



# **Examiners' Report June 2023**

**GCE History 9HI0 30**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0\_30\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this of exams with A Level paper 9HI0 30 : Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII, 1399–1509.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1). Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated. A minority of scripts continue to pose some problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting; examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to continue to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question and shaped their responses appropriately to meet the demands of the question. More responses were seen this summer that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a debate, where appropriate. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question. It was disappointing this summer to note that a number of candidates seemed to have only a weak grasp on the timing of key events.

Section C requires candidates to answer a breadth question. The questions in this section are set to encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded that, as has been pointed out in previous Principal Examiner reports, this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology. It should also be pointed out that 'bookending' the chronology with little between those 'bookends' is unlikely to meet the demands of the higher levels in bullet point 2. Candidates are also reminded that engaging with the specific stated factor, or turning point, if one is identified in the question, is vital if candidates are to show that they have responded to the specific question asked.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1

Candidates of all levels were able to access the source and to at least reference both enquiries, although Richard's failings were often dealt with in more detail than the reasons for Henry's successful usurpation. There was good understanding of the events of 1399 and the years leading up to it, meaning the overwhelming majority of candidates were able to comprehend the source accurately and most were able to link this to some contextual knowledge. The vast majority of answers were able to make some inferences, many of these were developed and used contextual knowledge to assess the accuracy of the information. Interpreting the evidence in the light of the values of the time (e.g. what was normal for monarchs, what was expected by parliament, what Henry and parliament were trying to do in 1399) was rarer, but when done well led to good evaluation of the source. The most impressive answers teased out inferences regarding Henry's ability to usurp the throne (considering the absence of Richard in Ireland and the role of nobles. The analysis of the provenance was not always as strong. Quite often there was an assumption that parliamentary documents would be accurate, but often this was brief or simplistic: i.e. As it is from Henry's first Parliament it will be biased/pro-Henry. This was not always fully developed or explained. Often provenance was added as a paragraph towards the end, whilst only the strongest answers integrated these comments into their evaluation of the two enquiries. Comments on the weight of evidence were sometimes asserted and not explained. Once again, a large number of students wasted time on an introductory paragraph that added little to their answer. An effective introduction should set out the debate surrounding the two enquiries and suggest a judgement, not offer a narrative.

1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the failings of Richard II and the reasons for Henry IV's successful usurpation of the crown.

Explain your answer, using the source, the information given about its origin and your own knowledge about the historical context.

(20)

This source is incredibly valuable in revealing the failings of Richard II in terms of his misuse of finances. The source proclaims that Richard "taxed his people heavily" resulting in the "impoverishment of his realm" and using the sums raised for "his own glory". This ~~concern~~ <sup>condemnation</sup> regarding Richard's use of finances was true of his reign as the Wonderful Parliament of 1386 raised such concerns involving ~~his~~ issues. Furthermore, these financial problems were compounded by Richard's <sup>financial</sup> over-generosity to his close advisers ~~John~~, de la Pole (who was appointed earl of Suffolk in <sup>1385</sup> ~~1386~~) and de Vere (who was awarded the dukedom of Ireland in 1386). The fact that this source is a record of parliamentary proceedings means it is valuable for revealing ~~the~~ parliament's negative attitude towards Richard.

The source also demonstrates Richard's miscarriages

of justice. As well as proclaiming "that he alone could make, alter or create the laws of his realm", Richard "did not allow justice" by employing "threats". It is true ~~to~~ that Richard claimed to have personally made the law. Additionally, he utilised intimidation through his retinue of 700 Cheshire archers (300 of whom formed his personal bodyguard), for example, surrounding parliament with these men to ensure the conviction of the Lords Appellant. ~~Further more,~~ <sup>Thus, members of</sup> the parliament would have witnessed such corruption of justice first hand, meaning this source has bias in part as Richard did indeed undermine judicial process.

This source also emphasises, Richard's untrustworthy nature which, as well as highlighting his failings, serves to establish part of the reason Henry Bolingbroke was able to usurp him. The source characterises Richard's failings as being "inconsistent", "misleading", "untrustworthy" ~~and~~, allowing <sup>his</sup> "disgrace" to befall the realm as well as establishing truces with England's "enemies". Indeed, ~~the~~ Richard's conciliatory attitude towards the French, coupled with the fact he had previously been known as "Richard of Bordeaux" allowed for

widespread suspicion of his pro-French leanings. In addition, some of his actions were considered disgraceful and "inconsistent" with what was expected of a king in the public eye. For instance, his taking the crown jewels with him to Ireland. These factors were key failings of Richard II. However, they also serve to evidence the reasoning behind Henry's successful usurpation as such discontent prompted the defection of York ~~king~~ (the defender and protector of the realm), for example, to join Henry. This record of ~~the~~ parliamentary proceedings was made <sup>in October 1399</sup> directly following Henry Bolingbroke's usurpation. As a result, it usefully and accurately establishes the reasoning behind a contemporary event. Therefore, ~~this~~ <sup>the detail in this</sup> source is consistent with the events which occurred and successfully displays the failings of Richard and the reasons for Henry's usurpation.

