

Examiners' Report
January 2012

GCE History 6HI01 A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at www.edexcel.com. For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at www.btec.co.uk.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

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

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

Alternatively, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson about Edexcel qualifications. Their contact details can be found on this link:

www.edexcel.com/teachingservices



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk .

January 2012

Publications Code US030577

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

Unit 1 - General Comments

Candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the amount of knowledge shown and the serious application given to answering almost the entire range of questions across the six options. Legibility was generally good and very few scripts were difficult to read.

The standard of English and spelling is a perennial concern. Colloquialisms were commonplace and the use of abbreviations, perhaps linked to the universality of text messaging, seems to be on the increase. Some abbreviations might be tolerated where they are in general use, such as MLK for Martin Luther King. However, to link MLK to JFK and LBJ, and to credit him with the passing of the CRA and the VRA, not to mention the success of the MBB, can be confusing and often obscures the point being made.

It is interesting to note that long narrative answers, which were once common, no longer appear very often. Fewer candidates reiterate the question at the beginning of their answers, and more are attempting to engage with the question from the outset. Some groups of candidates, however, appear to bring a learned response to the examination room, with a succession of scripts offering the same factors and the same supporting evidence. While this approach may produce an acceptable level of attainment, it can be a limiting tactic because candidates have difficulty in accessing a wider pool of evidence and ideas in order to show their own initiative and thinking; such answers find it difficult to meet the direct focus and explicit understanding required for Level 5 marks.

Answers at Level 5 require elements of sophistication in which students can provide analysis, inter-related links and judgements using evidence which reflects their own opinions and thoughts on the specific question asked.

Stated factor questions were generally approached with a discussion of the stated factor in the first paragraph and a consideration of other factors in the following paragraphs. However, some candidates were not able to play the factors confidently one against the other as the answer unfolded. Also a substantial number of answers applied a stated factor approach where none was needed or desirable. Question D9 asked 'How successful was Martin Luther King's campaign for civil rights in the years 1955-68?'. There is no invitation in this question to consider other factors influencing civil rights, such as Malcolm X and Black Power, but many answers dealt only briefly with King's campaign as one of several, often irrelevant, factors.

A number of answers displayed an imbalance between content and analysis. Many of these were answers with a great deal of relevant content but with limited discussion of the effects or the significance of events, which thereby hindered the development of a detailed and focused analysis. Some perhaps considered the significance self-evident. For example, some answers on the Provisional Government (Question D5) contained much relevant detail about the continuation of the war, but then simply stated that this 'made them unpopular'. Lenin's slogan of 'Peace, Bread, Land' was apparently so popular it made the outcome of the October/November revolution a foregone conclusion. However, there are also an increasing number of responses which provide secure analysis, and often very good conclusions, but do not provide sufficient relevant and accurate factual supporting material to justify their argument.

Overall, however, there were few overtly weak responses, with most finding their home somewhere within Levels 3 and 4.

Question 1

The whole of the first bullet point in the specification for Option A covers 'Anglo-Saxon society in the 9th century: the different kingdoms, Christianity, agriculture and commerce', but many answers were very generalised and unable to draw on a secure range of supporting material. Monastic wealth was rarely mentioned, and few referred to the growth of trade, markets and towns, or to the complex trading links forged with European states. There was, however, frequent reference to the number of mints scattered across the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and the stability of the coinage. The contrary argument of rivalry and warfare, both within and between the kingdoms, was rarely mentioned beyond brief reference to the conflicts between Osbert and Aelle in Northumbria. Better answers had some depth and accurate chronological range and were able to address both economic and political factors.

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.) The year 865 marked the arrival of the 'Great Heathen Army' in Anglo-Saxon England, and the beginning of a century long siege by Viking forces against the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. It has been suggested that prior to the Viking settling England was a 'peaceful and thriving society.' However this is far from the case. Anglo-Saxon kingdoms frequently fought amongst each other, or even within each other, and from 793 the country was subjected to Viking 'hit and run' raids and overwintering.

The nature of kingship in

(This page is for your first answer.) Anglo-Saxon society often led to dispute. Kingship was non-hereditary, successors were chosen by the Witan and were intended to be the most powerful candidates. Kings occasionally tried to secure the throne for their sons but often failed. Elective kingship often caused dispute as there was no clear successor, and could result in civil war. Between 710 and 810 Northumbria had 15 kings, only 3 of whom died of natural causes. This suggests the extremely unstable nature of the kingdom as a result of their system of kingship.

Society was hierarchical, with the king at the top, and ceorls at the bottom. Each class of person had a wergeld attached, a fine payable if they were murdered, becoming more expensive the higher up the social ladder you were. Murder was not the only crime with a fine attached, most law-breaking in Anglo-Saxon society was punishable by

(This page is for your first answer.) Fine. On one hand this seems a sophisticated and peaceful solution to the problem of crime. However, its usefulness as a real deterrent, and the authority with which it was enforced remains doubtful.

The Anglo-Saxons had a patriarchal society, however women could be landowners, and could (and did) run a kingdom upon their husband's death. Any property a woman brought into a marriage remained her own, and she could not be married without giving her consent. This fairly liberal attitude to women suggests the sophistication of society, and could be used as evidence of the society's more peaceful side.

However, society was almost entirely agriculturally based, with most areas remaining self-sufficient and trade fairly irregular. This

(This page is for your first answer.) meant that the wealth and prosperity of each kingdom was entirely dependent on the success of the harvest and welfare of animals. Bad weather or drought could result in famine.

It is also significant that the first officially recorded Viking attack was on Lindisfarne in 793. The event is described by Alcuin, and the Vikings took gold, hostages to sell as slaves, and burnt the buildings to the ground, leaving the area significantly poorer. This was then followed by several more 'hit and run' attacks, before the Vikings began overwintering ^{from the 850s} in places like Dublin and the Isle of Thanet. The Viking presence definitely questions the notion of Anglo-Saxon society as ^{peaceful} ~~peace-loving~~ and prosperous.

Furthermore the mobility of the

(This page is for your first answer.) Vikings; ~~the~~ for example their knowledge of the coast and extremely shallow boats, allowed them far inland, meaning that they were not only a threat to coastal areas of ~~Britain~~ England, but the ~~entirety~~^{entire} of the country. Viking arrival marked the loss of food, property and wealth, leaving the Anglo-Saxon population destitute.

The notion of Anglo-Saxon society as peaceful and thriving is generally false. Although they had sophisticated administration and laws, ~~generally~~ the majority of the time Anglo-Saxon England was struggling. It was entirely dependent on agriculture, and the system of tithing. Elective kingship made kingdoms unstable, and rivalry between kingdoms was an added pressure. The plague of Viking attacks seriously impaired Anglo-Saxon wealth, impoverishing the ~~Anglo-Saxon~~ people. Although Anglo-

(This page is for your first answer.) Saxon England became a place filled with turmoil after 865, it would be unfair to call it 'peaceful and thriving' prior to that date.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer challenges the question at the outset by noting the unstable nature of Anglo-Saxon kingship, especially in Northumbria. There are developed references to the structure of society and the role of women, the significance of Viking attacks from 793, and the threat these posed to the stability and wealth of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. A secure Level 4 answer.

Question 2

Many candidates produced an effective and wide-ranging answer. Candidates were able to discuss in some depth Alfred's reforms to the fyrd and the navy, and the creation of the burghal system, though more might have been made of the development of the coastal fleet and the role which the large West Saxon ships were intended to perform. Some referred to cultural and religious reforms, though effective links to the question were not always made. Chronological comprehension was sometimes lacking in answers, which made it difficult for a focus to the answer to develop. A number of candidates considered the military reforms and concluded that they were effective, without supporting this point very well. Better answers assessed the effectiveness of Alfred's reforms by referring to the Viking attacks of the 890s, which were far less successful than those of the 870s: many noted that Haesten's leadership was by no means as effective as that of Guthrum or Ivarr the Boneless.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14 | |

(This page is for your first answer.)

The sharp contrast between the Viking attacks and their overwhelming success before Alfred's reforms, which led to Alfred retreating to the small stronghold of Athelney in the Somerset Marshes, compared to the failure of subsequent Viking attacks after 879 is clear. Alfred's reforms greatly strengthened Wessex so that it could withstand future attacks or raids from Danes, including the return of the Great Heathen Army in 892.

