

Examiners' Report
January 2012

GCE History 6HI02 A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at www.edexcel.com. For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at www.btec.co.uk.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification 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 speak directly to the subject team at Pearson about Edexcel qualifications. Their contact details can be found on this link:

www.edexcel.com/teachingservices



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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk .

January 2012

Publications Code US030595

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

There were many good responses seen in this examination series. The best responses demonstrated well developed analysis which was focused on the task; the sources were used effectively and, in part (b), supporting own knowledge was specific and detailed. It was clear that such candidates were often aware of the demands of the assessment objectives and were framing their responses in order to meet these demands. It is therefore worth reiterating the key issues with each assessment objective:

Question (a) requires the application of AO2a. This requires candidates to analyse, cross-reference and evaluate source material. They should aim to develop this as fully as possible in relation to the focus of the question and not merely assert similarities and differences.

Question (b) requires the application of both AO1 (the selection and deployment of historical knowledge) and AO2b (the analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context).

An understanding of what each assessment objective tests would help candidates to focus their comments more securely. For example, there are still a significant number of candidates who spend considerable amounts of time exploring the provenance of sources in question (b) and may very well be addressing AO2a which is not rewarded in this question.

There were far fewer candidates working through the sources sequentially in question (a) than has been the case previously. This is to be commended. However, candidates now need to develop the quality of the cross referencing that they are engaged in. A significant minority pick out a quote and match it to another quote without explaining how this relates to the question. It should also be pointed out that although a discrete paragraph on provenance is preferable to no reference to this at all, the very best answers integrate provenance within the arguments that are presented in the cross referencing. This enables the candidates to develop more specific arguments than the general comments that characterise most of the separate paragraphs. Candidates should be encouraged to use provenance as the basis for reaching a judgement in response to the question. This particularly distinguishes level 4 candidates from those operating at level 3. The purpose of testing the weight and validity of the evidence is to come to a judgement. It is always disappointing when perceptive comments made in the body of the answer are ignored when reaching a conclusion.

In question (b), examiners were impressed by many responses which demonstrated a strong understanding of the sources, the issues that they related to and which were supported by extensive own knowledge. Fewer candidates than has been usual treated the sources and own knowledge discretely. There were however many responses which demonstrated very little knowledge beyond what was offered in the sources. Where this material was well used, it was possible to achieve top level 2 in AO1. It is however, disappointing that some candidates have not prepared well for the examination.

It was pleasing to note that previous advice in examiners' reports has clearly been acknowledged and this applied also to the use of inappropriate abbreviations. There was however, this January something of a resurgence of the use of bias, with its attendant misspellings and misuse.

Question 1

Question 1 (a)

There were many good responses where candidates successfully cross referenced the sources and tested the validity of the sources by a careful discussion of the provenance of the sources that formed the basis of the judgement. High scoring candidates were able to debate the term "considerable" effectively. However, many candidates still work their way through the sources numerically and this does reduce the overall achievement. In many scripts provenance use was often generic, such as "we can trust Source 1 as Warham was a commissioner". The ability to move beyond this is the mark of a good candidate.

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) There is evidence in the sources to suggest that there was considerable resistance to the Amicable Grant of 1525. Source 1 clearly agrees with this notion as Warham tells of the "dissatisfaction prevailing". This implies that there was considerable resistance as it gives us the impression that the majority of the people were opposed to the Grant. Warham is writing a private letter, and thus is likely to enclose his personal feelings. Source 3 offers a degree of support to source 1 as Henry admits that in some places people "arose up in arms". The element of disagreement between these two sources comes over the issue of whether the resistance was 'considerable', Henry says that this has only occurred in some places whereas Warham says that this attitude is "prevailing".

We may conclude that Warham's account is likely to be more accurate as the King would not want to exaggerate the extent of the opposition, and would try to press on with the Grant.

((a) continued)

On the other hand, there is also evidence to suggest that any opposition to the Grant was not considerable. Source 2 states that in "all Suffolk, except Ipswich" people "conform" to the Amicable Grant. The Duke of Suffolk gives the impression that there was very little opposition so we may say that it was not considerable. However, the Duke wishes to know what "authority" collectors have; he seems worried. If we consider the provenance, the Duke agreed with the Amicable Grant and would be reluctant to accept that it would not work, as with Henry in Source 3.

