom into nationalist movements. Kwame Nkrumah as an example became involved in the movement of Pan Africanism, the idea which sought to unify African peoples and heritage into a global community. This was possibly enhanced by imperial problems with economy, (3) "Britain's commercial difficulties deepened with the onset of the "Long Depression" of 1873–96, a prolonged period of price deflation punctuated by severe business downturns which added to pressure on governments to promote home industry". This is evidence that the effects of back burning empire combined with World War 2 had resulted in the deterioration of African and other British colonies. 12 years later Ghana had reached independence and other colonies fell quickly afterwards, pointing again toward the idea that World War 2 had been the "Key turning point".

In conclusion looking over the events which took place in Africa across the 20th century many Key turning points can clearly be observed. The Boer war, World War 1, World War 2 and the Suez Crisis all contributed to the changing of Britain's relationship with Africa, but it took all of them to combined together to allow World War 2 to be the key turning point. Had the Boer war, World War 1 and Suez not happened, I would imagine that World War 2 would not have had the same effect as it did upon Britain's relationship with Africa. It took the Boer War to show that change in Africa could be achieved, although it did not give them the chance this information was the basis for independence in future. World War 1 allowed all colonial Nations to see for themselves the cost of being part of Empire and brought forth the first discussion of whether it was good or not, although this was not a key turning point again this event in history was a way of letting future relationship change evolve further. The Suez Crisis which took place after World War 2 was as I see it not a key turning point in relation to African relations with Britain, but it quickened the processes of independence as it forced Colonial powers to reconsider the changes taking place and re-evaluate their political stances. I believe that it was World War 2 which was the key turning point because without it the focus on Empire would have been continued and any resistance to it or any ideas which preached change could well have been jeopardised. Although I also feel that the war could not have been as significant a turning point without other events It was the pressure which bought the cracks of Empire to breaking point.

Candidate 3

A low-scoring piece of work, sufficient for a pass.

Part A

An enquiry consisting of developed statements with some focus, although this tends to be implicit rather than explicit. Supporting evidence is accurate and even precise in places. The sources selected are linked to their historical context. There is some attempt to cross-reference between them or tackle them as evidence, but this is limited.

Part B

An enquiry showing some analytical focus but with descriptive and narrative passages. The factual material included is accurate and relevant and the conclusion shows some understanding of the patterns of change over the period. There is very little evidence shown of wider reading.

Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet

This authentication must be attached to the front of the candidate's work at the time it is submitted for assessment

Centre Number	
Candidate Number	
Candidate Name (in capitals, surname followed by forenames)	
Coursework Programme Title (if Edexcel designed please provide reference code from specification.)	Rebellion Disorder in Tudor England CW7 1485-1587
Assignment Title	Part A: What was the short-term significance of Cornish Rebellion Part B: Assess the significance of the actions taken by individual monarchs and their advisers in relation to political stability in England in the years 1485-1603
Content (please tick box to acknowledge that content is attached to assignment.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Record <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix
Examined Units Give details of all Units (title and option code) making up the AS and A2. Please Note Where Unit 4 is a centre-designed coursework programme, one copy of the centre's Coursework Approval Form must be included with the work when submitted for assessment.	Unit 1: a world divided a world divided Communism and democracy 20th century
	Unit 2: Conflict and change in 14th and 20th Britain
	Unit 3: united states challenge and transform

Word Count	2485		
Mark for Part A: AO1 (mark out of 13)	Mark for Part A: AO2 (mark out of 12)	Mark for Part B: AO1 (mark out of 25)	Total Mark: Part A and B (final mark out of 50)
6	0	5	11/50

Statement by candidate
I declare that I have produced the assignment attached without external assistance, apart from any which is acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment and is recorded.
I also declare that the word count given above is correct. I am aware of the penalties that will be imposed for exceeding the word limit (4000 words) by any amount.

Signature: _____ Date: 26-4-10.

Statement by teacher
I declare that the candidate given apart from any work has been under regular supervision and that to the best of my knowledge no assistance has been given and has been identified and recorded.

Signature: _____ Date: 10-5-10

What was the short-term significance of The Cornish Rebellion, 1497.

England had entered a new age as of 1486; it was now under the rule of the Tudor family and Henry VII. In 1497 had finally captured Perkin Warbeck the man who passed himself off as Richard Duke of York the murdered son of Edward IV, and brought the true end to the War Of The Roses. So the Cornish rebellions couldn't have come at a worse time. The Tudors had just come to power Henry VII had beaten Richard III at the battle of Bosworth on 22nd of August 1485 thus ending the *War Of The Roses*, and subsequently married Elizabeth York in 1486 in an attempt to build his claim to the throne of England and in doing so uniting the warring houses.

The relevance of this being Henry had fought long and hard to make his rule uncontested as king even by dividing and undermining his Noble's power so none could challenge his total control over the aristocracy. This is why the Cornish rebellion is so significant in it is almost completely planned and carried out by peasants (A factor the nobility overlooked) it may have been lead by James Touchet and Thomas Flamank, the Cornish rebellion was a direct reaction to the kings tax levy there is no doubt about that Cornish people had no idea how something that happened all the way in London reflected on them and why should they, England was not a united country by 1497 most did not speak English as far as Cornwall was concerned London could be a completely separate country Cornwall was not London. The Cornish people had their own national identity own set of values. Henry had just brought an end to the wars that had ripped the British monarchy apart and was in the mist of negotiating with Spain so the timing could not be worse now Henry must suppress this uprising after he just stabilized the aristocracy, the impact this must have had on Henry Tudor is unbelievable he was already paranoid about when it came to his hold on the throne and had taken power from the nobles who were previously in a large position of power. Now if the Nobles funded or even joined the Cornish rebellion Henry may suffer the same fate as Richard III. Despite this there is how close the Cornish army came to London after issuing a declaration of grievance at Wells the army marched through the south of England as the Cornish people progressed further through England and the king gave no response it became clear that the Cornish people had only one clear option and that was to take up arms, the rebellion then moved to Kent the scene of other uprisings such as the peasants revolt of 1381 here they hoped to recruit the men of Kent in to joining there army however this was not so , by June of 1497 the rebellion had arrived in Guildford, Henry at this point had assembled an army in an army to combat the rebellion ,the rebellion kept moving and was now in Blackheath and in reaction to this the Royal family were moved to the tower of London with the archbishop of Canterbury.

The city of London was in panic Henry could face its clear that the Cornish rebellion was now longer a movement it was an insurrection.

During the battle of Deptford Bridge the Cornish were ultimately defeated but their act of defiance had done more than they could ever of dreamt of Henry whilst trying to create an alliance with Spain now looked weak an unable to control his own country men this internal, matter would have threatened the Kings foreign policy no country wants to ally itself with a weak nation, the reflection of a nation was at that time in judged by its King, in fact the king in a sense was the country and Henry was illegitimate, paranoid and self conscience, the rebellion had also taught Henry the significance of the people through disregard and an unwillingness to listen Henry VII came close to having the Tudor dynasty crumble in 1497.

However the Cornish Rebellions had also aided Henry in his consolidation of power, now Henry had defeated an uprising that threatened London he had saved the people, now Henry could return to London a hero and a protector, The Cornish rebellions had made Henry Tudor into a hero after all the people of London didn't know or care what happened in Cornwall to a London Peasant The Cornish tried to seize power and Henry and his army stopped them. Henry also mad example of the leaders as a warning to anyone else that would dare challenge the king. Obviously the leaders were made example of they were executed with their heads displayed on pikes on London bridge.

The Cornish rebellion's greatest significance lies in progress it made yes the Cornish rebellions ultimately failed but they had woken the drawn the attention of the these people who were simple peasants rose up against the king someone who was chosen by divine right to lead the country in its I not saying that revolts never happened but they were usually always unsuccessful in the Tudor and Medieval period, so not many people used to join. Moreover revolts were usually puppets of nobles, nobles used peasants for their own gains peasants were expandable and seen as the lowest for of life they were essentially born into the role of pawn. Nevertheless the Cornish rebellion was an answer to Henry's tax (levy) it was a people defying and rising against their king and ruler, a free thinking carried out by the lowest of society. This is truly an unpredictable action in a time where there was a Totalitarian Monarchy was all there was not aside from god the king was your highest authority peasants knew the order o things and knew to not stick their neck as it was liable to get chopped off without a second thought so to speak. The real significance would be if it had inspired the people or made them wary of Henry's wrath since Henry remained in power I can only consider the latter and due to the divided nature of Britain, it meant the peasants of London and Cornwall probably spoke different a language the peasants of London most likely saw Cornwall as fools and heretics. But the overlooked significance of the Cornish rebellions is definitely the impact it must have

had on Henry Tudors rule Henry was known to not trust the nobles the Cornish rebellion taught him not to trust the people. Henry could have even suspected that the Cornish rebellion was just another event ordained by the nobility. It's most resonating blow would have been with Henry Tudor he has to forge a dynasty at 1497 he is literally assuming total control (threw) war and politics. And he was almost brought down by a rabble of peasants and farmers Henry must have felt besieged upon all sides by his court his people and even his family. Moreover the significance of the Cornish rebellion manifest itself in many ways from the shock that peasants were capable of unified and revolutionary thought, England was not as powerful and strong as had been though, a dangerous impression when total war resides throughout Europe, Henry did have the strength as a king to quell any uprising, and this may have even solidified Henry's resolve that he needed to consolidate his power within England not just among the lords but with the people he didn't just need to rule he had to dominate. But that England must by United that if the country was to progress and succeed it needed a national identity a single flag religion language and idea to rally behind without, this Britain would be no more than an island that would be constantly torn apart by revolution and strife and never be a set to be a country just an island of different people. The Cornish Rebellion is not the most important event in Tudor times at all but the fact that it was such minor event only adds to its impact and significance.

