



A-level HISTORY 7042/2A

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



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

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

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reign of King John.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2*

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

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

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this author is anonymous and this limits his value as it is impossible to decide if he had an active agenda in favour of/against King John. The author is Flemish (which is not the same as being French) and Flanders offered support to both John and his enemies, so this makes the author likely to be well informed, and possibly even an eye-witness to some events in England
- the account was written around the time of the events which it is describing, which might increase the value, although it is not clear whether the author has the hindsight of how John's reign ended (in civil war and disgrace) and this might have coloured his views on John earlier in the reign – 1210 as he discusses here
- the chronicle account here is part of a much broader volume on the Dukes of Normandy and Kings of England, which might increase its value as there does not seem to be a particular agenda re John. Indeed, chronicles usually offered a narrative account of events as they occurred. This author seems to have been well informed, due to the level of detail he is able to supply, which might increase its value
- the tone of the source is highly critical of John, seeking to portray him as a bad king and a bad man. Some of the accusations are quite general, but there is use of specific examples, which would be readily verifiable, which helps to increase value.

Content and argument

- the source alleges that John had a 'nasty streak'. He enjoyed humiliating his barons. This is supported by John's treatment of men like Robert Fitzwalter (John was accused of raping his daughter) and even his own half-brother, the Earl of Salisbury – John seduced Salisbury's wife whilst Salisbury was away fighting on his behalf. Many of the rebel barons in 1215 named particular grievances about John's personal behaviour towards them
- the source suggests that John was cruel and particularly outlines the treatment of the de Briouse family. That John did persecute the family was well established at the time, and Giles de Briouse was a key rebel in 1215. A key clause of Magna Carta discussed the appropriate treatment of prisoners. In 1202/03 John had allegedly starved prisoners from Mirebeau to death at Corfe Castle and there were widespread rumours that he had murdered his nephew Arthur. Thus, the source's claims seem credible
- the source suggests that John's behaviour was such that many of his barons came to hate him on a personal level. This is supported by the scale of the support ranged against him in 1215/16. A significant majority of the English barons seemed to have preferred the prospect of a French king of England, rather than standing by John
- however, the source is very one-sided and dramatic in its presentation of John as king. John retained the support of key barons (such as the Earls of Pembroke and Chester) and seems to have ruled

England in an active and personal manner. This was the cause of some of the baronial grievances, especially in the north, they were used to less regular royal interference.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a letter from the Pope, a man who had had many dealings with King John, and so was well placed to comment upon the King (although they had never met in person)
- Stephen Langton was the controversial Archbishop of Canterbury, whose appointment John had tried to resist from 1207–1213. Thus, any correspondence between the Pope and Langton was from a partisan perspective
- 1213 was the year in which John was reconciled with the Papacy, and became a Papal Vassal. However, this early in the year, Innocent was concerned that John would row back on the promises that he had made. It is clear to see from the instructions to Langton that Innocent did not trust John's promises. This makes the source quite valuable in showing how others viewed John
- the tone is quite inflamed, suggesting that John was a ready breaker of his word and actively impious – Innocent is putting Langton on the front foot in his dealings with John. This is valuable, as it presents the view that John was untrustworthy, even in his dealings with the Church.