Alfred focused on reform of the military after his victory at the Battle of Edgemoor in 879 and the subsequent years of relative peace from Viking attacks. He noted the benefits of Viking tactics, where they plundered and attacked before retreating to a fortified stronghold. He also noted that the Vikings had no advantage

of mobility due to horsed military and the element of surprise attacks. The west Saxon army on the other hand known as the Fyrd were reluctant to move far from their homes and

(This page is for your first answer.) needed to be back at their homes in time for the harvest. Alfred's reform of the Fyrd leading to a immediate response unit of trained men on horseback greatly increased the mobility of the Fyrd, which enabled them to compete with the mobility of the Vikings and combat the Vikings' 'element of surprise' tactics. With this reform Alfred greatly limited one of the Danes greatest advantages and this meant subsequent attacks were far less successful by the Vikings.

Another reform which greatly hindered Viking success was the formation of Burghs, which were garrisoned fortified strongholds about 30 kilometers apart in a grid structure across Wessex. These strongholds greatly damaged the Vikings mobility as they were forced to besiege ~~fortification~~ burghs which allowed time for the new fast response unit to arrive and relief the burgh.

Each burgh was placed so that it would take no more than one day for men from one burgh to travel to another. In 892 a raid of Danes on the coast managed to capture a burgh which was undergoing construction, however Alfred's reformed Fyrd prevented and burghal system prevented them from getting any further and they retreated back to their ships. This burghal system not only prevented mobility and stopped the Vikings from settling, but also encouraged trade as some burghs turned into centers of commerce such as Winchester. This boost in Wessex economy increased Alfred's prestige and strength of Wessex.

Another reform was building of about twelve longboats in order to combat the Vikings' ships which were built for warfare. The Vikings had previously used rivers to penetrate deeper in to Wessex with their ships. They were also more experienced than the Anglo-Saxons in ship warfare which involved tying two enemy ships together and then engaging in armed combat of the crew. Alfred's ships were twice as large as Viking ships which allowed for more crew members but hindered manoeuvrability so that some ships could not fit down the narrow rivers of Wessex. Also, there was a fleet of ships in Wessex before the reforms as Alfred used them in battle as documented by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, however the reform of these ships based on Danish design made the Wessex Navy a more powerful unit. The ships also served the purpose of raising the alarm of Viking invaders early from the sea, and attacking them before they reached land which was vital in preventing coastal raids and preventing the Vikings from settling on land and building strongholds.

Alfred reformed the tax system in order to help pay for the Burghal Navy and the Fyrd. In a document called the Burghal Hidage Alfred demanded that each Ealdorman in Wessex should provide a certain number of men to garrison and maintain a Burgh. In one area an Ealdorman had to provide ~~free~~ for 1,200 men in order to garrison 30km of a Burgh wall. This greatly elaborated on the community service in place before the arrival of the Vikings, and the burden

placed on the Ealdormen, Magnas and Creds may have caused some resentment to the cause of Alfred's Reforms, however Alfred suffered no rebellions of his own people in ~~his later~~ his later years. Showing the advantages of the reforms must outweigh the negatives.

Alfred's reforms of culture and religion did little to prevent Viking success however his tactics of converting Guthrum to Christianity and becoming his Godfather ~~was~~ was clearly successful as Guthrum retreated north and never attacked Wessex again. Alfred set up two monasteries, one in Athelney, however the Vikings had destroyed many monasteries and Alfred did little to repair this. In fact he turned many coastal monasteries into Burghs or small strongholds to prevent Viking attacks.

However, despite the clear strength and innovation of Alfred's reforms there were other reasons for Viking failure after 879. It is important to note that even before Alfred's reforms, the King of Wessex had managed to gather the support of Ealdormen from surrounding areas of his small stronghold at Athelney. Had Alfred not had the support and loyalty of his nobility (and therefore previously been a good enough king to earn it) then he could not have defeated the Vikings at Edgemoor or gone on to make his reforms. Wessex would have crumbled before the strength of the Danes just like the other three major kingdoms. Therefore Alfred's ability to inspire loyalty in his Ealdormen was also a key factor in preventing Viking success.

Another factor was Alfred's ~~son Edward~~ ability to secure the succession to his son Edward at his death in 899-900. In Northumbria and Mercia dynastic feuding had led to their defeat by the Vikings. However Alfred ensured that his son was recognised as heir to the West Saxon throne. The evidence of the Alfred Jewel which was an example of a gift Alfred sent to all the bishops in his kingdom, inscribed with the words 'Alfred had me made' shows that Alfred understood the need to gain the loyalty and approval of his people and their acknowledgement of the succession of his son. Alfred also did this through his translation of personal preface to the translation of many books which were sent to all the bishops in West Saxon and illustrated that a king was God's appointee on Earth and should be respected and obeyed as such. This authoritative propaganda ensured the loyalty of his subjects and successors of his son, which were crucial in defence against Viking attacks.

Therefore, although Alfred's reforms were the main reason for the lack of Viking success after Alfred's victory at Edgemoor, his reforms would have been impossible if he had not had the loyalty of his subjects, the assured succession of his son and the wealth which West Saxon possessed before the reforms. It is clear however that Mercia and Northumbria were also wealthy kingdoms and they were defeated, and also Alfred defeated Guthrum's army before he could

arrange his reforms, showing his strength as a military leader and the loyalty of his subjects. The sustained raids and return of the Great Heathen Army in 892 would have been incredibly damaging to Wessex, if not successful, had it not been for Alfred's reforms, particularly of the military.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has a secure focus on the question, with developed material on the fyrd, the burhs and the navy. The taxation system and the military responsibilities placed on the nobles are also explained. More might have been made of Viking weaknesses in the 880s and 890s, but there is only brief reference to the army of 892. Sufficient range and depth for low Level 5.

Question 3

Some candidates decided that the answer to the question was self-evident and wrote extensively, but solely, on William's leadership from his landing at Pevensey to the victory at Hastings. Other, obviously quite knowledgeable, candidates lacked a clear understanding of the leadership being given, and struggled with this dimension of the question. For others, the trigger of the 'battle of Hastings' in the question seemed an invitation to produce a lengthy and detailed narrative of the events of 1066, with little attempt to engage with the question itself. Better answers placed William's leadership into some context by discussing his achievements as Duke of Normandy before 1066, his detailed planning of the invasion, and his role during the battle. William's successes were then contrasted with Harold Godwinson's mistakes and misjudgements from Stamford Bridge onwards. Other relevant factors were discussed, such as the nature and size of the opposing forces and the significance of papal support given to the Normans.

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

Duke Williams Leadership - skills 10 years Duchy
| 'papal banner'
well organised + skilled army
X - well, Harold tired from Stamford Bridge

How accurate is it to say that Duke Williams leadership was the main reason for his success at the Battle of Hastings?

It is clearly a great factor of Williams success at Hastings that he had many leadership skills. Due to being Duke of Normandy for 10 years prior to the event, William had gained much experience in leading an army, ruling a country and much awareness of how to plan and tactically win battles. However, Williams leadership skills

(This page is for your first answer.) were not the only reason for his success at Hastings. He was also influenced by Harold's previous victories, and sheer luck of the wind changing when crossing the Channel.

Through William's role as Duke prior to the battle ~~the~~ William had great experience. Successfully raising an army which was well trained and made up of knights, cavalry and other well trained soldiers was just one way in which William was able to use his leadership skills to be successful in battle. William's well trained army contrasted greatly with Harold's which was made up of 'fyrels' and 'harsecarls'. Fyrels were merely peasants who were not trained to a great standard.

Not only were Harold's army of a lower fighting ability but having previously fought a battle at Stamford Bridge were also tired and lacking capability. As Harold's army was exhausted, they were at an immediate disadvantage. Harold did not stop off at London to ~~rest~~ rest his men or gain extra support as some had been lost in ~~the~~ the previous battle. This is therefore an argument as to why William's leadership skills were not the only reason for

(This page is for your first answer.) his success at Hastings

On the other hand, William managed to secure support from the Pope and gain the papal banner. As William argued the English church was corrupt and he would be able to rectify it. The Pope would not support Harold as Sigound was a notorious abuser of clerical privileges such as being pluralism; as he was both Bishop and Archbishop of Winchester. This showed great leadership skills from William as he was able to gain support in this greatly religious age. As many believed going against the papal banner would be going against God.

