



A-level HISTORY 7042/2A

Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Henry II’s relationship with King Louis VII of France.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- William was a contemporary to the events that he is describing and is usually considered by historians to be reasonably accurate throughout his chronicle
- however, it should be noted that William is based in the North of England, and thus was a long way away from France and even the main centres of Henry's power in England, which were in the south. This would mean that he was reliant upon news from travellers and would often be second or third hand
- as an English subject, it is possible that William might be inclined to view Henry's role in the events more positively than the French king's, however, the tone is not excessively positive or negative in either direction, which might increase the value as it is seemingly striking at a balanced account of the events
- William is a churchman and it is possible that he was somewhat critical of Henry's subterfuge in the marriage of the two children (which he would be unlikely to agree with on moral grounds). Perhaps this explains the slightly condemnatory tone towards the end of the source, and perhaps limits the value a little. However, William is clear in his blame towards the 'arrogance' of both monarchs, and this would help to increase the value of the source, as William seems to be striving for objectivity.

Content and argument

- the source has value as it shows that the behaviour of Henry was a clear issue in terms of the relationship between himself and Louis. Henry is accused of acting provocatively and out of impatience – this rings true with wider evidence of Henry. Despite being technically a vassal of Louis', Henry often acted in this high-handed manner (eg his marriage to Eleanor or his coronation of Young Henry)
- the source is also valuable as it shows that possession of the Vexin was important to the relationship between the two kings. The Vexin had been an issue since the time of Henry's accession to the Duchy of Normandy in 1150 and would continue to be a point of dispute (eg after Young Henry's death, the Vexin became the dowry of Alys – leading to more warfare in the 1180s with Philip)
- the source is also valuable in suggesting that the two men were 'never long at peace'. Throughout Henry's reign he was frequently disputing with Louis over territory (eg Louis sided with Geoffrey of Anjou in the 1150s, Toulouse in 1159 and Louis' involvement in the Great Rebellion)
- however, this source does have a limitation as it describes Henry's relationship with Louis before the Great Rebellion. After this, Louis becomes less of a threat to Henry and the Treaty of Ivry was concluded between them in 1177.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- as a letter from Henry to Louis, this is very valuable as it can give us a direct insight into the personal relationship between the two men
- Henry's tone in this letter is rather obsequious and suggests that Henry is a most loyal subject and friend to Louis. This was not necessarily always the case
- Henry was writing this letter once it had become apparent that Thomas Becket had fled to France in exile. Henry was concerned about the diplomatic ramifications of his quarrel with the Archbishop and so obviously had an agenda in writing to Louis in such a placatory manner. The fact that Louis went on to do exactly what Henry asks him not to, suggests that this letter might have been more of a formality than a realistic request
- Henry's tone about Becket is extremely negative and shows the depth of his feeling – his letter has a clear agenda and so it becomes difficult to see what his true feelings might be about the King of France.

Content and argument

- the source is valuable as it does show that Henry was aware of his feudal status with regards to Louis. There are other occasions when Henry behaves in such a way – such as when he backs down from an invasion of Toulouse. Even though Henry often manipulated Louis and pushed boundaries, he always sought to stay on the right side of feudal law, never going openly into rebellion
- the source is valuable as it shows that, in his continental lands, Henry was reliant upon Louis to an extent. The reason for the excessive pleading in this letter is that Henry knew that Becket could cause serious problems for him on the continent and Henry would require Louis' support in this matter
- this source has limits as it suggests that Henry and Louis' relationship is much better than it really was.
- the source is also limited as we only get Henry's side of things. We would need to see Louis' reply in order to determine the full picture.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- as a royal clerk and diplomat working for Henry II, Roger was extremely well placed to have access to up-to-date information and key insiders to the events as they unfolded, though he was writing this account much later, after the relationship with France had deteriorated significantly, and this might affect his account
- this positioning also limits Roger's value as he will be likely to take the side of his master, and would wish to downplay Henry's own role in provoking the rebellion of his son. Thus, the role played by Louis in encouraging Young Henry might be exaggerated
- equally, although Young Henry was clearly in the wrong, Roger was writing with the knowledge that the rebellion would be quashed and Young Henry would be forgiven. By 1189, Young Henry had died in quite tragic circumstances and was often viewed more favourably than he had been in life – making it expedient for Roger to write about him more positively
- the tone of the source is very critical of Louis and avoids placing any blame upon Henry for the French King's 'hatred' – thus making it seem like Louis was in the wrong on this matter.

Content and argument

- this source has value as the role of Louis in the Great Rebellion of 1173 was very important in the relationship between the two men. It was from Louis' court that Young Henry plotted his activities and Louis seems to have provided much of the funding and supplies utilised
- that Louis 'hated' Henry would seem to be supported by wider evidence. Henry had always treated Louis with a level of contempt (eg the marriage to Eleanor) and it is clear that they two men distrusted one another (eg after Young Henry's coronation, which Louis was convinced was a trick)
- this source has limitations when it portrays Henry as an innocent bystander who has been forced to endure Louis' frequent 'deceit and malice'. In reality, Henry had often acted in a provocative manner towards Louis. In the same way, Henry provoked Young Henry and his other sons to rebel – he was not the innocent as is suggested here
- this source only shows us a snapshot of the relationship at a particularly fractious period – after the failure of the rebellion, the relations became a lot calmer again (as they had been around the time of the agreement at Montmirail in 1169).

