

Examiners' Report
June 2019

GCE History 9HI0 30

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0_30_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates continue to be able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 30 which deals with Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII, 1399-1509.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1). Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated this summer. Examiners continued to comment on the fact that a significant minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is pleasing to note that last summer's advice was taken on board by many candidates and there were fewer examples this summer of candidates suggesting that weight can be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and discuss the source. This resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. However, it continues to be the case that weaker candidates often wanted to turn questions into a main factor/other factors approach, even where this was not appropriate to the focus of the question. Candidates should be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, most candidates were able to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded again that this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

In both Sections B and C when dealing with AO1, not all candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement. There was some tendency this summer, in all sections of the paper, for

some candidates to replicate the words and phrases of the mark scheme in their responses. It is the application of the requirements of the mark scheme that is crucial.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

The source question was answered in general very well. Some candidates recognized that in order to properly address the question both enquiries had to be treated. Candidates that recognized the reasons for the treaty generally wrote about the Burgundian alliance and the factional aspect of the French court as well as the victories of Henry V throughout the late 1410s. The outcome of the negotiations was generally analyzed well with inferences made about the marriage of the French Princess and Henry's elevation to the French throne upon the death of the French King. Fewer were able to comment on significance of the terms by considering the order in which they were mentioned by Walsingham. Quite a few answers dealt with one enquiry much better than the other. Many students also included an introduction, which often just restated the question and did not add anything to their answers. They would have been better off just launching straight into their analysis. Some candidates offered more contextual knowledge to support these inferences such as the mental state of Charles VI and the marriage between Henry and Catherine. The stronger answers were able to use contextual knowledge to support or challenge what was in the source, although again, too much time was wasted on what was not in the source, without explaining why that might be and many students felt the source lacked value because it did not talk about what was to happen in the future e.g. the death of Henry V before Charles VI and the problems encountered by Henry VI. A significant number of candidates were undecided about the author of the source and how he got his information. A lot of candidates spent a significant portion of their respective answer attempting to determine the truthfulness of the source based on the author. A surprising number of candidates mentioned that the source could be judged as truthful because the author was a religious person. On the whole, candidates could have focused more on how the provenance of the source informs the contents of the source and the impact of this on the enquires.

1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the reasons for the Treaty of Troyes (1420) and the outcome of the negotiations.

Explain your answer, using the source, the information given about its origin and your own knowledge about the historical context.

(20)

The source provides an account of the ~~transition~~ ^{situation} wherein cause, negotiation and outcomes of the Treaty of Troyes are all ~~stated~~ ^{clearly} represented* which provides utility when assessing its value regarding the reasons for the treaty and the consequences of negotiations. The source also implies other useful ~~points~~ reasons and outcomes which are not explicitly stated, further adding to its utility. However, the provenance of the source places limitations on its utility in various places which must be considered when assessing its value.

The source states clearly within the opening paragraph that the Duke of Burgundy had been "treacherously murdered" by French advisors. ~~which~~ This conveys a heightened political tension ~~was~~ regarding the French ~~monarchy's~~ monarchy's relationship with other regions. This political tension placed France in a situation wherein compromise and the necessity for a treaty was pivotal in order to avoid a complete disintegration of the monarchy and the fact that the source ~~states~~

specifies that "an oath to not harm any of the other party" ~~was~~ that was present ~~of~~ supplements the earlier illustration of political tension. This is because the source highlights political tension through the reference to the murder and then conveys how serious this tension was by adding that an oath ~~of~~ ~~of~~ had been broken.

Subsequently, this exemplifies how the source conveys a significant reason for the Treaty of Troyes being created as ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~as~~ the political tension which had been created by the murder of the Duke of Burgundy had resulted in the French realising they were even more vulnerable at the hands of an Anglo-Burgundian alliance. The fact that the source does ~~not~~ not only indicate a reason for this tension but also expands upon it expressing how the source is very useful ~~at~~ regarding revealing the reasons for the treaty.

