

History A

Advanced GCE **F963/01**

British History Enquiries. Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1660

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a and b	AO2a
1	13-14	15-16
2	11-12	13-14
3	9-10	10-12
4	7-8	8-9
5	5-6	6-7
6	3-4	3-5
7	0-2	0-2

Notes related to Part A:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>

Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	A01a and b	A02a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

<p>Level 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28-34</p>
<p>Level 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21-27</p>
<p>Level 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14-20</p>

Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

1 The Normans in Britain 1066-1100

(a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the strengths of William of Normandy's invading army.

[30]

Both mention knights and archers. Both suggest the Norman army was well organised and that William was there with his troops. **B** says specifically that William could give his orders easily and **C** backs this up when he was able to tell the archers to change their tactics. Both indicate that William was a fine leader, in **B** he had courage and in **C** he led his troops nobly. Both imply that the Normans were likely to win, perhaps because of hindsight.

B is alone in mentioning the powerful support the Normans had from the Pope, while **C** sees the power coming from the fury and force with which the army advanced. **B** indicates that the Norman armour was a great strength, heavily clad footsoldiers, while **C** sees the archers as crucial. **B** has the size and strength of the Normans as decisive but **C** looks at the tactics used. However the strength of his discipline was undermined by the rashness of his footsoldiers.

Both the sources as chroniclers were writing a narrative and selected the events which seemed significant to them. **B** is well known as a pro Norman source but both write favourably of William. The impact in **C** comes very much from the use of adjectives. In terms of judgment **B** may be the better Source given the more precise information given about the army and its proximity to the Norman victors.

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that William I's leadership was the main reason for the Norman victory at Hastings.

[30]

Sources **A**, **B**, **C** and **E** are most inclined to suggest that William's qualities were crucial. **B** refers to his courage and the sound disposition of his troops. **A** mentions his tactics whereby he secured his rear by building a castle and took the English by surprise. Both **B** and **D** suggest that he was well placed to give out his orders. **C** refers to his noble bearing and to his change of tactics. On the other hand, **B** indicates that the Church was on William's side, implied with the reference to the Papal banner and possibly in **D** by Harold having killed his brother.

The English had some disadvantages such as the size of their army, from **A** and **D** and the difficulty Harold had in giving orders as explained in **E**. **E** also refers to the lack of archers in the English army because it had been hastily assembled. Candidates are likely to refer to the Battle of Stamford Bridge to underline the weakness of the English and to the long march south. **A** implies that Harold suffered desertion – "those that would stay with him". Source **D** also states this – not many ready "to obey his call" given retention of Norse plunder. **But** Source **A** shows how hard the English fought and candidates could support this from the evidence that the battle lasted all day. They did also have the security of the ridge – Senlac Hill and the shield wall as mentioned in **E** and the picked house carls who fought to the death.

Source **E** argues strongly that the lack of cavalry was a key factor and that the Normans were a more efficient killing machine. Candidates may argue that the decisions taken on the battlefield were responsible for the outcome and William, with his greater experience, his rallying of his troops when they thought he was dead and his exploitation of the Breton retreat was a better leader than Harold, who was foolish in committing to battle before all his troops were assembled.

The sources are mainly pro Norman **B**, **C** and **D** and including the historian in **E**. They downplay Harold's strategic advantage and the power of the shield wall if kept intact. All except **A** are post-1070, 2 are 12th century, and assume a Norman viewpoint. **A** gives Harold credit for challenging William and for fighting fiercely and bravely with many loyal

companions. Nonetheless **D**'s evidence on the impact of the Battle of Stamford Bridge is telling and could be used to argue that Harold's weakness was more important than William's leadership in achieving victory at Hastings.

2 Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569
Social and Economic Change 1536-1558

- (a) Study Sources A and B**
Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems facing the poor between 1536 and 1550. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources **agree** that the poor are lacking food. Source **A** says they are 'in need of meat' and Source **B** says they 'starve and die'. The Sources agree that the poor no longer receive charity and they also agree that there is no hospitality for travellers. They also agree that profits of the land no longer benefit the poor, as in Source **A** they go to the King, rather than the abbeys who used the profits to pay their servants, and in Source **B** the profits go into the pockets of the greedy enclosing landlords who 'have no pity for the poor' and merely 'seek their own profit'. They both agree on 'decay of the commonwealth'. Both Sources refer to unemployment. In Source **A** tenants 'do not know how to make a living' whereas in Source **B** they are no longer able to keep a cow to feed their family. Source **A** refers to the loss of tenancies and Source **B** to loss of common pastures.

