

AS

# History

Paper 2B The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1471  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version: 1.0

---

---

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 Assessment Writer.

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 2B The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1471

#### Section A

- |          |          |  |                   |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why there was opposition to the actions of the Yorkist lords in 1459–60? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

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

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be partial. There may be <b>either</b> some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question <b>or</b> some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.  | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will <b>either</b> describe source content <b>or</b> offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.                                       | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## 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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

### Provenance and tone

- John Whethamsted was an authoritative and highly educated contemporary chronicler to the events that he wrote about.
- He had been connected to Henry VI's deceased uncle, Humphrey of Gloucester, a benefactor at St Albans. Richard of York was widely regarded as Humphrey's political heir.
- The source presents a range of motives in a largely balanced and impartial manner.

### Content and argument

- The source refers to the Yorkist lords as being Richard of York, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick and Richard Neville, Earl of Salisbury.
- It is acknowledged that the Yorkist lords acted against the king.
- One possible motivation for resistance to them was that they were acting out of ambition and desire for power, a possible reference to the first and second protectorates.
- Another possible motive for the opposition to their actions include the desire of existing favourites around the king, at this time a reference to Margaret of Anjou and her supporters, to defend themselves and their influence.
- The final suggested interpretation is that Richard of York provoked opposition because he intended to seize the throne for himself.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- the reasons why the Yorkist lords had been excluded from the Coventry parliament and had amassed military forces
- the power base that Margaret of Anjou had built up own based around opponents to the Yorkists

- the events between 1453 and 1459 which had led to the establishment of blood feuds
- the strong dynastic claim to the throne of Richard of York and the events in 1460 when he exercised this claim. His previous failure to do so is also worth exploring.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### **Provenance and tone**

- The provenance here is clearly critical in that the polemic was written as a justification for the attainder of the Yorkist lords at the Coventry parliament of 1459.
- Unsurprisingly the source is hostile to the Yorkist lords and uses strong language to justify the actions taken against the Yorkists.
- Sir John Fortescue's major theory as to instability in this period was the excessive power of key nobles in comparison to the crown.

### **Content and argument**

- The source condemns the Yorkists by considering Richard of York's past actions.
- The source refers to two occasions when Richard of York and his followers had appeared in arms against the government of Henry VI, the first at Blackheath in 1452 and the second at St Albans in 1455.
- The source makes accusations about the behaviour of Richard of York and his supporters and presents them as accepted facts.
- The source makes reference to those killed whilst opposing Richard and his followers, implicitly the Duke of Somerset, Earl of Northumberland and Lord Clifford among others.
- The source explicitly rejects one of Richard of York's key defences, namely that he acted in the interest of the public good to reform the king's government, by rejecting that he had any right to take this position without Henry VI's express permission.
- It is clear that the view taken is that there is no possibility of reconciliation and it unsurprisingly agrees with Margaret of Anjou's supporters that the Yorkist lords should be destroyed.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- Richard of York's claims throughout the decade to have been acting for the common good and the reaction by the nobility to these assertions
- the role the Yorkists had previously played in initiating violence against the king's supporters
- the actions of the Yorkist lords at the time of the Coventry parliament and their flight abroad
- the outcome of the Coventry parliament and its consequences for the Yorkist lords.

---

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that Source B is much more subjective than Source A and the motivation of the writer is known from the provenance, which does appear in the extremely negative picture of the Yorkist lords. Whilst Source B is valuable evidence of Margaret of Anjou's reaction to the Yorkists and the wider support she enjoyed in 1459, Source A is more objective and may be argued to be of more value as it provides a range of plausible motivations. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Financial and economic weakness undermined the authority of the Lancastrian regime between 1450 and 1461.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 financial and economic weakness undermined the authority of the Lancastrian regime between 1450 and 1461, might include:**

- there was an economic depression in foreign trade which began about 1450. Poor foreign relations with England's trading partners, an inability to control the piracy in the English Channel by Englishmen and poor commercial policies all contributed
- the export of wool was much lower than in previous periods and resulted in a significant drop in royal income from the subsidy
- Jack Cade's rebellion of 1450 was strongly connected to claims of corruption in Henry VI's government and among his favourites
- the weakening of trade eroded political support for the Lancastrian regime in London as demonstrated in 1460 when the city turned against Queen Margaret
- Henry VI's annual revenues by the 1450s were only approximately sixty percent of those enjoyed by his father Henry V
- Henry VI was not successful in increasing the crown's income from assessed taxes
- the costs of the war in France in the previous decade were significant and the crown's debts could breed discontent. Richard of York was one of those who had been owed substantial amounts by the crown
- Purveyance, which involved compulsory purchases of food to feed the king's household, was widely abused by the 1450s and caused much resentment
- attempts made by Richard of York, during his two protectorates, to mend royal finances were rapidly undone after his dismissal from office
- Henry VI's household had a reputation for extravagance which increased in the 1450s as a consequence of Margaret's spending and the need to endow the educational projects established by the king.

