

Candidate 1 evidence

9	<p>John Balliol is a Scottish king of no parallel. He is the only king to have been put on the throne by a foreign monarch, and who was stripped that title from him 4 years later. His reign followed a classic of succession and due to this he is perceived to be the tragic figure of Scottish history. This essay shall argue that the view that "King John lacked the sufficient character to stand up to King Edward" is very probably ^{mostly invalid}. It shall do so analysing the key arguments for and against Balliol as well as taking the abundance of Pro-Bruce propaganda that brights King John's name.</p> <p>In her earliest work Fiona Wilson argued that John Balliol should be called "King John" and that his in situation as a king under an overlord would have been impossible for anyone even Bruce the competitor. It is often overlooked when it comes to the great cause that Balliol was the last to submit. Bruce's critics say that he was a defective king due to homage is largely wrong in that he was the first to give the oath and Balliol the last - days after the official final deadline to do so. Balliol was resistant to overlordship but if he wanted to be king he was forced</p>
---	---

to submit by the list greedy claimants of Bruce and Hastings - if anything it is them who lack character and moral backbone.

The MacDuff case is often cited as Balliol's greatest humiliation as asking with the legal appeals undermining the very concept of sovereignty yet when the first request came in to appear before Edward's court it was refused, whilst he did attend at the second request Balliol refused to answer the king's questions - instead retorting that he would have "to consult his lords". Prestwich mentions that this ~~act~~ infuriated the English king, it was an act of defiance to his overlord - Edward found it intolerable. The quiet acts of defiance such as this are often overlooked when judgements of King John are made - under the confines of his sovereignty agreed by Braca also. he could not act boldly instead he presented a quiet resistance. Amanda Beam ^{argues} ~~says~~ that he cannot be slighted as lacking in strength due to his actions of 1295 in securing ~~an~~ the Franco-Scott Treaty of Amiens.

~~The~~ The treaty was anti-Plantagenet, a vow of dual unity to support their ~~own~~ native in their fight against English tyranny when they were attacked. Beam's

point centres around the anti plenigenet clauses within the treaty - they were explicit in their vitriol hatred of the English and Edward I - prompting her to question whether Balliol was that weak. There is also a great irony in the portrayal of Edward I and Balliol in that Edward is lauded by historians such as Prestwich and Morris for his refusal to attend the court of King Phillip of France and yet they condemn Balliol as weak for not attending that of King Edward. Furthermore Balliol ~~Balliol was a king~~ is often written of as ~~conforming~~ up the traditional role of the crown - never organising his lands, yet in a 15 year reign he held 3 parliaments, a greater proportional number than Bruce can attest to. These parliaments were not also the pointless musings of a vassal king. At his final parliament he declared his intent to go to war with England - not an act of someone lacking the strength to stand up to the English. Despite his defeat it was still Balliol at the helm, he led the fight against Edward - clearly standing up to him. ~~That is not~~ The views presented in this paragraph firmly contradict the views given with many of the historians believing it hopeless.

However there must be a basis for the reputation of Balliol and the given viewpoint. If homage had only been given once to Edward I then it would have almost been acceptable, yet 3 times during the reign he knelt before the king and swore to hold Scotland for him. Morris calls Balliol fully subservient at these occasions "offering little resistance" to the demeaning process of homage. The trials at which define the reign of King John cannot all have the king's quiet resistance attributed to them, at the second trial the resistance was brutally quelled by King Edward - he threatened to take 3 of Balliol's castles did he not speak - a threat which Balliol obeyed immediately to. The third hearing was humiliating to the greatest possible degree for Balliol. Walter Court chronicler Rushanger calls him "a lamb amongst wolves" while Prestwich talks of the deliberate humiliation inflicted by the king and his lords designed to degrade the crown. "During the process no more acts of defiance occurred - Balliol seemed resigned to his fate - in this instance he simply lacked the strength of character to stand up to ~~the~~ Edward I. A question must also