In conclusion, one must ultimately accept that because of the flawed probative value of sources 2 and 3, that there was considerable opposition to the Amicable Grant of 1525. The

personal opinions of Henry VIII and of
The Duke of Suffolk means that
Warham's account is more reliable.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response achieved high level 4. The candidate is clearly focused on the task of cross referencing and provides sound comments on the attributions of the sources which are then used to inform the overall judgement. A particular strength of this answer is the focus on the term "considerable" and the judgement made on this.

Question 1 (b)(i)

This was the most popular question on the paper and virtually all candidates were able to access the sources and focus on the question. In levels 2 and 3 there was a tendency towards narrative description in varying degrees of accuracy but in level 4 candidates were able to weigh up the arguments both in terms of historians' perceptions of success and failure and also with regard to how Henry would have viewed his foreign policy. Successful candidates integrated sources and own knowledge and used knowledge to test the opinions in the sources.

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

*(b) PART (i)

PLAN: How far 1511-25 success outweighed failure

FOR:

SOURCE 4

→ Diplomatic Success

But possible ←

→ Just needed money.

~~7) Diplomatic
6) Financial
5) Last 15 years
4) Nobles
3) F.F. W.
2) F.F. W.
1) F.F. W.~~

AGAINST:

SOURCE 5

→ Financially unrealistic to achieve success abroad.

SOURCE 6

→ "Economic weakness."

(i)

While on first sight one may say that English foreign policy was, on the whole, successful in the years 1511 to 1525, ~~a~~ ^{on closer} ~~stronger~~ inspection we can see that several successes are not enough to conceal England's failures.

A case can be made that England had a successful foreign policy. In source 4, M.D. Palmer states that Wolsey's "greatest triumph" was the Treaty of London, which brought together twenty European powers for universal peace. This is clearly a success:

Foreign policy does not have to involve winning decisive battles to be deemed a success. The other sources fail to mention Wolsey's successful diplomacy, except that source 6 praises Wolsey's alignment with the Empire. One cannot deny that the diplomacy may be presented as a failure but it was, perhaps covering up England's issues. We may place a lot of weight on M.D. Palmer's views due to the fact that, as a twentieth century historian, he would have access

to a wide variety of sources and would not have a personal agenda to twist the evidence.

We must not ignore Henry's successes in the First French War, as he ~~became~~ managed to win French land while Wolsey showed off his organisational muscles. Source 6 states that these campaigns were "expensive" and of "little long-term value". Although the probative value of this source is strong, for the same reasons as source 1, we may argue against Armstrong's views.

The successes in Tournai and Therouanne gave Henry an advantage when it came to negotiating peace and England were able to secure a sizeable pension as a result of the foreign policy. We can see, then, that a case can be made that England achieved some successes.

A stronger case can be made that, despite having some successes in foreign policy, these successes were outweighed by failures. Henry had spent £1.4 million in wars according to source 6 and had only two small French towns

to show for it. Hence Armstrong states that these campaigns were of "little long-term value". He has a point. Wolsey's diplomacy, whilst paraded by source 4 cannot really be seen as a success as the peace failed to last and this was England's way of looking powerful and taking centre-stage without bankrupting themselves as was the real issue.

Financially, it was difficult for England to impress on the European stage as they simply did not have the funds to compete with their rivals. As Warham suggests in source 5 an invasion of France would cost England "greatly", Warham's comments come in 1525 when England's foreign desires to invade France after the Imperial success at Pavia caused problems at home as a result of Wolsey's Amicable Grant. We may place a lot of weight on Warham's opinions because he is a contemporary source, and his opinions are put across in a personal letter, thus containing his

personal feelings. If we cross-refer sources 5 and 6 there is a high level of ^{mutual} support as Armstrong states that "England's economic weakness limited effective action". This agreement is convincing as both credible sources. England's lack of financial power meant that they could only achieve small successes with foreign policy and France and The Holy Roman Empire always seemed more powerful.

