



AS History

7041/2E-The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Component 2E The origins of the English Civil War, 1625–1642

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

The English Revolution, 1625–1660**Component 2E The origins of the English Civil War, 1625–1642****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining divisions within the Political Nation by 1642?

[25 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- Ludlow was very pro-Parliament, an activist in Parliament's armies and religious radical who supported the regicide. This context limits the value of his account of his decision with regard to allegiance as a view for the wider political nation, although this is balanced by Ludlow's opening that does relate to the breadth of concerns in 1640
- Ludlow constructed his Memoirs later having seen the civil war and regicide and himself moved to a republican position and thus also wrote in explaining the stance he took
- tone of Ludlow's justification for his stance is shaped against Charles and is illustrated by the use of terms such as 'mischiefs'.

Content and argument

- Ludlow expresses the concerns many MPs came to Parliament in 1640 with in regard to the Personal Rule and whether Charles would address their grievances. This is seen in the general unity of MPs in the abolition of Star Chamber, Ship Money or the passing of the Triennial Act
- Ludlow's reference to Charles' resort to forceful measures may be linked to his dissolution of the Short Parliament or the 5 Members' Coup
- Ludlow has exaggerated the support for Parliament, certainly after division starts to develop more among MPs and the Political Nation after the Irish Rebellion of October 1641.

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

Provenance and tone

- as a private letter of the time it can be seen as an honest reflection by an MP dealing with the competing calls on his allegiance
- tone of the letter indicates the struggle many moderates had in deciding allegiance in 1642
- May 1642, with the forcing of allegiance through the Militia Ordinance, was a key time in the shaping of, or need for MPs to actually decide allegiance.

Content and argument

- the concern expressed and eventual conservative decision about allegiance could be seen as illustrative of the wider trend of Constitutional Royalism as MPs reacted to what they saw as the radicalism of some of Parliament
- the comment in relation to increased tension is supported by the date of the source as after March 1642 the question of allegiance became more imminent for MPs in the context of the Militia Ordinance and Commissions of Array
- while representative of general conservatism of many, as implied in the comment of discussion among like-minded MPs, this still remains an individual example of one MP.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source A has value in reflecting the parliamentary perspective and Source B of the Constitutional Royalist perspective. Source A might be seen as having the value but also the limits of hindsight whereas Source B might be seen as having the value of a private source from the time. Source A may also be seen as of value in relation to the initial concern about Charles' position and Source B about allegiance being shaped by 'royalism' rather than support for Charles.

Section B

- 02** 'Charles I's belief in Divine Right was the main cause of conflict with Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Charles I's belief in Divine Right was the main cause of conflict with Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- Charles' strong belief in his Divine Right in a time of Personal Monarchy shaped his style of rule and interaction with the Political Nation
- Charles was convinced of his own rectitude and this shaped his committed protection and use of his prerogative in a provocative way
- Charles' shaping of his court reflected his view of Divine Right and reduced the points of contact with the Political Nation that could have eased his interaction with Parliament
- some of Charles' actions with Parliament indicated his apparent absolutist approach. For example, 3 dissolutions in the period, his 1626 speech, his appointment of Montagu as his royal chaplain in the face of parliamentary calls for his impeachment and his response to the Petition of Right or Three Resolutions in his Declaration of March 1629.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles I's belief in Divine Right was the main cause of conflict with Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- the actions of Parliament over finance, for example, tonnage and poundage or their vote of £140,000 caused tension
- Buckingham was a source of tension in Parliament through his influence as favourite or position as Lord High Admiral
- foreign policy and religion also created tension between Crown and Parliament
- some MPs were radical, Pym, Eliot and Coke, and could be seen as causing tension through their actions.

Charles' belief in the Divine Right of Kings, but more importantly, his unwillingness to accept criticism or compromise which derived from this and his character was a key source of tension with Parliament. Charles' style of rule escalated practical disputes to constitutional debate. In this, some MPs also had a role in looking to scapegoat Buckingham or in using finance to impose the influence of Parliament. In doing so they also created tension in the relationship between Crown and Parliament.

03 ‘The financial policies of Charles I’s Personal Rule were successful.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that the financial policies of Charles I's Personal Rule were successful might include:

- Charles was able to raise substantial finance to be independent of Parliament for 11 years
- Charles made peace with both France and Spain and this helped to secure his independence from Parliament and saved an enormous amount of money as war was the biggest cost for government
- Charles was able to use various forms of fiscal feudalism without significant opposition, for example, 90% collection rate for Ship Money
- Charles was able to further remodel his Court to save money and reduced his debt from £2 million in 1629 to £18,000 in 1635.

Arguments challenging the view that the financial policies of Charles I's Personal Rule were successful might include:

- rule without Parliament was unsustainable, particularly with regard to finance if there was a crisis
- Charles' peace with France and Spain was driven by his financial weakness
- Payment of fiscal feudalism hid growing discontent as suggested by the Hampden Case
- Charles's financial policies were viewed negatively in the context of his imposition of Laudianism as contemporaries naturally saw absolutism linked to Catholicism

From Charles' perspective it could be argued that the financial policies of the Personal Rule were a success. Charles ruled without needing to resort to Parliament and raised substantial finance without serious opposition. Ship Money raised c£200,000 p.a. compared to a parliamentary subsidy of £70,000. Up to 1637 his regime appeared financially stable and viable as non-parliamentary regime. This should be set, however, in the broader context of growing underlying discontent in England that built up among the Political Nation who were the key group impacted by fiscal feudalism and viewed his financial policies as part of a drift towards absolutism but also Catholicism.