

ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY GCE**HISTORY**

British History Enquiries

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1660

F963/01

Candidates answer on the Answer Booklet

OCR Supplied Materials:

- 8 page Answer Booklet

Other Materials Required:

None

Wednesday 20 January 2010
Morning

Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes**INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

- Write your name clearly in capital letters, your Centre Number and Candidate Number in the spaces provided on the Answer Booklet.
- Use black ink.
- Read each question carefully and make sure that you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- Answer **both sub-questions** from **one** Study Topic.
- Do **not** write in the bar codes.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **100**.
- This question paper contains questions on the following three Study Topics:
 - The Normans in England 1066–1100 (pages 2–3)
 - Mid-Tudor Crises 1536–69 (pages 4–5)
 - The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637–60 (pages 6–7)
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure of argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Sources in the one Study Topic you have studied.
- In answering these questions, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you understand and interpret the Sources, as well as to inform your answers.
- This document consists of **8** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

The Normans in England 1066–1100

Study the four Sources on Problems in Ruling England and Normandy and then answer **both** sub-questions.

It is recommended that you spend two-thirds of your time in answering part **(b)**.

1 (a) Study Sources A and C.

Compare these Sources as evidence for military campaigns fought by the Norman Kings of England. [30]

(b) Study **all** the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the problems arising from the linking of Normandy and England were caused **mainly** by members of William I's own family. [70]

[Total: 100 marks]

Problems in Ruling England and Normandy

Source A A chronicler who was a prominent clergyman and was born in East Anglia describes fighting in France.

In 1076 King William crossed over to France and besieged Dol in Brittany. But the Bretons defended the castle manfully and then the king of France came to help them and William was defeated. Afterwards the French and English kings made peace. Meanwhile, Malcolm, king of the Scots, plundered Northumbria as far as the Tyne and took back with him a great amount of loot and many men in chains. King William was also fighting against his son who led a rebellion and William was thrown from his horse and many of his men were killed. The king cursed his son Robert. 5

Henry of Huntingdon, The History of the English People, written between 1123 and 1133

Source B: A chronicler, who was born in England to an English mother and a French father, who later became a monk in Normandy, gives an account of the state of England under Norman regents.

Whilst the king was in Normandy his regents, ruling in his absence, Bishop Odo, his half-brother, and William fitz Osbern were so swollen with pride that they were not prepared to listen to the pleas of the English, however reasonable, nor to give them impartial judgement. The English were groaning under the Norman yoke and they suffered oppressions from these proud lords who ignored the king's instructions. Their subordinates who were guarding the castles oppressed the native inhabitants both rich and poor and heaped burdens on them. When their men-at-arms were guilty of plunder they protected them by force and vented their wrath even more on those who complained about these cruel wrongs. 10 15

Orderic Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, written between c.1125 and 1141

Source C: A chronicler, who had Anglo-Norman parents, describes events in Normandy in 1088.

In 1088 William Rufus bribed the garrison and captured the castle of St Valery. His brother, Robert, lacked the courage to resist but told his lord, the king of France, about it and begged for help. The French king came to fight, but met the money of the king of England on the way, accepted it and went back. But Normandy suffered from civil war between William Rufus and Robert for a long time. Sometimes one party, sometimes the other was victorious. The nobility who were men who easily changed sides and were faithful to neither brother made matters worse. A few of the nobles who were more sensible and attentive to their own advantage since they had possessions in both countries, negotiated a peace. The treaty was ratified and confirmed by the oaths of the nobles on both sides. 20
25

William of Malmesbury, Deeds of the Kings of England, written between 1135 and 1143

Source D: A modern historian outlines the reasons why William Rufus wanted to impose his control over Normandy.

