

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2011

GCE History 6HI01 A

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results

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 contact our History Subject Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

ResultsPlus

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

January 2011

Publications Code US026427

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

Examiners reported very positively on the overall quality of candidate responses for Option A. The majority of answers were planned, which meant that most were able to sustain a clear focus on the question set. Answers were supported with a range of relevant and developed information, though some candidates provided extended narratives of accurate material with only limited explanation or analysis. Some stuck quite rigidly to the PEE system of point, evidence, explanation. This process worked well for many answers, but for high Level 4 and Level 5 marks answers needed some sort of overview, with candidates standing back and reflecting on how to evaluate their response to the question. There were few candidates whose quality of written communication weakened the impact of their answer; and, happily for examiners, even fewer whose work was difficult to read.

A common weakness, which has been mentioned several times in previous reports, is the failure to develop an accurate chronology of events. This influenced the effectiveness of some answers, notably questions 5, 6 and 12. If candidates are not certain of the course of events, they will be unable to understand the ways in which some key events influence subsequent developments. Candidates sometimes failed to cover the whole timescale set in the question. Question 12 focused on England's relations with Spain and Burgundy during Henry VII's reign. Many candidates failed to get beyond Medina del Campo in discussing Anglo-Spanish relations.

Question 1

The answers on the role of weak leadership tended to focus on the weak response of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms to the Great Army in the mid-860s. There was extensive reference to the civil wars in Northumbria and the general disunity of the Anglo-Saxon leaders in the face of a common threat. Alfred's weakness received a lot of attention, which seems rather unfair given that Wessex proved far more durable than the others. Some answers did struggle to make the links between weak leadership and Viking success and were content just to describe the bickering of Aelle and Osbert. Many other factors were raised. Some discussed the importance of Viking settlement in the Irish Sea region during the 9th century and described it as crucial in the success of the Great Army; and there was a good range of discussion of Viking leadership, tactical mobility and the changing situation in Francia. Generally the answers were well written and explained.

(This page is for your first answer.) To what extent was the weak leadership of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms responsible for the Viking success in the years 793-877

- Mercia, Wessex Northumbria - civil war
- Asse → Osbert, disunity
- base in Francia
- leadership of Halfdene + Guthrum
- landing in EA, horses
- Plunder, lack of land etc pushing them from Scandinavia back → Norway
- control of few families → Sweden

Between 793 and 877 the Vikings had many success in their campaigns in England. These include weak leadership in Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms, their successes elsewhere, Viking leadership and their reasons for coming to England in

(This page is for your first answer.)

The first place.
In 793 when the Vikings first attacked and plundered Lindisfarne, there ^{where several} kingdoms in Anglo-Saxon England, these included Wessex, Mercia and Northumbria as well as several smaller areas such as Kent. At the time leadership of these kingdoms was not necessarily handed down hereditary but instead decided by the witan, this meant that there was often coups or uncertainty over leadership.

This is especially seen in Northumbria where King Osbert was attacked and forced to leave York by Asa who then took the throne. The Vikings used this disharmony to their advantage allowing ~~them~~ ^{Harald} to take the crown and install a puppet king. Another event that shows weak leadership of Anglo-Saxon kings was at the beginning of his reign is when the Vikings were able to force him from Chepperton and into hiding allowing Guthrum to take the throne, as the Anglo-Saxon chronicle states "the people submitted" it would appear that the Vikings were able to exploit his weak leadership at the time and govern instead. All together the weak leadership in Anglo-Saxon England

(This page is for your first answer.) did give the Vikings a helping hand in their successes in England but not to a full extent.

The Vikings' successes on the Continent allowed them to settle in Normandy. This meant that they had a good base from which to travel back and forwards to England from and instead of all the way to Scandinavia as their success grew they were able to settle in the Orkney, Hebrides and Shetland as well as Ireland which also gave them quick access to England and some where they could place their attention when things weren't going so well on England. This helped the Vikings' success in the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms to a slight extent but was not as great as areas such as their leadership skills.

As mentioned leadership of Vikings such as Ivarr the Boneless, Hastein and Guthrum gave the Vikings a great advantage over the Anglo-Saxons. They were able to unite Guthrum and Hastein were able to unite the Vikings who normally sought in small bands together into the Great Heathen Army something which the Anglo-Saxons with their individual kingdoms appeared unable to do. Their leadership was also

(This page is for your first answer.)
shown in their ability to manipulate Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms and traditions to help them, such as landing in East-Anglia where there were plentiful food and horses allowing them to stay over winter. Their leadership enabled them to ~~use~~ use Christian traditions to their advantage by attacking the Anglo-Saxons on holy days, thus catching them on the unawares. Viking leadership was to a large extent responsible for their successes in Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms due to their inspired tactics and ability to unite their men towards a common goal.

This leadership could only ~~exist~~ have existed due to the Vikings great wish to find new lands. In Norway land was scarce and in Sweden it was controlled by only a small number of families, this along with the plunder and land available in Anglo-Saxon England gave the Vikings a great incentive for success as they didn't have much to lose due to their religious belief in the greatness of death in battle and a lot to

(This page is for your first answer.) gain with war was achievable in England. This was not helped by the Anglo-Saxon policy to pay them danegeld to leave their lands which also could be linked to poor leadership. These incentives to come to the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms would have been to a great extent a reason behind their success especially when compared with Viking leadership.

In conclusion lack of weak leadership in Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was not to the greatest extent responsible for Viking success between 793 and 877, instead it was to the largest extent the leadership of the Vikings which allowed them to change from small raiding parties to unified armies, this was greatly supported however by their incentives to leave Scandinavia and go to England which would have spurred them on to follow these leaders.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

After a slightly hesitant opening paragraph, the answer develops a detailed survey on the weaknesses of Anglo-Saxon kings. Set against this factor is the Viking success in establishing themselves in the northern islands of Scotland and in Ireland, allowing easy access to England. There is a secure section on the strength of Viking leadership, and a useful commentary on the Vikings quest for land. There is an attempt to evaluate material with a good number of factors analysed: low Level 5.

Question 2

Question 2 posed more of a challenge as many candidates found it easier to list what Alfred did rather than analyse it as a 'cultural renaissance.' Some candidates focused on the meaning of the word "rebirth" while others argued that the reforms only impacted on the top echelon of society. It sometimes seemed as if candidates wished to answer a question on why Alfred introduced these reforms rather than assessing their consequences. However, the candidates were clearly very knowledgeable, and it was encouraging to realise that young historians are being taught about Gregory the Great's "Pastoral Rule".

Question 3

For the most part candidates did not have any depth of knowledge regarding William's experience as Duke of Normandy and sadly this was not confined to candidates at the lower end of attainment. A question calling for an assessment of 'To what extent' was obviously hampered when 'the given factor' lacked rigour and depth. Many candidates tended to produce imbalanced answers to compensate for this.

William had 30 years of sole rule in Normandy which gave him both military and political experience, including the submission of Brittany. Other examples might be the feigned retreat, the planning of attacks and the use of cavalry and archers. These factors translated into playing some part in his success in 1066 as did his powerful reputation. William was able to attract adventurers from Flanders, Brittany and further afield to his invading army. There was an expectation of military glory and reward. Despite the lack of explicit linkage to William's experience prior to 1066, many candidates were able to offer a multi-causal answer to explain William's success. The factors included were the difficulties created by the number of challenges to Harold Godwinson, along with the king's own personal weaknesses and poor decision making. These factors were played alongside William's luck. There was much made of the change of wind direction, but little comment on the propensity for horses to suffer acutely from sea-sickness. There was also some confusion as to the impact of Papal support for William's success via the symbolic gonfanon of St Peter. The symbolism was not lost on any of the participants - it was not a one sided message. However, it should be recognised that there was also some linkage of Papal support for William's campaign to the scandal surrounding what was regarded as Stigand's uncanonical consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury and the exile of Robert Jumièges. Papal support was not just legitimising the visit of William to England in 1051 during which King Edward's intention and William's agreement were probably made. There was a wider statement which William was able to capitalise on.

(This page is for your second answer.)

To what extent was William's experience as Duke of Normandy responsible for the success of his campaign against Harold Godwinson in 1066?

- He had the strongest army in Europe - beat France 3 times

- Harold only brought together untrained farmers - so he had waited could have brought 50,000 men - rushed because of Halley's comet

- Wind change - meant William crossed channel earlier than expected } Luck

- ~~Halley's comet~~

- Harold just beaten Harold at Stamford Bridge - weak army but overly confident

- Castles

(This page is for your second answer.)

