

<p>OCR – AS GCE British History Period Studies F 961</p>	<p>Unit 1 Henry VIII to Mary I, 1509–58</p>	<p>ESSAY</p>
--	---	--------------

<p>Examiner’s Specific Advice</p> <p>In this question, a full, balanced assessment of the roles of both Henry and Wolsey is essential, and a considered judgement should form the conclusion. The best answers will offer comparative assessments of different factors and assess the <i>relative</i> importance of the two men before reaching a conclusion. Less effective essays are likely to supply more general comments without relevant supporting details. They will probably consider one or two issues rather than several, may stray outside the period specified in the question, and will fail to use their historical knowledge effectively.</p>	
<p>Exemplar Question</p> <p>Assess the relative importance of Henry VIII and Wolsey in directing foreign affairs from 1515 to 1529. [50 marks]</p>	<p>Click Here for a Chronology Relating to this Topic</p>
<p>Examiner’s Exemplar Plan and Essay 1</p> <p>Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tournai and Therouanne 1513 • Treaty of London 1518 • Campaign in France 1523 • Landriano 1529 • Wolsey’s role • Conclusion <p>Wolsey was noticed by Henry as a skilful administrator doing the seemingly impossible during Henry’s campaign of 1513–14 against France. Wolsey organised troops and supplies extremely well, and was key in the capture of Therouanne and Tournai, <u>even though they were useless</u> (1). From 1514 onwards, Wolsey became deeply involved in England’s foreign affairs. Henry VIII was undoubtedly more important in directing foreign affairs from 1515 to 1529 as he gave Wolsey his orders. Yet Wolsey’s implementation of Henry’s policies meant that he was also of great importance (2).</p>	<p>(1) If these towns were ‘useless’, explain why they were captured.</p> <p>(2) You clearly outline your argument in this opening paragraph, which is a sensible approach.</p> <p>(3) What success? The conference in London ended prematurely with the death of Maximilian in 1519, no crusade against the Turks ever took</p>

In 1516 the Holy Roman Empire, Spain and France signed the Treaty of Noyon, without including England. Wolsey turned a potentially difficult situation into an advantage for Henry and England. Wolsey set about drawing up the Treaty of London, and it was signed in 1518. Over twenty European rulers, including the Holy Roman Emperor and the Kings of Spain, France and England signed the treaty. The Treaty of London said that countries who had signed it must not go to war with each other but instead unite against the threat of the Turks from the Ottoman Empire. The treaty was the highlight of England's foreign affairs from 1515 to 1529, and it had been organised by Wolsey. This shows that on the occasions when Wolsey did take a more directive role, he brought with him success (3).

The Treaty of London was one of the rare events when it could perhaps be argued that Wolsey took a leading role. Usually, Henry told Wolsey what to do regarding foreign affairs. Henry's directions, however, did not bring with them nearly as much success. For example, in 1523 Francis I of France was distracted with trying to secure French land in Milan and Henry decided to go after the prestige he longed for and invaded France. Henry and Wolsey sent troops to Calais and gave them orders to march to Paris to meet the French army. Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, had agreed to help the English troops. However, the French army did not show up, nor did the help from Charles. The English army got nervous and retired. The sequence of events had proved to be nothing more than a costly waste of time as a result of Henry's naïve directions (4).

Another example of Henry's poor direction of foreign affairs can be seen in the events that took place after Charles V took Rome in 1527. Charles's actions had shocked the rest of Christian Europe, and England and France decided to come together against the Holy Roman Emperor. Historians such as Randell have suggested that Wolsey's political career rested on success or victory in this war. In 1529 the English and French suffered defeat at the battle of Landriano (5). As a result of this defeat, Wolsey lost his position as chancellor (6). It could be argued that if Henry had not decided to go to war with Charles V, Wolsey might have survived longer as chancellor.