Section B

0 2 'By 1166, Henry II had failed to resolve the problems of royal authority which he faced upon his accession in 1154.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that by 1166, Henry II had failed to resolve the problems of royal authority that he had faced upon his accession in 1154 might include:

- the methods used by Henry to control the barons were viewed by some as abrasive and oppressive. For example, there were complaints about the levying of Scutage for the Toulouse campaign in 1159
- at the start of his reign Henry had problems with the sheriffs – many had been appointed by local barons. The fact that Henry had to investigate these men on a number of occasions and replace them shows that he had failed to completely solve the problems. Barons continued to control sheriffs in some localities and Henry could not always be sure of the direct loyalty of these men – the General Eyre of 1166 highlighted major discrepancies in the exercise of justice across the country
- Henry's legal reforms were mostly introduced by the Assize of Clarendon – but this only happened in 1166. It would take time for Henry's reforms to be implemented
- the Church's relative independence had been a key issue for King Stephen and the situation potentially deteriorated further after the appointment of Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162.

Arguments challenging the view that by 1166, Henry II had failed to resolve the problems of royal authority that he had faced upon his accession in 1154 might include:

- the Cartae Baronum (1166) evidences Henry's ability to make requests from his barons – and he could now levy scutage effectively. This contrasts with the situation in 1154 where he had faced overmighty barons and adulterine castles. Henry dealt with this directly through shows of force (eg Roger Mortimer) and the confiscation and destruction of adulterine castles
- Henry brought Nigel of Ely out of retirement and ensured that the Exchequer was reinvigorated. Henry also increased Crown finances through ruthless exploitation of Forest Laws and his rights as feudal overlord – the principles of escheat and purpresture were used to increase the size of the royal demesne at the expense of the barons. This contrasts with the financial situation in 1154, as the Exchequer was barely functioning and the King's revenue was down to about a third of its normal amount
- Henry was also able to gain control of finances and the economy through the minting of a new silver penny in 1158 (this helped to prevent counterfeiting and prevented inflation)
- Henry was able to deal with the threat that Scotland posed to northern England by direct military action across the border. Malcolm IV was completely cowed and even contributed money and manpower to Henry's invasion of Toulouse in 1159
- Henry largely controlled the Church after his accession. Becket aside, he had the support of the majority of the English prelates and was almost always successful in getting his candidates appointed to high ecclesiastical office (Becket himself is a good example of this).

Students are likely to be very knowledgeable about this topic and it is important that they actually analyse the extent to which the problems were resolved or not, rather than just describing a series of actions taken by Henry. 'Royal authority' covers a range of possible areas – barons, finance, justice and the Church, but the focus should be on England, rather than Henry's control of his continental lands. Better answers should recognise that 1166 is an interesting date – Henry had clearly regained a lot of control, but there were many problems which were still only partially dealt with and might resurface in the not too distant future. Judicious reference to later events such as the Great Rebellion may be used, so long as the analytical link to the question is explained. However, the majority of evidence should come from the period 1154 to 1166. Any supported judgement will be rewarded, and some balance of evidence should be expected for higher marks.

0 3 To what extent was the absentee kingship of Richard I damaging for England?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the absentee kingship of Richard I was damaging for England might include:

- Richard was almost constantly absent in person from England, but this did not mean that England was free from providing funds for his expensive projects. It was England which bankrolled his crusade, ransom and wars with France, and some historians have suggested that he virtually bankrupted the country as a result
- Richard's financial plans for the Crusade, in particular, seem to have been very myopic in their creation. Richard alienated large portions of the royal demesne, which would affect the king's ability to 'live of his own' in the future – this, in turn, would lead to more extraordinary methods of raising money which would likely be harmful to the population (eg complaints from fitzOsbert in London in 1196 about the financial exactions)
- Richard's reign saw an escalation in anti-Semitic violence (eg York pogrom 1190) – and his own absence from England made the Jews more vulnerable as they relied upon the King's own protection as the 'King's Jews'
- Prince John caused upheaval and disturbances in England in both 1191 and 1193/94. The reasons for this were Richard's absences and John's belief that Richard had undermined him by not leaving him with enough authority. This caused violence in certain key areas and upheaval in central government in 1191 when William Longchamp was replaced
- Arguably, Richard caused a power vacuum in the north of the country when he appointed William Longchamp and Hugh of Le Puiset as co-justiciars. By putting so much power in the hands of Longchamp (thus effectively causing him to oust Hugh from power), there was no real royal representation in the north. This was exacerbated by Richard's ban on the Archbishop of York entering the country.

