

Examiners' Report  
June 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 visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



### 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](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

### 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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2012

Publications Code US032391

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

# Introduction

## General Comments

Examiners reported that many candidates were comfortable with the essential requirements of the examination. They were able to structure their work effectively, provide a range of relevant and accurate material to support the points they were making, and maintain a sustained focus on the question set. At the highest levels of attainment were those who displayed the ability to analyse a range of factors in detail and present a convincing answer overall.

However, there were some candidates who did not do themselves justice overall. A number failed to respond to the specific demands of the questions in front of them. These candidates often focused their answers on material with which they felt comfortable rather than targeting the specifics of the question set. Centres are advised to ensure that candidates are ready to use, and to adapt, the material they have learnt. Most centres use previous questions for revision and preparation for the examination, but they might warn candidates that their paper will consist entirely of previously unseen questions, and that they should be prepared for this uncertainty.

Many candidates became trapped within Level 3 or low Level 4 mark bands because of a lack of accurate and relevant exemplification. Most are able to develop some argument in an answer, but assertions must be supported with sufficient evidence to make these points stand up. In addition, they should explain how these points relate to the question, whether in supporting or challenging the premise of the question.

Many very good answers reached high Level 4, but were unable to access Level 5. It is important to note that otherwise strong answers sometimes stayed in Level 4 for one of two reasons. Firstly, the support material offered, while accurate and broadly relevant, was lacking balance in places, with uneven evidence in parts of the answer. A more widespread concern was that some able candidates were unfamiliar with, or unable to use, analytical concepts and terminology used by historians. While most are able to investigate economic and political factors, many were unsure of the precise meaning of, for example, 'social conditions' in Options A and B, and even 'foreign policy' in Options E and F.

The comments on spelling, punctuation and grammar made in previous reports remain relevant and valid. The literacy curriculum notes that, in a formal setting such as a public examination, appropriate language must be used, and should be free of abbreviations and colloquialisms. It also states that, if a candidate is to communicate effectively, what is written down must be legible. On several occasions this summer examiners could not decipher what might have been key words or phrases, and this inevitably influenced the final mark awarded.

## Question 1

Most answers discussed a number of Viking military skills, but the range of material offered was variable. Higher scoring answers were able to tie these factors to specific battles and actions, often by implication noting some Anglo-Saxon weaknesses. Many pointed out the element of surprise in Viking attacks, whether by longships sailing up rivers, or by the use of horses taken from East Anglia to attack Northumbria and Mercia. The size of Viking armies was commented on, especially the Great Heathen Army of 865, while the powerful leadership provided by Ivarr the Boneless and others was also noted. Less secure answers reported on Viking military prowess in more general terms without reference to the course of events; in the process, the time period in the question tended to be ignored. Anglo-Saxon weaknesses were addressed, notably the organisation of the fyrd, the divisions between the kingdoms, and the lack of clear and cohesive leadership. The internal weaknesses of the kingdoms were mentioned, notably in Northumbria and Mercia. Many answers provided a number of points on Viking strengths and Anglo-Saxon weaknesses, but failed to compare these or to show an understanding of the balance between them.

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~Plan - now for do you agree that the Viking military skills were the main reason for their successes against the Anglo-Saxons in the 860's and 9c?~~

| For                       | Against               |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Besiegers                 | Unarmed               |
| ferocious, fierce         | few associated skills |
| longships                 | punishment for sins.  |
| struck at times (federal) |                       |
| when they were            |                       |
| weakest & less            |                       |
| would be undefended.      |                       |

Conclusion  
Yes eg. longships, besiegers

For Against



(This page is for your first answer.)

How far do you agree that the Vikings' military skills were the main reason for their successes against the Anglo-Saxons in the 860s and 870s?

Starting from the year 793 when the Vikings attacked Lindisfarne they had several decades of success in raiding which led to settling and finally colonising. Their success was due to a combination of contributing factors, however it is probable that it was mainly down to their military tactics, such as the use of Berserkers.

The Vikings were aggressive and brutal and a popular method of attack was a fast raid. This meaning that the Vikings would attack when they were least expected, would violently pillage and raid and leave just as suddenly. Combined with this tactic they also ensured never to take all wealth and property during a raid. They would always leave monasteries or settlements with enough resources to rebuild. This enabled them to return and gain more in consecutive

(This page is for your first answer.) years. These ~~words~~ military tactics greatly contributed to the Vikings success over the Anglo-Saxons.

The Vikings always made sure to consider carefully when to attack and the nature of the area they were attacking. They would often wait until just after a long winter or drought before attacking, thereby ensuring that they would be low on supplies and would be unready and unprepared to defend themselves adequately. A lot of thought was put into the nature of the areas attacking. Initially in early years when they were restricted to merely raiding they chose independent monasteries, usually isolated and therefore an easy target. All tithes and taxes went directly to the church so they were after ~~the~~ <sup>full</sup> at wealth. However in later years as their success and strength increased (as well as the fear associated with them), they attacked settlements before moving onto towns & cities. The tactical planning of where and when to attack certainly helped contribute to the ~~defeat~~ <sup>success</sup>.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~off~~ over the Anglo-Saxons and could also be attributed to military skill.

A crucial advantage the Vikings held over the Anglo-Saxons in terms of military was that of their longships. The Viking longships could contain up to 60 men. They were ~~quick, fast and~~ streamlined, fast and very easy to manoeuvre. Their manoeuvrability was down to the fact they possessed a shallow draft which made them independent of harbours. This allowed for quick and successful attacks. They also used them for patrolling the coast and preventing rebellions. The Viking longship was a key part of the Viking military and was definitely instrumental in their success.

Lastly the Vikings had a group of warriors named the Berserkers. They were greatly feared and were thought to be invincible. They worked themselves into a frenzy before battle and were seemingly totally insensitive to pain. There is a possibility that their state of madness was brought on by the consumption of

(This page is for your first answer.) Hallucinogenic drugs.

The ~~addition~~ <sup>addition</sup> of the Berserker ~~units~~ ensured the Vikings were feared and received little opposition.

On the other hand there are several factors contradicting the ones of military skills being the reason for the Viking success. Such as the fact that England was completely ununified. England was divided into seven kingdoms, known as a heptarchy. The lack of one complete ruler hugely damaged the Anglo-Saxons chances. The divisions of the kingdoms were constantly producing turmoil and internal disputes, often breaking into civil war. Kingdoms were not united against the Vikings and were therefore disadvantaged. This factor contradicts the statement that military skills were the only reason for success.

Secondly there was a huge and almost irrational fear associated with the Vikings. People believed that the Vikings had been sent by God as a punishment

(This page is for your first answer.) for their side. People therefore believed that the Vikings had a god given power and would be indestructible. This added fear towards them produced very little rebellions or attempts to overthrow the Vikings.

In conclusion there are obviously many different contributing factors that culminated in the Vikings success over the Saxons in the years 860's & 870's. However it appears that the weight of the evidence suggests that the dominating factor was that of the Vikings military skill. This combined with the knowledge that the Great Army arrived in 865 starting off the colonisation it appears that military skill was the main reason.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This answer considers a number of Viking methods and tactics, along with the contrary view of Anglo-Saxon disunity and an irrational fear of the Vikings. This is a focused response, though lacking in specific detail to support the points made. Mid Level 4 marks were awarded.



(This page is for your first answer.) How far do you agree that the Vikings' military skills were the main reasons for their successes against Anglo Saxons in the 860s and 870s?

Plan: The inter and intra kingdom skills, the tactics (Geog with draw), compare fyrd and G.H.A. ✓  
Sheer size of G.H.A. used to force Dane geld, draining AS kingdoms.

---

The Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in 865 were presented with a threat that was ~~unseen~~ never seen before, ~~on the~~ the Vikings, a known enemy from years of raiding, combined with leadership and organisation. While the threat was large, it was not unstoppable but the issues of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms presented

(This page is for your first answer.)

the Vikings with, at times, a very simple conquest.

~~The AS kingdoms for a large extent were, not in any state to repel such a foe.~~

The Vikings were able to fully exploit the poor situation of the kingdoms, largely because of the strength of the Great Heathen Army. Arriving in about 300-400 ships in 865, this army contained 5000 professional soldiers, compared with the fyrd, acting as

a militia and, while it is not fair to say that the Fyrd lacked all military talent, they were not the same level as the Viking warriors. This is shown at many points, such as the siege of Nottingham in 867 which allowed the Vikings to escape, or at Wilton where a Viking feigned withdrawal led to the Anglo-Saxon shield wall breaking and subsequent slaughter defeat. While it is true that in these examples the skills of the Vikings are evident, especially the leadership of Ivarr, Halfdan and Ubba, they exploited the weakness of the Fyrd.

Much of the time, however, the Vikings avoided battle by a number of tactics, mainly making the kingdom pay danegeld, as in 865 by making King Edmund, or by supporting a coup as in Mercia in 872. Other than with Wessex the Danegeld did not benefit the Anglo-Saxons, it may have bought time but the at massive monetary cost and with Vikings not always keeping to a bargain (Guthrum used danegeld to leave Wareham but only to get to Exeter). This ability to extort danegeld was mainly from the sheer size and menace of the Great Heathen Army and less the military skill.

More remarkable is the ability of the Vikings to exploit weakness in the political landscape. In 872, instead of fighting in Mercia, the Vikings

supported Coelmeith II in a coup. This is also shown in the initial stages of the conquest, attacking Northumbria, which was drained by civil war stemming from its creation from Deira and Bernicia, and with a recent change in leadership as Aelle had just overthrown Osberht. But, while the Vikings were able to exploit the issues within the kingdoms, they were only

(This page is for your first answer.)

able to do this because the problems were so clear; Northumbria, once jewel of the North had a major civil war unrest leading to unclear power structure that was easy to exploit; Mercia was in decline ever since Offa died.

If the relations within the kingdoms were fraught, they were not as problematic as between kingdoms; any little sense of unity between Wessex and Mercia was dashed as Mercia treated with the Vikings. This led to the kingdoms disunity to the extent of Mercia trying to use the Great Heathen Army as a weapon against East Anglia by allowing them to pass through in 869. Instead of a united England that would have repelled the Vikings, the Vikings found four squabbling kingdoms with each individually weak.

In this way the Vikings military skills did not seem to matter as much as the brute force allowing them to gain control



of the weakest kingdoms. Perhaps this is shown most by Wessex, the strongest Kingdom surviving the Viking attack even though, at times, this seemed doubtful.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer is focused on the question but is quite narrative in form, and lacks a clear conclusion. The stated factor of Viking military skills might have been developed in more detail. High Level 3.

## Question 2

A small number of students were confident enough to consider the whole of Alfred's reign, comparing the problems he faced before Edington with the reform programme carried out after the Treaty of Wedmore. Some failed to give Alfred sufficient credit for his achievements, and failed to identify the explicit implications of the outcome of Edington. In considering Alfred's achievements after 878 candidates often focused on the military and naval reforms which were carried out. The strengthening of the coastal fleets was understood, though the burghal system and the reorganisation of the fyrd appeared to be less well known. Some simply described these reforms without pointing out how well they operated against the incursions of Haesten and the Appledore Vikings in the 890s. Cultural change was usually addressed, but legal and educational reforms were apparently not well known. In some cases candidates were lured into providing a list of Alfred's achievements which led to a narrative response rather than one which assessed the significance of these changes over time.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan

info: after battle with Alfred started on reforms - wanted to establish culture

pg 1 military: fyrd organisation, <sup>burgh</sup> <sup>with establishment</sup>  
Naval, success in Kent

pg 2: religion/learning/governance  
- papacy - religion books - schools

pg 3: law/finance  
- ~~education~~ <sup>education</sup> <sup>is</sup> <sup>near</sup> <sup>on</sup> <sup>both</sup> <sup>finance</sup>  
split into 2 - military & church.

After the <sup>success</sup> ~~success~~ of the Battle of Edington in 878, we ~~see~~ ~~to~~ ~~king~~ ~~Alfred~~ ~~win~~ Alfred win back his kingdom, however this is only the start of Alfred's achievements in which he begins to reform his kingdom to make the Vikings would ~~not~~

(This page is for your first answer.) no longer be a threat. At the battle of Edington the heath of rethmore and the Danelaw was established which created peace with the wing leader Guthrum and ~~was~~<sup>involved</sup> a period ~~of~~ of peace. In his time Alfred begins reforming the ~~rest~~ military, religion and learning and law and finance.

After many years of losing battles against the Vikings, Alfred immediately started to improve the West Saxon military system. The West Saxon fyrd was completely reformed into a standing army which was ~~more~~<sup>made</sup> 'pro-achie' ~~unlike~~ rather than 're-achie'. Alfred split the fyrd into two which meant that while one half was defending the land, the other was farming and at home - they could switch roles every so often. This ~~strategy~~ was evidently successful as when the Vikings returned in 892 the fyrd was able to be summoned quickly and ~~efficiently~~<sup>effectively</sup>. Another reform Alfred did was the establishment of a navy, although this was not an entirely new concept, Alfred made sure that the seas were ~~never~~ never undefended and ships would patrol the coast. Arguably Alfred's main achievement in his

(This page is for your first answer.) Military reforms was his creation of the burghs. These acted as fortified towns and were much like the vikings' fortified camps. The ~~fortified~~ burghs began to be built all across England and were never more than 20 miles away from each other. Along with the burghs a network of roads were established linking them together. This improved the king's mobility as they were able to easily travel from one burgh to the other, in which they would garrison. In the later viking attacks the vikings would stay well clear of the fully built burghs, showing their significance in Alfred's achievements. The burghs did not only have a military purpose, they were also later used as market towns and mints for coins. Overall, Alfred's accomplishments in his military reforms are vital when analysing why viking opposition calmed down after 879 and there is clear evidence to see why and how they were so effective.

Alfred was a strongly religious man and felt that the vikings had been sent as a punishment from God for the moral failings of the Saxons. Alfred began making clear



(This page is for your first answer.) reforms in the religion and ~~education~~ <sup>education</sup> of the west saxon, he also began his great works. ~~Alfred~~ ~~that~~ Alfred believed that re-establishing the significance of religion was just as important as military defence. He began ~~begin~~ in the early 880's by securing relations with the Papacy again by sending gifts and alms, these were used to make the English quarter in Rome. Alfred also began translating key religious texts such as Pope Gregory's pastoral care which was told Priests how to look after their ~~own~~ church and congregation. He also wanted to improve the education of people's lives so set up ~~a school~~ schools for the sons of noblemen ~~where~~ where they would learn to read and write in English and Latin. One of Alfred's main ~~priority's~~ priority's was to establish the English ~~own~~ culture and wanted people like judges and members of the clergy to be able to read and write in English. We are able to see how important literacy became to society as documents ~~as~~ such as tax administration began to start being ~~recorded~~ <sup>recorded</sup> in English. Alfred also began writing his own hand book on his own thoughts and observations and the Anglo-saxon chronicle. Although it is clear

(This page is for your first answer.) That Alfred achieved a great deal in his religious reforms which also influenced education. Alfred was able to develop the English culture through his religious reforms which is ~~one of the~~ one of his greatest achievements.

Lastly, Alfred also began improving the law and finance organisation. As a pious man Alfred took a man's word as ~~holy~~ a promise which could not be broken. He made sure every ~~thing~~ over the age of twelve swore an oath of loyalty to the king and also established 'wer-geld' or blood money. Wer-geld gave everyone value and created a just system. If someone ~~was~~ hurt someone else they would either be killed or punished some other way. Alfred was also able to establish the Dane law with Guthrum ~~which~~ which ensured that the land was divided ~~into~~ between the Vikings and Saxons and caused no more conflict. Alfred's reforms were also expensive and <sup>he</sup> started collecting tax. Alfred split his income into two and made sure half of the money went on reforms or on the military and half ~~was~~ went on reforms for the church. In conclusion, the reforms Alfred established or on

(This page is for your first answer.) improving the law and finance system definitely benefited England and can be accounted as one of Alfred's achievements as we can see how much more structure there was in society.

Overall, the battle of Edington was just the beginning of Alfred's achievements. He made sure that in his reign there were no more brutal Viking attacks which would put his kingdom into danger. He ensured this by his effective military reforms. However, the military reforms are just one aspect of Alfred's achievements, he was also able to establish English ~~culture~~ literature. This is arguably his greatest achievement as it was long-lasting and gave him the title of 'Alfred the Great'.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a direct focus on the question. Many of Alfred's reforms are discussed, with links established between some of them. The success of the reforms overall is evaluated, with secure range and depth of material throughout the answer. Low Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.)