The source establishes that Henry has a God-ordained right to the throne and is "descended by right line of blood". Henry proclaims, "God in his grace has sent me". It is true that Henry was Richard's cousin and related

to John of Gaunt, meaning he did have a right to the throne. However, up until this point, kings had been appointed by the line of succession through birth. Thus, kings were thought to have a divine right to rule (an attitude which Henry uses to his advantage in this source). However, Henry's usurpation and the criticisms of Richard in this source illustrated a king's actions could be speculated upon and he could be usurped by an over-mighty subject. Thus, though Henry's usurpation was military, its success lay in his attempt to affirm that it was his divine right to rule in spite of this. The ~~pro~~ nature of the source enhances its usefulness as it features direct speech (which has been recorded) by Henry which evidences the image of himself he wanted to present.

Moreover, the source illustrates the support Henry had in his usurpation from "my kin and of my friends". This support consisted of the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland as well as his Lancashire retainers. However, as the first parliament of Henry IV's reign,

This source inevitably emphasises ~~Henry's~~ the support for Henry, neglecting the element of luck in his usurpation: the fact Richard was away in Ireland and did not return until the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July had allowed Henry to seize his treasures at Holt Castle.

Nevertheless, this source is useful ~~and~~ is illustrating that part of Henry's success lay in the support he received.

To conclude, overall this source is immensely useful for revealing Richard II's failings (his <sup>avaricious</sup> misuse of finances, miscarriages of justice and untrustworthy nature) and the reasons for Henry IV's successful usurpation of the crown (his claim to a God-given right, and the support he received). The provenance of this source enhances its usefulness as parliament did depose Richard in 1399. ~~and~~ Furthermore, in ~~books~~ regarding Richard's failings ~~and~~ in conjunction with Henry's successes, one can clearly see why a usurpation was possible "~~at the~~ in a society "at the point of ruin for lack of governance and destruction of the good laws."



This candidate draws heavily on the source, using quotations throughout the response which are then supported by contextual knowledge. The provenance of the source is used to inform the validity of the arguments made and to support the judgements made in the conclusion. There are points when this response could be more tightly linked to the specific enquiries but overall, this candidate meets the criteria for level 5.



Make sure your response is source led. Contextual knowledge should be used to support the points you make from the source not the other way round.

## Question 2

There were few very short or weak answers to this question, which was the slightly more popular question in Section B. Most students had at least some relevant knowledge to draw on and were able to understand the conceptual focus of the question. That said, a large number of answers to this question interpreted mistakes of the Lancastrians as being Henry VI's weakness as a monarch and his incapacity as well as Margaret of Anjou's partisan relations. These answers often did not address the dates in question and gave a lengthy analysis of Henry VI's reign. Weaker candidates also tended to approach the answer in a more chronological rather than analytical way. Stronger answers had a strong focus on the period 1460-61 and drew on mistakes and other factors in those years to engage with the question. For example, if the Parliament of Devils was mentioned, it was linked to the Yorkist invasion of 1460. The role of Margaret's army and the failure to march on London was also used, but Henry's failure to act as a strong military leader could also be contrasted with Edward to engage with the question. Most answers also discussed Yorkist strengths such as Edward's military skill, the financial support, propaganda and military support of Warwick as well as bringing in ideas about luck/weather on the battlefield at Towton. The best answers were able to analyse the likelihood of Yorkist success at different stages and were able to conclude that no one factor brought about Yorkist success and were able to explain the combination of events and circumstances.

The success of the Yorkists in the years 1460-61 can be attributed to a multitude of reasons. 'Lancastrian mistakes' involves many factors including the role of Margaret of Anjou and the failings of Henry VI himself, which are a significant reason for Yorkist victory. However, although Lancastrian mistakes were a significant consequence, as growing ambition of the Duke of York and Warwick also played a major role in Yorkist success.

