

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Cromwell's refusal of the offer of the crown in 1657. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- Speech by Cromwell, the main individual involved, on his reasons for refusing the Crown. For example, Cromwell refers to ‘providence’ having ‘laid aside the title of king’.
- Cromwell has a clear purpose justifying his actions, for example, in his reference to the question having long been deliberated and the evidence of the years of war being against kingship.
- Speech to Parliament, so shaped by audience who had been at the heart of ‘the issue of ten or twelve years civil war’.

Content and argument

- Cromwell touches upon his perception of his own role.
- Religious reasons given for refusal. Cromwell indicates the rational argument for taking the crown but stresses in the second part of the passage that this is overridden by the religious reasons, the ‘providence’ of God having judged against the title through the judgement of the civil wars.

Tone and Emphasis

- Language indicates Cromwell’s attempts at self-justification. Reference could be made to the first part as an excuse for those in the army as to why he had flirted with the idea of kingship and the civilian Cromwellian approach because of the ‘strong and rational’ argument about the ‘office’ being ‘interwoven with the fundamental laws of the nation’.
- Cromwell’s focus on religious reasons, for example, through his use of language such as, ‘providence’, ‘God’, ‘Jericho’.

- Cromwell makes no direct reference to the opposition of the army but his acknowledgement of the bloodshed and religious reasons as underpinning his providential based refusal of the Crown was a signal to the army that he accepted their position and the decision they had made, for example, in April 1648 at the Windsor Prayer Meeting.
- The tone also could be indicative of Cromwell's own personal struggle with the regicide and then the offer of the crown as a 'reluctant regicide'.

Source B: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- Someone connected to Cromwell as a member of his own troop and therefore well known to Cromwell.
- Representative of army opposition that was predominantly from those of more radical religious views and who appealed to Cromwell on their shared background as members of what they regarded as an army of saints.
- Representative of opposition of religious radicals who appealed directly to Cromwell's own religious radicalism.
- Written a month before Cromwell's refusal of the Crown.

Content and argument

- Reference to army opposition, the 'greatest part of the officers of the army', which is probably a reference to the high profile opposition of the three leading officers, Lambert, Fleetwood and Desborough.
- Appeal to Cromwell's religious beliefs through reference to the 'Lord' and the 'power of God'.
- Reference to their shared experience of battle, particularly the experience of Dunbar where they were heavily outnumbered and Cromwell saw this as providence.
- Bradford is appealing to Cromwell's greater experience and membership of the army and religious radicals over his experience of the civilian Cromwellians.
- Reference is made to previous declarations and engagements, such as the Windsor Prayer Meeting, and the Remonstrance of November 1648, that Cromwell and other officers regarded as covenant documents that bound them against kingship.

Tone and Emphasis

- Implied threat in Bradford's words with reference to army opposition, the power of God or the 'threatening change'.
- Persuasive language used by reference to those he believes Cromwell should trust or Cromwell's known indication to trust in providence.

Source C: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- Official report of an ambassador whose task was to report as fully as possible to Head of State.
- Ambassador sought out information deliberately rather than being a passive observer.
- Outsider, even though with access to political circles through his position as an ambassador. As an outsider it is possible he would have a less subjective view.
- Written at the time of the vote in Parliament.

Content and argument

- Ambassador clear that there was army opposition to the offer of the Crown and is accurate in their isolating of Lambert as the principal army officer opposed to kingship.
- Ambassador convinced that Cromwell would agree which can be set in the context of Cromwell's initial favouring of the scheme and the optimism of the civilian Cromwellians.
- From content it is also clear that Ambassador has taken account of the debates in Parliament and has commented particularly on Fleetwood's intervention.

Tone and Emphasis

- Neutral language of an official report on the whole.
- Ambassador confident in his view/reading of the proceedings, but this was in line with general feeling at the time, thus giving weight to his view. Some of his confidence might, however, be attributed to his need to appear to his employers to be good at his job of finding out and reporting accurate information.
- Quite a negative view of Cromwell, but one that is shared by a lot of contemporaries that he was a hypocrite or adept at shaping his messages to his audiences.

Section B

| | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 2 | 'It was Charles I's stubborn adherence to Divine Right that produced conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.' | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

| | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments in support of the proposition:

- Charles' stress on his Divine Right left little room for manoeuvre in his reaction to criticism
- Charles' prominence in a system of Personal Monarchy meant that he was the key figure
- Charles' prominence in light of the influence of the prerogative meant that he shaped and decided policy in all areas
- Charles' conception of 'opposition' escalated tension because he refused to compromise
- Charles' inability to communicate effectively with Parliament meant that it ceased to function as a point of contact
- Charles' promotion of Montagu in the face of parliamentary calls for impeachment escalated a religious dispute to a constitutional issue during 1625 and 1626
- Charles' use of the Forced Loan as a test of political loyalty turned a financial issue into a constitutional issue
- Charles' manipulation of the judgement in the Five Knights' Case of 1627 escalated the tension over this issue into a constitutional question
- Charles' response to the Petition of Right raised the question of trust in the context of an unwritten constitution in 1628 and 1629
- Charles' protection of Buckingham prevented his use as a scapegoat and a means to relieve pressure in 1626 and 1628.

Arguments challenging the proposition:

- religion caused conflict; specifically Charles' imposition of Arminianism, reference through Montagu, York House Conference or Laud as examples or from the perspective of Puritan radicalism
- foreign policy caused conflict, in particular the impact of the failures at Cadiz and La Rochelle
- Buckingham through his position as 'favourite', but also as Lord High Admiral could be regarded as the focus of MPs anger or as a convenient scapegoat
- finance cause problems as Charles' need for finance to conduct foreign policy put pressure on his relationship with parliament and can be illustrated through reference to tonnage and poundage or the Forced Loan
- parliamentary radicalism can be seen in reaction to Charles' policies but supported by examples such as the Petition of Right or the Three Resolutions.

Good answers may conclude that while Charles' adherence to Divine Right was a very important factor it was the combination of factors, the practical issues, alongside Charles' style of rule that escalated the tension increasingly across the years 1625 to 1629.

- 0 3** How significant were developments in Scotland and Ireland in the years from 1637 to the outbreak of civil war in England in 1642? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments in support of the proposition:

- impact of the Scottish Rebellion, July 1637 in bringing to the surface the underlying discontent that was present in England
- Hampden's Case as caused by the Scottish Rebellion
- Charles's need to call and keep Parliament from 1640 because of the impact of the Bishops' Wars
- political issues caused for Charles by the Bishops' Wars, 1637-40, notably the need for finance or the realisation that a settlement for Scotland had to be linked to some resolution in England
- the Incident of 1641 and the undermining of Charles' position in Scotland as well as the impact of this on his return to Westminster
- impact of the Irish Rebellion of October 1641 in raising the crucial dividing question among MPs and raising the profile and influence of 'King Pym' even further
- political consequences at Westminster of the Irish Rebellion, for example Militia Bill and Grand Remonstrance and their role in the consolidation of a 'royalist party' necessary for war in England.

Arguments challenging the proposition:

- the development of parliamentary radicalism in reaction to the policies of Charles or specific example such as the Bill of Attainder
- the failure of settlement, such as Bedford's Bridging appointments
- the development of two sides from Constitutional Royalism in reaction to the development of parliamentary radicalism. Reference may be made to individuals such as Hyde or to the concept through the Answer to the 19 Propositions
- the continuing influence of the actions of Charles I, through examples such as the Five Members' Coup
- the activities of religious radicals in the period March to August 1642.

Good answers may conclude that while events in Scotland and Ireland were important in leading to a crisis events in England, particularly the division as a result of the Irish Rebellion, led to the two sides necessary for civil war in England. The actions of the religious radicals after March 1642 turned the division in to conflict.

0 4 To what extent was the regicide a religious rather than a political act?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments in support of the proposition:

- the Windsor Prayer meeting of April 1648 may be referenced as a key turning point in the public espousal of regicide by key millenarians in the army, particularly the influential Thomas Harrison. This may include reference to the use of the Book of Numbers or the description of Charles as ‘that man of blood’
- providence as a key influence in the thinking of leading figures such as Cromwell in their reflection on the defeat of Charles in both wars or Cromwell’s own self-perception of himself as Gideon
- Charles’ repositioning himself as a martyr, notably during his trial, gave him a religious impulse to accept his own death
- religious elements of the Heads of the Proposals, especially related to episcopacy, indicate the religious influence of officers like Ireton and Lambert when considering settlement
- religious elements of the Remonstrance drafted by Ireton show providential thinking and the clear argument that God had judged Charles
- Pride’s Purge as a religious judgement on MPs opposed to the regicide, reference possibly being made to their confinement in ‘Hell’ by the godly officers who organised the Purge.

Arguments challenging the proposition:

- Regicide was an act of political necessity in light of Charles’ approach to the Irish Catholics to start a Third Civil War that came to light during the trial
- failure of the attempts at settlement with Charles from the Newcastle Propositions, Head of Proposals and continuing negotiations of the Newport Treaty
- negotiations over the Newport Treaty were seen as a threat by the New Model Army, especially after Parliament’s vote of 5 December 1648
- removal of Charles could lead to a development of settlement
- division between Parliament and the New Model Army, especially from the politicisation of the army in 1646
- the impact of the Second Civil War on Parliament and Army in their approach to settlement. The consequent division between the two became a factor in the approach to regicide.

Good answers may conclude that while the regicide was caused by religious and political factors it was a combination of both, driven by the actions of Charles I, that triggered the army leadership, notably Ireton, Harrison and Cromwell, to take action against Parliament and execute Charles I. Furthermore some candidates may stress the fundamental link between religion and politics in the seventeenth century and that for many contemporaries such as Cromwell such a distinction is anachronistic.