GCE AS/A LEVEL

2100U20-1

S25-2100U20-1

MONDAY, 19 MAY 2025 – 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.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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 facing the King in the period from 1635 to 1641. [30]

Source A The legal statement of Roger Shattock, servant to Henry Hodges, Sheriff of Somerset, presented to the Lords of the Privy Council regarding the collection of Ship Money (1635)

This statement confirms that the Sheriff granted his warrants to Thomas Hilliard, the Constable of Ilchester to collect the amounts assessed. I, Roger Shattock, gave one of these warrants to John Napper, who at first refused it, but afterwards received it, saying he did not care a fart for it, nor would he do anything … [even] if it cost him a £500 [c. £60 000 in 2025] fine. All of this was done openly in Ilchester, on market day, in the hearing of many persons. … Shortly afterwards the Sheriff sent me to Thomas Hilliard for the amounts assessed. Hilliard answered that he had not collected – nor would he collect – any money by that warrant. Many coastal counties refused to pay and said they would pay no money [in the future].

Source B Charles I, writing in a letter to Archibald, Marquess of Argyll, seeking his support and that of the Scottish people (1641)

Now that (by the grace of God) I have resolved to make my journey to Scotland it makes me more determined that my actions and intentions are not misunderstood by my subjects there. Therefore, in the first place, I think it right to tell you that I intend that my journey to Scotland is for the settling of the affairs of my Scottish Kingdom in such a way as may establish the affections of my people fully to me. I am far from intending to cause division by my journey, and I mean to establish peace in State and Religion in the Church so that there may be a happy harmony amongst my subjects there. Thus, having explained my intentions to you [Argyll], I expect you to help me resolve mistaken perceptions of me which may arise.
And so I rest,
Your assured friend
CHARLES R.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Source C Sir John Temple, courtier and trusted royal servant, in a confidential dispatch to the King reporting on the state of Ireland (1641)

As your Majesty has happily returned in safety from Scotland and has settled affairs there without loss of blood, I give an account of the condition of Ireland, which lies here, desperately bleeding. The crisis has burst on us with the suddenness of a violent torrent. The whole province of Ulster is entirely in the hands of the rebels, except that part in which the Scots live. These [Scots] have no arms to fight against them. The Lords of the Pale fraternise with the rebels, and they disrespect the King's name by saying that their rebellious acts are done with his permission. Further, they pretend to be religious, and their priests and Jesuits have with so great cunning convinced the people – by making them believe that the Romish [Catholic] religion was presently to be rooted out here – that horrid persecutions were now intended, and cruel massacres to be suddenly executed upon all.

They march furiously, destroying all the English, most barbarously murdering them.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

0 2 Historians have made different interpretations about **the attitude and policies of Charles I**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations together with 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 the weakening of his authority by 1642? [30]

Interpretation 1 David Cressy, in this extract from his article 'The Blindness of Charles I', in the *Huntington Library Quarterly* (2015), presents an interpretation that suggests Charles's responses weakened his authority.

People could live with a king's difficult personality, provided it did no damage. A king that did little could be endured, but not a king who pursued active policies that touched subjects in their purses, their consciences and their everyday lives. The kingship of Charles I concerned not only high politics and constitutional theory but also the affairs of the locality, the parish, and the household. Charles set out to rule as well as reign, and [he] ruled narrowly, provocatively, and unwisely. He subjected England to unnecessary torments, and most historians, like many contemporaries, know this to have been true.

Interpretation 2 Tim Harris, in this extract from his article 'Has history been unfair to Charles I?' in *BBC History Magazine* (2014), presents an interpretation that suggests Charles's responses strengthened his authority.

Charles's regime was quite sophisticated in its approach to politics. Things changed in 1641–2, when the Long Parliament overplayed its hand. Having addressed what it saw as the abuses of the personal rule, it now began to call for more far-reaching reforms in church and state. Charles's response was brilliant: to position himself as a king who stood for the traditional constitution, the rule of law, and the Church of bishops and prayer book, against the threat of political and religious extremism.

END OF PAPER

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.