**Arguments challenging the view that financial and economic weakness undermined the authority of the Lancastrian regime between 1450 and 1461, might include:**

- the merchant oligarchies of English cities were, arguably, only marginally affected by conflict during the 1450s and only significantly in 1459-61 when the Lancastrian regime was already in great trouble
- it has been argued that the apparent financial weaknesses of Henry VI's government in the 1450s were, in fact, the normal state of affairs for the crown by this time and did not, inherently, pose any risk. It was Henry's failure at foreign war that had led to parliament's reluctance to grant him taxes so the failures were political in origin
- evidence of a fundamental undermining of the Lancastrian regime is rather thin. The number of disaffected nobles was not great and should not be exaggerated as most of the aristocracy continued to support Henry VI until his removal in 1461
- there are many other plausible reasons for disaffection with the Lancastrian regime including the incompetence of Henry VI's rule, England's humiliating loss of its French possessions and the growing and increasingly aggressive disaffection of Richard of York.



In summary, students may conclude that the economic and financial weakness of the Lancastrian regime led to tensions that were exploited by ambitious nobles such as Suffolk, Somerset and York. Although other factors such as the loss of Normandy and Henry VI's own personal failings helped to undermine the regime they were arguably both either caused by the economic weakness or apparent because of the government's corruption.

**0 3** 'The unpopularity of Elizabeth Woodville and her family up to 1471 was a consequence of the opposition of the Nevilles.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 unpopularity of Elizabeth Woodville and her family up to 1471 was a consequence of the opposition of the Nevilles, might include:**

- the marriage embarrassed Warwick who was actively negotiating a French match for Edward IV
- John Woodville's scandalous marriage to Warwick's elderly aunt was especially provocative and drew opposition from the Nevilles
- the promotion of the Woodville family, especially the queen's brothers and sisters, had an impact on the composition of the nobility. The monopolising of the 'marriage market' by the Woodvilles led to resentment, especially from the Nevilles as it prevented suitable matches being found for Warwick's heiresses, Isabel and Anne
- Warwick did all he could to demonstrate his dislike of the Woodvilles, in the later years of Edward IV's reign he refused to attend court if they were present
- Warwick used the alleged corruption and evil influence of the Woodvilles as a justification for his rebellion against Edward IV
- when Warwick captured Richard Woodville and his son John he put them before a hasty show trial to further undermine their reputations before having them executed
- Warwick had Elizabeth's mother, Jacquetta of Luxemburg, put on trial for witchcraft in 1469. The implication was that she had used dark arts to ensure the marriage.

**Arguments challenging the view that the unpopularity of Elizabeth Woodville and her family up to 1471 was a consequence of the opposition of the Nevilles, might include:**

- Edward IV's unpopular secret marriage to Elizabeth Woodville led to wider resentment than just the Nevilles. Elizabeth was English, she had already been married to a Lancastrian and had children from her first marriage. By contemporary standards she was obviously unsuitable as an English queen
- the humble origins of the Woodville family was well known and nobles married into the family could resent such a match. It has been suggested that the Duke of Buckingham resented being married to Elizabeth's sister, Katherine
- Richard Woodville, Elizabeth's father, was created Earl Rivers and Lord Treasurer in 1466 and Constable of England in 1467. This rapid promotion was resented and his low birth had previously been mocked by the Yorkist lords in Calais in 1459
- George, Duke of Clarence was another opponent of the family's influence, he resented Elizabeth as offspring from her would remove him from succession
- the infamous treatment of Sir Thomas Cook, led to much resentment towards Elizabeth. Her parents had attempted to buy goods from him at a cut down price
- William Hastings, a close favourite of Edward IV, became embroiled in a series of disputes with the Woodvilles, especially the queen's eldest son, Thomas Grey
- the Woodville family strongly pressed for the Burgundian alliance that Edward IV arranged with the marriage of his sister Margaret. This was partly out of a desire to emphasise their connections with European nobles through the family matriarch, Jacquetta of Luxembourg. Such pretensions were resented
- with the exception of Elizabeth and her father the family were arguably less influential than the Nevilles and the 'New Yorkists' so unpopularity is exaggerated.

In summary, students may conclude that the Nevilles clearly resented the Woodville family. Their influence developed through marriage in the same way as the junior branch of the Nevilles had done themselves only a generation earlier. However, the resentment that existed extended beyond them more widely within the nobility and they merely exploited it.