I believe that Alfred the Great's greatest achievements, came after the battle of Edington in 878 because during the 880's Alfred made a number of key reforms that can be regarded as his greatest achievements.

The reforms Alfred made are split in to two sections of society, literary and military.

Alfred believed that the main reason the Vikings were attacking the English Anglo-saxons was because of the Anglo's ~~simplicity~~ simplicity.

Therefore Alfred decided to go about reforming the church. He did this by rebuilding monasteries that were ~~seriously~~ severely damaged from the lightning raids made by the Vikings.

(This page is for your first answer.) And in some parts of his realm built 3 whole monasteries from scratch. This can be seen as one of Alfred's greatest achievements as he gave hope to his people that if God was on their side, the building of monasteries to worship, the Vikings would leave.

Another literary reform made by Alfred to be one of his greatest achievements could be the education system. This education allowed the translation of Latin text to English. For example in the 880's 13 books known as



were translated by Alfred and his men.<sup>H</sup> These books included 'The Plough' and 'The History of English people' also pope Gregory's readings were translated. This education system was also a great achievement as it allowed everybody the opportunity to learn to read. So therefore even farmers/peasants could understand letters passed on by messengers. This is a great achievement because being able to read meant many of Alfred's people could be warned about Vikings approaching their land.

Literary reforms were seen as some of Alfred's greatest achievements as in a way it gave people safety and

(This page is for your first answer.) allowed the expansion of Wessex.

However, historians know that Alfred didn't just make literary reforms after 878, but military too.

Arguably, one of Alfred's greatest achievements was the reorganisation of the fyrd. This re-organisation of the fyrd allowed Alfred to have a stable and ready defence for whenever the Vikings decided to attack. This can definitely be seen as one of the king of Wessex's greatest achievements as it gave stability for the people of Wessex. However for the reorganisation of the fyrd the men needed to stay somewhere on their three month job. This was done by the use of Burhs. Burhs were small fortified

towns which were based along trade routes, no  
Burh was further than twenty miles away from  
the next one.  
each other. This gave safety from the Vikings  
as Back up was just a days march away.  
One Another one of Alfred's greatest achievements  
was to fall under the category of coastal defence.  
This involved the Navy. Alfred was the first  
dominant power in all the history of England  
to set a Navy up. This Navy was important  
as it hindered the Vikings' naval sea dominance.

(This page is for your first answer.) and their quickest way to  
pursue fighting raids. This is seen as one of  
his ~~own~~ ~~is~~ ~~believe~~ ~~that~~ ~~Alfred's~~ ~~the~~ greatest  
achievements as it allowed ~~an~~ ~~more~~ ~~more~~ time  
to be organised for when the Vikings did eventually  
reach Anglo soil.

Overall I do believe that Alfred, King  
of Wessex, achieved his greatest achievements after  
the battle of Edington in 878. As a number of  
vital reforms were made <sup>in the 880s</sup> so that Alfred could  
defeat the Vikings.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

The answer focuses on the question and considers a number of Alfred's reforms. However, development, explanation and evaluation of these reforms are not secure. The reorganisation of the fyrd, the burhs and naval defences are all partially developed, but there are significant weaknesses and inaccuracies elsewhere. Mid Level 3.

### Question 3

The most successful answers compared the two battles factor by factor rather than dealing with Stamford Bridge and then Hastings. Leadership, tactics, size of armies and simple luck featured highly. This obviated the need to spend too much time on one battle at the expense of another. Others showed a good understanding of both battles and the reasons for their different outcomes. Most noted that Gataferpud had weakened Haradrada's forces somewhat, and that he was unprepared for Godwinson's sudden appearance in the north. For many students, however, Stamford Bridge was not considered as a separate event in its own right, but as one of the reasons for the subsequent outcome at Hastings. Some answers became imbalanced, with Stamford Bridge dealt with briefly before a long section being offered on Hastings. Only a few fully appreciated the significance of Stamford Bridge other than as a means of tiring out Harold's army. Several answers dealt with the preparations for Hastings apparently believing that the outcome was certain. The battle was unusually long for its time, suggesting that the outcome was not certain from the outset.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Harold Godwinson was able to defeat Harold Godwinson at Stamford Bridge on the 25<sup>th</sup> September 1066 with great leadership skills and preparation yet he was unable to defeat William of Normandy at Hastings due to William's use of Cavalry, in addition with his use of Archers and infantry as well as the important factor of Harold's weakened and going to the Pope's support.

On the 25<sup>th</sup> September 1066, Harold Godwinson, the 'Harold' who was one of the three aimed with Tostig (Harold's brother) and attacked England from the North. Harold who was well aware of the potential invasion marched up North with remarkable speed covering 180 miles in four days and was able to mount a surprise attack on Harold and Tostig's army, which ultimately resulted in his defeat. Harold was able to defeat Godwinson, it can be said through great leadership skills and the composition of his fighters and horse archers. Harold continually promised his troops that they had never lost a battle under his leadership and his previous battles in Wales against Llewelyn Gwynedd provided him with more

(This page is for your first answer.) Confidence to suppress and defeat Hurdvada's army. Before the battle, Harold had promised Hurdvada '7 feet of English Soil' - referring to his grave, which is evidence of how confident he was and prepared for battle. This is also supported by the fact that Hurdvada lost 40,000 men, due to his overconfidence and surprise attacks by Harold.

Nevertheless, Harold was unable to defeat William of Normandy at Hastings which ultimately resulted in his death and defeat of the Anglo Saxons.

William was immensely experienced in battles at Normandy, and his successes at Ules du nes, Uvoville where the King of France was defeated three times. In addition with his defeat of the Count of Maine where only some of the few testaments of William's military experience. This ended

~~In addition William to enter battle~~

In addition, William had employed the use of Cavalry during battles which was the essential difference between the two armies. This represented a new type of society - that is, the knight was to pay his homage and serve the King in the army. William had thousands of men on horseback and organised them in units called *carroi*. This allowed communication to be made easier and each soldier knew the position and role in the army. Further, knights were trained from the age of 5 on horseback and knew how to kill without mercy. Nurses too, were trained how to bite and kick their opponents. William also used Cavalry effectively prior



(This page is for your first answer.) To the battle of Hastings, ~~as shown by~~ for example, the Germans were defeated at the battle of Civitate in 1053 by the skilled use of lances by the Normans whilst on horseback. This is evidence of how important the cavalry were, and can be said to be the main factor as to why Harold was unable to defeat William at Hastings.

Furthermore, William's claim to the conquest and his success at Hastings, was largely driven by the addition of archers and infantry at battle which provided him with more flexibility and organisation. William wanted to defeat Harold's army by weakening the Anglo Saxon's through a battle of 'attrition'. He did this by setting his archers at the front row, who would shoot arrows after arrows and quickly followed by infantry who would engage in close combat. This was a new style of warfare that the Anglo Saxon's had never seen before and so this was very significant to William's success. In order to break the Normans' shield wall of the Anglo Saxon's the archers and infantry were essential to a large extent. Moreover, it can be said that William was lucky in the sense that Harold's military skills at Hastings were very poor and very predictable. This was clearly shown by the so-called 'feigned retreat' whereby it was claimed that Harold's right flank broke up and chased the Normans down the hill, which was clearly a great fault as they were easily circled and mowed down by Norman cavalry. The Anglo Saxon's didn't learn from his mistake and ironically allowed William to retreat only the feigned retreat for three more times which resulted in heavy casualties from the Anglo

(This page is for your first answer.) So as you said. In war, it is essential that you adapt to the changing conditions of battle, and this will only be achieved if you have that haste and great leadership skills. Hudd on the contrary was very predictable in his next move and his poor leadership skills at Hastings resulted in his downfall to a great extent. This said, the use of Norman Cavalry seems to be more important in Harold's defeat as it gave him more mobility and more of a threat which Hudd could not defeat.

Moreover, Hudd's success at Stamford Bridge, meant that he needed to return south where William had landed at Pevensey Bay in Sussex. Hudd marched rapidly south to the south, and it was claimed his troops covered 29 miles in how which undoubtedly would make them tired by the time they reached Hastings. In addition, Hudd's over confidence, meant that he decided against reinforcing his 40,000 men with troops from London which was a big mistake to his defeat at Hastings. Many historians believe that if Hudd was more confident with the ability of his men and instead reinforced them he could have inflicted more hardship on William and might have won at Hastings. However, on the contrary, it may be that Hudd decided to march south without reinforcing because he wanted to provide a surprise attack on William, as with Harold. Also, the fatigue of his men, might not have been as significant as his success at Stamford Bridge could be said to have given him more morale.

(This page is for your first answer.) and confidence.

Finally, ~~the~~ Harold's willens claim to the conquest and his success at Hastings, was largely a cause of the pope's support given to him prior to the battle of Hastings. William pruned to reform the English church, once he invaded England in areas such as simony, nepotism and pluralism and also promoted the peace of God movement which the pope was greatly in favour of. As this, he was able to march in Hastings with the papal banner and his troops became even more confident as now 'God was on his side' and they had a case to fight for, unlike Harold any who were fighting to secure more than anything else. This said, although this was an important factor to Harold's defeat at Hastings, the case of Wynn's crusades can be seen as more important as this set the stage for the battle itself and without it, even the pope's support may be seen as insignificant although at a time of deep religious era.

Overall, Harold Harold showed great military and leadership skills at ~~start~~ upon Harold's defeat and his quick movements him to defeat the king of Norway and his brother Tostig with great admiration. Yet he was unable to react as successful a defeat on William, which was largely determined by William's use of cavalry which represented a new type of society and was the essential difference between the two armies. In addition, William employed effective use of ~~arches~~ arches and infantry and his fatigue from the battle of Stamford bridge at Hastings all in one week's duration was a significant factor of his defeat to William. The pope's support

(This page is for your first answer.) Was also significant at a time of deep religious war and aided his success at Hastings. This would however, it goes without doubt that cavalry was the most significant tool for helping success and Harold's defeat at Hastings, as it determined the actual military organisation and the new type of society that ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> the English had never seen before. Many historians believe that without the ~~use~~ <sup>use</sup> of cavalry, all the other factors would not have been ~~so~~ <sup>so</sup> sufficient ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> implant a defeat on Harold.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is an analytical response. The first section is a little light on range of material, but this is picked up again later in the essay when more range and depth are both offered. Hastings is well developed, and the conclusion provides comparisons and an analysis for Godwinson's success and failure. Low Level 5.



(This page is for your first answer.) plan: more military skills, better soldier.

Sent fyrd - no opposition.

luck for William - wind.

more Calvary. Harold didn't get a fresher army. - Melnears

Harold Godwinson was crowned king ~~on~~ on the <sup>day</sup> death of Edward the Confessor's death; 5th of January 1066. Edward had made a death bed-bequest that Harold should be his successor due to the fact he remained loyal to Edward throughout his reign and was the most likely contestant to be accepted by nobles for his great military skills. Other contestants ~~to~~ yearning to be succeeded included William of Normandy, Harold Hardrada and Edgar the Atheling.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~2~~ Harold Godwinson

realised he faced serious opposition from William and maintained coastal defences in the south. However, he had fallen out with his brother Tostig, after failing to assist him in the almost impossible task of crushing a rebellion against his authority in Northumbria. It it was not for this he would there would have been no battle on Stamford.

Therefore, he sided with Hardrada creating the battle of Stamford Bridge. Here Tostig sailed 300 ships over from Norway to the north to meet Hardrada + march onto York together. Although Harold Godwinson was a

Much more effective military leader and knew how cavalry worked. This is evident through which he sent the Welsh prince's head Guffedd to Edward in 1062. <sup>Haradrada was begged and both him + Tostig were defeated.</sup> This is a reason why Godwinson was able to defeat the King of Norway, Haradrada at Stamford Bridge on the 25th of September 1066. This was a bloody battle in that 200 ships were needed to bring the remnants back to Normandy.

Although, Godwinson was unable to defeat his ~~second~~ <sup>opponent</sup> William of Normandy at the Battle of Hastings 1066. This was due to the fact he had sent his fyrd home for harvest. Due to William's superior political skills he had made Harold Godwinson wait

(This page is for your first answer.) and anticipate ~~to~~ his attack, and after Godwinson, after waiting two extra months had to send his army of peasants home for harvest, leaving him scarcely protected and unprepared for an attack. This then meant that William faced no opposition when he arrived in the North.

Another factor that contributed to Harold being unable to defeat William at Hastings was William's luck. Whilst Godwinson was up in the South defeating Haradrada and Tostig, the winds had changed and William was able to set sail on the 27th of September 1066, ~~at~~ and arrived in the North <sup>in Pevensey</sup> on the 28th September 1066.

Harold Godwinson, upon hearing this, then ~~he~~ marched his ~~as~~ fyrd back North from the South in less than 3 weeks. By the time they arrived his army must have been very tired. Although Harold could have delayed in order to gain a bigger and fresher army ~~as~~ as many of his housecarls and thegns must have suffered losses. Although, Harold still went ahead and confronted William of

in alive. Ahrs.

(This page is for your first answer.) Normandy. William had a superior army with cavalry, ~~with~~ which Harold Godwinson did not. William was also well prepared in that he had loaded his ships with food and supplies. Although, Harold was a good military leader so was William evident through which he made a number of feigned and real retreats. Harold Godwinson's army ran down their advantageous superior position on top of Senlac Ridge to chase after them, which led to William then turning around and defeating them. During this battle there was a rumour that William had died. William, due to his good leadership, then raised his hat and shouted that he was alive. His army then came on with the attack. This ~~is~~ a factor that may have contributed to Harold Godwinson being defeated ~~in~~ in 1066, possibly ~~through an~~ <sup>due to an</sup> arrow going through eye. Although, stories differ in the Bayeux tapestry.



Although, Harold Godwinson was defeated  
~~at~~ at the Battle of Hastings his great  
military skills were shown through the fact  
the battle of Hastings lasted nine hours

(This page is for your first answer.) of a hard fought battle. However,  
his few mistakes including sending his  
pyrd home and his dispute with Tost, contributed  
to William's victory. William was crowned  
king on Christmas day 1066 at  
Westminster Abbey.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer is descriptive in form, and there is some irrelevant material. The answer becomes more focused in the last two pages, but is lacking both range and detailed development. Low Level 3.

## Question 4

Some candidates had difficulty with the focus of the question, considering how William gained control of England rather than why resistance to the Normans was unsuccessful. Others adopted a chronological approach, running through the attempts to challenge William, and the Norman response to these challenges. Few noted that William's attitude towards rebels changed over time, from some initial conciliatory gestures to the Harrying of the North. More effective answers discussed the impact of disjointed and localised rebellions, and the absence of effective leadership of the English. Some described the building of castles without pointing out that these allowed a small number of Normans to control a much larger English population. Some of the best answers noted the failures of English resistance, and pointed out that William gradually began to exercise far more power, in government and the Church, than his English predecessors had done, making the suppression of unrest much easier over time.

(This page is for your first answer.) Why was English resistance to the Norman Conquest so unsuccessful in the years after 1066?

The English resistance to the Norman Conquest was so unsuccessful after 1066 as William had a great well organised army, built castles and consolidated power.

The English resistance was unsuccessful as the rebellions created by the English had no threat towards the Normans as for example the first uprising in Kent were unable to create panic as it was just one town <sup>against William</sup> rebelling which was fairly far away and had little impact. However the ~~the~~ Northern rebellion ~~caused~~ 'Harrying of the North' was far worse. Thus meaning that the English resistance against Norman conquest was unsuccessful. However the midland uprising was more important and dangerous

(This page is for your first answer.) as because it was in the middle of the country it allowed other places to start rebellions, William actually went down and approached the problem

personally; this shows ~~that~~ how dangerous the resistance was as he personally appeared at the rebellion. ~~Although~~ Although the English resistance was a failure, this particular uprising caused panic and did create resistance to the Norman Conquest even though William ended it.

The English resistance was unsuccessful after the battle of Hastings as William introduced Normanisation into England. ~~The English were~~ He combined Anglo-Saxon laws with Anglo-Norman laws; this implies that William didn't ~~or~~ eliminate every part that was Anglo-Saxon but intertwined them in order to create a better well governed country thus meaning that there was little resistance as William was benefitting country. William also had a great belief of reform, ~~and~~ with the monasteries and churches being misused by the bishops, William wanted to change the corruptions under his government as many

(This page is for your first answer.) of them had a string of mistresses and wives even though they signed a law of celibacy. This means that the corruption was being mended which again helped <sup>As a</sup> Norman England become a better country which implies little resistance.

