

# History

## Answers and commentaries A-level (7042)

### **1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of the Monarchy, 1603 — 1702**

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

# Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

<a href="#">Question 1</a>	3
<a href="#">Question 2</a>	9
<a href="#">Question 3</a>	12

## Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

### Question 1

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to divisions within the Political Nation from the late 1670s to 1702.

**[30 marks]**

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**

## A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/1D STUART BRITAIN – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Student responses

### Response A

From the 1670's to 1702 there was a significant amount of change in the political climate which sparked both divisions but also unity between crown and parliament which had not been seen for a number of years, and it would be this growth in collaboration between both monarchy and parliament which would continue and lead to a somewhat stable constitution.

Extract A is somewhat convincing in describing the political divisions within the political nation confusing and to how 'little sense' sense could be made of them. The extract outlines the fact that internal party divisions and shifting political alliances could be seen as one of the key reasons for political disputes however, but it was in fact the unification between the whigs and tories which established the start of collaboration between crown and parliament and furthermore gave parliament a stronger hold on the power to control the country through William of Oranges inheritance of the throne and subsequently his ideas on how the country should be run.

Furthermore the extract claims that 'William III was willing to employ anyone , irrespective of their party allegiance' to establish the idea that William had given no thought to the contrasting ideas throughout parliament and as a result 'men in office shared power uncomfortably with others of violently opposed principles.' This argument is somewhat convincing as continued disputes still occurred inside of parliament so to establish a one group party which included both Tories and Whigs there were always going to be disputes and disagreements. Over all this extract is somewhat convincing as there is some weight in the arguments about disputes between both Tories and Whigs in the 'joint' parliament, but where it lacks however is in showing instances of success i.e. the establishment of the Bank of England and reunifying the bond between crown and parliament.

Extract B is somewhat convincing in suggesting that it was changing political environments and the inhabitants of the political nation was the key cause of divisions. The extract describes the owning of land as a dying investment and also claims that it is 'less attractive' based on the fact that London had become a key figurehead in the financial world and it was easier to 'make a fortune'. Furthermore, alongside the idea of land becoming less important when determining ones political power the extract also outlines the fact that this had an affect inside of parliament and was a key contributor to political divisions based on the fact that the new 'financial classes' were seen as superior to their predecessors so they replaced their seats inside of parliament which was a significant change based on the fact that previously ones place inside parliament or the political nation was based on inheritance this meaning that parliament was mostly built up with the gentry. However, the idea that someone had the ability to be accepted into parliament based on their high wealth meant that a more diverse parliament was established which subsequently resulted in divisions. Overall this extract is convincing as it successfully outlines the growing financial climate as a key reason for divisions and backs it up with suitable points.

Finally Extract C is not very convincing in giving a broad scope of reasons for divisions inside of the political nation. Firstly the extract outlines the fact that political divisions had to be seen in

the 'legacy of the civil war and the various religious and constitutional problems that had been left unresolved by the restoration settlement.' This suggests the fact that the restoration settlement was unsuccessful which is categorically untrue based on the fact that it was a turning point in the crown and parliament relations and had a significant and successful impact on the ruling of the country. Additionally, the extract describes religion as to be a continued cause of political division, this may be somewhat true based on the fact that there is a diverse amount of different beliefs. However by 1702 the toleration act had already been put in which increased religious freedom and toleration. Furthermore, to put down the idea of absolute catholic ruling would be ridiculous based on the fact that William was protestant and it was not longer possible to have a catholic monarch.

Overall all three extracts provide somewhat relevant arguments to the key reasons for political divisions. Where they lack however is in outlining some success that was seen in order to provide either examples or to backup their points.

### **This is a Level 3 response**

There is some illustration of understanding of the interpretations of all three extracts, but the main argument of each extract is not isolated clearly to show a very good understanding. For all three extracts there is some evaluation of how convincing the interpretations are, as well as some attempt at considering the limits of the arguments put forward. For all three extracts the linking of supporting context to reinforce the evaluation of the interpretations is limited.