Arguments challenging the view that the absentee kingship of Richard I was damaging for England might include:

- as a rule, Richard seems to have appointed very capable men to take charge of the government and administration of England (eg Hubert Walter) – this was really no different to the system employed by Henry II who also spent much time out of England (two thirds of his reign)
- Richard's absences actually allowed the government of England to become even more standardised and professionalised – eg the development of a team of professional judges to hear legal cases and the institution of the office of coroner to deal with cases of suspicious deaths
- Richard's planned absence on the crusade caused him to reach an agreement with William of Scotland (the Quit Claim of Canterbury) – this ensured that Scotland did not pose any threat to the northern English border for the rest of Richard's reign. William also contributed money towards Richard's ransom
- there were no major baronial uprisings in Richard's reign (unlike Henry II or John) and this suggests that Richard managed to strike an appropriate level of royal authority. He ensured that vacant jobs and titles were promptly filled and he ensured a wide base of support by promoting men for their loyalty and ability (eg William Marshal). Those barons with lands across the Channel would also have expected Richard to look after their interests overseas
- Richard maintained a positive relationship with the Church – again, his absences were probably helpful as it meant that he did not interfere in the way that Henry or John had. The appointment of Hubert Walter as justiciar and Archbishop helped to achieve cooperation and stability, as did Richard's policy of not keeping bishoprics vacant for profit.

Students can argue effectively for either proposition, and any supported judgement will be rewarded. Stronger answers will consider what ‘damaging for England’ might actually mean in practice (ie lives for the majority were able to continue relatively unimpeded), where weaker answers might focus more on describing key events. Coverage of the reign from 1189 to 1199 should be reasonably attempted in better answers.

0 4 'King John's financial policies were the main cause of the baronial rebellion of 1215/16.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Argument supporting the view that King John's financial policies were the main cause of the baronial rebellion of 1215/16 might include:

- John's barons had long been dissatisfied with his money raising for his ambitions on the continent – especially the levying of scutage, and some had notably refused payment (eg 1206 and 1214) – when his campaign in 1214 failed (at great expense) then this seems to have been what triggered the rebel barons into action in 1215
- numerous clauses of Magna Carta relate specifically to John's financial policies. For example, there are clauses which sought to limit how much John could charge for inheritances and when he was able to levy scutage payments
- a number of those barons on the rebel side in 1215/16 were debtors of the King. These men included Roger Bigod, who was in massive debt to the Crown, and Geoffrey de Mandeville who had paid an extortionate sum to marry Isabelle of Gloucester
- there are numerous clauses of Magna Carta which discussed local government issues and sought to limit the payments which could be taken by royal officials in the localities. Equally, the payment of fines seems to have been a key clause in the charter, which aimed to limit fines to a reasonable amount – suggesting that John had been extracting unreasonable amounts
- Forest Law was also a key bone of contention for the barons – and this was closely associated with unfair and disproportionate financial punishments.

Arguments challenging the view that King John's financial policies were the main cause of the baronial rebellion of 1215/16 might include:

- the other Angevin Kings had also extracted large sums of money from England – most notably Richard for his crusade and wars in France – without sparking a rebellion like the one in 1215, which suggests that the issue was more personal than just unpopular financial policies. John was perceived by many barons to be cruel and unchivalrous and those in rebellion against him often had personal grievances (eg FitzWalter and Giles de Braose)
- the first clause of Magna Carta related to the 'Freedom of the Church': John had treated the English Church badly during the long years of the Interdict and his own excommunication. Key rebel barons in 1215 had also acted against John in an assassination plot in 1212 – suggesting that they had wider motives than their own financial concerns
- Magna Carta was quite wide ranging in its demands and covered 'all freemen' and also clauses relating to the treatment of hostages held from the Scottish King and land disputes with the Welsh. This suggests a broader concern about John's rule than simply the barons being unhappy with his financial policies
- the trigger for the rebellion in 1215 may have been John's perceived military incapability rather than his money raising. The barons had put up with Richard raising huge sums because he used the money wisely and was generally successful – John was clearly less so, as the campaign of 1214 so aptly demonstrated
- even once Magna Carta had been annulled, the barons continued with their rebellion and invited the French Prince Louis to take over in England. This would suggest that their dislike of John was more personal, and less to do with specific policies (especially as many returned to the royalist side once John had died and been replaced by his son).

Any supported answer to this question will be rewarded. Students should ensure that they tackle the key factor of 'financial policies' in a reasonable amount of detail, but they could balance their argument in a wide range of ways. Some students might wish to consider that the causes of the rebellion were longer

term (ie that Richard or even Henry were to blame for beginning policies which John merely continued), but they do not have to and could focus entirely on John's own reign. Students might point out that Clause 61 of Magna Carta attempted to constrain John's behaviour in the future by the appointment of a council of 25 barons – this, along with the invitation to Prince Louis, might suggest that the problem was more with John personally than his policies.