The source explicitly states a variety of outcomes of the treaty which include that after the "death of the King of France, the crown and kingdom of France should belong to and remain with Henry and his heirs. This is a very useful piece of information regarding an outcome, as it highlights that Henry V was ~~to~~ become essentially the heir to the French throne. This is very useful as it was the most significant ~~of~~ outcome of the Treaty of Troyes as it both disinherited the dauphin

~~and massively~~ and would have massively expanded the lands commanded by Henry V. ~~This outcome is~~
This aspect of revealing an outcome of the treaty can be ~~most~~ regarded as even more useful due to the provenance of the source. The fact that the source was a contemporary account indicates that ~~the~~ Walsingham was writing in the specified time period therefore would have had access to ~~relevant~~ information to produce his account. Furthermore, ~~to~~ Henry V was noted to have a very close and ~~prosperous~~ relationship with the church and various Abbeys which can be exemplified by his continual dismissal of Lollardy and his seeking advice from Catholic priests during the 1414 Lollard's rebellion instigated by John Oldcastle. As a result, we can combine this close relationship with the fact that many monasteries were delivered information directly from the monarchy to conclude that the outcomes ~~described~~ stated were truthful and coherent. ~~with what~~ subsequently, this makes the source even more ^{valuable} ~~useful~~ as we can trust that the outcomes ^{are} ~~were~~ accurate.

The source states that in "1420, the most visible King, Henry V, was at Poitiers when ambassadors from the so-called King Charles VI of France came to him."

This highlights that Henry was already in France prior to the treaty being arranged which is very valuable when assessing the reasons for the treaty. This is because it accentuates the fact that Henry was already posing a threat to the French monarchy, this was in fact true as by seizing Rouen he had cut off support to Paris. Furthermore, Henry had already set up administrations in Caen and enjoyed a major victory at Agincourt in 1415. As a result, the source implies that Henry was already posing a ~~threat~~ direct threat to the French government by ~~cutting~~ cutting off support to Paris. ~~therefore~~ This highlights the desperation on France's behalf ~~that~~ and indicates that ^{on other reasons the} the treaty was created was that the French were effectively in desperate need of a final attempt to curtail Henry's military ~~to~~ drive into France. This idea of fear and desperation as a reason for the creation of the treaty also links to the outcomes of the treaty. The source highlights that "a marriage was arranged" between Catherine of Valois and Henry. This proves how the source is valuable in linking the reasons and outcomes as it portrays that the French were still seeking to have an influence in the future government through ~~the~~ the wedding of Catherine and any future heirs whom would be Anglo-French. Although this is very a useful, ~~the~~ very valuable presentation by the

source, limitations regarding the provenance of the source must be considered. The source being composed ~~in~~ during Lancastrian reign in the early 15th century would always ~~lead~~ lead to favour the King as the King and Church were very close. This could be why ~~relevant~~ ~~omissions~~ there are relevant omissions about the marriage aspect such as the payment of 20,000 crowns annually from England to France. ^{due to its unpopularity} ~~mis omi~~ ~~omissions~~ Omissions from the source do not always take away from the value of the source but in this case leaving out such a crucial clause of the marriage limits what can be revealed about the ~~source~~ outcomes by the source.

In summary, the source is ^{mainly} very useful at revealing both the reasons for the Treaty of Troyes such as the political tension after the Duke of Burgundy's assassination. And also, the outcomes such as the marriage of Henry V to Catherine of Valois. The provenance does ~~supplement~~ support the source's value in places however also limits its value due to relevant omissions due to ~~bias~~ Lancastrian bias, therefore the source is very useful majoritively but has slight limitations.



This is a well considered answer that has all the hallmarks of a level 5 response. The candidate has a clear and considered opening, the response is well focused and the candidate uses the provenance and contextual knowledge to inform their interpretation of the source.



Make sure that your consideration of provenance is linked to the contents of the source, not just included as a standalone paragraph.

Question 2

This was the most popular question and was in general answered extremely well. Most candidates focused on Richard II's tyranny and the short- and long-term causes of his downfall. The detail that was displayed by some candidates was extemporaneous. Most candidates were able to analyse information and were able to reach a judgement at least partly based on criteria, although stronger answers clearly set criteria in their introduction and then referred back to these throughout their answers. Some candidates focused on Richard and his many poor decisions, but some also recognized that there were matters out of his control or at least it was not all his own doing. When candidates did establish this criterion, it was mainly Henry Bolingbroke that was attributed to have led to Richard's downfall. The most popular criteria mentioned were Richard disinheriting Henry after the death of John of Gaunt or his decision to go to Ireland and delay his return. The strongest candidates noted the term 'solely' in the question and focused their debate around this term.