But the Sources also **disagree**. Source **A** takes a positive view towards the abbeys and sees them as supporters of the poor. It refers to poor communications due to highways and bridges not being maintained by the abbeys and the loss of the beautiful buildings. Source **B**, on the other hand, concentrates on the effects on the poor of enclosure for sheep farming, which has caused evictions, depopulation and inflation. Food prices have reached a peak, especially those connected with sheep farming, to maintain profits of capitalist landlords. The monks displaced by the dissolution of the monasteries in Source **A** have been replaced by greedy landlords whom the author states are behaving like monks.

The **provenance** of the Sources may be used to determine which is more useful or reliable for explaining the problems facing the poor. Both Sources are subjective and reflect their context. The key aspect for comparison is their purpose. The author of Source **A** is Robert Aske, who is under interrogation as leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace rebellion in Yorkshire a few months earlier. He might be trying to justify his actions and receive clemency, by drawing the king's attention to the grievances of poor people who have no political voice. The author of Source **B** is a servant of Somerset, supporting his patron's view that economic problems are the fault of greedy enclosing landlords rather than the policy of Somerset's government.

Aske, the author of Source **A**, is a Catholic, wishing to restore the monasteries which he sees as 'commendably serving God', whereas the author of Source **B** is a Protestant chaplain who condemns the gentry as behaving like corrupt monks.

The **context** of the two Sources has some points of similarity, in that both are written at a time of social unrest, but whereas Source **A** sees the change of land ownership from the church to the king due to the start of the dissolution of the monasteries and the recent Break with Rome, Source **B** sees the longer term effects of the loss of monastic welfare for the poor. It also reflects the impact of the sale of those same lands to the capitalist gentry, which includes enclosure, rack-renting, food shortages, unemployment and evictions. At the time of Source **B** wars have also led to the debasement of the coinage and inflation.

A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the Sources as evidence. Source **A** focuses narrowly on the impact of the dissolution, but is useful as

evidence for this, whereas Source **B** has a broader view of wider problems and of long term effects of royal policy, especially the sale of monastic land to capitalist gentry. Source **A** might exaggerate the impact of the dissolution to justify rebellion. The purpose of Source **B**, to attribute blame, also undermines its value as evidence, though it is very useful for the effects of enclosure. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Tudor government policy was the main cause of social and economic problems between 1536 and 1558. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view is shown predominantly in Sources **A**, **C** and **E**, whereas the **opposing** view features in Sources **D**, **B** and to an extent in **C**.

The **supporting** view in Sources **A** and **C** is that Tudor governments followed economic policies which caused social and economic problems, such as sale of church land to the gentry and a 'humanitarian' anti-enclosure policy, both of which encouraged riots and rebellion. This may be evaluated by reference to knowledge of other non-humanitarian policies such as a harsh Vagrancy Act of 1547 and the repeal of treason and heresy laws which took the lid off pent up grievances and allowed extremists to gain support. Source **E** adds that successive governments after 1542 also debased the coinage and followed mercantile policies which undermined English trade. Source **E** refers to licences granted to foreign merchants to the detriment of English subjects. Source **E** also refers to the impact of an aggressive foreign policy, with wars against Scotland and France which brought a serious national debt.

The Sources also support the **opposing** view. Source **B** places the blame for social and economic problems on greedy capitalist landlords enclosing pasture for sheep farming. Knowledge of slumps in the wool trade and the collapse of Antwerp might be used to evaluate this point. Rioters are blamed for making the problem worse in Source **C** after taking matters into their own hands despite the government trying its best to deal with the situation by humanitarian anti-enclosure commissions. The title of Source **C**, a proclamation 'Pardoning Enclosure Rioters', reveals the weakness of Somerset's government in dealing with unrest. Knowledge of the local economic grievances which led to Kett's Rebellion might be used in evaluation. Source **D** takes a different line, suggesting natural disasters are another cause of the problems, which was beyond the control of the government. It reveals the impact of bad weather and epidemics in causing food shortages, wastage of arable land and famine. In contrast to the unemployment cited in Sources **A** and **B**, a shortage of labour is given as a problem in Source **D**. Knowledge of population change might be used in evaluation.