Henry was more important in directing foreign affairs in that it was he who decided what action should be taken. Henry showed a great deal of naivety in this role, as he was constantly distracted by his hunger for personal prestige (7). Wolsey's role in foreign policy was to implement Henry's decisions to the best of his ability. On the rare occasions when Wolsey did take charge of foreign affairs, for example, the organisation of the Treaty of London, England seemed to benefit, as did Henry's personal reputation. It may be argued that Henry would have been much wiser if he had given

place and in 1521 war between France and Spain recurred.

(4) There is too much narrative in this paragraph. You could have explained that while Wolsey tried to raise money to fund the war, he was also trying to persuade Henry not to join in.

(5) Error here – no English troops were present at Landriano.

(6) In fact Henry dismissed Wolsey because he failed to procure a divorce because the Pope continued to be threatened by Imperial troops. Victory at Landriano might have saved Wolsey.

(7) A good point, which should have been illustrated with more examples, e.g. Henry's candidature for the Imperial throne or the Field of Cloth of Gold spectacle.

(8) This is undoubtedly true but it discounts Henry's natural inclination for war.

(9) This needs further explanation.

Wolsey the role of directing foreign affairs. Wolsey showed much greater insight and perception, and Wolsey's natural inclination towards peace would have also benefited domestic policy (8). If Henry had not decided to go to war against the French in 1523, then the fiasco of the Amicable Grant in 1525 would probably not have happened (9).

In conclusion, Henry VIII was more 'important' in directing foreign affairs, as it was Henry who decided what the best course of action would be. This 'best course of action' would invariably be an attempt to gain personal prestige. Wolsey's role as the implementer of Henry's policies was also of importance, as matters would no doubt have been a great deal worse for England had Wolsey not used his good perception and skilful methods of diplomacy (10).

Examiner's Assessment

The essay uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence that demonstrates some command of the topic. The answer is structured and generally clear. This element of the essay merits a Level III mark of 15 (AO1a).

There is a limited and patchy understanding of a few issues in their historical context, and analysis of the importance of developments is weak. Nothing was said about Henry's candidature to the Imperial throne or that of Wolsey's to the Papacy, and, in overlooking the Divorce, an excellent opportunity was missed to discuss the relationship between Henry and Wolsey in directing foreign affairs between 1527 and 1529. This part of the essay merits a Level IV mark of 15 (AO1b).

The overall total mark is 30 (low Grade C).

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Essay 2

Plan

- Introduction
- Wolsey's role: similar aims, different methods
- Prestige through war and peace
- Treaty of London but Wolsey was not a peacemaker
- Field of the Cloth of Gold and Treaty of Bruges
- Wolsey and the Papacy
- Conclusion

In Henry VIII's reign foreign policy differed greatly from the previous stagnant reign of Henry VII. Although Wolsey was constantly involved in foreign affairs and many contemporaries believed he was in control of affairs in England, Henry VIII was

(10) Your conclusion largely repeats the previous paragraph, which in turn summarised the main points of the essay.

(11) A good start. It is relevant, clear and to the point.

ultimately King and his decision was final (11).

Wolsey played a major role in England's foreign policy from 1513-29. His co-ordination of administration for the French campaign and the Battle of Spurs in 1513 brought him to Henry's attention and it was from here that Henry realised the extent of Wolsey's capabilities. Henry made Wolsey a key person in managing foreign affairs, as Wolsey was more than capable of the task. Henry and Wolsey had similar aims in foreign policy although they probably wanted to achieve these aims through different methods.

Henry wanted war. He wanted to put England back on the international stage. Henry believed in chivalry and in order to make England a dominant force in Europe he needed to display chivalric virtues. The best way to achieve this was through war. Wolsey too wanted to make England a recognisable force in Europe; however, he may have preferred a policy more inclined to peace (12). Both Henry and Wolsey wanted prestige for England and so far little had been achieved by military campaigns against France.