1399 saw the usurpation of Richard II by his cousin, Henry Bolingbroke which began the Lancastrian rule and was the first deposition in England's history.

Prior to this time, a claim to the throne was purely hereditary and supposedly pre-determined by God, showing that the success of Henry IV must have been due to a number of problems in Richard's reign, considering the extreme detriment of Richard II. One reason for the deposition was Richard II himself, and historians argue that his military incapability and over-rewarding of favourites ~~was~~ were solely responsible for Richard II's loss of the throne. However, an alternative argument regarding Richard's reign during his minority, must also be considered in order to reach a full assessment of the causes of Richard's deposition.

Firstly, it can be argued that Richard himself was solely responsible for his own fate in losing the throne, and this is because of his

military failures and insufficient military ~~and~~ commandment which saw increasing resentment towards him, which ultimately ended Henry in gaining the support he needed to depose his cousin.

Henry succeeded 'The Black Prince', Richard was undoubtedly expected to be a capable military leader and win victories against the Scottish and French, both of whom were enemies of England at the time - however, it was clear that Richard lacked the military skill of his father. He refused to lead military expeditions himself, and when he led forces to Scotland, would not fight past Edinburgh.

This caused opposition to him ~~as~~ from both the nobility and the commons. Following Edinburgh, John of Gaunt (Richard's Uncle) left England to pursue claim to the Castilian throne, which demonstrates the ~~resent~~ extent of the resentment towards Richard felt within the nobility. ^{caused by Richard's lack of commitment} Also, it angered peasants who were still being heavily taxed despite Richard's losses in France. The fact Richard was 'Richard of Bordeaux' worsened this as it fueled suspicion of his pro-French leanings.

In turn, this contributed to his loss of the throne because it meant that when Henry Bolingbroke invaded in 1399, Richard did not have the support of the realm to stop him taking the throne.

Henry Bolingbroke was allowed into the country by Henry Percy, who was in control of the North, and arguably had Richard managed to prevent Scottish-English tensions, he would have had the support of Percy (who was responsible for protecting the border) and Henry would not have managed to re-enter England. Also, the opposition of the commons to Richard meant they were more inclined to accept Henry as their new ruler, so the deposition became almost inevitable. To this extent, Richard was solely responsible for his loss of the throne due to his military failures and incapability.

Another reason why Richard was arguably entirely to blame for his own deposition was because of his unpopularity and alienation of senior nobles which lost him support and also inspired Henry's revolt against the king.

Richard's favouring of nobles such as Robert de

Vere and William de la Pole caused the resentment of senior nobles such as Gloucester and the Lords Appellant. The Merciless Parliament of 1388 saw the extent of the resentment of Richard at this stage, as he was forced into subjugation whilst a several of his 'favourites' were hanged, drawn and quartered. This meant that Richard was left with little support later in his reign, so Henry was more likely to be able to gain the throne. In fact, when Henry gained the throne, he included the resentment of the Lords Appellant in his '39 accusations' against Richard II which helped him secure his position, highlighting how significant Richard's alienated nobles was.

Furthermore, the alienation of Bolingbroke by Richard was also a primary cause of the deposition. When Henry became heir-apparent, Richard deprived him of his lands and titles and disintegrated him. This meant that when Henry returned to England, he could not do this as the reason for his return, as he claimed to only be wishing to repair his former inheritance, although his admittance into the country.

Therefore, Richard could be said to be solely responsible for his loss of the throne because his mistreatment and disrespect towards his nobility caused a loss of support, which ultimately aided Henry, and also encouraged Bolingbroke's rebellion in the first place -

Despite this, there are also reasons to suggest that Richard was not solely responsible for his loss of the throne, because a considerable part of his reign was during his minority, when he was in fact advised by "evil councillors", which could be said to be responsible for his downfall.

Henry inherited the throne from a medieval king who was highly regarded within society, Richard was compared to his successful father and therefore resented more strongly due to the disappointment of the realm. This meant that it was always going to be more difficult for Richard to gain support as he was constantly compared to the "Black Prince" and opposed to the natural differences between himself and his father.