be posed as to why the trials took place when the Treaty of
 Bingham (1290) declared that all matters concerning Scotland
 were to be ~~settled~~ ^{decided} within Scotland. Upon the granting of the
 kingship Edward had declared the ~~Treaty~~ Treaty "to be
 true being" and annulled it. This was a cataclysmic
 decision for the kingship of Balliol yet Morris talks of how he was
 quickly engulfed into submission. GWS Barrow ~~talks~~ ^{besides} his lack
 of 'wisdom or courage' to fight for the treaty with his pitiful
 acceptance resigning his kingship as that of a vassal king. As Fison
 Watson argues less sympathetically in her later work Balliol
 was bullied by ~~the~~ King Edward and especially on issues such
 as the Treaty of Ayr and the war vs England had less input
 than believed. At this point Balliol had been replaced by a
 council of 12 nobles, resigned to a ceremonial figurehead. It is not
 even known if Balliol knew about the treaty or if he actively
 wanted to go to war. ~~It is clear that~~ ^{It is clear that} much of the defense of Balliol
 in ~~the~~ ~~text~~ ~~is~~ ~~based~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~did~~ ~~not~~ ~~have~~ ~~a~~ ~~degree~~ ~~of~~ ~~validity~~.
 The rebuttal argument of this paragraph give the view given credence,
 yet they do not overwhelm the long body of evidence in favour of ~~Ball~~ ^{King} John.

However Michael Penman would argue that opinions such as the view given are firmly tainted by the work of pro-Bruce chroniclers. He would argue that while Balliol was occasionally weak his character flaws have been highly exaggerated by the anti-Balliol chroniclers. Following his victory over Balliol in 1296 Edward ordered the official chronicles of Scotland should be taken to London, however the ship carrying them sunk soon after it left Leith - leaving Scotland with no official history prior to 1296. However Bruce's accession to the throne after he murdered John Comyn would change that. Bruce was in desperate need of legitimacy and so he started a huge effort to re-write history using the clergy under his close ally Bishop Wishart. The church's propaganda was vitriolic and degraded the right of Balliol's kingship in order to legitimise that of Bruce. The declaration of the clergy in 1309 associated Balliol with the devil and painted out Balliol to be a "de facto" king according to Brown. However this was the less significant predecessor of the church's masterpiece the Declaration of Arbroath. Penman believes it to be

a thinly ~~with~~ veiled attack on Balliol - an opinion echoed by
 Amanda Beam. The Deposition Clause justifies the deposing of Balliol
 while the Freedom clause shows him to be a factor of nationalhood.
 Cowan argues that the "advanced constitution" has imbued a ~~part~~ prejudice
 against Balliol into the Scottish mind - colouring the views of many - including
 the vital view. Unsurprisingly the English chronicles view
~~Balliol~~ Balliol with equal - if not greater disdain - than Bruce. However
 it is important to remember that Lanercost - the most critical
 chronicle of ~~Bruce~~ ^{Balliol} - was written in a priory founded by the Bruce
 family. Furthermore the both Lanercost and Gislebrough were written
 in the mid 1300s using the Bruce propaganda as a source for their
 chronicles. Prof David Brown argues that the English chronicles
 and Scottish equivalents such as Geste are riddled with Bruce
 propaganda as it was their chief source of information. He claims
 it gives them an immense bias against figures such as Bruce and Comyn
~~and~~ prejudicing opinion against them. Hence the view given
 should be taken ~~as~~ ~~not~~ ^{not} as the whole truth as it is likely
 to have been colour by these chronicles.

Overall this essay has found the view to be ^{mostly} ~~partially~~ invalid as there is a vast amount of evidence showing Balfour did attempt to stand up to Edward I and did not simply lie down and take his punishment. Whilst there is also evidence and opinion supporting the view it has clearly been viewed and influenced by contemporary sources with ulterior motives: such as asserting the validity of Robert I's kingship and proclaiming the strength of Edward I to please an English audience. Thus the view is mostly invalid.