A01 6/13 L2

A02

0/12 L1

Asses the significance of the actions taken by individual monarchs and their advisers in influencing political stability in England in the years 1485-1603.

The Tudor reign in itself is so diverse in the way each monarch ruled and used their lords. First of all we obviously have Henry VII, Henry rose to power after the defeat of Richard the III Yorkist army at Bosworth in 1485, this is crucial to the way that Henry ruled. first of all Henry had usurped the king of England and his claim to the throne was unsubstantiated at best in fact it was so dubious that both parliament and his supporters ever made it clear how Henry had claim to his new title, and by illegitimate descent. This reflected in Henry's statute, Henry VII spent his reign quashing any issue of legitimacy that surrounded him, (there is even speculation that he killed Richards children and then blamed it on him.)Henry certified his power by marrying Elizabeth York and ending the rivalry between the Lancaster and York families uniting the families consolidating his power and Henry in fear of his throne knew the power that the nobles held so intern would undermine their power so that he could not suffer the fate of Richard. Henry ripped back the power from the lords and made England a true indisputable Monarchy system whereas lords before were given royalties and exceptional traits as part of their status as lord Henry completely shook up this old system if lords wanted to be treated well and favored in Henry's court they had to earn it. He did this by reforming the royal parliament and introducing a king's council to ensure the nobles paid their taxes. Henry did not just force his hand in parliament, he sent warnings to Tudor towns around England putting up severed heads arms and legs as a constant reminder to their subjects that their was a price to pay to defile this king, Henry did not want his "*royal dictatorship*" to descend into the anarchy of his predecessor. "*that herefore the Roses had troubled the kingdom, but now it seemed they desired to sharpen the thorns of the Roses.*" There is no doubt that Henry took a squabbling divided monarchy and aristocracy and reformed it into a profitable structure Monarchy. Henry had not just done this because he saw the state of England's governing body and knew it needed to be reformed Henry's actions were always enacted with the level of paranoia, Henry lived in constant fear that he would be usurped by anyone who blood ties to Yorkists and Lancaster, Henry's reign seemed purely economical with Henry striking up treaties with France, Spain and even Scotland, you could say despite all of Henry's paranoia towards his nobleman and warnings towards his subjects Henry's main goal was peace, Henry had no interest in pursuing campaigns or reclaiming Frances lost regions Henry concentrated on internal power (even creating the Portsmouth the oldest working dry dock)and creating wealth opportunities. Despite Henry's success in England towards the end of his reign he became more unpopular among his nobles and knights even though it is said that Henry had one of the richest kingdoms in all of the Christendom and rumors of his wealth were always rife, (having said that many historians dispute this however they may be speaking of resources rather than gold stockpiles.) moreover Henry's influence would not be on political stability his

influence is political stability Henry VII created a totalitarianism Monarchy out of a feudal system where the lords in acted their own agenda.

By the time you reach the rule of Henry VIII its an entire different way of ruling first of all Henry has no issue with legitimacy but Henry had a different way of dealing with opposition from lords whereas his father would make his enemy depend on him Henry had his own way of dealing with opposition he would remove them as he did with sir Richard Empson and Edmund Dudley two days after his coronation in 1509. Henry VIII inherited a thriving economy but Henry saw himself as a renaissance man surrounding him and his court with poetry, art, and indulging in gambling (also Henry the VIII as well as having six wives was rumored to have no end of mistresses) needless to say this carefree lifestyle led to spending and high taxes which left henrys kingdom in financial ruin. but it was not just Henry spending on himself, in an attempt to make himself known in history Henry began to build he had 15 palaces all decorated with exotic items and increased the Royal Navy from 5 ships to 50 needless to say Henry had big ambitions for his rule Henry's biggest and most drastic decision he was to split from the Catholic church and form his own branch of the church this was indeed risky as Henry had joined the Holy league creating his own church would have meant segregation from not only Spain and Rome he could be proclaimed as any enemy as France was. Religion was such a huge part of life at this point that creating your own church is radical, however this would change the face of Britain forever. Henry would have to implement this core belief system into people and hope no loyalists rebelled against him, or nobles tried to over throw him for their own means under the facade of heresy, although this was indeed a silver lining Henry was no longer bound to the pope's rule and regulation he was truly a free to govern his country as he saw fit. Henry after establishing the church of England went about liquidating and taking monasteries and using their land to great benefit by transferring a fifth of wealth to them, as Henry removed anyone in his way he was able to carry out this reform without encountering too much resistance many people fell in line and loyal Catholics just kept quiet, whereas Henry VII concentrated on achieving a political stability, Henry VIII made England an independent nation while under Henry the VIII legitimacy conspiracy none of those aspects seemed to phase Henry he governed and ruled a much more relaxed country the country had political stability as with Henry VII but this time there would be no warnings if anyone stood in Henry VIII way they would not last long it's due to the fact that Henry the VIII had no controversy around his ascent to the throne so he was able to be the king he saw fit and not have worry about betrayal he is king now by divine right he is untouchable. Simply put Henry was able to rule through fear up until his death in 1547.

Edward was raised protestant and this would undoubtedly affect his rule but in reality the regency council ruled as Edward never came of age. Edward unfortunately disrupted the economic stability his predecessors had achieved Edwards age probably played a key part in this as a boy he did not demand

respect and during his rule was faced with withdraw from Scotland civil unrest and riots it seems as though if anything Edward has disrupted the peace that the Tudors fought over, Edward however would be the architect of a major reform in England Edward introduced Protestantism to Catholic England. Edward prohibited Catholic rituals. Sadly Edward died in 1553 just 15 when he died. Edward wanted Jane Seymour to take the throne he passed over his sisters so that she could finish what he started, and Jane Seymour was queen, for nine days until Mary I proclaimed herself rightful queen.

Edward had hoped his cousin Lady Jane Grey would continue his work to make England protestant but this was not so, when Mary I came to power she set about undoing all of Edwards work Mary would force England back into Roman Catholic religion and burning she would burn a few people in her way, earning her the nickname "*Bloody Mary*" if Edward had disrupted the stability Henry the VII and Henry VIII had left for them Mary completely destroyed it and not just from her nasty habit of burning people Mary wanted to marry Phillip II of Spain this sparked civil disobedience throughout the country on top of this Mary Had to deal with claims that Lady Jane Grey was still rightful queen and had to combat Thomas Wyatt's Force in London fighting to restore Lady Jane Grey. Mary I despite defeating Thomas Wyatt had let England slip back into a state of chaos in which the Monarchy could be challenged again by Lords and Nobles if Henry the VII brought political stability Mary I did her best to eradicate it Mary died in 1558 having burnt 300 people and destabilizing a country.

5/25 L1

Candidate 4

A piece of work that cannot achieve a pass

Part A

An enquiry consisting of statements with some development in the form of the material selected. There is some attempt to focus on significance, but this is not convincing. No contemporary or primary sources are used.

Part B

An enquiry consisting of simplified statements, some of which have accuracy and relevance, but very generalised and lacking any convincing support for judgements made. No evidence of wider reading.

Throughout, there are problems with written communication.