~~Before~~ Around the time of Edward the Confessor's reign there were three potential heirs to the throne. These included his son in law Harold Godwinson, his cousin William the Conqueror, and feared warrior Harald Hardrada. William's future success of the throne at Hastings in 1066 could be considered to have happened for a number of reasons.

The first important point to consider is William previous success as Duke of Normandy. His reign had actually resulted in the defeat of France 3 times, something that Harold Godwinson would have had no chance of achieving. Because of this repetitive success he had consequently built up the strongest and most powerful army in Europe. Again, this is not something that Harold could possibly compare to.

In some ways some credit of William's success is his use of castles. First used as a transportable form of protection that could be built in a matter of days, they later developed into a strong and successful defense system. The creation of the Motte and Bailey castles in particular secured a strong Norman defense, making a form of protection

(This page is for your second answer.) for the army to stay in, but also acted as a military base from which they could attack outwards but would come to no harm when they stayed inside.

However, as well as William's achievements that led to his overall success, it is also important to consider how Harold's failures gave William the advantage. One example would be to compare to William's outstanding fleet of highly trained knights. In comparison, Harold was limited with mainly low trained farmers, many of whom were even left behind because they did not have the ability to access a horse for transport. If he had waited several more weeks he would have had more time not only to train his men, but even could have increased the number to 50,000, which potentially have given him a great advantage over William.

Harold also was, it could be considered, very overconfident going into battle at Hastings. He had only recently been in battle against Harald Hardrada at Stamford ~~Bridge~~ ^{in 1066} and had succeeded in defeating them, killing him. Whereas it would have been important to rebuild up the army before another battle having gained many casualties in

(This page is for your second answer.)

the last, his confidence overcame him and pushed him towards fighting again. He was under the belief that if he used the same tactic of attacking he would once again succeed.

A final failure of Harold Godwinson would be considered a factor of luck. Adding to the overconfidence he had gained at Stamford Bridge, Harold was also under the strong religious belief about Haley's comet. He thought if he didn't attack almost immediately it would result in a bad omen on his part; something he greatly wanted to avoid. Another factor of luck was the fact there was a change in wind direction at the last minute. It meant William and his army were able to cross the channel to attack much earlier than he expected, giving him even less time to prepare and gather men together to fight.

To conclude, despite William's previous success as Duke of Normandy, it is misleading to believe the strong army he had gained because of it was the only factor resulting in his success at Hastings. Without the chance of the events happening to Harold Godwinson and his army he may have been able to build up

(This page is for your second answer.)

better defense and consequently could have had more success in the long term. Therefore, if he had the same amount of preparation time William did, he could have created a much more powerful force than he actually ended up being able to.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer notes William's successes against France and the buildup of his military power. There is also mention of the portable castles transported to England, and to the overall strength of William's forces. These points are set against the weaknesses of Harold's army, especially after Stamford Bridge, when the candidate notes Harold's possible overconfidence after his victory. Although the Battle of Hastings itself is not mentioned in any detail, there is sufficient evaluation of the given factor, and of other relevant factors, to warrant low Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

You will find it helpful to have some understanding of William's position as Duke of Normandy, and of the military skills which he had developed before 1066.

Question 4

Most candidates had enough information to produce a balanced answer, yet there was a tendency to offer one-dimensional answers. There was a general awareness of the extension of forests, the importance of castles and the Harrying of the North in 1069 to link to the twin traits of cruelty and oppression. However, specific examples of William's less brutal response to the risings of the English such as those of Eadric the Wild and those in Kent and Exeter were generally overlooked, leading to a lack of dimension to this aspect of William's policies. For many candidates, William's response to rebellion from the English limited their interpretation of the way in which he fundamentally went about gaining control of his new kingdom. There was some lack of understanding of William's differentiated approach or the need for him to change his approach over time. For example, William took over the English administrative and judicial system in its entirety and allowed the native magnates to continue to operate as under Edward the Confessor. On the other hand, he did break with the past from the outset, when it came to defence. The castle building programme and the appointment of new earls such as William Fitz Osbern could be seen to bear all the hallmarks of oppression. The building programme clearly aped the continental model and William's distrust of the English nobles was clearly evident. However, after the great insurrection of 1069-70 and its reputed cruel and oppressive response from William, there is evidence that the English gave their support to the king to put down any further insurrections, which indicates a growing acceptance and a change of perception by some regarding oppression.

Few candidates, even at the higher levels, tried to consider William's policies as oppressive rather than cruel - this differentiation might be applied to the introduction of feudalism. Conversely, the role and responsibilities of the sheriff were augmented under William as they were to be solely responsible for summoning the fyrd. This also showed how they were integrated into the feudal system. The collection of information for the Domesday Book was interpreted by many candidates as oppressive yet the gathered information also served to settle the disputes about landholding which arose with the arrival of the Normans.

(This page is for your first answer.) How accurate is it to describe
Norman rule in England after 1066 as cruel and oppressive?

There were many ways in which England run by the Normans after 1066 can be described as cruel and oppressive. Some reasons include castle building, ^{forest laws} ~~the Domesday Survey~~, and the harshness of punishments. My preliminary judgement as to whether Norman rule after 1066 was cruel and oppressive is that it was however there were a few aspects of Norman rule which did improve the lives of Anglo-Saxons in England after 1066.

One way the Normans oppressed the people after 1066

was through the process of castle building. When William (the conqueror) landed at Pevensey in 1066 his first move was to pillage and destroy the towns, then build a defensive castle to defend the South east coast. After the rebellion at Exeter in 1070, castles

(This page is for your first answer.) were constructed to quell disorder and keep the people (mainly rebels) under control. This meant many towns were destroyed in order to build the castles. However, castles were not completely oppressive as they could help prevent entire civil war if a rebellion got out of hand which would affect the entire population. Therefore, castles can be mainly seen as an oppressive and cruel method but did have some uncrueel uses.

Another reason ~~why~~ how Norman rule in England was oppressive and cruel was the Domesday Survey which was commissioned in 1086 by William the Conqueror to determine how many hides of land, cattle etc. people owned. William sent out commissioners to each earldom to gather the data. This can be seen as cruel and oppressive because it allowed William to tax the people and also keep an eye on what people owned. Under Henry II, the Danegeld was re-introduced and was also a similar method of getting people to pay tax. However, the Domesday Survey cannot be described as fully cruel and oppressive as it was the first major survey to be recorded which enabled the country to

develop. Also, it allowed people to be taxed fairly because some people were being over-taxed. On reflection, the Domesday survey seems to ~~be~~ not be a

(This page is for your first answer.) Very cruel or oppressive method as it helped keep the taxation system fair and did not really affect the people of England's lives very much.

A third way the Norman rule after 1066 can be described as cruel and oppressive is the ~~extension of forest laws~~ ^{extension of forest laws} ~~to the people of England~~. From the beginning of William I's (Rufus) reign, forest laws were extended so that most of the forest belonged to the king. Laws stated that if anyone attempted to kill a deer, they would have punishments put upon them ranging from blinding to castration to death or the right hand being cut off. These laws oppressed the people of England because it restricted part of their lives and affected their lives severely. Taxes were also placed upon people who insisted on living in the forests which also could be seen as a cruel method of extracting money. Overall, the forest laws were cruel and oppressive and can provide evidence of how the people's lives began to be controlled after 1066, as before 1066, Edward the Confessor had had forest laws in place but they were nowhere near as restrictive or harsh.

Finally, another piece of evidence which can demonstrate that England run by the Normans after 1066 ~~was~~

was cruel and oppressive was the harsh punishments inflicted on people for ~~minor~~ breaches of the law.

(This page is for your first answer.) One example of this was in the William De Briouze case in 1108 when he refused to pay a tax. His wife and son were taken and kept imprisoned until they both starved to death but only after the mother had eaten her child out of sheer desperation. This demonstrates how cruel the methods of punishment were after 1066 and in Norman rule. Another example of harsh punishments was the introduction of the 'Murdrum' fine. This meant if any Norman was found dead, then the whole village would have to pay a hefty fine if the person who killed them wasn't found. The only way people got round this was to put the body into another village and blame it on them or prove that the body did have an Anglo-Saxon bloodline. The murdrum fine also illustrates how harsh punishments became after 1066 and drove the people to extreme measures because they felt oppressed. Overall, the hefty punishments introduced after 1066 does describe how the people were oppressed and treated cruelly.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer might have benefited from clearer organisation. However, the building of castles, the Domesday survey, the forest laws and the legal system are all relevant to the question and are reasonably developed. There is an attempt to build up an analytical focus, and the material of that goes beyond the reign of William I: a high Level 4 response.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Sometimes you will find that a question asks you to consider two separate points. In this question, 'cruel' and 'oppressive' refer to different features of Norman rule.