11	<p>Robert the Bruce is widely regarded and viewed as Scotland's great medieval champion of independence. His statues like the Cities of Scotland - mostly showing his military prowess with a sword in hand. The popular media has embellished his tale to with folk books by authors such as Walter Scott romanticising his rise to the crown with the story of the spider. In reality his accession was far more grim as he murdered John Comyn at Greyfriars church in 1306 and crowned himself king. This essay shall argue that his victory in the following civil war was due to the weakness of his opponents contrasting this factor with his military genius and the influence of the Scottish church.</p> <p>John Comyn was the leading figure in the Scottish political community - head of Scotland's most powerful and influential family and a guardian ^{or patron} of Scotland since 1298. Prestwich offers him a glowing tribute as "the most influential magnate in Scotland" with Bishops and influence spreading from the South West to North</p>
----	--

East. His position as "head" of the political community gave his opinions much credence amongst the nobles with many simply prepared to follow his judgement. Thus his death at Greiglass Church in Dumfries in 1306 at the head of Robert the Bruce shattered the political community. The Comyn family in particular suffered with a near total breakdown of leadership. Their once coordinated castles and castles at Buchan, Wigton, Bute, Uigat amongst others became isolated and insecure as the Comyn power struggle began. The family began to collapse from the inside with brothers, cousins and his wife all vying for power. Cowan notes that the "Comyn family went into a huge decline post 1306" clearly due to John Comyn's death. In terms of the civil war the death of Comyn was cataclysmic. It robbed ~~the~~ an experienced military leader who despite defeat ^{it is widely regarded that his} had led the resistance well until 1304, ~~with~~ knowledge would have been crucial in the fight against Bruce. Furthermore his family's divisions provided the perfect grounds for Bruce attacks. The manner in which the castles of Comyn had become isolated and did not

communication facilitated the first and stealthy Bruce attack. Their belated refusal to talk allowed him to travel through Conyn lands with the ability to surprise any Conyn force. This was clearly seen with the successive captures of Inverurie and Uquost in 1307 - two castles which normally would have been in close contact - wiped out "surprisingly" in a matter of days. Hence the weakness of Bruce's Scottish opponents contributed largely to his civil war victory.

However it was not only his Scottish opponents who were weak - the English were in decline with an ill Edward I in 1306. In the final months of his reign Edward was met with the news of the Bruce rising of 1306. He was too ill to lead a conquest north and so sent Aymer de Valence - a young knight and nephew to put down Bruce. On the surface of things Valence returned his required task defeating Bruce at Methven in 1306 - prompting his defeat to the West of Scotland. However according to Barrow "it is clear that played its part in defeat" yet Valence became self-congratulatory.

His youthful naivety made him believe had won the war for England: a fact relayed to the king. It is ~~also~~ regarded that Bruce was lucky not to meet Edward I as he would not have been ready (in the opinion of Prestwich and Morris) and instead met Wallace who lacked military insight. ~~It was~~ Wallace failed to strike at all on the west coast leaving Bruce had won possession of 5 castles around the firth of Clyde - the base that allowed him to return in 1307. Wallace had not won nearly postponed the battle of Loudon Hill in 1305 where he would ~~retreat~~ retreat humiliated by a lesser force. However Wallace's weakness and incompetence paled in comparison to the other key event in 1305. At Bannockburn in 1314 Edward I died trying to move north to stay Bruce. ~~With~~ Bruce argues "the plan of invasion did not change but the ~~best~~ forces did" as Edward II another inexperienced leader sought to battle Bruce. In the words of Morris the English lost a "brilliant tactical mind and general" and were left with a young inexperienced man, clearly distracted by his father's death. The generalship of Edward II was expectedly weak. His forces seemed to march aimlessly, unable to find any

semblance of an army. He was unversed and unprepared for the guerrilla tactics of Bruce and it showed on his return home - his military inventions achieved nothing. Overall the English strategy in the war was beyond poor - they sent inexperienced and inexperienced young men north with little understanding of the magnitude or intelligence of Bruce. Their political weak experience must be viewed as a key factor in Bruce's victory.