GCE History
Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet

Confidential: Edexcel and QCA use only

This authentication must be attached to the front of the candidate's work at the time it is submitted for assessment

Centre Number	
Candidate Number	
Candidate Name (in capitals, surname followed by forenames)	
Coursework Programme Title (if Edexcel designed please provide reference code from specification.)	EARLY MODERN FRANCE 1559-1661
Assignment Title	Part A: What was the short term significance of Henry II's accidental death in 1559? Part B: To what extent was the French monarchical crisis of the period 1559-1592 resolved by 1661?
Content (please tick box to acknowledge that content is attached to assignment.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Record
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix
Examined Units Give details of all Units (title and option code) making up the AS and A2. <i>Please Note</i> Where Unit 4 is a centre-designed coursework programme, one copy of the centre's Coursework Approval Form must be included with the work when submitted for assessment.	Unit 1: England in the Middle Ages A3: Angevin Empire 1154-1216 A4: Black Death to Great Revolt, 1348-81
	Unit 2: Early Modern British History A2: Crown, Parliament and Authority in England, 1588-1629.
	Unit 3: The United States: Challenged and Transformed C2: The United States, 1917-54: Boom, Bust and Recovery

Word Count	3997 Part A: 1991 Part B: 2006 = 3997		
Mark for Part A: AO1 (mark out of 13)	Mark for Part A: AO2 (mark out of 12)	Mark for Part B: AO1 (mark out of 25)	Total Mark: Part A and B (final mark out of 50)
13 ✓	12 ✓	25 ✓	50 ✓

Statement by candidate
I declare that I have produced the assignment attached without external assistance, apart from any which is acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment and is recorded.
I also declare that the word count given above is correct. I am aware of the penalties that will be imposed for exceeding the word limit (4000 words) by any amount.

Signature: _____ **Date:** 04/05/10

Statement by teacher
I declare that the candidate's activities have been kept under regular supervision and that to the best of my knowledge no assistance has been given apart from any which is acceptable under the scheme of assessment and has been identified and recorded.

Signature: _____ **Date:** 4th May 2010

25/25/10

2

What was the short term significance of Henri II's accidental death in 1559?well-diverted
analysis

Henri II's death will always appear to be significant because a civil war in France emerged only three years later. Yet the beginnings of the religious civil wars resulted from a culmination of factors, least importantly yet still significantly the death of the king. It provided a power vacuum which was exploited by rivaling factions. Yet these factions' pre-existing relationships along with the growing religious disunity were still more significant.

Evidence integrated
into
sustained
argument

Henri II's death laid the foundations for the tensions to come. France lost a powerful figurehead, which meant that a number of figures attempted to fill the space. It allowed the most influential factions to gain ascendancy to the crown and court, while the authority of the state decreased with the introduction of the younger king, Francis II, and the foreign regent, Catherine de Medici. This allowed confidence within the nobility to arise without hindrance.

For example, the duke of Guise, according to Haton, had more power than the king "Guise ... through the princes and lords who followed him ... could, if he had wanted, have made himself king of France."¹ Even if the writer of this source, a Catholic priest, might have favoured Guise and not the apparently tolerant government, it still shows the power Guise

had. In fact the provenance further proves the existence of the speculation over the kingdom's most influential individual. With no figurehead, it became difficult to organise the country. The consequent collapse of France's fiscal system and the regression of French society to a provincial level was also partly due to his death.

For example, attempts to reconcile any religious differences such as the Colloquy of Poissy, the Edicts of Toleration and Saint Germain were largely ignored because of the loyalty towards the local governor's religion rather than the state.² In the same light, Henri's death turned the court from a relatively stable and healthy system, albeit expensive to maintain, into a meeting place for warring factions.

The lack of a powerful and personal monarch meant that neither side had anyone in authority to refer to in a crisis. Both were convinced that their choice was the right one, doing the right thing, "in respect for the king."³ Of course, Guise's ignorance of the real king's wishes further proves that he did not have much respect at all. However, if after Henri II had died, Francis II had survived to reign for the next twenty years, it would probably have stayed a Catholic-dominated country. Mack Holt rightly points out the fractious and unpredictable nature of the rivalry: "... elevated to power with one royal death, the Guises found themselves dismissed with another when Francis was succeeded by Charles IX."⁴ This is certainly significant if we are analysing the causes of the civil wars because it was this death and Catherine de Medici's regency that, with the fall of the Guises, allowed Protestant nobles to ascend at court and allowed two warring sides to develop. It is clear by these letters dedicating the subjects' life to avenging the death of Francis, duke of Guise, that at this time sides began to become serious and militaristic: "I ... promise to render such obedience and

well-introduced

Nature of
source
integrated
confidentlyWell-
selected
factual
materialGood use
of
historians

530 words

¹ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 10, pg 26 – **Consequences of the death of Francis II**

² This was gradually ironed out by Richelieu and his 'intendants' later in the century

³ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 19, pg 48 – **The Massacre of Vassy, the duke of Guise's view** – this was when he sent armed men to disrupt a Protestant meeting.

⁴ Mack P Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*, (Cambridge, 2005) pg 45

Source interrogated confidentially

loyal service to the Duke of Guise ... for the recovery of his property as to avenge the death ... up to the fourth generation of those who committed the homicide.⁵ This source is valuable because it is an extremist view, to which only the strongest supporters of the Guise faction would have sworn, indicating the aggression Guise's clients had and the measures they were prepared to go to achieve their aims. Yet, most significantly, the death of Henri II was a catalyst for the events to come, speeding up the inevitable. Without this, neither the extremist Protestant nor Catholic sides would have had the taste of power they received in the immediate years leading up to the civil wars. Therefore, it was significant in speeding up the issues that were already affecting the country.

Effective transition

Implications of evidence evaluated in the light of the historical context

Well-sustained analytical focus

One of these issues was the pre-existing factional rivalry and it is more plausible to say that the death of both the kings only accentuated and was not the main cause of the ensuing rivalries. For example, although exacerbated by religious differences, the enmity between the Guise family and the Bourbon princes had always caused disquiet. The evidence that the enmity was not caused solely by the royal death is provided by the immediacy that tensions arose and factions were chosen, as the memoirist Claude Haton describes: "What astonished the princes of Bourbon the most about this withdrawal of the lord of Guise ... was that he was then followed by nearly all the ordonnance companies."⁶ It would have been hard for Haton to achieve complete objectivity, writing this later on, so this may be an exaggeration in order to make Guise seem more influential. The fact that there were distinct sides at all, by this stage, shows that rivalries pre-existed. Also, Knecht insightfully points out that "as respect for the government declined, various aristocratic factions ... flexing their muscles since the last years of Francis I moved into action."⁷ In other words, because of the lack of monarchical control, tensions started to boil over. Clientage also made the nobility's rivalries nationwide, and this is partly responsible for the breakdown of relations. If it was simply the court that was affected by factional rivalry, the country would never have erupted into Civil war. It was the influence that the major nobles had in the provinces that made the wars so destructive. Men changed their religion in order to conform to their overlord's beliefs; so France became both religiously and geographically split as power bases emerged. This meant that the longevity and militancy of the wars was bound to increase. It was the nobles' desire to keep men by their side that increased the level of aggression in the civil war. Ignoring Haton's possible bias and taking his words at face value, he interestingly states that: "there left ... with the lord of Guise more than 500 mounted gentlemen ... these companies offered their services to the last drop of their blood."⁸ The lack of a controlling monarch meant that the aggression previously channelled into war (before 1559 and the Peace of Chateau-Cambresis,⁹) now stagnated, looking for a new direction. This argument, implying that the

Good contextualisation

Source interrogated with confidence

529 words

⁵ R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion - 1559-1598*, Document 6, pg 106 - Promises to avenge the murder of Francis, Duke of Guise (1563)

⁶ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 10, pg 26 - Consequences of the death of Francis II

⁷ R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion - 1559-1598*, (Longman, 1996) pg 85

⁸ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 10, pp 25-26 - Consequences of the death of Francis II

⁹ The Peace between Spain and France, ending a stream of European struggles beginning after Henry's coronation in 1547.

royal deaths were the main cause for the increase in domestic militancy is stated by Knecht: "The most powerful nobles ... loved the material rewards of war. They looked up to a monarch, like Henri II, who led the troops into battle."¹⁰ Yet this argument has its limitations because the pre-existing factional rivalries also caused the population's aggression to increase tenfold: "I promise to use all my strength up to my last breath to expel ... or to kill those who have made peace without punishing the murder."¹¹ Although this view is radical, it highlights the influence and power the factional leaders had, causing emotional and aggressive reactions from the population. Clearly, the country thought that these rivalries, caused by the splits in faction and religion, represented a war. In this sense, the only result could have been a war, whether the king had authority or not. *Well-referenced*

Well-directed analysis

Good transition and prioritisation

However, the most important factor was the religious differences within the nobility, which essentially caused the rivalry in the first place. Even if Henri II had survived, he would not have been able to prevent the religious split between the Catholics and the Huguenots that occurred in the later sixteenth century. This emphasises how the significance of Henri's death can be exaggerated. The Calvinists considered themselves a large enough institution to attempt to take over the whole state. For example, as early as 1560, they attempted to rival the leading factions at the Conspiracy of Amboise, with the kidnapping of the king. In addition, they considered themselves strong enough to stand up to the state in 1561 at the Colloquy of Poissy. There was a lack of belief in the state's ability to control religion in the country from both the Protestants and the Catholics. The state's edicts predict a growth in Protestant confidence and strength, demanding: "ministers will be held to appear before our officers in those places to promise not to preach any doctrine contrary to pure word of God."¹² The value and reliability of this source comes from the government's honest attempts at reconciliation. Also, this outsider's view from a primary source written in 1561 displays the spread of Calvinism by this time: "There is no province that is not infected with heresy and there are some where the epidemic has spread even to the countryside."¹³ Even if it is not a wholly neutral and accurate representation, the writer talks about Calvinism as a disease, as though it is not the perpetrator's fault that they have converted. Despite the apparent bias, it is extremely valuable because he has understood the most important part of Calvinism; that it was threatening, like a plague, the status of French Catholicism. The significance of the rapidity of the spread of Calvinism is great, because it is something neither the Catholic nobles and state, nor the people, could quell before 1572. Between the building of the first Calvinist churches in Paris in 1555 and 1563, ten percent of the population had converted: "it sprang up in disconnected places spontaneously and found support in most social groups. After 1560 it was found in almost every province."¹⁴ The organisation of the institution was so well established after four years that it formed National and provincial

Really?