One suggested aim of Wolsey's foreign policy was that he wanted to be a peacemaker in Europe. In 1518 Wolsey organised the Treaty of London, a peace spectacle that gained great prestige for England. Various treaties were also made with the most dominant powers in Europe: France and Spain. However, the idea of Wolsey wanting to be a peacemaker is unlikely. The Treaty of London collapsed after a year due to the election of Charles as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519 (13). If Wolsey wanted peace, why did he spend most of his time as war minister? The dismissal of the idea of peacemaker could also be evidence that Henry VIII was in control of directing foreign affairs. The constant military campaigns showed Henry's desires in foreign policy and Henry's desires were met, making him the more important in directing foreign affairs. Another suggestion for Wolsey's aims in foreign policy is that he wanted to balance power in Europe. However, this idea can also be dismissed as England sided with Spain against France when Spain was obviously the stronger power in Europe (14).

Wolsey and Henry worked as a partnership in foreign affairs. Although Henry was influenced by people around him, he was King. They acted decisively and ultimately outside events decided their next action. In 1519 the election of Holy Roman Emperor strengthened England's bargaining position. It had created a situation where both rivals, Spain and France, wanted England as an ally. Henry and Wolsey hoped to use the enmity between Francis I and Charles V in order to secure the best diplomatic deal for England. The purpose of the spectacle of the Field of the Cloth of Gold (1520) and the Calais conference was to put more pressure on Charles V in order to obtain a treaty that would benefit England more. In

(12) This highlights the fact that their aims and/or methods were quite different.

(13) You have not made it clear how Charles's election led to the collapse of the Treaty of London.

(14) Your assessment of the balance of power interpretation is too dismissive. Moreover, in 1527–28 England did side with France, the weaker power, against Charles V of Spain.

1521, England signed a treaty with Charles V – the Treaty of Bruges. No doubt, had all of these events been disagreeable to Henry, they would not have gone ahead.

It has been said that Wolsey's aim in foreign policy was to become Pope. Wolsey was already papal legate in England and a vital link between England and the Papacy. However, the idea of the Treaty of London had been hijacked from the Pope and so Wolsey cannot have been trying to appease the Pope (15). If Wolsey was more important than Henry in directing foreign affairs, and his aim was to become Pope, then the situation in 1529 should not have taken place. The Pope was completely under the control of Charles V. In 1527, Charles's troops had sacked Rome and, together with England and France, a league had been formed against Charles. Again, Henry's desire for war was fed. England and France declared war on Charles in 1527. This war proved to be costly and very unpopular. In 1529, though, England was left isolated: the Pope had made peace with Charles at the Treaty of Barcelona and France had also made peace at the Treaty of Cambrai. If Wolsey had wanted to be Pope, then he would have seen that Pope Clement was protected (16). Therefore this suggestion is unlikely.

England's foreign policy between 1515 and 1529 seems to have quenched Henry's thirst for war, glory and honour. Wolsey's aim in foreign policy was most likely to be servant to Henry, his King. Wolsey had been chosen by Henry to play a key part in directing foreign affairs. However, Henry was King and his decision was final. England's foreign policy appeased Henry's desires and therefore it can be concluded that he was more important in directing foreign affairs. Henry would take advice from those as intelligent and diplomatic as Wolsey but ultimately Henry made the decisions. Henry was the arbiter of foreign policy. Wolsey worked to meet Henry's vainglorious needs (17).

Examiner's Assessment

This is a well constructed, focused and, for the most part, clearly argued case. The language and style are easy to read and suggest that you are in full control of your material. The use of factual knowledge is also very sound: names, dates and events are accurately cited and, most importantly, used relevantly to illustrate the answer. It merits a Level IB mark of 20 (AO1a).

The essay is mostly analytical and substantiated, and judgements about the relative importance of factors are made, but the answer would have been stronger if the Divorce had been discussed. In this respect, Henry and Wolsey appear to be directing contradictory foreign policies. This AO1b skill merits a Level IB mark of 22.