Historians such as Chris Brown argue Bruce was a "military genius" and to a certain extent that must be deemed true. He had the crucial foresight to refuse pitched battles would not favour a war against England and lengthy sieges would not win him the crown north with the speed he required to consolidate his kingship. Thus he developed a guerrilla strategy of intense speed and surprise in order to win the war. Brown and Brown consider that his tactic was highly effective in the North. Bruce's tactics in the north ~~were~~ ^{are rightly} lauded, with intense speed and the benefit of surprise he took Inverurie and Orkney Castle.

in ~~the~~ quick succession - two key Cwyn castles and
bursting of power and activity in North Scotland. His capture
of the former Cwyn "Headquarters" at Buchan was brilliant also,
he coolly analysed that it would be most effective if the castle
were taken from the North side. The key ^{was} ~~to~~ was executed with
the typical Bruce speed and aggression. ~~upon~~ Occasionally small parties
would use the cover of darkness to take more minor outposts and
wooden forts - utilizing the act of surprise and enemy weariness.
The guerrilla warfare was also extended to the English but in a
subtly different manner. Morris summarizes that he knew he
had to make life as difficult as possible to the English, to make them
want to go home. Hence Bruce ordered the burning of crops and supplies,
as well as the murder of livestock in frequent raids into the English
strongholds of Lothian. He simply could not allow the English to advance
north. An army marches on its stomach and when the supply ships
were delayed Edward realized he had to turn back. His army was
unsustainable and becoming unmanageable. Bruce had ensured they were
poorly and under-supplied instructing small groups to attack unprotected
parts of the baggage train. Thus it is his to praise Bruce

17011	<p> military endeavours - he truly can be seen as a great guerrilla general. However his greatness in these early years was dependent on the incompetence of his opposition - without whom the taking of the north would have been impossible and the wrecking of havoc on the bridge train unthinkable. Hence this must be viewed as responsible for the victory in the civil war to a lesser extent than Bruce's opponents. </p>
	<p> The Scottish church was a major asset was a major asset to the Bruce effort from the offset. No sooner had he murdered Comyn at a church was he absolved of sin by Bishop Wishart. The Bishop was a firm advocate of Scottish independence and acted with due favour to the self-proclaimed king. Wishart was the political spin doctor of his day and had the church immediately immediately immediately produce pro-Bruce propaganda. Initially his support came in the form of pro-Bruce sermons preached by the clergy across Scotland declaring Bruce to be the rightful king, deserving of support. Penman comments that these sermons were hugely influential driving the ambivalence towards the Bruce cause. However it was not just the church </p>

goes that the church it caused to support the Bruce cause. Bishops Lamberton and Wishart furnished the Bruce army with an estimated 2000 men - hugely proving up his effort. Their greater effort for support was in 1304 with the declaration of the clergy - the defining piece of Pro Bruce propaganda. It was to legitimize Bruce's kingship declaring Balliol as an illegitimate king - with several references to the devil. Bruce notes the downstream success in naming Balliol to be a "de facto king" as it gave the Bruce cause - at this point on the verge of victory - needed legitimacy and a moral boost. The church's ability to transcend the factional divide in Scotland was invaluable to Bruce bringing essential men and legitimacy to his cause, however it cannot be viewed as responsible for victory to the same extent as the Comyn and English weakness as had they been factional opponents they would have countered the constant Pro Bruce propaganda - instead their weakness facilitated it.

Overall this essay has conclusively proven that the weakness of Bruce's opponents (the Comyns and the English) allowed him to

win the civil war to a greater extent than the church or
Bruce was military genius. As a single factor the longer
inighting and English incompetence does any other factor as simply
they facilitated them. Their weak lack of opposition not only
allowed Bruce to comprehensively win militarily but to win the
propaganda war for the otherwise neutral. The Comyns, Wallace,
and Edward II must ~~take~~ ^{take mostly} responsibility for the civil war
victory and Scotland's ~~republican~~ ^{liberal} independence under
Bruce as without their weak incompetence he never would
have been king.

