

## Candidate 2 evidence

QUESTION	
9)	<p>King John Balliol reined from 1292 until 1296 in Scotland. He has been remembered as a weak and ineffective king who done little to stand up to his overlord Edward I of England. It can be argued that John failed as he lacked the strength of character to stand up to Edward. This can be seen in his relationship with Edward, the way he governed Scotland, his relationship with the Bruce family and the Treaty Scotland made with France during his reign. These factors show it may be valid to blame John's failure on lacking the strength of character needed</p>

to stand up to Edward I.

King John had come to the throne as a result of being chosen as the rightful King of Scotland by Edward I. During the contest to be King John along with other claimants had recognised Edward as their overlord. A traditional narrative suggests John was chosen as King specifically because he lacked the strength of character to stand up to Edward who looked to exploit his weakness and use him as a vassal. However Fiona Watson stresses this idea

Must be reviewed as John was chosen on the basis of primogeniture, the right of the first born and any weakness in his character during his kingship was a result of this. Therefore it is invalid to view John's reign as a failure because of his strength of character because this played no part in bringing him to the throne and ~~the~~ as Watson has argued anyone of the claimants would have struggled to stand up to the powerful, legally minded and militarily strong Edward as overlord. When

John was crowned king he swore homage to Edward I ~~the~~ securing his place as overlord. It could be said that this was the moment John resigned his kingship to failure by not standing up to Edward and failing to resist paying homage. Having Edward as overlord had serious implications for John particularly when Edward began hearing Scottish legal cases in his own court. One such case ~~which~~ was that of Macduff who claimed he had not been given lands he was owed in

life. When asked to answer the case at the English court John initially resisted. This would suggest John did not lack strength to the point that he never stood up to Edward, and that he did try to resist intervention by Edward expelling the idea of him as a puppet king. However when Edward drafted rules to state John had to attend court and stopped him refusing to answer questions by threatening him with contempt of court. John's attempts to resist became futile. As GWS Barrow suggests John

was in an impossible position where no matter how hard he tried he could not stand up to Edward. This means it can be seen as more valid to suggest that Edward I was too strong a character for anyone to resist and so John cannot be overly criticised for failing to do so in his reign. Although it may still be argued John could have done more to try and stand up to those who created problems for him.

John did try to govern Scotland suggesting he was not entirely weak and did try to reign as a good king in spite of Edward suggesting he had some strength of character. According to Nicholson Clums Bruce seemed to be a king no less than any other. John tried to govern his kingdom by clearing a back log of legal cases and inviting French merchants to trade and boost Scotland's economy. This shows John did not just act when Edward told him to and he did try to take charge of his kingdom. Continuing on from the work of

his predecessor Alexander III John looked to bring the West under greater control through the creation of Sheriffdoms. This actions suggests John understood the work expected of him. As King and had some understanding of the way he could use government to extend his authority. Therefore John's reign was not a total failure. However it may be argued that his lack of strength of character undermined his promising work as it would all be undone when Edward I took over Scotland.

perhaps in part because of a lack of resistance from John particularly military resistance. It must also be remembered that John relied heavily on the Comyn family to help him govern the Kingdom. They have looked to use John for their own gains and to grow their power. Michael Penman believes that if John was a puppet king it was for the Comyns. Therefore it ~~can~~ is valid to view John's reign in the way Rishanger did as a 'lamb amongst the wolves' meaning despite determination and effort John could never

Be an effective King as he lacked the strength of character to assert himself as the ultimate authority in his own kingdom and this only weakened his attempts to stand up to Edward I.

Steven Boardman suggests that the position of John was made harder by the resistance to him by the Bruce family. Therefore John cannot be overly criticised for not standing up to Edward as he was in a difficult and vulnerable position. The Bruce family had lost out.

on the throne when Balliol was chosen as king over Bruce the competitor. They were determined to make John's reign difficult by trying to avoid paying homage to him. It could be said that if John did not have the full support of his nobles, then he was not in a strong enough position to stand up to Edward. The actions of the Bruce and not John's character can therefore be blamed for his failed reign. To avoid paying homage the Earl of Carnarve looked to pass his earldom onto

his son, John agreed to this, appeasing their demands and allowing the Earl to avoid homage. It could be argued that if ~~John~~ John could not stand up to his own nobles then he certainly would have lacked the strength of character to stand up to Edward who was far more powerful. Balliol was undermined by the Bruce's supporting Edward and so since he lacked proper authority in his kingdom it could be said that little is to be expected of John's reign. However John

can be seen as giving into the Bruces in hope of winning them round suggesting he was a more tactile, able and strong king than is ~~pre~~ popularly believed.