Moreover, as his father had died in the midst of the Hundred Years' War, young Richard inherited a throne which was already in debt, at war and demanding high taxes, so early support from Parliament and the commons was always unlikely.

This chancellor arguably made this worse. John d'Gaunt's poll tax was introduced which demanded equal payments from all in the realm, independent of earnings. This caused a severe amongst peasants who were already impoverished and could not afford to pay.

Following the Black Death in 1347, which killed 30-45% of the population in its first outbreak, the poor began to move socially as labour increased and so did wages. However, the chancellor passed the Statute of Labourers in 1350 which limited wages to pre-Black Death levels, preventing the poor's social rise.

These factors grew into the Peasants' Revolt which occurred when Richard was only 14, ~~He~~ demonstrating the extremity of the dissatisfaction of the realm.

Richard pardoned the rebels, but then ordered a number of executions of them within a

tonight presumably under the advice of his councillors. This meant that before Richard had even emerged from his minority, he had ~~an~~ an unhappy realm and appeared weak and easily misled. To this extent, it could be said that the deposition of Richard which ended his reign was caused not by Richard himself, but by his councillors depicting him as a child king, and therefore the argument emerges that he was not solely responsible for his loss of the throne in 1399.

To summarise, whilst there are reasons to presume Richard was responsible for his deposition, it can be said overall that it was both his own fault and the consequence of the actions of others earlier in his reign, and therefore a number of factors contributed to his loss of the throne, not just his own mistakes.

His military incapability and abuse of his nobility undeniably caused opposition and resentment which allowed Henry the support he needed to depose Richard, however it can also be said that Richard was already

opposed prior to this because d his canceller's
dump his minority which caused
resentment amongst the commons -
Thus, it seems that Richard's loss of the
Throne in 1399 was a result several
causes, and Richard ^{was} therefore not
solely responsible for his deposition.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A wide ranging and well-focused level 5 response. The candidate identifies criteria for judgement in the introduction and then refers back to them throughout the response. A well-developed conclusion where the criteria are effectively weighed up ends the response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Refer back to the criteria you have established in the introduction, at the end of each paragraph.

Question 3

This question was not as well answered on the whole as the Richard II question. Most candidates did recognize the focus of the question however some preferred to bypass Simnel and instead talk about the revolts against Henry VII. A surprising number of candidates were confused as to who Simnel and Warbeck were pretending to be. Some candidates did give a good understanding of the Simnel threat and this was coupled with the threat of Warbeck and the tax revolts as a comparison. Most answers attempted analysis but many would have benefitted from setting out more clearly what made a threat significant from the outset and then referring back to this. Stronger answers were able to use criteria successfully in this way. The conceptual focus of the question was understood by the vast majority, and there was some range and depth of detail, but greater precision was possible.

Lambert Simnel posed a significant and troubling threat towards Henry VII's hold on the throne in the years 1485-99. However the threat posed was one of many during Henry VIII's reign such as the rise of Perkin Warbeck, the Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions of 1489 and 1497 respectively as well as the influence of the Duchess of Burgundy and Henry's own actions such as an extensive utilisation of bonds.

Lambert Simnel gathered a significant following in Ireland and was ~~first~~ proclaimed as the real Edward, Earl of Warwick who was actually in the ~~tower~~ Tower of London. The threat which was substantiated was the fact that the ~~Earl~~ Edward had a strong claim to the throne which could effectively destabilise Henry's grip on the throne. Although the threat was ~~as~~ significant it did not force Henry to take lethal action such as an execution, in fact Henry allowed Simnel to gain a job ⁱⁿ at the Royal Kitchen and Simnel eventually became a baker which illustrates that Simnel was never a ~~high~~ exceptional threat. However the significance of Simnel's threat lies in the nuances which are best ~~explained~~ explained ~~against~~ by contrastly against

Other factors.

Henry faced 2 major tax rebellions during his reign, the first of which was the Yorkshire tax rebellion of 1489. The rebellion was regarding the North of England being forced to pay the same tax as the South despite the traditional lower tax rate due to an engagement in defence with ~~the~~ ^{Sc} on the Scottish border. The rebellion saw a mob lynch a member of the Percy family.

