

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F963/01**: British History Enquiries.
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1660

Mark Scheme for January 2011

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 2011

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

	AO1a 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)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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"> • 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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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

	AO1a 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

Marking Grid for Question (b)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<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>
<p>Level 1</p>	<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>
<p>Level 2</p>	<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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Level 3	<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. 	<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.
	13-16	28-34
Level 4	<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. 	<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.
	9-12	21-27
Level 5	<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. 	<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.
	5-8	14-20

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
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>

The Normans in England 1066-1100

- 1 (a) **Study Sources A and B.**
Compare these sources as evidence for the changes the Normans made to the Church. [30]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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 the attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources are **largely in agreement** over the change the Normans made to the Church. The Chronicle in A ascribes William's victory to God whilst William of Malmesbury in B also implies a religious purpose that became evident after the conquest – William and the Normans 'revived the practice of religion'. Both comment on considerable physical change and stress this revival, Source A commenting that William favoured those who loved God, Source B explicitly stating it in these very terms. In particular both stress a considerable revival in monasticism, both in terms of rebuilding, re-founding and new endowments, and in terms of the number of monks. Source B also mentions the building of humbler parish churches and particularly stresses their new style (Romanesque).

The Sources **differ** in some of the aspects they comment upon. The Chronicle in A refers to changes in the higher echelons of the Church. Bishops and Abbots had to bend to the royal will and were dismissed if disobedient. This is not mentioned in Source B. Although both are positive about the changes, William of Malmesbury, in B, introduces a note of negativity, implying that there was an element of wanton destruction and plunder about the physical changes that occurred. However he is careful to comment that such criticisms are far from general (and indeed are 'mutterings').

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both Sources can be viewed as reliable as both are quite balanced. In Source A the implication is that William generally did his best for the church and, arguably, was entitled to get rid of those who opposed him, although the word *hurled* indicates some precipitancy. This is useful as the Chronicle is generally critical of William. Source B is more favourable as the only negative point (about mutterings), hardly indicates much opposition, and the tone indicates that William of Malmesbury approved of the new style Norman architecture. But it could be argued that he was used to it, unlike the English. He is looking back from the vantage point of half a century. As a religious scholar from a great monastic institution one can expect approval of the changes the Normans made. More surprisingly (although it does date from the end of the reign) the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle also approves. Nonetheless one can also sense the sheer power of the Conqueror in its tone, determined to bend the Church to the new changes and to the royal will. Given their respective positions and the extent of corroboration candidates may well judge that they are of equal use as evidence.

A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. 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 William I used the Church mainly to uphold his power. [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing on 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, that William did use the Church to uphold his power is found mostly in Sources C, D and E, whereas the opposing view, that William was concerned for the good of the Church is mainly outlined in Sources A and B.

The **supporting** argument is seen in Source E where the new building style is seen as a sign of Norman domination. Source B could be used to support this view. The vastness of Norman cathedrals was probably interpreted in this way by the natives. Source E also refers to Church Councils and Source C shows an example of a Church Council in action. Synods were presided over by the king, so boosted his power and the presence of the cardinals from Rome showed he had Papal approval and this also gave him more backing. The bishops may have been removed for unworthiness, but their replacements were Normans and moreover royal chaplains, so clearly William's men. The example of Lanfranc could also be used. Source D shows very obviously how William used the church as the Abbot was forced to send the king knights under the feudal system in just the same way as secular lords did. This was very detrimental to the work of the monastery and was bitterly criticised by the writer, but the **provenance** of the Source indicates that, as a monk at Ely he is unlikely to be critical of his abbot. William's power is demonstrated by the abbot's obedience, despite his protests. Presumably he knew the fate of the disobedient as outlined in A and he would have been aware of the rebellion of Hereward, based in Ely, which had held out for some time, but eventually been overcome.

The **opposing** argument is that William was genuinely trying to reform the Church. In Source A he was *mild to the good men who loved God* and built monasteries to show his gratitude to God. In Source B there was a religious revival and churches and monasteries were constructed. Source C shows the deposition of unworthy prelates who were guilty of major crimes in the case of Stigand and ungodliness in the case of other bishops. Source E indicates that William wanted to reform the church for moral reasons. This evidence all supports this interpretation. Candidates could argue from their **contextual knowledge** that the Anglo-Saxon church was unjustly criticised by the Normans, and that Stigand was targeted by William as much for his crowning of Harold as for his misdeeds. William was bound to carry out reforms favoured by the pope who had given him support in 1066. William's later disagreements with the papacy do show that maintaining his power was probably more important to him in the last resort.

Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.