Question 5

There were some very good answers on this question. Candidates clearly knew this topic well and were able to write in detail about Henry's policies towards the nobility and castles, the judicial system, finance and other aspects of governance. Many set the reign into some context by making a brief reference to the disorders of the civil war, and to Henry's increasingly bitter relations with members of his family towards the end of his reign. While many referred to the restoration of royal power throughout the country, there were few references to Henry's policies with regard to Wales, Scotland and Ireland. More might have been made of the restoration of royal finances through the reform of the Exchequer and the updating of the system of knights' fees. Many potentially excellent answers ignored the 'to what extent' aspect of the question and talked only about the ways in which Henry II strengthened the powers of the crown without considering any weaknesses in his rule.

(This page is for your first answer.)

To what extent did Henry II strengthen the powers of the crown in England?

Plan: -

pro:

centralisation: -

itinerant judges

inquest of sheriffs (1170)

made church sub-ordinate to crown

Assizes of Clarendon (1166) &

Northampton (1176)

cons:

Becket caused probs with

Church

sons.

conc: pro.

(This page is for your first answer.)

The powers of the crown were very weak before Henry II, the civil war between Stephen and Matilda had destroyed any system of law and order. Antis previously held by parties loyal to the crown had been usurped by barons. Henry perfected this

system, adding his own ^{ideas} so that the country was unified. However, two public displays of defiance by Thomas à Becket and his own children made the crown weaker. ~~However,~~ ^{Despite this} I believe Henry strengthened the crown enormously.

Although, there is an argument that he weakened the Crown. Firstly, in his attempt to control the Church, he came up against an old friend, Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. When ~~the~~ Becket had been Henry's chancellor, he had directed policy and the two had been mostly of the same mind. But his promotion to Archbishop in 1162 had changed Becket's views. He now wanted the Church to be independent, which meant he and Henry clashed over clerical privileges, such as the right to be tried in a Church, not King's court. Becket defied Henry, and then fled to France, leaving England without an Archbishop of Canterbury for the coronation of the young Prince Henry. When Becket found out that Henry had crowned his son anyway with the Archbishop of York, he excommunicated the Archbishop. Even after four knights rid

(This page is for your first answer.)

Henry of Becket in 1170, Becket's murder within his own cathedral put a shadow on Henry's reign to fight for law and justice.

Henry's actions towards his own family also weakened the Crown. He refused to ~~let~~ let Prince Henry after his coronation, or Prince Richard, after he was invested

with Aquitaine, have any power. This led to them both seeking help from Louis VII of France, nearly culminating in civil war in England. The fact that they had very little power caused competitiveness amongst the boys, making them turn on each other. His love (and reluctance to find land for) his youngest son John alienated his eventual heir Richard, leading to both John and Richard betraying Henry shortly before his death in 1189 by siding with the Cap King of France, Philip II.

However, concerning Becket, it was not all Henry's fault. Becket believed he could ~~destroy~~ control Henry, so even when Henry attempted to make amends, Becket became antagonistic. Even the rage that prompted Becket's death was not meant - although history has made him pay. His sons, when they first rebelled, were defeated, and when Richard and John allied with Richard in 1188, Henry, although broken, held England together for Richard to inherit on his death.

Henry did many good things to strengthen the Crown

(This page is for your first answer.)

throughout his reign, ^{one of} the most important being his reforms of law. Firstly, the highest of Sheriffs in 1170 ensured that all the corrupt barons were removed from the posts of sheriff and replaced by loyal civil servants. This ensured that Henry knew exactly what was going on in the land. His use of itinerant judges meant that

England became ruled by one set of laws, not dispersed ideas, and these judges carried this through the entire country. He did finally make the Church mostly subordinate to the Crown, which meant in England, King's Law controlled nearly everything. By using The Cartae Baronum in 1166 to update Domesday Book material, he ensured that he was getting the required amount of money from the barons for their retainers. The Assizes of Clarendon (1166) and Northampton (1176) ensured that the law was reformed to a judge and twelve men on the jury.

Overall, the conclusion is that despite the mistakes made, Henry turned an unbalanced crown inherited by Stephen to a powerful monarchy that withstood Richard I absenting it for the 3rd Crusade. That is what he should be remembered for, not the murder of his Archbishop on the grounds of Canterbury Cathedral.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer addresses "how far" in a balanced response which is contextualised by reference to the disorders of Stephen's reign. The answer notes that Henry's relationship with Becket, and with members of his own family, weakened the powers of the Crown. The strengthening of Royal power is illustrated essentially by Henry's legal reforms only, which is a slightly narrow focus. However, the balanced nature of the answer, coupled with the effective introduction and conclusion, merits low Level 5.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Any question which starts 'to what extent' is asking you to consider a number of points for and against the statement in the question.

Question 6

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to consider Philip Augustus' role in the collapse of English power in France, though with varying degrees of success. At the highest levels candidates considered the king's political and military skills against the Plantagenets. The invasion of Anjou, the cynical alliance with Richard in 1189, and the manipulation of John were all addressed. Some were less secure after 1204, with the War of Bouvines receiving little attention. At lower levels of attainment, Philip's role was ignored altogether. Most candidates, however, were able to address the role of Richard and John in these events and the best responses came from those who were able to weigh up the significance of Philip Augustus' role in relation to other factors. Some candidates, however, focused too heavily on the events of John's reign at the expense of Richard's which led to chronological imbalance.

(This page is for your first answer.)

- ✓ ^{was} come home from crusade.
- ✓ was offended by what had happened to father
 - financial reforms
- ✓ turned John against Ed. Rich. ✓ asking for permission
^{wasn't}
- ✓ ~~Richard made good~~ John annoyed barons
so they swapped sides
 - taxes
 - mercenaries
- ✓ Le Goulet ✓ ✓ marriage ✓
- ✓ Tyrannical behaviour
- ✓ death of Eleanor of Aquitaine!

There:

Phillip Augustus played a huge role in bringing about the collapse of ~~the~~ English power in France. He was driven by ~~the~~ revenge for the Angevin

(This page is for your first answer.) ... empire as it ^{is former monarchs had} ~~had drastically~~ insulted his father, ~~as~~ Charles VII as King

However, there are many factors that brought about the fall of English power in France, ^{that do not relate to} ~~most~~ Phillip, many of which occurred in the first 5 years of John's reign.

~~John was seen as a tyrant~~ John signed the treaty with Phillip called Le Goulet. Although in some ways this was seen as a triumph for John it was in fact a huge disadvantage as John had to pay a huge amount of money to Phillip and he also, indirectly, lost control of two ~~of~~ of his vassals in France. This showed that John had already lost power in France as he had lost control of vassals that under his brother, Richard's reign had been loyal to the Angevin Empire.

John was also seen as a tyrant. ~~And~~ During his years ~~when~~ attempting to ~~gain~~ regain areas of France he had lost to Phillip, he ~~had to charge~~ huge taxes ~~upon~~ on his barons forcing them to become bitter towards John. John also had many favourites among his barons as he did not trust many of them, such as Gloucester, due to this he used mercenaries to fight for him when trying to regain France. This increased the dislike

(This page is for your first answer.) of John among the Barons.

John's marriage to ~~the previously engaged Isbet~~ Isabelle of Gloucester had produced no children and so after getting the marriage annulled, John searched for another wife. He chose Isobel of Angoulême ~~and he~~ who was already married to a French noble. This created another ~~enemy~~ ^{which} enemy for John ~~and~~ further decreased his power in France instead of, as he had hoped, increasing his power by marrying into the lands in France as his father, ^{Henry II,} had done by marrying Eleanor of Aquitaine.

Eleanor of Aquitaine was loyal to her son John, ^{she would rather have had the power belonging to her son than} although not her favourite, ^{someone else,} and as governor of Aquitaine ensured that ~~this~~ this area remained loyal to England. However, after her death in 1203 this saw Aquitaine come under French powers.

Many of these acts however, ~~were~~ were created by Phillip, apart from the death of Eleanor of Aquitaine.

Phillip began to meddle in Angevin affairs long before the death of Richard in 1199. During the third crusade, Phillip returned home to France, whilst Richard was still fighting Saladin, & so he could work on destroying the Angevin Empire.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~This proves that~~ This proves that Phillip was determined to bring about the downfall of the Empire and he had a number of ways in which to do this.

Whilst Richard was being held captive by Leopold of Austria, whilst trying to make it home from his crusade, Phillip had approached John encouraging him to raise troops in England and create a state of chaos within the Angevin Empire for a huge reward from Phillip.

~~During the reign of John~~ When John was crowned in 1199, he declared himself Duke of Normandy to make sure that his cousin Arthur could not try and claim his title of King of England, as Arthur technically had a much more secure claim to the throne. However, it was tradition that a new king must ask permission from the King of France before claiming their titles. As this had been irrelevant in the time of Henry II and Richard, John did not as they were considerably more powerful than France, it did not occur to John that this was necessary.

