

A-LEVEL

History

Component 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702
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 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to James I's views on monarchy. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. 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 assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

Extract A: In their identification of Smith's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Smith has a generally positive interpretation of James' views on monarchy
- James was very careful in defining what kingship involved to make clear the duties of a monarch and communicated this to the Political Nation through Parliament
- James recognised that his views on monarchy needed to be set in the context of his interaction with the political elite
- James' pragmatism made his views on monarchy suitable to the nuances of the constitution.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- James enjoyed intellectual debate and wrote on the theory of kingship but did distinguish between the theory of divine right and the reality of ruling, for example, the willingness to allow the Monopoly Act
- James kept an open court as a reflection of his character but also so that it served as a 'point of contact' to allow monarchy to function in alliance with the political elite rather than as an absolute monarch as some of his writings or speeches first indicated
- James' speech of 1610 was a deliberate political show by James to make the point to Parliament, in the context of the Great Contract, that he was a divine right monarch but understood the importance of co-operation with Parliament
- James' reference to the Commons as a 'House of Hell' in 1610 shows the difference between his public expression of the views of monarchy and his private anger when his prerogative was questioned.

Extract B: In their identification of Davies' argument, students may refer to the following:

- James' 'persistence' in his expression of his views on monarchy led to a defensive reaction by Parliament in stating their 'rights'
- James stated clearly the extent of his powers in relation to his subjects and the limits to the right to resistance
- James stated clearly the extent to which he could make laws without Parliament
- Ultimately, James did not pursue the theory he outlined too aggressively in reality as he lacked the will to do so.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- James did believe he had the right and intellect to educate and lecture to his people through his prerogative position as the source of the law

- There were repeated instances of James making clear to Parliament his powers – through dissolution or grander statements, as in 1621 when he ripped the Commons' Protestation from the Commons' Journal
- James' limited pursuit of the theoretical powers he outlined was not just because of laziness but also his pragmatic realisation of the political controversy that it would spark. This can be seen in his tempering of his statements in, for example, in the second part of his speech of March 1610.

Extract C: In their identification of Hill's argument, students may refer to the following:

- James was a capable politician who expressed his views on monarchy well aware of the political benefits of using such statements rather than being 'tactless' and not understanding the English constitution
- James was not any different from Elizabeth in his views but did express them more often and more forcibly
- James used his statements to push Parliament in to challenging him
- James claimed an absolute prerogative right in an emergency.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- James was a very pragmatic monarch who could distinguish between the theory of his statements and when he needed to compromise, as can be seen with the Buckinghamshire Election Dispute or Shirley's Case
- James' speeches were carefully crafted for political ends rather than intellectual discourse
- James manipulated parliament in 1621–22 over their right of free speech to try to achieve the Spanish Match, resulting in the 1621 Commons' Protestation.

Section B

- 02** ‘Charles I addressed the financial weaknesses of the Crown, in the years 1625 to 1640, more successfully than James I, in the years 1603 to 1625.’

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 supporting the view that Charles I addressed the financial weaknesses of the Crown, in the years 1625 to 1640, more successfully than James I, in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- Charles moved from being £2 million in debt in 1629 to only £18,000 by 1635
- Charles made productive use of prerogative income after 1629, for example, forest fines and particularly Ship Money
- Charles was able to rule without Parliament until 1640, thereby illustrating his relative financial strength
- James was in financial difficulty throughout his reign with various attempts by his ministers to control him, for example, the Book of Bounty

Arguments challenging the view that Charles I addressed the financial weaknesses of the Crown, in the years 1625 to 1640, more successfully than James I, in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- Charles did not attempt to address the structural weaknesses of the Crown's financial position
- Charles' financial policies were shaped more by his desire to avoid Parliament than addressing weaknesses, for example, peace with France and Spain
- James did attempt to reform the system in 1610 through the Great Contract
- Charles' methods were unpopular and created growing underlying discontent, illustrated by the Hampden Case and reaction to it
- James made productive use of forms of prerogative income, such as Impositions and Monopolies

James' extravagance increasingly put him in debt and was also one of the reasons why the major attempt at reform, the Great Contract, failed. Charles, through the use of prerogative income, after 1629, did put himself in a stronger financial position than James by 1640. Yet, Charles' methods alienated the political nation in contrast to James' methods being a means through which he manipulated many of the elite. Charles never resolved the structural weaknesses and by 1640 recognised the need for parliamentary finance.