In 1294 Edward I went to war with France over his right to lands there. This shows Edwards ambition which can be seen as being so strong no character would be able to stand up to it. Edward demanded that John and his nobles do military service for him in France. This was refused as the nobles believed it wrong

One king should do such service for another. There is some debate regarding who was really resisting Edward at this point making it difficult to judge the validity of the idea John failed in his reign because he could not stand up to Edward. It is sometimes suggested by this time that a council of twelve had replaced John as ruler or had been appointed to aid him. This would suggest that the Scottish nobility recognised John lacked the authority to stand up to Edward and

Something had to be done to protect Scottish kingship. An envoy was sent to France to agree a treaty with the French king. ~~at~~ Such a deal was reached and Scotland and France became allies against the English. This would suggest that John was able to and willing to take a stand against Edward. He may have lacked the strength of character to refuse to do homage directly but he was strong enough to take a stand diplomatically.  
Howard GWS Barrow

believes that this was the community of the realm not John taking a stand once again suggesting even the nobility saw John's character as a problem. Meanwhile Michael Perman believes John's links to France would have meant he was involved in the treaty. The treaty was not necessarily good though as it set Edward on course for Scotland meaning ill advice by the nobility combined with John's inability to directly stand up ~~for~~ to Edward can be blamed

for leading to his failed reign.

Overall it is difficult to argue that John done enough to stand up to Edward I. However it must be remembered he was in a difficult position and during the Macbeth case and treaty with France there was attempts to resist Edwards authority. Ultimately though John did lack the strength of character to stand up to Edward, although most would have, and it was this which meant his reign failed.

QUESTION	
12)	<p>The Scottish victory at Bannockburn in 1314 was a major turning point in the War of Independence however it did not end Edward I's desire to see Scotland overlord. <del>How</del> It can be suggested his stubbornness was the greatest obstacle to peace. The extent to which this is true can be <del>seen</del> <del>assessed</del> assessed by considering Edward's attitude, the Scottish succession problem, Bruce's excommunication and the weakness of Edward I. This suggests that whilst Edward was an important obstacle to</p>

for peace others must be considered.

Despite lacking the interest in Scotland his father had possessed, Edward II proved none the less determined to remain overlord of Scotland. Despite the defeat he had suffered at Bannockburn Edward refused to accept the war was over. His adamant attitude that he was and would remain Scotland's overlord prevented negotiations regarding peace as any peace deal with King Robert Bruce would involve giving up his claim. GWS Barrow believes that it

Is valid to suggest that Edward was a significant obstacle to peace given his poor attitude towards Scotland. Edward made his feelings regarding peace clear ~~when~~ in the way he reacted to Andrew Harclay making peace with Bruce. Harclay was the Earl of Carlisle, which had been a target for Scottish raids in the north of England. In ~~1297~~ 1327 he agreed to enter peace with Bruce agreeing to a deal in which Scotland would be recognised as a free and separate kingdom and Edward would agree within

a year. However the deal was made without Edwards approval and as a result he had Harclay executed. This made clear that he had no intentions of making peace. It can be seen as very telling that when peace was made in 1328 it was after Edward II had been deposed and therefore it can be seen as valid to view his attitude and stubbornness as the main obstacle to peace.