Phillip used this to his advantage and removed part of Normandy from John's power and gave Arthur parts of France as he had sought permission. This shows that Phillip used John's naivety to his

(This page is for your first answer.) *advantage and removing some of England's power in France.*

Overall, I believe Phillip Augustus ~~was~~ played a fundamental part in the decline of ~~power~~ England's power in France ~~however~~, I also believe that he ~~was~~ lucky. He planned the losses of power by taking advantage of ~~the~~ John and Richard's weaknesses and errors. After all, if ~~the~~ Phillip had not wanted a decrease ^{of} England's power in France then it would ~~surely~~ not have decreased ~~so~~ ~~or~~ as quickly as it did in only 5 years.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer might have benefited from clearer planning at the start. The candidate deals with John's relations with Philip, his supposedly tyrannical rule, and the importance of his marriage. Philip's treachery is also noted, but there is little here on the French king's relations with Richard I. Sufficiently analytical in shape for a high Level 4 response.

Question 7

Few of the candidates for Option A4 attempted Question 7, perhaps finding the period 1349-81 a more attractive option. Most understood some features of town life which helped to explain the devastation of the plague of 1348-50, focusing their answers on insanitary conditions and river pollution. Better answers noted that towns were linked by a network of internal trade, and that many coastal towns traded with France and the Hanseatic towns. However, there were several answers which misunderstood the focus of the question. These were often framed around the impact which the plague had on towns and their inhabitants.

The growth of towns does not explain the devastation caused by the Black Death 1348-1350 very far. It was definitely an important factor in spreading it so rapidly, but ultimately was not an important factor causing it, which were the more important reasons. Without causal factors, the growth of towns would have had no importance. The main devastation was caused by lack of medical knowledge. * = next paragraph.

* The growth of towns was certainly important. With ~~more~~ more people inhabiting towns, living conditions became ~~poor~~ increasingly worse hygiene and sanitation - wise. This is definitely important as it allowed the plague to rapidly spread around these towns which meant that not only did the population decrease, ~~the population~~, but decrease it incredibly quick. However, communication links to

(This page is for your second answer.) The rest of the country definitely proved more devastating, & no matter how big these towns grew to, it was only naturally spread because of rural-urban travel routes. If there were no travel routes, the plague could have become isolated within one town only therefore only affecting ^{one} a particular area. Even if towns were small and there were travel/communication routes, the plague still would have spread around England causing greater devastation. This shows how communication/travel routes were more important cause of devastation than the growth of towns.

As previously shown, communication/travel routes were incredibly important. These allowed the plague to spread to every corner of the country and indeed was an important factor in causing the widespread devastation. However, overseas trade was more important factor than this. It was only because of overseas trade that allowed the plague to inhabit England. 3 years before the plague, it had spread through Europe and was on the verge of coming into England. The plague was only able to cross over to England because of trade. If there

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~was~~ no trade, the plague would have certainly stayed with Europe and not England. The only reason ~~trade~~ communication/travel links were able to spread the disease was because it was in England due to overseas trade. As shown, these travel links ~~were~~ could only spread plague if it came into England by trade. Showing how travel links also ~~were~~ the most important. This shows its more importance than the growth of towns also. The plague wouldn't have been located in these growing towns if trade had not let plague into the country. Showing its dependency.

As shown, trade was pivotal in allowing plague into England and can be seen as very important in causing devastation. What is even more important than trade was the rats carrying the plague itself. The plague ~~would~~ never had reached England if it ~~were~~ for the plague carrying rats being onboard ~~the~~ ships. It wasn't definite that trade ships had plagued rats on them. Those that didn't had nothing to spread showing their limited importance. However the ships carrying the rats did let plague into England and on top of this, the rats were the source of the plague showing their greater importance.

(This page is for your second answer.)

than overseas trade.

However, the most important reason plague caused such devastation was the lack of medical knowledge.

Even if plague originated in England (reducing trade was a useless factor), it ~~was~~ ^{was} almost certain to cause much devastation. Without travel links,

the plague would not have spread but would still have caused a lot of devastation in a certain area. However, the fact they

couldn't treat it allowed many people to die.

Some people may still have died even if there was a cure, as with some outbreaks in the modern world. No matter how quickly ~~travellers~~ travel links

allowed the spread of it, how trade and rats allowed

the plague into England or how big towns grew

to, medical knowledge would have been able to

cure all those affected. This shows how the factor

of a lack of medical knowledge was the most

important.

To conclude, growth of towns was certainly important in the devastation caused by Black Death.

It allowed quick and widespread spread of the plague in isolated areas. However, even if towns did

(This page is for your second answer.) grow immensely of ~~and~~ and all inhabitants were affected, an ~~area~~ of understanding of medicine would ultimately have ~~attained~~ nullified any devastation on any level. Showing how this is the most important factor. This shows how the growth of towns ~~were~~ doesn't explain very far at all the devastation caused by the Black Death 1348-1350.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

There is some fairly generalised material here on insanitary conditions and overcrowding in many English towns. However the candidate is aware of some patterns of domestic and overseas trade, and makes an attempt to categorise factors by reference to the state of medical knowledge. The answer is attempting analysis and does have some developed support: thus low Level 4 is appropriate.

Question 8

At the lower levels of attainment candidates were limited in the factors they addressed in dealing with challenges to the existing social structure. Some only compared the consequences of the Black Death to other factors in causing the Peasants' Revolt, whilst others looked at short-term consequences and omitted reference to the Peasants' Revolt. Other weaknesses included a descriptive approach, with a consequently weaker focus on the level of challenge to the social structure. Better answers made good use of challenges to the social structure and resistance to those challenges through the Ordinance and Statute of Labourers and the Sumptuary Law as well as the causes and outcome of the Peasants' Revolt. Candidates need to bear in mind the chronological limits of the option, since some candidates sought to address the overall decline of feudalism within their answer. The best candidates were able to produce a clear analysis of the consequences of the Black Death and show both the ways in which it challenged the existing social structure and the limitations to that challenge.

Question 9

Many candidates seemed comfortable dealing with a number of reasons apart from the given factor which explain Henry V's decision to invade France in 1415. The weaknesses of the French crown itself were well known, especially the growing insanity of Charles VI; many noted the king's belief that he was made of glass. Some noted that Henry felt able to capitalise on the division between the Armagnacs and Burgundians which had been so clearly demonstrated in the conflicts of 1413. Others noted that Henry had been determined to go to war against France for many years before his accession, to the extent that he was even stockpiling arrows in the tower of London. However, few noted that Henry was determined to establish Lancastrian legitimacy, which had been uncertain ever since Bolingbroke's usurpation of 1399. Henry knew how popular war with France would be, and that his own claim to the English throne would be assured by a short victorious war.

Question 10

There were only a few answers to questions 10. Higher level responses noted that the Burgundian alliance was largely insignificant in terms of military support, noting that Philip of Burgundy was unwilling to commit his troops too strongly in promoting the English cause. Candidates noted that for most of the period 1419-35 Philip's support was lukewarm, and the best that could be said of him was that he was not siding with the French against the English. Bedford's marriage was mentioned, though it was sometimes given more credit than it perhaps deserves. Weaker answers did not cover the entire chronology. The sealing of the alliance following the assassination of John the Fearless in 1419 was often overlooked, as was the treaty of Arras in 1435 when Philip brought the English alliance to a formal end.

(This page is for your first answer.) The alliance with Burgundy which was signed in 1419 after the murder of John of Burgundy, helped maintain the English position in France.

This was because the de French hated the English. For example in Joan of Arc's time the English were being referred to as 'Goden' which means God damn. What kept the English in France for so long was the fact that the Burgundians hated the Armagnacs more than they hated the English. This means that they were willing to help destroy the Dauphinists. Thus many Frenchmen accepted to be ruled by the English while they were allied to Burgundy. This is evident in the fact that after the Treaty of Arras in 1435 there were uprisings all over Normandy.

In addition the Burgundians who controlled Paris before

(This page is for your first answer.) King Henry's occupation had no qualms with co-operating with the English. This meant that the English had a loyal bureaucracy. This was very important as the Burgundians helped tax Normandy and Paris. As these taxes were very severe they would have not been able to collect them without the support of the Burgundian civil servants.

Bedford certainly thought that the alliance was important as he paid Phillip the Good over £100,000 to maintain it.

Furthermore, the Burgundians supplied the English with troops. At the battles of Vermander and Craval there was a large contingent of Burgundian soldiers. As England was itself very short of funds at this time, they proved very useful.

