
AS

History

Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

Component 1D Absolutism challenged: Britain, 1603–1649

Mark scheme

June 2016

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 2016

Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

AS History Component 1D Absolutism challenged: Britain, 1603–1649

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the reasons for the financial weaknesses of James I? **[25 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:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. 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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

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

- Smith argues that the financial system was weak because it needed fundamental reform and that this was the root of the financial problems faced by James
- the impact of inflation only put further pressure on a system already stretched
- limited nature of prerogative income gave little scope to strengthen royal finances.

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

- reference could be made to a variety of feudal prerogative fiscal methods employed by the Crown, for example, impositions, wardship, etc
- reference could be made to the reasons for the failure of the Great Contract, for example the advice James received from Sir Julius Caesar
- the financial problems based on James I’s approach rather than being based on the weaknesses of the system.

Extract B: In their identification of Croft’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Croft argues that James was the root cause of the financial problems
- that James’ ministers saw the king as a problem and attempted to control James
- that despite warning James continued his habits of spending and giving.

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

- Parliamentary subsidy was worth about £70,000 which was proving limited in the context of inflation
- England had a very limited state apparatus, especially in comparison to European fiscal-military state development
- Crown reliant on political nation for administration.

Students could argue that Extract A is more convincing in that it addresses the more fundamental structural weaknesses of the English Crown’s finances. Furthermore, students may argue that Extract A is more convincing as it deals with the fundamental financial turning point in the Crown’s finances in the period 1603–1689, the failure of the Great Contract, the only serious attempt to introduce the reform that was needed to the system before the financial revolution brought about by William of Orange. Students could, however, stress that Extract B is more convincing because James’ approach made it harder for his ministers to control the finances or persuade MPs that reform was necessary. Some may argue that the weakness of James’ financial position was a combination of structural problems and his own actions.

Section B

02 ‘The early Stuarts dealt effectively with religious problems between 1603 and 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 the early Stuarts dealt effectively with religious problems between 1603 and 1629 might include:

- the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 established James' position which he reinforced with Bancroft's Canons of 1604 and the Oath of Allegiance of 1606
- James' Authorised Bible of 1611 was a successful political reaction to Puritan use of the Geneva Bible
- James' appointment of ministers to the church, such as Bancroft, Abbott or Andrewes, with a range of views and acceptance of conformity kept the majority from considering religious opposition
- Arminianism does not become a prominent issue in parliament, and then linked with other issues, until 1628.

Arguments challenging the view that the early Stuarts dealt effectively with religious problems between 1603 and 1629 might include:

- religion was always an underlying context for all political issues throughout the period as religion and politics were one in the seventeenth century
- the threat from Puritans and Catholics illustrated early on by the Millenary Petition of 1603 and the Gunpowder Plot of 1605
- the impact of the Thirty Years' War after 1618 heightened the importance of religion as a source of tension
- the dispute over Montagu in 1625 and 1626 illustrated the tension created by religious issues.

James' pragmatic solution of constructing and accepting a 'Jacobethan balance' in the Church kept religious tensions across the spectrum of Protestant belief under control. Religious issues under Charles while creating some tension became more of an issue after 1629. Some may stress, however, that religion was always an underlying context for all issues and as the question of the Thirty Years' War became increasingly prominent it shaped the politics of not only foreign policy but religion, finance and Crown-Parliament relations rather than being distinct areas of concern.

03 ‘Charles I showed in the years 1628 to 1648 that he could not be trusted.’

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 showed in the years 1628 to 1648 that he could not be trusted might include:

- Charles' response to the Petition of Right
- the shaping and isolation of the court in the 1630s reducing its function as a 'point of contact' and thereby increasing the suspicion and distrust of Charles
- attempted arrest of the Five Members undermined confidence in Charles
- throughout the years 1646 to 1648, Charles appeared to play his opponents against each other, e.g. the Engagement.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles I showed in the years 1628 to 1648 that he could not be trusted might include:

- some support for the argument of Charles in his Declaration of March 1629 that most of the political nation supported him and only a minority questioned his position
- political nation accepted the Personal Rule and fiscal feudalism and Laudianism only saw limited opposition from a minority
- in 1640 the majority of MPs wanted a settlement with Charles
- in the years 1645 to 1648 Charles, having been defeated in war, used negotiation to maintain his position.

Stronger responses will illustrate that the question of trust in Charles varied across the period and depended on the position of those who were reflecting on his rule, for example Puritans such as Pym or moderates like Hyde. Stronger responses may also set the question of distrust in the context of arguments about a developing conspiracy theory mentality that shaped relationships between Charles and some of the political nation.