One significant consequence of Lancastrian mistake can be attributed to that of the failings of Henry VI. Yorkist success 1460-61 was the result of years of growing tension at the hands of Henry. Support for the Yorkist cause played a significant role in success at major battles like that of Northampton in <sup>June</sup> 1460. The support of Yorkist was heavily reliant on the allegiance of the nobility, who's allegiance tended to fluctuate dependent on which side could satisfy their self interest. Henry's impeachment in 1453 - Christmas 1454 as well as ineffective dealings with growing tensions provided a significant level of political instability. ~~This~~ This allowed for local disputes to breed

into chaos, and ultimately become issues of national importance, as local disputes ~~but~~ played a major role in determining where allegiance lay during the major battles of the wars of the roses in 1460-61. For example, during the battle of Northampton in June 1460, one nobleman, Lord Raby of Ruffin was fighting for the Lancastrian army, however when approached by Edwards men, he ~~lay~~ forced his men to lay down their weapons and help the Yorkist side into the Lancastrian camp, this was because of a land dispute he had with one of the leading Lancastrian men who was ~~high~~ high ranking in the army. This is one example of how Henry VI, ineffectual governance of his kingdom and passivity in establishing law order can be considered evidence of Lancastrian ~~strategy~~ mistakes which ultimately increased support of the Yorkists and ~~there~~ contributed to their success.

Another factor that can be considered a significant Lancastrian mistake is the role of Margaret of Anjou. Margaret was a significant political figure who dominated the political stage throughout 1460-61. It was at her hands that ~~the~~ the Lancastrian army successfully defeated the Yorkists at the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471. However, where her mistake lies is in her decision to march <sup>her army</sup> down to London.

To celebrate their success, pillaging passing towns along the way. This was a significant mistake as it lost Margaret the vital support of the Londoners, who could prove extremely consequential in success and failure of a king as London was the country's trade hub. It was also where <sup>parliament was</sup> ~~government~~ <sup>the capital</sup>. By the time Margaret reached London, the Londoners had shut their gates. The reputation Margaret's army had gained meant the Londoners had turned to support the Yorkists, ~~and~~ which proved fatal after the battle of Mortimer's Cross in early Feb 1461 when the Londoners welcomed Edward, proclaiming him as king Edward IV. Another mistake Anjou is responsible for is breaking the act of Accord passed in October 1460. This was because she ambushed Warwick at Wakefield in November. This was a mistake that led to dire consequences, as Richard Duke of York was killed at Wakefield, which only increased Yorkist motivation. It also put Edward, York's eldest son, in charge of the Yorkist army, who in the light of Henry VI's failures presented as a much ~~more~~ <sup>option for</sup> better king. Breaking the act of Accord was another significant reason in enhancing Yorkist success as it increased Yorkist support in London whilst also isolating support for the Lancastrian regime. Anjou was also responsible for the Parliament of Devils in 1469 which cen

be considered another example of Lancastrian failure, as it dishonoured Yorkist children and accused leading Yorkists of treason. This preceded the fighting of 1460-61, in which Yorkist success was spurred on by the motivation of mistakes made at the hands of Aragon (Lancastrian). Therefore, it can be asserted ~~the Lancastrian mistakes did~~ ~~play a major role~~ that Yorkist success was largely a result of Lancastrian mistakes, particularly those made by Margaret of Aragon.

\*

It would, Yorkist success during 1460-61 cannot be solely ~~to~~ attributed to the mistakes of the Lancastrians, as the growing ambitions of Richard Duke of York, along with the personality and influence of the ~~other~~ earl of Warwick played a significant role. It can be argued that up until 1460, the actions of the Yorkists was largely reactionary, for example after Henry VI was captured after the first Battle of St. Albans in May 1455, the Yorkist swore an oath of loyalty to him. This indicated they had little intention of taking the crown or engaging in war. However, as time went on, York's ambition ~~continued~~ <sup>began to</sup> grow. After Yorkist victory at Northampton, at which Richard was not present, he returned from Ireland and walked into

parliament where he proclaimed himself the rightful king. This action shows a complete change in attitude compared to that shown in previous years, suggesting his ambition had grown. This was only increased in 1461 after York's death at Wakefield December 30<sup>th</sup> 1460. Edward was more motivated, believed when he saw 3 suns ~~be~~ in the sky before the battle at Mortimer's Cross, this was a sign from God. Therefore, the growing ambitions of the Yorkist played a significant role in the battles of Mortimer's Cross in early Feb 1461 and at the decisive battle of Towton 1461, ~~where~~. The role of Warwick who later became known as the 'king maker' also played a significant role in Yorkist success in 1460-61. This is because he had a large fortune and possessed significant power. As Captain of Calais, he had access to a garrison which he, Edward and Salisbury were able to take advantage of after they fled from <sup>Calais</sup> after the Battle of Tewkesbury. His extensive use of propaganda was effective in discrediting Margaret's army and increasing support for the Yorkists. This support was exacerbated, along with financial resources which as a result of the very public policy Warwick engaged in along the channel. This not only increased funds which supplied the Yorkist army to contribute to their success in 1460-61, but also increased support,

particularly among the Londoners who were unhappy with as trade in England had been depleted in favour of foreign markets. Therefore, both Warwick and Yorkist growing ambition were pivotal in enabling Yorkist success 1460-61, and it cannot be justifiably asserted that it was solely a consequence of Lancastrian mistake.