Implications of evidence evaluated in the light of the historical context

Well-selected factual material

538 words

¹⁰ R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, (Longman, 1996) pg 84

¹¹ R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, Document 6, pg 106 – **Promises to avenge the murder of Francis, Duke of Guise (1563)**

¹² D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 16, pg 31 – **The Edict of Saint-Germain**

¹³ R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, Document 5, pg 104 – **The situation in 1562: A Venetian view of France**

¹⁴ R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, (Longman, 1996) pg 2

Good use of
historian

synods. It became a fully recognisable, and in terms of the extremist Catholics, irreconcilable establishment. However, ten percent of the population was still a minority; the remaining ninety percent were troubled by only 1.8 million Huguenots. More significantly, as Armstrong rightly indicates, there were a larger percentage of nobles converting than lower classes, meaning that the movement had a lot of influential and financial backing: "1200 churches was a major success in the face of harsh repression, but many relied upon the protection and patronage of the nobility."¹⁵ Thus, by 1562, while the Catholic state still desired both a temporary conflict and an amendment to the situation, they were obviously disturbed by the strength of Calvinism, knowing it could not be altered to suit them. If the government was truly seeking reconciliation, making the provenance of this source reliable, this can be seen in the Edict of St. Germain "made due to the pressing urgency of circumstances ... but ... everything is to be provisional."¹⁶ Also, comparing the Duke of Guise's view on the massacre of Vassy to a Protestant's, the disturbance in the society is obvious to see: "I sent two or three of my gentlemen to indicate my desire to speak with them,"¹⁷ "La Brosse entered with five or six men ... 'My masters, if it pleases you, take a seat.' To which they replied. 'God's death, let us kill them all.'"¹⁸ The later public reaction to the massacre and the Duke's covering up of his motives shows the Huguenot's influence at the time and the ensuing tensions that are growing from the religious disunity. Therefore, this split between the Catholics and the Huguenots had more significance on the upcoming events than Henri II's death.

Good cross-referencing and integration of evidence into a sustained argument

In conclusion, Henri II's accidental death caused disaster in the court, as previously influential figures were uprooted to be replaced by new factional leaders. This caused a power vacuum, which helped to split the country. Yet it was only significant in that it speeded up what was already bound to occur, causing the religious civil wars. The Huguenots' increase in strength and organisation, coupled with the Catholics' aggression towards them led to a domestic rupture worsened by two famously rivaling factions becoming heads of the two opposing churches. Therefore, the most significant causes of the subsequent events were the growing religious disunities and the pre-existing factional rivalries.

Well-concluded

Word count: 1991 words

A01 13
13
A02 12
12

Wide-ranging in argument. High quality analysis

Score 39/40 words

¹⁵ Alastair Armstrong, *France 1500-1715*, (Heinemann, 2003) pg 47

¹⁶ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 16, pg 31 - The Edict of Saint-Germain

¹⁷ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 19, pg 48 - The Massacre of Vassy, the duke of Guise's view

¹⁸ D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 18, pg 47 - The Massacre of Vassy, the Protestant view

core sophistication

Excellent understanding of key issues, well-selected factual material, wide range of sources used and interrogated with discrimination (including critical awareness of nature of sources)

25
25

Bibliography

Potter, D.; *French Wars of Religion*

Armstrong, A; *France 1500-1715*, (Heinemann, 2003)

Knecht, R. J; *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*

Holt, M. H; *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*

Primary Sources

The Edict of Saint-Germain, 17 Jan 1562

- D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 16, pg 31

The Massacre of Vassy, the Duke of Guise's view, 17 March 1562

- D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 19, pg 48

The Massacre of Vassy, the Protestant view, 1562

- D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 18, pg 47

Consequences of the death of Francis II (Claude Haton, memoirist)

- D. Potter, *French Wars of Religion*, Chapter 1, Document 10, pg 26

The situation in 1562: A Venetian view of France

- R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, Document 5, pg 104

Promises to avenge the murder of Francis, Duke of Guise (1563)

- R. J. Knecht, *The French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, Document 6, pg 106

25/25 ✓

1

**To what extent was the French monarchical crisis of the period
1559-1592 resolved by 1661?**

The status of the French monarchy in the years 1559-1592 was dangerously unstable. Religious factions dictated state policy, while the monarch had neither the influence nor the money to stop it. However, by 1661, the king had nobility that mostly listened to him, a stable religious and economic situation and a nation that were loyal to the king, not the provincial governors. Yet this was not the whole story for while this had been established, there were still continued tensions and instabilities from the crisis. *Clearly introduced*

what The greatest example of recovery over this century is the resolving of the religious crisis and the authority that was regained by the crown. During the monarchical crisis, there was a huge split in the country's religious loyalty. This was because of the patron-client system at court, which extended the original religious tensions, between the early converters in the nobility and the staunch Catholics in the provinces. The best example of this was the St Bartholomew's Day massacres, in which over 12000 Huguenots were killed. *Explicit understanding of KEY issue* Barbara Diefendorf rightly thought that it was a "disaster waiting to happen,"¹ while equally, Robert Knecht states that it was a "culmination of popular disturbances."^{2,3} *used* There were certainly French Catholics committed to the massacres everywhere and preachers were urging the slaughter on. Thus, there was genuine religious hatred in the provinces, even when the Huguenots represented a significant minority. This, along with the results of the massacres exacerbated the crisis, as the Huguenots received massive concessions, angering the Catholics. This was while the Huguenots had lost all faith in their own state and divinity after a "failure of divine intervention."⁴ Thus, there was a massive disturbance, culminating in two warring factions and the 8th civil war. All this simply illustrates the profound instability of the state and its inability to control the people. *well-ventured*

There are three factors that made the recovery and turnaround of this situation possible. *Explicit understanding of KEY issue* Firstly, if it had not been for Navarre's apparent sympathy for both sides, having converted to a Protestant and then reconverted to a Catholic, the Catholic League, the most influential religious faction of the period would still have had power. When he reconverted, they and

¹ Barbara Diefendorf, *A Prologue to a Massacre, Popular unrest in Paris 1557-1572*, (American Historical Review, 1985)

² R. J. Knecht, *French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, pg 45 (Longman, Second Edition, 1996)

³ However, some historians like Henry Haller and Boris Porchnev claim that the religious civil wars were not based on religious disturbances, but that instead, the reasons for the passionate killings were socio-economic factors, like the Huguenots mercantile advantages and their profitable position after the Peace of St. Germain

⁴ Natalie Zemon Davies - *The Rites of Violence*, in idem. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. (Stanford University Press, 1975) - (pg 184)

their ideas fell apart.⁵ Secondly, the recovery was partly due to the continuation of policy by Louis XIII and Anne of Austria, in their respective trusts of Richelieu and Mazarin, which resulted in constancy and stability that was not previously apparent. However, the most significant factor was Richelieu's containment, which employed the continual toleration of the Huguenots' religious views along with the gradual alienation of the Huguenot leaders and supporters from every part of French society, and the distraction of the Catholic hatred towards Spain, a national enemy. For example, The Huguenots' best political position was at the beginning of the century, when all the terms of the Edict of Nantes were still in action.

When the Duc de Soubise attempted to gain more power in 1622, Richelieu destroyed his forces and took away all the Huguenot strongholds apart from Montauban and La Rochelle, seriously compromising the Huguenots' previous position. In this way, Richelieu allowed the Huguenots to continue their aims for more political power but when they acted, he crushed the opposition and took away some privileges as penance. It was always Richelieu's aim to "ruin the Huguenots," but he managed to do this gradually and not in the way that the Guises, in the previous century, had attempted to: with pure force. Also, the war against Spain meant that the Catholics fought for a national cause, favouring and strengthening the French state. Domestic peace and the Huguenots' political diminishment testify to more successful policies.⁶ So Richelieu's religious policies of weakening their political and military status

allowed the crown to be in control of the anti-Huguenot movement, thus gaining monarchical authority.⁷ Equally, Knecht comes closer to Bercé in his opinion that this was the end of the war for he admits it is not a "complete assimilation," and, perhaps, it never could have been. For the law still tolerated Calvinist worship and the Huguenots stayed embedded in the nation.⁸ The situation was resolved as far as it could be, but it was not complete. Therefore, the once cataclysmic crisis was partially reversed and resulted in a stable religious situation for the monarchy to command.

