



---

History 7042  
Specimen Question Paper 2E (A-level)  
Question 01 Student 1  
Specimen Answer and Commentary

V1.0

---

**Specimen answer plus commentary**

The following student response is intended to illustrate approaches to assessment. This response has not been completed under timed examination conditions. It is not intended to be viewed as a 'model' answer and the marking has not been subject to the usual standardisation process.

**Paper 2E (A-level): Specimen question paper**

**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 regicide of 1649.

**[30 marks]**

**Student response**

Source A as a reflection by a Captain in the New Model Army who was present at the crucial Windsor Prayer Meeting when the army reflected on Charles Stuart as 'that man of blood' is clearly valuable to an historian in considering the regicide of 1649. The meeting was a key turning point in the army moving to consider regicide as a reaction to Charles' failure to negotiate with them seriously over their Heads of Proposals and his subsequent Engagement which sparked the Second Civil War that they were to face following Windsor. An historian would, however, take care with Allen's account as he constructed his reflections in 1659 in the light of a possible Restoration and was trying to rally the anti-monarchical opinion in the New Model by reminding them of their stance in 1648.

In Source A Allen comments on the religious reflection at Windsor that and the army's guilt at their moving away from their godly motivation in presenting Charles with the Heads of Proposals. Allen is also clear that at Windsor the army made a clear judgement that if God allowed them to be successful again in the Second Civil War that they faced they would be in the right in calling Charles Stuart 'to account for all the blood he had shed'. It is therefore useful for an historian in showing the importance of the Windsor Prayer meeting as a turning point in leading to the regicide as the army were central in enacting it.

Allen's tone in Source A clearly is valuable to an historian in illustrating the religious mind set of many in the New Model that allowed them to justify committing regicide. Allen's reflection indicates how important providence was in convincing the New Model that they had been given the right to enact regicide. Yet an historian would also take care to reflect on Allen as being representative of the more millenarian elements of the New Model rather than the whole of the army. In this his views could be seen a valuable as a reflection of key millenarian figures in the regicide like Ireton and Harrison.

An historian would clearly see Source B as valuable as an exchange at the trial that led to Charles I execution. While it is limited by being only an element of the exchanges at the trial it is useful in that it focuses on the complete breakdown between Charles and those prosecuting him indicating that there was no hope for the trial being a last form of attempted settlement. Charles directly challenges the authority of the court a reflection on the strength of his conviction in his own prerogative but perhaps also useful for an historian looking at the regicide in the context of Charles accepting by this stage the position of a martyr. Charles stance at his trial as indicated in Source B could also be regarded as useful in showing how necessity was vital in leading to the regicide, in that leading figures like Cromwell who some have regarded as a 'reluctant regicide' saw now that they had no choice but to execute Charles as he was not prepared even when on trial to negotiate. In commenting on this source an historian might also

use Bradshaw's aggressive tone to contrast with Charles's rather more cool statement of his position. Bradshaw's tone could be viewed as a reflection of the frustration many felt with Charles by this stage.

An historian would find Source C useful as the reflection of the wife of a regicide but would be careful because she constructed this account later after the Restoration. They would be particularly careful because of this later construction with comments on the role of Cromwell but that Hutchinson strongly justifies her husband's own action could be useful in showing the strength of feeling of the regicides, even if she is still seeking to justify what he did.

Source B could also be useful in terms of evidence of the later excuses of some regicides that they had been intimidated by Cromwell. This content clearly links to Hutchinson's construction at the Restoration when regicides like Ingoldsby sought to excuse themselves and ingratiate themselves with Charles II. Source B's tone also indicates, like Source A, that religious and a reflection on providence was a driving force for those contemplating regicide. Source C indicates that the regicides were concerned about being called themselves by God 'to answer for all the blood' of they did not make Charles pay for this. Like Source A this source is also useful in showing that they blamed Charles for the bloodshed caused and thus deserved to be executed.

### **Commentary – Level 5**

This response shows a very good understanding of each of the three sources. It comments for all three sources directly on provenance, content and tone. All the sources are supported by contextual knowledge, although this is stronger for source A than the other two sources and there is clearly some room for the development of deployment of own knowledge as part of the assessment of the value of these sources. Judge ment is made on the strengths and limits of each source.