In conclusion, Lancastrian mistake evidently played a major role in Yorkist success in 1460-61. However, it was not the only factor, as York growing ambition along with the influence of Warwick also played a hand in contributing to Yorkist success in 1460-61. This is particularly at the hands of Margaret of Anjou and the mistakes made by Henry which increased political instability within the country, thus allowing consequently leading to Yorkist success. However, this was not the only factor, as York's growing ambition, along with the influence of Warwick also played a significant role.

\* There is also an argument to suggest that many decisions made by the Lancastrians were not mistakes.



There are a range of factors considered here, and the candidate clearly attempts to establish criteria by which to make a judgement. There is also reference back to the question at the end of each paragraph which further develops the judgements. However, as the candidate considers the interrelation of the various factors and supports their arguments with detailed evidence, this response meets the criteria for level 5.



Aim to weigh up at the end of each paragraph and to make sure your links back to the question are explicit. This will ensure that you are making sustained judgements throughout your response.

### Question 3

Overall, there was good understanding of the conceptual focus of this question and most answers made at least some attempt to assess the reasons for Richard III's success in taking the throne. Weaker answers spent considerable time on the 1460s and 70s, discussing the marriage of Edward to Elizabeth Woodville and not linking this to the events of 1483. These answers also tended to discuss earlier Yorkist divisions, i.e. the actions of Warwick and Clarence in 1469-71 and the execution of Clarence on 1478, rather than on the events leading to Richard's usurpation and were only rarely linked to Richard's increased power and strength. A lot of candidates would have benefited from more detailed knowledge on the issues facing Richard in 1483 and his possible motivations for seizing the throne. Strong answers to this question were able to discuss the divisions among the Yorkists in the 1480s, such as the fear of the Woodvilles and uncertainty about a child monarch and the subsequent support for Richard among other nobles. They often then compared this factor with Richard's strength and support from the north, his removal of opponents like Hastings and the princes and the very best also brought in the role of Buckingham and parliament. These candidates were able to reach a sustained evaluative judgement.

Richard III was crowned King on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 1483, following the death of his brother, Edward IV, on the 9<sup>th</sup> April 1483. Arguably, earlier divisions among the Yorkists allowed this to occur, as the threats of Clarence and Warwick to Edward IV had allowed Richard to accumulate power and thus establish a strong position from which to usurp his nephew, Edward V. However, ultimately, the more convincing factors in Richard III's seizure of power are ~~the~~ his ~~short~~ ~~term~~ destruction of Edward V's support-base and his assertion of himself as a stronger claimant. ~~So~~ Prior Yorkist tensions were important but Richard's success lay in his actions immediately before his coronation.

Firstly, to some extent, divisions among the Yorkists allowed Richard III to seize the throne as the defeat of the over-mighty Warwick resulted in an acquisition of land and status for Richard. In ~~1464~~ 1467, in response to Edward IV's secret marriage to Elizabeth

Woodville (May 1464) and subsequent over-generosity to her family, Warwick shifted his allegiance to the Lancastrians. Warwick briefly returned Henry VI to <sup>the</sup> throne (earning himself the cognomen, 'kingmaker') before being murdered at the Battle of Barnet on the 14<sup>th</sup> April 1471. Following this, Edward IV aimed to increase control of localities as a means of increasing stability. Part of this process involved granting Richard (of Gloucester) leadership of the 'Council of the North'. In this role, Richard successfully defended the Scottish border, gaining a strong military reputation. Additionally, Richard was granted all the Northern territories previously owned by Warwick, increasing his personal influence. Therefore, Yorkist divisions in the form of Warwick's rebellion indeed had the long-term impact of placing Richard in a powerful enough position to seize the throne in 1483.

