

Mark scheme (Results)

Summer 2022

GCE History (8HI0/2A)
Advanced Subsidiary

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England
and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom,
c1053–1106

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin
Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–
89

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

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

Summer 2022

Question Paper Log Number P66260RA

Publications Code 8HI0_2A_2206_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Generic Level Descriptors

Section A: Questions 1a/2a

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little if any substantiation. Concepts of utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.• Knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.

Section A: Questions 1b/2b

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	6-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.
4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Section B

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	11-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106

Question	Indicative content
1a	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the operation of the feudal system in England after 1066.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It provides evidence that the feudal relationship was sealed by doing fealty to the overlord and provision of land for the vassal ('performing the ceremony of homage', 'In return for his fief')• It provided evidence that the vassal was required to supply knights for the King's army ('Peter promises that he will serve the King... He will provide the King with three or four knights')• It suggests that the knight had duties to both his immediate overlord and to the King ('serve the King, on behalf of the Abbot')• It suggests that the Church had a military role within the feudal system ('if the Abbot shall take Peter anywhere outside England, then the Abbot shall pay the expense of Peter's service').2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is an official document that outlines exactly the terms of the relationship under the feudal system• This is a rare source as most agreements were made orally and do not exist in the historical record• The Abbot was a vassal of the King and had a personal experience of the feudal system and the relationship between overlord and vassal.3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Anglo-Norman tenants-in-chief included earls, archbishops, bishops, abbot and barons• William I granted lands to a small elite in return for military service. By the process of subinfeudation, a similar relationship was constructed between tenant-in-chief and his vassals• Vassals had to provide a certain number of knights to carry out military service. This quota was known as the <i>servitium debitum</i>• The Church held over a quarter of the land in England and was not exempt from providing military service.

Question	Indicative content
1b	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the reasons for the appointment of Anselm as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1093.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The history was recorded by a close friend of Anselm who knew him before and after he became Archbishop and can offer insight into his character • Eadmer was a monk of Canterbury and provides the perspective of someone who was directly affected by the vacancy in the Archbishopric • The language and tone of the source is subjective, making it clear that Eadmer admired Anselm and was critical of William II. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that a new archbishop was necessary because there was a vacancy ('since the death of its Archbishop') • It provides evidence that Anselm's appointment was favoured by the leading barons and the bishops ('Some of the greatest of them were upset over the condition of the Church', 'held there by the bishops') • It suggests that William Rufus only appointed Anselm because he feared he was going to die ('he was close to death', 'necessary for the King's salvation'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William Rufus kept many abbacies and bishoprics vacant, preferring to keep the revenues for himself and only extreme necessity, e.g. the threat of eternal damnation, prompted him into making appointments • Anselm was a pupil of Lanfranc and a scholar of international renown. He possessed all the necessary credentials suited to the position of Archbishop • The monks begged William Rufus to appoint Anselm.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2a	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into developments in the legal system under Henry II.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It suggests that Henry II responded to concerns about the burden of justice by reducing the number of judges ('greatly burdened by the multitude of judges, there were eighteen judges... he chose five only')• It provides evidence that the judges were to hear cases in the King's court ('They were not to leave the King's court, but should remain there to hear the complaints of the people')• It suggests that the King was the ultimate lawgiver ('If any case should come before them which they could not decide, it should be presented to the King').2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The chronicle was written by a clerk to Henry II who was in close contact with the King and able to give an informed account of events• The content and tone of the source suggest the chronicler is taking an impartial stance• The chronicler was a Justice of the Forest and would therefore have a specialist insight into the development of the legal system.3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• By the late 1170s, the legal system was struggling under the increased workload brought about by Henry's legal reforms• Five members of the Curia Regis were permanently assigned to the new court of the King's Bench• The sitting of the court of the King's Bench did not depend on the presence of the King in the country. It contributed to the growing idea that the King was the ultimate source of justice.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2b	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the significance of Thomas Becket as Chancellor in the years 1155-62.</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• FitzStephen was a member of Becket's household and will have had a personal insight into his actions as Chancellor• The source was written nearly 2 decades after Becket was appointed Chancellor and will have given the writer time to reflect upon Becket's work as Chancellor• The account was written after Becket's murder. The circumstances of Becket's death and canonisation are likely to have had an impact on the assessment of Becket's work. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It claims that Becket was responsible for governing the country ('All things were entrusted to Thomas...Thomas differed from the King only in name, and he governed the whole realm')• It suggests that Becket wielded enormous power ('It was difficult at that time for any action to be taken which Thomas had not first approved.')• It suggests that Becket enjoyed enormous wealth in his position of chancellor ('His table was splendid with gold and silver ... No price was too high for such luxuries.')• It provides evidence that Becket was trusted by the great men of the realm ('Magnates ... placed their sons in the Chancellor's service', 'The King himself entrusted his son ... to Thomas' training'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As Chancellor, Becket served the King diligently and developed the chancellorship into a large and important part of royal government• Becket took on aspects of royal government that Henry II found tedious, such as attending ceremonies and brokering deals with foreign dignitaries• Becket played an important role in developing the financial security of the realm. He attended the Exchequer and was responsible for the revival of scutage as a flat 20 shillings from barons.

