



History

Paper 2E (AS) Specimen Question Paper

Question 01 Student 1

Specimen Answer and Commentary

V1.0 26/02/16

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 (AS): Specimen question paper

01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why there was a breakdown between Crown and Parliament by 1629?

[25 marks]

Student response

Source A is of value in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629 because it comes from Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. Although Hyde was considered a royalist, he was not uncritical of the crown, voicing his concerns over the collection of ship money and criticising Charles' continued use of Royal Prerogative during the 11 year personal rule, and from 1641 was advisor to the crown. This means source A is of value in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629 because one gets more than simply the crown's perspective: instead one receives the perspective of a more liberal royalist, someone close to the King but not so much that the information within source A is limited. The language used is explanatory and seemingly calm, 'And very many,' 'there was,' perhaps because Clarendon was not an MP during the parliaments leading up to 1629 therefore has a lesser emotional investment in the period. Source A is useful in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629 because it discusses the wrongdoing of the King, such as the misuse of Royal prerogative leading up to the petition of right. The Five Knights' case was the final misuse of Royal Prerogative that parliament would take, where Charles had infringed upon the ancient liberty of Habeas Corpus, and 'committed to prison' five men for 'refusing to pay' the unlawful forced loan he had ordered through the use of Royal Prerogative. Source A shows how this conflict arose: that the five knights would 'meet again in parliament' and naturally would want an 'inquiry into their own rights'. For Charles to be as presumptuous as to believe that parliament would not, and more importantly should not, be able to demand an inquiry as to whether their ancient liberties had been infringed by Charles' use of Royal Prerogative is symptomatic of why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629: both had very different ideas as to how the ancient liberties were applied and how Royal Prerogative should be used. Therefore source A is valuable in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament because it is a reflective and piece explaining the events leading up to the dissolution of the parliament of 1629.

However, source A does have its limitations. The fact that Hyde was not an MP in the parliaments leading up to 1629 could mean that his summary of the events prior to the Petition of Right is weak in portraying the tone and feelings of MPs as accurately as a witness to the events as they unfolded.

Source B is valuable in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629 because it comes from King Charles, whose actions were at the heart of the conflict between crown and parliament. Since 1625 Charles had been dissolving parliament in order to prevent it being able to impeach the Duke of Buckingham, causing growing animosity as parliament could not air its grievances properly. However, after the Duke of Buckingham's assassination, more issues arose, most significantly Charles' continued use of Royal Prerogative and the resulting infringement upon

the ancient liberty of Habeas Corpus through imprisoning 76 gentlemen. Five of which applied to the Court of King's Bench for a writ of Habeas Corpus- this failed and the five knights were returned to prison. This resulted in MPs creating the Petition of Right, reiterating the way existing laws protected their liberties. With this contextual knowledge, source B is valuable in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629 because the tone of source B is aggressive and accusatory, using language such as 'ignorant' and 'tolerated'. Specifically, in source B Charles accuses parliament of extending 'their privileges' of 'late years'. This is a reference to innovation, which was feared greatly by both Crown and parliament. However Parliament was simply applying existing legislation in its creation of The Petition of Right, thereby avoiding innovation. This fact, that crown and parliament disagreed on what constituted innovation, indicates why there was a breakdown between Crown and Parliament by 1629: Charles and parliament had fundamental disagreements. These disagreements extended to the use of Royal Prerogative, which Charles saw as part of his Divine Right to rule, and which parliament saw as a means for Charles to rule as an absolute monarch. So, from source B one can learn that the differing attitudes between Crown and Parliament on how England should be governed were a cause of the breakdown between Crown and Parliament by 1629. However, a limitation of Source B is that it is a declaration, designed to persuade others towards the attitude of the King, therefore may not be completely accurate.

In conclusion, source A is more useful in explaining why there was a breakdown between Crown and Parliament by 1629 because it is an explanatory source created years after events leading up to 1629, so it is more objective than source B, as well as being more informative due to its nature of being extracted from a document explaining the British civil war. In contrast, source B is created purely to sway others towards the King's opinion and accept the justification of his actions, so it is based more on opinion than fact. The consequences for source B would be greater than source A as source B came from the King so had to serve the purpose of justifying his actions, whereas source A is educational and would have no negative consequences for Clarendon as it was published after his death so could be a more unfiltered account of explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629. Therefore source A is more valuable in explaining why there was a breakdown between crown and parliament by 1629.

Commentary – Level 4

This is an effective response. It is direct, it makes useful and generally accurate comment on provenance and tone and deploys knowledge of context to the assessment of value. It also reaches a clear and generally persuasive conclusion as to relative value. There is some lack of development of the insightful comments that are made about the issues of the period and there the assessment of Source A is more convincing than that of Source B, but overall, a strong L4 response which, with some development, could have achieved Level 5.