The use of castles helped make the English resistance to the Norman conquest unsuccessful as <sup>a means of political improvement</sup> they were a way of

William consolidating power wherever evidence of the English were unhappy in a certain area William built a castle in order to ~~keep~~ maintain peace. In order for William to control England he had to also control Scotland and Wales, which he did again by creating castles along the Border. This implies a lack of resistance as people were unwilling and incapable of opposing the well organised, well disciplined Norman Army Military.

Overall William's leadership was enough to make the English resistance unsuccessful as he ~~also~~ Normanised the churches into a typical Norman Romanesque style, ~~mission~~ and controlled the country and it was politically and economically stable.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a secure focus on the question, but equally there is a marked lack of precise and accurate detail that leaves the answer somewhat lacking in development. Low Level 4.

(This page is for your first answer.) Eng resistance unsuccessful

- time & geography
- lack of leadership
- ~~no~~ no any alliance
- William's military power - castles, cathedrals

The English resistance during the Norman conquest would have been unsuccessful because William I was continuously consolidating his reign, which meant that any sign of resistance, he would want to put down as quickly as possible. Not only ~~was~~ it wasn't only William's military strength that led to the lack of success of the English resistance, but also the lack of geographical and timing co-ordination, lack of leadership and the failure of the non-~~to~~ ~~English~~ alliances.

(This page is for your first answer.) The English resistance after the Norman conquest was so unsuccessful due to the lack of coordination in both geography and timing. The geography of the resistance prevented the English resistance from being successful. The south western ~~resistance~~ rebellions of 1067-9 occurred ~~at~~ at Exeter and Devon and Cornwall. <sup>around similar</sup> Although they occurred at ~~the same~~ times, little success was occurred. This rebellion was then followed by the Northern rebellion of 1067. ~~Though~~ Although in 1069 two rebellions were



occurring in the north and south, they were easily put down to ~~th~~ due to their geographical divide which prevented any clear co-ordination of forces, which in turn limited the effectiveness and success of the resistances. Timmy was also a key as to why the rebellions during <sup>the</sup> conquest were unsuccessful. The ~~longer~~ <sup>farther</sup> into the conquest the rebellions occurred ~~the~~ the easier they were to put down. This was due to the fact that William I systematically built castles ~~to~~ after each rebellion which limited any further resistance. ~~This can be seen~~ ~~in~~ the well garrisoned and allowed

(This page is for your first answer.) on ~~easy~~ putting down of resistance. ~~The~~

✱ (1073) and therefore was easily put down.

The lack of leadership prevented the English resistance from being successful.  
The south western rebellions of 1069-9

had the potential to succeed due to the potential leadership they had. During these rebellions Harold Godwinson's 3 sons came over from Ireland. Being Harold's sons you'd expect them to have a drive and a passion to restore the Anglo-saxon monarchy after the death of their father. However, their leadership wasn't successful, because they were not Harold, they didn't have the same

(This page is for your first answer.) skills in leadership as he did which weakened the leadership of those rebellions. There was also the potential ~~of~~ of great leadership during the Northern rebellions of ~~1066~~ 1069. Edgar Aetheling of the royal House of Wessex, along with Malcolm King of Scotland were involved in this rebellion. ~~It had the potential to~~ ~~cause~~ ~~as~~ Edgar ~~to~~ could have threatened William's reign considering his blood kinship with the previous King Edward the Confessor. This attempt however was weak and was easily put down by William I. This lack of ~~these~~ strong and successful leadership prevented any clear, common cause as to why the Anglo-saxon people should revolt. Without a cause to fight ~~for~~ for this would have caused <sup>the</sup> fragmentation of rebellions and ~~the~~ reduce the likelihood of the English resistance being successful. The

any example of strong leadership can be seen in the first anglican rebellions under the leader Hereward the Wake. He was a charismatic leader who suggested the use of guerilla warfare as they had the advantage of knowing the land. However the resistance was too far into the conquest.

(This page is for your first answer.) The success of the English resistance ~~was~~ was unsuccessful due to the involvement of non-english alliances. The ~~at~~ Midlands rebellions and the Northern rebellions are clear examples of the problems these alliances caused during the English resistance. The midlands rebellions had the involvement of the Welsh, especially the Welsh princes. The Welsh were known for plundering along the English border ~~at~~ and would have seen the opportunity to plunder further and wreck devastation rather than fight for the injustices of the Norman conquest. This is further illustrated by the Northern rebellions and the involvement of the Danes. They also saw the opportunity to plunder York, which they did. After the initial plunder, they retreated with their spoils. They were also bought off by William I ~~the~~ with promise of further plunder. Showing that the alliance with the Danes was superficial. Any alliance with non-english people would weaken



the success of the resistance as they

(This page is for your first answer.) were not interested in the Norman conquest, nor the reassertion of the Anglo-saxon monarchy. They had their own agendas which meant that the Anglo-saxon people relying on their help would be let down.

William's military strength reduced the success of the English resistance. William was a keen castle builder and chose to build castles in areas where royal authority was weak. This is seen in the Northern rebellion where he built two castles at York. But he also built castles after every rebellion. The castles represented symbolised the conquest and the fact that the Anglo-saxon people were now ruled over by a foreign king. Castles were also built in strategic positions such as Chester castle, which was built to monitor the link between the north and the Midlands. Also Wigmore castle was built on the Welsh border to monitor the potential Welsh invasions. These strategic positions allowed William to monitor the Anglo-English countryside and react allowed quick reactions

(This page is for your first answer.) to any potential uprising. These castles prevented further rebellions (as they were garrisoned) but also sym



oppressed the local people. The fact that William personally dealt with the rebellions also made the resistance unsuccessful. This especially is illustrated with how he dealt with York after the northern rebellions. The episode known as the Harry of the North shows the brutality of William. Yorkshire According to the chronicler Orderic Vitalis everyone was killed ranging from men to children. Also he created artificial famine by burning the crops and killing the animals. According to the Domesday book 80% of Yorkshire was 'waste' or wasteland. Such brutality would incite fear into any future rebellions which would have reduced their success.

It also the further into the conquest the rebellions were occurring the more difficult it was to be successful due to the number of

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~castles~~ which allowed a rapid response. They were also built at a 15 mile radius apart allowing a rather detailed observation of the Anglo-saxon countryside. In conclusion the English resistance was unsuccessful due to their lack of co-ordinating, lack of leadership, the failure of the

non-english alliances and William's military strength. William's strength was key to the lack of success as he has inst continuous control buildys throughout his reign and his brutalif and uncompromising nature prevented the English resistance from ever being successful.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

There is plenty of range and depth on display here, though without a clear conclusion. The answer is analytical in form and understands some of the key issues raised by the question. Perhaps a little of a list, but sufficient analysis with accurate and relevant support for high Level 4.

## Question 5

It was unusual to see that many candidates were unable to address very clearly Henry's reforming attitude towards the Church, nor the reasons for his involvement in Church affairs. The role of Becket was sometimes mentioned, though his quarrel with the king was seen as personal rivalry rather than an important dispute about the rights of the Church. Many were able to describe a number of reforms in substantial detail, notably the changes in the legal system and in the Exchequer, and Henry's reassertion of royal power over nobles and sheriffs was also well known. Some did not manage to show the extent and success of the reforms in terms of the reassertion of royal power and authority after the conflict between Stephen and Matilda. Many thus missed the contextual focus of the question, which was a shame as these candidates clearly had plenty of knowledge. There was a clear difference in attainment between those who described and assessed a number of reforms and those who considered the extent to which these reforms suggested that Henry could be judged a great reforming monarch.

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: |                                     |             |                                     |             |                                     |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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.) *How accurate is it to describe Henry II as a great reforming monarch?*

*Henry II inherited a vast empire, the largest Europe had seen for centuries; with it however came the difficulties of keeping it secure from forces within and out. A crucial part of his Empire was his kingdom of England and in order to keep this secure and efficiently under his control he instigated many law reforms, for which history has often labelled him great. However one can rightly question how great these reforms were and if they were even the greatest part of his legacy, for there were other ways in which he secured his empire.*

*From the outset of his reign Henry strove to make*

*request of sheriffs  
curiae baronum  
assize of clarendon  
exchequer  
rigid  
common law reforms  
itinerant justices  
consolidation of power  
efficiency  
not just reforms*

the enforcement of his law ~~with~~ more efficient and  
similarly more profitable. He immediately reinstated his  
grandfather Henry I's ~~own~~ treasurer Bishop Nigel of Ely

(This page is for your first answer.) in his old office. He was eventually  
succeeded by his son Richard Fitz Nigel who wrote an  
unprecedented guide to the exchequer. The exchequer reached new  
levels of efficiency; a Beirham of Boff's debt records remained on  
the rolls for seventeen years, many of which he had  
been dead until his eventual son-in-law paid the remaining  
£9 debt. This shows that with his great Empire Henry  
was intent ~~of~~ on getting the most from his lands, England  
at least, as was possible. However this was no great  
reform, it was a much needed and beneficial step  
forwards to a better future, but one inspired by the past.

Henry also was keen to survey the land under his control,  
a measure to ensure his control <sup>over</sup> and benefit from his lands.  
In 1166 he introduced the ~~Great~~ <sup>old</sup> ~~Baron~~ <sup>franchise and</sup> ~~Baron~~  
to record what was owed to him in terms of land,  
taxes and military service from his tenants-in-chief,  
particularly impressive was ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ ~~it~~ ~~revealed~~  
what was owed from tenants both great and small,  
Henry wished to survey all his landowners. Again this was  
an impressive step forward but reminiscent of the Domesday  
book many years earlier it was not a magnificent  
reform.

It was not just his income which Henry wished to  
keep in order but also his law. Henry ~~was~~ ~~not~~



(This page is for your first answer.) worked hard to ensure a common law in England, reforms which included a universal use of trial by water and that oaths be taken always by all jurors and sworn over the bible. It made his law in England easier to enforce and preside over if there were not confusions and disputes between various courts and communities. Henry similar tried to bring church courts under the influence of the secular courts and his law. This ~~was~~ raised tensions between the church and state very high and was much of the reason for the dispute between Henry and his archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Becket. Henry was ~~perhaps~~ pushing his reforms ~~too~~ beyond what all his subjects were pleased by.

A successful example of Henry's legal reforms can be seen in the inquest of the sheriffs in 1170. The inquest went into very impressive detail and was a move by Henry to reassert more authority and to ~~ensure~~ reassure that he was ~~now~~ viewed as a <sup>positive</sup> ~~great~~ reformer, after a four year absence. It was enquired after and reported malpractice by sheriffs throughout the country which had been a growing problem in England for decades. Of the 154 sheriffs in place nearly all were replaced as a result of the inquest: a remarkable feat for Henry's law-reforming intentions.

(This page is for your first answer.) Henry ~~was not only~~ did not only possess the ability to ~~reform~~ make reforms, ~~John~~ historian John Gillingham describes Henry the law-maker as Henry Part II. For when Henry came to

power he was a young, energetic and charismatic young prince, credit must be given to Henry for the way he secured and held on to power in his lands and not just the way he reformed them. Henry's kingship was itinerant, he travelled around his lands constantly and with both charm and intelligent law making he held the support of the majority of his nobles. He was similarly able to extend his realm with an overlordship of Ireland having allied himself successfully to the King of Leinster. Henry held the borders of his realm, even when his own sons and Phillip II of France should have to deny him this. Working with his son Richard he put down rebellion in Wales by his son Geoffrey and by his death in 1189 had not allowed Phillip to take over any of his lands.

To conclude Henry did ~~not~~ take large and successful steps in reforming England, much was new but much was not. It cannot be ignored also that he had much military success and an impressive personality which led to a largely successful rule. It is impossible to view Henry as a great reformer, nothing less and nothing more.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The introduction considers the scope of the question very carefully, and the answer is directly focused. There is an explicit understanding of key issues, supported by accurate and relevant material which is broadly balanced. An attempt to provide some counter-argument takes the answer to low Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Opposition to King John's rule

~~Why was it bitter? - first meeting argument was because he  
he murdered the two princes~~ Richard

How accurate is it to describe Henry II as a great reforming monarch.

Reforms - Constitutions of Clarendon 1164 ✓

Assizes of Clarendon 1166 ✓

Wanted to take the way he ruled the government back to the ways of his grandfather Henry 1st 1135 ✓

Pipe rolls

Inquest of the Sheriffs - What Sheriffs owed ✓

Cartae Baronum - 1166 - look ✓

1215 - Magna Carta - failure - Stop barons from becoming over mighty. Could be argued that it was good & new rule in fact it wasn't Philip, Henry 1st to used similar methods ✓

Not great reforming monarch in the end - did not

(This page is for your second answer.)

Change that much - in fact took the reforms backwards ~~then~~ could argue taking a step back, not forward

Reforms church laws, financial reforms - exchequer - gets H.I.'s exchequer to become his - ~~generally~~

Can't control own sons - how was he a great reforming monarch?

Essay

You could argue that it is accurate to describe Henry II as a great reforming monarch. He reforms church laws, makes financial reforms and reforms the government.

But by doing this you could also argue that really his reforms that he made were not really his own but his grandfather's (Henry I).

Firstly, it is accurate to say that Henry II was a great reforming monarch. His administrative reforms such as the request of the Sheriff, Cartae Baronum (1166), the Assizes of Clarendon (1166) and the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164) all benefited the realm in some way. Henry II ruled the Angevin empire, that practically came together by mistake. Until he crowned his son Henry the Younger as he was worried about his succession. His sons Henry, Geoffrey, Richard and John all got a part of this geographically well bounded

(This page is for your first answer.) empire.

The constitutions of Clarendon (1164) set out 16 constitutions that people had to abide by. The constitutions were law reforms and in 1166 the Assizes of Clarendon reinstated those reforms.

Moreover, the request of the Sheriff was introduced by Henry II ~~to see what the Sheriff~~ as the Sheriff were Henry's key administrative people he got them to take ~~taxes~~ of who owed him (lords or money) and get them back. Obviously this was beneficial to the king & the realm, increasing income in the treasury.

Furthermore, Carta Baronum (1166) ~~was set~~ ~~and~~ and the famous Magna Carta in 1215. Henry ~~however~~ all of these reforms ~~that~~ introduced the standardisation and writing down of taxes etc on pipe rolls.



However, all of these reforms that Henry put in place were not new reforms. Henry wanted to take the times of his ruling & the ways in which he governed the realm back to the times of his grandfather (Henry I).

For example, Magna Carta in 1215 was basically put in place to protect Henry & prevent ever-increasing barons & nobles being a threat. Some historians would argue that it was great but when you

(This page is for your first answer.) More closely at it, in fact it wasn't. It barely achieved anything and Philip and Henry the 1<sup>st</sup> had used the same process before when they had problems with barons & nobles but they and the church but they never put a name to it.

So, when you look more closely at the arguments how accurate is it to describe Henry II as a great reforming monarch the answer is clear that you can't describe Henry II as a great reforming monarch.

His reforms were not new and perhaps didn't work as well as they should have because he was trying to use methods of governing that his grandfather used in 1135 and times had changed. You could argue that as he was trying to rule the realm like Henry 1<sup>st</sup> he took reforms backwards and took a step back at the same time.

An example of this was when he brought wanted his grandfather's exchequer to be in charge of

the his finances & the treasury. He wanted  
the Bishop of Ely to become his exchequer like  
in the times of his grandfather. This was a  
bad move by Henry because the bishop of Ely  
was getting too old to become exchequer

(This page is for your first answer.) and only knew how to work  
the finances of the Henry I era.

Not finished. See p. 11.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The question is dealt with directly through most of the answer, it considers extent, and offers a challenge to the question, although that is lacking in depth overall. The last few paragraphs stray out of focus, and the conclusion is a little brief. High Level 3.