Similarly, the Yorkist tensions between George Duke of Clarence and Edward IV (Richard's brother) were also beneficial as they removed Clarence, who may have become a

Later threat to Richard ~~and Estelle~~ Aster  
(members of Clarence's household)  
Edward IV had executed Burdett and Stacey in  
April - May 1477 (in response to Clarence's  
un-just execution of Anneville Twynho ~~→~~ for  
supposedly murdering his wife), Clarence was  
engaged. He interrupted a council meeting  
at Westminster to read out their verbal  
declarations of innocence. This was problematic  
as it evidenced Clarence interfering with the  
judicial process. As a result, he was put  
on trial for treason in January 1478  
and subsequently executed, thus removing  
what may have materialised as a threat  
for Richard. As well as this, during these  
Yorkist tensions, Clarence had spread  
rumours of Edward's illegitimacy, which  
was a factor Richard later played upon to  
justify his claim. In late June 1483,  
Buckingham and Dr Ralph Shaw issued  
proclamations that Edward was illegitimate.  
Thus, as well as eliminating a potential  
rival, the Yorkist tensions of the late 1470s  
established factors upon which Richard  
would later base his claim to the throne.

However, arguably more important than these

earlier tensions were Richard's actions in the immediate aftermath of Edward IV's death to eliminate any possible opposition or support for Edward V. With the ~~the~~ assistance of Buckingham, Richard III arrested Anthony Woodville, Sir Thomas Vaughn and Sir Richard Grey, & executing them later on the 25<sup>th</sup> June 1485. This removed a faction of noble support from his nephew. Richard also executed Lord Hastings on 13<sup>th</sup> June 1483, in spite of the fact that Hastings had supported Richard's decision to come to London. Therefore, Richard's brutal ~~and~~ treatment of all those who ~~can~~ had the potential to oppose him, allowed his seizure of the throne in 1483.

Additionally, Richard's treatment and removal of the princes (Richard of York and Edward V) was imperative for his seizure of the throne. On the 4<sup>th</sup> May 1483, Richard assumed the role of Protector, according him a degree of power over the Princes: he was able to pressure Elizabeth Woodville into allowing both boys to be placed in the Tower of London by the 16<sup>th</sup> June. Moreover, Edward V's coronation date was repeatedly moved

in May and June, giving Richard the time to seize the throne. It is widely accepted that the Princes were subsequently killed on the orders of Richard, therefore allowing him to seize the throne without the obstruction of Edward IV's heirs. ~~later~~ Hence, Richard's removal of the Princes was more important than divisions among the Yorkists as, even with his accumulated power, it is unlikely Richard could have seized the throne without somehow removing Edward IV's heirs.

To conclude, although divisions among the Yorkists did assist Richard in his eventual seizure of the throne in 1483, it was his actions in eliminating opposition and removing the Princes that were of paramount importance. Through the rebellions of Warwick and Clarence, Richard gained land, power, and the opportunity to display military prowess. However, these <sup>long-term</sup> factors alone would not have secured Richard the throne if it had not been for his brutal and dramatic self-assertion (with the assistance of Buckingham) in April - July 1483.



This candidate has produced a well-focussed response considering a range of factors which are well supported by carefully selected evidence. The candidate does well to explore the stated factor in detail, before comparing other factors back to this stated factor at the end of each paragraph. The candidate also ensures that their response is tightly focussed upon the correct chronological period when making their judgements. This is a level 5 response.



Consider the stated factor in sufficient detail before moving on to other factors. This will ensure that your response is tightly focussed on the specific question that is being asked.

## Question 4

This was the less popular of the breadth questions. Unfortunately, a significant number of answers to this question did not go into sufficient detail on the Southampton Plot with relation to the crushing of conspiracy against Henry V in 1415, and therefore did not fully engage with the question. Some candidates focussed solely on the reign of Henry V, which meant that their responses lacked sufficient breadth. Although, the very best answers were able to compare the relative significance of different factors in weakening the ability of the nobility to challenge royal authority, these were quite rare. There was not sufficient knowledge and understanding of the issues of 1415. Students were often able to talk in more depth about other issues that weakened the ability of nobles to challenge royal authority, such as the use of bonds by Henry VII and the strength of the monarch after 1471 as well as other examples of crushing of conspiracies across the period. The very best answers accepted that the nobility were never really subdued over the period and this allowed an analysis of long term versus short term reasons for fluctuations in the ability to challenge the Crown. Candidates are reminded that the most effective answers focus first on the factor or event stated in the questions and compare subsequent factors back to the stated factor in order to evaluate.

I agree with the judgement that 'the crushing of the conspiracy against Henry V (1415) most significantly weakened the ability of the nobility to challenge royal authority in the years 1399-1509' to a minor extent. I believe that consequent challenges to <sup>real</sup> ~~subtle~~ authority by nobility in the years after such as Warwick's challenge to ~~Henry~~ Edward IV show clearly that this was not the case since ~~Allement~~ was not long lived but additionally that even the crushing of Warwick in 1471 did not suffice and ultimately it was Henry VII's statute against retaining in 1503 and his employment of bonds and recognisances that most significantly weakened the ability of the nobility to challenge royal authority 1399-1509.

The crushing of the conspiracy against Henry V in 1415, also known as the Southampton plot, was a significant blow to the ability of nobility to challenge royal authority. The instigators involved Baron Scrope, Sir Thomas Grey and were supported by the earl of Northumberland and his troops as well as a number of Welsh and Scottish rebels and hollards, the conspiracy involved killing the King and replacing him with Edmund Mortimer. The participants were defeated and the leaders executed with their heads displayed, serving as a chilling reminder to those who would consider challenging Henry V's royal authority. The reason this might be regarded as the

instance that most significantly weakened the ability of nobility to challenge royal authority is because for the rest of his reign, despite frequent absence from England in France, no further ~~noted~~ noble led rebellion materialized. However the conclusion that this demonstrates the most significant weakening of noble ability can be challenged on two counts. Primarily because Henry V, owing to his numerous victories in France including Agincourt and Harfleur in 1415 and Normandy in 1419, was fulfilling his role as monarch which was to act as defender and protector of the realm and demonstrate military capability in France. The implication of this is that since he was operating within the ~~boundaries~~ expectations of his position, the nobility had no reason to challenge his authority, however this doesn't mean their ability, should they so choose, to challenge him was weakened. The absent longevity of this noble opposition lends further credence to this view as had noble ability to challenge royal authority really ~~been~~ been weakened to such an extent, Edward the IV would not have been able to usurp Henry VI and in turn been usurped by Warwick in 1470. The continued recurrence of overmighty nobles exerting influence over royal authority to such an extent that Warwick was deemed 'king maker' highly undermines the judgement that the crushing of Campagna against Henry V was the most significant weakening of noble ability to challenge authority in the years 1399-1509.

Perhaps then, owing to the overzealous challenge to <sup>royal</sup> royal authority

-by <sup>Edward</sup> by Warwick ~~restored~~ and his recurrent involvement, it was his demise that most significantly weakened noble ability, in that it gave clear indication of the consequence of such machinations. Support could be given to this assertion by the evidence that Edwards second reign was increasingly more stable and, like Clarence his brother, he faced no significant noble opposition. This could suggest that Warwick's demise served as a harsh reminder of the effect of noble challenge, further compounded by Clarence's demise in ~~the~~ 1478.

However again the stability of Edwards reign can be attributed elsewhere in that the financial stability granted to him by the 1474 Treaty of Picquigny (from which he received £15,000 upport and an annual pension of £10,000) allowed him to be above noble critique and intervention as he no longer had to cede requests in return for taxation. This significantly weakened parliament and hence the nobility's ability to challenge royal authority (since they made up a large part). Additionally attention can be called once more to the brevity of supposed implications on noble ability since the battle of Bosworth in 1485 with evident noble support against the crown, clearly demonstrated such noble ability was still strong enough to support usurpation of the monarch. Indeed noble involvement can be cited as a key reason for the success of the usurpation with the earl of Oxford leading Henry Tudor's vanguard and Sir William Stanley's intervention with his 2500 men proving key in granting Henry Tudor (later Henry VII) a decisive victory. This recurrent theme of noble usurpation, arguably the highest ability of the noble to

challenge the authority of the crown, but ultimately removing it and granting it elsewhere, certainly does not suggest the longevity or extent of effect you would expect to see from a significantly weakened ability to challenge. This paired with the alternate explanation for lack of opposition in ~~the~~ Edward's reign leaves me to conclude the demise of warwick was not enough to ~~be~~ be deemed the factor that most significantly weakened the ability of the nobility.

Since such demonstrations of royal authority ~~seemed~~ seem underwhelming in their continued effect, perhaps a more cogent weakening of ability would be more significant. This was provided by Henry VII <sup>in his policy of</sup> ~~the~~ deterrence via bonds, recognisances and physical limitations via his act against retaining. I believe these measures enacted by Henry VII were the most significant ~~the~~ weakening of noble ability to challenge royal authority. Via the introduction of bonds and recognisances ~~of~~ the nobility essentially had to pay for privileges and ~~pay~~ <sup>pled</sup> for disloyalty and violent quarrels. By the end of his reign over half of the peerage had been forced to pay such fines, indicating widespread employment by Henry and the consequence of fiscally tying people to him was a highly effective method of control, especially since most were stripped of assets for even potential disloyalty. An example of the measures employed by Henry was the case of Lord Abergavenny who was fined the enormous sum of £70,000 which Henry agreed to reduce to