Besides, there was also diplomatic co-operation as is evident from the fact, Phillip the Good marched with Henry into Paris to aid and also signed the Treaty of Troyes. This gave the English more of a moral right to the throne.

Furthermore, since Burgundy was a very powerful duchy and controlled the Low Countries this

(This page is for your first answer.) ... meant that alliances were more likely to be made with the English and less Frenchmen would be think of joining the English cause. This was because most Frenchmen believed in peace and allied with the Burgundians, the English were more likely to win a war.

Bedford wanted to maintain the alliance to the point that he married Phillip's sister and made sure the Gloucester withdrew from Hainault after he invaded it in 1434.

It can also be said that most historians point to the year 1435 as the year that the English cause began to collapse. It is no coincidence that this year coincided with the Treaty of Arras.

It However, there are other reasons why the English managed to maintain their position in Normandy. Credit must go to their remarkable commanders. The most famous being Henry V, Bedford, Salisbury and Warwick. These people lived a life of warfare constantly raiding and fighting. This is evident in the fact the Salisbury for example won a great victory

(This page is for your first answer.) at Granat and he was responsible for countless other successful battles which the English fought.

Furthermore, there was Bedford, who has been described as a great Anglo-Frenchman. He genuinely loved the French and he issued letters which protected household and villages against pillaging by the deserters and garrisons. In addition he won a great victory at Verneuil. ~~Some~~ Some historians have speculated what would have happened had he marched at Bourges in the aftermath of the battle, instead of completing the conquest of Anjou and Maine. Some maintain the France would have capitulated.

However, ~~there were also notable~~ these notable commanders were also staffed by an efficient level of soldiers. The most notable being Lord Talbot, Lord Scales and Sir John Fastolf.

Talbot for instance was constantly on the attack and his energy was responsible for maintaining the English position in Normandy and Maine.

However, apart from these commanders the hatred

(This page is for your first answer.) The Burgundians and Armagnacs felt towards each other, also kept the English in Normandy. For instance ~~or~~ ~~most~~ ~~commented~~ showing Francois I the ^{broken} skull of John of Burgundy, commented that 'this was the hole through which the English entered France'. The hatred that they felt towards each other can be seen in the fact that when the Burgundians took Paris, thousands of Armagnacs were killed.

This was the reason why the English managed to hold Normandy. Furthermore there was also revulsion towards the Armagnacs because they had killed John of Burgundy in cold blood and many French Burgundians feared reprisals if the Armagnacs ever retook Paris.

~~In~~ ~~add~~ However, the poverty of the Dauphin and his mental problems kept the English in Normandy for many years.

For example, it is estimated that while Normandy brought in 100,000 - 200,000 crowns a year, the territories controlled by the Dauphin brought three and perhaps even five times that amount so clearly the French had the resources to fight the English. Furthermore the South of

(This page is for your first answer.) France, (which was the territory that the English controlled) had not been plundered and its inhabitants not murdered by the English. Thus Charles could also raise men to fight the English. However, he did not because he was dominated by his favourites whose only interest was to enrich themselves. The most notorious of these was La Tremoille, a notorious murderer, who plundered the revenues of the Dauphin.

In addition, due to the Dauphin's mental problems and immaturity, the taxes were not normally collected. The Dauphin's figure also caused many problems for his cause, as he was not a ^{normal} leader and people were reluctant to join his cause.

Furthermore, the flower of the French chivalry had fallen at Agincourt and until late in the war, the French could not field any decent commanders. This led to many defeats, such as at the 'Battle of the Herrings', where the French commanders' inability to control the Scots meant that they were routed.

For in addition the English won countless victories against the French and besieged and took many strongholds. They took Rouen, Falaise, and many other places. The English

(This page is for your first answer.) also won great victories at Cravant, Vermand, 'the Battle of the Herrings'. This meant that the Dauphin's army was destroyed and could not fight the English. As the French needed an army to fight the war, the English kept ~~London~~ Normandy, until the French got a raised a new army.

In conclusion, it would be fair to say that the alliance with Burgundy was an important factor, although factors such as the English having good generals and the poverty of the Dauphin also played the role. The most important factor was probably the poverty of the Dauphin.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer notes the important role of Burgundians in providing the bureaucracy which underpinned English rule in France. The candidate demonstrates the importance which Bedford attached to the alliance, and the steps he took to maintain it. Set against these factors is consideration of a number of French problems, notably the importance of Agincourt which led to the death of so many French nobles. There is an attempt to develop an overview of the significance of the alliance: low Level 5.

Question 11

Generally question 11 was answered well with most answers in level 4 and 5. There were no answers in level 1 and few in level 2. Generally the lowest marks seemed to be on papers where it was the second essay and was either rushed or unfinished.

Some answers within the Level 4 attainment band spent too much time on narrative at the start of the essay, focusing on either a comparison between Henry VI and his famous father, or on a description of his fairly bleak childhood. Most answers included his mental state, which every candidate agrees was that of catatonic schizophrenia, the effect of the war on finance, the substantial ambitions of York, and the role of favourites, most notably Somerset. Others in addition mentioned Margaret, her unexpected pregnancy, and the implications of the birth of her son for the duke of York. The role of the war was not developed by all candidates. Some only mentioned it in passing. Others discussed it along with a lengthy description of York's time in France and after, and tried to draw a comparison between York and Warwick. Very able candidates compared the varying fortunes of the Lancastrians and Yorkists, and linked this to Henry's treatment of favourites. Even the weakest of candidates understood the significance of York and Henry's treatment of him. A few misunderstood the question and framed their answer on York himself, with Henry getting barely a mention. A number of candidates mentioned Cade's rebellion but not many referred to the defeat at Castillon; neither of these events was linked to their effect on the prestige of the crown.

In the year 1455 the first of a long series of battles broke out, since named, The War of the Roses, between two rival English factions, The Houses of York and Lancaster. The reasons for the outbreak of the wars were as follows; English military defeats in France, the weaknesses of Henry VI as King, Royal debt, the involvement of Margaret of Anjou, Noble rivalries and the power ambitions of Richard of York. It is clear that defeats for the English in France did play a role in the outbreak of conflict, However, what is far more important is Henry VI's weaknesses as King, his failure to control a divided nobility and reward/promote nobles his

(This page is for your first answer.) personal mental frailties which made a fight for power almost inevitable.

Before the Reign of Henry VI his father, Henry V established a large English 'Empire' in France holding large amounts of territory and posing a significant military threat to the French leadership. England's military accomplishments culminated in the historic victory at Agincourt. However, after Henry V's death, a new king Henry VI was crowned who was certainly not the warlike leader England had grown to serve. During Henry's reign England suffered humiliating defeats to French hands both under the command of the Dukes of Suffolk and Somerset who were given the lieutenancy of France in the absence of a warrior king. England lost huge areas of land and so by the end of 1450 were left with only a small area of France, Calais, protected by its English garrison. This loss of land and wealth did not directly cause the outbreak of ~~the~~ civil conflict in England, however, what it did do was antagonise Richard of York,

(This page is for your first answer.) The large northern magnate who, holding lands in France, felt he should have been in charge and lost his land ~~unreasonably~~ without real reason. What is also clear is that the defeats in France served a much more important role, in showing Henry VI's inadequacies as king. Instead of the warrior taking land from the hostile French, the pious new king dedicated most of his time to church and university building back at home.

Henry VI had many significant weaknesses as king. The first was his inability to rule like his father due to his pious nature, in the medieval world a warrior king was required to keep England on the map, his absence meant England was to suffer greatly at the hands of its enemies. Also, Henry had a very poor concept of patronage and, with the guidance of his wife, Margaret of Anjou, initially supporting the hapless Suffolk and then after his death the divisive ~~Suff~~ Somerset, Henry only served to alienate the powerful nobles, such as Richard of York, who were left out

(This page is for your first answer.) and left without a true place at court because of his Henry's favouritism towards unhelpful or problematic allies. Furthermore, Henry's most important failure and weakness was his mental insecurity which, after his collapse in 1453, left a power vacuum where his wife Margaret and the next heir Richard were to come into greater conflict over who should rule England. Henry's combination of failures meant that those whose alliance Henry could have used were abandoned and possible enemies were not resigned in but in fact antagonised to a point where a power struggle became inevitable.

Henry's lavish use of ill-judged patronage and spending on failed campaigns meant that the English crown was left in a state^{level} of debt never seen before in English history. Henry gave money to nobles such as Somerset along with large areas of crown lands instead of paying off his debts and leaving the crown open to attack. Henry's greatest debtor was in fact his cousin.

