

**AS**  
**HISTORY**  
**7041/2E**

The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Component 2E The origins of the English Civil War, 1625–1642

---

Mark scheme

June 2022

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 Examiner.

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)

#### **Copyright information**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## 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, ie 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.

**Section A**

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the impact of Ship Money during Charles I's Personal Rule?

**[25 marks]***Target: AO2**Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.***Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and having little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. 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.**

**Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

**Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### Provenance and tone

- from the provenance comment can be made on this source being a report and therefore the writer should have actively sought out information to relay. However, it is also possible with such reports that the writer, a Crown supporter, could shape their report to be more in line with what they thought the recipient wanted to hear, also a supporter of the Crown. There is therefore a danger that the positive acceptance of Ship Money may be overstated. There is some suggestion of this in the use of the phrase, 'for the most part'
- from provenance a comment could be made on this report being a snap shot within the period when Ship Money was used and from a limited geographical location
- the tone of the source could be commented on in relation to the writer indicating acceptance of Ship Money and the comment in relation to how the population should view it if they appreciated the broader context and that they were writing to a courtier suggests an insider point of view. This can also be referenced, however, against phrasing that reinforces that while a contact they were clearly not aware of central policy direction and elements of their phrasing can be read as looking for information from the courtier as part of what would have been a two-way correspondence, for example, 'I suppose it will become permanent'.

### Content and argument

- the writer suggests that the impact of Ship Money has been limited and he reports political quiet or 'calm'
- there is an indication of some possible opposition with the use of the phrase, for 'the most part' and reference to private discontent. Some may reference the diaries of gentry as indication of such private discontent or the more open opposition of the Earl of Warwick and his circle
- the writer is able to report that most liable for Ship Money are paying the tax, even if there is some private grumbling and this can be seen in the 90% collection rate
- the writer touches upon the acceptance of Ship Money means that it could become a permanent tax, as had been seen since the first levy in 1634 on coastal regions and the move to a national levy from 1635.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### **Provenance and tone**

- the provenance of the source may be referenced for the writer being able to be open in his comments as he is corresponding with his wife. Students can back this up with reference to content which indicates honest reflection on the issue of Ship Money
- the provenance may be commented on in relation to the time period being one part of the period when Ship Money was levied and before there were more open concerns as a result of the impact of the Scottish Rebellion. As a private letter it is also possible to use as evidence that there was more unexpressed discontent over Ship Money than was openly visible. Some may comment more precisely on the date as November was the start of Hampden's Case but the final judgement was not delivered by the 12 judges until June 1638
- the tone of the author indicates real engagement with the political debate about the legitimacy of Ship Money but also through the use of 'boldly' and 'bravely' clear support for those opposing Ship Money.

### **Content and argument**

- the content of the letter clearly shows that Hampden's Case was a source of real political interest in London and the reference to not being able to get into the Court reinforces this
- the content of the source shows how political information from London was transferred to the localities
- reference to John Hampden as 'one' and to 'lawyers' indicates knowledge of others who were Ship Money refusers. Some may reference Hampden's links to Pym
- the writer recognises the dangers of opposing Charles but also that Charles had allowed this case to develop as he wanted a legal precedent to further enforce the payment of Ship Money. Some may comment on the case in the context of the Scottish Rebellion and the subsequent collapse of the collection rate in 1639.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that both sources can be commented on in terms of their value in illustrating general acceptance but also elements of resistance to Ship Money. Both sources can be commented on in relation to being during a key period of Ship Money, 1637, but that this was also not able to relate the broader context for developments in late 1637 to 1640. Both sources can be commented on for different positions in relation to Ship Money, with Source A being publicly more supportive but Source B being from someone who had sympathy with those who opposed it. Both sources, therefore, are valuable in presenting different perspectives on the impact of Ship Money.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'The main cause of the fear of Catholicism, in the years 1625 to 1629, was Charles I's court.'

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 supporting the view that the main cause of the fear of Catholicism, in the years 1625 to 1629, was Charles I's court might include:**

- the prominence of Arminians at Charles' court, such as Montagu as royal chaplain, was interpreted as his support for Catholicism, especially by Puritans, given how Arminianism was viewed by most Calvinists
- the increasingly prominent position of Henrietta Maria at court, over the period 1625 to 1629, reinforced the impression that Charles was under the influence of Catholics
- the order Charles imposed on the court after the openness of James' reign was interpreted as part of his absolutist ambition which for the English was seen in the context of Catholicism as a result of the nature of the development of English anti-Catholicism
- the culture of the court was increasingly interpreted as favouring a Catholic style reflective of the impact of Charles' Madrid Trip of 1623.