## Question 6

Many candidates seemed well prepared and knowledgeable about the reign of King John. The best answers displayed considerable range, and addressed matters such as royal finances, the losses in Normandy, and John's apparently scandalous private life, and were able to prioritise these factors. The terms 'Angevin despotism' and 'financially exhausting the empire' were repeated in many answers, but with varying degrees of understanding. It should be noted that the king's quarrels with both the English church and the papacy, the Interdict of 1208 and John's excommunication the following year, were only rarely mentioned. Links between these factors and the growth of baronial opposition were often well made, but only a handful of answers went beyond Magna Carta to consider the First Barons' War of 1215-16. Only a few candidates explained the use of the term 'bitter' in the question. Where the word was used, it tended to be as a statement rather than an explanation. Many implied that opposition to John grew steadily worse, but did not really address reasons for this change.

(This page is for your first answer.)

R15 - Magna Carta - climax of events

PLAN

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| John's personality                                    | long term                         |
| - Arthur of Brittany                                  | - Angevin Despotism               |
| - Treatment of de Broose family                       | - Financial instability           |
| - Constant presence in England                        | - Long term weaknesses            |
| - Taxes, closure of independent courts at Westminster | - Richard + crusade               |
| - Treatment of the Lusignan                           | - Henry plus castles              |
|   | - Philip Augustus                 |
|   | ↓<br>Richard's involvement of war |

- P1 (INTRO) - long term, not John personally
- P2 - Closure of independent courts + French ministers
- P3 - Arthur of Brittany + Des Roches
- P4 - De Broose / Marshall / 28 sons of Welsh chieftans
- P5 - BUT! long term weaknesses left by father + KI
- P6 - Philip Augustus
- P7 - Financial instability
- conc - Not John's fault.

(This page is for your first answer.) Although John has gone down in history as the infamous "wicked" prince whose terrible reign accumulated so much bitter resentment that he was forced to legally sign away feudal rights in 1215, it would be inaccurate to carry his ~~big~~ Whig view forward when accounting for the opposition John experienced during his reign. The long term weaknesses of the Angevin Empire not to mention the incredibly weak hereditary situation left to him by his supposedly magnificent brother added to Anglo-Norman despotism were the main reasons for bitter opposition <sup>during</sup> ~~against~~ John's reign; not the man himself.

Before we can conclude with this argument however, we must firstly explore the arguments that it was John's personality that sparked the opposition. When John was forced to fight for his kingdom in 1202, his military successes earned him Arthur of Brittany along with the Lusignan brothers on July 31<sup>st</sup> 1202. The most important noble in John's army, William



(This page is for your first answer.) de Roches, knowing John's violent nature, asked if he could be responsible for Arthur of Brittany. John's unacceptably vicious response caused great bitterness between him and his chief leader, resulting in him having to fight a two front war with de Roches. The subsequent rumours that he had then brutally murdered his nephew in 1203 led to the revolt of the Bretons, whose ~~best~~<sup>violent</sup> opposition helped to end John's Empire.

When John returned to England permanently in 1204, the independent courts at Westminster (set up by Henry II) allowed land disputes to be tried in a fair and reasonably unbiased manner. When, however, the king closed these courts in 1206 and sat on the judge's bench himself, all anger and resentment that a baron may feel at his cases refusal was directed at him. For instance, the Earl of Arundel was denied his inheritance by John.

(This page is for your first answer.) For five years, resulting in his joining the rebels of 1214-1215 when they occupied London. The closure of the independent courts and the installation of foreign ministers such as de Artois as Warden of the Welsh Marches caused bitter resentment as the barons felt that John was overruling their "ancient liberties".

John's cruel and violent nature led to bitter opposition, as seen in his treatment of William de Brocasse. De Brocasse had served John faithfully during his attempts to regain his lands however on ~~his~~ <sup>John's</sup> return to England in 1204, coincided with an act of extreme paranoia. Convinced that William Marshal and William de Brocasse were plotting against him, he stripped them of their titles and demanded hostages. When Matilda de Brocasse refused to surrender her son because of what had happened to Arthur of Brittany resulted in John hounding her out of Ireland and capturing her in 1210.

(This page is for your first answer.) He then watched Catter demanding a 40,000 mark ransom/ her and her son starve to death. Actions such as these could not endear John to the population and it resulted in bitter opposition to him. John also hanged in 1212 28 sons of Welsh chieftans whom he felt were plotting against him. Despite this however, although John's personality was not of a lovable disposition, he acted only as his predecessors had before him. John's actions mimicked his brother's who had slaughtered 2000 "infidels" / innocent captives in 1191. ~~That~~ It was the long term results of a population overwhelmed with Angevin despotism that bitterly resented not John's rule but the Angevin government in general. Because John simply was the one under whom all these problems amassed. It is in his reign in which we see the accumulation of bitter resentment.

(This page is for your first answer.) It had been Richard in around 1186/7 who had firstly highlighted the weaknesses of the Angevin Empire and the importance of Philip Augustus when he had appealed to him for help in fighting against his father. Since that point, ~~the~~ the Angevin's had been more susceptible to Capetian meddling (such as the Lusignan in 1201) and it was this that weakened the Angevin Empire. Those such as the Counts of Lusignan who resented John ~~had~~ could do so, not because of John's actions, but because of his brother's appeals to Philip. Philip himself, really wanted Normandy and was prepared to do anything to get it. The high rates of tax which caused bitter resentment under John were due to Henry's weak defense system and Richard's love of mercenaries, not John himself.

The financial instability which left John unable to fight at Le Boulet



(This page is for your first answer.) and caused bitter resentment and the nickname "Softsword" was due to the incalculable debts which Richard had amassed. £12,000 (twice Normandy's annual revenue) was spent on one castle - Chateau Gaillard - which caused bitter resentment as the populations of England and Normandy were already grossly overstressed. The £32,000+ that Richard collected for the third crusade and the £60,000 ransom demanded all combined with bad harvests and the bitter resentment at Angwin despotism.

The signing of Magna Carta therefore in 1215 was not the result of John's personality. As with the Jack Cade Rebellion under Henry VI, the people were protesting about the high rates of tax which achieved nothing. After the failure at Bouvines in 1214, the barons had had enough of

(This page is for your first answer.)

Fighting and they consequently summed up all their resentment against the Angevin Government by rebelling in 1214/1215. Therefore, the rebellion could have happened under Richard or Henry II. It was just John who unfortunately bore the brunt of the long term failures of the Angevin Empire.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer is directly focused on the question and develops a clearly analytical response. Supporting material is broadly balanced, with good range and depth, and the argument is deployed in a controlled and logical way. Mid Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.) Why did opposition to King John become so bitter during his reign?

### Plan

- Personality of John:
  - o lost Angevin Empire
  - o Magna Carta (1215)
  - o Arthur of Brittany - supposedly killed him
  - o Nobles resented his presence in England
  - o Raised taxes to try and win back France - unpopular
  - o Didn't ask Philip's permission to inherit Normandy
  - o Angevins vs Lucigans
  - o Married Isabelle
  - o Did not obey Philip as suzerain
  - o Quarrel with the church (however many people supported him in this)

- Long term weaknesses of Angevin Empire
  - o It wasn't designed to last. Henry had intended

(This page is for your first answer.) for it to be divided between his sons when he died.

- o Defence weaknesses - allowed for Philip to initiate short stabbing raids which destroyed the Empire
- o The empire cost a lot to run, it was twice the ~~amount~~ annual revenue of Normandy.

### - Angevin Despotism

- o John ruled after two brilliant kings, and was unfortunate in this respect
- o John acted as any other Angevin king would - he followed the examples set by his father and

brother in terms of the French and his acquisition of Normandy. ~~to~~

Essay

Although it can be argued that it was the personality of King John that caused such bitter opposition during his reign, it is in fact the long term weaknesses of the Angevin Empire combined with Angevin despotism that is the real cause.

Although on the surface John's actions seem foolish, this is the way in which his father and brother had ruled, and so it is only natural that he should too. His acquisition of Normandy without paying homage to Philip, the suzerain, was in typical

(This page is for your first answer.) Angevin fashion; ~~to~~ Henry and Richard had not sought Philip's permission, and so neither did John. However, this led to a problem which John alone faced; he lost Normandy. Although it was not just his defiance of Philip in regards to Normandy that caused this, it certainly played a major role. Due to his loss of Normandy <sup>and the other French lands</sup> John was forced to spend time in England which caused resentment and dissatisfaction amongst the nobles. The loss of the French lands however, was due to another flaw within the Angevin Empire. The defence system was built so that there was one castle every 50 miles along the border, which allowed for Philip to make small straggling raids into John's French territories. These raids left the inhabitants of ~~the~~ John's French lands wondering why they did not just side with the



French, which eventually they did, causing John to lose his lands.

Although John spent the rest of his reign attempting to win them back, he never did, and the taxes he imposed upon the people of England in order to fund it were astronomical. The people of England did not see the French lands as a necessity and so they became angry at John for the taxation. However, because he was an Angevin he saw the

(This page is for your first answer.) French lands as essential, which led to conflict within England. In order to get the nobles to pay the taxes John resorted to taking their families hostage and starving them to death. This caused an uprising within the nobility as not only did they see the increased tax as unnecessary and unfair, their families were now being harmed too.

This led to the Magna Carta in 1215, which limited the power of the monarchy. King John was the first monarch to ever have to sign an agreement with his nobility that restrained his power, and this can be seen as a major failure. However, the Magna Carta was put together by 25 barons who held personal grudges against John for his treatment of their families in order to gain tax to win back the Empire, which suggests that yet again the weaknesses and Angevin despotism ~~was~~ were at the heart of the problems.

~~At~~ In conclusion, the reason for the bitter opposition to John was not due to him, but due to the problems left for him by his predecessors who were

both very mighty and difficult to temper well to)

(This page is for your first answer.) (Plan continued)

~~Other~~ - Other problems

• Richard had left the country in a very bad way as regards finance due to his crusade and ~~to~~ ransom

• Nobles who signed Magna Carta had personal issues with John

• Magna Carta not as important as what historians make it out to be



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer draws together some reasons for the bitter opposition to John. However, the focus on a few aspects of John's view of the French lands has really led to only a partial answer which has skewed the response overall. Other aspects of the reign are hinted at but not explained. High Level 3.

## Question 7

'Existing social conditions' caused problems for some candidates, who were unsure of the exact meaning of the phrase. However, many were able to refer, with varying levels of supporting knowledge, to the growing urbanisation of the fourteenth century, and the problems which this caused in terms of overcrowding and insanitary conditions. Candidates were much more comfortable dealing with other relevant factors. The limits of medical knowledge were assessed, along with lack of understanding of contagious diseases, which explained the high death rate among priests. A few answers went beyond the narrow confines of 1348-50 and explained that the speed with which the plague spread was partly down to conditional factors such as poor diet and food supplies, and to the effect of troops returning from the conflicts in Europe.

(This page is for your first answer.) The Black Death of 1348 spread quickly through Asia, Europe and devastated England, killing approximately half the population. The existing social conditions, such as a weakened population due to urbanisation and the crisis of the <sup>late</sup> middle ages, were clearly a main factor in the extent of the Black Death's devastation. However, it is more accurate to say that a lack of medical knowledge, and the nature of the disease and the role of flagellants and soldiers, were responsible for the rapid spread of the disease.

The Black Death swept rapidly through the English population partly because it was just beginning to recover from the crisis of the late middle ages. Ironically, this ~~had begun~~ ~~being~~ was the result of great prosperity during the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. The

<sup>For example,</sup>  
(This page is for your first answer.) Medieval warm periods which lengthened growing seasons, bolstered the economy, and social stability brought about by clerical reforms encouraged families people to have more children. During this time of

prosperity, the population is estimated to have grown by 5-7 million. However, as Professor Postan attests, the population had 'gone too far'; and in accordance with Malthusian economics, outstripped its resources. This led to starvation, thus weakening the population before the arrival of the Black Death.

The end of the warm period and a series of 'mediocre harvests' (John Kelly), coupled with disease among livestock, brought about the Great Famine of 1315. It is thought that 15% of the population died, and did not begin to recover until after 1325, and had certainly not fully recovered by ~~the~~ ~~time~~ 1348.

The growth in population had also led to urbanisation in the early 1300s. By ~~1348~~, 1300, 4-5,000 places could call themselves towns and more and more villeins were attracted to the towns as they offered a life of significantly more freedom. However, this

(This page is for your first answer.) meant that the living conditions in towns in 1348 were terrible due to overcrowding. Philip Ziegler writes that the streets were more "drains than lanes" and polluted water sources caused illness such as diarrhoea, which weakened the townsfolk.

Furthermore, ~~the~~ urbanisation accurately explains the rapid spread of the plague because the ~~too~~ conditions were perfect for the breeding of fleas. With many people



sleeping in one room, fleas carrying the disease could easily spread it to a whole family in a single night.

The growth of both trade and religious communities, were also social conditions which explain the rapid ~~at~~ spread of the Black Death. The Medieval period saw the opening ~~up~~ of old trade routes such as the Silk Route, which dated back to the Roman Empire. It was undoubtedly ~~through~~ <sup>on</sup> merchant ships that the disease was brought to England, most likely from Calais, the first port ~~being~~ <sup>to be</sup> affected: Melcombe Regis in Dorset. The development of trade in towns brought the disease inland, particularly affected large, prosperous towns such as

(This page is for your first answer.) Leeds and Lincoln. Meanwhile, trade ships ~~at~~ spread the disease around the coast and on to Ireland. Bristol was the first major port to be devastated and the coast of Hampshire was also ravaged by the Black Death very quickly.

The growth of isolated, religious communities explain the ~~Black~~ Black Death's rapid progression, because although they were set up ~~to~~ for monks and nuns to protect themselves from the evil of the outside world, their hospitality and kindness in caring for for the sick was well known. Naturally caring for the diseased led to a <sup>rapid</sup> spread of it, ~~and~~

However, there were others who were responsible for spreading the plague, who came as a result of the plague Black Death and not existing social ~~too~~ conditions. They were known as flagellants, and they travelled from village to village, whipping themselves in an attempt to purge themselves from sin and be saved by God; for many believed the plague was his punishment. Unintentionally they spread the disease through the countryside. Outside of social ~~too~~ conditions, the very

(This page is for your first answer.) nature of the disease and the way that it was passed, explains its rapid progression. Fleas were a part of every day life, and a few bites would have gone unnoticed. Arguably the best explanation for the rapid spread of the plague was the lack of medical knowledge at the time. There was no concept of germs and so the ~~airborne~~ passing of the plague by breath was not understood. Instead, people blamed it on miasmas, planets, Jews, God, the devil or even a dirty look. ~~The~~ Subsequently the only way to prevent it was to cut themselves off from the infected. However, in one case when Norwich closed its gates, the disease was unfortunately inside, and as a consequence, 5,000 peasants died, due <sup>simply</sup> to their ignorance.

In conclusion, it was not the <sup>already</sup> weak

state of the population that best explains the rapid spread of the Black Death, as other places in Europe which were not weakened, for example Tuscany, still lost 70% of the population. It was therefore the nature of the disease and lack of medical knowledge which most accurately explain

(This page is for your first answer.) its rapid progress; although the growth of towns, ~~and~~ religious communities and trade, all played some part in it.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is a clear and analytical framework here. A range of factors which explain the spread of the plague are well developed, and the candidate attempts to evaluate the relative importance of factors overall. Low Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.) How accurate is it to say that existing social conditions were mainly responsible for the rapid spread of the Black Death in the years 1348-50

PLAN

INTRO

Before Black Death Pop. TRENDS

MAIN POINTS

- ① Social conditions - of towns overcrowding city streets
  - ② Trading - everyone trading brought goods to the towns
  - ③ Economy - changing from farming
  - ④ Lack of knowledge
- Conclusion

How Accurate

Before the Black Death towns and cities were very overcrowded from people coming from out of the country side to find jobs and trade. England had trade links with the rest of Europe, which brought people to the towns which led to them becoming dirty and overcrowding but is this the reason it spread so quick?

Before the 13th

Social conditions before the Black Death was very bad. Houses were cramped together and the streets in towns and cities were full of all sorts of stuff like animal carcasses, mud, manure and dirty straw which gave diseases a perfect breeding ground. In towns then days there were no sewage system which made the rivers and street full of left over urine and faeces which made people's social life bad from having to walk around in the crowded streets in all the dirty conditions, trying to get jobs to feed their family. Life for the lower classes were



bad from them not having enough money whole families had to share very small houses from having to share beds and being close together all of the time. From these social conditions the Black death would spread rapidly through towns and cities

(This page is for your first answer.)  
Trading was the new trend before the black death which was very big in England with trade links to all of Europe, which led people to towns and coastal towns to trade, which did lead to overpopulation. The black death did come from trading and did hit the coastal towns the hardest which means it must of spread through them quick, this may of been from overpopulation or it could of been through trading fabrics with the fleas on through the town to spread it very quick, ~~but, think it was more to do with the~~

People lacked medical knowledge in them days so when the black death came people did not know how to stop it or cure it, which made people try anything to cure it. Doctors had no other cures for it and tried all sorts of stuff to cure it, but none of them worked. This may of been a big factor of why the Black death spreaded so quickly from them not even knowing it was the rats who brought it and carried it and not even knowing how to cure it.