## Response B

Extract A argues that Whig and Tory divisions in parliament were the most significant contributing factor to the divisions within the Political Nation, from the late 1670s to 1702. The extract states that 'Shifting political alliances' contributed to division. This is convincing to an extent as Charles II found he had support from the Tories as their views aligned on Divine Right and parliament only featuring as a way to grant finance. However, the Whigs at the time were pro-exclusionist and believed parliament should rule as a governing body. Later in 1689, Whig supported William and Mary as the Immortal 7 wrote to him convincing him to invade England as they sought a protestant monarchy. However, the Tories saw this a foreign invasion and didn't accept James had 'vacated' the throne. This shows a significant reason for political divisions as the parties changed their alliances, which threatened the monarch's control. However, both Charles II and William III were able to exploit these divisions to gain support, such as defeating the 1681 Exclusion Crisis. This limits the convincingness of the argument. Rose also states that the two parties have 'violently opposed principles' under William, this may be true at the start of his reign as Tories opposed the expenditure in the Nine Years War and wanted to opt for a blue-naval strategy, while the Whigs granted £4 million a year to support it. However both parties worked collaboratively to reform finance with the introduction of the Civil List and Commission of Public Accounts. This factor contributes to the limited value of extract A, as it overexaggerates Whig and Tory divisions.

Extract B states that the fundamental reason for divisions was the new, developing financial class. The extract states that the 'rise of 'moneyed interest'' led to division within the Political Nation. This relates to the rise of merchants and 'moneyed men', many of whom were Whigs. This would have contributed to divisions as the traditional ruling classes would feel threatened as the social hierarchy is changing after years of it being stagnant. Extract B also states 'it became easier to make a fortune' which relates to the dramatically improving trade in the 1670s and relative stability on the continent. However, this argument is not convincing to an extent as it states this reason was more important than the 'Whig and Tories' when in fact the two reasons are intertwined. The Tories represent the ruling gentry and nobility and the Whigs represent the merchants and 'moneyed men'. The fall of the Great Chain of Being had also been gradual, so this weakens the argument. The argument is also weakened as in 1701 both classes work together to limit the power of the King and prevent Catholicism from controlling the nation. So, whilst during Charles II and James II the new financial class may have caused limited divisions, these divisions were not long lasting and include divisions of Whigs and Tories making extract A more convincing.

Extract C appears most convincing of the three arguments as Harris states that a combination of religious issues, constitutional problems and even draws on the 'distinctive class dimension' being the main reasons for divisions within the Political Nation. The extract states that divisions centred around 'constitutional issues' such as 'the Exclusion Crisis'. This was a serious source of tension as the Divine Right of Kings was being questioned and it laid the foundations for William III's invasion in 1688. Whilst Charles was able to defeat the Exclusion Crisis in 1681 through securing a secret treaty with France in March to ensure he had funds and due to Tory support, he was only able to do so by proroguing and dissolving Parliament which shows the divisions in the Political Nation were never truly resolved. This shows that constitutional problems were a very significant reason for divisions in the Political Nation.

Harris also argues that a 'fear of Popery' sparked party divisions. This relates to the 1678 Popish Plot which not only pushed for the Exclusion Crisis but raised the fears of Catholicism nationally. Even though by 1681 the belief in the Popish plot had subsided the fear it instilled remained, even when William III came to the throne seen in the 1701 Act of Settlement, not allowing Catholics on the throne. The extract also states 'religion' remained a major cause of division to '1702'. This is convincing as the rise in Latitudinarianism put a strain on the Anglican Church and led to significant rise in dissent. This, overall, demonstrates extract C as being most convincing due to its combination of factors.

Overall, extract C can be seen as most convincing as it gives the most comprehensive view of the divisions within the political Nation. While extract A and B demonstrate some convincing factors on the Whigs and Tories and developing classes they're more intertwined than extract C.

### **This is a Level 5 response**

There is a clear isolation of the main argument for each of the extracts in this response as part of a well-structured overall answer that lays out in stages an evaluation shaped by the words of the question. For each extract there is a clear comment on how the arguments can be seen as convincing, as well as some attempts to evaluate their limitations. The response also has directed support for this evaluation linked to precisely selected historical context.



## Question 2

How serious was the threat posed by Catholics and Puritans to the authority of James I in the years 1603 to 1625?