(This page is for your first answer.) Richard who even after giving his king huge sums of money was passed over time and time again leaving Henry still indebted. Having a large sum of his wealth tied up in the only served to antagonise Richard further and reduce Henry's ability to fight back in the event of a violent challenge.

Queen of England, Margaret of Anjou, also played a key role in the outbreak of conflict in 1455. Although not a major player before 1453, the collapse of her husband and birth of an heir meant that she then had a significant role to play in the politics of the nation. Margaret let her support to Richard's rival, Somerset, and even tried to have Richard killed on a number of occasions. Furthermore, giving birth to a new direct heir to the throne meant that Richard of York was now left with little position at court. During Richard's protectorate Margaret also strove to protect the claim of her son, so much so that

(This page is for your first answer.) after the recovery of her husband all Richards advisors at court were expelled and Somerset, put in the tower by Richard was reinstated as chief advisor. Margaret antagonised Richard at Evesham and in so doing created a climate of hatred between the two which certainly added to Richards growing level of discontent leading him to rise up in 1455.

The greatest noble rivalry in England was that between the Kings Lancastrians and Richards Yorkists. This rivalry, extending from the questionable rise of a Lancastrian to the throne left Richard of York seeking a throne that should be his from a man incompetent to rule. Another rivalry also existed between York and Somerset. The intense hatred between the two and the Somersets loss of French lands meant York was left isolated at court and increasingly rebellious. Also and much more importantly throughout the country local rivalries existed in which they failed to intervene which by far was one of

(This page is for your first answer.) The main causes of noble support for both sides. The two largest rivalries occurred between the Bonvilles and Courtenays in the south west in which Richard personally intervened and between the Percy's (Lancastrians) and the Yorkist Nevilles in the north. The failure to control rivalries meant dividing lines were drawn and support now grew for an opposition to Henry who left tensions to brew and spill over.

The final factor in the outbreak of the wars was the ambition of Richard of York. Swept from the throne due to the Lancastrian takeover in the century previous left Richard feeling left out and betrayed whilst also the birth of Henry's son also meant he was no longer the heir and so power could only be achieved through action. Henry, indebted to Richard failed to reward him and instead left him antagonised by 'evil advisors' who sought to keep him out. The final straw came when after Henry's mental collapse

(This page is for your first answer.) and Richard's taste of power, Richard was again swept from office more alone than ever before.

It is certain that Henry's inadequacies as king and failure to rule in a way which kept the nobility of England strong and united without a powerful leader was the key reason civil unrest broke out in 1455. If Henry had not had a mental collapse Richard would never have tasted power, Margaret would not have the position to antagonise Richard and support for an opposition to a weak and frail king would ~~never~~ ^{have} arisen. Although military defeats played a role Henry's inadequacies were by far the most responsible for the outbreak of war.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The candidate provides some appropriate contextual material on the reign of Henry V, and has a clear understanding of the significance of the loss of French lands in causing the Civil War. There are some effective links made between English losses, the growing antagonism of York, and the personal weaknesses of Henry VI. The role of Margaret of Anjou is addressed, and there is a substantial section on divisions within the nobility. A well focused conclusion and secure evaluation overall: mid-Level 5.

Question 12

This was a popular question, but candidates should be reminded of the need to read the question carefully and to take note of any dates. There were quite a few cases where candidates had focused on either the first or the second reign of Edward IV, which meant that their answers lacked chronological range. The best answers dealt confidently with the whole reign and were able to consider issues such as Edward's changing authority over time and how far he managed to restore it by the time of his death. Again, there was a tendency amongst some candidates to focus on one aspect of his reign, for example his relationship with the nobility at the expense of considering other areas of his government such as foreign policy and finance. Weaker answers had little to say on Edward's first reign, when the king established his power throughout the country, notably in the north. Only a few noted the extent to which Edward relied on his brother Gloucester who, unlike Clarence, was completely trustworthy. The second reign was known in greater detail, though more might have been made of the restoration of royal finances and the significance of the Chamber.

(This page is for your first answer.) How far did Edward IV restore the authority of the monarchy in the years 1461-83?

Plan

- Got rid of Lancastrian threat after 71.
- Powerful regional magnates
- money
- foreign alliances

Edward IV ^{definitely} restored the authority of the monarchy in the years 1461-83. He did this by being heavily involved in Government and restoring political stability. After the reign of Henry VI, the country was almost bankrupt, but by being more involved and gaining finances wherever possible, he helped restore authority. After being overthrown by Warwick & Henry VI in 1470, he soon returned in 1471 and made sure to get rid of any possible Lancastrian claimants. He also set up powerful regional magnates around the country who were not overmighty and thus relied on him for power, restoring authority. Any problem was how young ~~Edward IV~~ Edward IV was when Edward IV died, as this caused many problems, but this was really out of his

(This page is for your first answer.) words, so during the years 1461-83, he really did everything he could to restore royal authority.

At the start of Edward's reign, it was clear he needed to bring about political stability and establish himself as King, unlike his weak predecessor, Henry VI. He made sure he locked Henry VI up, so he could continue with his reign. Not killing Henry was a problem that would eventually come back and depose him through Warwick's rebellion of 1470. However, he learnt from his mistakes and made sure he killed Henry VI in his second reign. He also made sure he got rid of any possible heirs of Henry VI that may try and overthrow him later on, but luckily for Edward, Edward of Lancaster (formally Prince of Wales) was killed in the Battle of Tewkesbury in 1471, leaving him clear of any possible Lancastrian claimants.

~~With Henry VI~~, Edward ~~eliminated~~ Warwick was also a ^{clear} ~~clear~~ problem during this reign, nicknamed the 'king maker' as he had helped to get both Edward and Henry on the throne. After his rebellion of 1470^{with Clarence}, however, Edward had to once again learn from his mistakes and get rid of him. Warwick was killed at the Battle of Barnet, thus ending his extraordinary career in politics. ^{Clarence was also killed, who had helped} Edward had eliminated ~~any~~ any possible Lancastrian claimants and eventually got rid of the overmighty subject, Warwick, thus restoring his royal authority ~~words~~ at the start of his second reign.

Edward also did not distance himself from the

(This page is for your first answer.) nobility and was very hands on in managing his magnates. He established his most trusted magnates around the country, not favoring a certain few like Henry had done. He placed his brother, Richard, Duke of Gloucester in the north who had proved to be very loyal to him and allowed him to build up a great power base there. The Grey brothers were situated in the south-west, Edward, Prince of Wales and his protector, Earl Grey were put in the Welsh Marches, ~~and all~~ All of these nobles relied on Edward for their power and thus remained loyal, restoring the authority to the monarchy.

Edward also had to do a lot to turn around the royal finances. His predecessor had not managed them very well, ~~and~~ ~~he~~ ~~had~~ ~~freely~~ ~~given~~ ~~out~~ ~~money~~ ~~to~~ ~~his~~ ~~favorites~~, this had not left him a very good position. Edward ~~had~~ appointed special ~~commissioners~~ ~~to~~ ~~make~~ ~~sure~~ ~~he~~ ~~was~~ ~~getting~~ ~~his~~ ~~royal~~ ~~fees~~ ~~when~~ ~~it~~ ~~was~~ ~~due~~. He did this through the means of royal lands, custom revenues and feudal dues. He also exploited ~~some~~ ~~extraordinary~~ ~~income~~, ~~by~~ ~~using~~ ~~situations~~ ~~where~~ ~~his~~ ~~feudal~~ ~~rights~~ ~~and~~ ~~gained~~ ~~money~~ ~~through~~ ~~wardships~~, vacant bishoprics and judicial fees. Not only this but he looked for extraordinary income wherever he could find it, ~~and~~ ~~did~~ ~~so~~ ~~by~~ ~~adding~~ ~~taxes~~ ~~and~~ ~~maneuvers~~ ~~to~~ ~~like~~ ~~on~~ ~~exports~~ ~~for~~ ~~example~~. By the end of his reign, Edward died solvent and thus ~~did~~ ~~restore~~ the authority of the monarchy.

Finally Edward handled his foreign alliances well. He invaded France in 1475, but ~~did~~ ~~not~~ ~~manage~~ ~~to~~ ~~sign~~ ~~the~~ ~~Treaty~~ ~~of~~

(This page is for your first answer.) Piquigny, where Edward was basically bought off with by the French and left with a French pension. Also upon hearing of the Scottish attacks, he sent the trusted Richard, Duke of Gloucester into Scotland and successfully gained Berwick upon Tweed. In reality, Edward knew that gaining land in Scotland or France and Scotland would cause more trouble than its worth, and really only wanted their alliance, and this is what he got. He also made a lot of money out of the short lived French invasion, as he did not have to spend the money he'd raised because the French were so quick to come to terms. He established himself as a power in Europe and regained some of the respect lost on behalf of Henry VI and his losses in France.