This highlights a significant level of unrest which was a threat to the ^{King's hold on the throne} ~~North~~ which was heightened by the fact that the North was ~~totally~~ full of Richard III supporters.

~~What~~ Simel did have a significant following including leading nobles from Ireland which ~~attestates~~ ^{attestates} how with regards to a rebellious uprising Simel posed a more serious threat to ~~the~~ Henry VII's hold on the throne. The 1497 ^{Comish} ~~Yorkshire~~ tax rebellion posed a different

kind of threat mainly in the form of support for the rebellion in the form of domestic lords such as Lord Audley.

A rebellion supported by local lords was a much more significant threat to the throne compared to Simel who was mainly supported by ~~2~~ foreign nobles. However,

the fact that the likes of Lord Audley were swiftly executed conveys that their movement was never a sustainable challenge to Henry's throne. This makes Simel's threat more significant as Simel did have

a substantial threat which can be conveyed by the fact that his support base had grown since the ~~early~~ 1480.

The plain fact that Henry was a usurper made him vulnerable on the throne. It allowed pro Yorkist factions mainly in the North to grow but ^{a significant} ~~the main~~ threat posed to Henry by his own usurpation was the fact that he alienated many nobles through an extensive use of Bonds. By dating his reign to a day before the Battle of Bosworth Henry VII ensured that the majority of Yorkist would seek redemption as they were branded traitors. This only heightened Simel's threat to the throne as Henry did not have a strong, developed support network. Henry also forced bonds to encompass extended families which further alienated supporters and led to the likes of the 1486 Lovell rebellion. Simel therefore posed ever more of a significant threat as Henry was ~~only~~ supported by ~~as~~ thoroughly by a close network of blood relations therefore Simel's ~~extensive~~ ~~was~~ support for Simel was enabled to grow in many regions of the country to a greater extent which made the threat posed ever more significant.

Rertin Warbeck attempted to claim he was the ^{younger} son of Edward IV and had escaped from the Tower. The threat posed by Warbeck was of the same nature as the Simel threat, however Warbeck's threat to the throne was

more structured and widely supported. This can be highlighted by the fact that coins were minted with his face on in Ireland, this feature ~~was widely~~ indicated the threat was more significant than that posed by Simnel. Furthermore, the Duchess of Burgundy claimed Walsby to be her nephew which not only galvanised support for Walsby but also attracted international attention to the situation. This made Walsby's ~~claim~~ threat more widely supported and better funded than Simnel's as the Duchess of Burgundy provided financial. Subsequently making Walsby's threat more significant than Simnel's.

In summary, Simnel did pose a significant threat to Henry VII's hold on the throne ~~and~~ and was more significant than the likes of the 2 tax rebellions due to a stronger power base. However, the sheer support and extent of Walsby's ~~power~~ claim made ~~his~~ his threat to ^{Henry VII's} ~~the~~ hold on the throne more significant. As a result, ~~it is not agreeable~~ it is not agreeable that Simnel posed the most significant threat between ~~1485-97~~ 1485-97 although he did pose a major threat.



The strength of this level 5 response lies in the manner in which the candidate weighs up the stated factor against other factors throughout the response, culminating in a conclusion which sets Simnel effectively against other threats to the throne.



Aim to compare alternative factors back to the stated factor at the end of each paragraph, assessing their comparative significance.

Question 4

This question was answered well in general. However, only the very strongest answers were able to compare the relative significance of events and say what would make a significant difference to the power of the crown. Answers often included knowledge of France, but did not always focus enough on 1453. Some answers were able to make the link to the loss of land and therefore the anger of nobles and the subsequent decline of Henry VI leading on to the protectorate. Some then linked this to the start of hostilities in 1455. However, quite often the losses in France were not dealt with in sufficient depth. Other common issues identified were war and diplomacy in general, particularly Henry V successes and the diplomacy of Edward IV at Picquigny. Fewer mentioned the diplomacy of Henry VII, instead choosing to talk about his financial policies. Financial strength/weakness was also a common topic of discussion as was the power of parliament and the impact of usurpation on the power of the crown, namely that Henry IV set a precedent. Answers usually attempted analysis, but this was not sustained throughout the answer and on the whole answers lacked sufficient range and depth of material. Many answers did cover most of the date range, but still did not get high levels because the information lacked depth and precision. Candidates would also have benefited from dealing more explicitly with the 'significantly changed' element of the question by setting and referring to clear criteria.

