

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (6HI02) Paper A

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 2016

Publications Code 43898

All the material in this publication is
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Grade Boundaries

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

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

Introduction

Centres and candidates are once again to be congratulated for their performance this series as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. In an examination in which the majority of candidates were re-taking the examination paper, there were many impressive answers to be seen and relatively fewer weaker answers than has been the norm in the past.

In part A, the majority of candidates did attempt to cross reference the sources in their answer, although this was developed with varying degrees of success and for some this amounted to merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Answers of this type are unlikely to have moved beyond level 2. There were a number of candidates who did not consider the provenance of the sources and this meant that they could not advance very far in the mark scheme. There were also proportionately more candidates than in the past who spent considerable amounts of time elucidating their answer with own knowledge - this cannot be credited in this question. Indeed those candidates would have gained more credit if they had focused on cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There were certain stock phrases that were used by some candidates e.g. taken as a set; this is only appropriate if that is what the candidate is doing. In too many cases, the phrase was not accompanied by the action.

In part B, there were a number of candidates who relied primarily on the material in the sources. There were also a number of candidates who demonstrated some range and depth of knowledge that could be applied to the part B questions. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. It continues to be the case that despite comments in previous examiners' reports for all recent exam series regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B in this exam series. Such comments are frequently very generic e.g. the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in part B. Some candidates spend an excessive amount of time on this and they would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work.

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

The Henry VII section Q1 was once again far more popular than Q2 Elizabeth and the early Stuarts. As the candidates this year most likely year 13 students completing their A level the standard was higher than in recent years.

Question 1a

The sources provided candidates with the opportunity to look at surface features or go further. This allowed for support for both the role of Ferdinand or for other factors being the determinant cause of failure. Candidates had the opportunity to develop a range of cross references both for and against the stated view. The provenance was accessible but some still were a little simplistic in their application and there were limited numbers of L4 responses as a consequence. When done well the responses at L4 were impressive in their balance after approximately 25 minutes of focus.

Example:

This is a good Level 3 response. There is a range of cross references and the discussion on provenance is developed. However, the weight of the sources is not sufficiently developed to reach a judgement and hence this cannot access level 4.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

(a) Plan:

Agree - S2 "never have trusted..." "cannot fight..."

S3 "believing the promises of..."

S1 "need..." due to lack of help.

C1 - sickness. S1 "rain..."

S2 "dying..."

S3 "sickness".

Elements of all three sources imply that the 1512 campaign in France failed because Henry was let down by his ally, Ferdinand, King of Aragon. This can be seen in S2 which states "Our king should never have trusted the King of Aragon..." which is followed by "cannot fight without horses and provisions" and is reflected in S3 which claims that "the army was left idle" following the bishop who "came with nothing" from Ferdinand. Similarly, S1 claims "they will need constant supplies from England". Collectively, this ~~exp~~ exemplifies that without the necessary resources from the



((a) continued) King of Aragon, failure in the 1512 French campaign was inevitable due to the continued demand it placed on England which could not be fulfilled. Also, it emphasises the severity to which English troops relied on Spanish ^{and foreign} assistance for success in foreign policy campaigns. This argument is strengthened when the provenances of S2 and S1 are considered. This is because S1 is from William Knight to Thomas Wolsey and S2 is from Edward Howard to Wolsey. Both authors are reporting a first hand account so have knowledge others wouldn't have. Then S2 is also from a senior military commander who has expert knowledge. Though, Howard may be exaggerating the disastrous elements of the campaign since his company had been in poor conditions for some time. Nevertheless, this argument adds weight.

On the other hand, elements of all three sources also portray the argument that the campaign failed due to



((a) continued) sickness, perhaps brought about as a result of the poor weather conditions. This can be seen in S1 which comments on the "rain has been continuous" which links to S2 which claims soldiers were "dying of sickness" which is reflected in S3 which states "sickness spread". This implies that ~~the~~ natural influences like poor weather and an outbreak of sickness made success in the 1512 French campaign very unlikely, no matter if Ferdinand hadn't let Henry down. The provenance of S3 adds weight to this argument because, though Hall does not have first hand experience of the campaign, he has the advantage of hindsight and is able to assess the situation fully, thus reaching a more valid conclusion as to why the campaign failed.

In conclusion, though the sources can be interpreted differently, the weight of the argument clearly states



(a) continued) That the 1512 campaign in France failed because Henry was let down by Ferdinand. This is because, though circumstances were always going to be tough due to poor weather and sickness, help from Ferdinand was key for English success.

* out of time → final argument = Campaign failed due to "troublemakers in the army" (S3) who caused unrest over salaries (which links to lack of resources). *



Question 1 b (i)

This was the most popular, of the two essay questions in the paper and was accessed by candidates in all levels. The question asked candidates to discuss the extent to which failures in foreign policy were the main reason for Wolsey's fall and the source material provided the opportunity to examine this together with a range of other factors. Most candidates discussed the full range of factors which lead to Wolsey's fall and only a small number became descriptive. Much fewer candidates than in previous years gave an overview of Wolsey. Own knowledge was usually present and was generally well selected. Sources were handled well with limited examples of ill-placed generic provenance occurring.

Example:

This is a level 3 response for both A01 and A02b. Analysis is attempted and there is a good range of supporting knowledge to support the points made. Explanations are not sufficiently developed to achieve level 4. There is some reasoning from the sources although they are mostly used as a launchpad for own knowledge.

Q1, part b)

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) PLAN

Agree - SA Tol, FoCoG, E

C1 → failure to grant ann - SA, SS, S6 .LC
Campeggio.
SoR

C2 → factions/nobles: SS, S6. * Chamber,
enclosures,
CoR.

Source A portrays the view that the main reason for Wolsey's fall from power was the failure of his foreign policy. This can be seen where it states "his foreign policy was going nowhere" and his failure to have "taken them (negotiations) seriously".

This implies that Wolsey's failure to grant Henry's wishes of becoming a 'warrior king' and claiming the French throne directly led to his downfall. For example, Wolsey did have some successes in foreign policy, like establishing the Treaty of London^(Tol) in 1518 and organising the Field of Cloth of Gold^(FoCoG) between Henry and Francis of France in 1520. However, even these few successes had serious



((b) continued) limitations, like how by 1523 Henry redeclared war on France (or at least made the first steps to) which rendered the Tol useless and that the FoCoG led to very minimal political success. Instead, Wolsey's foreign policy was more deemed a failure, particularly because he never raised sufficient funds to fund Henry's adventurous campaigns, like the 1525 Amicable Grant which failed and caused rebellion in Suffolk and the 1522 forced loans as well as the parliamentary tax of only £200,000 when Wolsey had asked for £800,000. Clearly, this highlights that Wolsey's failed foreign policy strategies led to his downfall as he was no longer the right man to serve Henry who wanted a Lord Chancellor who had foreign aims as ambitious as his.

On the other hand, elements of all three sources demonstrate that



((b) continued) The downfall of Wolsey was due to his failure to ensure an annulment between Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon so he could marry Anne Boleyn instead. This can be seen in SA which states "not only had Wolsey failed to secure the annulment" which is reflected in S5 which mentions "Henry's desire to marry Anne" and in turn, is reflected in S6 which mentions the "great affection the king had for Anne". Collectively, this implies that Henry's desire to wed Anne meant that he desperately sought an annulment to his current wife Catherine and since Wolsey couldn't achieve this, he was no longer of use and thus, could be disposed of. For example, Wolsey failed to obtain an annulment for Henry in the Legatine Court of 1527. Though this was likely due to forces beyond Wolsey's control like the 1527 Sack of Rome meaning the Pope was under the control of the Holy Roman Emperor, Catherine's



((b) continued) nephew, Henry still held Wolsey accountable. Similarly, following Wolsey's continued failure, Henry grew closer to individuals like Crommer who suggested asking universities for their opinions on the annulment. Pairing this with the dissatisfaction of Wolsey by the Boleyn factor, it becomes clear that Wolsey's fall from power was more to do with his failure to grant the King an annulment than his foreign policy interests.

Another line of argument the sources suggest is that Wolsey's fall from power came as a result of many nobles disliking him. This can be seen in §5 which claims that Wolsey "must have created envy and made dangerous enemies" which is reflected in §6 which claims that noblemen bore a "secret grudge against the Cardinal" due to him treating them as "ordinary subjects". These



((b) continued) Sources thus suggest that Walsey's downfall was due to a vast dislike towards him due to his critical low position in society at birth and his arrogant personality. Though it is likely to portray Walsey as innocent and wronged since Cavendish was Walsey's gentleman servant, there is considerable evidence which would add weight to the argument that tensions existed between noblemen and Walsey. For example, Walsey pursued the policy of enclosures - a practice done by noblemen to exploit land and earn large sums of money. Clearly, this led to many nobles disliking Walsey, meaning they manipulated any mistakes the Chancellor made to abolish him from Court. Also, Walsey allowed common people to challenge nobles in the Star Chamber, overseeing 120 cases each year when only 12 cases were heard prior to Walsey. Subsequently, alongside the work Walsey



((b) continued) did for the poor, like increasing the use of the Court of Requests and tackling unfair prices in London, it becomes clear that Wolsey and the nobles had a turbulent relationship which contributed to his downfall.

In conclusion, when all arguments are considered it becomes clear that the sources disagree with the proposal that Wolsey's downfall came about due to the failure of his foreign policy. Instead, the sources suggest that Wolsey's downfall came about due to his failure to obtain an annulment of Henry's marriage to Catherine. So, since Wolsey could no longer grant Henry his wishes, he had no use for him so he fell from power in 1529!



Question 1b (ii)

This was the less popular of the two essay questions. Some candidates found it difficult to develop their arguments and this often resulted in candidates not always developing a perspective of the context of religious change beyond the content of the sources. Lower level responses had either simple historical knowledge or did not develop beyond content of sources fully. Those that did understand the need to look at both actions by monarchs and evidence of the response of the country were able to address the question effectively and produce a high level of analysis, using sources as a set and linking with chosen references such as rebellions. Some students clearly had an excellent understanding of the Reformation but in places some responses did become descriptive narrative of the legislation rather than by looking wider.

Example:

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The answer is fully focused on the question and sources and knowledge are integrated well. There is a sustained argument running through the answer and knowledge is used to probe the claims in the sources. The representations are fully discussed and weighed to reach a judgement.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) (b) (ii) Do you agree with the view that the Reformation of the 1530s was driven by the spread of Protestant ideas in England?

There are a number of factors that drove the Reformation of the 1530s. Source 7 asserts that although there is evidence of Protestant ideas and Lutheran books in England, 'support for such ideas was minimal'. Sources 8 and 9 seem to concur that Protestant ideas were in fact making an impact in England, source 8 being an example of the criticism the clergy was facing from Lutheran sympathisers and heretics.

Source 7 makes it apparent that for the majority of people in England, the Catholic Church provided a sense of security through its 'longstanding traditions, rituals and ceremonies'. For King Henry, the Catholic Church was a restrictive influence. When he had the Reformation Parliament pass the Act of Supremacy and the Treason Act in 1534, he became Supreme Head



((b) continued) of the Church of England. The religion in England at this time is often referred to as 'catholicism without the pope', due to the little change in religious doctrine. This would concur with the ~~stom~~ thought that Henry's break with Rome was not influenced by protestant ideas, but by his desire for more power. If as in Source 9, ~~the~~ Anne Boleyn was instilling such 'radical ideas' in Henry's mind, surely the previous Catholic doctrines like transubstantiation or the real presence in the Eucharist would of been completely abolished.

In contrast, Source 8 is an example of protestant ideas making an impact in England. As a pamphlet published, it would have reached many people causing these ideas to spread. The Source refers to the abuses of the clergy, calling them 'holy idle thieves'. Many members of the clergy held multiple positions that they were paid for but did not fulfill their duty at them all. The Source also mentions 'persistent begging', which would be reference to



(b) continued) taxes paid to Rome. Fish thought that the 'good Christian people would give to poor people', if the money going to Rome became available to them.

Money going to Rome could be seen as an influential factor in Henry's decision to reform. This can be seen through the Act in restraint of Annates and Act of dispensation in 1534, ~~the~~ suggesting that Henry had one eye on the extra money that could be his if it were not being paid to Rome. However, Rome did not necessarily benefit all that much from England. A tax referred to as 'Peter's Pence' gave them no more than a few hundred pounds per year from England.

Furthermore, Source 9 mentions Henry's divorce from Katherine of Aragon, and how if it was not granted, 'Henry would be forced to adopt those remedies which are injurious to the Pope'. This suggests that it was actually the issue of the divorce that led to the Break with Rome. After the Sack of Rome in 1527, Charles V had taken the Pope prisoner. With Katherine being Charles'



(b) continued) Aunt, he was reluctant to grant Henry a divorce due to the circumstances he was in. He did not want to do something to shame Charles' family whilst he was in his custody. The source also labels Anne a Lutheran sympathiser who encouraged Henry to break with Rome. Whilst this may have been true, it could be argued that it was Henry's love for Anne which encouraged him to break in order to obtain a divorce. That being said, Henry was reluctant to break with Rome and tried to find other solutions to his divorce issue, suggesting that he did not completely oppose the Pope and Catholicism. This can be evidenced in Source 7, where again by keeping 'longstanding traditions, rituals and ceremonies of the Catholic Church', Henry's actions surrounding the break seem unlikely to be motivated by religious or protestant ideas. The Act of Six Articles is evidence of this.

To conclude, although taken together the sources do show some evidence of protestant ideas in England, they cannot be said to be the driving force behind the



((b) continued) Reformation. The weight of the evidence suggesting these Protestant ideas had any affect on Henry and his decision to Breach with Rome is insignificant in comparison with Henry's own personal motives. Additionally, the fact that England practiced Catholicism without the pope after the Breach ~~stage~~ concludes that Henry was not motivated by religion but by his need for a divorce, the extra money he would receive, and ultimately to increase his own power to overcome the restrictions placed upon him by the pope.



Question 2a

Most students understood the idea of Parliament pressuring James but may have been unsettled by the limited focus on impositions. While this was evident from the source selection the question hinged on the evaluation of what constituted a challenge with the level 4 issue being the word 'major'. When done well, some very impressive answers were produced. There were far less examples of sources in sequence, a lot of cross reference and at least attempts at provenance.

Example:

This is a level 4 response with some cross references and perceptive inferences drawn. The response clearly addresses 'how far' with analysis that is sustained. The attributes of the sources are used to attach weight to the judgement.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

(a)

It could be said that the sources show that James I faced a major challenge to the royal prerogative over impositions. All the sources show that by discussing the king's prerogative, there is already a break from precedent. Both source 11 and 12 are similar in expressing the discontent of monopolies impositions however, while source 12 is explicit in stating impositions 'without the assent of Parliament may be quite abolished' is a direct and major challenge on the king's prerogative. While source 12 has a cordial tone, ~~the fact that by the end of the source~~ addressing James as 'the most humble Commons', yet attack James by stating his power on impositions is unprecedented as he had 'greater impositions' than any of his 'noble ancestors' (11). While this therefore is an open attack on the king's prerogative over 'impositions' and can be said to be a major challenge as it is by the a 'petition of grievances from the Commons as a whole - to have a political body who represent the nation attack James' impositions



((a) continued) does point to a major challenge on his prerogative. While source 10 mentions that source 10 further supports his representation of a major challenge as James is legally challenged in the 'Bate's Case' by a merchant, this shows that although the Commons wanted to protect their political body from absolutism, the very fact a merchant 'refused to pay impositions' shows that the challenge or opposition was widespread. Unlike source 12's abrupt challenge to James's prerogative source 11 is much more subtle in that he implies that James would be that 'the power of the King in parliament² is greater' than his power out of parliament which implies that James was reliant on parliament, this alone is not a strong source as 'Whitlocke' as a 'reventy-bleedell' may not have been as brutal as source 12 and more polite but it nevertheless shows the nature of the major challenge of on James prerogative.

On the other hand, if the sources can be interpreted to show that, ~~and~~ there James I didn't face a major challenge² to his prerogative over impositions. Both source 10 and 11 are similar



((a) continued)

in declaring the king's 'absolute power' (10), while source 11 is trying to create an argument for Parliament's power and how James would be 'greater' alongside Parliament, source 10 is explicit in stating that on a legal standpoint 'the laws prove expressly that the king has the power to increase the tax' ~~therefore~~. This is further source 10's representation can also be more reliable than Whitelocke's as source 11 aims to persuade the king whereas 'Chief Baron Fleming' is providing an objective assessment which can be disputed from his source stone when he boldly states 'therefore I judge in favour of the king'. The fact a 'chief' has ruled 'in favour' of the king leads to the conclusion that there was not a major challenge on James' prerogative over unparliamentary. Both sources 11 and 12 show the desperation of Parliament in trying to halt James' importation with Whitelocke's permission persuasion of the in front of his peers to rally there and threaten the king by saying 'it is it will be 'easily proved' that James needs Parliament.



((a) continued)

Taking the sources at face value, it can be said that source 10 argues that there was no major challenge to James' prerogative and ~~that others~~ ^{source 11 and 12} disagree. However, when considering that 'Chief Bwon Fleming' ruled in favour of the king' is making his imposition lawful and the discredited source 11 attributes as a result of being a persuasive 'speech' intended to rally Parliament and the despicability source 12's 'petition of Grievances' abruptly asking for imposition to be abolished culminate to show that there was not a major challenge or James' prerogative despite challenges from Parliament.



Question 2b (i)

This was marginally less popular than Q2bii. The question gave the potential for students to audit the end of Elizabeth I's reign to determine if there was a crisis and thus the degree of control she exercised and the extent to which her final years were a success or failure. Those that did have a good range of knowledge provided a good depth of historical knowledge. Some candidates struggled to integrate their historical knowledge with the sources or rather some simply used the sources as determining the points of reference and just added extra details dictated by the subject raised. There were several which took a source by source approach but again the calibre of candidate was generally higher than in previous years and some very impressive answers were produced.

Example:

This is a level 4 response on both assessment objectives. There is sustained analysis and the knowledge is used to probe the sources and reach a judgement. The validity of the claims made in the sources is discussed. There is weighing and judgement.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) Elizabethan England was in a period of crisis
1588-1603.

There is much to debate when considering whether the Elizabethan period of 1588-1603 was a country in crisis. While source 13 shows how there was a 'strained economy' as a result of '18 years of war against Spain', source 14 and 15 highlight her naval successes which raised her reputation 'to new heights of glory and prestige'. Taking all sources into consideration and my own knowledge, 1588-1603 was an economic and social country in crisis but not a political country in crisis.

While source 14 boasts of how Elizabeth 'betowed the peace to which all kingdoms aspired', source 14 is more accurate in addressing how Elizabeth's foreign policy negatively impacted the country. The '18 years of war against Spain' feared were not viable as huge expeditions like the one in 1589 would cost £100,000 and the expedition would return with £11,000 casualties. Furthermore, Elizabeth lost two great privateers in Sir Francis Drake in 1595 as



((b) continued)

through these expeditions. While it can be said that source 14 is accurate in some respects as 'her country was the sacrifice & when staying Elizabeth was the 'crèche of her allies', lending 5000 troops to the Peloponnese in 1585 and 4000 troops to Normandy and Brittany in 1593; her 'allies' were not consistent and as Henry of Navarre reverted to Catholicism in 1593. therefore forming an ally which invested vast amounts of resources into, which may have caused her to implement 'forced loans' in the years '1590, 1597 and 1601'. Furthermore, source 14 cannot be taken as reliable as it is a 'jovial oration' therefore would 'praise' Elizabeth in calling her the 'bane of her enemies' when in fact even the Irish rebellion in 1595-1601 was as a result of the Earl of Tyrone despoiling this myth' (15). Furthermore, the fact she was a 'natural consequences' of the the 'war against Spain' event 'wide-spread peasant resistance' (16) would have accumulated as a result of this foreign policy failure despite the victory of the Armada. Therefore,



((b) continued) ~~into~~ when judging Elizabeth's foreign policy it can be said that the country was in crisis.

However, ~~Admiral~~ ~~for~~ source 13's fulsome mention of Elizabeth's excellent management of 'passive resistance' from parliament and the ~~and~~ in her 'forced loans' ^{acquiring} is ~~not~~ could be seen as a weakness in the source in evaluating her reign. The 'widespread passive resistance to the demands of the privy Council' is completely untrue as amidst the threat of Irish rebellion and a 'war against Spain' (15), Elizabeth managed to attain a quadruple subsidy in 1604 and a triple subsidy in 1593. Her parliament also 'Privy Council' also issued Book of Orders which, as in 1593, was, at a ~~the~~ time, of 'periodic outbreaks of plague' (1593, 1601) and 'disastrous harvests' ordered the JP's in localities to force the selling of grain and instructed them to manage the year and reduce enclosures which would increase unemployment when real wages were already down by one quarter. The fact she effectively 'defeat of Catholicism' and



(b) continued)

& the 'true religion' (18)

had defended Protestantism, by 1603 shows that Elizabethan England was not in a state of crisis as the Earl of Tyrone had been killed and the Essex Rebellion had been dealt with in 1601. Therefore this ~~was~~ 'wide-scale passive resistance' was dealt with a firm hand by Elizabeth.

However, it can be argued that the economic 'strain' was great throughout the 1588-1603 period as parliamentary subsidies had decreased in value to £80,000 by 1603 forcing Elizabeth to demand 'services of men and equipment' in order to defeat 'her greatest foe' and maintain the 'new heights of glory and prestige' in 'attained from the 1588 Armada. This was a great crisis, further added to by the collapse of the Antwerp market, which brought in £1m per annum - its the market's collapse affected the country causing 'a malfunctioning of the relationship between the centre and localities' which then meant that 10% of the ^{urban} ~~rural~~ population and 20% of the ~~urban~~ rural population fell



((b) continued)

into poverty as a result of losing their livelihoods. Elizabeth tried to counter this 'malfunctioning' with Poor laws of 1601 which contradict the 'malfunctioning' relationship between the 'centre and periphery' but overall, the poor rates were 0.2% of the national income and in times of 'poor disastrous harvests' could not support the 2/5 of the population who were below the poverty line. The 'pressure of war' and the 'disastrous harvests' would ultimately destroy the 'myth' of a prosperous England and source B can therefore be seen as reliable as it shows how this to be the case.

In conclusion, it can be said that while Elizabeth had shown some victories in foreign policy 'against Spain', she was poor in dealing with her 'allies' (14) and could not live up to the 'new heights of glory and prestige' (15). Source B is the most reliable source as it shows the period 1588-1603 as a whole was 'strained by the impact of 18 years of war against Spain', while Admond



((b) continued)

fails to address any more than the 'myth of English sea power' which played a large role ~~into~~ in foreign policy (judged to be a failure as Spanish peace was not attained in fact the Treaty of Verdun 1598 saw France and Spain ally against England). ~~yet~~ Howard did not address the social and economic tensions in the 1588-1603 period. Some 14 can be seen as the least reliable as it was a 'funeral oration' therefore it would be 'praise-worthy' of Elizabeth's rule; although it agrees with Howard that Elizabeth 'restored the peace' which showed 'God's blessing rests upon us', the very fact peace was not attained and in fact the years of war only added to the 'outbreaks strained' situation in England due to 'outbreaks of plague' and 'disastrous harvests' shows Elizabeth's England was a country in crisis during the 1588-1603 period. Elizabeth can be applauded for defeating her 'greatest foe' in the Irish Rebellion, which was over by 1601 - the cost of this was £2m of a possible £4m spent on foreign policy therefore 'the pressure of war' had incurred a 'misfortune'.



((b) continued)

of the States social and economic stability, it had increased 'passive resistance' yet not to the degree since 13 presents it as 'commonplace' as Elizabeth I retained control of her parliaments and government - exemplified by the 1607 quadruple subsidy. Therefore, Katherine source 13 is inaccurate in stating there was 'widespread passive resistance' as Elizabeth maintained control of her government and people (The first Oxfordshire Rising 1596), Elizabeth's foreign policy was inefficient and notorious as it cost £2,000 for 'each county' and caused her to demand 'pre-emptive taxation' which led to the a souring of relations with parliament. Therefore the England was not the 'sanctuary of the distressed' (14) in the period 1582-1603.