(This page is for your first answer.) I would say that the existing social conditions were mainly responsible for the rapid spread of the black death in the years 1348-50 from the dirty streets and crowded conditions so it was so spread so quick from person to person and from the street being a perfect breeding ground for the rats, but ~~there~~ also I would say a big factor is lack of knowledge from them not knowing how to cure it so it couldn't be stopped.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer addresses the stated factor and one alternative. There is reasonable supporting material here, though it is undeveloped in places. The conclusion is reasonably effective. Low Level 4.

## Question 8

Some weaker answers were little more than a narrative, either of the causes of the revolt, which was not the question asked, or of a few events in 1381. However, even some of the better answers failed to focus on the nature of the peasants' demands within the context of the suppression of the revolt. Most of these demands were too extreme to be given serious consideration. The best answers had good focus and depth of development, noting in particular that the localised nature of the revolt made it relatively easy to suppress.

(This page is for your first answer.) The Peasant's Revolt of 1381 was so easily suppressed because it failed to achieve the aims of the Peasants, their support declined as they became more radical and violent ~~at~~ as well as their demands being extreme, especially Wat Tyler's, which could have caused anarchy across England. Other reasons such as the unorganised regime the rebels had once they reached London, Tyler and Straw's lack of control over the other rebels and their naive beliefs of Richard II's false promises led to the failures ~~at~~ of the Peasant's Revolt, thus making them easy to suppress.

On the 13<sup>th</sup> June 1381, the Peasants entered the city of London from the Tower of London, where they started to cause havoc; they

(This page is for your first answer.) executed the Archbishop Sudbury, Sir Robert Hales and John Legge - three of the King's advisors. They then ~~started to~~ ~~burnt~~ burnt down John of Gaunt's Savoy Palace and continued to burn down parts of London, attacking, and in some cases, murdering lawyers and sermons. This turmoil led to ~~the~~ public the rebels' popularity with the public to decrease;

it was one thing, to fight for justice and equality, but another to burn down London and risk the lives of thousands of innocent people. This caused failure for the rebels as they needed the support to carry on with the revolt.

Sir Robert Knollys, Master of War, was sent with a number of trained and experienced soldiers to deal with the rebellion. The mob of angry peasants was no match ~~to~~ of Knollys' military experience and they were surrounded. This shows ~~that~~ how inexperienced the rebels were with military regimes and ~~that~~ the rebels did not realise how ~~organised~~ ~~Richard II's~~ army that Richard II's army was more organised than they had anticipated.

(This page is for your first answer.) When Richard II's approached the rebels, they gave him demands <sup>such as</sup> ~~that~~ the feudal system was to be abolished, there was to be a fixed rate of 4d per acre as the lawful charge for rent and that all that played a part in the rebellion were to be pardoned and the king's advisors were to be punished. Richard also listened to Tyler's demands, which were more extreme; All ranks ~~of~~ and status under the king were to be abolished, Church ranks were also to be abolished, leaving only one Bishop in England,



Church lands were to be divided up amongst the people and that he would be the Commander of the army. Tyler's tactics were to provoke Richard with such high demands that he would then have an excuse to seize the king. However, the King, falsely agreed, in a panic, Tyler ~~then~~ attacked ~~the~~ one of the King's servants, causing his own death. ~~It~~ made the Peasant's revolt easy to suppress ~~as~~ ~~it~~ some peasants, + Many Peasants, believing the King's false promises, went home. Whilst others stayed because they wanted to see London or they did not trust Richard and wanted to see if he kept his promises. ~~But~~ Yet Richard

(This page is for your first answer.) did not keep to his promises and in 1389 there was another Statute of Labourers as the government found it easy to repress them to protect the ~~the~~ country from another rebellion.

Even though the Peasant's Revolt was seen as a failure, there were some successes - The revolt showed the nobles the distress of the Peasants and the havoc that they could cause. The poll tax was abolished and was never brought up again, which was one of their aims. The revolt had scared Richard II and his parliament and they did not want a repeat. Even though Kings did not work out for the peasants immediately, in the years afterwards they started to improve

such as more lords gave wages and rented land giving more independence to the peasants.

As a whole, the Peasant's revolt of 1381 was easily suppressed because of ~~how~~ ~~time~~ the lack of organisation of the rebel leaders such as Wat Tyler and Jack Straw. The rebels were naive and weak in thinking that Richard would have

(This page is for your first answer.) granted their demands. Also his unorganised and feeble regime the Peasants had when they reached London caused them to be easily suppressed by Sir Robert Knollys and his army. The unpopularity with the public caused failure for the rebels as they needed the support to thrive. However, Peasantry came to an end by the ~~end~~ <sup>fifteenth</sup> ~~fourteenth~~ century and lords accepted wages and rent which meant more equality for peasants.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer has some understanding of the issues raised by the question. Much of the answer is, however, quite descriptive, and there is only a limited focus on why the revolt failed to achieve its objectives. Mid Level 3.

The peasants' Revolt of 1381 was easily suppressed because of the several causes such as poor leadership, peasants' excessive demands and the lost opportunity of taking an advantage at the meeting at the Mill End. However, the most significant disadvantage was that of the lack of organisation.

In 1381, when the King's government tried to collect the poll tax <sup>for the</sup> fourth time since 1297, Sussex tenants refused to pay as well as the peasants in Kent. Wat Taylor was chosen as their leader; a man who had no military experience at all. However, 20000 strong marched to London: these people joined the revolt not ~~because~~ <sup>due to</sup> of the Taylor's great leadership skills but because they were suffering from high taxes, tax collectors and poor living condition. In London peasants faced a professional army. This was one of the causes of the peasants' suppression.

On the other hand, it were peasants' demands that were put forward. They wanted the abolishment of the feudal system, no control of the wages, the lawful charge on rent at hid and, furthermore, they asked the King to punish his advisers; the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Chancellor, Simon Sudbury, King's regent, John of Gaunt and Heil, the Lord Treasurer — those who were responsible for the poll tax. These excessive demand could not be put into practise. The peasants were simply asking to ruin the feudal system and to develop the free market mechanism. Richard II would never agree



with this statement. Peasants' demands were formed another cause of the Peasants' Revolt suppression.

Moreover, <sup>on the 10th of June 1381</sup> having a great advantage in number (20000 peasants were facing just the King, as ~~the~~ his army was in France at that time), peasants did not take the advantage ~~and~~ at the Mill End: he was an opportunity to catch or to kill Richard - but they did not take that opportunity. All the peasants remained still, listening to the King's foolish promises. This previous time gave an advantage to the King

over the peasants. He persuaded them to leave London and remain loyal to their King. <sup>was another reason</sup> This ~~is~~ why the Peasants' Revolt was so easily suppressed.

It is clear, that the main reason of the Peasants' Revolt failure was their lack of organisation. At the beginning of the revolt people thought that they had an aim to reach: they wanted ~~to put~~ their demands <sup>to be put in practice</sup> and they wanted to punish the hated advisors. However, after the first meeting with the King those peasants, who decided to stay in London did horrible things. Many houses were burnt: the Savoy palace was burnt to the basement. Some people were murdered; not only the Archbishop of Canterbury was killed, but many ordinary people suffered. ~~This~~ This shows that the lack of organisation among the peasant was the main reason why the Peasant's revolt of 1381 was easily suppressed.



In the conclusion it is worth saying, that there was not one particular reason of that led to an easy suppression, but all the causes: excessive demands, poor leadership and dealing with a professional army - led to the Peasants' Revolt failure. However, the most important reason from all described is the lack of organisation. People who do not know what to do are more likely to be suppressed than those who have a clear understanding of their &



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer relates well to the demands of the question. It is analytical in shape and shows some direction and control. There is range and development of material here, making for a high Level 4 response.

## Question 9

Many answers displayed a high level of relevant information which was pressed into service with varying degrees of effectiveness. At the lower levels of attainment were those who were not very assured on the stated factor of the Burgundian-Armagnac feud, or on the links which John the Fearless established with Henry V in the years to 1419. Others were apparently mesmerised by the events at Agincourt, producing an extended narrative on the weather and the state of the ground, the poor state of the English forces, and the different qualities of leadership provided by Henry and the French. These answers usually did not include the breadth of material necessary to get beyond Level 3. Some went beyond the period given in the question and ranged over the lifetime of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance until it came to an end at Arras in 1435. Better answers considered a range of factors which contributed to Henry V's successes in France. Inevitably, there was a strong focus on the campaigns of 1415-20, with often well-developed material on Harfleur, Agincourt and the Normandy campaigns of 1417-19. The finest answers displayed a confident grasp of an impressive range of material. These explained how Henry's successes were partly down to the rivalries within the French nobility which had led to civil war, and the insanity of Charles VI which encouraged rivalry and intrigue at the heart of the French government. The situation within England was also well known, with candidates noting the importance of the pacification of Wales and Scotland, the generous subsidies from parliament and the church, and Henry's organisational skills in preparing for the French campaign from 1413. Some noted that the reburial of Richard II, coupled with the French war, symbolised Henry's determination to legitimise the Lancastrian dynasty and put to rest the long-standing unease felt about Bolingbroke's usurpation of 1399.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Between 1415 and 1428 England had much success in France, being able to take all of Normandy, Maine and Aquitaine. Much of this success was due to the treaty of Troyes between England and Burgundy because of their rivalry with the Armagnacs. However, there were other reasons for English success as well.

In 1419 John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy had agreed to meet with the Armagnacs. However, he was betrayed by them and brutally murdered at the place of meeting. Instead of encouraging his son, Philip the Good who was now the new Duke of Burgundy to make a treaty with them, he forced him into making a treaty with Henry V and England. This gave England ~~the~~ ~~support~~ ~~and~~ ~~resources~~ in the Treaty of Troyes in 1420. The treaty also meant that Henry was now recognised as the rightful heir to the French throne after Charles VI died and would rule as regent until he died. Without the conflict between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs, ~~this treaty would~~ ~~probably~~ not have been made but Henry V would not have had as

(This page is for your first answer.) *much success in France*

The treaty that was made between Burgundy and Henry also gave England the resources and support that were much needed at that point. After already having had two campaigns to France, one in 1415 and one in 1417 to 1419, England was running out of money and not as willing to support Henry's war plans. However, with Burgundy's support there were many more troops at his disposal and they could now start using one more modern technique of cannons to break down walls when invading new towns and ~~and~~ cities.

~~The result was~~ This meant that when the Armagnacs tried to go against Henry's army at <sup>Vernon</sup> ~~Borlingham~~ in 1428 they were easily defeated and the Armagnacs were not a threat. Therefore from a resources and weapons point of view the conflict between Burgundy and Armagnac was very helpful to Henry's success in France.

It is also clear how important the rivalry between the Burgundians and Armagnacs was to Henry's success ~~in~~ and England's success in France when the rivalry began to break down in 1428 and finally when it ended in 1435 with the Treaty of Arras. Even though Henry V had died in 1422

from dysentery ~~and the result~~ <sup>by the Duke of Burgundy</sup> the territories in France had still been maintained until the Burgundians started to not support England. Then, after 1428 England began to lose territories in France, and great English leaders such as Lord Talbot <sup>The Dauphin</sup> Charles VII was crowned king in Reims and then recognised as the rightful king by Burgundy in 1435. Because

(This page is for your first answer.) of how quickly English successes occurred in the years after the rivalry between the Burgundians and Armagnacs broke down, it shows how important it was to Henry V's successes.

However, Henry V had had success in France before the Treaty of Troyes, ~~and~~ with the French Campaign of 1415. Henry V had seized the town of Harfleur in the August meaning that the French no longer had their base for attacking English merchant ships. There had also been the battle of Agincourt where the English had won an overwhelming victory against the French, with only 500 losses to their over 10000. This was all due to the confidence and strength of Henry V's military leadership. He was able to organise his army in the best possible way for success, such as the use of long bow men, and gave confidence building speeches at the beginning of battles to make sure that his army had the best chance of winning. Henry's leadership skills and military strength were a reason for his successes in France.

Another reason for his stability and successes were because he had the support of the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund. In 1416 Sigismund had gone to England, after already having been to France, with the aim of being a peace broker between the two countries. However, after spending four months in England and ~~returning~~ becoming a knight of the Garter, he agreed to support Henry V's claim to the French throne. This was signed and agreed to in the Treaty of Canterbury. This meant that Henry now had support from the Holy Roman Emperor and could



(This page is for your first answer.) ~~not~~ have to worry about much opposition or invasion from other countries. I think that this support was important to Henry V's success in France.

I believe that the rivalry between the Armagnacs and the Burgundians were the most important factor to Henry V's success in France. Because ~~there~~<sup>there</sup> was faction in the country, even before the Treaty of Troyes they could not put up a united force which was strong enough to stop the English from taking territories. ~~How~~ I do think that Henry's military skills were important to his ~~main~~ successes though. Therefore the rivalry between the Burgundians and Armagnacs was the most important factor to Henry V's success in France.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer attempts a focus on the question, but might have been improved with clearer initial planning. Relevant points are made, but development is sketchy overall, and the answer drifts out of focus with reference to events in 1428 and 1435. This was a high Level 3 explanation.

Henry wishes  
Henry to be  
French in competition  
in context

(This page is for your first answer.)

In the years 1415 up to the year of his death in 1421, Henry V had a number of successes in France, culminating in the treaty of Troyes which declared him the heir to the French throne following the current King's death. There were a number of reasons as to why this became so, however a vital factor was the rivalry between the Burgundian and Armagnac factions.

The French Valois monarchy had been experiencing a period of great weakness - its King, Charles VI had been suffering from bouts of insanity since 1393, and his government was disputed by two factions; the Burgundians, who promoted the interests of <sup>John</sup> the Duke of Burgundy and the Armagnacs who supported the King's brother, the Duke of Orleans. Fighting and disagreement greatly inhibited the French from mounting a strong defence against the English - they

(This page is for your first answer.)

sent no relieving force to Harfleur which was under siege from the English in September 1415, and despite the crown having assembled armies for such a purpose largely because John was threatening Paris with his own forces. At the time of the siege of Caen in August 1417, the Burgundians had encircled Paris and by the time of the siege of Rouen in July 1418, Paris had opened its gates to the Burgundians and the Armagnacs were forced to flee with the Dauphin. As such, it seems little surprise that the fighting between the two sides during the defence put up by the French was rather pitiful.

when the government was thrown into much confusion. Arguably, however, that the French failed to put up an effective resistance was all the worse when considering the military skills of their opponent, Henry V. Indeed, Henry was an experienced fighter and naturally he saw his path to glory and prestige in war in France. He showed particular ability at the battle of Agincourt, 25<sup>th</sup> October 1415 where despite being exhausted from marching for 17 days and many suffering from dysentery, the English made a resounding victory. Henry had made a stirring speech prior to the battle, decided to use his crown as a helmet and showed determination to

(This page is for your first answer.) fight in the midst of the melee all to raise morale whilst he made effective use of the longbow, of which success having been witnessed in Wales, meaning that the French were picked off before they even reached the English. Furthermore, his brutality at the siege of Caen where 2000 of all ages were killed executed indiscriminately seemed to be an attempt to put off resistance from other towns. At any rate, it worked judging by the way Henry's brother Gloucester took rapidly took the towns of Normandy such as Falaise and Verneuil. What little fight the French had put up, at for example Agincourt, proved to be no match for Henry V's skill.

However, Henry also happened to be a



man capable of organisation, a key vital reason for his success. He had used the factions in France to negotiate his demands - they would ultimately fail, discussions breaking down with the Armagnacs in Ghent Winchester in June 1415 and with the Burgundians a year earlier however despite this most importantly they brought him time to prepare for war - Henry began to raise loans from the clergy as early as 1413 and was granted a double subsidy from parliament

(This page is for your first answer.) in 1414. Furthermore, the reign of Henry gave the English control of the garrison which caused the threat of the French continuing to use it as a base for attacking English merchant ships. Similarly, to ensure supplies for his campaign of 1417, two naval battles in 1416 and 1417 left the French navy virtually destroyed and gave the English control of the channel.