[25 marks]

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is 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**

## Student responses

### Response A

In the years 1603 to 1625, James' religious policy was one of the compromise. Although Catholics and Puritans were a potential threat to James, in reality both groups were a minority. They had an impact on religion, politics and foreign policy, but this impact was limited and James mostly overcame the threat to his authority.

James' religious authority was challenged to an extent by Catholics and Puritans. Throughout James' reign Puritans asked for reform, as early as the Millenary Petition of 1603, which could be interpreted as a threat to James' authority over religious policy. However, James made it clear at the 1604 Hampton Court Conference that he would not tolerate excessive Puritan demands. He was willing to negotiate with Puritans regarding religious policy, which demonstrates how he was able to maintain good relations with the Puritans; this in turn reduced their threat, as they didn't actively strike for authority over matters of religious policy. James was also able to maintain the Jacobethan balance of the Church of England without being challenged on his policy or authority, allowing freedom of worship for Protestants including Puritans. As for the threat of Catholics to his religious policy, there was no such threat. Although James didn't support the Catholics or extend toleration to them, after the 1606 Oath of Allegiance he allowed them to worship in private without harsh punishment, except for recusancy fines. The Catholics were a passive minority and didn't seek any reforms or changes regarding James' authority over religious policy. The Puritans were also a minority, hence they posed little threat as well. Although they opposed James' shift towards Arminianism in the 1620s, supporting such figures as Laud and Montagu, James had royal prerogative over religious policy and his prerogative was not challenged in this way. While the Puritans, and Catholics to a degree, did not support James' religious policy, they didn't pose a serious threat to his authority regarding it.

James' foreign policy was challenged by Puritans but the threat to his authority wasn't very serious. He faced potential conflict with Catholic nations but this was not a serious threat to him either. James' approach to foreign policy was to be *Rex Pacificus*, the peacemaker king. By choosing to remain a peacemaker king he ignored the requests and demands of Parliament for him to enter the Thirty Years War in 1618. This frustrated the Puritans who wanted James to fight against the Catholic powers, France and Spain, and defend his Protestant son-in-law Friedrich. This refusal to do so was seen by radical Puritans as evidence of his Catholic leanings. The Puritans challenged his foreign policy, but James mostly ignored these challenges and maintained his authority. He was also able to avoid Catholic threat to his authority by not entering the war against Catholic France and Spain. Puritans also opposed the Spanish Match of 1623, in which James attempted to marry his son Charles to Catholic Spanish princess. The anti-Catholic Puritans challenged this decision and greatly opposed Charles' marriage to French Catholic Henrietta Maria, which James settled for after the Spanish Match failed. However, the Puritan outrage was nothing more than a reaction to unpopular policy, and the Puritans didn't have the power of authority to challenge James'. The Catholics also didn't challenge James' foreign policy, nor his authority.

Puritans and Catholics did pose a potential threat to James politically and regarding his monarchy, though this threat was still limited especially later in his reign. The only significant threat posed by the Catholic to James was the 1605 Gunpowder Plot, a small coup carried out by a minority group among a Catholic minority to assassinate James. This was seen as a significant threat to James and fuelled the rampant anti-Catholicism of the time. However, the plot in reality was not a huge threat and didn't reflect the aims of Catholics as a whole to assassinate James. The threat of Catholics was also quelled after the 1606 Oath of Allegiance, forcing Catholics to swear allegiance to James. As for Puritans, the political role they played had the potential to be a threat to James' political authority, but in reality James' authority didn't waver as a result. Puritans in Parliament were vocal about their desires for social reforms, but they didn't have the political power to implement them if James disagreed with their demands. The Puritans feared James' potential desire for absolutism in the early 1620's when he demonstrated a clear shift towards Arminianism regarded by the Puritans as too Catholic. Since the Puritans have no means to challenge James' authority politically, they had no power to challenge his potential for absolutism. The most serious political and constitutional threat posed by Catholics and Puritans was the 1605 Gunpowder Plot and the Puritans disagreeing with the extent of James' power, but neither group could actually threaten his authority realistically.

While divisions over religion between Catholics and Protestants, Puritans in particular, were significant in the years 1603 to 1625, the religious groups didn't pose a significant threat to James or his authority in any regard. Puritans opposed his policies in many ways, but without the political means to challenge James, there was little to no threat to his authority at all. Singularly, the Catholic threat was exaggerated and virtually non-existent after 1605-6.

