

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2B The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1499
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2B The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1499

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons why Richard of York took up arms between 1450 and 1452. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

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

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance

- Comments might be broadly positive in that it is an authoritative source that does not clearly indicate a preference in the dispute between York and Somerset.
- However the precise identity of the author is not stated and indeed is not known.

Content and argument

- The source has a useful and clear focus on the rivalry between Somerset and York before the direct issue at Dartford and therefore sets the context for the crisis.
- There is a suggestion that Somerset was extremely powerful, but this is partly balanced by the implication that the Commons in parliament were opposed to this and therefore supportive of the position of Richard of York.
- There is specific mention of Somerset's promotion to Captain of Calais. Given the losses in France and York's own view of the reasons for loss this was a potentially significant provocation.
- There is the suggestion that the situation had already descended to political violence with the attempted murder of Somerset and York's assembling of a military force.
- There is the suggestion that supporters of York in the Commons were seeking to assert his dynastic claim to succeed the, at this point, childless Henry VI.

Tone and emphasis

- Although the source does not take a clear side in the noble dispute it is critical of Somerset in tone, commenting on his power, control as well as the consequences for those who were seen as questioning of it.

Source B: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance**

- Provenance is especially relevant here. Given the context of the Coventry parliament of 1459, it is unsurprising that this account is strongly anti-Yorkist.
- It is part of the formal indictment of Richard of York used to justify the act of attainder placed upon him and his supporters by the Coventry parliament.

Content and argument

- Henry VI is presented as patient and wise. In contrast Richard of York is insolent.
- The account refers to Richard of York's actions in 1450 and again in 1452.
- The source comments on the pride and the vanity of Richard of York making reference to his 'great display' and his disrespectful treatment of the king.
- Richard of York has resorted to violence or at least the threat of it both in his large number of followers and in his personal violence against the king's chamber itself.
- The account clearly implies that Richard of York's poor behaviour gained him nothing and that he was outwitted. A lack of noble support did leave York exposed.
- Richard of York treacherously sought forces to battle the king and his claim to be acting for the common good was a lie. This view may have been informed by later events at St Albans.

Tone and emphasis

- Unsurprisingly the tone is clearly formal and hostile to Richard of York, it heavily praises Henry VI and suggests that York was very much an isolated figure.

Source C: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**Provenance**

- Provenance is especially relevant here. This is Richard of York's own justification for his intention to gather forces and march to London in 1452.
- The manifesto is designed to incite hatred against Somerset and secure Richard the popular support needed.

Content and argument

- The principal argument relates to the failures of the Duke of Somerset.
- Somerset is presented as the main cause for the loss of the French territories that had been won by Henry V, it is noted that they fell when he had command over them.
- Somerset is also presented as the obstacle to the reform of the government that York asserts is necessary. Somerset had undermined some attempts at resumption.
- It is alleged by Richard of York that Edmund Beaufort, duke of Somerset, intends to ruin York and his family, the claim is a reference to the threat of an attainder.
- Richard of York is keen to emphasise his personal loyalty to Henry VI and talks of him respectfully, he claims to be acting out of a desire to protect the king.

- The source claims that Richard is not alone in his concerns and has the backing of a wider group of supporters. This is most likely a reference to the Nevilles.

Tone and emphasis

- The tone is clearly angry and amounts to a vicious character attack upon Edmund Beaufort who is presented as the cause of all the ills facing the kingdom.
- The manifesto attempts to demonstrate the loyalty of Richard of York to Henry VI, the reasons for his actions and, implicitly, the reasons why he is seeking support.

Section B

0 2 'The reasons for the outbreak of violence between the Yorkists and the court party were the same between 1459-60 as in 1455.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Factors that may be used to support the premise of the question:

- both at the beginning and end of this time period Richard of York felt marginalised and cut off from the government of England
- both the outbreak of violence in 1455 and again afterwards can be seen as a reaction to the termination of the Richard of York's protectorates by his enemies
- both at the battle of St Albans (1455) and at the later battles including Blore Heath (1459), Ludford Bridge (1459), Northampton (1460) and Wakefield (1460) the support that Richard of York received from the Neville family was crucial
- throughout this time period the incompetence and inability of Henry VI to effectively rule was a constant. Without the king's personal involvement it was difficult to resolve the issues that had developed
- both at the beginning and the end of this period the nature of noble power remained unchanged. Long-term issues such as retaining and bastard feudalism remained present and allowed nobles on both sides to amass substantial military power
- the private feuding between noble families remained. It can be argued that an 'escalation of private feuds' led to the outbreak of violence throughout this period.

Factors that may be used to challenge the premise of the question:

- in 1455 the target of Richard of York's animosity was Edmund Beaufort, the duke of Somerset. His death at the First battle of St Albans (1455) removed this as a factor
- the loss of Normandy and other French territories was a justification for attacks on the government led by Edmund Beaufort as he had been in control of them when they were lost. This was much less of an issue by 1459-60
- the deaths of prominent 'Lancastrian' supporters of the king at St Albans, most notably Somerset, Northumberland and Lord Clifford had created blood feuds which motivated their successors to seek revenge against the Yorkist lords despite the superficial reconciliation of Loveday (1458)
- the direct involvement of the queen, Margaret of Anjou, changed the dynamics of the conflict and therefore the outbreak of violence. Margaret regarded York as a dynastic threat to the succession of her son, Prince Edward
- Margaret of Anjou's actions made it almost impossible for nobles who had remained neutral in 1455 to do so by 1459-60. To remain neutral was to be treasonous
- unlike at the beginning of the period when Richard of York was fighting for dominance it can be argued that by the end of the period he was fighting for survival. The attainder of the Yorkist lords threatened to permanently disinherit them
- by 1460 a dynastic element had emerged because Richard of York formally claimed the throne of England. Margaret would never accept the consequent Act of Accord.

In summary, although the Yorkist lords were involved in both sets of encounters it is plausible to argue that the motivations for violence were rather different. Although possession of the king still played a role in 1459-60 it was no longer enough due to the faction that had developed under Margaret of Anjou's influence, it was now necessary to consider longer term solutions such as replacement of the king.

- 0 3** To what extent was Margaret Beaufort responsible for Richard III's downfall? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Factors that may be used to support the premise of the question:

- it was through Margaret Beaufort that Henry Tudor was able to make a dynastic claim to the English throne, without this it would have been difficult for him to attract the support needed to challenge Richard III
- Margaret Beaufort was a constant and clever, advocate of her son and worked to support him during his exile
- Margaret Beaufort was most likely involved in encouraging Buckingham's rebellion, he was her nephew by her third marriage and she sent to Henry Tudor to capitalise upon it, although the attempt ultimately failed
- Henry Tudor's public declaration of his intention to marry Elizabeth of York was a very clever move that gained him much support among former followers of Edward IV and it was arranged by his mother and Elizabeth Woodville
- Margaret Beaufort's influence on her husband Thomas Stanley is arguably demonstrated by his decision to decision not to support Richard III at Bosworth, despite the king holding one of his sons as a hostage
- elements of the Stanley forces, led by Sir William Stanley, supported Margaret's son, Henry Tudor, in 1485 and led the decisive charge against Richard III at Bosworth.

Factors that may be used to challenge the premise of the question:

- it is worth considering some of Henry Tudor's strengths as they helped to remove Richard; he was a clever opponent, avoiding direct confrontation until he had a large enough force
- Richard might be considered to be unlucky in his links with the murder of the Princes in the Tower and the allegations that he killed Queen Anne in order to marry Elizabeth of York. The distrust that surrounded Richard was a key factor in explaining why he was unable to create a wide section of support
- some answers might also argue that Richard's promotion of northern nobles and favourites alienated a large number of southern nobles, who would have been crucial to the long term survival of his regime
- events at Bosworth might also be considered and some might argue Richard was unlucky with the loyalty of some of the nobles
- although many answers may focus on Bosworth, without earlier events and developments he would not have alienated many who either supported Henry Tudor or waited to see the outcome
- many answers are likely to consider the circumstances of his seizure of the throne and argue that this was the start of his troubles as it raised doubts about his character
- Richard's poor judgement regarding the character of his followers may well be explored and Buckingham would be a good example.

In summary, students may conclude that although Richard III faced a determined foe in Margaret Beaufort and unreliable noble support, the instability of his regime was largely a consequence of his own actions, not least the coup which had put him in power in the first place. The disappearance of the Princes in the Tower and the rumours surrounding his Queen's death and his alleged attempts to marry Elizabeth of York only gained currency because of his own actions that had demonstrated his ruthless ambition.

0 4 'The Yorkists were never a serious threat to Henry VII.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1487 to 1499.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Factors that may be used to support the premise of the question:

- marriage to Elizabeth of York did much to reduce the danger of Yorkist challenge, as the eldest surviving daughter of Edward IV she was a popular figure with a clear claim to the throne of her own
- the birth of children with clear Yorkist descent also limited the impact of dynastic challenges
- the reliance of remaining Yorkists on pretenders to the throne like Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck showed how weak the cause was. Richard III's death at Bosworth had removed the most obvious senior male Yorkist claimant
- there might be consideration of Henry VII's handling of the nobility, some might argue that again he was successful in destroying overmighty subjects through bonds and this weakened their potential ability to support Yorkist challenges
- uprisings such as the Northern Rebellion of 1489 and the Cornish Risings of 1497 were both primarily about taxation rather than dynastic challenge.

Factors that may be used to challenge the premise of the question:

- the weak nature of Henry VII's claim to the throne. There were very many English nobles with stronger claims to it through Yorkist blood
- the Simnel and Warbeck incidents were linked to support from abroad, particularly Margaret of Burgundy and Ireland. Warbeck secured the recognition of the Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian von Habsburg
- there was support for Perkin Warbeck's rebellion in Scotland and James IV had allowed Warbeck to marry his sister
- both the Simnel and Warbeck uprisings occurred in the name of the Yorkists and both gathered support by claiming to be Yorkist princes. Edward, Earl of Warwick in the case of Simnel and Richard, Duke of York in the case of Perkin Warbeck
- Henry VII battled the forces supporting Lambert Simnel at Stoke in 1487. This was a threat because it forced the king into battle, which might have gone the same way as Bosworth
- fear of being encircled by supporters of Warbeck led Henry VII to launch an invasion of France in 1492. Abandonment of Warbeck was one of Henry VII's key demands for peace
- support for Warbeck's cause extended into the royal household as shown by the actions of Sir Robert Clifford and Henry VII's paranoia and sensitivity is demonstrated in the execution of John Ratcliffe and William Stanley
- the execution of the Earl of Warwick in 1499 showed how seriously Henry VII still took the Yorkist threat
- the younger brothers of John de la Pole remained alive and Edmund de la Pole was out of Henry VII's hands by 1499, having fled the kingdom.

In summary, students may conclude that although rebellions against Henry VII were unsuccessful they were a significant threat and were regarded as such by the king himself. The Tudor dynasty was new and dangerously dependent on the lives of a very small number of individuals. There were many other people, including those in Henry VII's own nobility with considerably stronger claims to the throne than he had, many of these had external support and the events of recent years had demonstrated that violence was now a legitimate method of seizing the throne.