- 03** How successfully did the rulers of England deal with religious radicalism in the years 1637 to 1667? **[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 supporting the success of English rulers in dealing with religious radicalism in England in the years 1637 to 1667 might include:

- despite the Scottish Rebellion there was no major religious rebellions in England
- Cromwellian Church 1653–1658 imposed more control over religion in comparison to 1637 to 1653
- the control reimposed by the conservative political nation through the Clarendon Code limited threat of religious radicals after 1660
- the developing introspection of millenarian Puritanism as a reaction to the Restoration of 1660 meant that it was less of a threat to Charles II, as seen by the Quakers or an individual like Milton, and therefore easier to deal with successfully through the Quaker Act.

Arguments challenging the success of English rulers in dealing with religious radicalism in the years 1637 to 1667 might include:

- the post-Cromwell explosion of the Quaker threat in the years 1658 to 1660 was a more serious concern for the rulers of England than during the Protectorate
- 1637 to 1660 was a period of the most intense religious radicalism, perhaps in English history, as illustrated by the role in Scottish Presbyterians in alliance with English Puritans bringing about the collapse of Charles' regime, the role of millenarians in the regicide or the emergence of groups like the Baptists, Fifth Monarchists, Ranters and Quakers
- the religious radicals held power 1647 to 1660
- the very nature of the Clarendon Code created a broader non-conformity that was a greater political issue for Charles II than it needed to be
- Venner's Rising of 1661 and underground plotting through the Restoration remained an issue for Charles.

In general, religion did appear to become less of a direct issue after 1660 because of the collapse of interregnum and thereby the direct political influence of religious radicalism. The political nation, rather than Charles, reimposed a narrow Anglican Church and reinforced this through the Clarendon Code. Radicalism itself changed in response to the Restoration, the key example being the Quakers, but by narrowing the Church it could be argued the regime itself maintained religious non-conformity as more of a threat than it needed to be.

04 ‘From absolutism to constitutional monarchy.’

Assess the validity of this view of the monarchy in the years 1678 to 1702. **[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 supporting the transition of monarchy from absolutism to constitutional in the years 1678 to 1702 might include:

- the Glorious Revolution changed the relationship between Crown and Political Nation
- the Financial Revolution was the real root of the shift of power towards Parliament through the 1693 creation of a national debt and the 1694 creation of the Bank of England, underwritten by Parliament
- William's wars with France and the priority he gave to them made him willing to see the transfer of power to Parliament
- Parliament became an institution more than an event as a result of William's wars and the financial revolution
- Parliament had more control through key legislation: 1690 an Act established a Commission of Public Account; 1693 Land Tax; 1694 Triennial Act; 1698 Civil List Act; 1701 Act of Settlement
- the Crown had to accept ministers who gave them parliamentary support
- Parliament began to oversee foreign policy.

Arguments challenging the transition of monarchy from absolutism to constitutional in the years 1678 to 1702 might include:

- the monarchy was not absolutist in 1678, as shown by the Exclusion Crisis, and actually became closest to being absolutist, on the surface, in the years 1681 to 1685
- there was still a working alliance between the monarchy and the political nation that continued to serve both of their interests through the whole period
- the monarchy in 1702 still had few restrictions on them and remained powerful and the key institution
- power shifted within the elite after 1688 rather than there being a constitutional monarchy
- the changes after 1688 could be seen as merely the formalisation of the influence the Political Nation always held over the monarchy
- Declaration of Rights was transferred in to a more limited Bill of Rights
- William could be seen as more powerful in 1702 because he was in charge of a more powerful state.

The monarchy did change in this period, predominantly after 1688. This was driven by the European priorities of William of Orange. The greater role of Parliament due to financial revolution brought about the most fundamental change as England became a 'fiscal-military state'. While the power of the monarch was more limited than in 1678, through the institutionalisation of Parliament as a result of the financial revolution, the monarch was still powerful. In 1702, as in 1678, the political nation retained the key influence they had always held but had now formalised it more through increasing the importance of Parliament.