Content and argument

- Innocent claims that John is 'wicked', equating him with Henry II's own treatment of Thomas Becket (killed in his own Cathedral). This suggests that John is tyrannical and impious in his behaviour. This has value, as John was determined to control Church appointments in England and his continental territories, and he threatened any churchmen who took the Pope's side in the Canterbury dispute with physical harm if they remained in England
- Innocent complains about John's unjust treatment of the Church. After John came to terms with the Papal legates it was agreed that he would pay a huge sum of money to recompense the Church. Indeed, John took advantage of the Interdict and amassed a huge war chest for his 1214 campaign as a result of the vacant bishoprics
- that John was well known for breaking promises can be supported by his behaviour after the negotiations with the barons at Runnymede in 1215. John promised to listen to, and act upon, their grievances, and then immediately appealed to the Pope for an annulment – suggesting that he was notably untrustworthy
- however, Innocent wrote this letter at a time of great tension. Later on, he would be very supportive of John and his regime – the struggle with John had reflected badly upon Innocent's own power, and he had a vested interest in trying to exert his authority. In many ways it was Innocent who had acted unreasonably in unilaterally appointing Langton in the first place.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Wendover lived through John's reign, so is valuable in having experienced it first hand, but he composed his chronicle afterwards, thus his accounts may have been negatively affected by hindsight and the knowledge that John's reign ended in failure and defeat for the King
- as a monk, Wendover may have been negatively affected by John's argument with the Papacy over the appointment of the Archbishop of Canterbury and John's treatment of English churchmen and monks. This might affect Wendover's objectivity
- the general purpose of chronicles is to provide a narrative account of events, which is what Wendover does here, but the authors often imposed their own judgements and opinion, which we can see in the language deployed. This might negatively affect value
- the tone of the source seems to be quite objective, setting out the events in the order that they happened (which can be corroborated by other evidence). However, describing John as 'deceitfully pretending' does show that there is an agenda against John, as compared with the messengers who are acting 'without deceit'. These choice phrases help to build a negative picture of John and might lead us to question the source's value as a factual account.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that John only offered to reach terms with his barons after he realised that he had very little support. This can be corroborated by the events of 1214/15. The barons had aired grievances in the autumn of 1214 and, most notably, in London in January 1215. However, John did very little until the barons took control of London. It was the potential economic and strategic problem that this caused for John which led to his offer of meeting the rebels at Runnymede
- the source suggests that John never really intended to keep any promises and that he was being 'deceitful'. After agreeing to the terms of what would become Magna Carta, John immediately requested an annulment from the Papacy, which would support Wendover's assertion
- the source suggests that John's supporters, like William Marshal, know nothing of John's plans. However, that the barons did not trust John, as suggested here, might be shown by the Clause in Magna Carta which established a Council of Barons to ensure that John ruled appropriately in the future. Wendover had the hindsight of what would happen after the meeting at Runnymede, and this might have affected his recollections of the events of May. Wendover could not possibly have known what John was thinking in his mind
- the source suggests that John was totally to blame for the argument with his barons and that they were joyful about the prospect of peace with the King. Arguably, they were rebels, refusing to obey the orders of the King, who had been the first to take arms. Wendover offers only a partisan account, with no consideration of John's perspective.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent did Henry II rely upon the support of the English Church to establish his royal authority in the years 1154 to 1166?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Henry II relied upon the support of the English Church to establish his royal authority in the years 1154 to 1166 might include:

- Henry's accession in December 1154 was relatively straightforward thanks to the Treaty of Winchester which had been brokered with King Stephen in 1153. This written agreement clearly stated that Henry would succeed upon Stephen's death and the leading men in the country had witnessed it. Key in arranging this treaty were leading Churchmen, most notably Theobald of Canterbury and Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester
- the long civil war between Stephen and Matilda had seemed like it would continue indefinitely. However, Archbishop Theobald's refusal to crown Prince Eustace in Stephen's lifetime, signalled that the English Church wanted hostilities to be brought to an end. Because of the Church's role in supporting Henry as King, they had to continue to support him once he had been crowned, otherwise they would undermine their own political position (Henry's coronation was performed by the Church and they would not want to question this)
- Theobald and Henry worked effectively together and Henry was able to promote men he trusted into high church office (eg Thomas Becket). Churchmen were very important as they helped to direct people's views, but were also important landholders and feudal vassals and so needed to be kept onside. Henry's expanding bureaucracy would not be able to function without the support of the Church and so Henry did rely upon them in developing his reforms to the Exchequer and the justice system
- men from the English Church helped Henry with political matters – for example, Becket acted as an ambassador for Henry in 1158, brokering the marriage agreement between Young Henry and Margaret of France – an agreement which was critical in ensuring that disputes in his French lands didn't become a distraction to his rule in England.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II relied upon the support of the English Church to establish his royal authority in the years 1154 to 1166 might include:

- Henry's accession to the throne was arguably the result of other strengths – his young age and political skill, added to the vast resources at his disposal thanks to his position as Duke of Normandy, Count of Anjou and husband to Eleanor of Aquitaine. This made it likely that many of the barons in England (who also held lands in Normandy) would support him as King of England
- the main way in which Henry secured Royal Authority in England was arguably through his firm but fair treatment of the barons from early on in his reign. By tackling problematic barons (eg William of Aumale and Roger of Hereford) in 1155, the other barons were keen to work with the King and support his regime. Henry could then start to reorganise the royal finances and control over the law courts, areas which had been encroached upon by the barons in Stephen's reign
- the Church actually delayed Henry's establishment of his authority: Theobald was famously a reforming bishop, not inclined to surrender Church rights to the monarchy. Indeed, Theobald probably recommended Becket as his successor precisely because he thought that Becket would also protect the Church from the King. Henry had concerns about the powers that the Church had accumulated in Stephen's reign, but could not do anything about this whilst Theobald lived
- by 1166, Archbishop Becket had damaged Henry's position – he had rejected the Constitutions of Clarendon (an attempt to codify the Church's feudal position) and he was in exile, drumming up opposition to Henry in Europe and at home.

Students could argue persuasively for or against the idea that Henry relied upon the support of the English Church. They might argue that the Church was just one component explaining how Henry was

able to establish a strong position by 1166. The appointment of Becket does suggest that Henry saw the potential for using the Church in this way but, when this didn't work, he exiled Becket and carried on without him, thus, suggesting that his strengths were more broadly based. Students could just look at how the Church was helpful versus how it was not, or they could consider other ways in which Henry was able to establish his position. They could also combine these approaches. Any valid and supported line of argument will be rewarded, but they should not just focus their answers on the dispute with Thomas Becket.

0 3 How successful was Henry II in re-establishing his authority in the years after the Great Rebellion?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Henry II was successful in re-establishing his authority in the years after the Great Rebellion might include:

- following the involvement of the barons in the Great Rebellion, there was no further rebellion from his English barons for the rest of Henry's reign. Henry himself clearly felt secure enough in his English territories to spend the vast majority of the 1180s in his French lands, leaving the day to day running of the country to his justiciar, Ranulf Glanville
- although Henry had seemingly backed down over controlling the English Church at Avranches, in reality he was in control. He was able to appoint many royal clerks as Bishops and he worked well with the next two Archbishops of Canterbury. He was even able to appoint his own bastard son as Bishop Elect of Lincoln
- the Assize of Northampton reaffirmed the legal reforms which had been implemented at the Assize of Clarendon and tightened up a few loopholes and punishments. The legal textbook, 'Glanville', was authored in this period, indicating that the legal system was functioning effectively. This was an important aspect of royal authority
- Crown revenues were very healthy by the time of Henry's death, indicated by the huge sums raised by the Saladin Tithe (1188) and the huge sums that Richard would be able to raise for the Third Crusade. That the Crown could collect taxes, fines, tallages and scutages efficiently suggests that Royal Authority had been re-established successfully. A further recoinage in 1182 also helped to ensure a stable economy.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II was successful in re-establishing his authority in the years after the Great Rebellion might include:

- the end to Henry's reign saw his sons in open rebellion against him and the humiliating agreement whereby he acceded to the demands of Richard and King Philip. He was abandoned by most of his barons and died alone. This suggests a lack of authority, especially given the other rebellions he had faced, such as that of Young Henry in 1183 and Geoffrey in 1186. The ambitions of his sons were never really dealt with and their motives remained the same as they had done in 1173
- one of the key areas that Henry had been determined to assert his authority over was the English Church. However, following the death of Becket, he was forced to submit to the Papacy at Avranches, accepting the renunciation of the Constitutions of Clarendon. Henry was also subjected to the humiliation of being publicly flogged at Canterbury in 1174
- in 1172 and 1188 Henry took the Cross and agreed to go on Crusade. However, he was never able to do this as he had too many pressing problems at home, suggesting that he did not feel secure enough to leave his lands. In 1176 he took all castles in England into royal hands for a time, suggesting a concern about baronial loyalty (and that of his son, Young Henry)
- in the immediate aftermath of the Great Rebellion Henry seemed to be in a strong position with regards to the King of France. However, after Louis died in 1180, it soon became clear that King Philip posed a serious threat to Henry's authority. It was Philip who encouraged the ambitions of Henry's sons, turning them against their father one after the other, meaning that his time in the 1180s was often absorbed in internecine strife.