However there may also have been problems within Bruce's Scotland which made him

reluctant to seek a peace deal. Perhaps one of the greatest problems was that regarding succession. As of 1315 Bruce's only legitimate child was Marjorie. Having a female heir was seen as too great a risk and Bruce needed a male heir to secure his dynasty's future. In 1316 it was agreed that should Bruce fail to have a son his brother would be made heir and ~~that~~ then Marjorie and her descendants. Bruce's preoccupation with the succession problem in his own kingdom distracted him

from seeking peace and he may have seen the securing of his dynasty as more important. Ronald Nicholson suggests that Bruce's cause was Bruce meaning he may have put his own dynastic ambitions before the cause of independence and peace. The problem was deepened and peace made even more unlikely as by 1318 both Bruce's brother and daughter were dead meaning a new feudal lord had to be agreed. It was agreed that Marjorie's son Robert would be made heir. However as he

was a child Bruce may have looked to avoid peace in order to allow time for his heir to age to avoid a minority during a time of war. The ultimate weakness of Bruce's position as highlighted by the succession problem can be seen as the most important obstacle to peace from a Scottish point of view meaning it is invalid to solely blame the continuation of the war on Edward II.

Bruce's position was weakened further because he had come to the throne by force rather than right. The <sup>papacy</sup> church had excommunicated him for the 1306 murder of John Comyn in a church. Fiona Watson believes Bruce never fully overcame his usurper status and this may have prevented peace as Edward was unwilling to negotiate with someone who was excommunicated. The excommunication also provided the Scots with another distraction which prevented them focusing on decisive military

action of ~~the~~ entering  
peace talks. In 1320  
a letter was wrote to  
Pope John XXII known  
as the Declaration  
of Arbroath which  
claimed Bruce was the  
rightful king as he had  
saved Scotland from English  
oppression. Although it was  
said the Declaration  
made the <sup>case</sup> ~~cause~~ for independence  
it is widely regarded  
as propaganda which  
tried to legitimise Bruce's  
position. This can be  
seen as further  
evidence that the  
Scottish leadership

was distracted by its own problems and so unable to focus solely on achieving peace. Excommunication also meant the pope could not pressure Edward II to enter negotiations in spite of his stubbornness. GWS Barrow believes that peace would have come much sooner had Bruce had the pope's support and so once again it can be valid to say internal weakness rather than Edward II's stubbornness was the main obstacle to

QUESTION	peace,
	It was not only Bruce
	who was hindered by
	internal weaknesses
	In the years after
	1314. Edward II may
	have been unmovable
	in his position on
	overlordship but many
	of his nobles had begun
	to lose interest in the
	Scottish war. Bannockburn
	had been a humiliating
	defeat which left many
	unhappy with Edward's
	leadership and unwilling
	to continue to
	support the war. Steve
	Boardman believes that

had they wanted to an English force could have easily undone the effects of Bannockburn. However failure to do so would suggest that Edward found his military growing weaker as nobles became less willing to aid him. Therefore the English were unable to force a decisive victory in battle but Edward's stubbornness meant he would not discuss peace meaning an end to the war and sustained peace was made impossible. The war had also taken its toll on the English

economy meaning Edward could not continue to pour money into his war. Therefore it can be seen as valid to say a combination of stubbornness and weakness made Edward II the main obstacle to peace.

In conclusion it is hard to deny that Edward II's attitude played a role in preventing a conclusion to the war. However the weakness of Bruce's position was also important as it distracted the Scots and made them cautious of entering peace. The same can be said for the weakness of Edward's position

and therefore it is valid to conclude the inherent weakness of the two kingdoms rather than Edward's stubbornness was the obstacle which prevented peace.

14) Source A is by GWS Barrow a modern historian meaning it can partly describe Edward I's increasing influence in Scotland as a result of much research and consideration of various sources. The source states that of the Treaty of Birgham's terms 'they might have formed the basis of a closer union of the two kingdoms.' The Treaty of 1290 agreed the heir to the Scottish throne, the Maid of Norway, would marry Edward's son. The Treaty agreed that Scotland would be a free and separate kingdom.

despite the marriage and the Scottish church would also remain separate. However the treaty can be seen as the beginning of Edward's intervention into Scottish affairs and opening the door to further intervention. Claiming to be acting in his daughter-in-law's interests. The source then goes on to say that 'only six months after her death he was fully committed to imposing his authority upon the Scots through more forceful means. The death of the queen in 1290 in Edward's eyes meant an end to the treaty of Brechin as it was based on a marriage which would never occur. This made Scottish independence far less certain as seen by Edward