On the other hand, some consideration must be taken into account for what the French did do in regard to the English, regardless of the faction. The most prominent example would be at Agincourt however where, as mentioned, the English won a significant victory. Arguably decision making for the French lay with Charles D'Albret and Bourbonnais, the Constable and Marshal of France respectively the former the Constable of France and the latter the Marshal - even then, it was unclear who was truly the leader, as they were missing someone like Henry V to provide clear



leadership, something disastrous when combined with his large numbers, was at the extinction of near to 10,000. Discrimination ensued; the minor houses forced their commanders to the back and the French cavalry proved to be every league for the English archers. Aside from the fighting

(This page is for your first answer.) between factions, the French had displayed an ultimate incompetence in utilizing their forces.

Therefore, the fighting between the Burgundian and Armagnac factions can be seen as incredibly significant in causing Henry V's successes in France, as they inhibited France from mounting an effective resistance and likely was part of the reason played a huge part of their incompetence in military action - the best of taking military action - and of course, the decision to make none - particularly considering that Henry V was a man of both military and organizational skill, making him an <sup>formidable</sup> opponent that the French would be could not stand against.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has a sustained focus on the question, and is strongly analytical. Many relevant points are made, supported by impressive and extensive relevant information. A high Level 5 answer.

## Question 10

Many candidates may have been expecting, or hoping for, a question covering the years 1435-53. A significant number of answers started with the ending of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance and the death of Bedford in 1435, and went on to consider the course of events to Castillon in 1453. The narrow chronological range inevitably influenced the marks awarded. Equally, however, there were many excellent responses which covered the whole chronology and explained the significance of a number of factors which led to the gradual collapse of English power. The role of Joan of Arc at Orleans was well known, with many stating that her death at English hands in 1431 only strengthened her influence as a folk heroine for the French people. Some discussed the growing political and military skills of Charles VII, especially in the 1440s, and noted the significance of the use of cannons, and of metal cannonballs, in various battles. Set against the revival of French power was the growing weakness of the English position in France, especially after Bedford's death. Many were aware of divisions which developed within the English nobility, and the importance of the inadequate leadership provided by Henry VI.

(This page is for your first answer.)  
29-53.

Plan

29 Orleans. → Burg. alliance starts.  
32 Death of Burg dies  
35 Death of Bedford  
36 Arras  
39 fr. take Paris.  
39 Graculus collapses.  
40 Aristocratic rebellion fails  
40 Joan of Arc at Orleans.  
42 Attempt on Norm. → Geoffrey.  
43 Somerset fails to aid Norm.  
44 Tours - many surrender.  
49 Rouen.  
50 Formigny - Normans  
51 Agincourt  
52 St. Albans  
53 Castillon.

French Monarchy  
- Political skill → Arras  
Tours.  
- 39 Aristocratic rebellion.  
- Bribery. no more Charles  
7th → more.

Joan of Arc  
1429 Orleans  
God on side  
inspiring  
took TIDE.

Bedford  
Power vacuum in Eng.  
- End of A-B alliance.  
↓  
already weaker 24/23.  
but Bed's death  
pushed it  
↓  
Burg helped Eng in past

Henry VI  
Seign 1440  
Army from 35  
44.

Divisions in Eng.  
Talbot threatened Paris 37 but no  
- help  
- 43 Somerset fails to aid 4 in Norm.  
- 53 everyone distrust.

(This page is for your first answer.)

→ During the years 1429-53 the ~~French~~ <sup>English</sup> position in France declined, until in 1453 there were few remaining territories. Paris was lost in 1436, Normandy had fallen by the Battle of Formigny in 1450, and by Castillon in 1453 Aquitaine had also been lost. This collapse was due to a number of reasons; the actions of Joan of Arc in 1429, the revival of the French monarchy, the Death of Bedford in 1435, the collapse of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance, and the divisions that emerged in England.

The actions of Joan of Arc were a key factor in turning the tide of the ~~en~~ English campaign in 1429. Up until this point the English had been largely successful, taking Cravant and Coctoy in 1423 and Montagnis in 1427. However, <sup>after</sup> ~~before~~ Joan of Arc relieved the siege of Orleans in May 1429 the English position began to collapse. This was partly due to the impact that Joan had on the French forces, making them believe that God was on their side due to her visions, and giving them an inspirational leader after the death of generals such as d'Albret and the unpopularity of advisors such

(This page is for your first answer.) Georges de la Trémoille. However although the Actions of Joan of Arc do go some way ~~at~~ being a reason for the collapse of the English position, they do not go very far as her effect was short lived as she was burnt as a witch by the English in 1431, and her actions were under the allowance of Charles, therefore can be attributed to the revival of the monarchy.

The revival of the monarchy in France goes a great deal of the way in being the main reason for the collapse of the English position in France by the years 1429-53, due to both the political and military skill of Charles VII. The most significant military impact of the revival was the increased efficiency of the armed forces. From 1435 Charles began to create a standing army out of the mercenaries of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance, redundant after the Treaty of Arras in 1435. This was a key factor in allowing the French re-taking of Paris in 1436 as the French army ~~at~~ now outnumbered the English forces, and this also pressured the English into Peace talks at Gravelines in 1439 and the Treaty of Tours in 1444 in which the French gained Normandy. Furthermore Charles also used the peace following the Treaty of



(This page is for your first answer.) Towns in 1444 to build up the Army, and took full advantage of the 1440 siege warfare revolution ~~is~~ of the invention of the cannon. This enabled the taking of Rouen in 1474, with extensive use of cannon, and the increased numbers of the French Army enabled the conquest of Normandy in 1450 and Aquitaine by 1453. Therefore the revival of the monarchy and its subsequent military impact goes a long way in being the key reason for the collapse in the English position.

However, it was not just the military impact of the monarchical revival which was a factor in the defeat of the English; the political skill of Charles also played a role. The political skill of Charles contributed to the breakdown of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance with the Treaty of Arras in 1474-35, which both bolstered the French position and weakened the English through the loss of an ally and subsequently troops. Furthermore the 1444 Truce of Tours also weakened the English position as it denoted the surrender of Maine to the French. Therefore it can be seen that the political advantages of the revival of the Monarchy also go some of the way

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~in being~~ the main reason for the collapse of the English, more so than ~~the~~<sup>it's</sup> military impact, as the military advantages were largely due to political advancement. The standing army in 1435 could not have been created if not for the breakdown of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance at Arras, as it was comprised of ex Anglo-Burgundian mercenaries, the Truce of Tours in 1444 enabled Charles a period of peace in which to build up the army, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~stre~~ ~~of~~ Furthermore the revival of the monarchy put an end to french faction with the treaty of Arras in 1450 uniting the Armagnacs and Burgundians and the failure of the 1439 aristocratic rebellion. Therefore it can be seen that the revival of the french monarchy goes a long way in being the reason for the collapse of the English position in France due to its military and political impacts which led to the conquest of Normandy and Aquitaine, and the surrender of Maine and breakdown of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance.

The death of the Duke of Bedford in 1435 ~~was~~ also goes a long way in explaining the decline of the English in France, ~~the~~ due to its impacts. The most

(This page is for your first answer.) significant impact of this was the breakdown of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance in 1435. Although the breakdown did have other causes such as the death of Anne of Burgundy, who championed the alliance, in 1432, Bedford's death was the main reason. This can be seen ~~as~~ from his actions to preserve the alliance in the past, eg. in 1423 when Gloucester and Philip disagreed over the conquest of Harfleur, Bedford mediated between the two, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> the fact that it collapsed so soon after his death denotes it as a key reason. The breakdown of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance was a key reason for the collapse of the English position as it meant that Charles was able to create a standing Army from his mercenaries after the formal - Burgundian Treaty of Arras in 1435, meaning that the French now outnumbered the English. This was instrumental in the French victories at ~~Formigny~~ <sup>Formigny</sup> in 1436, Poitiers in 1449, Formigny in 1450, and Castillon in 1453, this going a long way ~~to~~ <sup>in being</sup> the reason for the collapse of the English in France. Furthermore the Burgundians had previously aided the

(This page is for your first answer.) English by dividing the French forces, eg. in 1418 the English were able to capture Rouen due to the French Army being occupied defending Paris from the Burgundians. The English no longer had their support and so at the breakdown of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance can be seen ~~as a key reason~~ to go a long way to being the reason for the collapse of the English in France.

A final factor is the division that emerged amongst the English. In 1437 Talbot attempted to re-take France but failed due to lack of support, in 1443 Somerset failed to aid York in Normandy, contributing to its eventual conquest in 1450, and in 1453 many magnates were engaged in noble feuds in Britain meaning that English forces were greatly reduced, allowing the conquest of Aquitaine. Therefore division goes a long way in being a key reason for the collapse of the English in France.

Overall the revival of the monarchy goes a long way in being the key reason for the decline of the English position due to its military and political impacts. The death



(This page is for your first answer.) of Bedford and the collapse of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance go the same distance in explaining this, as the subsequent Treaty of Arras was a huge asset to the French and blow to the English. Divisions in England also go a small amount of the way, and the actions of Joan of Arc go a very little way as they can be attributed to the French monarchy.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer offers a highly developed analysis from the outset. The promise of the initial plan is maintained in the answer itself, where a number of relevant points are made, sustained by a high level of detailed information. High Level 5.

(This page is for your first answer.)

- ~~1415 - Agincourt (Harfleur, calais)~~
- ~~1417 - Caen~~
- ~~1419 - Rouen~~
- ~~1420 - Treaty of Troyes~~
- ~~1422 - Death of Henry V~~
- ~~1423 - Treaty of Amiens~~
- ~~1423 - Cravant Eng vict~~
- ~~1424 - Vernueil~~
- ~~1429 - Joan of Arc~~
- ~~1431 - 35 diplomacy~~
- ~~1435 Treaty of Arras~~
- ~~1444 - Treaty of Tardes~~
- ~~1455 - St Albans~~
- ~~1458 - Love day~~
- ~~1459 - Act of Accord (Richard of York)~~
- ~~1460 - Wakefield~~
- ~~1463 - Oxford plot~~
- ~~1468 - Towton, meadows cross~~
- ~~1471 - Tewkesbury, Barnet (Princ of Wales death)~~
- ~~1483 - Oxford plot buckingham's rebellion~~
- ~~1485 - Bosworth (Richard III death)~~

~~Henry VI  
gave back manna  
married French  
woman~~

~~John of B~~

~~or - 1470 - Warwick~~

~~1470 - 71 Henry VI~~

~~Edward IV~~

~~Richard III~~

~~act of attainder.~~

~~1483-85  
Richard  
reign~~

~~1429-53~~

(This page is for your first answer.)

1422 to 1435 was John Duke of Bedford's reign, in which he saw 10 battles, Cravant and Vernueil which were both English victories. 1429 was the arrival of Joan of Arc, her goal was to crown the Dauphin and drive English out of France. During the period 1429 to 1453, England was known as having the 'Fau of Lancastrian France'. John Duke of Bedford spent his reign building up the Lancastrian force however at the same time France were beginning

to rebuild themselves after so many great losses at battles against the English.

In 1435 the Treaty of Arras appeared which was between Burgundy and England, the truce meant England could ally with Burgundy against France, due to revenge being wanted with John the Fearless's murder. However after Bedford's death the treaty was void and Burgundy crossed over to be with France.

Joan of Arc was a great positive for the French, she inspired soldiers

(This page is for your first answer.) that victory would be theirs. Now this was a problem for England as many of the soldiers believed God wasn't on their side as a result of Joan of Arc's work and soldiers didn't want to fight.

England had another problem, Henry VI was a mad king and had no sense of leadership which was shown when Henry VI gave back Maine, it meant England had lost a piece of France. Henry VI also married a French woman, Margaret of Anjou who was a powerful woman. <sup>she had</sup> Her strong influence on Henry VI. ~~increased~~

The French monarchy were growing strong, they improved their

military and weapons and armies had more training for battles.

The main point in which England lost power in France was at St Albans in 1455, the Lancastrian forces were defeated and the battle was a Yorkist victory. With the influence of Warwick on Henry VI, England were not equipped for battle. Overtime it

(This page is for your first answer.) was clear that Henry VI had too many people in control of him.

The influence of Joan of Arc lifted the spirits of the French armies. The improvement and involvement of the French monarchy gave back stability to the French. For France its unite with Burgundy ~~was~~ was a strong point. England had it tough, the Fall of Lancastrians meant a loss of place and power in France. With England having a weak king it meant strategies were weak. Overall the French between 1429 and 1453 had a large amount of change which affected its success. Englands position gradually weakened in France to a point where all of their place had been lost and the French monarchy and power continued to grow.

In previous years England had



held a strong position in France due to the lack of the monarchy in France but also due to England's strong leaders and so whilst the French monarchy was an important factor

(This page is for your first answer.) into the collapse of England's position in France, other factors such as important people and leadership affected England's position in France.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The question asks for an assessment of the period 1429-53, with the stated factor of the revival of the French monarchy. Some of the material here is out of period, and points made are fairly disconnected and without clear links established. Supporting knowledge is not very extensive. Low Level 3.

## Question 11

A significant discriminator was the extent to which candidates understood and were able to explain the financial weaknesses of the crown, and how far this factor contributed to the outbreak of civil conflict. Weaker answers mentioned the impact of the wars in France but without providing information of much substance to support the points made. Better responses noted that the collapse of Lancastrian France had a serious impact on both royal and noble finances, turning a difficult situation into a desperate one. Henry VI's extravagance, and the rewards he bestowed on his favourites, were well known and exemplified. Some of the best answers were able to link financial matters to the personal failings of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou, and that his personal financial grievances influenced the position taken by Richard, Duke of York. Most candidates referred to local rivalry among different noble houses without showing an understanding of why these conflicts had broken out.

| Chosen Question Number: |                                     |             | TO what extent of the crown was the financial weakness responsible for the outbreak of civil conflict in 1455? |             |                                     |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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.) ~~the extent of~~

Plan. - Henry VI poor decision maker.

- In Debt with other members of nobility. owed money to Richard putting him in a weak position.
- IN Debt because:
  - Country in trade depression ~~again~~. 100 yr war being lost and military defeats were expensive.
  - money could not be afforded to reward nobility - unhappy nobility.

---

Financial weakness of the crown was partly responsible for the outbreak of civil conflict in 1455. Because of many different factors concerning the king's income, the country ~~was~~ as a whole was suffering from financial ruin. Of

(This page is for your first answer.) course, other factors should also be taken into consideration as of why the civil conflict occurred, but I would argue that Henry VI's weak financial position was a ~~reason~~ major reason.

~~the 100 year war which~~  
The 100 year war which ~~was~~ had been fought with France throughout the past century was a massive strain on English finance. Probably because of Henry VI's poor military skills and inability to lead an army into battle, France was winning the war with ease. ~~Therefore~~ the more England failed to ~~deliver~~ deliver a winning battle to the war, the more it cost them financial. This was angering the English people as they were being taxed on a war that was not benefiting them at all. The people rebelled in protest to Henry, arguing that they were no longer paying for a war he was not committing to. This was known as the Cade rebellion which Henry managed to control, but ~~the~~ resulting in ~~the~~ his subjects trusting him less and less.

(This page is for your first answer.) Along with Military defeats costing England financially, ~~the~~ England was experiencing a general trade depression most likely because of Henry VI's poor decision making when it came to organizing any sort of foreign policy with other countries to negotiate trade.

~~There was also an issue for this~~  
One of the major factors of Henry's financial weakness in relation to civil conflict breaking out I believe is The Crown being in debt to his own nobility. Henry had borrowed money to pay for his ~~expenses~~ last expenditure on Military defeats and also his own pleasures, for example setting up his own institute of education, Eton. Not only was this showing very poor decision making as to where money should be spent, these actions were putting him in debt with his rival to the throne, Richard duke of York. Richard loaning his own money to Henry put him at an advantage over the king, and leaving the king in a weak position as his rival had power over him. This was necessary for Richard as he was the person



(This page is for your first answer.) who instigated the Yorkist Challenge and lead the Yorkist army to the battle of St. Albans in 1455 against Henry's Lancastrian army.