In 1089 at a Council in Winchester William pointed out the great wrong that his brother, Robert, had done him in rebelling in Normandy. He added that he had received an appeal from the Church in Normandy which was suffering from attacks because Robert was not strong enough to deal with bandits. William urged his barons to join him in suppressing those who were looting monasteries, which had been founded by the ancestors of his barons and himself. He said that the whole of Normandy was suffering and regretted the loss of the great Duke William who had defended it from violence. The barons responded by unanimously approving the plan to invade. The monasteries were mostly under the patronage of the barons who held land on both sides of the Channel. Damage done to them in attacks threatened to undermine the political influence of those barons as much as it damaged the monasteries themselves. 30
35

Emma Mason, King Rufus, 2005

Mid-Tudor Crises 1536–1569

Study the five Sources on Royal Advisers 1540-1569, and then answer **both** sub-questions.

It is recommended that you spend two-thirds of your time in answering part **(b)**.

2 (a) Study Sources **A** and **E**.

Compare these Sources as evidence for relations between monarchs and their advisers. **[30]**

(b) Study **all** the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that advisers could be trusted to serve royal interests between 1540 and 1569. **[70]**

[Total: 100 marks]

Royal Advisers 1540–1569

Source A: Eight months after the execution of Thomas Cromwell, the French ambassador reports on Henry VIII's opinions of his ministers.

In his illness, King Henry has a gloomy attitude and an evil opinion of his ministers. He said that most of his Privy Council, while pretending to serve him, were only seeking their own profit. But he knew the good servants from the flatterers, and if God lent him health, he would take care that their plans should not succeed. The King sometimes even blames his ministers for Cromwell's death. He says that, by lies and for little reason, they made him put to death the most faithful servant he ever had. **5**

Charles de Marillac, letter to the Constable of France, 3 March 1541

Source B: The Privy Council's allegations against the Duke of Somerset, after the successful suppression of the 1549 rebellions.

Somerset encouraged the common people to revolt. He said: 'Good people, in the name of God and King Edward, let us rise with all our power. We must defend the King and the Lord Protector against gentlemen who would depose the Lord Protector and so endanger the King's royal person. They threaten this because the poor common people, after ill-treatment by the greedy gentlemen, were pardoned this year by the mercy of the King and the goodness of the Lord Protector. Let us fight for him, for he loves the poor people of England.' **10**

Privy Council charges against the Duke of Somerset, 6 October 1549

Source C: The Imperial ambassador, who was very influential with Queen Mary, reports to the Emperor on the factional rivalries in Mary I's Privy Council.

23 November 1554: it has proved impossible to reduce the excessive number of councillors, for it created too much bad feeling between the old and recent members of the Privy Council. 15

10 February 1555: the split in the Council has grown. The two factions no longer consult together; some councillors transact no business. Paget is now out of favour with the Queen and most of the Council, so he is often in King Philip's apartments.

27 March 1555: the Council is very much divided. Neither Arundel nor Paget attended because of their hatred for the Chancellor, Bishop Stephen Gardiner, and other councillors. When the Chancellor reaches a decision, the others immediately try to defeat it. 20

Simon Renard, extracts from letters to Charles V

Source D: Elizabeth I's reported words to William Cecil, when she appointed him as a Privy Councillor on the third day of her reign.

I give you this charge. You shall be a member of my Privy Council and content yourself with working hard for me and my realm. This judgement I have of you, that you will not be corrupted with any manner of gift, and that you will be faithful to the State. I judge that you will give the advice you think best, and not change your view to please my private wishes. I judge that, if you know anything that should be declared to me privately, you will tell only me. You can be certain that I shall keep your secret. 25

Instructions, 20 November 1558

Source E: Elizabeth's relations with her advisers are commented upon by an experienced secretary in the next reign. He was a young child in the 1560s.

Queen Elizabeth ruled using faction and parties, which she created, upheld and weakened according to her own great judgement. In a court dispute in the 1560s, a courtier asked Robert Dudley if he thought he was King. The Queen told Dudley: 'God's death, my lord, I have many servants whom I favour, and if you think to rule here I will restrain you. I will have here but one mistress and no master.' This so alarmed Lord Dudley, that he behaved more humbly long afterwards. She was the absolute and sovereign mistress of her councillors. 30

Sir Robert Naunton, Fragmenta Regalia, published in 1641

The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637–1660

Study the five Sources on The Second Civil War and the Trial of King Charles I, and then answer **both** sub-questions.