Williams success at Hastings was also influenced by the sheer factor of luck. As Harold Godwinson fought Harald Hardra at Stamford Bridge the wind changed direction and William was able to sail him and his troops across the channel. This gave meant that there was only 19 days between Godwinsons two battles therefore leaving his troops exhausted. As William reach South of England he stayed along the coastline and started destroying the area around Hastings forcing Harold to come down.

(This page is for your first answer.) In conclusion, it can be argued that William's leadership skills were the main factor behind the win at the Battle of Hastings. Even though there are clearly other factors which influenced the victory, it can be seen that if William hadn't had such great leadership skills the victory would most probably not have occurred or have been a much difficult task for William. Through events such as securing the papal banner, I feel William showed great leadership and I believe this was the main reason for success.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer has a secure focus on the question, and addresses William's leadership and other factors, including the state of both armies and the significance of Papal support. The analysis is supported by a range of accurate material, making for a Level 5 response.

This is another response to Question 3.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.

If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

for / Against
professional
brigade
tactics
like
Harold
mistake

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14 | |

(This page is for your second answer.)

How accurate is it to say that Duke Williams leadership was the main reason for his success at the battle of Hastings.

Duke Williams leadership ensured his success at the Battle of Hastings (1066) however other factors affected this such as other foreign threats on England and lack of preparation.

William prepared his army well through the use of ships designed to carry horses and bribery of other important Normans and by promising them land or booty this ensured William had the highest possible standard of army to fight Harold Godwinson with

(This page is for your second answer.) Williams tactics both before and during the battle of Hastings meant that William had superiority over Harold. ~~was~~ when William landed in Pevensey bay he waited and rested his men which meant they were not fatigued and that they were prepared for battle. William then marched forward where he then met Harold at Hastings. During the battle of Hastings Williams set up of his army was superior to that of Harold's depleted and fatigued army. In the course of the battle of Hastings William ~~feigned~~ feigned retreats to which Harold fell for on more than one occasion.

William had luck on his side to get to England as just at the right time the direction of the wind changed to allow William to cross the channel with little losses and much ease. Had the wind not changed direction William may ~~had~~ have not decided to set sail to England or could have possibly lost a considerable amount of men on route.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Other foreign attacks ~~at~~ ^{around} the time of the battle of Hastings such as the threat of Harold Hardrada attacking in the north meant that Harold was unprepared. The battle against Harold Hardrada had depleted Harold Godwinson's army and also tired them out, this meant that by the time Harold ~~Hardrada~~ ^{Godwinson} had reached William at Hastings his men were fatigued due to the battle and the time took to travel to Hastings and depleted due to the battle against Harold Hardrada in the north.

Harold Godwinson made key mistakes leading up to and during the battle of Hastings that led to William Duke of Normandy defeating him. After the attack of Harold Hardrada, Harold Godwinson heard of news that William had landed in Pevensey so decided to try and surprise Duke William by launching an attack, this was a large mistake because in thinking that he would surprise William by attacking fast

(This page is for your second answer.) William was already prepared for battle and ended up surprising Harold Godwinson instead. ~~Following the at~~

Following the attack on Harold Hordrada, Harold Godwinson should have rested his army and gathered more men whereas instead he thought he would surprise William by attacking fast. In doing this Harold ~~#~~ Godwinson fatigued his men severely meaning that his army was ill prepared when ~~he~~ they met William at Hastings.

During the Battle of Hastings Harold made key mistakes such as panicking for Duke Williams forced retreats on more than one occasion and his lack of tactics in the battle field. Harold's poor preparation lead to an imminent defeat by Duke William.

Duke Williams leadership ~~was not the key factor that led~~ although being well organised and far superior

(This page is for your second answer.) to that of Harold Godwinson was not the key factor as to why William won the Battle of Hastings. The key factor as to why William succeeded at the battle of Hastings is the foreign invasion of Harold Hardrada, this heavily affected Harold Godwinson's army because it depleted the number of fighting men and fatigued the army. Harold Hardrada's invasion also in the north gave William time to prepare and rest his army for when the two sides met at Hastings in (1066) this is the key reason as to why William won at the battle of Hastings.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There are some references to William's preparations, and to his tactics on landing in England. Harold's problems are considered, notably the rapid march south and the battle of Hastings. The question is addressed, but selection of material is not entirely secure and lacks balance overall. A Level 4 response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Always consider the factor mentioned in the question in some depth before bringing in other relevant points.

Question 4

The question invited candidates to consider elements of change and continuity over time which are referred to in the third and fourth bullet points. With such a wide range of material to be considered, a comprehensive answer was not demanded for the higher range of marks. Most candidates seemed to be comfortable with discussing elements of change such as castles, land ownership and the church. Some referred to forest laws, but often in quite general terms, while others used the 'harrying of the north' as a base for change in society without developing this point with any substance. Some of the best answers considered matters of change and then noted that continuity was at least as important a feature of Norman rule. The unchanged coronation ceremony, the failure to make substantial changes in the government of the country, and William's attempts to work with the remnants of the English elite, were all investigated quite effectively.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your first answer.)

It can be argued that Anglo-Saxon England was transformed dramatically by the Norman Conquest. One such argument which can be used to support this is in the landholding patterns. After the Norman Conquest of 1066, much of England's land was ruled by only 190 Barons, which differs ~~considerably~~ from pre-conquest England in which the land was ruled far more egalitarianly. After 1066, twenty-five percent of the land was owned by 11 men, such as the Bishop of Odo, William's brother. The king ~~the~~ now also ~~is~~ ~~officially~~ owned all the land in England, and rented it out to his barons, who further ~~sub~~ rented it out to sub-tenants. This differs from Anglo-Saxon England pre-1066, in which the title of 'king' only referred to the person who owned the largest plot of land in England, and ~~so~~ even here the term is vague, as the Godwins collectively ~~had~~ owned more land than king Edward the Confessor during his rule. Pre-conquest England therefore, the king did not own all the land in England, however this is transformed after the Norman conquest.

The laws were also transformed after the Norman

(This page is for your first answer.)

Conquest, for example they were changed from being written in Old English to being written in Latin. This further distanced ~~person~~ the inhabitants of England from the law as before the Norman Conquest the only obstacles were literacy and geography. Introducing a completely alien language into Anglo Saxon culture can only be described as a significant transformation, as now only Normans could write, and understand, new laws. ~~and~~ Forest laws were also introduced.

Forest laws were also introduced in which certain forests were forbidden to be trespassed by peasants, or indeed any other land owner, save the king, and fines and punishment would be forced on those who do. This is an example of how the transformation of laws after the Norman Conquest affected the population even to a local level, a sign that every land in England now belonged to the king.

Language was not only changed in the writings of the laws, but round about 10,000 Norman words entered the English language, around of which 3,000 survive today. This change in language would have been a fairly sizeable cultural shock, and represents a massive change in Anglo-Saxon ~~society~~ society.

However, there are plenty of arguments to suggest that the Norman conquest did not bring about a transformation in Anglo-Saxon England. Firstly, it appears quite clear that the aristocratic lifestyle between England and Normandy had very few significant differences. This can be seen in the Bayeux Tapestry, describing a scene in 1052 in which William the Conqueror and Harold Godwinson ~~are~~ are hunting together. In this scene, it is apparent that in terms of authority,

(This page is for your first answer.)

lifestyle and even fashion, there is very little difference between the Anglo-Saxon and Norman aristocracy. Therefore it can be seen. This is evidence that the aristocratic lifestyle, at least, would not have been transformed in Anglo-Saxon England and after the Norman conquest.

The style of government was also not transformed. It appears that William approved of the localised ~~author~~ areas of authority and government found in the shire system, in which Barons and sheriffs governed their own bit of land and the peasantry within them. This is shown by the fact that William changed very little about it, indeed it wasn't until 1074 that the shire system ~~legally~~ of the shire system disappeared. The fact that local government remained the same after the conquest means that, locally, there may have been no ~~any~~ major ~~trans~~ transformation after this ~~is~~ the Norman conquest.

