



GCE AS/A LEVEL

2100U20-1



S24-2100U20-1

MONDAY, 20 MAY 2024 – 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 pressures confronting Charles I in the period from 1628 to 1636.

[30]

Source A Alvise Contarini, Venetian Ambassador to England, in a diplomatic dispatch to the Doge [leader] and Senate of Venice (1628)

It seems that there is no longer any doubt about Parliament meeting at the time appointed. In the meantime, the King continues his country diversions [hunting] until the very eve of the opening. With respect to the outcome of this Parliament, there is more doubt than hope, as not only in the more distant provinces, but even in the city of London – under the eye of the Court – members of Parliament have been returned even though they refused to pay the previous subsidies. Thus, I hear it has been voted in the Privy Council that unless the Commons grant the money without further debate, the King will be justified in exercising his prerogative, burdening them with taxes and compelling them to pay. For this end it is said that the Crown has raised a thousand cavalrymen and given orders for body armour for the Scottish and Irish regiments.

Source B Robert Thorne of Ludlow, a lawyer, in a petition to the King's Secretary of State, Dudley Carleton, Lord Dorchester (1629)

The late King, James, granted me the office of taking oaths before the Council of Wales, after the death of Fulke, Lord Brooke. I have been admitted to the office, but Sir Marmaduke Lloyd, Sir Nicholas Overbury, and Mr Justice Waties debarred me from receiving the fees, whereupon the King, by letter, ordered them to stop from meddling with the same fees. On delivery of the King's letter, the justices used many threatening and bitter speeches to me, and threatened to petition the King against me. I wish to inform the King of the criminal behaviour of the justices, that they may be commanded to treat me with the respect befitting my position as His Majesty's sworn officer.

Source C Evan Evans of Tanybwlich, Sheriff of Merionethshire, in a letter to the Privy Council (1636)

As sheriff, I was required by writ to collect £416 and 2 shillings for ship-money from the gentry. Having assessed them according to their wealth, I appointed several collectors, whereof John Lloyd, Thomas Salusbury and Thomas Jones have collected the sums within their areas, yet they refuse to make full payment. Also, Robert Simon Owen and several others have neglected the collecting of the sums by my warrants. Griffith Rowland has failed in payment of the sum he collected, because Griffith Lloyd, Justice of the Peace, granted a warrant of felony against Rowland for taking the goods of several persons that refused to pay, which encouraged several other persons to refuse to pay till they were ordered [to do so]. Edward Thomas, John Lewis, and many others, understanding that Lloyd sympathised with them, also refused to pay.

For this reason, I am unlikely to pay the sum assessed.

0 | 2

Historians have made different interpretations about the **personal rule 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 methods of government were controversial? [30]

Interpretation 1

Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in this extract from his academic book *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642* (1884), provides an interpretation that suggests Charles I's methods of government were tyrannical.

“Eleven Years’ Tyranny” best describes Charles’s divisive personal rule for a variety of reasons. During Parliament’s enforced absence, the King ruled in ways that violated his subjects’ rights, liberties and property. The King used his prerogative powers to raise revenue without Parliament’s consent drawing upon sources such as knighthood fines, forest fines and Ship Money. The King was so energetic in his enforcement and collection of these ‘taxes’ that some of his subjects began to question their legality. In true tyrannical fashion, refusal to pay was met with punishment and imprisonment.

Interpretation 2

Graham E Seel, in this extract from his academic book *The Early Stuart Kings, 1603–1642* (2001), provides an interpretation that suggests Charles I's methods of government were reformist.

Charles I was no tyrant and his personal rule was not divisive, but some scholars have for too long viewed the 1630s through the eyes of Charles’s opponents and have neglected the positive aspects of these years. It may be suggested that Charles pursued a positive programme of reform, guided by a coherent vision of Church and state, that opposition to his policies has been exaggerated and that these were years of stability and calm. In the absence of Parliament, the Privy Council became Charles’s principal instrument in implementing reform. He streamlined its procedures and record-keeping to ensure that it could handle an ever-growing volume and range of business promptly and efficiently.

END OF PAPER