Yet while the religious situation in the years 1559-1592 was devastating, the crown's decentralised administration prohibited any chance of fast recovery and made the crisis much

⁵ Their chief displeasure was the fact that the heir, Henry de Navarre, was Protestant. When he became Catholic, they had no reason to oppose him.

⁶ "Ultimately it was the three decades of living under the Edict of Nantes and its goal of "one faith, one king, one law" that brought the Huguenots' defeat." Mack P. Holt – *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*, pg 192 (Cambridge, Second edition, 2005)

⁷ "Although this was not the complete assimilation and religious unity that most French Catholics had hoped for, it was certainly close to the kind of co-existence that Catherine de Medici and some 'politiques' had sought since the 1560s" Mack P. Holt – *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*, pg 193

"The cycle of religious wars came to an end in 1629." Yves Marie Bercé – *The Birth of Absolutism*, pg 102. (Macmillan Press, English translation, 1996)

⁸ When religious toleration was reintroduced, in the eighteenth century, thousands of Huguenots emerged from hiding, all around France, and the censuses registered a massive population increase.

more profound. The monarchical crisis occurred, to some extent, because of the monarchy's lack of strength. The religious factions were allowed to raise their own armies and influence their own subjects, without reference to the crown. For example, in the Guise's case the crown had to rely on them to raise troops if necessary, and this reliance on them limited the control the crown had in court and therefore the provinces. This was resolved by two of Richelieu's most effective policies: greatly increasing the size and efficiency of the country's standing army and the augmentation of the 'intendants'' power.⁹ He used any funds he had to create an army dedicated solely to France's cause, fighting a Catholic Spain. This weakened the Guise's prominence because the nobility's mentality changed; the state now no longer relied on the nobility to raise an army, while the nobility now relied on the crown to gain more status, buying into offices in the army. This along with the increase in venality made the previously influential 'noblesse de la robe' much less so. It also made France a nation to be reckoned with, Europe-wide. For instance, by 1640, the state controlled an army of almost 200,000 and there had been no invasions since the 1590s, in which the Huguenots, the Spanish, the Germans and the Catholic League had all attempted to take power. The 'intendants' also aided the growth of monarchical control in the provinces. For Richelieu effectively implanted his own loyal, stubborn administrators into the provinces, while replacing the corrupt governors with his own men. If they were corrupt, he would simply remove them because their offices were based on commission, not hereditary prominence¹⁰ and the state effectively controlled the governors through them. Proof of their loyalty and effectiveness is provided by the fact that disorder arose in the 1630s because of the intendants' obstinacy in their insistent tax collection, which sometimes used force. Both these factors, most importantly, managed to change the provincial patron-client loyalty to a national state loyalty. Thus, using the new standing army and the intendants, the crown put France on the way to an absolutist and centralised state. *Well-ventilated*

Of course, the intendants instigated a needed reform in the country's economy, as well. The fiscal system was cumbersome, inefficient and the wars were testing the state's finances. This is where the monarch's lack of strength stems from, as he could not control the country with no money to pay his subjects. Henry IV and his financial adviser, Sully, most significantly, introduced their own financial commissioners into the provinces, greatly increasing the revenue, as taxation came straight back to the king and this, along with other measures improved France's economy and hence, the security of the crown. For example, Sully introduced new taxes, the 'gabelle' and the 'paulette' and established less court expenditure and peace. The evidence of his financial recovery is provided by the fact that the

⁹ Alastair Armstrong makes a strong consideration, reckoning "the rise of the intendants combined with the control of the army ... the twin instruments by which Richelieu bolstered royal authority." Alastair Armstrong, *France 1500-1715*, pg 116 (Heinemann, 2003)

¹⁰ Bercé states that: "the intendants were meant not to supplant [the governors], as has often been suggested, but to supplement them." Yves Marie Bercé – *The Birth of Absolutism*, pg 138. (Macmillan Press, English translation, 1996)

Excellent understanding of KEY issue

Explicit evaluation of KEY issue

Good chronological range

Good range

highest revenue in one year came during Henry's reign¹¹, which is a remarkable achievement considering the circumstances. On the other hand, the system collapsed after Sully died and so this shows the fragility of the system and the need for continuity in every part. Concini's needless expenditure with Richelieu and Mazarin's reliance on foreign wars counterweighted any further recovery, and it culminated in public issues in the Fronde. The greatest sign of weakness and instability is public disorder displayed by a revolt.¹² This resistance was due to offence taken by the nobility after the state attempted to strip their local privileges; offence taken by the peasants for the provincial invaders disrupting their social structures; and offence taken by the 'bourgeoisie' for the extra taxation that was being aimed at them.¹³ However, it would be facile to suggest that this meant there was no monarchical control at the time of the Fronde. For the nature of the conflict from both the 'parlements' and the nobility was such that it was aimed at particular concerns, not the head of the state.¹⁴ This, conversely, shows strength and a definite difference to the monarchical crisis beforehand. Therefore, the economic situation improved measurably after the monarchical crisis, enough for the state to become so centralised that it could aim its concerns at particulars, while also gaining enough revenue to increase its foreign and political status.

This subsequent establishment of criticism for individuals other than the monarch shows a lack of 'personal monarchy', which is a theme throughout the period. This, along with a growing confidence in the nobility greatly affected state control. It was factional rivalry that made the religious civil wars, which surround the monarchical crisis, so long-lasting and of such high intensity. Early on, the nobility became very influential both in the provinces and in the court, especially the princes of the blood, key members of the royal family. By 1588 the nobles' influence was so great that the state seemed like a faction opposing them, not *vice versa*. For example, the retaliation to the Day of the Barricades by the king was the ordered assassination of the Duke of Guise and his brother. However, the following retaliatory assassination of the king, himself, shows the greatest weakness of royal authority of the time.¹⁵ A noble religious faction killing the head of state is unnerving and displays the critical status of the crown. It really demonstrates a lack of personal monarchy, as the people seemed to be ruled by factional, rather than individual, authority. Henry IV saw that the nobility were in a very strong position throughout the state and he noticed that they had inflicted a lot of damage on the state through their power. He managed to gradually undercut

¹¹ In 1588, the revenue hit a record 200 million livres, which it did not make again until the 1620s

¹² "The fiscal disorder introduced since 1635 was not to be cleared up until the 1660s," Bercé – *The Birth of Absolutism*, pg 147. The Fronde was a major revolt sparked by parliamentary and noble issues, in 1648

¹³ The *taxe d'aisés* was aimed at the wealthy Parisian merchants surrounding the city centre.

¹⁴ In 1661, factions were targeting ministers, whereas before, they were targeting the king.

¹⁵ This was described by Knecht as the "nadir of the monarchy before the French revolution." R. J. Knecht, *French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, pg 86 (Longman, Second Edition, 1996)

that power by appeasing their demands,¹⁶ while he replaced them with loyal supporters using venality. Evidence that this did restore some royal authority comes from how, after Biron was executed, there was no immediate retaliation from any faction or institution.¹⁷ The people accepted it as the final decision. Thus, there was a certain degree of recovery by this point and the following kings used the same measures to slowly decrease factional influence.

Well-qualified

However, the fact that so many threats arose from the nobility does highlight some sort of continuation of instability from the former crisis. The princes of the blood were always threatening and sometimes achieving more influence in some areas than the king. For example, Condé, during Concini's regency and Richelieu's influence, was a national favourite, even after his attempted coup in 1617.¹⁸ The influential members at court created disorder when they felt they could do a better job than the ministers above them. Yet all of these threats were handled in the immediate years before 1661 and this testifies to the flexibility, control and authority of the crown.¹⁹ Hence, the king handled the nobility by gradually taking their power away to the extent that when disorder arose, it was no longer targeting the crown, while also placing individuals who were clear proponents of the nation as heads of state. In this way, the nobility's dissatisfaction no longer expressed itself as aggressive opposition.

Well-selected factual material

In conclusion, the monarchical crisis of 1559-1592 was largely resolved by 1661 because of the settlement of the religious crisis, the alteration from patron-client loyalties to state loyalties, the centralisation of the country's economy and the control of the nobility and key individuals of the era. However, the resolution was not complete, as numerous opposing (civilian or noble) factions proclaim, and perhaps royal absolutism never could be; Mack Holt supports this view by quoting Parker: "Absolutism ... always in the making, never made."²⁰

Very well-sustained analysis, which

Excellent conclusion

Total word count: 2006

directly and very successfully evaluates process of change. Excellent command of chronological range, with well-supported factual material.

Sources evaluated with confident discrimination.