~~It is clear~~ It is clear that Edward did make a few mistakes in his first reign through his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville infuriating Warwick. However, he learnt from his mistakes of having overmighty subjects and possible Lancastrian claimants still alive to overthrow him. His brief over usurper in 1470, was clearly a big learning curve for Edward and many other medieval kings to come, so he got rid of anyone who had the power to run his reign.

The other possible problem he had was leaving a minor, Edward II to rule. This caused a lot of problems with Richard, Duke of York and the Woodvilles and led to the eventual disappearance and possible murder of his two sons.

Clearly though, this was not Edward's fault of his own

(This page is for your first answer.) as he died naturally in his bed. Upon his death, it can not be denied that the authority of the monarchy had been restored. He had most importantly of all, got rid of any Lancastrian claimants with Henry VI and his son dead, and ~~the~~ made sure there were no overmighty subjects ~~to~~ who could possibly feel ill-treated and attempt to seek revenge. He did this through the death of Warwick and execution of Clarence. He established himself more firmly in government and appointed several trusted, ~~is~~ undermighty magistrates around the country to oversee ~~the~~ and enforce his authority. He also died smart, having ~~firmly~~ firmly secured the throne's finances by appointing special commissions to make sure he was getting money where his money was due through both ordinary and extraordinary income. It was an incredible achievement ~~and upon his death it is clear~~ and upon his death it is clear that royal authority had most definitely been restored in the years 1461-1483.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has secure range and depth of material, with an effective introduction and a clear conclusion. The threats posed by Henry VI and Warwick are addressed, as well as the significance of the territorial control exercised by the Duke of Gloucester. The restoration of royal finances, and an effective foreign policy, are both considered well. A good range of developed information, coupled with a clear overview. Mid Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Remember that 'how far' is asking you to reach a judgement and draw conclusions. For this question you should mention ways in which Edward did restore the authority of the monarchy, and ways in which he failed to do so. Then you reach a judgement!

(This page is for your first answer.) The Nobility were extremely powerful during Edward IV's reign and the monarchy was always in doubt as there was always internal and even sometimes external threats. England were in civil war for a lot of the 15th century and it continually affected the authority and also the prestige of the monarchy because the king during this period was never safe.

The End of Warwick or 'Kingmaker' as he would be known was very important in Edward's rule as he helped Edward take the throne from the ill Henry VI. However after Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville the Earl of Warwick lost power as he saw himself greater than what he actually was and after Edward went against Warwick's proposal to marry a French lady Edward turned on Edward and made an attempt to get Henry VI whom was trapped in the tower back on the throne. So really because of Warwick not getting his way he went against the authority of the Crown showing the lack of authority.

In 1460 Warwick used his brother Clarence to start a rising in the North and when Edward was off fighting

(This page is for your first answer.) In the North Warwick and his troops landed south and marched on London and restored Henry VI to the throne for the second time while Edward was busy fighting in the North. Edward fled from England so as not to be captured again, showing the weakness of the Royal authority and the crown that one man who was not the king, Warwick had so much power in England to be able to make a king in Edward IV and then to take that away from him and restore the previous king, Henry VI, which undermines the power of the monarch.

Edward did not have to wait long however in exile he along with his brother Richard who later became Richard Duke of Gloucester and Richard III defeated Warwick in a battle where the Kingmaker was finally killed, and then Edward became king for the second time. Edward still had to deal with a lot more problems after that Henry VI for one who was still alive and his son Edward Prince of Wales.

In 1462 Edward IV and Edward the Prince of Wales finally fought in the battle of Tewkesbury with Edward IV winning but not only did he win but Edward Prince of Wales was killed in battle and Henry VI was captured again by Edward and eventually, as the historian Colin Meade said "murdered" in the tower however he was suffering from schizophrenia so he could not die of natural causes but still with Henry VI dead and his son killed in battle Edward and with Henry Tudor in exile in France Edward was the undisputed monarch which proved to be the end of civil war in England until Edward's death.

(This page is for your first answer.) Edward IV was very clever quickly having people about him whom he could trust and who would never fight against him. His most trusted soldier his brother Richard was named Richard Duke of Gloucester and he was sent to the north which was the most troublesome area with the Scottish his other friend Lord Hastings controlled the middle and all this made England a lot more stable which in turn regained the crown's prestige and authority after the threat to it by the Earl of Warwick and Edward prince of Wales.

Edward was gaining a lot of power in the way he ruled he even had his brother Clarence killed by being drowned in a barrel of wine after he called Edward a bastard and saying he should not be king, showing Edward's strength. The respect which was not there for the crown before when Henry VI lost Agincourt in France was returned under the warrior king.

Edward being the warrior king turned his attention to increasing Royal prestige overseas with a war in France where he did not lose out too. When France signed a treaty with England where they said England must have the same as a big success for Edward and for the English crown.

A big problem in England was the dynasty and how the country was to be ruled and who would rule it after Edward died. Edward needed a son and he had two children the oldest Edward who was to become the next king of England after his father's death. This left England strong the dynasty was secure and Royal authority was growing and growing under Edward and that is so clear to see that after the

(This page is for your first answer.) Death of Warwick and Edward prince of Wales
 there was no internal threats against Edward after that period
 of time ~~from~~ 1462.

Royal authority was lost under Henry VI after
 he failed to keep Agincourt which his father Henry V won
 in 1415 against England's main enemy the French. After that
 England were in constant civil war named the war of the Roses with
 significant battles; the battle of Tewkesbury where Henry VI was captured
 and the battle of Tewkesbury 1462 where Edward prince of Wales was
 killed were both ~~a~~ decisive ~~the~~ victories for the Yorkists and
 it was they who restored the authority under Edward IV when he ~~was~~ became
 undisputed king in 1462 he used that to limit the power nobles
 had and give great power to his most trusted e.g. Richard Duke
 of Gloucester. The Royal authority was at its peak under Edward
 until his ^{unexpected} death in 1483 when it was questioned by Edward's
 most trusted friend and brother Richard Duke of Gloucester.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Much of the answer considers the role of personalities only, and is unclear on the developments during each reign. There is only a limited range of relevant material in the answer, but there is an attempt to frame an explanation. High Level 3.

Question 13

Perhaps the wording of the question required a need for candidates to re-arrange the information from the oft used format. This seemed to challenge many candidates from across the levels of attainment. For those who chose to focus on Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck there seemed to be a lack of understanding about the fact that both in essence were Yorkist inspired and led threats. Many seemed to think that the involvement of Margaret of Burgundy somehow meant that English nobles were not involved and hence concluded that 'the nobles did not pose a threat to Henry VII'. Several simply focused on Simnel and Warbeck, thus producing a one-dimensional and imbalanced answer. The issue of the way in which Henry enforced noble loyalty and hence lessening the chance of a threat was overlooked by many candidates. Bonds and recognisances, and effective measures to limit retaining are two obvious examples, coupled with the work of the Council Learned in Law. Some candidates tried to show that the nobles only really posed a threat when they allied with foreign powers, but there was little evidence of this observation being developed into a discussion about the relative threat posed by individual nobles rather than the nobility as a body. Candidates tended to see the noble threat at a constant level of seriousness in terms of events. For example, they noted the long term threat of Warwick and Suffolk rather than considering the wider picture where changes were taking place which in reality lessened these threats. Furthermore, although Henry may have felt constantly challenged by noble threats until the end of his reign, in reality his position as king was strengthened through his foreign policy and the improvement in the finances of the crown, both of which had an adverse effect on the ability of the nobility to pose a serious threat. Equally, the ease with which Henry dealt with some of the rebellious nobles should lead to a conclusion that the particular threat under discussion was not serious. This question showed that many candidates had not really appreciated the inter-connectedness and dynamic nature of the strength of noble threats versus the power of the king and in so doing the assessment of 'how far' was mechanical by necessity.

(This page is for your second answer.) How far do you agree that the nobility never posed a ^{serious} threat to Henry VII's rule?

After winning the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485, Henry VII's main priorities were securing the throne and ensuring his dynasty. Although he went about this in several ways, his main concern was control of the nobility.