Outroad	Inroad	Finance
1418 Loss in France actually ended war, provided diplomacy	1411 - Feud led to his usurpation, ended a long period of rivalry with crown and nobility	1411 - Grants led to rise in loans Royal debt increasing
1449 Grants led in France set up these events - more significant	1414 - Took the life of Richard II. set the precedent	1414 - Rectification of his opposing states 1417 - Creation of modern monarchy

When analysing the power of the crown in the years 1399 to 1509, it is important to remember Sir John Fortescue's quote that it is necessary to "maintain the peace both inroads and outroads". This meant being militarily successful, and keeping control within the realm. Furthermore it is clear that a king could only do this through having stable royal finance, and so royal finance, military success and control of the realm must be considered when analysing the power of the crown. ~~However this was~~

* It is also clear that the loss in France in 1453 did significantly change each of these areas, and so from the article, the statement appears to have some weight.

As for military success, it is clear that the loss in France in 1453 was a significant change for the worse for royal power, as

it proved that Henry V was militarily unsuccessful, and opened himself up to criticism. It also made future nobles more wary of making war with France in the future, as Edward IV settled with the Treaty of Picquigny and Henry VI didn't even invade France at all. This meant that their royal power was increased, as they did not use up as much royal finances, and there was more stability in the realm, thus it could be argued that the loss in France in 1453 changed the power of the crown significantly as it ended the war with France, and allowed future kings to have more stability. However it is perhaps clearer that the French campaigns of Henry V in 1415 and 1417 to 1419 were the most important significant change - the power of the royal crown militarily. This is because Henry V's success at Agincourt gave him significant power, as parliament was happy to grant taxation and gave Henry V tonnage and portage for life in 1416, a privilege which was bestowed on no other king during this period. Furthermore this success in France meant that Henry signed the Treaty of Troyes in 1420, which could be argued as what led to the loss in France in 1453, as it meant that Henry VI was forced to keep defending a crown which wasn't truly his, and so as a ~~more pious king~~ he was a more pious king, it seemed that these losses were inevitable. Therefore it is clear that, regarding the military success and maintaining the peace abroad, the Treaty of Troyes in 1420 and Henry V's military campaigns were the most significant change in the

power of the crown in this period.

However it is also necessary to note how a king maintained the peace inroads. The loss in France in 1453 significantly changed royal power in as it led to Henry's mental collapse in the winter of 1453, which led to a power vacuum dominated by York and Aragon and to seemingly divided the country in two. Therefore it could be argued that the loss in 1453 led to Henry's usurpation by Edward IV after the Battle of Tewkesbury in 1471, which symbolised a low for royal power, as it was effectively decimated. However it appears that this was not the most significant change during these years regarding maintaining the peace inroads, as Henry IV had usurped the throne from his predecessor in 1399. This significantly changed royal power as it completely broke the rules of divine right and primogeniture which existed in England beforehand. These stated that a King was chosen by God, and had to follow the line of inheritance, and so Henry IV effectively shattered all notions of royal power through his usurpation. It could be argued that this was the most significant change in this period, as other ~~over~~^{over}-mighty nobles such as Edward, son of Richard of York (later Edward III) and Henry Tudor (later Henry VII) could also usurp the throne, so while the loss of France in 1453 did highlight a momentary change in royal power regarding maintaining the peace inroads, Bolingbroke's usurpation was more significant as it highlighted a fundamental change in royal power which lasted the whole period.

The loss of France in 1453 was also important as it changed royal finances, and the royal power, but it is hard to discern how significant this change was. One of the major blows of the loss of France was the loss of Gascony in 1451-52, a key wine-making region, and so ultimately revenue from trade and customs duties fell. Furthermore the loss of France in 1453 significantly reduced the amount of land that the crown had, and thus created debt, reaching a peak of £372,000 in 1450. The fact that this debt was the highest experienced in the whole period proves that it was a significant change in the royal power, and meant that Henry was open to criticism, leading to Lady's Rebellion in 1450, and more importantly support for the Yorkists and hatred towards Joaze in the years following 1453. However there were other significant changes to royal finance as well. Edward IV managed to negotiate the Treaty of Picquigny in 1475, giving him an annual pension of £10,000 and allowing him to die without a heir not achieved by any of his predecessors during this period. Therefore the Treaty of Picquigny was also a significant change to royal power regarding finances. However more important is Henry VIII's use of royal finances, as he used bonds and minimized patronage increasing his annual revenue to £100,000. This has led historians to term his reign as the creation of a modern monarchy which is true as royal finances helped him to secure the throne for his son Henry VIII in 1509.