2 **Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569**
Religious Beliefs 1538-46

- (a) **Study Sources A and E**
Compare these Sources as evidence for the treatment of religious opponents.
[30]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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 are **similar** in that they both concern burning as a punishment; both individuals are acquaintances of a queen and there is a political context to their treatment; both are condemned for unorthodox beliefs about the scriptures; both are untypical cases as the victims are linked with a queen; both are published after their deaths.

But the Sources are also **different** in that one victim is a Roman Catholic Friar, chaplain to the divorced and deceased Catherine of Aragon, the other a Protestant female acquaintance of the current queen Catherine Parr. Only in **Source E** is the victim recorded as having been tortured, whereas In **Source A** it was untypical for reformers to burn Catholics. **Source A** concerns the burning itself, while **Source E** concerns the interrogation and makes no specific comment on the burning. **Source A** makes a joke about the friar's death, whereas **Source E** is more factual, claiming to quote the victim's own words.

The **context** of the Sources is different. **Source A** is recording events in 1538, when the dissolution of the monasteries was at its height and friars were a target for punishment. Cromwell's reforming influence dominated the Council, and Bishop Latimer, later burned by Mary, preached against Forest's Catholic beliefs. On the other hand, **Source E** is from 1546, when Cromwell's influence had ended, and the government had reaffirmed Catholic orthodoxy in the Act of Six Articles with the death penalty for heresy. Some may develop the reference to 'no ladies or gentlewomen' to explain that Catherine Parr had come under attack by the Catholic faction at court. This might be used to explain the particularly brutal treatment of Anne Askew to try to extract evidence against the queen. **Source E** is consistent with the Catholic tradition of burning for heresy, whereas **Source A** is unusual, in that friars were generally hanged for disobedience to the Act of Supremacy, not burnt.

Source **provenance** may be used to evaluate which is more useful or reliable in answering the question. **Neither Source** is typical as treatment for religious opponents, as there were strong political factors involved in both. **Source A** is a chronicle recording events with an objective tone - 'the prophecy now took effect', whereas **Source E** is a subjective personal account. Hall's style is typical of a chronicler, whereas Askew's account is immediate, courageous and published immediately after her death to enhance her reputation as a scholar and martyr. Askew's account was published at a time when Catherine Parr had retained Henry VIII's favour and was having Prince Edward educated in the reformed religion, whereas Hall's was published ten years after the event, when the Act of Six Articles had been repealed and moves towards Protestantism under Edward, might have made it a useful reminder of previous Protestant ascendancy. **Source A** might be seen as more objective, but **E** as more useful in light of beliefs, but no set conclusion is expected. A substantiated judgement is required 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 the scriptures were more important to Henry VIII's government than Catholic traditions and beliefs in the period 1538 to 1546.

[70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

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 both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation. The argument for the scriptures is shown in **Sources B, D** and to an extent **A**, though burning was a Catholic practice for unorthodoxy, whereas the argument for Catholic belief and practice is in **Sources C and E**, though Askew's argument in **Source E** exposes the argument against Catholic beliefs and practices.

The **argument for the scriptures** is most prominent in the **content of Sources B and D**. Cromwell in **Source B** emphasises the need to instruct the laity in the true meaning of the scriptures as the means to salvation and Henry VIII in **Source D** sees 'that most precious jewel', the true meaning of the scriptures, as essential to a settled religion. Yet the **provenance and context of Sources B and D** are different. Cromwell was himself a reformer who issued the 1538 Injunctions, as Vicegerent, without Henry's official approval but in a time when the reform party was in the ascendancy. His policy was reversed in 1539, changing the context of **Source D** to one of an officially Anglo-Catholic doctrine in line with the King's conservative views, when the conservative faction had some influence. Henry seems to take a moderate line and is concerned with order and his duty to God. The victims of **Sources A and E** are punished for misinterpreting scripture, but from different religious and political affiliations. In both cases, burning of heretics, a Catholic practice, is being used - in the case of **Source A**, untypically against a Roman Catholic. **Source A** also refers to superstitious images being banned and burnt.

The **argument for Catholic beliefs and practices** is most prominent in **Sources C and E**. The content of C and E establishes harsh punishments for those not following Catholic traditions such as transubstantiation, priestly celibacy and confession. The **provenance of Source E** is a personal Protestant account of interrogation and torture, but suggests that Catholic beliefs could be used by the Council as a means to remove political opponents, in the **context** of factional rivalry at Court. The nature and reliability of **Source C** as official statute might be seen to show government attitudes more effectively than the other Sources, whose subjective views are those of individuals. Discussion of the limitations of the Sources as a set might refer to the untypicality of **Sources A and E** and to Cromwell's fall from favour. A supported overall **judgement** is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious and political context. No specific judgement is expected.