Also, in terms of keeping the Anglo-Saxon style of government the same it can be argued that William's continuation of the monarchy represents no real transformation. Indeed, pre-conquest England was legendary for its effective monarchy, as it had a flawless political system unlike any other European country. It would be obvious that once William got his hands on the English monarchy, he wouldn't want to change it. This is further evidence that Anglo-Saxon England was not ~~changed~~ transformed by the conquest.

It could ~~in fact~~ be argued that Anglo-Saxon England was already experiencing a ~~shift~~ transformation towards Norman lifestyles before the conquest, as Edward the Confessor himself was raised in Normandy, and in his return to England in 1042, brought over

(This page is for your first answer.)

Norman administrators to help him rule. England therefore was already experiencing a gradual change towards Norman lifestyle before the conquest, the Norman style architecture of the Westminster Abbey during Edward the Confessor's reign being a prime example. It can therefore be argued that the Normans did not transform Anglo-Saxon England, merely advancing a course that England was already slowly advancing towards.

Overall, Anglo-Saxon England was transformed very little by the Norman conquest, only in its landholding patterns and use of language in law and culture. Many aspects of Anglo-Saxon England remained unchanged, and it could be argued that any change that did occur was simply a change centered around deep social changes we do not yet understand, and not due to the Norman conquest.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer considers issues of both change and continuity. Change is highlighted through landholdings, the legal system and forest laws, while the answer notes elements of continuity in both government and the monarchy. Securely focused with extensive and accurate supporting material: a strong Level 5 answer.

This is another response to Question 4.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your second answer.) After the Normans' success at the battle of Hastings 1066, ~~some~~ ~~of~~ elements of Anglo-Saxon England were transformed when William I came to the throne.

For example, during his reign, William built 500 castles in England. Castles were significant to geo-political changes to English society. The English had never seen such construction since the Roman invasion. Castles were key to defence and ~~so~~ to social events. However, Anglo-Saxon homes were destroyed in the process, ~~and~~ ~~not~~ having greater change not to the favour of Anglo-Saxons. It should be noted that very few Anglo-Saxons were residents in castles, and therefore the living standards of Anglo-Saxons were not changed considerably.

Also, Anglo-Saxon England was changed by the Norman conquest, because people with a status of power ~~to~~ the conquest were replaced by Normans. This changed the governing of England as the Normans took a slightly different approach.

(This page is for your second answer.) to those before them. An example of this is the

Norman law which states that if any Norman was found dead, the whole town was responsible for it (which often meant death.)

Showing us that the governing of Anglo-Saxon England was changed to some extent. By the 880s, almost all the 1080s, not all the bishops had been replaced by Normans.

On the other hand, the governing of England was not changed significantly. Systems such as Shire courts were kept, as well as most English laws (with the exception of the introduction of the Forest Law) showing us that Anglo-Saxon England was not changed significantly regarding the governing of England.

Shortly after the Norman success at Hastings in 1066, and increase of rebellions occurred. For example the Welsh started a rebellion in 1067, and left England with much booty. As the number of rebellions started to increase, actions were taken by William. All adult males between Nottingham and York were killed and 80% of the Wasteland recorded in the ~~Monday~~ Domesday book was recorded in York. This shows that oppressive approaches were taken to anyone challenging the king, as rebellions did not just change England geographically, but politically as well.

After the Norman conquest, ~~religion~~ was the religious system that England had before was altered slightly. The Archbishop of Canterbury who was seen as a significant figure to the English, was replaced by a Norman. Also, William believed that the English connection to

(This page is for your second answer.) Christianity was poor, and therefore William took action to get the Pope's blessing. Although this had no immediate effect, ~~the~~ English religious connections were changed after the Norman conquest. For example, the Normans introduced a tax ~~which~~ where all proceedings went directly into the church.

It should be noted that no significant military reforms came from the Norman conquest, stating us that the Normans believed that the English army was satisfactory.

*

In conclusion, the Norman conquest of 1066 led to some changes to Anglo-Saxon England, however I agree that Anglo-Saxon ~~was~~ England was not transformed completely. Evidence to suggest this would include the preservation of Shire courts and English laws. Although some major changes occurred e.g. the introduction of the Forest law and the building of castles, Normans found the governance of England good, and decided to keep it.

* ~~The~~ The Norman conquest settled the Anglo-Saxons' problem of not having an heir to the throne. When William was crowned king of England in late 1066, he changed the ceremony procedure in order to send out a clear message to Anglo-Saxons that he was king and ruler over them. This changed the procedures of a new monarch, and still stands in the present day.

Also, after the Norman conquest, William increased the power of sheriffs, which enabled the authority of England to change when these powers were granted.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The question is addressed, and some issues of change and continuity are considered. While there is some attempt at analysis, the quality and range of supporting evidence is not very extensive. Low Level 4.

Question 5

At a lower level were answers which described the relationship between Henry and Becket but offered nothing more. Better answers were able to move beyond this narrow range of material, noting that the clash was not simply Henry versus Becket, but was concerned with important issues concerning the structural relationship between crown and church. Some noted the king's determination to restore royal power after the civil war of Stephen's reign, and that the Constitutions of Clarendon were an important attempt to stabilise and define the rights of both church and state. Some of the best answers noted that Henry's policies towards the church were simply one part of his broader ambitions to restore the powers of the crown to all areas of government. Too many decided that the church-state crisis effectively came to an end with Becket's death in 1170.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your second answer.)

It can be argued that it was due to Henry II that the conflict between church and state arose during his reign, him being mainly responsible. His personality can be considered to be a major factor as to why his reign the conflict arose. From the beginning of his reign in 1154, Henry II built up a reputation of being a short-tempered angry bully who refused to have his will crossed, this is clearly seen in the incident where, on receiving some bad news he "tore off all his clothes, jumped to the ground and started gnawing at pieces of hay". Clearly, Henry II was a man who did not like to be crossed. When his own appointed archbishop, Thomas Becket decided to speak out against Henry, it would not be a stretch of the imagination that his reaction to this, angry letters and foul tantrums would have ~~not~~ inflamed the situation significantly. Indeed it was apparently his exclamation "Who will rid me of this turbulent priest?" that led to Thomas Becket's murder. This then is clear evidence that it was Henry's personality, and thus Henry himself, that was responsible for the conflict.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Henry II's legal reforms were also responsible for the conflict between church and state. This can most clearly be seen in his constitution of Clarendon, which stated that any legal offense committed by members of the clergy should be tried in a king's court and not by the church, where their sentences may be lenient or ~~be~~ disregarded altogether. To state this overruled the law enforced by William the Conqueror during the Norman conquest, and angered many of the old church, ~~whom~~ whilst it can be argued that Henry enforced the law in order to give more ~~the~~ power to the monarchy in the otherwise decentralised 'Anglo-Norman' Empire, the church saw this as a challenge of the church's dominance over the state, and as such a personal insult to both ~~the~~ them and God. Therefore, it can be stated that Henry's legal reforms, and as such Henry himself, that was responsible for the conflict with the church.

However, there are other factors to consider other than Henry, perhaps the most important being Thomas Beckett, ~~who~~ who was appointed to Archbishop of Canterbury by Henry. Having been educated in Paris, Beckett received a highly skilled education, however he abandoned this ~~in pursuit of~~ education nearing his final years. This would have an impact on his life later, as when Henry appointed him to Archbishop Beckett found himself surrounded by ~~the~~ intellectuals ~~who~~ ~~know~~ which then spawned an inferiority complex within Beckett who felt the need to prove that he was indeed the right man for the job appointed to him, and not just because of his close friendship

(This page is for your second answer.)

with the king, despite the fact that he did not receive a full education. Beckett therefore felt the need to prove to his peers that he was both strong and independent, and overtime this resulted in Beckett actively turning against the wills of the king, firstly refusing to sign the Constitution of Clarendon ~~as~~ⁱⁿ 1164 and convincing his peers not to go through with it. Eventually this greatly inflamed the conflict between the church and the state, and it can therefore be argued that it was the personality of Beckett, namely his inferiority complex and determination to prove that he was a man of God separate from the state and king, ~~some~~ that caused this.