It is recommended that you spend two-thirds of your time in answering part **(b)**.

3 (a) Study Sources A and C.

Compare these Sources as evidence for issues involved in the King's negotiations during 1647–8. **[30]**

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the King was brought to trial because after 1647 he could no longer be trusted. **[70]**

[Total: 100 marks]

The Second Civil War and the Trial of King Charles I

Source A: King Charles I's treaty with the Scots, signed when he was on the Isle of Wight after his escape from army custody.

The King will confirm a Presbyterian system for three years. Separatists and Independents will be suppressed. An army shall be sent from Scotland to England to preserve and establish religion, to defend the King's person and authority. They will restore him to his government, royal rights and full revenues. They will defend the privileges of Parliament and the liberties of the subject, and make a firm union between the two kingdoms. The King authorises the Scots army to temporarily control Berwick and other towns and castles. He will pay them arrears of £200 000 and all the expenses of their army in this future war. 5

The Engagement, signed at Carisbrooke, 26 December 1647

Source B: An elected representative of the soldiers, who attended a meeting in April 1648, later records the views of the Army officers. The meeting had been called to decide what action to take in response to opposition towards the Army.

We agreed that we had to go out and fight against those potent enemies, which that year appeared against us everywhere, with humble confidence in the name of the Lord only, that we should destroy them. We reached a very clear and joint resolution, after much soul searching and debate, that it was our duty, if ever the Lord brought us peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to account for that blood he had shed, and mischief he had done to his utmost against the Lord's cause and people in these poor nations. 10

William Allen, memoir, 1659

Source C: The wife of an officer in the Parliamentary army describes the re-opening of negotiations with the King in September 1648.

Commissioners from both Houses of Parliament took a treaty to the King on the Isle of Wight. The terms they agreed for his restoration betrayed their whole cause. He would not give up the bishops, but only lease out their revenues. He insisted that his one concession, acknowledging himself guilty of the blood spilt in the late war, should not be used against him. He promised all the commissioners great honours and offices if Parliament confirmed the treaty. Both Houses disputed for most of the night. Colonel Hutchinson argued that restoring the king's power, after his defeat and capture, would be inconsistent with the liberty of the people. 15 20

Lucy Hutchinson, memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, written c. 1664–71

Source D: The following charges were made against King Charles I by the High Court of Justice set up by the 'Rump'. This body consisted of fewer than 80 members of the House of Commons who remained after Pride's Purge on 6 December 1648.

Charles Stuart, as King of England, was trusted with a limited power to govern according to the laws of the land, for the good of the people and the preservation of their liberties. Nevertheless, he traitorously and maliciously levied war against Parliament to erect an unlimited and tyrannical power, and to overthrow the people's liberties. Charles Stuart is the author and continuer of the unnatural, cruel and bloody wars; and so guilty of all the treasons, murders, burnings and damages to this nation caused by these wars. 25

Charges against Charles I, January 1649

Source E: In his final speech before his execution, Charles I declares his innocence and defends his actions.

Truly I desire the people's liberty as much as anybody. But their liberty consists in government with laws protecting their life and goods. They have no right to share in government. A subject and a sovereign are totally different things. If I would have ruled in an arbitrary way, to have all laws changed according to the power of the sword, I need not be on trial. Therefore, I pray to God not to judge you, for I am the martyr of the people. I go from a corruptible, to an incorruptible Crown; where no disturbance can be, no disturbance in the world. 30

Charles I, speech before the scaffold, 30 January 1649

**Copyright Information**

OCR is committed to seeking permission to reproduce all third-party content that it uses in its assessment materials. OCR has attempted to identify and contact all copyright holders whose work is used in this paper. To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced in the OCR Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations, is given to all schools that receive assessment material and is freely available to download from our public website (www.ocr.org.uk) after the live examination series.

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third-party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

For queries or further information please contact the Copyright Team, First Floor, 9 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 1GE.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group; Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.