In order to be able to conclude that English foreign policy was more of a failure than a success, we must be able to dismiss Wolsey's diplomacy. Source 6 states that "Charles V increasingly pursued his own aims and ambitions", although allied with England, the Empire only had their own ambitions in mind. They embarrassed England in the French campaign by failing to appear at the arranged date. We may say then that Palmer's account is not entirely accurate as he neglects to mention the diplomatic failures. * [SEE LATER]

Ultimately, one must conclude that England's foreign policy was more characterised by failure than by success. There were, admittedly, some successes, but these were outweighed by the failures. England's real major failure, was that Henry "squandered" his father's swings trying to convince people that England was a major European power, when in reality they were unable to compete with France and the Empire as England had a population only a fraction of the size of their rivals, and thus could not generate the same level of financial power, despite Wolsey's best efforts, English foreign policy was not, in general successful.

* If we cross-refer sources 4 and 6, we can see that source 6 refutes source 4, especially with regards to relationships with Charles V, the Emperor.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a very focused response which achieved high level 4 for A01 and maximum marks for A02b. The response is driven by the arguments in the sources and knowledge is displayed effectively to develop the argument. The conclusion provides an excellent example of reasoned judgement.

Question 1 (b)(ii)

This question was less popular and often not as well done as b(i). There were a range of excellent answers with a tight focus on the question and developed reasoning from the sources. However, a significant number of candidates did find it difficult to focus on the dissolution of the larger monasteries and tended to offer own knowledge that explained the first dissolutions in 1536. As such many were placed in level 3 for implicit focus.

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

* (b) ii

Plan Yes

- 1535-47 13 million from monasteries
- sold everything, roofs, windows, books
- monasteries had valuable goods of value, plates, jewels, books etc
- Church corrupt between 1/2 & 1/3 of land, more than King
- not doing badly next out of 800 years

No

- Church corrupt (sinners, breaking celibacy)
- Political - wanted to grant divorce
- Set up not good rich bishops, poor priests

It is possible to argue that the dissolution of the monasteries was not done to money. If we look at Source 9 for instance it clearly states that the main reason for the dissolution was corruption. It says, 'even among the great Abbots ... examples of corruption & extravagance' - that is clear evidence for corruption of the monasteries. It also accuses the monasteries of being against the establishment, saying that they took 'part in the rebellion of the North', therefore the dissolution could be said to be a defensive measure. To back this previous point up it goes on to say that they were 'stirring up disaffection'.

generally'. Therefore this source shows that the dissolution of the monasteries was not for financial purposes. From our knowledge, it can be said that corruption of the monasteries ran deep with examples of: simony (people paying for the positions), people giving positions to their family when they are not fit for the job & also people holding multiple positions being able.

This source was written by traditional historian Innes, amongst whom the popular opinion of the dissolution was for corruption. However he is a secondary source & as a result would not have an agenda. As a result I would say that this source is reliable but would not be of popular opinion amongst modern historians of today.

On the other hand, if we cross reference Source 8 with Source 8 we can see they disagree because Source 8 was written by a modern historian who believes the abolition was due to financial reasons. The author writes the abolition brought 'greater wealth' than the taxation would have brought - therefore insinuating that the dissolution was due to financial reasons. The author then backs their inference up with figures, saying that the King made '£1.3 million between 1536 & 1547', therefore there is solid proof that the King was increasing his finances. The source even provides reasons, in order to increase 'his war chest' therefore the dissolution was due to King's financial problems which led to him not being able to launch military expeditions. From our knowledge, this point can be backed up because Henry sold everything of the monasteries from the lead on the roof to the stained glass windows to books, so he clearly was selling off to use the money.

over the short term. The Church also provided a bit of land which could be sold off as it came between $\frac{1}{3}$ & $\frac{1}{5}$ of the land, which was more than the king.

I would say this source was reliable because it was written to inform (a text book) by a modern historian.