¹⁶ These were primarily offices, property and money

(25/25)

Level 5 v. high

¹⁷ Biron, a former marshal of France' army and former general of the Catholic League, had been very influential and his plot against the crown became involved with Spain and Savoy. Had it been Henry III executing Biron, the king may have received the same revenge as he did from the Guises

quality analysis

¹⁸ "Condé was seen as defender of the Crown and people, and his every public appearance was an occasion for noisy popular rejoicing." Bercé - *The Birth of Absolutism*, pg 70

good range

¹⁹ The Fronde, again, is a good example of this, as explained in the previous paragraph, for the crown emerged victorious in the face of massive unrest all over the country and from some influential institutions.

historian's

²⁰ Mack P. Holt - *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*, pg 222 (Cambridge, Second edition, 2005)

Bibliography

Mack P. Holt – *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*, pg 222 (Cambridge, Second edition, 2005)

R. J. Knecht, *French Wars of Religion – 1559-1598*, pg 86 (Longman, Second Edition, 1996)

Yves Marie Bercé – *The Birth of Absolutism*, pg 138. (Macmillan Press, English translation, 1996)

Alastair Armstrong, *France 1500-1715*, pg 116 (Heinemann, 2003)

Natalie Zemon Davies - *The Rites of Violence*, in idem. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. (Stanford University Press, 1975)

Barbara Diefendorf, *A Prologue to a Massacre, Popular unrest in Paris 1557-1572*, (American Historical Review, 1985)

Candidate 5

This is the work of one of the 211 candidates who achieved full marks. The annotations of the original teacher-marker and those of the internal moderator have been left on as they are accurate and clearly recognise excellent performance.

GCE History
Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet

Confidential: Edexcel and QCA use only

This authentication must be attached to the front of the candidate's work at the time it is submitted for assessment.

Centre Number	
Candidate Number	
Candidate Name (in capitals, surname followed by forenames)	
Coursework Programme Title (if Edexcel designed please provide reference code from specification.)	CW36: The USA: the making of a nation
Assignment Title	Part A: What are the short term consequences of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address? Part B: To what extent did Westward Expansion affect the political culture during 1815-1917
Content (please tick box to acknowledge that content is attached to assignment.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Record <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix
Examined Units Give details of all Units (title and option code) making up the AS and A2. <i>Please Note</i> Where Unit 4 is a centre-designed coursework programme, one copy of the centre's Coursework Approval Form must be included with the work when submitted for assessment.	Unit 1: Was of the Roses - A6 Henry VII - A7 Unit 2: A2 - Crown, Parliament & Authority in England 1688-1689 Unit 3: A1 - Political Crisis & Rebellion in England

Word Count	4000 3974		
Mark for Part A: AO1 (mark out of 13)	Mark for Part A: AO2 (mark out of 12)	Mark for Part B: AO1 (mark out of 25)	Total Mark: Part A and B (final mark out of 50)
9	9	18	36

Statement by candidate
I declare that I have produced the assignment attached without external assistance, apart from any which is acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment and is recorded.
I also declare that the word count given above is correct. I am aware of the penalties that will be imposed for exceeding the word limit (4000 words) by any amount.

Signature: _____ Date: 5/05/2010

Statement by teacher
I declare that the candidate's activities have been kept under regular supervision and that to the best of my knowledge no assistance has been given apart from any which is acceptable under the scheme of assessment and has been identified and recorded.

Signature: _____ Date: 7/05/2010

What are the short term effects of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address?

Key issue.

Importance clear but only one distinctive effect given.

The Gettysburg Address had a hugely disproportionate impact upon the American political landscape for 272 words. The concept of state rights and state loyalty, which was integral to the Southern argument to the causation of the Civil War, were challenged in the short address by Abraham Lincoln. The idea of a singular United States that existed principally as a nation rather than a collection of individual states was brought forward by the address, and this theme would be amplified and continued long after Lincoln was assassinated within the political zeitgeist. President Lincoln's address at Gettysburg was one that crystallised many of his firm beliefs into one finely constructed speech, and indeed one that revolutionized the political way of thought in America.

Context of key issue defined.

well selected evidence. Status of evidence considered - backdrop of hysteria.

The American Civil War provided much of the backdrop in which the Gettysburg Address was laid out. The official Southern argument for secession, and the spark of the American Civil War, was derived from the states right argument which argues that each individual state had the ultimate sovereignty, or freedom, within the Union as the history of the State preceded the Constitution that bound them together. This line of thought was common throughout the declarations of secession by each state in the confederacy, and was prevalent as a result of the hysteria and apprehensions of a supposedly 'Black' Republican party. The Declaration of Causes of Seceding in Georgia states that: "*The people of Georgia having dissolved their political connection with the Government of the United States of America...For the last ten years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave-holding confederate States with reference to the subject of African slavery. They have endeavored to weaken our security, to disturb our domestic peace and tranquility, and persistently refused to comply with their express constitutional obligations to us in reference to that property, and by the use of their power in the Federal Government have striven to deprive us of an equal enjoyment of the common Territories of the Republic.*"¹ To Lincoln this was an affront to his political thinking as he had never supported to the Southern right to secede, and has always considered the Southern Confederate as more of despotism, a rebellious faction than a foreign nation: '*Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy... Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that,*

Well selected source. Demonstrates contrasting contemporary views on key issue.

¹ <http://sunsite.utk.edu/civil-war/reasons.html>

rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left.²

Sources in support of each other.

Status made clear by explaining Lincoln's view/intentions

He also felt that on a larger scale secession would indicate the failure of the only contemporary democratic institution: *'Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves...'*

We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this... The world knows we do know how to save it... we assure freedom to the free - honorable alike in what we give, and what we preserve. We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth.' Thus it is vital that he win the intellectual battle as much the

A key issue well defined, but the effect of the speech not really identified, more the intention.

physical one: Garry Wills remarked, *'Lincoln is after even larger game - he means to "win the whole Civil War in ideological terms as well as military ones... Words had to complete the work of the guns.'*

Linked to previous.

The constant reference of United States as a nation, and a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, was integral to Lincoln's idea that the South therefore had no right to secede as the Union, the nation, was sovereign over the states, the government of the people can never be rejected by one of its own. Although ~~it can be~~ the civil war can be seen as the physical removal of such ideology, the Gettysburg Address has provided a long term buffer and reminder

More specific.

against state-driven ideology, paving the road for future expansions of the Federal government such as the Reconstruction. The Gettysburg Address also fostered an ideology of a singular United States rather than the image of several states linked together out of necessity. In Battle Cry Of Freedom, James M. McPherson raised a comparison between Lincoln's first inaugural address to congress to his address at

Well supported by historian. Good evidence.

Gettysburg: *'In his first inaugural address he used the word "Union" twenty times and the word "nation" not once... in his address at Gettysburg, the president did not refer to the "Union" at all but used the word "nation" five times to invoke a new birth of freedom and nationalism for the United States... the war marked a transition of the United States to a single noun.'*³ It was under the spirit of nationalism that

A more specifically supported theme as continuation of context in previous.

Reconstruction after the Civil War was carried out, with the Federal government actively involved within the Reconstruction program, before the Redemption of the South and subsequent withdrawal of Federal troops.

The reaction to the Gettysburg Address that took place at the newly constructed Soldiers' National Cemetery was varied. On one side were the abolitionists, such as Horace Greeley, who despite the occurrence of the Emancipation Proclamation in the same year, 1863, felt that Lincoln could have done more to expand on the issue of

² Lincoln's first inaugural address

³ Battle Cry Of Freedom p859 James M. McPherson

Well selected evidence.

Source discrimination. Interrogation.

Cross reference skill.

Key issue well supported.

Key issue.

well selected in support.

True but could've been explained why Address led to 14th Am.

Balance.

slavery, which the address has remarkably avoided. Garry Wills notes a reaction from a national newspaper, the Chicago times: "The Chicago Times quoted the letter of the Constitution to Lincoln—noting its lack of reference to equality, its tolerance of slavery—and said that Lincoln was betraying the instrument he was on oath (the Constitution) to defend, traducing the men who died for the letter of that fundamental law." However, in addition to the fact that the Chicago Times was a Democratic newspaper and therefore prone to bias against the Republicans, Harry V. Jaffa refutes that "In making the accusation of deception, both the Times and Garry Wills assume that the American people had been paying no attention to Lincoln's widely published speeches, and that in electing him president they did so without knowing what they were voting for!"⁴

The concept of equality was another theological pillar that Lincoln sought to address. Through the American constitution to provide a fitting answer against the introduction of slavery and of slavery itself - "Four scores and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"⁵ - For a nation that is founded on the basis that no man is better than another, with the example of monarchy, the peculiar institution provided an anomaly in some ways more extreme than the monarchy, as monarchs do not claim to possess their subjects in the way slave owners do. Indeed, Abraham Lincoln saw the government as the instrument to introduce and the duty of American citizens to uphold such an ideal: it was 'the great task remaining before us'⁶, 'the unfinished work'⁷: 'that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.'⁸ Thus, in one way, the Gettysburg Address has influenced the political thinking that enacted of the 14th amendment in the American Constitution that still holds a significant sway upon American political thought and daily life with the protection of civil rights of its US citizens.