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. The purpose of the Sources may be discussed. In Source **A**, Aske may be trying to justify his leadership of the Pilgrimage of Grace. In Source **B**, Becon's Protestant bias against the monks is evident, and as a Somerset sympathiser, he may be trying to justify Somerset's government and exonerate it from blame for increasing economic instability. The fact that Somerset acts by proclamation in Source **C** rather than legislation reveals the weakness of government policy. The tone of Somerset's proclamation, 'by the advice of his said dear

uncle', suggests that he is trying to deflect blame from himself for a failed policy of anti-enclosure commissions, 'His Majesty set up'. In the context of a royal minority, it is unconvincing that he is merely following the wishes of the King, not acting on his own behalf. Source **D** is from a later biography of Thomas Cranmer written by a Protestant preacher, who possibly might see the natural disasters of the reign of Mary as judgement for the martyrdom of Cranmer. In Source **E** Sir Thomas Gresham is an economist who desires to become an adviser of the new monarch on her accession. By looking back at the Mid-Tudor period he wishes to serve the interests of his merchant class by identifying financial policies which the Queen should follow to benefit them as well as the country.

Supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that government policy caused the social and economic problems mentioned. No specific judgement is expected.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of government policies within the Sources: religious changes, sale of crown lands, anti-enclosure commissions, the use of proclamations, debasement of the coinage and trading regulations. They are likely to set the Sources within the context of strong or weak monarchies, perhaps due to age or gender. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-1660 The Outbreak of the First Civil War

(a) Study Sources C and D

Compare these sources as evidence for attempts to rally support in June 1642. [30]

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. Context is useful in explaining the different arguments used in attempts to rally support. A very significant issue is that the basis of Source **A** is the Commission of Array and that of Source **C** is the Militia Ordinance. Parliament had passed the Militia Ordinance in March 1642 to give them the right to raise troops to protect England. This was not an Act of Parliament in the absence of the King's signature. They claimed that the King was intending to use the army in Ireland against English Protestants. The King therefore felt compelled to revive the medieval Commission of Array in an attempt to rally support for England's protection. The purpose of the two Sources is **similar** in that both King and Parliament are rallying military support for their cause.

The King sets out his aims to gain support to defend his 'person, honour and just prerogatives' and likewise Parliament's cause is to 'uphold the power and rights of Parliament'. Both Sources claim to be defending 'the laws of the land' and 'personal liberty' in Source **C**; 'laws and freedom' in Source **D**. Charles in Source **C** adds that he 'shall never enforce his prerogative above the law', showing that this is one of the charges made against him by his enemies. This statement might be evaluated in light of the stripping of his prerogative powers by the Long Parliament. Both Sources claim to 'defend the Protestant faith': Charles, in Source **C**, stating his 'daily zeal for the protestant faith' and Parliament stating that those supporting Lords and Commons will 'show their love for the Protestant religion'. But there is a subtle difference here. Charles is referring to the defence of the church and state against the threat of 'separatists' who 'act unlawfully by spreading new doctrines.', whereas Parliament has support among those very sects.

So the Sources are also **different**, first of all in their nature and cause. In Source **C** the King sets out his aims to gain support to defend his person, honour and just prerogatives in a royal declaration, whereas in Source **D** Parliament issue a pamphlet to maintain their power and rights. In Source **D** Parliament claims to be 'serving the nation', thus addressing a broad audience in a published pamphlet. On the other hand, Charles, in Source **C**, promises all his subjects 'full personal liberty and property rights', showing the different audience he is appealing to, face to face, outside York: a more limited assembly of the propertied classes in a traditionally Catholic area of the country. He focuses on the concerns of his conservative audience by stressing his regret that 'separatists act unlawfully by spreading new doctrines to disturb church and state'.

On the contrary, Parliament state the reason for their need to rally troops is that 'the king, led on by wicked advice, intends to make war against his Parliament'. They maintain they are not against the King but his advisors who have misled him. It seems that Parliament distrusts its opponents. Source **D** refers to 'rebellious persons who are pretending to serve the King' offering rewards and promotion to those who join up'. There is no hint of this in Source **C**, where the King appeals for protection against those 'disturbing church and state'. The implication in the King's declaration, Source **C**, is that separatists will endanger freedom and property rights, whereas Parliament, in Source **D**, suggests that the 'king is pretending he needs his own guard' in order 'to call together great numbers' of armed men. The purpose of Parliament is to attract not only men but funding, weapons, horses and horsemen. Context might be used to explain that many of those attracted to the Parliamentary cause may be of a lower economic status than those to whom the King appeals. This is shown by the statement in Source **D** that they need to 'maintain horses, horsemen and arms' suggesting they do not yet have cavalry, unlike the Royalists.