### **This is a Level 5 response**

The response displays a very good understanding of the full demands of the specific question. It is very effectively organized with a structure that allows for a balanced answer across the range of the period in the question. Throughout the response the argument is supported directly with well-selected, specific, and precise, historical context. The response illustrates a very good conceptual grasp of the period and the specific issues relevant to the question as part of directed evaluation.

### Question 3

‘Charles I’s views on monarchy were the main reason for political division in the years 1629 to 1649.’

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is 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**

## Student responses

### Response A

This statement is valid to a considerable extent as, while divisions can be attributed to foreign policy failures in the three kingdoms, parliamentary resistance and unpopular religious reforms, all of these issues can be inherently related back to Charles' view on monarchy. Specifically, his focus on divine right and his inability to negotiate which that would cause.

One of the most significant divisions in this period was religion, specifically with regards to the imposition of Laudianism. In 1626, to the dismay of puritan and Calvinist MPs, Charles had the Armenian preacher William Laud open parliament. This was a clear sign to the political nation, made worse by Laud being made Bishop a few years later. This was significant in beginning the divisions in parliament that would anger the Protestant members to the point of executing Laud. Charles' views on monarchy meant that he positioned himself as head of the Church of England, with the right to enact whatever religious reforms he pleased. Therefore, Charles would impose reforms like the Book of Sports in 1633, or an increase in ceremony in religious services, regardless of opposition from the Puritan political nation. Though at the time of these reforms there was no parliament to oppose Charles, once parliament reconvened these reforms were instantly attacked, and political divisions on religious grounds became rife. Therefore Charles, due to his belief in divine right giving the monarchy authority over the church, would spark fierce divisions on religious grounds.

These religious reforms would also cause foreign divisions within the three kingdoms, again stemming from Charles' hardline stance on his divine right to reform. Notably, the imposition of a new prayerbook in Scotland would divide the two nations, and instigate violent rebellion in 1637. Then, Charles would again impose reform which sparked the Bishop's War of 1639, a humiliating defeat. Charles had stuck to his divine right, and quite literally paid the price through payments to Scotland required from the Treaty of Ripon while they held York. Therefore, Charles' tone-deaf insistence on the monarch's right to reform had caused political divisions between the crown and Scotland. The significance of this is made even greater due to these divisions with Scotland being the start of the civil war on the British Isles.

It is due, however, that parliament did little to stem these divisions and instead often exacerbated them. Due to the Bishops Wars, Charles ended his personal rule and turned to parliament for financial aid in 1640. Due to previous aggravations and their being ignored for the past 11 years, they resisted, instead passing the 'Grand Remonstrance' attacking the King's actions. In this way, parliament's refusal to work with the King, justified or not, led to increased divisions to an extent. However, following this instance, Charles' view of divine right would escalate the situation tenfold. In an unprecedented act, Charles would enter parliament with an armed entourage and attempt to arrest 5 members, like John Pym, for their involvement with the Grand Remonstrance. This was Charles' right as monarch, he believed, but it infuriated the political nation. Furthermore, where parliament would sometimes be willing to work with the King, Charles would be stubborn. After his defeat in the First Civil War, Charles would reject both the Newcastle Propositions in 1646 and the exceedingly generous 'Heads of the Proposals' in 1647. Therefore, the stubborn nature of Charles, hardlined in his 'divine right', was more significant than parliament's actions.

In conclusion, Charles' view on a monarch's divine right is integral to his poor decision making, which caused political division from the start of his personal rule to the end of the war. Whether it was hardline religious reforms, or an inability to work with parliament even after losing a war to them, Charles' view would see him reject compromise even up until his refusal to acknowledge the legitimacy of the court which sentenced him to death.

**This is a Level 3 response**

The response shows some understanding of the demands of the specific question, but the overall argument remains quite general rather than being shaped to the specific wording of the question. There is an isolation of some of the key themes appropriate to be commented on as a response to this specific question but there is limited selection of evidence to develop evaluation of these themes or produce a convincing overall argument. While the argument is effectively organized the response does not cover the whole date range of the question and therefore does not address the full demands of the question.

# Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at [aqa.org.uk/7042](https://aqa.org.uk/7042)

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