Searching for proof of his claim to overlordship of Scotland. It also created an opportunity for Edward to exploit the fears of the Scottish nobility who were concerned they would not be able to find a new king for themselves now that the kingdom was without a ruler. Finally the source states that 'with the Spring of 1291 the crisis in Scotland had arrived' ~~the~~ ~~back~~ ~~was~~. The Guardians of Scotland feared that they would not be able to find the rightful king of Scotland themselves given personal loyalties for different claimants. Bishop Fraser wrote to Edward asking him to judge the claimants. It may be seen as

significant that Edward accepted the invitation and only became involved when he was asked to do rather than exerting power over Scotland by military means when the maid died. However the source does not mention that Edward only accepted as long as it was agreed that he would be recognised as overlord. Robin Frame believes it naive to say that the chance to extend his power did help motivate Edward to take part in the judgement and exert his influence. When he met the Scots at Norham and asked to be recognised as overlord he had with

him a large army and a blockade of ports organised showing he looked to increase influence by intimidation although this is not mentioned in the source. Edward also refused to recognise the gawrdians ~~est~~ resistance to overlordship by asking the claimants to the throne to recognise him meaning he exploited the desire of some to be king. The source also fails to discuss how Edward dragged the process on for two years becoming more and more comfortable in a position of influence. He considered all the claimants even though 6-7 were illegitimate with little chance of really taking the throne. He also deliberated over which law to use by consulting with Paris

Lawyers who suggested if no law already existed then natural law should be used despite Scotland have a fairly established law of primogeniture Grant Simpson. Believes Edward slowly grew his influence through involvement in the great cause and became more determined to retain it. The source also fails to mention that prior to the Mar's death Edward had taken the Isle of Man which had been under Scottish control since 1263 showing he could assert influence by force. He also installed Bishop Beke as his lieutenant foreshadowing the later administration he used to ~~reassert~~ ~~strengthen~~ control and influence Scotland. Overall the source partly describes how Edward grew his influence but makes some significant omissions.

15) Source B is an extract from the Chronicle of Walter of Gainsborough who was a monk at Gainsborough Priory. It can be seen as useful as it may draw on sources such as eyewitness accounts now lost to history. It was written in 1305 the year William Wallace was captured and executed meaning it gives a contemporary view on how people of the time viewed Wallace and how they considered his leadership. The source states that 'The Scots invaded and ravaged Northumberland from 18th October 1297 to 11th November.' This came shortly after the Scottish victory at the Battle of Stirling Bridge suggesting Wallace was a confident leader who felt comfortable and confident enough to lead his men into the enemy's lands. It also suggests Wallace was inspiring in ~~being~~ encouraging men to join him. This shows that Wallace

was a highly thought of leader. The source then goes on to say that 'They threatened the canons demanding the priory's treasures but Wallace rescued them.' This would suggest Wallace was a Chivalric leader. The source is useful as it offers a view which contrast with that of English chronicles which suggest him to be 'a savage outlaw'. The source finally states that 'while his men plundered around and granted to the some canons letters of protection' This would suggest Wallace was both cautious and diplomatic in his leadership. It may be suggested his hatred was not of Englishmen themselves but the way the English king had reduced Scotland to nothing but a land and installed an administration to replace Scottish leadership. However the source does not mention that Wallace had previously been aided by the leadership of Andrew Murray who before the battle of Stirling Bridge had successfully taken most castles north of Tayside.

from the English. Murray died shortly after Stirling Bridge and so greater emphasis has been placed on the way Wallace was effective. However Wallace failed to achieve a victory at ~~Stirling Bridge~~ Falkirk and this can be seen as proof that Murray was important to the effective leadership had Stirling. The source also does not mention that Wallace used guerrilla tactics to attack seats of English authority. Fiona Watson believes that he helped prove to the nobles that effective such tactics could work further proving he was an effective and inspiring leader. It is

Sometimes said Wallace's actions inspired Robert Bruce and foreshadowed him as a way of effectively leading a small force. Overall the source is partly useful but focuses on one specific example of Wallace's leadership rather than his leadership as a whole.