14	<p>Source A explains the approach taken by Edward I to increase his influence in Scotland between 1280 and 1297 partially fully</p> <p>The treaty tells us the Treaty of Brigham may have formed the basis of close union between the countries. The Treaty of Brigham was part of the marriage agreement between Edward I and the queen for the marriage of the Prince of Wales and the Maid of Norway. It attempted to guarantee Scotland's sovereignty in the union with separate government and churches. However Robert Bower argues it was meaningless and gave Edward huge influence over Scotland.</p> <p>The source mentions that Edward was prepared to use force to increase his influence over the Scots.</p> <p>At the ^{Notham castle} and of Brigham - where Edward I demanded overlordship. Edward I had ordered an army to assemble, this was repeated when he gave his verdict for overlordship as he had assembled another army at Notham in case his ruling wasn't accepted.</p> <p>A further point made in the source is that a crisis</p>	
----	---	--

As Scotland had arrived in 1291, the crisis described is the request of overlordship from Edward I at Notham. He demanded that he not be an arbiter but a judge of kingship in his capacity as overlord. It is called a crisis as Baskop insisted the guardian had to 'judge' it as only a king could accept such a thing.

However the source ^{does} not fully explain the move as it omits when Edward went south seeking mastering claimants to the throne. Edward decided that if the guardians would not accept overlordship then the claimants had to - hence the move claimants the quicker acceptance was. Frestuch calls this move an extreme act of intelligence, removing the resistance of the guardians on constitutional grounds.

The source also omits the Anglo-Norwegian discussions prior to the Treaty of Salisbury and Brijham. Edward reached out to King Eric suggesting the marriage of his son to the Maid of Norway as it would bring Scotland within his empire without consulting the Scots. However the guardians found out and quickly became involved.

The source also omits the letter of the 7 lords. Bruce the Contestant wrote to Edward I declaring that it was his right to be King of Scots. Upon reading the letter Edward realised that Bruce would pay him homage for Scotland before the contest began - he used Bruce to trigger all the other contestants' calls of faulty

Another omission is the ^{scottish debts} dowry paid to Eric by Edward I.

To ensure the marriage went ahead Edward I

paid the dowry owed to him for Alexander III's daughter, in order to keep him happy with Scotland.

A further omission is the marriage proposal to marry Edward II and the maid. This would have seen Edward I become king in law of the Scottish queen - and able to exert his influence over her.

Overall the source gives a partly full explanation of the approach taken by Edward I to increase his influence over Scotland.

15	<p>Source B is potentially useful as evidence of the effectiveness of William Wallace's leadership.</p> <p>The source is from the <i>Chronicles of Grossetest</i> (Grossetest P. 64) a priory of which Grossetest was on one of the main highways to Scotland in the north of England - and likely would have been privy to the views of returning English soldiers. This makes the source relatively useful as it will give a first hand outsider's view on Wallace's leadership.</p> <p>The source was written in 1305. In 1305 Wallace was captured by Methven, given to Edward I and executed. His trial was highly publicised - and many would have known of his endeavours. This is useful as it means the actions of Wallace will be portrayed most accurately as they will not have been altered as they were passed down. Furthermore it is useful as it ensures none of his leadership actions were omitted as with his death he could no longer lead.</p> <p>The source tells us that Wallace ordered men in his army who committed sacrifice to be executed*. Wallace was the second son of a knight - meaning he was destined for the clergy, and thus took a strongly religious attitude that *but the men were not properly looked for</p>
----	---

shaped his military leadership. This is useful as it shows that Wallace's leadership was moral yet this did not fully translate to his troops who were mercenary - interested in personal gain.

The source also tells us that Wallace's men were scared of when challenged to take Carlisle. Carlisle was the key border castle ~~at~~ on the English side - it was a strategic base for Edward I and was a repeated target for the Bruce raids.

This is ~~not~~ useful as it shows Wallace was not able to motivate his men to attack a heavily fortified English stronghold.