despite the fact that he originally came from an illegitimate line. Also Henry VII was able to turn England into a truly profitable nation, after the devastation caused by the loss of France in 1453, and so it is clear that his use of royal finance was the most significant change in royal finance during this period.

At first it appears that the losses in France in 1453 were not the most significant change in the royal purse in this period since ~~they~~ ^{Henry VII} ~~did~~ ^{was} the most significant change for military success (or failure), maintaining the peace inroads in royal finance, the three pillars which built royal power. Instead Henry VI's success was the biggest change militarily, Henry VI's usurpation was the most significant change within the realm, and Henry VII's means were the most significant change financially. But upon close analysis it is clear that these three events only impacted the subgroup that they belonged to, for example Henry VII's financial policy ^{made} ~~made~~ ^{made} little change militarily. Therefore it is clear that only the losses in France had an impact on each strand, and therefore it is clear that overall, the losses in France in 1453 did change the power of the crown most significantly in the years 1399-1509.



In this level 5 response the candidate effectively considers the stated turning point and compares all other turning points back to 1453. The candidate does well to weigh up the relative importance of each alternative turning point and assesses them in comparison to the stated turning point.



Make sure you spend enough time on the stated turning point identified in the question before comparing it to others.

Question 5

This was the more popular of the breadth questions and was answered very well in general. Answers to this question generally adopted a for/against approach, although a few did consider the nobility as a key issue in enabling crown control among other factors, which was often a valid response, although analysis often suffered in this case. In the first approach answers commonly included the use of nobles in regional councils, the use of noble retinues in war and the help nobles could give in times of crisis e.g. the protectorate under Henry VI or in taking the throne e.g. Warwick. Counter arguments very often focused on noble rebellions such as Hotspur, Warwick or the Duke of York. Stronger answers included the changing power of the monarchy under Henry VII, particularly his use of bonds. Weaker answers taking this approach tended to generalise about land ownership, retinues and law and order without providing specific examples from the period 1399-1509. Some answers also included knowledge on nobles harming crown control under Richard II (e.g. Wonderful/Merciless Parliaments), which was outside the date range and could not be credited. If the second approach was taken, alongside the nobility as a factor enabling crown control, finance, parliament and war/diplomacy were often discussed. Most answers tried to address the conceptual focus of the question and included some analysis, but this question suffered from insufficient coverage of the date range. There also seemed to be a trend where some candidates focused on the early period of Henry IV and Henry V whereas other candidates almost exclusively focused on Edward IV and Henry VII (almost all of which contained Henry VI). Some candidates displayed excellent knowledge of the nobility and specific instances which could give weight for judgment in order to answer the question properly.

plan

⊕ Henry V = nobles fought in France, Agincourt, Cherbourg, Caen, Rouen, Humphrey.

⊕ Henry V = ~~Ed~~ Henry prince of Wales with nobles helped use Exchequer, stabilise, Henricton Hill

⊖ Percy + Nevilles under Henry III

⊖ Edward IV 1469 Edgecote Warwick betrayed

To identify whether or not the nobility enabled the crown to control the kingdom we must investigate the most significant periods that involved the nobility having an impact over control over the kingdom.

The most significant period where the nobility helped control over the kingdom was under Henry V and his invasion of France in 1415. Nobility such as Humphrey and Edmund Mortimer helped Henry V stay in power and expand his scope of influence and control. 1415 there was a resurgence of anti-Lancastrian sentiment that is known as

The Southampton Plot: Henry Scrope, earl of Cambridge and Sir Thomas Grey plotted to assassinate Henry V and place Edmund Mortimer on the throne. If it wasn't for Edmund Mortimer denouncing the traitors to Henry V men the plot may have succeeded and Henry V would have been killed and ultimately lost control over the kingdom. Furthermore Henry's V's brother Humphrey played an imperative role after the battle of Agincourt in expanding territory in 1417 - 1419. Humphrey won important battles in Cherbourg, Caen and managed to cut off Paris and take the capital of Rouen. Why this helped Henry V keep control was because Humphrey established councils and committees in each city and helped fight off any resistance. More importantly fined the French £50,000 which helped Henry V stabilize the land he had captured and help settle in the power base Humphrey had helped to build.

