
HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/05E

Paper 5E Special Subject: The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 3: 8–10 marks

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 1: 1–3 marks

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18 marks

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 2: 7–12 marks

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 1: 1–6 marks

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

- 1 (a) **How far does Document B corroborate the interpretation of the origins of the Irish Rebellion as presented in Document D?** [10]

Document D makes two claims: that the rebellion was 'framed and contrived' in England; and that the rebels claimed to be acting on the authority of the King and called themselves the 'Queen's army' (there is some corroboration for this impression in Document B). Moreover, the implication is that the rebels are acting in concert with 'English Papists'. Document B claims that the King has commanded his Irish subjects to take possession of strongholds in Ireland and to seize the property of English Protestants. Further, it is claimed that the King has apprised the rebels of the 'affronts' perpetrated by the English Protestants and Parliament against the King and Catholics. By claiming royal authority O'Neill refutes the charge of the Irish being 'rebels' as stated in D. So the origins of events in Ireland are presented differently; this is not a rebellion but a response to orders given by lawful authority. From contextual knowledge candidates should be able to assess the reliability of both documents, particularly over the issue of the King encouraging a rising in his name. Certainly Charles had negotiated with Ormonde and Antrim in order to raise a royalist army in Ireland but these negotiations were not, in fact, pursued. Nevertheless, many rebels believed that they did, indeed, act in the King's name. Both documents should also be evaluated in terms of authorship, audience and dating.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the breach between King and Parliament was the result of religious controversy? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

Document E argues that the ‘strongest ideological drive behind the opposition to the King in the 1640s was religious zeal’ and sees the cause of Parliamentaryism as being linked with that of Puritanism. However, Coward also points out the political, constitutional and financial grievances of the pre-1640 period. The attack on Finch (as recorded in Document A) is concerned entirely with what might be seen as constitutional and legal matters. As Speaker, Finch had ‘gagged the Commonwealth’ and is also charged with abuses of royal power during the period of personal rule. Candidates may point out that, although Falkland was later a Royalist, he might be regarded as an oppositional MP in the Long Parliament; and he was one of those who demanded reform of the episcopacy (a religious issue).

The references to Catholics and Protestants in Document B demonstrate the importance of religion to events in Ireland; and opinion in England was influenced by the prospect of ‘Papist rebellion’ which, it was feared, could lead to an invasion of England itself. This religious dimension is also made clear in Document D (i). Candidates should demonstrate the importance of the Irish rebellion to the widening breach between Crown and Parliament. Strong prejudices were raised in England, not only against ‘Papists’ but also against ‘the Irish’. It might be pointed out that the Irish had other grievances, besides religion, which had arisen out of Strafford’s rule as Lord Deputy. The need to put down the Irish rebellion also raised crucial issues about the raising, command and control of the armed forces. Could the King be trusted to do so? For Parliament to take on this function would be a fundamental challenge to the royal prerogative. Document D (i) could be used alongside B in discussing the significance of the Irish Rebellion.

In the portion of the Grand Remonstrance set out in Document C, grievances over religion are given prominence. However, the Remonstrance also condemns the ‘malignant design of subverting the fundamental laws and principles of government’ and the influence of counsellors and courtiers who have sought to divide the King from his subjects over matters of ‘prerogative and liberty’ and to ‘further the interests of some foreign princes’. Document D (ii) raises the issue of breach of privilege and helps to corroborate portions of C. Using contextual knowledge, candidates may be expected to put forward views to support or to counter the proposition suggested by the question.

On the one hand, candidates could argue that the reign of Charles had seen the intensification of conflict between Puritanism and Arminianism/Laudianism and there were deep suspicions surrounding a Catholic queen and a Catholic party at Court. Shorter-term issues such as the Root and Branch Petition and the Bishops’ Exclusion Bill might also be brought into the argument. On the other hand, candidates might wish to indicate other interpretations of the breach between King and Parliament, for example, structural social and economic issues (a broadly socialist/Marxist historiographical approach); Ins v. Outs, Court v. Country, Provinces v. the Centre, a Noble Revolt; the period of personal rule; shorter-term events such as the Militia Bill (most if not all of these approaches have echoes in this set of documents). Finally, candidates may draw attention to the close connections between religion and politics in this period.

2 How much personal responsibility should Charles I bear for the defeat of his cause in the First Civil War? [30]

AO1/AO2 – A narrative account of the First Civil War, even with some relevant comment, should not score highly. Nevertheless, examples of battles, sieges, negotiations and other events will help to illustrate the argument. Candidates should consider the King's role, covering strategic, military, political and diplomatic issues. They should also look for a balance, the responsibility of other individuals on the Royalist side, the strengths of Parliament, the balance of resources, the element of chance. Answers might begin by discussing responsibility for not preventing the outbreak of war in the first place, for example, the failure of the Nineteen Propositions. The extent of the support for Charles on raising his standard was disappointing but the King was not entirely to blame for this and, meanwhile, his greater supporters were generous with donations. Candidates could criticise the choice of a commander in the early stages (Lindsey) but the King should be given credit for the appointment of Rupert as demonstrated at Edgehill (although there must be some reservations about him in the war overall), Hopton and Newcastle. The strategy of retaking London was sound but candidates could criticise the delay in advancing on the capital. Nevertheless, the decision to withdraw was wise and there is much to be said for setting up the royal capital in Oxford. Even so, the failure to secure an early victory in 1642 was costly.

Charles may be given credit for the strategy of 1643, when considerable success was gained. However, it might be argued that these successes were not properly exploited and that the King failed to exert a proper control of his commanders in the North and the West. Indiscipline and plunder by Royalist forces alienated support and the King must bear some responsibility for this. In terms of diplomacy, the King failed to gain effective support from Europe and Ireland. Although this was not entirely his fault, it was his policy. Meanwhile, the Scots allied with Parliament. Throughout the War the King failed to negotiate favourable terms with Parliament (notably in 1643 and in the aftermath of his final military defeat). An important reason was the King's own duplicity. Divisions among the King's own commanders and advisers (for example, Rupert and Digby) were never fully resolved and this weakened the royal cause. Candidates should also assess the extent of the King's responsibility for the crucial defeats at Marston Moor and Naseby. Candidates may argue that Charles was not a trained soldier, although his failings go beyond the purely military. Important in finding the balance is the debate as to whether the King's defeat was largely a matter of his own weaknesses and failings or Parliament's greater strengths. Candidates might also explore the issue of the point where the King's cause was clearly lost.

3 Explain the failure of attempts made to establish a political and constitutional settlement in the period between the First and Second Civil Wars. [30]

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should not take a narrative and descriptive approach but they should be aware of the significant events and stages of the identified period (say, from May 1646 when the King left Oxford to surrender to the Scots at Newark to the invasion by the Scots of England in July 1648). Candidates should take a thematic line but some of the following events should be considered: the Propositions of Newcastle (July 1646); the abolition of bishops (October 1646); Parliament's vote to disband the New Model Army (May 1647); the seizure of the King by Joyce (June 1647); the Putney Debates (October 1647); the King's escape to the Isle of Wight (November 1647); the King's Engagement with the Scots (December 1647); the 'vote of no addresses' (January 1648); and the Royalist Rising in South Wales (March 1648).

In approaching the question in terms of issues and themes, candidates should refer to: Charles I's belief that no settlement was possible without him and his determination to maintain the Church and his own position; the King's duplicity and the failure of negotiation (the Uxbridge 'treaty', the propositions of Newcastle, the negotiations at Caversham in summer 1647); the divisions within the 'Parliamentary coalition' and its breakdown over political, constitutional and religious issues and matters of the rights of citizens and soldiers; the power of the Army, its radicalisation, its disputes with Parliament, the divisions between Grandees and Agitators/Levellers; the willingness of the Scots to come to an agreement with the King; and substantial remaining support for the Royalist cause. Candidates should consider whether any settlement was possible without a complete break with the traditional constitution; how much responsibility should be borne by the King; and once the Army became the principal political force in the country, whether any settlement was possible without its support.

4 How accurate is the judgement that the execution of Charles I was ‘a cruel necessity’? [30]

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should engage in a wide-ranging discussion concerning explanations for the King’s execution and the motives of those responsible. It is not easy to account for the trial and execution of the King, partly because of the nature of the evidence. The various solutions proposed for ‘the problem of the King’ reveal the divisions within the Parliamentary coalition. Moderates were in favour of another attempt at a settlement, partly on the grounds that the King had learned his lesson. The Commons voted to continue negotiations even after Charles had rejected the ‘Newport proposals’. Another view was that the King should be exiled. By contrast, elements in the Army demanded a court martial or that Charles should be shot out of hand. There are some indications as to why the King was executed in the charges made against him. He had placed his ‘personal interest’ above ‘the public interest, common right, liberty, justice and peace of the people of this nation’ and he was responsible for ‘all treasons, murders, rapines, burnings, spoils, desolations, damages and mischiefs done to this nation’. There were both pragmatic and ideological arguments for the regicide. The King’s death was a necessity as a matter of political reality. Since Charles had escaped from Hampton Court he had allied with the Scots, proved untrustworthy in negotiations, supported a second civil war and rejected the Newport proposals (as late as December 1648). Ideological arguments were to do with ‘providence’. The King was seen as ‘the man of blood’, the contriver of the renewed war, ‘the capital and grand author of all our troubles’. Charles was a sinful man without whose death God’s blessing would not be regained.

Candidates should consider a range of explanations and motives and the conflicting evidence as to precisely why Charles was executed and who was responsible. They could argue that much of the answer to the nature of motives and fixing responsibility lies in the Army – the most potent and radical force in the country (although even the Army was not united). Pride’s Purge (an Army *coup d’état*) might be seen as the necessary preparation for trial and execution. Candidates could argue that once a trial was agreed, execution was bound to follow.