The overall total for the essay is 42 marks, and worthy of a

(15) Is 'appease' the right word? In implementing a policy that was advocated by the Pope, Wolsey was endearing himself to the Papacy.

(16) In 1521 and 1523 Wolsey was a papal candidate – and this should not be ignored. To suggest that Wolsey should have been able to protect the Pope is to give Wolsey undue political influence outside England.

(17) A sound conclusion, which reaffirms the relationship between Wolsey and the King.

Grade A.	
----------	--

Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above

Click here for further sample Questions to test your skills

Mark Scheme

Examiners use Mark Schemes to determine how best to categorise a candidate's essay and to ensure that the performances of thousands of candidates are marked to a high degree of consistency. Few essays fall neatly into the mark levels indicated below: some answers will be particularly well argued but offer little supporting detail; others may be factually full but poorly organised or contain few judgements. Examiners therefore seek to find the 'best fit' when applying the scheme. Each essay has a final mark based on two Assessment Objectives (AO1a and AO1b) worth 24 + 26 = 50 marks. As the standard of the two essays lies between Level I and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels have been tabulated below.

	AO1a Mark Scheme for Levels I, II, III and IV
Assessment Objectives	Recall, select and use historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding clearly and effectively
Level IA 21–24 marks	Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence. Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology. Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly.
Level IB 18–20 marks	Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence. Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology. Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly.
Level II 16–17 marks	Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence, which demonstrates a competent command of the topic. Generally accurate use of historical terminology. Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear.
Level III 14–15 marks	Uses accurate and relevant evidence, which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy. Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used. Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated.
Level IV 12–13 marks	There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.

AO1b Mark Scheme for Levels I, II, III and IV	
Assessment Objectives	Demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation and analysis, arriving at substantiated judgements of key concepts and of the relationships between key features of the period studied
Level IA 24–26 marks	<p>Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic.</p> <p>Clear and accurate understanding of issues in their historical context. Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected.</p> <p>The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links.</p>
Level IB 22–23 marks	<p>Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic.</p> <p>Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations.</p> <p>Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context.</p> <p>Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high.</p>
Level II 19–21 marks	<p>Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic.</p> <p>Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context.</p> <p>Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description.</p> <p>The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages.</p>
Level III 16–18 marks	<p>Some uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context.</p> <p>Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin.</p> <p>Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues.</p> <p>Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions.</p>
Level IV 13–15 marks	<p>Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory.</p> <p>Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context.</p> <p>Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis.</p> <p>Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions.</p>

Further sample questions

- (1) Assess the claim that Wolsey's domestic administration was very successful until Henry VIII's wish for a divorce.
- (2) How far do you agree that foreign policy from 1515 to 1529 failed to make England stronger as an international power?
- (3) Assess Wolsey's achievements in **three** major aspects of domestic policy.
- (4) How far do you agree that handling the royal finances was Wolsey's **most** important success in domestic affairs from 1515 to 1529?
- (5) Why did Wolsey fall from power in 1529?
- (6) How do you explain the unpopularity of Wolsey between 1515 and 1529?
- (7) How successful was English foreign policy from 1515 to 1529? Explain your answer.
- (8) 'Wolsey's successes in domestic administration were much more important than his failures.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1515 to 1529?

Chronology: Key Events in *Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-29*

- 1511 England joins the Holy League against France.
- 1512 Disastrous campaign in France.
- 1513 Henry and Wolsey travel to France. English troops win the Battle of the Spurs and capture Tournai and Therouanne.
- 1514 England makes peace with France (1).
- 1515 Wolsey is appointed Lord Chancellor by the King, and Cardinal by the Pope.
- 1516 Treaty of Noyon ends war in Italy.
- 1518 Treaty of London is signed (2).
- 1519 Maximilian dies. Henry is a candidate for the Imperial throne (3).
- 1520 Henry entertains Francis I at the Field of the Cloth of Gold near Calais.
- 1521 Henry signs the Treaty of Bruges with Charles. Wolsey stands as a candidate for the Papacy (4).
- 1522 Henry declares war on France. Francis I invades Milan but loses at the battle of Bicocca.
- 1523 Wolsey again stands as a Papal candidate (5). English troops wage an unsuccessful campaign in France.
- 1525 Amicable Grant provokes disturbances in East Anglia (6).
- 1526 England joins the League of Cognac against Charles.
- 1527 Divorce proceedings begin. Imperial troops sack Rome and take the Pope prisoner.