However, the Gettysburg Address as an impressive a speech it maybe, full of lofty ideals that inspired millions, it is hard to imagine it to have immediate short term effects on America's policy making. One obvious example is that it is overshadowed by actual practical change that came from the Emancipation Proclamation that freed the slaves from bondage during the course of the Civil War. With no mention to

⁴ <http://www.firstprinciplesjournal.com/articles.aspx?article=1378&loc=r/>

⁵ Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

⁶ Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

⁷ Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

⁸ Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln

Very important observation.

slavery and concrete plans of how to deal with the problem of the postbellum America, it has laid out the grand vision of 'the great task', but had given the people no tools on how to accomplish it. Whereas the Proclamation was a wartime policy, and the 14th amendment a postbellum act that officially recognized the rights of the slaves, the Address failed to have an immediate effect in terms of policies. Yet nor was it Lincoln's intention to do so: the primary purpose of the speech at Gettysburg was to eulogise the dead, to boost the morale of the Union troops who had grown disillusioned by the lack of victories, and to win the high battle of interpreting Gettysburg which both the North and South had tried to define during the aftermath of the war. The matter of the actual battle was eschewed: Garry Wills noted that 'his speech hovers far above the carnage. He lifts the battle to a level of abstraction that purges it of grosser matter – even "earth" is mentioned as the thing from which the tested form of government shall not perish'.⁹ In terms of government policies and the civil war in the background, the Gettysburg Address maybe considered as less important as the Emancipation Proclamation is to the slaves, and the Appomattox surrender of the South, but what is truly remarkable about the Gettysburg Address is perhaps no other event marked as huge a transition in terms of the political atmosphere during the civil war, and beyond that.

Good use of history

Key paragraph defining limitations

Key conclusive statement.

It is therefore perhaps inappropriate to suggest that this address was immensely influential on the civil rights of the African Americans as it is more so a defence against the intellectual problem of secession and an argument for equality than anything else. Abraham Lincoln built a foundation on which countless thinkers and activists in the future would be inspired by, and offered the clearest representation of his political ideology, of his thoughts on equality, his interpretation of the Declaration of Independence: the bedrock of American political culture. In a long enough timeline the importance of the address would outshine all the others, and the same speech is now a part of the minds of countless Americans, regardless of the other comparatively smaller examples such as the Emancipation, the Reconstruction, and the surrender at the Appomattox. In a mere 2 minutes, Lincoln came and did what he intended. Indeed, the day after the Address, Edward Everett praised the speech, telling Lincoln that, "I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came, as near to the central idea of the occasion, in two hours, as you did in two minutes."¹⁰

Important conclusion Emphasises how the address' effects are more ideological than tangible.

good argument

⁹ Lincoln at Gettysburg, p.37, Garry Wills

¹⁰ <https://www.msu.edu/~schopie1/cep909/gblesson/address/politic.html>

Sources for Part A

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate...we cannot consecrate...we cannot hallow...this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us...that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
November 19, 1863

word count - 1800

1. The Gettysburg Address
2. Lincoln's First Inaugural Address
3. Lincoln's Annual Address to Congress
4. Emancipation Proclamation
5. The 14th Amendment
6. <http://sunsite.utk.edu/civil-war/reasons.html>

A01 - 9/13 ✓ 18/
A02 - 9/12 ✓ 25/
12

Agreed. Declaration of Causes of Secession - Georgia
• Essay is quite well formed. Use of primary sources is well selected key issues. In some cases there is rather a lot of contextual build up before addressing the actual effect of the Gettysburg Address. The candidate spends rather too long analysing what Lincoln intended, rather than what happened. Focus improves throughout essay.
Decisions on effects are reached and these are sustained from the introduction in part. State Rights in particular + the other themes in a more general sense.
Evidence well selected. Sources cross referenced with others + additional evidence. Some discrimination used but could have been done more. Status could've been more specific.
Well balanced with counter argument explaining limitations. - This is extremely important as it explains why candidate is so cautious with regards to specific effects earlier in essay.
Analytical structure. ✓ Context of Lincoln sources good due to explaining his will so clearly.

To what extent did America's westward expansionism change the political culture within the country between 1815 and 1917?

"The whole continent of North America appears to be destined by Divine Providence to be peopled by one nation, speaking one language, professing one general system of religious and political principles... For the common happiness of them all, for their peace and prosperity, I believe it is indispensable that they should be associated in one federal Union." – John Quincy Adams¹

Important definition

Political culture can be defined as the underlying assumptions that politicians often take for granted. At the very heart of this phenomenon lies the American Constitution: it lays out the role and limits of the government and the way they carry out their roles, both internally and externally. By internal conduct one considers the relationships within the government, and by externally one takes into account of the policy making of the government. Therefore it is obvious to note that political culture is rarely static – it is a dynamic concept that is affected by a multitude of factors such as political ideologies which are ever changing in themselves, events; external shocks, internal conflicts and peace, and the inherent sector differences.

useful paragraph. well thought out.

Key issue.

The essential link between change in political culture and westward expansionism is thus: each time a state was admitted into the Union, the question of whether it be Slave or Free appeared, hereby imposing political pressures on the government – within the Congress party lines were drawn up along the distinction of Northern/Southern, the executive and judiciary were to perform a more background role, as the Founding Fathers envisaged whilst drawing up the Constitution. All of this is to be subjected to change as the events of the century slowly unfold. In some sense, it was inevitable: Lincoln once said that, "I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided... A house divided against itself cannot stand."²

Drive from Historian.

Frederick Jackson Turner argues that by the second quarter of the 19th century, the infant nation of United States of America has turned its attention towards the West, after finally freed itself from the "[the struggle] to prevent ourselves being drawn into the European wars"³. Since the War of 1812, the retreat of European dominance in North America has coincided well with the signs of American expansionism. The fact that the legacy of the Monroe Doctrine, which was adopted in 1823 that outlined

¹ John Quincy Adams

² The Causes of American Civil War: Problems In American Civilization by D.C. Heath and Co., 'The House Divided' by Abraham Lincoln, edited by Edwin C Rozwenc, pp.25

³ The Frontier in American History, Frederick Jackson Turner, Chapter IX

Good evidence. America's policy of isolationism, survived until the end of the 19th century, suggests that America has by then turned its attention inwards, to consolidate their claim of North American dominance, and to achieve this "Manifest Destiny", which can be surmised by the quote in the beginning. The extent of westward expansionism has led American politicians to demand an increase of domestic improvements in order to better support trade between different sectors of America. John C. Calhoun, in an address to the US congress, said that whatever 'impedes the intercourse of the extremes with this, the centre of the Republic, weakens the Union, The more

extended that of social intercourse; the more strongly are we bound together; the more inseparable are our destinies.⁴ Calhoun counselled the Congress '...to bind the Republic together with a perfect system of roads and canals. Let us conquer space.'⁵

Lots of good points + evidence. Not yet bound by an overarching argument.

Clear statement well supported.

Thus, the American pioneering spirit intending to expand westward from "sea to shining sea" and the degree of government intervention was entwined: the more America extends its borders westward the more the Federal government has to support the expansion, which by 1830s had been extended to the subsidies of big train and rail companies. In addition to economic support, the government, by the 1840s, was made by President Polk to use its military weight to annex Texas. In twenty odd years later this type of Federal intervention intensified significantly during the Civil War; to defeat the South, then to rebuild it; during the Reconstruction era - only to be drawn away by the Redemption period in the Compromise of 1877.

Historiographical concept well understood.

Key point.

This expansion of government intervention is in effect a gradual realisation of Hamiltonian federalism. Firstly, this level of government intervention has the effect of involving the public into political affairs, into the budding two party system in America. The broad geographical frontiers of America necessitated an 'umbrella party', consisting of multiple political planks that coexisted uncomfortably with each other in a sprawling platform. Reynolds argues that "Each [party] was an uneasy nationwide coalition always in danger of falling apart," whilst noting their common "heterogeneous character"⁶. With the Democrats and Whigs entrenched around such broad organisations, what was originally considered as a threat to liberty by the Founding Fathers, the Party has by then become integrated within the political culture. Against the ever expanding America and the fulfilment of the Manifest Destiny, the Jeffersonian Democrats fought an uphill battle to keep their idealised individualism, their white independent farmer, afloat.

Good evidence + use of historian.

Understanding of key historical ideas in US history.

⁴ America, Land of Liberty, David Reynolds, pp.148

⁵ ibid.

⁶ America Land of Liberty, David Reynolds, pp.128

Key factor.
Clear

Secondly, Westward Expansionism meant that as the Federal government increased in power, the power of the states has become more weakened. John C. Calhoun was no stranger to what he saw as an endangerment of Southern state rights: "The increasing power of this Government and of the control of the Northern section, furnished the cause... of hostile feeling on the part of the North towards the social organization of the South."⁷ In his final address to Congress Senator Calhoun blamed much of the sectional crisis on the Northern prejudice of Southern liberties, which, above all stood slavery.⁸

Evidence used
well together.

"Geographical conditions changed at about the 95th meridian, and beyond that point slavery was not thought to be profitable."⁹

Key issue.

Analysis of
evidence.

One of the greatest political problems raised by Westward Expansionism was whether slavery should be brought into the new territories. As the source above suggests, with limited economic incentives and little personal stakes within the Peculiar Institution itself, the North was against the spread of what they perceived as an integral Southern phenomenon, a corrupting influence that is against their economic, political and to some Abolitionists, moral well being. The Missouri

Compromise that drew the 36. 30" line, however successful in postponing the

inevitable question of the existence of slavery in America, was only temporary. By setting out the physical boundary of the sectional divide between North and South, the slavery question was still not answered in a satisfactory manner, but only served to highlight and remind the Americans of the division within.¹⁰

Strong analysis
of key issue.

For three decades the basic principles of the Missouri Compromise lingered, yet this precocious peace was destroyed with the arrival of Popular Sovereignty in Kansas & Nebraska. Originally a principle utilised to justify California's Free State status, this political ideology was used in a more contentious area, Kansas-Nebraska, which lay just West of the 36. 30" boundary. Kansas promptly used to enshrine slavery within its state Constitution. With the introduction of slavery, "the repeal of the exclusion of slavery, hallowed by thirty-four years of existence, fanned an indignation which the

⁷ The Causes of American Civil War: Problems In American Civilization by D.C. Heath and Co., 'The Causes By Which The Union Is Endangered' by John C. Calhoun, edited by Edwin C Rozwenc, pp.7

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ The Stakes of Power 1845-77, Roy F Nichols pp.5

¹⁰ The American Civil War: Causes, course and consequences, 1803-77, Alan Farmer pp.30

Well supported + related to question.

politically minded were quick to use to their advantage¹¹ This sort of hysteria, along with the Supreme Court decision in the case of Dred Scott (1857) has intensified tensions along the sections as both sides are under pressure to protect their Abolitionist and fire-eater ideals. Thus, the ideal of popular sovereignty, originally devised as a solution to the sectional crisis, only served to aggravate it.

Linking.

As a result of this sectional divide, the new Republican party whose platform was tightly concentrated on the Abolition plank was popular, not because of its stance on abolition, but rather as a check on what the North perceived as the growing 'slave power'. This undermined the party system, which as we have mentioned before was inherently broad. Breadth of a political party meant that compromise can be eventually reached, yet with a party that is perceived as narrow and solely

Strong analysis. Related to earlier definition.

concentrated on constraining the 'slave power' meant that the political process would be severely handicapped, leading to the disenfranchisement of the minority i.e. secession.

Paragraph gives idea of change over course of century

"...This nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."¹² - Abraham Lincoln, 1863

Change over time Civil War identified as watershed.

The effects of American Civil War had an immediate effect upon the political psyche.

westward expansion

When President Lincoln addressed the public in one of the most memorable speeches in the aftermath of the Battle of Gettysburg, he also induced a fundamental change in the way America was perceived by itself. Though his philosophy was hotly disputed at the time, instead of several states with different rights, America has emerged, from 1863 and the Civil War as a nation that is defined by its common values. Reynolds noted that "Before the Civil War, people usually

Driven by history

referred to their country as a plural noun - 'the US are a republic.' [After the Gettysburg Address] they tended to say 'The US is...'¹³ The Emancipation Proclamation, with the subsequent 13th and 14th Amendment to the US Constitution, meant that in a historical sense the Slavery question was finally concluded. In a wide

Important distinction between theory & reality.

sense the American Civil War finally gave, theoretically, equal rights to its citizens, which would have political implications that are to come in the future. This also hinted at a shift of focus to the Union from the individual states themselves, as the argument of popular sovereignty and state rights for slavery had been washed away by the imposing of the US Constitution

¹¹ The Stakes of Power, 1845-77, Roy F Nichols pp.54
¹² The Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln, p.115
¹³ America: Empire of Liberty, David Reynolds pp.206

Change with time

Furthermore, state rights became less important as the Union asserted themselves in the South. The talk of secession, what was seen in the South as the ultimate state right, has vanished after the Civil War. All the state powers that John C. Calhoun presupposed as a defence against what he saw as an unjust imbalance in the central government, for example, the Calhoun Doctrine, which suggested that States had the ultimate decision in terms of incorporating Federal law into their legislation, had disappeared. In the era known as the Reconstruction the Congress made the states look even more powerless as Reconstruction, the name ascribed to the rebuilding and reconciliation of the South, was mostly directed by the Federal Government. Its enforcement of the recent amendments gave the freedmen, for a brief moment, equal rights. This sort of progressive thinking proved too much for the Southerners and Democrats, whose political pressure upon the Republicans finally forced the Union to withdraw Federal troops, postponing the question of the rights of the freedmen until the Civil Rights era.

Second important change with time identified on issue! End of Reconstruction.

As the ripples of the Civil War went past the 1890s, the American politick with no Manifest Destiny to fulfil, no sectional crisis to solve, returned to a period of peace during which the scope of government had shrunk back to its original 'layer cake' format, in which State has regained much autonomy over the period.¹⁴ However big private enterprises and monopolies, such as the Standard Oil Company owned by John D. Rockefeller, caught the attention of President Roosevelt, Expanding upon the original Hamiltonian way of thought, he used the Federal Government as a financial regulator, breaking up monopolies which he saw as an infringement upon liberty. This can be seen as the beginning of a progressive thought process that would, after the Panic of 1907, spark the passing of the Federal Reserve Act by President Wilson, an act that is still considered today "as perhaps the biggest reform of the progressive era".¹⁵ Thus, with the period of relative calm, the volatility of Civil War/ Reconstruction politics gone, the nature of America politics has turned to belated economic progressivism, which lasted until America's entry into WWI in 1917.

Change over time

Over this turbulent century, political culture has gone through massive alterations. The most observable changes can be seen in the American Constitution, as well as the acts and addresses given in congress. The changes in the more subtle, political assumptions are harder to detect, and impact of western expansionism is even harder to differentiate given that it was the longest, most prominent American phenomenon during the 19th century. However, Western Expansionism has had a

¹⁴ http://www.cas.sc.edu/poli/courses/scgov/History_of_Federalism.htm

¹⁵ America: Empire of Liberty, David Reynolds pp.281

massive role to play in the development of American politics, the sectional crisis, the party system, and implicitly, by aggravating the slavery problem so, dissolving America's 19th century bottleneck so that by 1917 it was ready to emerge as one of the world's leading powers: as Reynolds noted, "Americans... could not truly conquer space until they faced up to their past".¹⁶

Word count - 2174

- Essay becomes increasingly focussed. Key issues more clearly identifiable. Thematic + balanced.
- Initial definition of terms useful but clear introduction of overall argument is absent.
- Change over time becomes more obvious in 2nd 1/2 of essay too. Civil War identified as an important benchmark for change.
- Many historians used in development of argument. Historians used to drive argument in some instances. May have been done more frequently.
- Spread over 100 year period used. Increasingly clear on the change aspect as essay progresses.
- Well selected evidence within each theme. Analysis of evidence strong. Combined with themes = Analytical response.
- Some discrimination when using sources. Cross reference skills.

22/25 LS

Moderator.

18/25.

Not Level 5 work.

An analytical response. The comments of the prime marker put more to level 4 - change understood, factual information used, range of sources identified through ¹⁶ Ditto, pp.154 through footnotes. Mid Level - material less convincing & range.

Candidate 6

This work is an excellent example of good practice in annotation. The prime marker has annotated on the left hand side of the candidate's enquiry, commenting on the ways in which the candidate met the AO1 and AO2 assessment objectives. The summative comments at the end of the Part A and Part B enquiries are full and detailed, relate well to the mark schemes and give a very clear idea of the teacher-examiner's thinking. This work is from a centre running four coursework programmes. With the candidates entered as a single cohort, internal moderation to ensure comparability between the different teaching sets was essential. Here, the internal moderator has commented in green, usually on the right hand side of the pages, and his underlining shows where he agrees with / emphasises the comments of the original teacher-marker. He makes it clear that he supports the original marks by summative comments. The marking / internal moderation is accurate.

Grade Boundaries

6HI04 Unit Grade boundary model

Grade	Max Mark	a*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw mark boundary	50	45	41	35	30	25	20	15	0
Uniform mark scale boundary	80	72	64	56	48	40	32	24	0

a* is only used in conversion from raw to uniform marks. It is not a published unit grade.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA024105 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH