

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI02 A

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to MARK BATTYE on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028136

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

General Comments

This June examination session produced a good range of attainment, and some truly impressive work. The best responses to part a) questions proved able to use the sources as a set, cross-reference evidence confidently and evaluate conflicting interpretations with an awareness of context, to establish a balanced judgement. In part (b) questions candidates were able to develop their arguments more fully through the integration of contextual knowledge with the source material. It should be noted that the most successful accessed the key themes through the sources initially and then proceeded to develop these themes through deployment of their own knowledge. The very best used this analysis to arrive at judgements that drew on, and sometimes reconciled, conflicting interpretations of the evidence.

Although it was gratifying to see so many candidates handling source material with confidence and proficiency, there were, still, some recurring errors that undermined the quality of some candidates' work.

1. A significant minority of candidates chose to tackle the sources in part a) questions in sequence. Such an approach made detailed cross-referencing, the identification of similarities and differences, all but impossible and thus frequently limited the award to Level 2 at best. Candidates should always look to tackle the sources as a set.
2. Another common reason for poor performance in the (a) questions was the inability to understand and interpret the sources effectively. In some cases there was real misunderstanding but, more often than not, it was simply a case of careless reading. Although it is understandable that candidates will feel under pressure in examinations, they should, nonetheless, try to take sufficient time and care to clarify the task that they are undertaking and to equip themselves with secure understanding of the materials that they are given. Here making a plan may help to eradicate errors that stem from undue haste.
3. Most candidates are aware that, for part a) questions, it is essential to weigh up the evidence contained in a source in the light of its provenance. However, for the higher levels this should not be relegated to a discrete section of the response but should be integrated into the answer and applied directly to specific points contained within the source material.
4. In part (b) questions, candidates at the lowest levels resorted to paraphrasing the sources with any reasoning limited to simple cross-referencing. For higher levels it is essential that candidates are able to deploy accurate and focused contextual knowledge to challenge or support the representations contained in the sources.

5. A number of candidates, despite recognising the importance of both source analysis and the deployment of contextual knowledge, limited their mark by taking the sources in sequence and in isolation, with only a brief comparative reference. Alternatively, others began from a base of wider knowledge, and developed arguments on this basis, using the sources as illustration. While many of these responses achieved good marks in AO1, they tended to offer only simple or barely developed reference to the sources, at L2 or at times L1 in AO2. The best responses used the sources and their own knowledge in combination, beginning with analysis and interpretation of the sources as a set to establish the core of the debate, before presenting support, development and evaluation from wider knowledge, to offer a balanced conclusion. Again, as for part a), the foundation of such high level responses lies in the initial planning.

6. Finally, candidates should remember that the source skills required for part b) questions are focused on AO2b not AO2a. A number of candidates still routinely evaluate the utility and reliability of the sources in part b). Such evaluation should only be employed where it assists a candidate in weighing up the strength of the representation contained in the source material. Speculation and generalised observations about the objectivity or otherwise of secondary historians serve little purpose.

Question 1 (a)

At the lower levels, candidates viewed the sources as offering a basic challenge between Sources 1 and 2 support of the contention and Source 3 against. This line of argument was frequently supplemented by undeveloped observations on provenance ('Hall is biased'). Through closer reading of the text, higher performing candidates were able to use all three sources both to support and challenge the claim. Thus, many argued that although the bakers' petition in Source 2 appeared, on the surface at least, to endorse the idea that Wolsey pursued justice for all, the time lag between the advice in source 1 and complaint in source 2 was used as evidence of the gap between rhetoric and practice. At the very highest levels a careful exploration of the attributions was applied explicitly to the evidence contained in the sources.

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: 13Aa
21AbaO1
13AbaO2

Question 1 Question 2

(a) Wolsey had to achieve justice for all?

	1	2	3
Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • although it's law it may not be just • highest authority • who is not just • court of chancery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1526 - injustice to bakers • bakers had petition • petition to Wolsey • then Wolsey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for brought bread on table + revenue
Disagree			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • parallel with

On the whole, source 1 appears to agree with the claim in the statement whereas source 2 and 3 refute this statement.

Source 1, written by Wolsey in 1515, states he had been made the second most powerful man in the country after the King by becoming Lord Chancellor. It highlights the conflict with the legal system of the time. Wolsey states that the King should be told that "although it is law, it may not be justice" and called to Henry VIII to "soften the rigor of the law" where it is unjust by using his power as King to change it to increase fairness within the law. This implies that Wolsey was determined to change the law practices at the time from Common Law, based on precedents, to Civil Law, which was based on justice, in order to bring justice for all. His function of the "Court of Chancery"

((a) continued)

'Chaucer' enabled the just: new belief that law should be done with 'equity' in mind, results in this source strongly agreeing that Wolsey was trying to achieve justice for all.

In contrast, sources 2 and 3 contradict that Wolsey was trying to achieve justice for all as implied by source 1. Source 2 is written in 1526, 11 years after source 1, and highlights that despite Wolsey claiming to strive for justice, this has not been achieved by 1526. Source 2 gives the example of the Bakers in London who, when they 'refuse' to buy the more expensive 'mushy wheat', which was not mouldy and hence not fit for baking, from the Mayor and Aldermen they are sent to 'Newgate gaol for 11 days' with their family unable to 'visit them or sell bread'. This very fact that the Mayor is able to give this punishment implies the lack of progress Lord Chancellor Wolsey has made for enforcing justice in court. Source 3 endorses this lack of justice by stating that the poor 'perceived Wolsey punished the rich', if he did this, it may be justice in the eyes of the minds of the poor but cannot be seen as Wolsey trying to 'achieve justice for all' as he little suggests, as 'all' encompasses both ~~rich~~ the rich and the poor. Source 3 goes on to say that the poor used the perception in order to bring many on a just 'haunt man to trouble and vexation'. As the poor were able to manage to do this in the legal system which had been subjected to changes by Wolsey, justice was certainly not achieved. This lack of justice is demonstrated further in source 2 where the bakers have stated "in vain ... for the last 5 years for an end to these", these referring to 'injustices', yet they have been 'continuously rebuked, imprisoned and wronged'. This does not suggest that 'justice for all' was achieved even by 1526 in Wolsey's reign as Lord Chancellor which implies that he did not try hard enough to achieve it.

In conclusion, although source 1, written by Wolsey, suggests that from the outset Wolsey aimed to achieve justice for all in his policies, especially in reform of the legal system, both source 2 and source 3 contradict by giving evidence later in Wolsey's

((a) continued)

reign and as Lord Chancellor, that this justice was never achieved no matter how persistent
campaigns such as that of the Bb Bakers was. As a result the sources, overall, disagree
that liberty had or at least succeeded, in achieving "justice for all"



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response presents some valid cross-referencing and the time differential between Sources 1 and 2 is picked up on and used to good effect. However, the scope of the cross-referencing needs to be extended and there is little developed comment on the significance of the source attributions. The candidate received a mark of 13.

Question 1 (b) (i)

There was a fairly even split between the part b) options. Candidates found the debate in the sources for this question readily accessible and many displayed an impressive range of own knowledge to develop further the themes raised. Some, at the lower attainment levels, became sidetracked by narratives of Henry's divorce from Anne Boleyn and failed to develop to any great extent the counterview raised in Source 6. Many candidates also drew on their knowledge to explore the role of finance in Wolsey's fall, with the Amicable Grant featuring heavily.

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

* (b) i) ~~It is~~ It is certain that, as the King's mistress Anne Boleyn's personal feud with Cardinal Wolsey will have greatly impacted upon his decline and fall from the King's favour. However, Wolsey had begun to fall from grace through various other occurrences, and regardless of the hatred she had for him, he would have ultimately met the same end.

Anne Boleyn's sway over the King was monumental after her clever game of relishing the King's advances, until he was most certainly infatuated with her. Indeed, the role she played in furthering England's Protestant beliefs and Henry's own Calvinism demonstrated how powerful and influential she was. This is suggested in both sources 4 and 5, where Anne highlights 'the wrong you Cardinal have done me' and in source 5 'I am able to speak with the King on your behalf for fear of madame Anne's displeasure', thereby highlighting the dominance Anne held at court.

However, the main reason for his downfall was his inability to carry out the King's will effectively in his later years: from the failure of the Amicable Grant, preventing Henry invading France at a time of weakness. I believe Wolsey was destined to fall. This viewpoint contrasts the sources 4 and 5, but is complimented by the view in source 6 which states 'when he ceased to do so [serve Henry well] he fell from favour'. Therefore after the monumental battle of Dorset, Wolsey's fall arose from his

((b) continued) failure to carry out the king's will effectively. When Henry lost faith he was doomed. A series of unpopular policies followed with the Anglo-French alliance causing trouble with the English trade routes in the imperial-controlled low countries, and causing significant disruption in England due to the Francophobic nature of the English people. Despite these policies being 'forced on him' by the diplomatic situation, it still resulted in a failure to carry out the king's will.

Indeed, the breakdown of imperial relations was devastating for the king's ~~the~~ great matter. When pope Clement was held captive by Charles V after the Sack of Rome, the pope's involvement looked increasingly unlikely. This is shown in both sources 6 and 6, with 'after all your high promises about a divorce you have changed your purpose and prevented it'. Henry's expectations of Wolsey as Legate a Latere to be able to achieve the divorce ~~the~~ exceeded his ability, as he was forced to wait for Cardinal Campeggio, who ultimately adjourned the case to Bruges. However, Wolsey only lost power initially (as described in source 6) with the failure of the Bruges divorce, and in ~~1529~~ ¹⁵²⁹ he was stripped of his powers. This contradicts the view in sources 6 and 8 that 'Anne's displeasure' was the ^{main} ~~the~~ reason for his downfall.

It is ~~highly~~ ^{in no doubt} ~~clear~~ that by 1529 Henry's allegiance lay with the future queen, but, as shown in source 6, 'truce in the months ~~the~~ that followed he received pleas

((b) continued) of friendship from the King that raised hopes of his reinstatement. This is not due to the 'Bleyn poison' as suggested in sources 6 and 5. Although it is definitely played a significant role but more due to the fact that Henry had 'bad faith'. Some would perhaps argue that the tokens of friendship shown ^{the king's} ~~the~~ conflicting loyalties and that Anne must have been the key reason to poison the King, against wisdom to have so swiftly changed his opinion. Comparing the view in source 5 that stated 'none dared speak to the King but for Anne's displeasure' and in source 6 'the King still less portrays the illusion that Anne speaks on behalf of the King. However, crucially in 1529 the treaty of Cambrai left England diplomatically isolated in the face of a separate treaty between France and the Empire. This therefore shows that once more problems in Wolsey's failure to serve the King's interests in his foreign policy created his downfall not Anne's hatred. The whole nature of Henry's relationship also supports this, Anne was ruthlessly and easily removed when her time came. The King's loyalty was to those who served him - Wolsey had ceased to do so.

Furthermore Wolsey's relatively gentle treatment at the hands of the King shows his favour - he was allowed to live out his days in relative peace after the charge of praemunire and died of natural causes. Therefore in conclusion I am inclined to side with source 6, in disagreement with sources 6 and 5, as I believe.

((b) continued) Anne's personal hostility toward ~~Harless~~ ~~Madsey~~ was not the reason for his downfall, it was his inability to serve the wishes of the King effectively.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

In this response the candidate displays a good range of relevant contextual knowledge and integrates this well with the source material. There is a clear attempt to present a balanced and focused analysis, and although the structure is a little disjointed there is sufficient reasoning from the evidence of the sources to warrant a Level 4 award in both assessment objectives. The script received marks of 21 for AO1 and 14 for AO2b.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

Most candidates found the source material very accessible but, for a significant number, lack of contextual knowledge resulted in very restricted attempts to reason from the evidence of the sources. Others who displayed a reasonable knowledge of the Pilgrimage of Grace failed to integrate this fully with the source material. At the higher levels, candidates developed the arguments for and against the contention by close cross-referencing of the sources and then developed these themes with accurate and focused own knowledge.

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

* (b) (ii) Do you agree that in 1536-7, opposition to religious changes posed a serious threat to Henry's rule.

	7	8	9
Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ reliability of York was ✓ ◦ 60,000 troops, 10,000 ✓ ◦ such as houses - in good order ✓ ◦ Norfolk was in government ✓ ◦ a week battle ✓ ◦ population able to defend towns ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ potential for foreign invasions ✓ ◦ king had weak army, smaller than rebels army ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ largest uprising in Tudor period ✓ ◦ organised ✓ ◦ military superiority ✓
Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ little money ✓ ◦ 'hope amongst supporters' lack of King A.D. ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Northern movement, South unlikely to support ✓ ◦ By 1536, religious opposition in south was "broken" ✓ ◦ lands were dem. ✓ ◦ did not follow loyalty to King ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ would rather not revolution ✓ ◦ had to trust Henry's word who never planned on concessions becoming permanent ✓

All three sources highlight the potential of the opposition in 1536-7 had on the Pilgrimage of Grace to seriously threaten the King's authority in particular with military superiority, yet they highlight the limits to the movement, namely in their numbers, desire for greater support and lack of financial backing to pose a serious threat to Henry. I believe that the Pilgrimage of Grace posed a serious threat, not to Henry directly as many wanted reform rather than revolution, but rather to his policies especially in terms of religion as well as the run, such as Council, around King where problems

((b) continued)

were under threat as highlighted by the Pilgrimage of Grace.

Source 9 states that the Pilgrimage of Grace was 'numerically the largest rising of the Tudor period' and it was chosen relating to the size of their army and military strength, which consisted of '10,000 combatants amongst them 10,000 horsemen' as stated in Source 7. This number consisted of the northern men involved in the Lincolnshire rising led by Robert Aske, who successfully organised the Pilgrimage to ensure that the rebellion was in 'good order' as both Source 7 and Source 9 allude to, on the 6th October 1536. This great number eclipsed the number that the government, led by especially the Duke of Norfolk who was ordered to lead the resistance against this rebellion, were able to gather resulting in 'Norfolk and his colleagues avoid battle' as stated in Source 7, whilst Source 8 conveys the same military superiority of the rebels over the royal forces as highlighted in Source 9 which states that if the rebels had engaged the royal King's men in battle 'it is likely that they would have won'. The military strength of the rebels is again emphasised with the fact that many of these groups involved had fought for the King against Scotland earlier in Henry's reign.

Source 7 alludes to the fact that the King was not only King of France and commoner but also the members of the nobility with individuals such as Lord Surrey supporting them and even granting sanctuary to his Pontefract castle to the rebels. This is the site at which the Pontefract Articles emerged in October 1536, which highlighted the rebels' cause and is the petition that Source 7 refers to. Source 8 highlights the fact that the Pilgrimage was a papal 'sanction' by the Pope and Charles V as Chapuys in Source 7 alludes to in trying to get Charles V to support the cause.

However this is one of the reasons why the Pilgrimage of Grace was never able to offer a serious serious threat to Henry, in Source 7 Chapuys states that 'the Pope ought to help them' but as he never did, the rebellion remained a domestic problem for Henry and as a result he was

((b) continued)

able to treat it less seriously than if it had been backed by either French or Imperial support in the form of Charles V. This lack of foreign aid resulted in the rebels having 'little money' to fund their desperate for campaign and to strengthen their cause, another reason why it can be considered a threat rather than a serious threat to Henry's rule.

Another different factor limiting the severity of the threat the Pilgrimage of Grace posed was that it was only ever a northern movement composed made up of disgruntled peasants who were angry at the ~~disruption~~ destruction of their lives, child hood religious beliefs by Henry's 'evil councillors' such as Thomas Cromwell and the economic times imposed by him. However, the scale of this ~~discontent~~ discontent was confined to the North and when the rebels marched south they were unable to gather further support as they had hoped for as attested to in source 8.

The Pilgrimage of Grace's aim was not to overthrow the monarchy as demonstrated by the 'Oath of Honourable Men' designed by the rebellious leaders such as Robert Aske and Lord Percy, which called for reform and the removal of the 'bad counsel' from men such as Cromwell which they declared was the corrupting influence behind the rebellion and the king's actions with the Dissolution of the smaller monasteries with an income of less than £200 a year, in 1536. The fact that they did not want to remove him from the throne is indicated in source 8 which states that the rebellious leaders 'died professing loyalty to the King'.

In conclusion, I believe that on paper the size of the rebellion with its military superiority as highlighted by all three sources, over the royal forces posed a threat to Henry's rule as did the fact that members of the nobility had risen against him, but the rebels lacked the desire and resources to alter this serious threat. This was due to the lack of foreign intervention which would have provided the pilgrims with not only money and increased motivation to rebel against

((b) continued)

against the religious changes at the time through having papal support, as Chapuys desired in June 7, and would have increased the threat to Henry's continuity.

However, I believe that the main reason why this rebellion was only a threat rather than a serious one, was as a result of the rebels themselves not wanting to overthrow Henry or rather to 'change the king's mind' as stated in Source B over the religious changes that were occurring rapidly with the dissolution of the monasteries. This enabled Henry to promise Aske concessions he was never going to put into practice such as protection of the larger monasteries, and Aske believed him as it satisfied his own aims and therefore the rebellion was unable to defend before any military force was needed. Another factor is the lack of universal support for the cause in England, as people in the low south were unwilling to support the rebels, which greatly weakened their cause. As a result, I agree with what the sources suggest, in that the religious opposition in 1536-7 did pose a threat to Henry's rule in terms of what he was able to do, but over a series that was the rebels didn't want to overthrow him.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response was awarded a Level 4 for both assessment objectives. This is tightly argued and balanced piece in which the sources are used as the platform to explore points for and against the contention through the deployment of a solid range of relevant own knowledge. There is also an attempt to reach a judgement in the conclusion, although this is not fully developed. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the candidate has spent some time analysing the sources closely as evidenced by the detailed plan. This is very good practice, although an additional column for own knowledge would have rounded it off. The script was awarded marks of 21 for AO1 and 13 for AO2b.

Question 2 (a)

Virtually all candidates could identify and support areas of support (Source 11) and challenge (Source 12) and thus access at least Level 2 for this question. Those operating at higher levels managed to point towards some areas of reconciliation between Sources 12 and 10. At the higher levels, candidates applied the attribution to weigh up the significance of the comparisons raised in the sources; these comments went beyond generic observations. Thus, the criticisms and defence of Buckingham were placed by many in the heightened passions of the immediate aftermath of the failure of the Cadiz expedition.

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) How far do sources 11 and 12 support the claims made in Source 10 about the Duke of Buckingham? PLAN.

They DO

Source 11 - "not by the ..."

Source 10 - "Did he not .. Cadiz"

|

Hold him solely responsible

"the cause..." Source 10

Also source 10 "He has taken..."

"exhausted and consumed..."

NOP - Source 10

He had an MP speaking out

about the King's sake could

face persecution

↳ he must really mean it.

Source 11 - promoted and served

with Buckingham

would not speak out against him

unless serious.

They DON'T

"you considered him worthy" CLASHES with "Is it fit".

"by appointing..."

CLASHES with

"out of that policy"

NOP - Charles great

friend. Would not speak

ill. Affirmed - "one so

that is so..."

CONCL.

Source 11, v.v. source 12

not at all, but due to

the fact that Charles &

Bucks are right.

((a) continued)

How far do sources 11 and 12 support the claims made in source #10 about the Duke of Buckingham?

In source 10, the Duke of Buckingham is seen as a failed military commander, a spendthrift and the reason for the many problems in England in 1626. However, in both sources 11 and 12, different views are taken of Buckingham, and there is conflict between the sources regarding Buckingham as either a failure or a trusted ally.

However within source 11 it is clear that the author of the source John Turner MP takes a similar view to source 10. He states that "our men perished; not by the sword, not by the enemy... but by those we trust," implying that Buckingham a trusted advisor is responsible for the disaster at Cadiz. This supports the view presented in source 10 that claims "Did he not... cause the failure at Cadiz?". The use of rhetorical question demonstrates Turner's belief that Buckingham is to blame, which is echoed in source 11. Within the source equally, source 11 supports source 10 when it states that "He [Buckingham] has taken Crown lands for himself, his friends and relations," presenting the idea that the Duke of Buckingham is abusing his privileges at the King and England's expense. Source 11 goes on to ~~claim~~ argue that Buckingham "has exhausted and consumed the treasures

((a) continued)

of both king and subjects", which reaffirms this viewpoint. Source 10 can be seen as evidence of the people's feelings towards Buckingham in England as Turner, as an MP has a duty to speak on the people's behalf. Equally the King may have reacted badly to Turner's outburst and his career may have been under threat for speaking out against a friend of the King, showing that the speech made in Source 10 is likely to be truthful as Turner is taking a risk in broadcasting his views. Similarly in Source 11, Eliot had been promoted by Buckingham and therefore profited through him, so would not speak out against him unless Buckingham was causing large problems. Also this source can be seen as an accurate representation of events as, as a Vice-Admiral, it can be implied that Eliot served with Buckingham and would have seen his failures firsthand.

However, Source 12 itself solely disagrees with the statements made in Source 10, claiming that Buckingham is not at fault. While Source 10 states ~~that~~ "ing" "Is it fit that he should... enjoy so many great offices?" implying that Buckingham has no right to his position; in direct conflict with this is Charles I's view that "you considered him worthy of all the honour bestowed on him by the

((a) continued)

late King". This presents the idea that Parliament were happy with Buckingham before Cadiz, which clashes with the idea that "the cause of all our troubles is... Buckingham" not just the military failures, which is argued in Source 10. However, Source 12 cannot be seen as an accurate representation of the successes of or failings of Buckingham as Charles I was a great friend of Buckingham, and a trusted advisor and this view is affirmed in the statement that Buckingham is "so near to me [Charles]".

In closing, Source 11 ~~and~~ supports Source 10 very well closely, and that puts them into direct conflict with Source 12. Sources 10 and 11 are more likely to represent the feelings at the time of the Duke of Buckingham's failings in Cadiz, as they are written by men who have served with him in battle and who have seen him without the "rose-tinted glasses" view of Charles I.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response received a mark of 18. There is detailed cross-referencing, fully supported by relevant selections from the sources. There are valid attempts made to explore and apply the significance of the attributions. The cross-referencing could be extended to reconcile Source 12 with Source 10 but, nonetheless, the script warrants its mark in Level 4.

Question 2 (b) (i)

Many candidates displayed an impressive range of tightly focused contextual knowledge when tackling this question. Some strayed outside the date parameters and explored Elizabeth's success in dealing with the Spanish in 1588 but most appreciated the restriction imposed by the phrase 'last years' and examined such issues as the Essex Rebellion and the Poor Law. At the lower levels there was a tendency to describe problems, drawn largely from the sources, rather than explore solutions, but at the higher performers directed their analysis precisely on the political skill, or otherwise, of Elizabeth.

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

*(b) It can be said that Elizabeth had a long and, until the end, happy reign, as longest reigning monarch at this point. However she was old and although she handled some situations well by the end of her reign she had lost her remarkable skill. She still managed to keep the situations from escalating however less remarkably than previously.

Source 13 and 15 show what difficulties Elizabeth faced, source 14 is Elizabeth telling herself what she feels are threats and possibly what she is unhappy with not being resolved.

Source 13 is showing Elizabeth ~~has~~ ^{has} problems and possibly a threat from below. The country is in debt because of a war, inflation is ~~rising~~ ^{rising} and Elizabeth tried to recall money, ^{higher taxation} and wages were dealt through the government. However as shown is source 13, "The poor multiply... beggars," showing a growing population that have no means of ^{an} income and food

is in short supply due to failed crops. Source 13 also states a "new poor" - meaning the

((b) continued)

soliders returning from war who are unable to work. Elizabeth showed she was trying to gain control but it was not enough.

Although she had recalled money inflation and debts were growing with the population quicker than expected and quicker than she could handle

Source 15 is reflective showing the escalating problems with her monopolies and patronage. The Essex Rebellion in 1601 Elizabeth dealt with remarkably well. She stopped him from seeing her so as he could not win her round. He was one of her favourites, who would write love notes to Elizabeth exploiting her for being un-mamed. But when he became overwhelmed with debt and she stripped his powers, she was slowly stopping him from recovering. By not renewing his licence for wine was a final blow to Essex. She was very careful not to allow his faction to gain public support by making Essex show himself to be corrupt and when he rebelled, it was the first real threat to Elizabeth, ~~it~~ being so close to her

((b) continued)

home. However, he was captured and she managed very skillfully to keep the situation under control. This shows that although she is aging, she still has her authority and stamina from her youth.

At the same time the Spanish invaded Ireland but were arrested before damage could be done. War with Spain was not what Elizabeth wanted, but because she had been excommunicated by the pope and his Bull told Catholics to stop supporting her. Elizabeth not only had Spanish to be wary of, she also had Catholics. Many priests were being hidden in England, trying to spread out and continue preaching. Extremists were not happy with the settlement Elizabeth made in 1559, this caused problems ^{at home and away}.

Source 14, "to defend... and oppression." Elizabeth is speaking about threats from Catholicism and she did not want war. She tried her best but when William of Orange was killed and the Treaty of Nonsuch was signed, she

had no choice but to go to war with Spain. Elizabeth had been sending the Netherlands money to help keep the Spanish from taking the land and supported Dutch rebels.

with men sent over too. She did not want war but it became inevitable.
Elizabeth had so many trials during the last years of her reign at home and abroad that she managed with skill to handle ~~the problems~~

However it was not remarkable skill, had she been younger during this time it may have been handled better. Elizabeth had no real threats during her reign, but seemed to have many more during her last years. Although the people were happy during her reign change was wanted nearer the end.

Elizabeth dealt with inflation as best she could trying to keep her population ~~and~~ as well fed as possible but some controls are beyond her like failed crops and she was unhappy about the war. She did have some trying times and was doing as best she could with her age.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response does use the sources to access the debate but the selection is limited to brief quotations or simple paraphrasing. Without more in depth analysis the mark at AO2b is restricted to Level 2. There is some relevant contextual knowledge deployed and this is partially linked to the sources, but the range needs extending and the focus tightening to the specific period in the question. There is just enough here for a low Level 3 award. Overall then, the candidate received marks of 13 for AO1 and 8 for AO2b.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was the less popular of the part b) options. The vast majority of those who tackled the question could access the debate embedded in the sources and present some reasoning from the evidence, if only through cross-referencing. The more knowledgeable combined their interrogation of the source material with carefully deployed contextual knowledge to challenge or, more often, support the contention in the question. A pleasing proportion displayed an impressive understanding of the conflicts that arose over such issues as finance, favourites and freedom of speech.

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

*(b) ii)

plan -

yes	no
(s.16) forced loans (s.18) (s.17) divine right of kings monopolies rule without parliament (s.17)	foreign policy ↓ money expenditure (s.18) BUCKINGHAM (s.18)

Answer -

Conflicts between crown and parliament in the years 1603-29 were mainly caused by a growing fear of absolutism to a large extent, although other factors were also certainly prominent in aiding the conflict between crown and parliament.