Henry VII witnessed Luckily for Henry, there was no 'kingmaker' like the Duke of Buckingham during Henry VI's reign or the Earl of Warwick during Edward IV's reign. These so-called 'over-mighty' subjects, which had plagued the reigns of previous kings,

were noticeably absent when Henry VII came to power. This simple fact already means Henry has no need to fear one overly powerful noble attempting to steal the throne by himself. Henry knew the nobles would have to make alliances to overthrow him. However

(This page is for your second answer.) This did not make Henry any less suspicious of the nobility. ~~however~~

This suspicion proved correct though, when, in 1486, Lambert Simnel, a boy of only ten, was masqueraded as the missing Earl of Warwick. This was of course a lie, as Henry had imprisoned the real Earl of Warwick within the Tower of London. What feared Henry most was the backing Simnel was receiving from both English nobles and Irish nobles. The Earl of Kildare declared him Edward VI in Dublin in 1487. Then, in the first half of 1487, the Earl of Lincoln led Simnel's forces against Henry which culminated in the Battle of Stoke. Although Henry proved victorious and the leaders of the affair killed, it deeply shocked the ~~the~~ ~~warring~~ Henry while also showing the fragility of his rule. If the nobles would follow a 10 year old son of a joiner, what else could they rally behind?

This was further emphasised during the ~~Warbeck~~ Warbeck rebellion, which lasted from 1491 - 1497. Unfortunately for Henry, this was far more ~~reading~~ ~~than~~ ~~this~~

widespread than the Simnel affair and had ~~for~~^{thus} was a far greater threat to his reign ~~the~~

~~thus~~ On the other hand, as the vast majority of the nobility welcomed Henry VII as they saw ending the past ~~30~~ thirty years of dynastic conflict known as the Wars of the Roses

(This page is for your second answer.) Henry kept his promise to marry Elizabeth of York, thus uniting the rival houses of York and Lancaster. This would have pacified many Yorkists as the reason for the conflict has disappeared. More importantly however, Henry was a firm ruler, who knew the full extent of how dangerous a rampant ~~rebellion~~ truly is. Writing in the ~~fourteenth~~ fifteenth century, several years after the death of Henry VII, Polydore Vergil states "he was either loved or hated". In many ways this reflects his rule. ~~When a~~ He was slow to reward but quick to punish, meaning only the most loyal nobles received his blessing. Many nobles were too afraid ~~off~~ of being attainted, ~~through~~ in which all your lands and titles were removed, to ever dare rise against him ~~or~~ or even show the slightest ~~hint~~ of disobedience.

In conclusion, it would be safe to say the rebellion did indeed pose a threat but ~~it~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~an~~ ~~extremely~~ ~~serious~~ ~~one~~ ~~is~~ it's seriousness is greatly exaggerated ~~there were~~ ~~many~~ ~~bi-~~

Many of the nobles had been all but neutralised by Henry and his to the degree that many did not dare rise against him. If anything, there were much more serious threats ~~from foreign nations as opposed to English nobility~~ in the form of foreign nations as opposed to threats from

(This page is for your second answer.) ... within.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The noble threat is illustrated largely with reference to the Simnel and Warbeck risings, though there is little information provided on the latter. There is an attempt to investigate Henry's relations with his nobility but there is insufficient information offered to make the points stand up. Low Level 4.

Question 14

Weaker answers described Henry VII's entire foreign policy without addressing the reason why relations with Spain and Burgundy were important. Most answers showed good knowledge of the main treaties between the countries, although development of this material was limited in some cases. Candidates needed to recognise that the question was about reaching a judgement about why relations were so important, rather than simply describing the relations, or asking which country was most important to Henry. Some students widened their range of supporting material to include reference to England's relations with France and Scotland. Weaker responses made basic comparisons between the relative importance of all four countries to Henry, stronger responses showed how relations with other countries, especially France, affected the reasons for the need to have good relations with Spain and Burgundy. At the lower end of the Level 4 answers concentrated on one main factor, usually the issue of securing the Tudor dynasty through marriage with Spain and countering pretenders with Burgundy. At higher levels candidates recognised how the disputes over marriage at the end of Henry's reign put a strain on keeping both Spain and Burgundy as allies, and linked relations to wider anti-French alliances. It is important to note that candidates were able to illustrate Anglo-Burgundian relations throughout Henry's reign to 1506. However, for many candidates the significance of the Spanish alliance was restricted to the treaty of Medina del Campo only. Future candidates are advised to develop their knowledge and understanding of Anglo-Spanish relations over the whole period.

When Henry first came to throne his security was extremely weak as there was a high possibility of his crown being usurped. He needed good relations with Spain and Burgundy in order to improve his royal security. Relations with Burgundy started off very strained at the beginning of Henry's reign. Margaret of Burgundy hated him because he had usurped her brother off the throne. Likewise Maximilian he was very unreliable as he was distracted by the Italian wars (This is shown in his failure to produce troops in Brittany). Henry needed good relations with Burgundy in order to improve his security and to stop Margaret constantly conspiring against him. However things only deteriorated after Phillip took over direct

(This page is for your second answer.) rule of Burgundy in 1493. Henry was extremely worried about his security after Margaret continued to support Perkin Warbeck. He wrote a letter to Phillip but when he got no reply he put an embargo on trade from 1493 - 1496. This showed how worried Henry was about his security and why it was so important for him to have a good relationship with Burgundy. Henry ~~did~~ manage Henry's relationship with Burgundy did manage to slightly improve during the middle of his reign, this was important as he was able to get Suffolk back and therefore improve his security. In 1504 Isabella of Castille died & Phillip and Ferdinand both wanted to be the new ruler. Henry decided to back Phillip as he hoped to get Suffolk back & improve his security. Luckily, a freak storm meant Phillip was forced to take refuge in England and ^{he signed} ~~signed~~ the Treaty of Windsor in 1506. This was very important as he was able to win Suffolk back who was greatly threatening his security. He ~~was~~ also gained a marriage alliance between Prince Henry & Phillip's sister which meant his security

(This page is for your second answer.) would be greatly increased as they would no longer harbor pretenders.

to his throne which was very important. However relations only got worse again after Phillip died a year later and the treaty of Windsor was abandoned with Phillip's sister refusing to marry. This meant Henry's security was low again as they could easily harbour more pretences. It was important that he had good relations so in turn his security would be improved, but he failed to do this with Burgundy.

Unlike Burgundy, relations with Spain started off well as they were both united in their fear of France. ~~This~~^{It} was very important for Henry to have a good relationship with Spain as they were the new dominant power in Europe. In ~~1482~~¹⁴⁸⁹ both countries signed the treaty of Medina del Campo. This was extremely important as it stated Spain would not harbour any pretences against Henry which massively improved his security. It was then renewed in 1499 which was again vital because it meant Lambert couldn't look to Spain for

(This page is for your second answer.) an alliance and so increased Henry's security. ~~Another imp:~~

Another important term of the treaty was that Catherine of Aragon would marry

Prince Arthur. This was important as it would cement their ^{Anglo-Spanish} relationship. However things started to deteriorate when Catherine refused to marry Arthur (due to the instability of Perkin Warbeck) and Henry & Ferdinand argued over the size of Catherine's dowry. Eventually Catherine did marry Arthur in 1501 but Arthur died a year later which greatly threatened Henry's relations with Spain, and therefore his security. Henry quickly betrothed his son Prince Henry to marry Catherine. However Henry began to think his relationship with Spain wasn't as important after the death of Isabella in 1504. He thought they were no longer the dominant power, so refused to let Prince Henry marry Catherine. To make matters worse Henry annoyed Spain by backing Philip of Burgundy instead of Ferdinand. Spain quickly showed their dissatisfaction with Henry by making an alliance with France and

(This page is for your second answer.) Showing ^{Henry,} ~~him~~ they no longer needed him. This greatly reduced his security as France was notoriously known for helping pretenders to the throne. Henry's relationship with Spain was important as it greatly affected his security. They were

a dominant and influential power who could easily help pretendes to usurp Henry's throne. Henry made a big mistake thinking that Spain was no longer important as it pushed them into making an alliance with France which left Henry isolated & very insecure.

Overall, Henry's relationship with Spain and Burgundy was very important to his security on the throne. By failing to keep good relations with either country, he was left feeling isolated and very insecure. After the Italian war, France, Burgundy and Spain signed a treaty together which further isolated Henry. His relations with Spain & Burgundy directly affected his security as they were in an easy position to help rebellions against him and push him off the throne, this making relations with them extremely important.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer considers both Burgundy and Spain. There is some lack of clarity on Burgundy, notably on the role of the Dowager Duchess Margaret, but information offered ranges over the whole period to 1506. There is some understanding of the implications of Medina del Campo, and Anglo Spanish relations are taken well beyond 1489. There is an attempt to analyse these aspects of Henry's foreign policy, with sufficient supporting material for mid Level 4.

All examiners commented that the standard overall for this examination session was very good. An increasing number of candidates are engaging well with periods of early modern history, and their enthusiasm often comes through in their answers. Some of the options are not very well resourced in terms of texts or other materials. Centres and their teachers are to be congratulated on effective teaching and learning for this unit, which is largely achieved by their own sterling efforts.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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 US026427 January 2011

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