Other smaller factors concerning financial weakness with Henry were also crucial, ~~for~~ for example he could not afford to reward loyal members of the nobility due to his debt and the price of rent on lands had increased due to ~~the~~ general inflation. ~~to other factors.~~

However, other factors of Henry's reign were the reasons behind civil conflict in England, much were to do with his weak personality and position as king. Henry was a quiet, well educated man who lacked the ruthlessness needed to be able to control his nobility and court. therefore Henry experienced over mighty subjects ~~who~~ who wanted to either take the throne for themselves, like Richard duke of York, or to simply control it, like his wife Margret of Anjou, or Suffolk.

In conclusion I would argue that the crown's financial weakness had a lot



PLAN: Financial weakness of Crown responsible civil conflict 1455

A = They are responsible → direct

P = York was owed £38,000 but only received 12,000 of that, lack of rebellion due to ill content w/ some finance

C = Finance was responsible

A = They gave out too large sums of money to favorites such as Suffolk and Somerset → royal council angry @ York

A = Ambitions of York

P = York wanted more influence → war against Somerset

A = Weaknesses of Henry

To a certain extent financial weaknesses of the Crown were responsible for the outbreak of civil conflict in 1455. This can be seen in many of the nobles, such as Richard <sup>Duke</sup> of York's ~~at~~ anger towards poor finance and not in their eyes receiving what they rightly were owed. On the other hand other factors such as the weaknesses of Henry or the ambitions of

(This page is for your first answer.) York can be seen to be more important.

Financial weaknesses of the Crown can be seen to be responsible when looking at the actions of York and the royal council. York fought in France for Henry VI throughout the 1440's and early 1450's and Henry owed him around £38,000. However Henry only gave £12,000 which was a mark of the financial weaknesses at the time. As a result York and some other nobles such as the Nevilles were unhappy with the Lancastrian rule, feeling that were not being paid what they were rightfully owed. This can be seen to have increased tensions which led to conflict in 1455.

Furthermore Henry VI was poor at effectively handling money. He often never followed up attaching, rarely paying attackers, and

was had poor judgement when rewarding nobles and supporters. The Duke of Suffolk for instance received gifts and money from Henry. This can be seen to lead to conflict as other nobles, especially York, were suspicious and angry towards Henry having favourites such as Suffolk, which increased tensions between the house of York and Lancaster. Suffolk was lynched on his way into exile in 1450, further angering the subjects and nobles massive hatred towards such poor financial judgement and inferior financial benefits.

On top of this, the Glorious Rebellion in 1450, started by Buckingham, can be seen to be a result of financial weakness of the Crown and poor leadership in terms of finance. Despite being 5 years before major conflict in 1455, it reflects the

(This page is for your first answer.) beginning of civil unrest and discontent of the poor financial ~~to~~ situation of the Crown.

On the other hand, other factors can be seen as more important than financial weakness of the Crown at causing civil conflict in 1455. Financial weakness can be seen to come under the generally poor leadership of Henry VI and his inadequacies as King. Henry VI to many was greatly unable to rule effectively, and this can be seen to be the real reason for the civil conflict in 1455. Henry's poor handling of the war in France meant that by 1453 England had lost all but Calais in France, where it once had a vast control. This caused much anxiety to the Lancastrian leader and a general anger towards the regime, increasing tensions. Henry also had ill-judgement and allowed himself to be easily influenced by his favourites such as the Earl of Somerset. In this favoritism York can be seen to have felt excluded which eventually led to violent conflict in 1455 where York actually killed



Somerset in the Battle of St Albans.

The ambitions of York can also be seen as greatly important. Many of the nobles, such as Somerset, felt uneasy about York as York had extensive estates and influence. Their suspicions were confirmed when in 1453 York became Protector after Henry VI's mental collapse and imprisoned Somerset in the Tower of London. York's apparent ambitions, to serve his father and not role as Protector greatly increased civil tensions which ultimately led to a violent feud between Lancaster and York.

(This page is for your first answer.) in 1455.

Finally, the actions of Margaret of Anjou can be seen as greatly important to in the <sup>outbreak</sup> of civil conflict in 1455. Anjou, Henry VI's wife, ~~was also~~ despised York as she believed he threatened the accession of her new born son and now heir presumptive Edward in ~~1453~~ 1453. Anjou greatly campaigned for herself to be regent and not York and aided Somerset after his release in ~~1454~~ 1454 in pushing the Yorkists from the royal council. This can be seen in Anjou's lack of invitation to the "Great Council" in 1455. Therefore York's violent response can be seen as ~~the~~ the York feeling isolated and threatened by Anjou and the Lancastrians, and not due to financial weaknesses of the Crown.

In conclusion, financial weaknesses can be seen to have greatly influenced the outbreak of civil conflict in 1455 with nobles angry at poor financial ~~control~~ <sup>control</sup> and a lack of the rightful money which some like York felt that they were owed. However other factors such as York's ambitions, Henry VI's misadventures as king and Margaret of Anjou's actions can be seen as more important. Therefore it

can be argued that finance was a major factor but other factors also influenced civil conflict in 1455.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer is sharply focused on the question set. There is an extensive section on the stated factor of the financial weaknesses of the Crown, and the points made here are linked to Henry VI's shortcomings as king. Reference to the grievances of Richard, Duke of York, and the aspirations and actions of Margaret of Anjou, make for a broadly balanced answer at mid Level 5.

## Question 12

Although there were some very good answers which showed a sophisticated awareness of the demands of the question, many answers were less assured. Such answers were often lacking in balance, addressing Edward IV's restoration of authority and comparing this to Richard III's relative failure. This broad brush approach led to the simple conclusion that Edward did, and Richard did not, restore royal authority. Other answers were reasonably well informed on Edward's second reign, but were unsure about the nature of government under Richard III. Better answers recognised that Edward faced, and indeed caused, problems which did not fully restore authority, while in many respects Richard continued Edward's methods. A few highly perceptive answers noted that the very act of claiming the throne at the expense of Edward's sons was in itself an attempt to maintain royal authority by having an adult ruler rather than a boy king and a protectorate. Bosworth was usually seen as the ultimate failure to restore royal authority, rather than recognising the closeness of the result.

(This page is for your first answer.)

INTRO - Ed = 2 reigns } Both similar but v. diff reigns  
R III = 1 v. short reign

P1 - finance

Ed - died solvent / 125,000 £35,000 / king's prerogative rights /  
(son)

R III - used privy chamber = more efficient

P2 - FP

Ed - Burgundy alliance 1467 (London merchants trade)

R III - during Ed's reign successfully invaded Scot - took Ed's burgh

P3 - Nobles

Ed -

R III -

P4

?

(This page is for your first answer.) After the turbulent reign of Henry VI which brought about the war of the roses in 1455, causing great weakness across the country in terms of finance, foreign policy, and the king's authority over the nobles and the readeption crisis of 1471, Edward IV needed to restore the king's authority if he was to avoid any more conflict after he reclaimed the throne in 1471 after the battle of Tewkesbury. Richard III, also needed

to restore royal authority after he usurped the throne from his nephew in 1483 if he was going to have any chance of creating a stable and peaceful reign like his brother, Edward IV's second reign was. It was crucial for both kings to restore royal authority because it had been undermined by both Henry VI and Richard himself.

One very effective way in which a king could re-establish his authority was through finance. Edward IV re-built the royal finances well after they were depleted during Henry VI's reign through failed French battles and over indulgence from his queen, Margaret of Anjou and himself with his overly generous gifts to favored nobles. Edward managed to die solvent - spending as much as he was bringing in - thus allowing his heir to take the throne financially stable. Edward's custom revenue rose during his second reign (1471-1483) from £25,000 to £35,000 per annum - he was able to build up his finances which could be

(This page is for your first answer.) needed in emergency of war; this security restored his position as king. ~~He also used~~ ~~the~~ He also attained more nobles than Henry VI of Henry V in the years 1471-1483 allowing for increased income and controlling his nobles. Edward also used his king's prerogative rights effectively and was able to 'live off his own' - a feat that would have been impossible for his predecessor Henry. Richard too had been successful in finance although his short reign ~~made this~~ is partly responsible in that he didn't have much time to drastically change finance policies; he learnt from his brother and both



Yorkist kings used the privy chamber for finance rather than so it could be dealt with less people and overseen by themselves if necessary. Both kings were able to use finance to restore royal authority, with Edward IV doing this quite effectively, Richard had no financial issues and indeed no one could deny that he dealt with finance well so it is quite accurate to say that through finance, both Yorkist kings were able to restore their royal authority.

With in their own countries, ~~the~~ control over the noblemen was key to restoring royal authority for both kings, as the downfall of Henry VI and Edward's first reign were due to implications from

(This page is for your first answer.) over mighty nobles, Richard, Duke of York and Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick. Edward controlled his noblemen by attaining them and he also punished those who proved unloyal, such as the execution of his brother Clarence in 1478. However, during the earlier parts of his reign, he was unable to fully punish those who backstabbed him as he was still weak in authority after Warwick's threat and the readeption crisis of 1471. ~~Richard on the other hand however rather than being overly cautious~~ However, in order to regain some authority, Edward placed trusted family members and nobles around the country to secure his kingship, such as the Croy brothers in the south-west, Edward Prince of Wales' household governing the marches, ~~the~~ Lord Hastings in the midlands, and of course his brother Richard, Duke

of Gloucester had extensive power in the north. By placing trusted family members around the country, Edward was able to restore royal authority by having a wide control of the country and the gentry who were all well seen by his loyal family. Richard, in contrast to Edward's fairly lax attitude to the nobles, was not worried about executing those disloyal or even a potential hazard such as his imprisonment and execution of Earl Robert, Sir Vaughn and Richard Grey in 1487. But these moves perhaps undermined

(This page is for your first answer.) his authority ~~as~~ as the nobles could see how worried Richard was if he was prepared to execute those who hadn't done any active disloyal behavior. ~~However~~ However, Richard was able to easily crush the Buckingham rebellion of 1483, despite being headed by his once loyal companion the Duke of Buckingham, and Richard appeared to have no qualms over his execution of the same year. Richard perhaps undermined his authority with his treatment of the nobles, exiling ~~the~~ the Marquis of Dorset for example in actually helping Henry Tudor's cause. ~~Edward~~ Edward focused less on controlling the nobles and more on extending his power bases to keep an eye on the nobles which proved to be more effective when restoring royal authority.

Foreign policy greatly helped Edward restore royal authority and kept the majority of the public happy too. Edward already had a successful alliance with Burgundy<sup>in 1462</sup> which allows extensive trade - something

the London merchants greatly favored. He also launched successful campaigns in France in ~~1475~~<sup>1450</sup> ~~1475~~ very successful invasion of Scotland, led by Gloucester in which they were able to seize ~~1475~~ Edinburgh. \* 1475 which led to the Treaty of Picquigny of the same year which granted

(This page is for your first answer.) Louis XI to pay Edward £15,000 immediately for war costs and a French pension of £10,000 a year as long as they both should live. Edward also had a Habsburg alliance which allowed further trade. Richard was less successful with foreign policy, with the French providing his enemy Henry Tudor ~~1485~~ with refuge and an armed mercenary force in 1485 for his planned invasion of England. Edward ~~acted~~ had an effective foreign policy - creating trade alliances and increasing royal income - and thus was able to restore royal authority, Richard however antagonized Europe with his usurpation and there was no loyalty when he took the throne.

In conclusion, Edward was fairly successful at restoring royal authority after the tragic reign of Henry VI and his own crisis of 1471. Richard was less successful and indeed was very unpopular despite his initially strong reign.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer attempts a close comparison of both Edward IV and Richard III. Finance, foreign policy and the nobles are all covered, but there is an obvious lack of balance here, with more information used on Edward IV than on his brother. An analytical and accurate focus overall allows for mid Level 4.



(This page is for your first answer.) How accurate is it to say that the Yorkist kings restored royal authority in England in the years 1471-85?  
- Richard  
~~Richard~~ didn't restore - Edward's second reign was untroubled until he died in 1483.  
didn't restore - how Richard took throne - reasons

In many ways it is accurate to say that the Yorkist kings restored royal authority between 1471-85. This can be seen by Edward's second reign. However, ~~there are~~ it could also be accurate to say that the Yorkist king didn't restore royal authority. This can be seen by Richard III's reign, how he took the throne and lost it.

One <sup>reason</sup> way in which is accurate to say that the Yorkist kings restored royal authority is Edward's second reign. Henry had been placed back on the throne by Warwick, but Edward won it back at the Battle of Tewkesbury. ~~Edward~~ There were no other battles during this reign and he died naturally in 1483. This can show that royal authority was restored because there was no challenge or rebellion against him.

People respected Edward and so authority was there. Another reason for the Yorkist kings was in Richard III's reign. Although it was short and he was unpopular, his regime was effective. Authority can be said to have been ~~there~~ there during his reign because even though he was unpopular amongst the nobles, his first challenge came from Henry Tudor and when that came to a battle (Battle of Bosworth), Richard had the ~~the~~ tactical advantage and ~~more~~ more men. However, there are also many reasons as to why it is accurate to say that the Yorkist kings did not restore royal authority. This can be seen by how Richard



lost the throne Richard lost it to Henry Tudor at the Battle of Bosworth even though ~~he~~ Richard had had the upper hand. Richard's supposed allies, the Stanleys and Northumberland, had switched sides and helped Henry. This shows that royal authority had not been completely restored because although they came with Richard, they had still switched meaning they had not cared ~~about~~ ~~rich~~ about Richard's authority over them. Another reason against the Yorkist Kings was in the way Richard III came to the throne. Richard's usurpation meant that Edward's children (Edward V and Richard) were placed in the Tower of London. Richard then claimed

that they were illegitimate making him the rightful king. This also showed that authority had not been completely restored because even though Richard did nothing while Edward IV was alive, he did when he died meaning that his authority had not carried on after death.

In conclusion, it is accurate to an extent to say that ~~royal~~ royal authority was restored by the Yorkist Kings, particularly Edward IV. His royal authority meant that he had a peaceful death unlike Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth 2 years later.

However, it is also accurate to an extent to say that royal authority was not restored by the Yorkist Kings, particularly Richard III. His royal authority, or lack of, meant that he was killed by Henry Tudor at Bosworth.

~~Therefore, it is accurate to say this for Edward but not for Richard.~~

Therefore, although Edward's authority may have been good, it had not affected Richard, who usurped the throne when Edward died, betraying him. This means that royal authority was restored but not completely.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

While the answer shows some understanding of the focus of the question, it is limited in its range of material covered. There is fair coverage of some rebellions against Edward IV, but detailed knowledge of Richard III's reign, and the extent of his authority, is very limited. This lack of depth and range means a mid Level 3 award.

### Question 13

Some candidates, perhaps focusing too much on the specific reference to Warwick and Warbeck in the question, saw issues of the king's security exclusively in terms of the threats posed by rebellions, notably Simnel's and Warbeck's, and went on to develop a lengthy narrative on these threats. Equally, however, there were a number of excellent answers that fully appreciated the demands of the question, noting, with explicit analysis, the importance of the year 1499 and the removal of two of Henry's greatest threats. Some answers made the point that Henry continued to face problems after 1499 due to the continued presence abroad of de la Pole. Most went beyond the obvious threats to the king's position by noting the steps Henry took to increase his security. These included the marriage to Elizabeth of York and the confirmation of his title by parliament. Equally significant were steps taken to limit noble power, which had contributed to the Wars of the Roses, and by ensuring financial stability through the Chamber system. Some strayed into foreign policy matters. This was acceptable as long as foreign affairs did not overwhelm the answer and as long as the issues raised were effectively linked to domestic security.

(This page is for your second answer.) Between 1485-1499

Rebellions - Battle of Stoke 1487

Finances - ordinary - extra ordinary revenue

Law and order. Dont mention Edmund de la pole

Foreign policy - crowned magnificence married

As Henry VII won the battle of Bosworth in 1485

he knew that he would have to strengthen his

position as he had a weak claim to the throne

which would make it inevitable for rebellions

However firstly Henry was crowned as king with

a magnificence, this was very effective as it showed

the people who was king. He also showed him self

in parliament which was very effective as it showed

he was a strong confident leader. Also in 1485

Henry married Elizabeth of York this was a very

successful move as it would of brought the

Yorkists on side which would of strengthened

(This page is for your second answer.) his position .