In addition, another important period was ~~1400~~ 1401 - 1406 onwards till 1414.

During Henry V's rule he had to deal with con-

ntless rebellions and a fraught relationship with Parliament due to his usurper status. However one of the key components of his rule was the actions of Prince of Wales Henry, his son. Robert III King of Scotland refused to accept Henry III as rightful king so consistently invaded the Northern borders with French and Scottish troops. However ~~Prince~~ Prince Henry and a group of nobles such as Suffolk and Hotspur helped defeat the Scottish at Homildon Hill in 1402. After Prince Henry had stabilised the northern borders he took control of the unified military commission and helped rule during 1406 long parliament when Henry IV became extremely ill. He ensured the Exchequer was using taxes for defence rather than the royal household. ~~As a result~~ It is therefore undeniable to say that without Prince Henry and his group of nobles that Henry IV would have been unable to keep control of his kingdom.

The Most significant reason ^{or} to suggest that nobles didn't help maintain control of the kingdom was during 1401 - 09. This period was dominated by Warwick 'Kingmaker'.

He had the largest retinue of any noble and was the reason why Edward Duke of York won the Battle of Tewkesbury in 1471. However ~~it~~^{he} was also the reason for the readeption of Henry VI. Warwick was infuriated by Edward IV's decision on secret marriage to Elizabeth Woodville as he had planned a marriage with the French to provide a diplomatic advantage. This was further supplemented by Edward IV refusing to accept Warwick's daughter's marriage to Clarence, brother of Edward IV. In retaliation Warwick took up arms against Edward IV and beat him at the battle of Edgecote in 1469. Later returning with Henry VI and a large army in 1470 to kick Edward IV off the throne. This emphasises the power Warwick had and how he could easily tip the balance and take away Edward IV's control over the kingdom causing a civil war.

In addition, another important reference as to why nobles hindered the crown's control over the kingdom is powerful noble houses such as the Nevilles and Percys. They were rival

houses in close proximity to one another and caused disorder for Henry III. In 1253 Maud Sturhope and Thomas Neville were planning to marry and claim previous Percy manors. Egremont and Richard Percy failed an assassination attempt which triggered a bloodthirsty feud between the households for power. The chaos and lack of control Henry III had over his kingdom caused him to have a mental breakdown. This sparked a power struggle between an over-mighty noble, Richard Duke of York and Margaret Anjou. The Nevilles supported York and the Percies supported Margaret. The presence of their relatives provided Margaret and York the men power to compete for control and led to the 1st Battle of St Albans that resulted in the death of the earl of Northumberland and the Duke of Somerset. This implies that without the noble houses feud for their own selfish gains instead of helping control the kingdom, there would have been a large scale civil war and Henry III's complete loss of control over the kingdom.

In Conclusion, the extent of which I agree is

nobles such as Humphrey and Prince Henry were extremely valuable in consolidating power and control over the kingdom for the crown, by expanding territory and crushing rebellions. However the nobles always providing control over the kingdom for the crown between 1399-1509 is untrue. The presence of Overmighty Nobles and houses such as the Nevilles, Percies and the 'kingmaker' Warwick undeniably provided the most chaotic periods and the periods ^{where} ~~where~~ the crown had virtually no control over the kingdom. Therefore I disagree that the nobles enabled the crown to control the kingdom ~~the~~ entirely through the period of 1399-1509.



The candidate effectively covers the chronological range of the questions in this level 5 response. A key strength of this question is how the candidate considers change over time, weighing up a number of events that impact upon the theme in the question.



Make sure that you include detailed examples from across the time frame in the question.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both enquiries
- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension of the sources
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Comments about this should be specific to the provided sources rather than generic comments that might apply to any source
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry.

Sections B and C

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions. This entails not just the bookend dates but some range across the whole chronology within the parameters of the specification.

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>