The source further tells us that he granted letters of protection to cannons. Despite English chroniclers such as Lanercost reporting mass ~~slaughter~~ ^{seldom} reports the violent murder of priests under Wallace - this shows that the letters must have worked in most cases. David Brown believes that the murders referenced may have been English propaganda to grow hatred towards Wallace and the Scots. This is useful as it shows that Wallace's leadership was effective in protecting ~~protection~~ ^{protection}.

However the source is not fully useful as it omits the desertion of the nobility at the Battle of Falkirk. The disastrous events that played out before the nobles made them decide to abandon Wallace in 1298. Proctitch blames Wallace's lack of tactical advancement in the face of a far stronger English army for the desertion. The fact that he was deserted showed he was not an effective leader in battle - which would have been a useful inclusion.

The source also omits the letter to Lubek. Following the taking of Berwick in 1297 Wallace sent a letter to Germany declaring Scotland open to trade. This would have been a useful inclusion as following it Europe began to trade lightly with the Scots - a sign of effective leadership.

Another omission is that Wallace had to threaten to hang those who refused to join his army - selling up town after town. This is evidence of ineffective leadership as it shows him unable to inspire Scots to fight. The omission makes the source less useful.

Overall due to omissions and inaccuracies the source can only be partly useful.

16	<p>Sources C and D reveal differing interpretations of the means by which Robert I ruled Scotland.</p> <p>Source C mentions Robert held parliaments to govern Scotland. Parliament gave the support of the political community - as hence Robert held them fairly frequently. The political community's approval was essential to him due to the deposition clause in the Declaration of Arbroath.</p> <p>The source also discusses his rule through a royal secretariat. From the very first days of the kingship Robert used the machinery of government to exert his rule. He revamped the system of sheriffdoms - ensuring that the justiciar and royal sheriff were all within his peace and favourable to his cause. Thomas Randolph was commonly given sheriffdom.</p> <p>The source further mentions he ruled using a law against the spreading of rumours about the king. The law was passed as a measure to try to stop a coup against King Robert (such as the case of the Scots Conspiracy) materialising - as people would not be allowed to talk approvingly of him in public.</p>
----	--

Source ~~BD~~ tells us that Robert reformed scots law & allowed him to rule Scotland. He changed Scottish law ^{and the judicial system} from being about the settling of personal grievances to the punishment of crimes that it was in the interest of the state to punish. Barons praise his reforms arguing their success in reshaping the role of the nobility and ensuring effective reign. The source also mentions he used officials to redistribute land holdings. The Bill of 1314 of Cambuslangh disinherited all those in the Scottish nobility that remained outwith Robert's peace following Bannockburn. He was cleansing his nobility in effect.

The source notes that Robert managed to impose a successful annual tax on his nobility. Taxation of the nobility had always been unpopular - it was the real cause of the 1297 rising against English occupation - however he argued that the nobility were better off under him regardless, as their incomes had risen due to their increased lands. It allowed Bruce to effectively fund his kingship and political regime.

However both sources omit Robert's use of trials as a means of control and severe crimes against him were rare. Following the Scots conspiracy Robert put the conspirators on trial for treason. The trials were widely regarded as harsh - causing Ingram Urrville to leave in protest - but served to convey the costly message. One conspirator called Mowbray was put on trial, then being drawn and quartered despite having died before the trial began. This was done to convey treason's costs - and ^{so} for he could have his lands seized.

Both agree the importance of such public trials as they showed the harsh cost of treason and drew attention to the community. The sources also omit the increased power of the church. In return for the service and loyalty of key figures such as Wishart and Lamberton, Bruce increased the powers and lands of the church - he did this as the sermons and chronicle produced were largely Pro-Bruce - spreading the legitimacy and virtue of his rule.

Overall the sources reveal that Robert used a highly legalistic and democratic role over Scotland - whilst both omit the use of harsh trials and the 'propagandising' church they seem to agree that he was heavily reliant on the law and community decrees for his rule.