Students are likely to consider that Henry was quite successful in re-asserting his authority in England, but was less successful when dealing with his continental territories. The main reason for this was the destabilising ambitions of his sons and the interference of King Philip of France. There is a range of areas that students could use to explore the idea of 'authority' and any supported judgement will be rewarded.

0 4 'Richard I was more committed to crusading and his French territories than to governing England.'

Assess the validity of this view

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that Richard I was more committed to crusading and his French territories than to governing England might include:

- Richard was King of England from 1189 to 1199, but he spent only 6 months of this time in England. It is claimed that he boasted that he would 'sell London if I could find a buyer', suggesting that he only viewed England as a source of revenue for his expensive projects in France and the Holy Land
- Richard's expenditure on the Crusade was enormous and his ransom meant that a tax of 25% on moveable property was imposed upon England. Hubert Walter was criticised by the chroniclers for extracting huge sums of money from England via inventive new methods (eg the carucage) – all to be spent elsewhere. The castle at Chateau Gaillard cost around £11 500 when Richard only spent £7000 in total on castles in England. Some have argued that John's problems in his reign were caused by Richard's reckless spending
- Richard was very keen to proceed upon his Crusade in 1189 to 1190 and this meant that his arrangements for the government of England in his absence were arguably rushed. William Longchamp was a poor appointment who caused political upheaval and problems with Prince John – and one of the main reasons for his appointment was that he had paid a large bribe
- Richard failed to make effective provision for his younger brother, John, whilst he was absent on Crusade. He allowed John to enter the country and have lots of territory in the South West, but failed to give him a meaningful role in government. This suggests that Richard did not really care about what would happen in his absence. Whilst on his way to the Holy Land, Richard made his nephew, Arthur, his heir as part of the Treaty of Messina. This possibly caused some of John's disruptive behaviour. Richard had prioritised his crusade at the expense of England's future stability.

Arguments challenging the view that Richard I was more committed to crusading and his French territories than to governing England might include:

- Richard's absences from England should not be viewed as a negative thing. Henry II spent only a third of his 35-year reign in England. The fact that the King was absent and that there was no major baronial rebellion suggests that the country was stable and able to operate effectively – this was a legacy of Henry II's reign where the governmental system had been developed in such a way as to accommodate a more itinerant style of kingship
- there are plenty of examples which show that, although absent, Richard was interested in what was happening in England. He sent Walter of Coutances to deal with John and Longchamp in 1191 and a key reason for the Treaty of Jaffa with Saladin in 1192 was news of John's rebellious activities. The reason why Richard did not return immediately to England from the Crusade was because of his imprisonment, an event which he could not have predicted
- whilst Richard was campaigning in France he was in regular contact with Hubert Walter, and many documents were sent for his approval. Hubert Walter was an excellent appointment and Richard could trust that England was being run efficiently on his behalf
- as the loss of Normandy in John's reign shows, England's security and stability were bound up in the condition of the French territories held by Richard. If the French king controlled Normandy then he could use it as a base to invade England and, perhaps more importantly, many of the English barons also held territories in Normandy and they would expect Richard to prioritise their security.

Students might argue that Richard was more interested in the more exciting opportunities offered on the Crusade and by fighting in France. However, his absences did not mean that he was not interested in or concerned about England, he just prioritised those tasks which required him to present in person. England had long been used to the King only being intermittently present and so, largely, it functioned

effectively without him, especially when competent officials like Walter of Coutances and Hubert Walter were appointed. The fact that there were no major rebellions suggests that the most important men in the country were happy with the situation. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.