It may ultimately come down to the relationship between Henry and Beckett that caused the feud between the state and church. ~~Now~~ This is because from a long time prior to the conflict, Henry and Beckett were described as being close personal friends, accounts describe them hunting on a regular basis for example, an honour reserved only for the king's closest friends and advisers. When, however, Henry appointed Thomas to become Archbishop of Canterbury in an attempt ~~to~~ to use Thomas' close personal alliance with the state to make the church easier for Henry to control, the plan backfired when Beckett started taking his role seriously to the point of disregarding the wishes of his ex-friend and claiming that the church should be superior to the state. It is clear that Henry took this as a deep personal betrayal, refusing to talk or communicate with the Archbishop, ~~due to the~~ ~~sear~~ despite the many instances offered. It is possible that Henry was unwilling to face the problem for years

(This page is for your second answer.)

due to his personal feelings and connection to the situation, and thus it may be due to the old personal friendship that the two had for each other that inflamed and prolonged the dispute, turning it into a devastating crisis ending in murder.

Overall, it is down to a large extent that Henry II was responsible for the conflict, his legal reforms being the trigger that caused ~~it~~ the conflict to start. However, if it were not for his close personal friendship with Beckett, whose inferiority complex and otherwise weak personality got the better of him, the conflict may have been avoided.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer deploys a good range of material on both Henry II and Becket, analysing the church-state conflict through personalities and policies. A well-argued answer, securely in Level 5.

Question 6

Some of the best answers considered this a three-way argument, considering Henry II, John, and the situation in France, addressing a range of factors and displaying a clear understanding of the chronology of events. Answers noted Henry's vast inheritance, and the measures he took to establish a considerable and far-reaching personal ascendancy, including his itinerant kingship. John was perhaps unfortunate to encounter Philip Augustus as a skilled and determined opponent, though the king's failings were compounded by his misgovernment in Normandy and the loss of Aquitaine following the death of Queen Eleanor. Some answers got caught up in a narrative of John's reign which limited the development of an argument. Others were sidetracked into considering Henry's reforms within England, which was not the point of the question. Examiners reported that Henry's control of the Angevin lands, an important part of the first bullet point, was often not well known or understood.

Question 7

A few answers simply described the plague and how it was spread, and thus struggled to make any relevant points. However, most candidates were able to make some valid comments which linked the fall in the size of the population and the shortage of labour, with the consequent impact on both wages and agriculture as a whole. However, a clear understanding of medieval society and how it worked was lacking in several answers. The emergence of bastard feudalism and the impact of the plague on both towns and trade were often overlooked. A feature of several answers was the failure to develop points made with much specific information, but to rely instead on largely unsupported generalisations.

Question 8

Most candidates were able to consider both the Ordinance and the Statute of Labourers, and the Sumptuary Laws, as evidence of royal determination to maintain traditional structures. Attempts made by many landowners to continue to demand labour services were noted, and the extent to which they failed. For some candidates this was virtually all they could offer apart from a passing reference to the poll taxes. Better answers noted the changing attitudes among many peasants and townspeople over the thirty year period given in the question. By 1381 questions were being asked about clerical corruption and the poll taxes themselves, and there were growing demands for a more equal society. Only a few considered the importance of the military situation in France, and the increasing number of coastal raids by French fleets.

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your second answer.)

attempts to maintain society structure

* Statute of labourers → 1351

* Sumptuary law → 1363

Poll tax 1377, 78, 80
4p 4p6d 412p

To what extent were attempts to maintain the traditional structures of society, responsible for unrest amongst peasants and townspeople in the years 1349-81?

After the Black Death struck in 1348 there were many repercussions. As the structures of society appeared to be altering. Many peasants fled from the land as either their lords died or were dead who were those tying them to particular land. Peasants often ~~fled~~^{fled} to town or demanded higher wages. These demands were often

(This page is for your second answer.) met as the Lords were in need of labour and the work force had dramatically deteriorated. This therefore led to a change in the social structure.

As peasants wages were rising the feudal system that was in place was being altered. In order to maintain this system the King introduced the Statute of Labourers in 1351. This was to put a limit on wages and reduce them to prior Black Death wages. This left the peasants angry as they had been able to experience more freedom. The new law was that landowners were not allowed to pay peasants wages any higher than they would have before the Black Death. However, some landowners were desperate for labour and therefore still paid higher wages. The Statute of Labourers was seen as more of a long-term cause of any unrest in later years.

Not only was the Statute of Labourers an attempt to maintain traditional structures of society which was a cause for unrest but also the introduction of Sumptuary law. In 1363 the Sumptuary law was introduced as a way to control what people wore. As the

(This page is for your second answer.) Peasants had earned more money. They had been able to afford better clothes. Rather than wearing the clothes suitable for their class many were now wearing colours such as royal purples and silks. These were seen as nobility colours and therefore inappropriate for peasants to wear. The Sumptuary Law introduced class structures, for the 7 classes in society each had clothes they were allowed to wear. This was an attempt at keeping peasants as peasants and townspeople as townspeople as in these times you were to die in the same social class you were born. This was also a long-term cause of unrest as the peasants had experienced freedom and were being forced to wear specific clothing.

In contrast to the attempts to maintain structure in society being a cause of unrest there were also other causes of the unrest amongst peasants and townspeople. It can be seen that an underlying major cause of unrest was the Poll Tax. ~~Introduced in~~ The first poll tax was introduced in 1377, this charged all adults (14+) a flat rate of 4 pence, this then changed in 1378 to 4 pence for peasants up to £4 for knights and

(This page is for your second answer.) lords. However, ~~this was~~ there was a third poll tax introduced in 1380 which charged all adults (14+) a flat rate of 12 pence. This left many peasants hiding from tax collectors as they could not afford to pay and ~~there~~ even though there was an increase in tax price the amount collected actually declined. The peasants were not happy about this tax ~~due to~~ largely due to it being brought about to fund the war in France. The 'Hundred Years War' was a largely a failure and there was being little gained from having a war. The poll taxes therefore created great unrest among peasants * and townspeople.

Therefore it can be seen that a great deal of the unrest was due to the attempts made to maintain social structure during these years. As many peasants had experienced freedom after the Black Death they were now reluctant to go back to prior circumstances and wanted to break out of the hierarchical system which had been put in place. Even though there were other factors surrounding the matter these could be seen as mainly responsible events.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer is focused on the question and notes attempts made to maintain the traditional structures of society through the Statute of Labourers and the Sumptuary Laws. The importance of the poll taxes in causing unrest is noted. An analytical answer which is focused well on the demands of the question: secure Level 4.

Questions 9 and 10

The two questions in Option A5 were answered by only a handful of candidates.

Question 11

Some weaker candidates struggled to move past Henry VI's personal and political weaknesses, often referring to material taken from the 1440s which was not always made relevant. Most, however, discussed Lancastrian weaknesses and Yorkist strengths, comparing the leadership of Henry VI or, rather, Margaret of Anjou, with that of Richard of York and the Earl of March. More might have been made of the role of Henry's queen, including her bitter hostility towards York and the errors she made during the years 1455-60, including the parliament of devils and her failure to take London. Better answers noted that both Lancastrian weaknesses and Yorkist grievances were apparent many years before 1455, and were brought into greater relief by events such as the collapse of English power in France. An important weakness apparent in many answers concerned the chronological range. Many referred to the first battle of St Albans in 1455, and to Towton in 1461, but the series of very clear events and decisions between these dates, which highlight both Yorkist strengths and Lancastrian weaknesses, were not always developed in as focused a way as they could be.

Chosen Question Number:						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 13	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

The Lancastrian Monarchy was unable to withstand the forces of the Yorkists in the years between 1455 and 1461 for many reasons: The current Lancastrian king, Henry VI, was pious and had "no interest in fighting" (pardon?). Some historians believe he was "a man before his time", with peaceful views and a saintly disposition. Therefore the leadership of the Lancastrian faction was weak, and it had a stronger opposing faction of Yorkists led by Richard

of York, who was ambitious and powerful, ^{combined the two} ultimately led to the downfall of the Lancastrians, and the victory of the Yorkists in 1461.

One reason the Lancastrians

(This page is for your first answer.) were unable to withstand the Yorkist was due to the unrest in the country and the dislike for the current monarch. This was due to Henry's inability to retain the lands in France which his father had passed down (Henry V), and by 1450, the last battle for France was lost, resulting in the loss of Normandy, which left the nobility humiliated and penniless on their return.

This was a sign of Henry's piety, along with his love for the church and education (he invested funds in religious buildings and Eton college rather than a campaign to win back France) which was very unlike his father, the "perfect medieval king" (Stanley) and meant his kingship was weak, which left the Lancastrians wounded ~~for~~, the perfect kindling for a Yorkist challenge.

The reason for the Yorkist challenge in the first place was the "unbridled ambition" of the Duke of York. Due to his wealthy estates (he was the second most powerful man in the

(This page is for your first answer.)

land, and part of the powerful and influential Neville family) he knew, that with his legitimate claim (descended from both the 2nd and 4th Sons of Edward III) he had the same right to overthrow the current king, Henry IV, as Henry's uncle Henry III did in Richard II's reign in 1399. With this ~~power~~ ~~he~~ ~~also~~ had knowledge, he was the leading figure in the Yorkist movement to overthrow the Lancastrian faction, and was one of the reasons why they were unable to withstand the Yorkist.

However, Richard Duke of York's main motive was a result of Henry's poor kingship (he had angered the duke through replacing his lieutenant in Normandy with his own rival, Somerset) and humiliated him through sending him to Ireland) and the fact that if the Lancastrian king hadn't been a "puppet of factions" (Pollard) or suffered a mental collapse in 1453, York wouldn't have been able to take

(This page is for your first answer.)

the Lancastrian treason!

It was due to the fundamental mistakes made by the Lancastrians that resulted in the Yorkist victory at Tewkesbury in 1471, led by the young Edward IV, York's son, and signalled the start of a Yorkist reign.

These mistakes were mainly due to the dominating nature of Margaret of Anjou, the queen. She wished to protect her son, the Prince of Wales (who was born just after Henry's mental collapse in 1453) and to keep the Lancastrian monarchy ~~at~~ on the throne. Her ~~profound~~ distrust in York led to the battle of St.

Albans in 1455, where the Lancastrians were defeated. Although York had won, he couldn't be king, ~~so a~~ compromise ~~was reached~~. The Act of Accord, which meant Accord, which meant when Henry died, York was ~~his~~ presumptive, or his son Edward Earl of March if he were to die.

This was a "recipe for more fighting" in history, ~~because it~~ ~~meant~~

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~York had had a motive to either kill the king or continue his attempt at usurping the throne~~

Margaret was severely distrusted York and his followers, and passed the dubbed "Parliament of Devils", passing the Act of Attainder on all those who supported York, giving him the motive to over throw the Lancastrians, as he was hard working to loose ~~and he fled to Ireland~~.

Due to this, the battle of Northampton commenced, and when the Yorkists were won, York proclaimed himself king and wished to take the throne for himself in 1460, yet Parliament where not

* This led to the battle at Ludlow, commencing in Lanc Lancastrian victory in 1459, and York fled with to the earl of Warwick.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Happy for York to become king, so the compromise of the Act of Accord proclaimed York heir presumptive after Henry's death. This was a "recipe for more fighting" in Perceval's eyes, for it gave him a motive to overthrow the king. ~~The consequence of~~

The battles which followed, were fueled with confusion from the inability over which side they should aid. For example, the Gentry's Gemson turned sides last minute in the 1459 campaign against Warwick and York, because they couldn't fight an appointed king, even if Warwick promised "If we are loyal to the king, it is the ministers we wish to overthrow". Due to the fluctuating situation (the battle between two rival factions, both very powerful and with legitimate claims) meant the nobility were divided.

This made a great impact on why the Lancastrians could not withstand the Yorkists in 1461, due to

(This page is for your first answer.) power of the nobility. They were the "natural leaders in society" (Grant) with private armies ~~and~~ (due to illegal retainers) and the circumstances of bastard feudalism, which gave them the power to settle local disputes. It was overmighty nobles such as York and Warwick (who aided the young Edward IV to the throne after Mortimer's cross and Tewkesbury in 1461) which led to the victory of the Yorkists, and why their ~~power~~ base of retainers could overthrow the king's army (due to his bad kingship, he had ~~weakened~~ weakened the finances of the country, and therefore the army).

To conclude, it was the combination of the ~~overall~~ upheaval of the country, caused by the rivaling factions which was why the Lancastrians couldn't withstand the Yorkist threat between 1455-61. This was due to Henry's inability to rule efficiently, his ~~own~~ mental collapse, and the

(This page is for your first answer.)

Mistakes made by both
Crown and his wife. This was taken
advantage of by York, and his
faction, and through the workings of
Western feudalism they had the powerbase
to overthrow the Lancastrians at the
bloodiest battle of the war in 1461,
Towton.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer considers the leadership of the rival forces provided by Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and Richard of York. The candidate also notes the importance of some of the events in the years 1455-61, and thus maintains a secure focus on the question set. A Level 5 response.

Question 12

The clarification of content refers to 'how and why Henry Tudor was able to launch a successful challenge in 1485. The crucial role of French assistance to the Tudor cause should be appreciated'. Regrettably, the nature, extent and significance of French support was not well known, and many answers could only refer to troops and ships in a very general way. Better answers were more specific on French assistance, also noting that the French were concerned about a possible attack by Richard III, and saw Henry's invasion as a useful diversion. Most answers noted how Henry's army grew in size as it marched through Wales, and were aware of the size and relative strengths of the two armies which met at Bosworth. There were some detailed descriptions of the course of the battle, and the extent to which the outcome was determined by the Stanley family. Some answers focused exclusively on Henry Tudor and thus failed to consider a range of other factors which explained the success of Henry's challenge. Richard III's growing unpopularity was often referred to, but many answers became bogged down in extensive description of the fate of the princes in the Tower. More might have been made of the nature of the usurpation of 1483 and the king's dependence on a small group of largely northern nobles, along with other factors which explained his fairly weak position in 1485.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your first answer.) Plan: ~~allowed Henry to invade~~

Bosworth

~~Richard unpopular - Princes / Northern allies~~ Ignore

French support was a significant reason for Henry VII's successful challenge of Richard III. However this was not the only cause.

Henry Tudor, the Lancastrian ~~heir~~ claimant to the throne of England invaded in 1485 and defeated Richard at the Battle of Bosworth. Without French backing Henry would have been unable to launch an invasion of England of any kind as he did not have the means. The King of France, Louis XI, provided Henry with skilled ~~german~~ mercenaries, money and ships. Without these Henry would not have stood a chance against Richard III.

France had also supported Henry's earlier failed attempt to invade via Kent in 1483. France was so

(This page is for your first answer.) willing to support Henry because they were afraid that Richard would invade them.

However, Henry's claim to the throne would have failed with or without French backing if Richard had had more support. Richard's unpopularity earned Henry the support he needed to even consider invading England.

Richard was unpopular for numerous reasons. Firstly he gave northern nobles more power and favoured them a great deal which led to the alienation of the southern and western nobles in particular.

Most importantly however he was held responsible for the disappearance of the Princes in the Tower; Edward ~~VI~~ and Richard, Duke of York. This common held belief, whilst having insubstantial evidence, caused the people to turn against him. This combined with the fact that Richard was seen as a usurper, ^{not} ~~not~~ ^{French support} to was the main cause for Henry's claim to be taken seriously for the first time.

The main reason for Henry's successful ~~was~~ challenge to Richard's rule was the Tudor's victory at the Battle of Bosworth, 22nd August 1485, as this saw the death of the last Plantagenet King.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Henry won the Battle mainly due to good luck as Richard had far more military experience than the young young Tudor. Henry was outnumbered and had the lower ground decreasing his chances of success. However due to multiple nobles, notably the southern and western nobles, committing treason and failing to turn up for the Battle Richard had less support. Additionally the death of Richard's commander, the Duke of Norfolk, and the subsequent refusal of Northumberland to take his place served to strengthen Henry's position.

Henry's commander, the Earl of Oxford, was by far superior to Norfolk and took charge of Henry's forces along side Jasper Tudor, Henry's Uncle.

The support of the Stanley brothers - one of which was Henry's step-father - was decisive in winning the Battle as it was their forces who killed Richard. If the Stanley's had supported Richard then Henry would have lost.

Richard's own arrogance worked in Henry's favour, this is because if Richard had not charge at Henry who was protected by foreign mercenaries he would not have been killed.

The victory at Bosworth allowed Henry to claim the throne.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Overall French support was crucial to Henry challenging Richard's rule as it enabled him to do so. However Richard's weakened position and lack of support at Bosworth was more significant. However Henry would not have been able to invade England without French assistance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate notes the support which the French gave to Henry Tudor in both 1483 and 1485, and its importance to the Lancastrian claimant. Some reasons for Richard III's unpopularity are noted, and there is a useful discussion on the progress of the battle of Bosworth. A Level 5 analysis.

This is another response to Question 12.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your first answer.) During ~~his reign~~ the start of his life Henry Tudor spent most of the time in France, where learning skills and gathering support that would greatly help him get the English throne.

During the time of his early childhood Henry Tudor was living ~~at~~ under a Yorkist reign of Richard III. His uncle Jasper Tudor took him into Exile into France. where they met his mother Margret Beaufort. One important thing that Henry picked up in his time in France and could be argued helped him to win the English crown in 1485 was knowledge in his time in France he saw ~~has~~ how things were run and from an insider point of view and how they could be done differently, so this French support of the understanding of how a

(This page is for your first answer.)

good King should be could be argued as an important reason for why he defeated Richard III - because he knew just what to do! The French also gave Henry support in the form of soldiers, and having military backing gives you good momentum. Having the starting point with the French soldiers will lead to further support so the French support was effective in building up this momentum. So it could be argued that without the French support being there from the start Henry would have never even started an invasion of England, let alone won it. So in this example French support is a very important reason why Henry had a successful challenge to Richard III's throne.

However, French support was not the only factor that helped Henry win at Bosworth. During this time in England Richard III was not a very popular king, and had many enemies, such enemies that would turn and fight on Henry's side in battle. So when young Henry Tudor ~~he~~ arrived

(This page is for your first answer.)

on a beach in Wales and headed for England he was met by various anti-Richard people. The first was a man called Rhys ap Thomas who was a large landowner in Wales but instead of putting up resistance to the newcomer he let him through and even joined his side. Another example for the lack of support for Richard comes in the form of the Stanley Brothers William and Thomas Stanley who claimed they would fight for Richard but after spending most of the time on the sidelines, stepped in and helped out Henry at the end of the battle when Richard charged at him you could also claim that luck was a important reason why Henry's challenge was successful. When Henry landed in Wales he didn't know how they would react to him ~~but~~ so was lucky that they went with him rather than against him. If things had been the other way round eg ~~if~~ Rhys ap Thomas put up resistance to him and the Stanlys had fought for Richard then thing would have turned out very different so this proves that luck was a very important reason why Henry's challenge on Richard III was successful.

(This page is for your first answer.) In conclusion then, I believe that the French support was important because it gave him the knowledge of how to become King and the soldiers in which to do it with. It started off the invasion by giving it momentum in which it continued to build. However the French support was only really important in starting it all off and without other things happening as well it would have never been as successful as it was. Luck was the most important in his challenge. You can see this because if you reverse all the things that happened to him (knys ap Iomas, Skutlegs, Northumberland running away) then the invasion would have never got through Wales. This is why although it was important in getting it going and triggering everything else it is not accurate to say that French support was the most important factor in his successful challenge to the throne as without other things happening he never would have been as successful as he was.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer notes the importance of French support, though is unclear on how extensive this was. Richard III is acknowledged to be unpopular, but reasons for this are not given. There is some relevant material on Welsh support. An attempt at analysis, but supporting material is descriptive and is lacking in depth in places. A Level 3 answer.

Question 13

One way of assessing the extent to which the financial position of the crown improved during Henry's reign is to consider royal finances in 1485 and again in 1509, noting what had changed and why. Many candidates adopted this approach, although a few drifted out of focus by straying into narrative material on previous reigns. There was plenty of knowledge on display here, though this sometimes meant that answers became bogged down in minute details. Various points were discussed in some depth: the Exchequer and the Chamber, royal lands, feudal dues, the French pension and Henry's determination to avoid wars. Some attempted a counter argument, but were unable to sustain this effectively. Many answers scored well on Question 13, but could have been more effective if they had considered 'to what extent' rather than asserting that this was a period of unbroken success in the development of royal finances.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your second answer.)

Over recent years money had never been in great supply, Edward IV and Richard III both tried to improve it but it is not until the reign of Henry VII that we see a ~~was~~ major development in collecting money.

~~He had seen the way the nobles had dealt with money and it didn't impress him. The first thing that Henry did was replace the nobles with more educated and wise people. Empson and Dudley were in charge of finances and it is these two that helped him to be known for the rich king that he was. Having people with ability in power means they will be more effective and in turn earn you more money. Another thing that he did as king to collect more money was collect what's~~

(This page is for your second answer.) called extraordinary income. This was money that he did not have a divine right as king but collected through other means. The French pension for example was paid annually to Henry from the French king as a way of keeping English soldiers out of France. This improved finances as it was income you would not normally get as king. Another way that he improved finances was to change from the exchequer to the chamber system. The chamber system was a very small group of people who looked after all the money. By having only a small group of people in charge of the money it is easier to keep track of and to ~~man~~ manage personally by Henry. He also added to the money he got from the crown lands to using acts of attainder were used when nobles were naughty and he often kept the lands and money that had been taken from them.

However it could also be argued that all Henry did was copy others. Edward I came up ~~to~~ with the chamber system to begin with and Henry just took all his glory

(This page is for your second answer.) It could also be said that Henry did not improve finances but was actually really greedy with the money he collected. He didn't give out as nearly ~~as~~ many titles and rewards as previous kings because he wanted to keep it for ~~his~~ himself. You could argue then at at least he wasn't improving the overall financial position of the crown but he was only interested in making more money for himself. Again you could argue that he was lucky with money as he had no idea how the nobles would react when he didn't give them any rewards and he invaded France to help Brittany he never would have guessed that the French king would pay him large amounts of money to stay away from France.

To conclude with, although it could be said no credit should go to Henry and that the crown finances only improved with him on the throne because he was lucky to get all that money out of France and he just took other people's ideas and used them for his own benefit. This of course is true but that it shows his

(This page is for your second answer.)

understanding of money, to see what works well and then to use it and improve it. You could also see that he had good finances as he was about to launch a full scale invasion of France, and I don't imagine that comes cheaply. This is why I have come to conclude that the crown finances improved to a great extent while Henry was king, he had the brains to use the right ideas and put the right people in the right places but also wasn't afraid to slap an act of attainder on a noble if they had been causing trouble.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer does make some relevant points, on Empson and Dudley, the French pension and the Chamber system. However, supporting material is not very extensive or developed in most parts of the answer, making for a Level 3 response overall.

Question 14

Weaker candidates were diverted from considering Henry's control over the nobility to an assessment of the ways in which Henry secured his position as king. This invariably led into a description of the Simnel and Warbeck rebellions, along with those in Yorkshire and Cornwall. Simnel and Stoke could be related to the question, Warbeck perhaps less so. Most were aware of the importance of bonds, recognisances and attainders as methods of control, though fewer were able to explain the constraints which these placed on noble behaviour. An important weakness reported this session was a failure to address retaining very often. Armies said it all, especially in the years after the Wars of the Roses, but many did not investigate the attempts which Henry made to curb retaining and thus establish his authority over the nobility.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14 | |

(This page is for your second answer.)

Henry III did ~~so~~ successfully establish ~~the~~ his authority over the nobility during his reign. He did this by eliminating their power in the country through illegal retaining, and using his power of law through ~~through~~ recognisances and bonds to control the nobility. He had no overmighty subjects during his reign as was not overthrown by the nobility at ~~at~~ any point, so it can be seen that he was successful in establishing his authority over them.

One reason why he was successful is because he had to control the nobility. Monarchs before him had been ~~overthrown~~ overthrown.