Question 2b (ii)

This was the more popular subject with most candidates having some understanding of the relationship between parliament and the king and most were reasonably well-versed in reference to Buckingham and foreign policy as a potential reason for the breakdown in relations. In many cases the sources were relied upon heavily as the main content of some responses but most candidates were able to explore the issues raised in the sources by integrating their contextual knowledge with the source material, to develop reasoning and to move towards making judgements. Those candidates who were able to examine the issues and reach secure and supported judgements on the validity of the view in the question were able to achieve high marks.

Example:

This is a level 3 response for both assessment objectives. The knowledge is not developed far but it is used to address the focus of the question. The comments on the stated focus are limited. There is some awareness of the representation in the sources and points of support and challenge are drawn out and commented upon.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) ii) The breakdown of relations between King Charles and Parliament by 1629 can be said to be chiefly the result of Buckingham's conduct of the wars against France & Spain, however as source 16 states, ~~that~~ it was not necessarily Buckingham's conduct but the state of the country Charles was left with, and it was the wars itself. Source 18 on the other hand says it was the "responsibility of Charles himself"

Parliament no doubt blamed Buckingham for the wars failures, ~~but~~ and it was no secret they severely disliked him. As source 17 shows, Parliament wanted him 'removed' due to such military failures, ^{that they blamed him for.} In the beginning Parliament supported the war and voted to fund it ~~and~~, in 1624, but it seemed that such subsidies were "wasted" and "misappropriated", ~~even~~ which was Buckingham's fault in their eyes. However all 3 sources fail to explain the bias Parliament had against Buckingham prior to the war failures as even during James' reign they wanted to remove him. Regardless, Buckingham remained a close 'friend' to James, and then to Charles who trusted him greatly. The sources again fail to note ~~these~~ this relation between King Charles and Buckingham, showing only how much Buckingham was to blame for the war failures. Instead it could be said that Charles's refusal to



((b) continued) remove or go against Buckingham, just as James did, caused a severe breakdown in Charles' relations with Parliament. Furthermore, this refusal was down to Charles' stubborn ~~and~~ personality as well as his belief in the Divine Right of Kings, which continuously conflicted with Charles' Parliament at the time, who felt disrespected and refused to comply with Charles.

This brings us to source 18, where Angela Anderson highlights the problems "mounting beneath the surface" linking to Charles pursuing "his objectives with determination" such as Arminians being promoted in Church. This suggests another factor of Religious differences being a cause of breakdown in relations between King and Parliament. Charles' marriage to a Catholic firstly angered many ~~of~~ ⁱⁿ the Parliament who were Protestant, and saw Charles' promotion of Arminianism as a threat. They believed him and the religion to be more Catholic causing further problems in their relations, and suggesting more that the breakdown was not chiefly the result of Buckingham's conduct of the wars against France and Spain. Moreover economic problems that arose after Charles dissolved the first Parliament led to the forced loan, another act greatly disliked by Parliament, all suggesting Charles to be the reason for the breakdown.



((b) continued) Regardless, it can be said to be Buckingham's fault for the breakdown.

Source 16 shows a more biased attempt to defend Charles, but acknowledges the unsuccessful attack on France and ~~the~~ Spain.

Buckingham was indeed in charge of these expeditions, and it can be said that these failures ~~to~~ led to a strain on the relations due to such economic and political issues. Therefore it can be claimed Buckingham was to blame, ~~not~~ not Charles, as Source 18 agrees, his "diplomatic blunders" even caused the war with France.

Generally the sources fail to elaborate exactly how far it was Buckingham's conduct of the wars that caused the breakdown and ignores other factors. Generally it can be said that



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

All Questions

1. Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination, and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
2. Too many candidates use certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.
3. Engaging with the sources needs to go beyond accepting the content at face value and to test it for validity considering provenance in part a and by testing the opinions in part b with knowledge set in the context of the period.

Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making stereotypical comments about the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable and thus negating any conclusions drawn. The key to a successful response is the ability to weigh the sources to reach a final judgement.
4. The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.
5. There are no marks available for knowledge in part a. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited and often impacts on the amount of time they have available to complete part b.

Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