If we cross reference Source 9 with Source 8 we can see that to some degree they agreed but also to some degree they disagreed. It agrees with Source 8 because it shows the king selling off Church land where it says, 'Earl of Sussex take an inventory of all the property' therefore he was using the land to raise finances. This is backed up at the end where it says, 'Look to the King's profit' - if the dissolution wasn't for finances why would there be anything to do with the King's finances?

On the other hand Source 8 supports 7 by inferring that the reason for the dissolution was due to corruption. We can see that it says, 'marks of an honest sort should be given money' therefore the source shows that it is only corrupt monks who deserve to be punished by the dissolution & financial gain was simply a by product of the dissolution.

If we look at the reliability, I would say that the source is not reliable. This is because it is written by Henry 8's office, who would want to justify the official reason that the dissolution was due to corruption & not financial gain.

~~It could also be said, from an alternative, that the reason of the o~~

Therefore, in conclusion, I would say that the dissolution of the monasteries could have been down to the corruption of the financial gain was a by product but more likely, I would say it was a mixture of politics, because the monasteries could be used by the Pope to regain power & also reminded the people of the old regime; the other reason being finances because Henry wanted to be a Renaissance warrior prince who earned his name fighting & after the opportunity of taking France in 1525 passed due to lack of finances he wanted to raise finances to launch another attack on France. Although, the reason for raising finances may have been debatable because he was worried of a Catholic mission from Europe, but either way I believe that the reason for the dissolution of the monasteries was due to Royal Finances, predominantly, whilst corruption was also a problem (although not of the 800 monasteries in England not a large proportion were that corrupt that they needed to be dissolved & the complete dissolution was probably now planned it was simply expedient due to the financial success).



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer was awarded secure level 3 for both assessment objectives. The answer is driven mainly by the sources with clear reasoning developed from them. The candidate uses cross referencing of the sources to develop the argument, but does waste some time in describing the provenance of the sources. This is not rewarded in A02b and so its inclusion does waste time for the candidate. The own knowledge is rather thin, but a good development in the conclusion does raise the AO1 marks into secure L3.

Question 2

Question 2 (a)

Many candidates were able to focus their responses on cross referencing, and very few were unable to recognise the conflict between sources 10 and 12 favouring James' extravagance with source 11 that suggested other reasons for James' financial problems. Where provenance was discussed it was often done well but many candidates did not attempt it this time or gave little more than stereotypical labels that did not allow progress beyond lower level 3.

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) James' extravagant giving: cause of fin. problems.

Source 10, is a letter expressing the "fears" among James' subjects, caused by his extravagant giving, that Archbishop Hutten's helms will "exhaust the treasury". Thus, this source presents a similar argument to source 12, who uses the metaphor of a cistern, to exemplify that ~~effect~~ financial problems resulted from James' 'giving'. The concurrence between these two sources provides strength to this ~~arg~~ view.

Furthermore, the evidence to source 12 presents ~~him~~ as a primary account can be deemed relatively viable because although this primary source is subject to contextual influences - indeed he cites 'common talk' and speaks in generalisations - his motives can be assumed to be unbiased as he is merely reporting to his employer. The ~~general~~ gossip 'talk' source 12 ~~is~~ alludes to however, is confirmed by the Archbishop of York, who expresses these concerns to Cecil, ~~putting~~ in a manner which implies James' extravagance will - in his view - cause financial problems. This suggestion is only given weight by the fact that assumptions and 'heard (h)' words of 1604 (source

10) are confirmed by source 12 (1610) which speaks us though the concerns of source 10 have ~~some~~ come into effect and James's governance is causing problems.

However, this well written letter written observations are based from external accounts, and their argument is indeed limited by source 11, which is written by the Lord Treasurer who would have knowledge of all the monarch's ~~the~~ fiscal transactions, and disagrees with what is merely 'common talk'. Source 11, in basic form, claims that ~~not~~ not only that their are issues (concurrent with source 12's view) but that they are a result of debts to the king ~~to~~ remaining unpaid, investigating the ~~the~~ monetary problems the question implies were present. ~~But~~ This limitation of the opposing argument is furthered by the fact it ~~also~~ is more helenistic, incorporating it (acknowledging that the King's family would lead ~~to~~ to more extravagant spending) but from the treasurer's view, this is minute compared to other influencing factors. However, this argument too is limited in that unlike the other two sources, it could ~~be~~ be twisted by a desire to appease the king, presenting him positively, making excuses for financial problems.

However source 12 describes James's extravagance as an 'incurable leak' on finances. ^{yet} ~~but~~ the fact both source 10 and 12 present views amongst

patrimonialism and greed, could explain why
Lentini is unwilling to provide the payment

((a) continued) on debts, like subsidies, because of
Jones giving unsanctioned giving. ~~These~~ ~~with~~

This leads to conclusion that not only was Jones'
giving a primary ~~to~~ drain on finances, ~~that~~ (source
10 and 12 suggest it) but that it had a secondary
impact, resulting in a loss of faith which
exacerbated his fiscal inefficiency. ~~The~~ Furthermore,
this view incorporates three primary sources, all with
different social outlooks and political roles, all of
which - holistically, present this argument. This
provides this interpretation with validity ~~and~~ ~~as~~
as it takes into account biases, negating them to an
extent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response scored the maximum mark. The response displays level 4 qualities from the start. There is an explicit focus on the question with cross referencing and consideration of source attributes which are used to reach a judgement. A real strength in this answer is the candidate's ability to use the sources as a set. Excellent communication skills aids the candidate's tightly focused argument.

Question 2 (b)(i)

This was the more popular option in question 2. There were some very good responses here where candidates had an excellent grasp of the key events and issues and were able to develop an integrated response using sources and own knowledge to provide a focused answer which showed consideration of both a range of factors and a weighing of their significance in relation to the stated factor in the question. Many candidates however, struggled to focus on the dates given and so became heavily reliant on the content of the sources to address the question.

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

* (b) To a certain degree, James I's attempt to follow a peaceful foreign policy in the years 1621-25 failed due to the lack of support from Parliament. Source 13 gives an extreme biased view of Parliament being unsupportive of James' efforts to resort peace to Europe & due to the rejection of the Spanish Infanta marriage ending in failure and the welcoming of the Thirty Year War. Source 14 depicts how James was trapped for his desires for peace with Spain and 'dynastic commitments'. Source 15 finally is a Petition presented to James in 1621 claiming that his efforts were useless to restore peace and that Parliament view with war 'must be considered'. C. Emmott depicts on how 'Parliament disliked peace with Spain'. This maybe is due to the Spanish Armada won by Elizabeth and also Parliament ~~having~~ ~~Popery~~ ~~Leana~~ possessing a Popery attitude since Spain was the Catholicism symbol of Europe. Emmott also expresses how Parliament still believes that Spain is ~~ea~~ a 'dangerous enemy': the ~~ea~~ constant Catholic threats during

Elizabeth's reign. For example Mary Queen of Scots and the Babylon Plot, and also the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 creates masses of tension within Parliament towards Catholic Spain, and still

((b) continued) consider them to be dangerous. This is supported by Source 15, where in the Commons people were fearful of the dangerous increase of Popish influence.

Parliament would always be fearful of Catholicism since the Tudor reign ~~was~~ is well-known for their dangerous shifts in religion. ~~Source 12 also can~~

Emmott would give his own biased opinion of James' foreign policy since it is his own research and historical account. Emmott depicts how Parliament 'bitterly opposed the attempt to marry Charles to a Spanish princess'. Parliament's struggles with Mary II's marriage to Prince Phillip of Spain would have had an enormous effect ~~of~~ on royal marriages since they did possess freedom of speech.

Source 14, suggests that it was actually Europe that failed to co-operate with James' foreign policy. Since foreign policy was a royal prerogative, Parliament could not have any influence over James' foreign affairs. Reeve quotes how the 'German conflict escalated and threatened to become a... European War'. James' foreign policy was threatened by German conflict rather than the lack of support from Parliament,

Since Protestant Germany was threatening the stability of his daughter's Elizabeth's ~~rule~~ rule. Reeves ~~also~~ also depicts how James was 'trapped'; this could represent James being influenced by other

((b) continued) people such as the Duke of Buckingham, who was behind the idea of Charles's failed marriage to the Spanish infanta. Parliament's lack of support cannot be blamed for James's failed foreign policy if his advisers are making mistakes. This is supported by Source 15, where the Petition states how James should 'abandon his own children'. Parliament see the failed Spanish marriage and Frederick's and Elizabeth's crisis as interrupting and threatening peace at home when they should not even be James's problems as King.

Source 15 is a primary source which will present fresher and more reliable evidence of James's failed foreign policy. The Petition states how "despite James's 'efforts to achieve peace' such as the Treaty of London in 1604 and the Treaty of Antwerp, 'war must be considered' as the solution to the growing tension in Europe. The Petition depicts how Parliament was never supportive of James in his efforts to stimulate peace in Europe and that Parliament always desired war with Spain for revenge on the failed marriage and the Gunpowder Plot.

To conclude, James I's attempt to follow a peaceful foreign policy in the final years of James' reign failed due to the lack of support from Parliament. The last line of source 15 states how problems within

((b) continued) Europe were not fully and clearly understood to James' knowledge, which depicts a lack of co-operation between the two.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response achieved a low level 3 for A01 and top level 2 for A02b. The candidate clearly identifies different representations in the sources and organises the response around the source material. There is some own knowledge integrated with the sources but that is focused on developing the underlying attitude to Spain rather than being focused on the time period set by the question. The sources are used for information but the candidate does not develop level 3 reasoning from them.

Question 2 (b)(ii)

There were fewer responses to this question but those candidates who did answer it tended to have a better grasp of the knowledge needed to address it. The best answers were able to distinguish between the "minority" stated in the question and parliament as a whole. Most candidates did not make that distinction and tended to focus on parliament as a whole as a factor in the breakdown of relations with Charles. The majority were able to draw out a range of other factors identified in sources 17 and 18 and link these with their own knowledge. Candidates who were able to weigh up their relative significance in relation to the stated factor scored well.

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

* (b) ii). Do you agree C - P breakdown relations brought about by actions of difficult H of C. minority
16, 17, 18. 16 - A01
short term 'Jews' support. fault. 24 - A02

~~The causes of the breakdown are many and varied but as sources 16, 17 and 18 indicate, I~~

The role of a minority in the breakdown of monarch-Parliamentary relations does indeed have backing by sources 16 and 18.

Historian Neale indeed described a 'puritan choir' acting as a minority of 40 puritan M.P.'s during Elizabethan times so it is justifiable based on this and generalisations of sources 16 and 18, that they certainly had an influence.

However, source 17 ~~acknowledges~~ firmly opposes this argument, even alluding directly to source 16, that this argument is limited and that Charles played a factor. Charles and Parliament seem to have played nearly an equal role in the disruption, but if the minority were responsible for the falling out, it seems so confusing that it only happened to the extent it did in 1629, unless the intransigence of Charles, rather than Elizabeth's James.

~~base~~ The argument of source 16, is acknowledged by

((b) continued) source 17 and presents the argument that 'the majority of Parliament were led astray by a few disaffected members'. A minority. Indeed the speaker of the Commons had attempted to dissuade the ~~the~~ extremists of M.P.'s such as Wentworth and Coke as far back as 1621. Furthermore, source 18 calls the M.P.'s who passed the 3 Resolutions 'Elliots group', implying a minority indeed.

the 3 resolutions naming those advocating arminianism, and payment of tithes and purveyance capital state enemies, resulted in Charles's fear that Parliament was dominated. Attacks upon more radical MP's by the House of Lords exemplify this. ~~the~~ ~~&~~ Even more so, ~~the~~ before 1629, Charles elected ~~to~~ 'troublesome men' such as Coke, to be ~~chief~~ sheriffs, preventing them from standing ^{for} ~~in~~ Parliament. ~~This~~ ~~kind~~ discipline propagates the view Charles personally expresses in source 16, that Parliament's "well meaning part of the House was to an extent, responsible for the break up of relations.

~~some~~
* evidence source 17 acknowledges.

However, this ~~view~~ ~~shows~~ Charles view ignores his own ~~role~~ in handling of Parliament. Unlike Elizabeth to James, Charles tried to enforce his divine right of kings uncompromisingly and his limited communication skill and immediate fear of treachery towards any criticism, can clearly explain ~~why he felt~~ not only why Charles believed in a troublesome minority, but encouraged

((b) continued) ~~that~~ this James had warned his son

'you will live to have a hully full of Parliament's but his neglect of James's advice can explain the situation which would encourage ~~an~~ ~~opposi~~ ~~on~~ not only ~~an~~ opposition, but a ~~an~~ more aggressive minority. Thus, Charles was the root of this minority, which helped ~~cause~~ ~~some~~ ~~new~~ relations, but was also, in ~~the~~ himself a cause of the problem.

Charles's role in causing the problems can be seen in his favouring of Arminians, & absolutist elements of absolutism. His limited circle of friends were in part responsible for this with his French wife (Henriette Maria) propagating European ideas of absolutism, which inevitably caused conflict with Parliament, and was a factor in dissolution. Furthermore, as one Royalist MP said "if you do not grant him subsidies, he will be forced to turn to other & less favourable options". This case characterises Charles as an aggressor, and weakens the evidence source 16 presents. His impetuosity, as source 17 puts it, led to other billings to fund foreign policy aims and martial law in some areas to maintain order. Characteristic of absolutism, this was responsible for in part causing Parliament's relations, implying Charles, rather than a Parliament minority was responsible, due to mistrust. Furthermore,

((b) continued) He rallying behind the rebranding of billings, martial law and the forced loans implies Parliament acted together, rather than acting feebly and in minorities. This is exemplified in source 17's 47th line, of how Charles alienated the more moderate MP's, rather than his own view from source 16, that the moderates had been best absconding. My own knowledge validates this, strengthening this interpretation, in the knowledge that Parliament was generally united in this period, collectively rejecting it

Buchinghams death and 'wholeheartedly' representing the King after the 5 Knights case 1628.

However, whilst a minority may have not played a large role Parliament as a whole certainly ~~did~~ played a part. Having deposed monarchs such as Richard II in the 13-14th Centuries, Charles ~~may~~ may not have been ~~entirely~~ unjust in dismissing Parliament and there is evidence Parliament was, as source 16 says, taking advantage of the situation. This can be seen in their ~~retaliation~~ ^{*}retaliation to Buchinghams purges in 1625, attempting to impeach him after Bristol and Auden were imprisoned. This evidence of Parliament showing their muscles ^{*}retaliation.

((b) continued) as some historians have described ~~it~~ ~~can~~ can be cited as a new cause of the break down of relations. After refusing to grant subsidies to Charles throughout his reign, ensuring overseers when they did grant 1/3 of what Charles wanted in 1625, they must clearly be accounted for.

The actions source 16 alludes to far a break down in relations, does hold

some both sources, Neel's Luntin
Chair Henry supports it as evidence of
minorities in the Civil War, suggest
this group existed. However, the
failures of Lincoln and his ~~to~~ selfish
unwilling responses as some 17
suggest, played a more central
role. More imp than a minority
in Parliament, was the actions of it as
a whole throughout this period
which is perhaps, more critical.
Although as the sources suggest,
~~they~~ a minority, did play a
role.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response scored the maximum mark for both assessment objectives. The candidate demonstrates a clear awareness that there is a conflict in the sources and develops a high level of analysis and evaluation to reach a judgement. The use of own knowledge is skilfully integrated with the sources, not by a lengthy passages of knowledge but by underpinning the argument with a developed understanding of the issues. The conclusion is brief and lacks source reference, giving the impression that the candidate ran out of time, but the overall quality of the response merits the full marks awarded.

Paper Summary

In order to improve performance candidates should address the following issues:

- Read the question carefully in order to be able to address the precise issues that are required
- Read the sources carefully before beginning to write in order to ensure that all the sources are securely understood
- Ensure that in part (a) the sources are cross referenced as fully as possible in relation to the question
- Ensure in part (b) that the sources are integrated with secure own knowledge
- Leave time for a well-judged conclusion to part (b)

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 US030595 January 2012

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