(This page is for your second answer.)

by over-Mighty Magnates and Henry was not willing to allow this to re-occur. It has been said that his regime was "harsh" (Penguin) for he eradicated the old practices of bastard feudalism (which meant the nobility could raise personal armies, and sort out local disputes, as well as ~~then~~ becoming both king-makers and overmighty nobles in their own right), and he treated the nobility harshly, ~~through~~ through strict law enforcement of bonds and recognisances, as well as fines if the nobles didn't keep to their word. This made them repressed, and

The first thing Henry had to do was shrink the nobility, so as to make them more manageable. This ties in with his "paranoid" (Baron) fear of an overmighty noble, or rebellion against his weak claim.

He shrank the nobility by 42% in his reign, only rewarding 3 earldoms (including his step father Lord Stanley) due to his aid at the battle of Bosworth.

Henry could control them

(This page is for your second answer.) and never handing out estates and land (unlike Edward IV).

Instead he issued people with the Order of the Garter, an honorary title with no financial gain. Due to this Henry was able to keep crown lands for himself (which he'd accumulated hugely through his act of Resumption, meaning he gained all vacant land) which could be seen as a policy of "ruthless efficiency" (Rogers/Turvey) for he never gave over too much power to the nobility, unlike previous monarchs.

Another factor of either his "harsh regime" or "ruthless efficiency" was his treatment of the nobility regarding punishment. He made two laws regarding illegal retaining, one in 1487, and one in 1504 (building on the regime of Edward IV) and he enforced this rigorously. It was such a harsh threat (one noble, Abergavenny, was fined £70,000 for illegal retaining) and could be issued to anyone

(This page is for your second answer.)

(The Lancastrian loyalist, Oxford was fined when Henry visited his lavish home, and tricked him into showing off all his illegal retainers, as told by Francis Bacon) meant he ~~forced~~ forced his authority on the nobility, albeit successfully.

However, there were occasions within his reign where, due to his "ruthless" actions towards the nobility (which dated from 21 August 1405, when he declared he was already ~~king~~ king before the battle at Bosworth, allowing him to put attainders on All those following Richard III.) meant they rebelled against him, showing he wasn't always in control of them.

The first of these was Lord Lovell's rebellion in 1406, which amounted to nothing essentially, but proves that right after he had obtained the throne, there were those who already opposed it. Also

Another would be the support of

(This page is for your second answer.)

both Lincoln and Lovell for the Lambert Simnel rebellion of 1487, when they both aided the claimant. However, at the battle of Stoke in the same year, the nobility didn't side with Simnel, and although it was ~~quite~~ reluctant, and was given to Henry at the battle from the nobility, showing he had authority ~~set~~ over them.

However, in 1491, the pretender Perkin Warbeck received support from the younger de la Pole brother, earl of Suffolk, and Marguerite's influential foreign involvement caused Henry to act rashly. This was shown when William Stanley, a powerful noble who had aided Henry in becoming king, was executed merely because he believed that "if Warbeck really is Prince Richard, I won't fight against him". This shows the period of unrest in Henry's reign.

(This page is for your second answer.) When he needed the support of the nobility the most, and due to his harsh regime, he was disliked, and at times lost his authority over them.

To conclude, Henry needed to establish authority over the nobility for he was a foreign king, with no knowledge of the logistics of the peerage and nobility, along with the notorious part of overmighty nobles. Therefore he enforced a repressed and ruthless regime to control them, possibly too harsh, for after his death, Edmund Dudley found 84 cases of unjust actions from Henry VIII, and it also meant he was an unpopular monarch, leading to the desertion of the nobility at times when he needed it most. However, he was successful in establishing his authority, for he had no major rebellions, which caused him to be overthrown, or any overmighty nobles (yet this

(This page is for your second answer.) could also be due to the fact he had no direct male line to worry about). Yet although he was successful, it was forced, and harsh, but to end, I would agree his regime was "ruthlessly efficient" (Rogers/Turvey) and he succeeded in establishing his ~~authority~~ authority over the nobility ~~the~~ during his reign.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer deploys a range of relevant material which explains how Henry VII established his authority over the nobility. There is a secure analysis here, with a range of accurate factual material in some depth to support the argument. A Level 5 response.

This is another example of a Question 14 response.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your second answer.)

1485-1909

Plan

How accurate is it to say VII was successful in establishing authority over the nobility

1) No. constant threats during reign
Warbeck, Simnel
Cornish, Yorkshire

2) Yes - big coronation
predates reign
rewards followers
didn't go to Parliament
Had wife + heir 2nd

answer



I believe that it is not very accurate to say that Henry VII was successful in establishing his reign over the nobility. Authority over the nobility during his reign. All throughout his years as king, Henry VII was constantly faced with ~~Yorkist~~ ^{Yorkist} threats, some because of his poor claim to the throne and others due to the taxes he issued his people. ~~Because of this, Henry was never secure on his throne, and all the more unstable at the beginning of his reign.~~ However, Henry did take ^{some} precautions at the beginning of his reign in order to consolidate his power and authority.

Henry, having a poor claim to the throne through his mother's ^{1st} marriage, ~~did~~ knew he had to establish his authority as soon as he was king. In order to do this, he had a very large and grand coronation cementing the idea in people's heads that this was the new king. He also didn't go to Parliament at first. This left him open to perform

(This page is for your second answer.) The very clever move of predating his reign to before the battle of Bosworth, so that every man who fought on Richard III's side of the battle could then be called a traitor to the king and have land taken away. Not only did this earn the king money, but also ^{partly} eradicated ~~was~~ the ^{Yorkist} ~~Yorkist~~ threat that was still around. He also rewarded the men who fought on his side, ensuring they kept their allegiance with the king.

~~XXXXXX~~
Another way in which he established his authority was by marrying quickly and having a son and heir in the first year. As soon as he had an heir, it made it much more difficult for any Yorkist to usurp.

However, ~~as did not believe~~ Henry faced constant threats from Yorkists throughout his reign. In the first year, there was the Mercian risings with Lovell and the Stafford brothers. The fact that this rising took place in the first year of his reign opened Henry up to vulnerability. He also faced the Yorkshire rebellion in 1489, as he was trying to raise money to defend Brittany and he didn't

(This page is for your second answer.)

give the North their normal tax rebates ~~the~~ Also the Cornish rebellion which featured in 1497, also showed how ~~little~~ angry the people were that he had raised taxes. These rebellions showed that Henry was never secure in his position as king, and that he did not successfully establish authority over his nobility.

There was also a more significant threat from 1491-1498 from the pretender Perkin Warbeck. The Warbeck plot went on for so many years, that Henry had to ~~make~~ make many foreign policies, for eg Melina del Campo with Spain in 1489 and the treaty of Etaples in 1502, to ensure that Spain and France would not hide any pretenders or aid any ~~people~~ people who may be a threat to his throne. The fact that the Warbeck plot reigned for 7 years, showed that Henry had not established his ~~authority~~ ^{authority} successfully enough over the nobility that people would aid him in capturing Warbeck.

To conclude, I feel that the many plots

(This page is for your second answer.) and uprisings over Henry's reign proved that he had not very successfully established his authority over the country and the nobility, despite ensuring that he had a large coronation ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~king~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~beginning~~ ~~of~~ ~~his~~ ~~reign~~ ~~and~~ ~~showing~~ his intentions to remain king by quickly producing an heir to the throne, Arthur. ~~Arthur~~



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The question concerns Henry's relations with the nobility, but this answer has only an oblique focus on the question. There is reference to Yorkist threats and the Simnel and Warbeck risings, but methods of controlling the nobility through, for example, bonds and recognisances, and attainders, are not addressed. Some material, such as the king's marriage, does not appear relevant. A Level 3 analysis and support.

Paper Summary

Centres might consider the following areas to help improve their candidates' responses:

- a) Answer the question set – are candidates concentrating on the specific wording in the question and the dates covered?
- b) Chronological awareness and application – do candidates know the key dates and are they able to explain/expand points made with accurate reference to the order in which events happened?
- c) Supporting material – are candidates using sufficient relevant, specific and accurate material to support their analysis and, in particular, the conclusions to which they come?
- d) Reaching a judgement - is a relevant and analytical conclusion just placed at the end of a response which makes a series of developed assertions/explanations or does the conclusion reached reflect the argument made and sustained in the main body of the essay?

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US030577 January 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