**3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-1660
Cromwell and Parliament during the Commonwealth (1649-53)**

- (a) Study Sources B and C**
Compare these Sources as evidence for criticisms made of MPs during the Commonwealth (1649-53). [30]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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 are **similar** in content, in that they both state that some members of parliament tried to gain more power for themselves - in **Source B** 'keep themselves in power' and in **Source C** 'make their party more powerful'. Both Sources charge MPs with ignoring the public good and being corrupt - in **Source B** for 'promoting the corrupt interest of the Presbytery and the lawyers' and **Source C** for 'discrediting others in a number of acts'. In **both Sources**, MPs are said to have upset Cromwell. In both cases, they seem to have been appointed by Cromwell to create a godly society, 'chosen other servants' in **Source B** and 'invariably obey his orders' in **Source C**, but having failed to do so, 'the Lord has done with them' and he has replaced them. Knowledge might be used in evaluation of these points - eg details of Cromwell's religious agenda. The 'tyranny and oppression' mentioned in **Source B** might be linked to the attempt to 'destroy ancient splendour' in **Source C**.

The Sources are also **different** in content. While **Source B** refers to the Rump Parliament, **Source C** refers to the Barebones Parliament. **Source C** suggests that Barebones MPs were warm adherents of Cromwell, whereas there is no suggestion of this in **Source B**. Knowledge of their means of appointment, as 'few persons of quality', might be used to evaluate MPs' actions. **Source B** suggests that Rump MPs favoured Presbyterians, while **Source C** suggests they faced opposition in the Barebones Parliament from some Anabaptist MPs who tried to discredit them. Contextual knowledge might be used to evaluate the influence of religious groups. Whereas, in **Source B**, Cromwell himself is reported to have criticised the Rump, the people are seen as the strongest critics of the Barebones Parliament in **Source C**.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. In tone, Cromwell's 'vile reproaches' in **Source B** might be linked to 'ignorant' and 'disgusting' in **Source C** as negative and emotive language. Ludlow, **Source B**, had reliable inside knowledge, as a Rump MP but had later quarrelled with Cromwell and his memoirs were published with hindsight, whereas the Venetian ambassador was an outsider, but subjective in implying that MPs acted as Cromwell's tools. **Source C**, by its first hand nature as a report, might be seen as more useful or reliable than **Source B** with its hearsay and hindsight.

No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required 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 Cromwell failed to work with the Parliaments of the Commonwealth (1649-53) because of his desire for personal power. [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

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 both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation.

The positive **argument** that Cromwell's problems with his parliaments were **caused by his desire for personal power** appears in **Sources E, C**, to lesser extent **Source A**, and is implied in **D**. **Source E** condemns Cromwell for his ambition to gain the throne, and sees the Barebones Parliament as his corrupt, unconstitutional tool for this, deliberately causing his problems in dealing with parliament so he could seize power. However, the **provenance** and **context** of **Source E** make it unreliable. It is an untypically malicious view, shown in the steer, with a highly emotive and subjective **tone**. The Venetian ambassador in **Source C**, unsupportive of Cromwell, agrees with **Source E** in suggesting that Cromwell sought an excuse to gain power. Knowledge might be used to evaluate this view of his aims. The content of **Source A** suggests that the army pressurised Cromwell into dissolving the Rump. Knowledge might be used to evaluate how far Cromwell's power depended on army support. **Source D** suggests that the Barebones Parliament, like the Rump in **A and B**, attempted to follow its own agenda and failed to co-operate, undermining Cromwell's power. The author of **Source D** blames scandal, hearsay and false reports for its problems, and aims to justify its work. The author of **D** considers Cromwell's dismissal of the Barebones Parliament ending moves towards a 'godly society' and thus unjustifiable, giving specific examples of its actions. This counters the religious view below. Some might infer that Cromwell did not genuinely aim to use Parliament for religious reform, but deferred to public opinion to gain power.

The negative **argument** is that Cromwell's problems with his parliaments were **not caused by his desire for personal power**. Desire for a 'godly society' is in the **content** of **Sources A and B**, and to an extent in **Source D**. Cromwell might be seen to have caused his problems by manipulating the membership of his parliaments for his religious purpose. In **Source B**, Cromwell's purpose is to justify the Rump's dismissal for its own self-seeking in favouring the 'corrupt interest of the Presbyterians'. This idea also appears in the last two sentences of **Source A**, and strongly again at the end of **Source B**. **Sources A and B** suggest that the Rump brought its downfall upon itself by power-seeking self-interest and, in **B**, supporting lawyers and Presbyterians. **Knowledge** of Pride's Purge, the nature and work of the Rump might be used to evaluate this view. The **provenance** of **Sources A and B** should be evaluated - Whitelocke, as a lawyer, being criticised in **Source B** by a Rump MP, later Cromwell's opponent.

A supported overall **judgement** is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of knowledge and Source limitations. 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 2011