**Arguments challenging the view that the main cause of the fear of Catholicism, in the years 1625 to 1629, was Charles I's court might include:**

- the appointments within the Church of England of leading Arminians in the period heightened the fear of Catholicism, for example Laud to Bishop of London in 1628
- the development of Arminianism and its broader appeal to many of the laity not attracted by the demands of puritanism prompted further insecurity about the apparent resurgence of Catholicism
- the specific failures at Cadiz and La Rochelle of English forces on the continent was set against the broader success of the Catholic forces in the European war. This was heightened by the differences seen by the English in the approach of their monarch compared to the example of the Swedish rulers or some of the Protestant German princes
- the broader anti-Catholicism that had become entrenched as part of English Calvinism and was particularly a feature of Puritanism by 1625 and was the lens through which they viewed any policy. Anti-Catholicism was thus shaped in the period by the development of a more radical Puritanism.

The change from the open court of James I to the closed and formal court of Charles I was interpreted negatively by many Puritans as part of their broader conspiracy mentality with regard to the dangers a revived Catholicism could pose to their ambition for a second reformation. The development of Arminianism, Charles' policies and high-profile individuals were all viewed as a means to reintroduce Catholicism by Puritans. In the period 1625 to 1629, their negative interpretation of developments at court were heightened by developments in the Thirty Years War where European Protestantism appeared under real threat. Charles' court was therefore just one part of the developing fear of Catholicism across the years 1625 to 1629 that was felt most keenly by Puritans.



**0 3** 'In the years 1640 to 1642, popular radicalism was a serious threat to the authority of Charles I.'

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 supporting the view that in the years 1640 to 1642, popular radicalism was a serious threat to the authority of Charles I might include:**

- the organisation of the Root and Branch Petition in December 1640 among the London Puritan network and its endorsement by at least 15 000 signatures was part of a development of organisation of the London population with links to MPs used to put pressure on Charles
- the trial and execution of the Earl of Strafford in May 1641 was undertaken in the context of popular demonstrations in London to put pressure on Parliament but also on Charles to agree to an execution. Strafford's execution drew huge crowds
- MPs used popular pressure to get agreement for the Militia Ordinance, specifically through the use of the Grand Remonstrance in November 1641 and in doing so infringed on Charles' key prerogative, control of the army, by March 1642.

**Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1640 to 1642, popular radicalism was a serious threat to the authority of Charles I might include:**

- popular demonstrations were centred on London, and while there were petitions to Parliament from other parts of the country, popular radicalism was only a serious threat in the greater population of the capital
- in the popular demonstrations there were still some distinctions made between direct attacks on Charles' authority and calls for reform or removal of 'evil counsellors'. This can be seen in elements of the focus on Strafford as a scapegoat
- the opposition in Parliament to Charles was a more serious threat to his authority and during 1640 and 1641 a number of measures were taken to limit his prerogative
- popular radicalism actually strengthened Charles' position in 1641 and 1642 as it was key to the reaction that led to the development of a royalist party as part of Constitutional Royalism.

Popular radicalism in London developed over the period 1640 to 1642 and put pressure on Parliament to limit Charles' prerogative and scope to repeat the Personal Rule. It also was a threat to Charles' control of London, especially after his failure to secure control of the Tower of London through his appointment of Lunsford. The links between MPs, such as Pym and the 'London Mob', enabled a co-ordinated campaign of popular politics seen in the pressure on Charles with regard to Strafford and the Grand Remonstrance. However, the perceived increasing radicalism of Pym using the London Mob and the threat he posed as a popular Puritan demagogue led more conservative members of the Political Nation to coalesce in a developing royalist party as part of Constitutional Royalism. This meant that in late 1641 and early 1642 Charles was actually in a stronger political position than he had been in 1640. In 1640 Charles faced a Political Nation generally unified against what were regarded as the abuses of the Personal Rule but the development of popular radicalism since 1640 had made moderates in the Political Nation realise that their advantageous position depended on the authority of the Crown.