The message differs, as Source **C** appeals for support for a religious and political cause, whereas Source **D** requests funds and supplies. Source **C** is a response to the Militia Ordinance, and Source **D** a response to the Commission of Array. Their value as evidence therefore differs. Source **D** attributes guilt, that the King intends to wage war against his people, whereas Source **C** blames separatists for spreading new doctrines. Thus in tone and opinion, Source **D** might be seen as more useful as evidence in rallying support. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that a dispute over control of the militia was the main reason for the outbreak of the First Civil War in 1642. [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Parliament interprets the King's action in Source **C** as a cause for military protection, which they had enabled by the passing of the Militia Ordinance. On the other hand, this was seen by Charles as a breach of his prerogative and exposing him to attack.

The Sources contain references to the interpretation in the question, but also to religion and political power, so they may be grouped view by view. The **supporting** view, that control of the militia was the main reason, is shown predominantly in Sources **B**, **C** and **D** and to a lesser extent in Source **E**, whereas Source **A** links military factors with religion and the **opposing** views on the significance of religion and political power feature to varying extents in all the Sources.

The **supporting** view, that the militia was the main reason for the outbreak of first Civil War, is shown by cross-referencing **A** with **B**, to explain why Parliament passed the Militia Ordinance in March 1642. However, the reliability of Source A might be evaluated. O'Neale's claim to have had a Commission from the King seems extremely unreliable, and there was no precedent. Its provenance, the author being the leader of the Irish Rebellion and his purpose, to justify himself, might cast doubt on its authenticity. Its ambiguous references to 'the said kingdom' and 'the same kingdom' might be evaluated in the light of Parliament's comments, in Source **B**, on the 'fears of similar rebellion in this kingdom', 'bloody counsels' and in Source **D** 'led on by wicked advice'. Own knowledge might include the execution of Strafford, where the same fear arose. The link between the Irish Rebellion and the 'most dangerous and desperate attack on the House of Commons', the Arrest of the Five Members, supplied from own knowledge, should aid balanced analysis and evaluation of the Militia Ordinance as a reason for the outbreak of the first Civil War. Charles I himself, in Source **E**, suggests that the dispute over control of the militia was a major reason 'They confessed that the militia was mine, but they thought it fit to have it from me', but the provenance is important here: Charles is about to be executed for waging war on his people and his purpose is to exonerate himself and appear a 'martyr of the people'. He blames Parliament for the outbreak of the first Civil War: 'They began on me', with the supporting evidence being 'the dates of their commissions and mine'. Sources **B** and **C** do show that Parliament began to arm in March, whereas his Commissions of Array followed in June.

This links to an **opposing** view, that political power and prerogatives were also a major reason for the outbreak of the first Civil War. One of the fundamental issues in Source **B** is the political power which enabled control of the militia: 'power to call all those fit to fight in war, train, arm, exercise and muster them. Here it is claimed by Parliament: 'those refusing to obey shall answer to Parliament.' In Source **D** also, the cause is to 'uphold the power and rights of Parliament'. However, the King, in Source **E**, states that 'they confessed that the militia was mine, but they thought it fit to have it from me', so he felt they were usurping his remaining royal prerogative. There may be discussion of defence of the law from those who wish to overturn it. Source **C** suggests the King's main causes in rallying support are defence of his person, prerogative and power. Whereas, in Source **D**, Parliament claims that the King 'intends to make war against his Parliament', in Source **E**, the King claims 'I never began a war with Parliament, nor intended to encroach upon their privileges. The two sides interpreted the situation very differently, and there may be evaluation of which view is the more convincing in the light of provenance, reliability and context.

Another **opposing** view concerns religion. Source **B** refers to the 'bloody counsel of Papists' which shocked Parliament into defending themselves with the Militia Ordinance, linking to Source **A** where the Irish rebels aim to 'seize the goods, estates and persons of all the English Protestants', thus contradicting the King's claims to protect property and rights but also stirring religious war and challenging the church. Yet in Source **E** and **C**, the King claims that God's church has come under attack by radical Protestants and that there is a need for all views to be expressed freely and openly. He suggests in Source **C** that 'separatists act unlawfully by spreading new doctrines to disturb church' causing the outbreak of the first Civil War. He claims to have wished to remedy this dispute with a 'national synod freely called', 'regulating his Church, according to Scripture'. Own knowledge might be used briefly to evaluate the religious intentions of the two sides at the outbreak of war, and judge which view is more convincing.

A supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that a dispute over control of the militia was the main reason for the outbreak of the First Civil War in 1642. No specific judgement is expected.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of themes within the Sources: control of the militia, political power and prerogatives, the church and perhaps defence of the law. They

are likely to set the Sources within the context of events such as the Irish Rebellion and the Arrest of the Five Members. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2010