£500 a year for 10 years provided he was not disloyal. This significantly weakened the ability of the nobility to challenge royal authority for fear of being stripped of their assets and titles. A more tangible method of weakening royal ability was Henry's 1503 statute against retaining. This masterfully solved the issue of allowing Henry to still acquire military support when needed whilst also ensuring noble opposition was rendered near impossible. It involved placing limitations on the amount of retainers a noble could acquire and depriving retainers required the King's approval meaning he could control the affinities of those who could oppose him whilst allowing his supporters affinities to grow. These methods in conjunction were highly effective and are even more significant if we consider that he faced no significant noble opposition in his reign despite his weaker hereditary claim to the throne and his constant struggles with pretenders, something that other kings of similar backgrounds did not have. Indeed the lack of opposition of Edward IV and Henry V is mainly down to their strong claims and popularity, whilst Henry had a weak claim and was extremely unpopular (particularly for his financial means and perceived avarice). This demonstrates all the more the success of his measures and leads me to conclude that Henry VIII's use of bonds and recognisances and the 1503 statute against retaining was the most significant impairment on the ~~was~~ ability of the nobility to challenge royal authority in the years 1399 - 1509.

Therefore I agree with the judgement to a minor extent owing to lasting longevity and recurrent opposition as well as alternative reasons for such and believe this assessment was applied to the demise of the earl of Warwick. In my opinion Henry VII's use of bonds & recognisances as well as <sup>1503</sup> the statute against retaining was the most significant weakening of noble ability to challenge royal authority in the years 1399-1509.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is successful as, firstly, it has just about sufficient coverage across the period, and secondly, engages explicitly with the wording of the question. There is a sense that an assessment is being made of the extent to which the nobility were 'significantly weakened'. The introduction sets out the debate and the criteria by which the judgement will be made, and this is revisited and developed in the conclusion. This is a level 5 response.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Consider the stated factor in sufficient detail before moving on to other factors. This will ensure that your response is tightly focused on the specific question that is being asked.

## Question 5

Answers to this question tended to be much stronger than answers to Question 4 and this was the more popular question in Section C. A thematic approach was often successfully taken, talking about diplomacy alongside issues of royal finance, the monarch's relationship with Parliament, war and sometimes bringing in relations with the nobility. Very impressive knowledge of diplomatic initiatives was demonstrated on many occasions, considering the different types of diplomacy monarchs could deploy (e.g. truces, marriage). The strongest answers were able to compare the impact of these factors on the power of the crown. The vast majority of answers to this question were able to include sufficient range of material across the time period. The very strongest answers showed an awareness of the interlinked nature of the issues discussed above. Some weaker answers would have benefited from more precise and detailed knowledge and greater explanation of how/why the monarch's power was affected, sometimes this was asserted. Weaker answers also tended to focus on listing prominent treaties, rather than demonstrating that while many treaties benefitted the English crown, others did not. The conceptual focus of this question was clearly understood and there were very few very weak answers for this question. Overall, there was a good range of knowledge on the whole across the time period; this was dealt with well.

~~Overall,~~ Diplomacy (including that in the form of marriages and financial agreements) was utterly imperative in increasing the power of the crown in the years 1399-1509. War was also a significant fact but frequently damaging from a financial perspective (though increasing military power). Financial measures were also useful in increasing the power of the crown, particularly under Henry VII. However, financial policy fluctuated in its level of usefulness in increasing the power of the crown, often acting as more of a curb on power. Therefore, diplomacy was most responsible for increasing the power of the crown.

Often, foreign marriage diplomacy was utilised in the years 1399-1509 as a means of increasing the power of the crown. For example, though Henry IV faced many threats to domestic security (such as Glyndwr's rebellion), he was able to maintain hold on his

position by engaging in diplomacy. In 1403, he married one of his daughters to the King of Norway, Sweden and Denmark, aiding his relationship with the Hanseatic League. Also, his marriage to Joan of Brittany in 1402 accorded Henry IV short-term support. Similarly, Henry VII used the 1499 Spanish marriage <sup>(marrying Catherine of Aragon to Prince Arthur)</sup> as a means of quashing domestic security concerns. A key part of this alliance ~~was~~ involved the execution of Warbeck and Warwick, while Henry VII was able to gain ~~increased~~ 200000 crowns, enhancing his wealth. Though elements of this marriage were not entirely successful (as Henry, diplomatically isolated, was left out of the League of Cambrai in 1508) it was incredibly important in affirming his security as King. Perhaps more important was the 1420 Treaty of Troyes whereby Henry V's marriage to Catherine of Valois allowed his son to claim the English and French throne (though longer-term Henry VI's claim was complicated by the early death of his father). This Treaty also involved the cementation of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance ~~into~~ which endured