Section B: indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the key features of the claims to the English throne by Harald Hardrada and Duke William were very similar.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the key features of the claims to the English throne by Harald Hardrada and Duke William were very similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both Hardrada and William based their claims to the throne on promises made by former kings of England; William was promised the throne by Edward and Hardrada's claim was based on the promise made by Harthacnut to Magnus of Norway• Both Hardrada and William based their claim on support promised by the House of Godwin. Harold promised to support William in the oath made in 1064 and Tostig promised to support Hardrada in the summer of 1066• Both Hardrada and William were warriors who intended to back up their claims by military conquest. <p>Arguments and evidence that the key features of the claims to the English throne by Harald Hardrada and Duke William were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Duke William's claim was bolstered by papal support and given the status of a crusade. Hardrada had no such religious support for his claim• Duke William claimed that both Edward's offer and Harold's oath made him the legitimate heir. Hardrada could not claim the same legitimacy because he was seeking to enforce a promise made not to him but to his uncle• Hardrada could base his claim on the support of Viking ancestors who had settled in the north of England who would welcome the return of Viking rule. William did not expect any support in England for his claim• Hardrada had to be persuaded by Tostig to make his claim to the throne. William was furious when he heard Harold had taken the throne in January 1066 and immediately began preparations to enforce his claim by invasion. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how significant the submission of the Anglo-Saxon earls to William I in 1066 was in dealing with opposition to the Normans in the years 1066-75.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the submission of the Anglo-Saxon earls to William I in 1066 was significant in dealing with opposition to the Normans in the years 1066-75 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediately after Harold's death, the witan chose Edgar Atheling as king. The submission of the earls ended this and gave a formal recognition of William's position by the leading men of the realm • Edgar Atheling, Edwin of Mercia and Morcar of Northumbria surrendered to William after he surrounded London. The leading earls were under William's control and their threat was neutralised • The surrender of the earls enabled William to force them to accompany him on his return to Normandy in early 1067. This meant that there were no leaders left to rally opposition against William. <p>Arguments and evidence that the submission of the Anglo-Saxon earls to William I in 1066 was not significant/other factors were more significant in dealing with opposition to the Normans in the years 1066-75 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The earls did not play a central role in rallying early opposition to Norman rule. The Exeter rebellion was encouraged by the presence of Harold's mother, Gytha, and the expected invasion of Harold's sons • The submission of the earls was short-lived. In early 1068, Edgar, Edwin and Morcar escaped William's court and fled north. Edgar was recognised as king by the rebels in the northern rebellion • Edwin and Morcar played a role in transforming Ely from a refuge for disaffected men into a centre for rebellion. Their previous submission had no bearing on their loyalty to William or in preventing opposition • William's harsh methods of punishment were more significant in dealing with opposition. The harrying of the north, the mutilation of rebels in East Anglia and the execution of Waltheof ended the Anglo-Saxon rebellions • Castle building was a more significant long-term solution to dealing with opposition. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the deposition of Stigand as Archbishop of Canterbury was the most significant of the reforms introduced into the English church in the years 1066-87.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the deposition of Stigand as Archbishop of Canterbury was the most significant of the reforms introduced into the English church in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deposition of Stigand was necessary in order that Lanfranc could be invested as Archbishop of Canterbury and lead the reform of the English church • The deposition of Stigand emphasised the removal of clerical abuses of pluralism and absenteeism that were prevalent in the pre-Conquest English church • The deposition of Stigand was the starting point for the purge of the Anglo-Saxon bishops of Selsey, Lichfield, Durham and Elmham, and their replacement with Norman clerics • The deposition of Stigand removed a supporter of the antipope Benedict X. This meant that William I could call upon papal support for the reform of the church in England. <p>Arguments and evidence that there were other, more significant, reforms than the deposition of Stigand as Archbishop of Canterbury introduced into the English church in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1072, the Primacy of Canterbury was established, which significantly extended the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury to control the church and introduce reform • Church Councils were introduced. These were used to drive reform in the English church, e.g. the outlawing of clerical marriage and enforcement of celibacy in the Council at Winchester in 1070 • Church courts were introduced where clerics would have cases heard by bishops. Clergy would not be subject to the judgement of lay courts • Bishoprics were reformed by transferring seats from rural to large urban locations and by subdividing dioceses into archdeaconries which allowed more effective enforcement of common standards in the church. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far the peace of Montmirail succeeded in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169-72.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the peace of Montmirail succeeded in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The peace of Montmirail, with the division of Henry II's territory among his sons, relieved Louis VII's fears that he would be overpowered by the Angevin Empire• Louis' daughter Margaret was married to Young Henry and his daughter Alice was betrothed to Richard, thus giving Louis VII powerful connections within Henry II's family, which should have limited disputes• The peace made Richard vassal to Louis for Aquitaine and Young Henry vassal for Normandy, Anjou and Brittany. Henry II recognised Louis VII as his overlord for Brittany, which he was holding until Geoffrey was of age• After agreeing the peace of Montmirail, Louis VII attempted to settle disputes in the Angevin territories by reconciling Henry II with rebels in Brittany, Maine and Aquitaine• The peace of Montmirail settled the border disputes between Normandy and Louis' Île de France that had resulted from Henry II's raids in the years 1167-68. <p>Arguments and evidence that the peace of Montmirail did not succeed in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169-73 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Henry II had no interest in being reconciled with rebels within his territories. In the aftermath of Montmirail, he destroyed their fortifications in Brittany and Aquitaine, thus strengthening his empire in relation to France• Henry II built a new castle in Maine, purchased the castle at Montmirail and fortified the Vexin. This sent a clear message to Louis that Henry did not want any interference in his relations with his own vassals• Louis VII continued to support the exiled Archbishop Becket after the peace of Montmirail. He believed Becket's claims that Henry II could not be trusted. This was an obstacle to settling disputes. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
7	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Henry II's authority over the English church did not change in the years 1154-74.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's authority over the English church did not change in the years 1154-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the whole period, the authority of the King to punish criminals was affected by the ambiguity over who was a member of the clergy • Throughout the period, the authority of the King over the church was limited by the weapons of interdict and excommunication that were used by the church • The issue of church courts and the limitations they placed on royal justice continued after the agreement of Avranches in 1172, just as they had since 1154 • The necessity for the Crown to co-operate with the church continued throughout the period, meaning that Henry needed to submit over Becket's murder, and his authority remained unchanged. <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's authority over the English church did change in the years 1154-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Peace of Avranches, 1172, strengthened Henry II's powers in punishing a member of the clergy if the clergyman had committed an offence against the royal forest and in issues concerning crown tenants • In the years 1154-70, Henry was able to use the schism to limit the authority of the papacy in England. This changed in 1172 when Henry recognised Alexander III as the true pope in the Peace of Avranches • In the Constitutions of Clarendon, Henry II forbade the clergy to appeal to the pope without his permission. In the peace of Avranches, he agreed not to obstruct appeals to Rome • In the Constitutions of Clarendon, Henry forced the clergy to agree to abide by the ancient customs of the realm. In the peace of Avranches, he agreed to abolish all customs that were prejudicial to the church. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
8	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether, in the years 1180-89, the main cause of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire was the ambitions of his sons Richard and John.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1180-89, the main cause of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire was the ambitions of his sons Richard and John should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard had ambitions to rule Aquitaine alone. He refused to do homage to Young Henry for Aquitaine in 1182 and strengthened his castles on the borders of Anjou and Aquitaine, which provoked war in 1183 • Richard had ambitions to inherit the whole Angevin Empire after the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey • Richard launched an attack on Henry's lands in France in 1189 because he wanted to force Henry to recognise him as heir to the whole Angevin Empire • John joined Richard and Philip II of France against Henry II because he feared that he would not receive any lands on Henry's death if he did not support Richard. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1180-89, there were other, more important causes of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire than the ambitions of his sons Richard and John should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry II's refusal to nominate his successor after the death of Young Henry fuelled the quarrels between Henry II and his sons, which were indicative of the complete lack of trust within the family, destabilising the Empire • By 1189, Henry II was less able to crush uprisings. The whole structure of the Angevin Empire rested on the ability and vigour of the ruler; Henry was too ill to fight on and Richard and Philip were militarily stronger • Philip Augustus was determined to expand France at the expense of the Angevin Empire. His anger with Henry was further provoked by his failure to return the Vexin. He entered into an alliance with Richard in 1189 • The Angevin Empire was a vast and disparate land mass of different cultures, language and feudal relationships. Its eventual collapse was very likely. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>