



GCE AS/A LEVEL

2100U20-1



S23-2100U20-1

TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2023 – AFTERNOON

HISTORY – AS unit 2

DEPTH STUDY 2

Royalty, rebellion and republic c.1625–1660

Part 1: The pressure on the monarchy and the drift to civil war c.1625–1642

1 hour 45 minutes

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

A WJEC pink 16-page answer booklet.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Use black ink or black ball-point pen. Do not use gel pen or correction fluid.

Answer **both** questions.

Write your answers in the separate answer booklet provided, following the instructions on the front of the answer booklet.

Use both sides of the paper. Write only within the white areas of the booklet.

Write the question number in the two boxes in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer,

for example

0	1
---	---

.

Leave at least two line spaces between each answer.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The number of marks is given in brackets at the end of each question.

You are advised to spend approximately 50 minutes on each question.

The sources used in this examination paper may have been amended, adapted or abridged from the stated published work in order to make the wording more accessible.

The sources may include words that are no longer in common use and are now regarded as derogatory terminology. Their inclusion reflects the time and place of the original version of these sources.

Answer **both** questions

0	1
---	---

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the growth of tension and pressure in the early 1640s. [30]

Source A The Petition of the House of Commons that accompanied the Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdom when it was presented to His Majesty at Hampton Court (1 December 1641)

Most gracious Sovereign, Your Majesty's most humble and faithful Subjects the Commons, in this present Parliament ... with much thankfulness and joy, acknowledge the great mercy and favour of God, in giving your Majesty a safe and peaceable return out of Scotland into your Kingdom of England, where the pressing Dangers ... of the State, have caused us with much earnestness, to desire the comfort of your gracious Presence, and likewise the Unity and Justice of your Royal Authority, to give more Life and Power to the Dutiful and Loyal Counsels and Endeavours of your Parliament, for the prevention of that eminent Ruin and Destruction wherein your Kingdoms of England and Scotland are threatened. The Duty which we owe to your Majesty, and our Country, cannot but make us very sensible and apprehensive, that the Malignity [severity] of those Evils under which we have many years suffered, are supported by a corrupt and ill-affected Royal Party, who amongst other mischievous Devices for the alteration of Religion and Government, have sought by many false Scandals ... to disgrace our Proceedings, and to get themselves a Party and Faction amongst your Subjects.

Source B An image, drawn from contemporary eyewitness accounts, depicting the siege of Drogheda between December 1641 and March 1642. As indicated in the centre of the image, it is illustration V in the picture book *The teares of Ireland* (1642).

The inscription reads: Droghedah so bloked [blocked] up that a bushell of wheate was sold for 23 Shill [shillings]: & meate scarce to be had at any rate [price]. Jan: 4. 1641 [this date refers to the old calendar, when the New Year did not begin until 25 March].



Source C House of Lords journal (4 January 1642). Following this, Charles I attempted to have the five members of the Commons arrested.

The Occasion of this Conference [the King taking the Speaker's chair in the Commons] was to put their Lordships in Mind that last Night, the House of Commons informed their Lordships of a Guard of Soldiers, which were in a Warlike Manner at Whitehall, near the Houses of Parliament. The House of Commons have met with [been made aware of] a scandalous Paper, as was published abroad, to the Scandal of some Members of both Houses. The Paper, being read, contained Articles of High Treason and High Misdemeanours against the Lord Kymbolton, and the five Members of this House of Commons: Denzill Hollis, Esquire, Sir Arthur Haslerigg, John Pym, Esquire, John Hampden, Esquire, and William Stroude, Esquire.

0	2
---	---

Historians have made different interpretations about **the attitude and policies of Charles I**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations and use your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that Charles I's attitude and policies were responsible for his unpopularity? [30]

Interpretation 1 John Kenyon, in this extract from his book *Stuart England* (1978), provides an interpretation that focuses on the personality of Charles I.

Charles I became unpopular in the 1630s because the increasing isolation of his court at Whitehall encouraged a sense of separation between him and his people. Charles ventured outside London even less than his father had, and he was content to fall back on an increasingly un-English lifestyle. His highly developed taste in art was an indication of the gulf between him and his subjects. The great art collectors of the age were Catholics. Van Dyck painted Charles as regal, melancholy and aloof. The court entertainments of the 1630s, ever more luxurious, highlighted the same themes, portraying monarchy as bringing religious and political order: divine right in artistic and visual form.

Interpretation 2 Barry Coward, in this extract from his book *The Stuart Age* (1994), provides an interpretation that focuses on the failures of Charles I and the dysfunction of the royal court.

Charles I did not become unpopular because of his attitude, artistic tastes and lifestyle: it was due to his disastrous handling of the crises in Scotland and Ireland. Charles's court was not the Catholic-dominated court that its critics from outside thought it was. The court was one in which factional competition was rife and in which the Queen was only one of many players. In the 1630s Henrietta Maria was part of an anti-Spanish court faction in which Protestant courtiers played a key role. Nor does the image of a cultural split between court and country have much substance. Future parliamentarians also had their portraits painted by the Catholic court painter, Anthony van Dyck.

END OF PAPER