and in 1425 successfully repelled Armagnac (Dauphin) forces at the Battle of Cravant. However, not also marriage ~~alliances~~ <sup>diplomacy</sup> was successful in increasing the power of the crown. The 1444 Treaty of Tours (negotiated by Suffolk) involved the marriage of Henry VI to Margaret of Anjou. However, there would be no dowry, England would have to pay the cost of the wedding and the area of Maine would be surrendered to France at the end of a 2-year truce. Therefore, marriage diplomacy did occasionally curb the power of the crown. Nevertheless, it was incredibly important for enhancing foreign relationships and extending the power of the crown in some cases.

Perhaps the most significant example of diplomacy in increasing the power of the crown <sup>from a giranical perspective</sup> was the 1475 Treaty of Picquigny. In 1474, Edward IV invaded France. However, the outcome was not war but rather a lucrative treaty. The Treaty of Picquigny involved a 7-year truce, <sup>and</sup> gave Edward IV £13000 immediately and subsequently an annual pension of £10000. This allowed

Edward substantial financial autonomy as well as peace (war with France had been a drain on the crown's financial power). This Treaty meant that Edward did not have to request taxation from parliament until 1482 and peace with France continued until 1492. Therefore, this example of ~~financial~~ diplomacy was most responsible for the increasing financial power of the crown, 1399-1509.

However, it could be argued that war and military conquest was most responsible for increasing the power of the crown. For example, Henry V's victory at the Battle of Agincourt in 1415 (through tactical superiority in his army of 80% arches) caused his subjects to view him as ~~chosen~~<sup>supported</sup> by God, improving his prestige. In addition, in May 1416, parliament gave him tonnage and poundage for life ~~in~~<sup>as a token of</sup> gratitude. However, Henry V's continued French campaigns began to limit his financial power. Damage to Gascony, for instance, limited wine trade. Henry V's debts became extreme to the extent that, on his

deathbed, he was forced to sell the crown jewels. In addition, failure in war could be incredibly damaging to the crown's power. Henry VI's army was defeated at Castillon in 1453, ~~g~~ prompting his breakdown and tarnishing the crown's reputation. Once again, this had a significant financial impact and Henry VI owed upwards of  $\pounds 370000$ . Therefore, diplomacy was more beneficial to the crown's power than war as the financial costs of war often outweighed the benefits.

It could also be argued that financial measures, particularly under Henry VII allowed the crown to gain more power towards the end of the period. Henry VII made extensive use of bonds and recognisances, to the point where half of the peerage were obliged to pay him bonds. Thus, the annual crown revenue was  $\pounds 42000$  and 40% higher than that under Edward IV. Henry VII also granted his wife only  $\frac{2}{3}$  of that which was given to Elizabeth Woodville, thereby improving this position. However, Henry VII

also faced major tax rebellions in 1489 and 1497 on account of his somewhat tyrannical ~~and~~ measures. Henry dealt with these effectively, but they decreased the amount he sought in taxation, thereby reducing his power. In contrast, diplomacy often had far more lucrative (and conciliatory) outcomes.

To conclude it ~~is~~ is abundantly clear that diplomacy was the most responsible for the increases in the power of the crown in the years 1399-1509. Though not always entirely successful, diplomacy was imperative for establishing good trading relationships, enhancing revenues and widening the bounds of monarchical power. Conversely, war had a tendency to cause financial damage, while financial policy could often cause discontent thus curbing the power of the crown. Thus, diplomacy was far more beneficial in the years 1399-1509.



This is a well organised answer that has a range of examples from across the period. There is a clear focus on the question with the candidate considering various ways in which diplomacy could be demonstrated. The candidate does well to evaluate each factor at the end of each paragraph, weighing it up against the factor in the question. The conclusion is then clearly supported. This is a level 5 response.



In the breadth questions ensure that you have sufficient chronological range in your argument and in your examples.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both enquiries; there will be material in the sources to support both enquiries
- Candidates should not simply paraphrase the content of the source; they should develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the source
- Candidates should read the caption carefully, so they do not mistake its intent
- Candidates should make use of relevant contextual knowledge to support inferences and evaluation. It is not the quantity of contextual knowledge that is key, but the use to which it is put.

### Sections B and C

- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this often undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Planning of essays will help candidates develop an analytical approach
- Candidates must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions.

## **Grade boundaries**

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