However Henry faced quite a few rebellions in the first part of his reign, such as the Lambert Simnel rebellion in 1487 pretending to Edward Earl of Warwick. The Simnel rebellion had a lot of support but were eventually defeated in the battle of Stoke by the death of Lovell. This showed instability in Henry's reign as there were many pretenders occurring. However the fact that Henry was able to defeat the rebellion showed that he was a strong leader in comparison to Henry VI. ~~Many~~ <sup>Two</sup> rebellions occurred to the fact of Henry's political mistakes the Yorkshire Rebellion which was led by Egremont for his anger to tax rise to help save Brittany. Also the Cornish rebellion in 1497 led by Joseph and Flammoek. Both these rebellions were defeated by Henry but shows that people were unhappy by the methods he was using which showed that he needed to strengthen his position with the commoners.

The Perkin Warbeck rebellion in 1491 - 1499 was also down to the fact of pretenders as he claimed himself to be Richard IV. This rebellion made Henry realise that he needed foreign policy to strengthen his position as



(This page is for your second answer.) as king as many foreign countries were interested in Perkin Warbeck. In 1489 Henry signed the Treaty of Medina del Campo with Spain this was very effective and successful as it stopped them supporting and pretenders and sandwiched France. This was signed by the Marriage of Catherine of Aragon and Arthur which also produced a future dynasty. Henry made many treaties because of the Warbeck rebellion which did secure his position. Such as the Treaty of Etaples which was with France that gave Henry £5,000 per annum and also the promise that they would support pretenders. This was also shown by the Poynings Law in Ireland and the Truce of Ayton in Scotland which secured his position as king as he had good foreign relations which was very effective. As it caused the capture of Warbeck who was eventually killed.

Another method to strengthen his position was law and order to control the nobility. Henry used new men who were responsible for law and order this was very effective as they were able to help Henry in controlling the country. However some of their methods

(This page is for your second answer.) became a bit harsh and did cause some trouble. Another method he used were the JP's - justices of the peace these were responsible for retaining law and order once again this proved to be successful which strengthened Henry's position. However people like Harry Uvedale exploited their position and took land of Sir George Talbot and made him pay £500.

He also used methods like the privy chamber the star chamber and the local council. This was very effective as it made things more effective and successful.

Henry also used the church to strengthen his position using John Morton archbishop of Canterbury to help as he was very influential. Henry was successful as he re established law and order and the Tudor dynasty. However he lost control of the JP's and made many people angry like the earl of Lincoln.

Henry also used finance to strengthen his position as he knew that money equated power. As he couldn't even afford his own coronation and by the start of 1485 only earning £12,000 he knew he had to make

(This page is for your second answer.) Changes. He used ordinary revenue such as crown lands to improve finance as the land became 5x larger he also used bonds and recognisance which proved to be very effective. Henry also used extra ordinary revenue such as benevolence which gave him £30,000. This method proved to be very successful as it gave him a lot of money. He also changed the exchequer to the Chamber which gave him direct control to the revenue. This made it more effective however as he had no time or experience it made things very hard.

Henry's finance did improve the strength of his position he was one of the wealthiest monarchs in the 16th century. However he started to Alum trade which could of caused a lot of problems. ~~He~~ despite this Henry equalled £15,000 compared to Edward who equalled £60,000. This proved to strengthen his position.

From looking at all these factors Henry did improve the strength of his position he improved on finances and was

(This page is for your second answer.) Henry able to control the nobility by acts of attainder and by the order of the garter. He proved to be very successful. Even though there were rebellions Henry was just at the start of his reign which meant that he had to prove himself to the people. Overall Henry did improve on the strength of his position as he gained many allies across Europe which helped him secure his place against any pretenders and also with *Marius Intercursus* with free trade in Burgundy. Even though in some cases he exploited many aspects searching for concealed lands which made him look extremely greedy.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer relates well to the question and is aware of the issues to be discussed. There is good range here, including rebellions, the nobles, foreign policy, the Church and financial matters. However, the support for these points is very variable, and thus the answer overall lacks balance. The range of material allows for a high Level 4 award.



## PLAN

| <u>Agrees</u>             | <u>Disagrees</u>  |
|---------------------------|---|
| Alliances to stop warbeck | controlling nobility<br>Battle of Stoke 1487 - Simnell.<br>weakened by raising taxes. |
| French pension            | ↓<br>rebellion<br>Yorks, Cornish  |

When Henry VI gained power in 1485 after defeating Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth, he had to make sure he got rid of any threat as he knew that he didn't have a strong claim to the ~~throner~~ throne. It was not just Henry that knew this as

(This page is for your second answer.) rebellions were to occur to remove him from the throne. Perkin Warbeck was a young pretender and gained much support by ~~claiming~~ in places like Ireland. However he was not the only pretender to worry Henry VII. ~~Was~~ Lambert Simnell was also another pretender. However he raised an army and led it to the Battle of Stoke in 1487. However ~~the~~ Henry put down the army and showed his strength and removed Simnell as a threat to him. With Henry showing his strength, ~~he~~ it meant that he would put a doubt into other people's minds if

they were ~~challenging~~ planning on trying to usurp him.

It was not just pretenders that ~~the~~ Henry had to worry about when protecting his reign. He also had to prevent nobles becoming overmighty. This was done by things such as attainders and rewards and punishments. He tried to keep his nobles faithful so he made them sign an agreement to be loyal to him. If they were to do so then he would reward them with titles, however he could easily take them away. He also tried to control marriages so nobles

(This page is for your second answer.) couldn't marry their way into a better position to challenge the throne. By controlling the power that nobles gained he made his throne more secure. ~~Despite~~ Despite losing an attempted invasion of France which weakened his position of king he also strengthened it at the same time by gaining a French income which allowed him to control his finance better. Henry used ordinary and extraordinary revenue well as ~~to~~ one of his aims was to ~~leave~~ leave his successor money to defend himself if needs be. The French pension also allowed him to have an ally with France. This also meant that the French agreed not to support Warbeck if he

tried to enter the "country. Shutting off different countries to Warbeck meant that Henry was able to gain more control over him. This was due to Warbeck being constantly on the move.

Overall I feel that Henry being able to gain the execution of Warwick and Warbeck strengthened his position on

(This page is for your second answer.) The throne as other possible people contemplating a possible rebellion would not want to as they would fear the strength and Henry and his army.

However I also feel that Henry's control ~~of~~ over the nobility enabled him to not worry about possible uprisings of overmighty nobles. ~~He~~ His finance also strengthened his position as he was able to easily raise an army which would mean he ~~could~~ could defend himself when he needed to.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The answer considers some aspects of Henry VII's security, notably the Simnel and Warbeck rebellions and the issue of noble power. However, development of the points raised is lacking in depth, although broadly accurate. An attempted analysis, though organisation is not secure. Mid Level 3.

## Question 14

There were two popular approaches to the question. Some candidates considered Henry's relations with each of France, Spain, Burgundy and Scotland, analysing the reasons for different relationships with these countries, and drawing overall conclusions. Weaker responses tended to take the form of a narrative which did not display much range or depth. The Treaty of Ayton with Scotland was often omitted or its implications were not fully recognised, in particular that it ended the threat posed to Henry's security from the northern kingdom. The trade embargo with Burgundy was also not well understood in terms of its implications for Henry's security, nor were the events of 1506. A few strong responses noted the relative significance of each country for Henry, pointing out that the Spanish alliance and Medina del Campo were highly successful, and that Etaples was financially beneficial. Overall, there was a good level of argument and some strong evaluation in many answers.

(This page is for your second answer.) To a certain extent it can be agreed that the main aim of Henry VII's foreign policy was in fact to strengthen his security in England.

Upon winning the throne from Richard III in 1483 at the battle of Bosworth, Henry was quick to establish security for himself as the English king. He crowned himself king, before the actual battle, which enabled him to declare all those who fought alongside Richard as traitors. This in a way decreased the number of Yorkist supporters, and more or less eliminated any more potential threats to the throne from Yorkists as they did not want to be seen as traitors.

One way that we can see that foreign policy

(This page is for your second answer.) was used in order to strengthen Henry's security in England was through the pretender Lambert Simnel. Simnel was able to gain the support of Margaret of Burgundy, Ireland, and Ireland who recognised him as Warwick -



Therefore giving him a claim to the throne. Henry was forced to improve relations with Ireland in order to prevent the pretender gaining any more support - even though he was a minor threat due to the real woman being alive in the Tower of London.

Having captured Simnel in 1468 at the battle of Stoke - he was later executed in 1469, after relations with Ireland were improved.

We can also see through Warbeck that foreign policy was able to strengthen the security of England.

Warbeck was again supported by Margaret of Burgundy, Maximilian, Scotland - James IV and France - Charles VIII.

The fact that he had gained so much support forced Henry to improve his foreign policy in order to eliminate the threat. The suspension

(This page is for your second answer.) of trade with Flanders was an attempt from Henry VII in order to cut off Margaret of Burgundy's help for Warbeck. On top of this, the Treaty of Etaples, established in 1492 ~~meant~~ with France in order to prevent a war provided Henry with a French pension, as well as the promise that France should not aid any pretenders of Henry's throne. This backs up the point made that

The main aim of foreign policy was to strengthen security as due to the treaty, no help was to be given to help any future pretenders meaning that Henry's throne would become less sufficiently challenged, increasing Henry's security.

The truce of Ayton in 1497 also is an aspect of foreign policy, which entailed that Scotland would not help any pretenders to the throne, again showing that the main aim of foreign policy was to strengthen his security in England. On top of this, the *medina del campo*, could not be continued with Perkin Warbeck challenging the throne/

overall security  
(This page is for your second answer.) meaning that Henry would want to increase aspects of foreign policy in order to insure that the marriage agreement between Arthur and Catherine of Aragon would be allowed from Spain.

On the other hand, not all Henry's foreign policies were focused around strengthening Henry's security. Trade agreements with Burgundy allowed Henry to sell goods in any of Philip of Burgundy's domains (except Flanders) without paying any custom duties. This shows us a financial aspect to Henry's foreign

policy, which can also be seen in the Poynings law established with Ireland, stating that Irish law could not be used against English merchants on Irish soil. The aspect of finance is widely important to Henry as it enables him to become more powerful and harder to threaten, but on top of this, his foreign policies did sometimes revolve around a financial point.

On one hand it can be seen that in the beginning of his reign Henry's foreign policy was focused around helping to secure his position in England due to Lambert Simnel, Perkin Warbeck and Edmund de la Pole posing substantial threats to the throne due to having support from other countries. But towards the end of his reign I believe that it was more to do with creating strong alliances.

1496 saw Henry join the Holy Roman League, in order to again gain support himself from other countries, as well as giving Henry money and alliances through marriage agreements such as son Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon in 1506.

In conclusion, to a certain extent it could be argued that Henry's foreign policy ~~was~~ carried the main aim of securing the strength of Henry's security of England. This was because

(This page is for your second answer.) due to Henry's claim to the throne and the fact that he usurped Richard III, numerous other claims to the throne arose, with Edmund de la Pole insisting that he was the new white rose pretender to the foreign support that was given to both Simnel and Warbeck allowing them to become such serious threats forced Henry to improve, and widen his foreign policy. However it could be argued ~~that~~ towards the end of his reign, security had already been established, therefore giving foreign policy an alternative main reason such as finance or creating alliances. Overall I think that it is accurate to say that the main aim of foreign policy was to provide Henry with a strengthened security in England.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer considers issues of security by dealing with the pretenders Simnel and Warbeck, and links security issues to treaties such as Etaples and Ayton. The development of trade as a feature of foreign policy is also addressed. Secure development overall, high Level 4 marks were awarded.



(This page is for your second answer.)

Due to Henry's usurpation of the English Crown, Henry had to legitimise his position and secure successful alliances with major foreign countries to secure the Tudor dynasty. It can be suggested that Henry's main aim throughout his foreign policy was to be recognised as the King of England, a major player in Europe and to secure the Tudor dynasty. Overall it will be reflected in this essay that the most significant reason for Henry's foreign policy was to secure the throne.

Henry dated his reign to be the day before Bosworth so anyone who fought against him would be seen as rebels. This was the first implication that Henry's biggest aim was to secure the throne. As soon as he became king Henry extended a 1 year treaty with France in 1485, extended a three year treaty with Scotland and James V and extended a 1 year treaty with Maximilian, ~~and Spain~~. This immediately shows that Henry's first major aim was to secure the crown from any foreign invasions whilst he worked on legitimising the throne entirely at home.

(This page is for your second answer.) Furthermore, traditionally France and England had been major rivals in Europe but as it had been suggested Henry was a peace maker and did all he can to try and prevent war. He made the truce with France as they had helped him win Bosworth and he made commercial treaties with Brittany which had helped him whilst he was in exile. However Henry's policy began to get disturbed when trouble brewed up between France and Brittany. France had a new king Charles VIII and he was a minor, his regent, sister Anne wanted him to marry Anne, the heiress to Brittany with an aging father Duke Francis. However Francis wanted Anne to marry Maximilian who had recently been widowed. Both countries sought help from England

which put Henry in an awkward situation. He decided to compromise and send 1000 troops to Brittany under Lord Scates and he tried to act as mediator between both countries. When this failed Henry disowned Scates and renewed his treaty with France. France won and a treaty was formed in which Anne could not marry without Charles' permission. This left England in threat as France was a major and an even more major power with Brittany. Therefore Henry decided to act. As he ~~had~~ did not want to appear weak in Europe he decided to call war on France even though he knew they could not conquer it. Fortunately Charles had other problems in Italy and thus resulted in the Treaty of Etaples where he recognised Henry as king, promised not to aid rebels as he had previously done with Perkin Warbeck and offered 1/3 revenue per year for the King.

Even though Henry could not fight back Brittany this was seen as a success as he gained in finance and he secured the throne which was his major aim as well as being recognised as a major power in Europe.

One of Henry's most successful diplomacy was the Treaty of Medina del Campo in which he promised his son Arthur to Spain's youngest daughter Catherine of Aragon. ~~sp~~ Due to the unification of Spain it was seen as a major Royal power in Europe and to have a treaty with them secured the Tudor dynasty as the conditions included that Spain recognised Henry as king, promised not to aid pretenders and rebels and if one or the other ~~got~~ involved with France in war the other would have to intervene. This was seen as a profitable treaty ~~for~~ Henry as it secured his throne in England and improved his prospect of becoming part of the Spanish empire.

Furthermore England and Burgundy had been allies against France for years. However Margherit of Burgundy was the

sister of Richard III and when she heard about the pretenders Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel she openly aided them and publically announced them as her nephews. This was a major threat to Henry as he stopped all trading links with Burgundy, however an eventual outcome the Magnus Intercourses, which restored all trading links with England and Burgundy, and Burgundy recognised Henry as king and promised not to aid any rebels secured Henry's throne

(This page is for your second answer.) In England and also increased his popularity with merchant and cloth traders as it restored their business.

furthermore Henry's trading links with Brittany was seen as an advantage as on many occasions they promised to pay for any mercenaries that Henry sent and this raised in revenue for Henry. Keeping on good terms with Brittany also meant that France could not use Brittany as a base point to invade England, thus securing Henry's crown.

moreover England and Scotland had always had rivalries, even more so when the Scottish King James VI aided pretender Perkin Warbeck and promised his cousin to marry him posing a serious threat to Henry. However Henry managed to negotiate the Treaty of Ayton in which James recognised Henry as king, promised not to aid pretenders and secured a marriage between Henry's daughter Margaret and James' son. Negotiating this treaty with Scotland improved Henry's popularity and also successfully secured the throne for him. <sup>Holy League</sup> or League of Cambrai

Therefore overall it can be said to the significant extent that Henry's main aim in all his policies was to secure the throne and secure the dynasty. The fact that every treaty included that the foreign countries should recognise Henry as king

explicitly implies that Henry wanted to be known and legitimised not only in England but throughout Europe. To a great extent Henry was successful in his aims and used his powers also to improve financial policy and to create greater magnates.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

There is an attempted analysis here. However, the answer develops into a narrative of the actions which Henry took, and does not link this to the king's aims and the extent to which he was successful. Accurate narrative with some attempt to frame an explanation: high Level 3 marks were awarded.



## **Paper Summary**

Centres might consider the following ways in which future performance might be improved:

- Candidates must answer the question set, not the one they were hoping for.
- The whole chronological range given in the question should be covered.
- Candidates should be familiar with, and comfortable with, historical words and phrases appropriate to the course of study.
- Candidates could study the factors relevant to an aspect of their course as a set rather than a number of disconnected factors; and their relative importance could be weighed up accordingly.

## **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](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US032391 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://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