Access to History – Online OCR British History Period Studies – Henry VIII to Mary I, 1509–1558 – Standard AS Question

- 1528 Wolsey signs the Treaty of Westminster with France. Henry agrees a truce with Charles (7).
- 1529 Imperial troops defeat France at Landriano. Wolsey falls from power (8).

(1) Wolsey negotiated a peace with Louis XII. Henry's daughter, Mary, was to marry the French King and Henry was to receive an annual pension. England retained Tournai (formerly part of the Holy Roman Empire) and Therouanne (formerly French).

(2) The London conference fulfilled two main purposes: Wolsey received his papal legateship and Henry and the other delegates pledged themselves to organise a crusade against the Ottoman Turks.

(3) Although Henry was a serious candidate, he stood no realistic chance of success. He was in competition with Francis I of France and Charles I of Spain and their financial resources were far greater than his.

(4) Wolsey received no votes in spite of having received Charles' assurance that he would use his influence on his behalf.

(5) Charles again pledged to support Wolsey's candidature and he again received no votes.

(6) The Amicable Grant was a non-parliamentary tax imposed on the laity and clergy to meet the costs of the French campaign. The King was informed of disturbances in Norfolk and Suffolk by the dukes of these counties – both were ill-disposed towards Wolsey.

(7) English merchants were outraged at the interruption of trade with Charles' continental territories and persuaded the King that a truce must be agreed.

(8) Within a week of learning of France's defeat at Landriano, Wolsey resigned as Lord Chancellor.

Teaching Activities

Introduction

Historians have long argued over the subject of whether Henry or Wolsey ‘directed’ foreign policy between 1515 and 1529. The absence of any state records that would definitively affirm who decided policies and who implemented them makes speculation an endless (and, some might argue, a pointless) exercise. Nevertheless, the relationship between king and servant is worthy of examination if we are to unravel the complexities of Henry’s foreign affairs.

Task

Divide your class into five groups. Each group examines one of the following subjects for the period 1515–29: Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, the Turks, France, or the Papacy. In each case, students should outline and explain:

- (a) Henry’s aims and strategies
- (b) Wolsey’s aims and strategies.

Remember that their aims and strategies may have changed as events unfolded.

1515-29	Henry’s aims and strategies	Wolsey’s aims and strategies
SPAIN		
THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE		
THE TURKS		
FRANCE		
THE PAPACY		

Resources

- G. Elton, *Reform and Reformation* (Arnold, 1977)
- M. Graves, *Henry VIII* (Longman, 2003)
- S. Gunn, *Early Tudor Government, 1485–1558* (Macmillan, 1995)

Access to History – Online OCR British History Period Studies – Henry VIII to Mary I, 1509–1558 – Standard AS Question

- S. Gunn and P. Lindley (eds), *Cardinal Wolsey: Church, State and Art* (CUP, 1991)
J. Guy, *Tudor England* (OUP, 1988)
P. Gwyn, *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (Barrie and Jenkins, 1990)
D. Loades, *Henry VIII: Church, Court and Conflict* (The National Archives, 2007)
T. Morris, *Tudor Government* (Routledge, 1999)
K. Randell, *Henry VIII and the Government of England* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1991)
J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (Methuen, 1968)
D. Starkey, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (Vintage, 2002)

Weblinks

www.englishhistory.net/tudor/monarchs/henry8.html
www.historytoday.com