\* Michael Penman has questioned Wallace's decision to give battle at Falkirk.

16) Source C is by Michael Penman who is a revisionist historian meaning he offers a more critical view of how Robert I governed Scotland. The source states Bruce issued a number of laws for the order and defence

of the kingdom. Many of the laws looked to protect people from the effects of war and secure stability. Bruce made clear to his nobles they were to use the courts not physical force to solve disputes in an attempt to retain stability and prevent further conflict. The source then goes on to mention 'the production of a second parliamentary act of succession which recognised two year old Robert as heir.' The tailzie was made necessary as Bruce was yet to have a male heir. ~~as~~ A tailzie of BLS had made his brother heir but he had been killed in Fughart in Ireland. The BLS agreement made Bruce's daughter next in line but she too

had died, after giving birth to Robert Stewart. This suggests that Bruce tried to govern the kingdom by securing his dynasty. Finally the source states "Robert also felt it necessary to issue reactionary laws against the spreading of sedition and rumour against the King" Bruce may have felt this necessary because his rivals, the Comyn family were still active within Scotland and the English court. Bruce had to try and legitimise his position ~~to~~ <sup>on</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> throne even that he had taken it after murdering Comyn

showing Bruce used the Government to secure his position. However the source does not mention the discovery of a plot in 1320 to remove Bruce and replace him with Edward Balliol. Bruce held his 'black parliament' where he tried the conspirators. He had David Brechin executed showing he governed through fear and harsh punishments. He also imprisoned Umfraville, Soules and the Countess of Buchan Strathern. This can be seen as surprisingly lenient but Bruce needed to play down the perceived threat to his government. The source also fails

to mention that Bruce revived important offices of government. This included the King's Chapel from which his Chancellor was able to issue documents and make demands through correspondence.

QWS Barrow thinks Bruce should be praised for reinstating such roles. Bruce also gave a significant role to local governments including burghs. These had to pay a fixed annual sum to the king and it was the decision of local governments as to how this was raised. Bruce also kept the justice system highly localised with sheriffs to deal with lesser crimes and justiciars, appointed in the style of Alexander III, for more serious matters although the source does not mention Bruce's use of de-centralised government.

Source D states that 'there was a number of crucial declarations of support by the community of realm.' This suggests Bruce's government was inclusive and widely supported. One such declaration was the declaration of Arbroath in 1320 sent to Pope John XXII which claimed the community fully supported Bruce for he had saved Scotland's independence. This would suggest unity amongst the government. However the source fails to mention that many would have given their seals over not knowing what they would be used

for, there also ~~is~~ exists suggestions that they were given over under force ~~of~~ suggesting Bruce governed by means of force. The source then ~~the~~ states 'There were successful forfeiture and an act of disinherence' This refers to the statute of Cumbristan in 1314 which Bruce made clear those with English and Scottish lands were to join him and give up their English lands or be disinherited of those in Scotland. This allowed him to know his supporters. However source does not mention that this was not an entirely effective act of government as

It forced a number of disinherited nobles to the English Court where they opposed Bruce and supported Edward II. Many of Bruce's actions to govern the kingdom shows he was concerned about the threat from the disinherited. Michael Denman believes that levels of support for Bruce have been exaggerated throughout his reign meaning he governed by means of caution. Finally the sources state there was 'the granting of a perpetual tax in the final years of the reign.' In 1326 the community of the realm agreed to a tax for the life time of Bruce to help the economy through the war.

He consulted lesser landowners on the matter in accordance to traditions. It also showed Bruce was a supported and respected king. However the source does not mention that Bruce governed with careful consultation of the community as he needed them to legitimise his position. Whilst the community needed the king's leadership and protection.

Council Source D is critical and sceptical of some of the means by which Bruce governed as they suggest he was cautious

and concerned with his position. Whilst source D sees Bruce's government as inclusive of factions, and ~~effective~~ Bruce as governing by means of consultation and effective legislation, meaning the two source give two slightly differing interpretations of the means by which King Robert governed Scotland.