
A-LEVEL

History

Component 2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

Version: 1.0 Final

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

June 2017

A-level

Component 2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Section A

- 01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the execution of King Charles I.

[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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as charges against the King, drawn up by Ireton and others in the army's leadership, the source will present a negative view of Charles and his actions
- charges were presented at Charles' trial in January 1649 as a means of justifying the trial and possible execution as an outcome to the audience at the trial, to the judges and for later wider circulation
- the tone and emphasis is shaped to place the guilt on Charles as can be seen through use of language such as 'wicked'.

Content and argument

- reference to the monarch as Charles Stuart, thereby linking back to the Windsor Prayer meeting and the New Model millenarians argument for Charles as 'that man of blood' as start of the process leading to the trial and regicide
- first part is linked to the view of the nature of kingship in England as a way of justifying how a monarch could be brought to trial and removed
- charges also shaped in the context of presenting the absolutist intentions and threat of Charles
- experience of Second Civil War and execution of leading royalists, for example, at Colchester, set up the argument put forward in the charges of Charles' guilt as the leader of that party and holding chief responsibility for the bloodshed.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- written after the execution by bishop John Gauden to appear as if it was Charles' defence of his position
- designed to reinforce the image of Charles as a martyr to the people of England, as illustrated by language shaping message directly to 'My People', 'My Subjects'
- shaped in tone and emphasis in response to counter the charges produced against Charles at his trial, to portray that event and subsequent execution as the act of a radical minority acting illegally and against Divine will.

Content and argument

- royalist arguments, subsequently and that of Charles during the process leading to the regicide, was that a minority were set on his death and were not enacting the will of the majority
- royalist argument carried weight and Eikon Basilike was extremely popular, going through a number of reprints. Even the regicides recognised and were proud of their position as a minority as they regarded this as a clear sign of their godliness
- argument of usurpation became increasingly influential against the Rump as it sought to perpetuate itself in power and was a particularly telling charge later against Cromwell
- presents Charles as willing to negotiate and others not. Elements of this counter his actions with regard to the Heads of the Proposals or the Engagement but are presented here in light of the Newport Treaty to appeal more directly to the conservative political nation.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as Clarendon was a leading constitutional royalist, a member of Charles I's war councils and after 1660, principal advisor to Charles II, he would present a negative view of the regicide
- Clarendon was not present at the events he describes and constructed his account at a later date
- Clarendon places the emphasis on Cromwell's role and uses tone to indicate the limited actual support for the execution of the King.

Content and argument

- Cromwell did have a leading role up to the trial and was a dominant figure
- Cromwell was seen as having benefitted most from the regicide and later accounts thus projected backwards to reflect on his motives in removing Charles
- there were members of the commissioners at the trial who did not sign the warrant and others who even refused to attend, e.g. Fairfax
- Ingoldsby gave this account at the Restoration, but did so in the knowledge he faced retribution for his signature on the death warrant.

Section B

- 02** How significant was parliamentary radicalism in the breakdown of relations 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/factors suggesting how significant parliamentary radicalism was in the breakdown of Crown and Parliament relations in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- Parliament's approach to finance may be regarded as an example of radicalism, e.g. tonnage and poundage, funding of foreign policy or, more generally, using finance as a means to address grievances or manipulate policy
- Parliament's attempts to impeach Montagu and Buckingham may be regarded as examples of radicalism in attempted subverting of the prerogative
- Parliament's use of the Petition of Right could be seen as a radical reaction to the Five Knights' Case
- Parliament's use of the Three Resolutions was a statement critical of Charles' policies and the manner of its declaration was also a radical action.

Arguments/factors challenging how significant parliamentary radicalism was in the breakdown of Crown and Parliament relations in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- the Petition of Right, rather than a Bill of Rights, indicates the majority in Parliament were not radical
- key individuals in Parliament were influential in shaping radicalism and Charles recognised this when he released his Declaration in March 1629
- Charles' role was central in a Personal Monarchy system and particularly with regard to his style of rule where he escalated practical issues in to constitutional ones
- the impact of Arminianism; of foreign policy and of Buckingham.

Students will illustrate parliamentary radicalism but will balance this with other factors and show the inter-relation between them, for example, how foreign policy was a religious and finance issue for Parliament but also raised the question of Buckingham as favourite through his appointment as Lord High Admiral. Stronger responses may comment on the reactive nature of the relationship between Crown and Parliament but also Charles' central role in a time of Personal Monarchy as the initiator of policies, the supporter of Buckingham and Montagu and, through his style of rule, the source of the escalation of some practical issues in to more serious constitutional ones.

- 03** How seriously did Puritan opposition to Laudianism challenge the authority of Charles I in the years 1633 to 1640? **[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/factors suggesting that Puritan opposition to Laudianism seriously challenged the authority of Charles I in the years 1633 to 1640 might include:

- limited Puritan open opposition masked broader underlying discontent
- Puritan opposition figures were part of a broader Puritan network
- some punishments provoked broader sympathy and concern at Charles' rule
- emigration was a form of opposition and the Companies facilitating emigration also functioned as networks of opposition.

Arguments/factors challenging the extent that Puritan opposition to Laudianism was a serious threat to the authority of Charles I in the years 1633 to 1640 might include:

- there were limited examples of Puritan opposition
- individual examples were the actions of radical Puritans such as Lilburne
- Charles managed the examples of opposition without provoking broader opposition
- Puritans were emigrating rather than opposing Charles.

On the surface, Puritans as a minority may be regarded as not posing a serious threat to Charles' authority. Charles' regime survived until 1640. Students may, however, stress the growing underlying discontent and how Puritans were merely the first group who would react to the breaking of the Jacobethan balance, and other Calvinists shared growing concern at Charles' apparent drift towards Catholicism and absolutism. Some may also reference the Scottish Rebellion as part of this as a turning point, a serious threat to his authority, and trigger for the underlying discontent in England to come more in to the open.

- 04** ‘Monarchy was restored in 1660 not because of what Charles II did but because of the actions of others after the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658.’

Assess the validity of this view

[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/factors suggesting that monarchy was restored in 1660 not because of what Charles II did but because of the actions of others after the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658 might include:

- Charles Stuart was invited back in to England, to become Charles II, by the conservative political nation through Monck and Fairfax rather than initiating his return
- the regimes after Cromwell were divided and factional infighting undermined their authority
- fear of the Quakers and their links with Lambert further developed the reactive process of Constitutional Royalism in the period after 1658 and this was key in allowing the Restoration to take place
- the division of the New Model Army, personified in a conflict between Lambert and Monck, the respective real leading generals in 1659–60, dating back to 1644, fatally weakened resistance to the Restoration.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that monarchy was restored in 1660 not because of what Charles II did but because of the actions of others after the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658 might include:

- Charles Stuart had established links with Monck and others post-1658 to seek military help to recover the throne and become Charles II
- Clarendon's Declaration of Breda, but also Charles' acceptance of the stance it outlined, was key in further convincing the conservative political elite that monarchy was a solution to apparent developing anarchy of 1659–60
- Charles had the key advantage of legitimacy
- Charles was pragmatic in 1660 to secure his throne in shaping it to include even those who had supported Interregnum regimes.

Students should be able to show a balance between internal collapse and how Charles was able to take advantage of this through his links with Monck. Stress should be placed on the role of Monck through his command of a remodelled Scottish New Model that was a more conservative force, as a result, than the forces commanded by Lambert in England. Strong responses will show the importance of Constitutional Royalism in reaction to the Quaker fear and economic problems. Comment on Charles' actions may also be developed, in relation to the little he did was to his advantage, as it allowed his stance to be interpreted positively by the political nation in light of the platitudes of Clarendon's Declaration of Breda.