

**AS**  
**HISTORY**  
**7041/1D**

Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702  
Component 1D Absolutism challenged: Britain, 1603–1649

---

Mark scheme

June 2019

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

---

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. <b>Always</b> provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

## 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.

## Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

### 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 Charles I's Personal Rule? **[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 Morrill’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Personal Rule being seen as a period of tyranny, even if partial
- the focus on Charles I specifically and his misuse of power to stretch his prerogative to the limits of tyranny and acting outside of parliament
- concern of the gentry was focused on extra-parliamentary actions and taxation.

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

- the unity of the Political Nation in 1640, when Parliament was recalled, illustrates the discontent with Charles’ Personal Rule. Reference could be made to the consensus on the removal of Star Chamber, Ship Money or the passing of the Triennial Act
- many of the gentry focused on Laud and Wentworth, rather than Charles as the source of problems to avoid a direct attack on the monarch and in the hope, through the trial of Wentworth, to secure an agreement with Charles
- concern at Ship Money shown in diaries of gentry and Hampden’s Case of 1637–38.

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

- the Personal Rule was a limited and ineffective period of government and therefore could not be a form of tyranny
- lack of success in finances and limits to the control of central government and limits to enforcement was reinforced by there being no coherent conception of ‘Thorough’ among government
- there was a ‘mounting tide of criticism’ and the limits of Charles’ government with ‘none of the tyrant’s powers’ left him exposed to opposition.

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

- a range of examples of opposition in the period from St Gregory’s Case and the escalation of discontent as a result of the Scottish Rebellion undermining Charles’ authority
- there was real financial success, for example, income from Ship Money of c.£200,000 with a collection rate of 90% and the debt declined from £2 million to £18,000 in the years 1629 to 1635
- opponents could be dealt with harshly, typically through Star Chamber, as seen in the case of Prynne, Burton or Bastwick.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might argue that both extracts have convincing elements. Both touch upon discontent with Charles’ rule developing. Both touch upon the development of tyranny or the beginnings of absolute government.

---

Morrill's could be seen as the reaction of the gentry and perception of Charles' rule while George's can be seen as coming more from the real limits to Charles' government rather than the impression made on the Political Nation.

## Section B

- 02** 'Disputes over religion were a serious challenge to the authority of James I in the years 1603 to 1625.'

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 disputes over religion were a serious challenge to the authority of James I in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:**

- the calls for further reformation in the Millenary Petition of 1603, that James felt he needed to address the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 and issue Bancroft's Canons, shows that he recognised the potential challenge to his authority from disputes over religion
- the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 was a direct attack by radical Catholics on James and the Political Nation and illustrated constant danger from a committed minority
- the development of Arminianism and James' position as Rex Pacificus was directly questioned by Puritans, in and out of Parliament, especially after 1618 and the Thirty Years War.

**Arguments challenging the view that disputes over religion were a serious challenge to the authority of James I in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:**

- the Millenary Petition of 1603 was presented to James and appealed to his authority as Supreme Governor; through the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 James engaged in dialogue with the Puritans and Bancroft's Canons were used sparingly by James in practice and this approach lessened the threat from disputes over religion
- the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 was the action of a minority where most Catholics were 'closet' or 'crypto' and the Oath of Allegiance was used to help distinguish between the passive and those who might pose a direct threat
- the development of Arminianism and James' position as Rex Pacificus did not see James break the Jacobethan balance and his treatment of Laud indicates his limited favour to Arminians.

James I had to deal with both Puritans and Catholics throughout his reign, as well as the development of Arminianism in the later stages of his rule. Both Puritans and Catholics questioned and, in some cases, directly attacked his authority. Stronger responses will be able to assess examples of how James was threatened by both groups but also assess the limits of this threat and the broader nature of both movements to set the threat in a broader context of the conservatism of both groups. Some may also consider this in relation to how James responded to both groups and how his policy reduced the potential threat to his authority. Some answers may consider the different kind of threat James faced after 1618 because of the changed context brought about by the outbreak of the Thirty Years War and the development of Arminianism. Some may do this in the context of how both developments impacted on Crown-Parliament relations.

**03** ‘Charles I was responsible for the failure of settlement in the years 1640 to 1649.’

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 was responsible for the failure of settlement in the years 1640 to 1649 might include:**

- Charles I's failed Five Members' Coup of 1642 allowed the passing of the Exclusion and Militia Bills that led to the formation of two armies and civil war rather than further attempts at settlement
- Charles' response to the Newcastle Propositions and Heads of the Proposals led to a radicalisation of the New Model Army and the end of direct attempts at settlement by the grandees of the army
- Charles' Engagement with the Scots and the Second Civil War was the trigger for arguments from millenarians to justify regicide, as seen at the Windsor Prayer Meeting, and the intervention of the army against Parliament to prevent final attempts by moderates in Parliament to negotiate the Newport Treaty
- Charles' approach to his trial meant that even 'reluctant regicides' like Cromwell accepted the arguments of more radical men like Ireton that regicide was not just providence but necessity.

**Arguments challenging the view that Charles I was responsible for the failure of settlement in the years 1640 to 1649 might include:**

- the actions of parliamentary radicals, in the years 1640 to 1645, such as Pym or Marten, prevented settlement as parliament became more fractured on the death of Bedford in May 1641, and the end of 'bridging appointments' – both indicate factors beyond the control of Charles I
- the development of New Model and Leveller radicalism, in the years 1645 to 1649, led to disputes within the parliamentary alliance over settlement, as seen at Putney or Whitehall and was, to a degree, independent of the actions of Charles
- the political pragmatism of Charles' approach, in the years 1646 to 1648, as he recognised the strength of his position in being able to divide the groups seeking settlement to strengthen his position at the centre of any negotiations
- the development of radical millenarianism and bible republicanism, in the years 1646 to 1649, particularly with regard to key individuals such as Harrison or Ireton, as seen in Ireton's Remonstrance of November 1648.

Charles I was certainly important in the failure of settlement. His perception of his Divine Right and character weaknesses, in a time of Personal Monarchy, shaped how he acted, predominantly in a provocative manner. Some might argue that some of the radicalism of these years developed as a response to his actions. Charles' attempt on the Five Members, failure to negotiate seriously and eventual role of martyr were all shaped by his character. Charles' actions, in the years 1646 to 1649, made it a 'necessity' for some to remove him to try to bring about some form of settlement. This can be balanced by a consideration of the development of radicalism and the actions of radicals through the period. In this, many will comment on providence being an increasing factor in shaping responses to Charles' intransigence.