Growing fear of absolutism, particularly in Charles' reign was triggered by many things: the forced loans of 1627, his (and James and Charles' mutual belief in the divine right of kings, although it was Charles who actually attempted to put this into action, monopolies, and James' and Charles' continual dissolution of parliament.

However, other factors such as foreign policy, expenditure, and the Duke of Buckingham also helped the conflict between crown and parliament. Nevertheless, it can also be argued that these factors were triggered by James' and particularly

((b) continued)

Charles' attempt towards absolutism.

Both James I~~s~~ and Charles I~~s~~ believed in the Divine Right of kings. However James 'was tolerant in religion; and did not directly attack the privileges of parliament' whereas 'Charles was less careful.' This would have caused tension in parliament as can be seen from Source 16; 'the privileges of the subject are, for the most part, an everlasting stand... but if lost, are not recovered without great difficulty.' This clearly demonstrates parliament's concern that they felt it the right of the commons, not the king, to deal with disputed elections. This is furthermore backed up by Source 17; 'subjects ought to challenge and oppose graceless tyrants'

Charles I's action on his ^{arminian} belief of the Divine Right of kings can be clearly shown through the forced loans of 1627. Since parliament did not grant Charles enough money to fund the ongoing war, Charles decided to raise money by force from those who usually paid towards the subsidies. Charles' absolutism is shown when he imprisoned five gentlemen for refusing to pay these forced loans

((b) continued)

in what is now known as the Five Knights Case. Source 17, in ^{which} ^{an} ^{MP} ~~which~~ comments about the period loans, states 'with loans and impositions and exalted claims, these tyrants deny right and liberty and oppress and exhaust the people.' ~~It~~ ~~is~~ Moreover due to the fact that this was written by a member of parliament who describes Charles as a 'Tyrant', shows that ~~it~~ much of the dispute between king and parliament was a result of growing fear of absolutism.

Many of James I's ~~of~~ disputes with parliament were often to do with growing fear of absolutism, although not to the same extent as Charles, because James was very extravagant with his spending, spending thousands of pounds on luxury for himself and on his favourites. This meant he was constantly in debt and parliament did not think he had the right to issue money and monopolies to his favourites. On the other hand, the fact that James was constantly in debt meant he repeatedly needed to ~~go~~ call parliament to grant more subsidies, therefore in a way it was to the advantage of parliament that

((b) continued)

James was constantly in debt. James also 'never felt compelled to take precautionary measures' as Charles did.

Growing fear of absolutism was not the sole cause of tension between king and parliament, however. Charles and Buckingham's failed foreign policy with the Cadix expedition, whereby troops landed in Cadix starving and thirsty only to find an ale house and get drunk, and the Mansfeld expedition, whereby the troops were so unprepared and were in awful conditions, most died of disease and starvation. By the parliament of 1628, Buckingham was the most hated man in England because parliament saw him as the reason Charles felt convinced to do the Cadix and Mansfeld expedition. Buckingham, therefore, was a large cause of tension between king and parliament. This is backed up by Source 18; 'The commons identified Buckingham as the source of all its concern.'

To conclude, fear of growing absolutism between 1604-29 was to a large extent the main reason for conflicts between

((b) continued)

King and parliament. This is due to James' favoritism and Charles' action towards absolutism e.g. forced loans, as is shown in Source 17. However foreign policy, and James' debt meaning his need for parliament all the time, and Buckingham are ~~all~~ all factors which also aided conflict between crown and parliament. Although, it can also be argued that these latter factors were as a result of growing absolutism from James and Charles.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is tightly focused on the question and presents a balanced analysis. There is a reasonable range of relevant contextual knowledge deployed, sufficient for a low Level 4. However, more needs to be made of the sources. There is a brief paragraph in which some similarities and differences are drawn out, but too often the source material is used as an afterthought (or indeed not at all). As a result it only received a low Level 3 for AO2b. Thus, the marks awarded were 19 for AO1 and 9 for AO2b.

Grade Boundaries

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

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

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028136 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning