A-level
HISTORY
7042/1D
Component 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

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

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 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]

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic 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**
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**

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 assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- the overall argument of the extract is that the Whig and Tory division of the period remained relatively fluid and William's willingness to use both groups helped manage division
- William III, in particular, was willing to use any grouping or individual who would benefit his rule rather than linking office to political allegiance based on party division
- the Whig and Tory groupings, rather than organised political parties, were broad, mutually hostile political traditions that continued to develop after 1681, the end of the Exclusion Crisis in real terms, through to 1702
- that while they may have been uncomfortable with each other men of differing political perspectives were willing to act in office together, thus lessening political division.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Whig and Tory were terms deployed as forms of abuse for the general positions that developed out of the Exclusion Crisis of 1678 to 1681 but then remained in place and were used but did not denote a formal party structure that led to a strict political party division
- the writings of Filmer and Locke may be referenced to indicate that there was more to the political division than just hostile traditions and it was grounded in a developing ideological position and this can be seen in clashes over legislation, for example, the Corporation Bill or Tory control 1681-85
- examples of William's ministries and range of different individuals can be referenced, such as the alliance between Foley and Harley with the Tories to show the continuing fluidity of the Whigs and Tories as groupings. The Immortal Seven were made up of Whigs and Tories
- the religious dimension of the division between Whigs and Tories suggests that the division was more pronounced than argued in the extract
- examples of men who served in the administration but were not closely aligned with the broad party divisions, eg Sunderland.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- the overall argument of the extract is that the emergence of a new moneyed class was a greater source of political division in the period than the fluidity of the Whigs and Tories
- land, which had been the basis of the wealth and influence of the Political Nation, now returned less wealth than the potential to be made in the City of London from finance and it was now being subject to more accurate levels of taxation than ever before. This was shifting real power in the period to the financial class as they were able to generate more wealth
- those with new wealth were starting to exert political influence by entering into Parliament at the expense of those in the landed elite who were less wealthy
- the new class added a new dimension and fracture to the Political Nation as they had wealth but were also using that wealth to establish themselves socially on the land and thereby become a new element in the Political Nation which previously, while beset with differences over politics, were all rooted in the landed interest.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the development of a fiscal-military state was linked to the development of the financial world in London from the 1680s, for example, Bank of England, Commission of Public Accounts
- the development of the professions had taken place over a longer period across the century but what was new and led to political tensions was the rapidity and extent of wealth that could be made because of the financial consequences of William's wars
- the Political Nation was a flexible enough concept and grouping to absorb new money and, while the pace of the growth of professions had increased across the century, such men had always sought to establish themselves socially and politically, for example, with purchases of land and marriage in to the landed elite
- the continuing influence of the land is shown by those from new money still looking to buy landed estates and contract marriages with the landed elite, for example, William Blathwayt, William's Secretary at War, created a landed estate based on his work in the administration and links to merchants or by the introduction of the Land Tax
- the ancient aristocracy still wielded influence beyond some of their financial means through the House of Lords, socially and through their links to the Crown.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:

- the overall argument of the extract is that the political divisions of the period were caused by a range of factors: political, religious and long-term
- constitutional division was linked to arguments about the powers of the Crown and Parliament
- religion remained a continuing source of division and central to this was anti-Catholicism
- the Restoration Settlement left unresolved the fundamental questions of the early modern period and was a source of continuing division after Exclusion to 1702.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- there was a crisis of state across much of the seventeenth century which was only slowly resolved after 1688
- political division was due to a range of factors and many of these were linked throughout, for example, the Glorious Revolution was a political and religious change
- anti-Catholicism was a key source of division in the Exclusion Crisis and Glorious Revolution
- other factors can be referenced as a source of political division, for example, different approaches to William's foreign policy
- the succession also developed as a political issue that caused division.

Section B

0 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]

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 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**

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 Catholics and Puritans posed a serious threat to the authority of James I in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- that Catholics did not recognise James as Supreme Governor and had allegiance to the Pope as head of the Catholic Church which meant that they were questioning his religious and political authority
- the various plots of the early part of James' reign, for example the Main, Bye and Gunpowder plots, illustrate the serious threat some Catholics posed to the authority of James I as head of the Church and state through political action to overthrow the state
- the Puritan presentation of the Millenary Petition in 1603 requesting a further reformation of the Church of England illustrates their direct questioning of James' authority over the church and demands for change
- Puritan support for an aggressive foreign policy in the years after 1618 were seen as questioning James' alignment with the emergence of Arminians in the Church of England but was also questioning a key royal prerogative
- Puritan action in areas where they had influence in shaping the Church and community were undermining central control over the Church. Examples such as Dorchester or Wymondham or any other Puritan dominated area can be referenced as part of their social 'reformation of manners'.

Arguments challenging the view that Catholics and Puritans posed a serious threat to the authority of James I in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- most Catholics were prepared to be politically quiet and were not active opponents of the regime like the minority that were behind the plotting of the period. Some of this was due to fear of punishment but also as most could be argued to be moderate in their beliefs
- most Catholics were 'closet' Catholics and were prepared to outwardly conform and James' open approach to the 'mother church' further reduced most English Catholics willingness to aggressively question James' authority
- most Puritans were prepared to work with the established Church, given its breadth under James' Jacobethan balance approach, and were reassured by his appointment of George Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1611
- James' management of Puritans through the Hampton Court Conference, Bancroft's Canons and the 1611 Bible allowed him to engage with most Puritans and remove their drive to push for a second reformation
- radical Puritans were able to emigrate to the Netherlands or New England and this provided an outlet away from directly threatening James' authority.

While both Catholics and Puritans should be addressed, some students may focus on one group more than the other. Challenges by Catholics and Puritans to the Church of England in the period were always a potential threat to the authority of James I as he was only Supreme Governor as head of state and religious issues were therefore always political issues for him. A minority of committed religious extremists could always pose a serious threat as the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 illustrated. However, most Catholics and most Puritans in England were relatively religiously and politically moderate and James' open approach to a broad church of England and acceptance of the Catholic Church as the 'mother church' meant that most Puritans and Catholics felt they had enough freedom not to feel that they had to challenge his authority. While the Thirty Years War and the development of Arminianism made religious tensions more pronounced, James' approach as Rex Pacificus also had the benefit of not escalating these tensions in the short term. Punishment of the radicals who did oppose him also acted as a deterrent to others who might have considered challenging his authority.

0 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]

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 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**

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 Charles I's views on monarchy were the main reason for political division in the years 1629 to 1649 might include:

- Charles' views on monarchy, were rooted in his belief in the Divine Right of Kings. From this, Charles' belief that he was God's representative on earth meant that he saw any criticism as a direct attack on his authority and a form of sedition, therefore exaggerating criticism as political opposition. This can be seen in his Declaration of March 1629 from which the Personal Rule began and in which Charles outlined a political division caused by what he regarded as radicals
- Charles' views on monarchy led to his rigid and defensive interpretation of his prerogative. This made him provocative in his approach to defending his policy and in doing so leading to political division. This can be seen in his response to those who questioned his fiscal feudalism in the 1630s
- Charles' views on monarchy meant he believed he did not need to engage in political communication with the Political Nation across the period 1629 to 1649 and this thereby inflamed political division. This can be seen in his failure to use the court as a source of political contact with the wider Political Nation through the 1630s or his misjudgement in dealing with opponents in January 1642 with the Five Members Coup
- Charles' views on monarchy escalated political division in the period 1642 to 1647 as it restricted him from taking advice from those in his own councils who wanted to negotiate a settlement with Parliament and also when he met personally with Henry Ireton and Oliver Cromwell to discuss the Heads of the Proposals and then following this can be seen as the main reason for political division in the years to 1649 through his Engagement with the Scots. This could then be reinforced by his self-image as a martyr for kingship.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles I's views on monarchy were the main reason for political division in the years 1629 to 1649 might include:

- the development of radical puritanism led to political division and questioning the authority of kingship. This can be seen in emigration to New England through the 1630s and the actions of organisations such as the Providence Island Company as forums of political debate
- the self-interest of the Political Nation, with regard to the financial system through the 1630s, led to political division as seen in reactions to Ship Money or calls for subsidy in 1640
- Civil War in the period 1642 to 1646, and again in 1648, accelerated divisions in the Political Nation as there developed different approaches to a possible settlement and the emergence of groups seeking conflicting peace terms, such as the Political Presbyterians, Political Independents, New Model Army, Levellers or the Scots
- distrust of the New Model and Cromwell was a source of political divisions, particularly between Parliament and the army after 1646 through to 1649
- key individuals in the period were also a source of political division and distrust, such as Laud, Henrietta Maria and Wentworth in the period to 1641, or Pym particularly in the period 1641 to 1642, which led to the development of Constitutional Royalism and the political division necessary for a Civil War to be fought. Thus, the development of constitutional royalism was a reaction to more militant Puritanism in the years 1640 to 1642 as seen in the Root and Branch Petition, the London Mob or Pym's emergence as the leading MP and was a source of political division
- the New Model Army's development of the conception of themselves as an Army of Saints and an instrument of providence was a key source of political division in the years 1645 to 1649 and their direct intervention in to the politics of settlement further created political divisions with Charles I, with Parliament, with the Scots as well as with groups like the Levellers.

Charles' views on monarchy, including his belief in the divine right of kings, were a key source of political division in this period as it shaped his provocative style of rule that alienated much of the Political Nation in the years 1629 to 1649. It also shaped his unwillingness to compromise in the attempts to negotiate a settlement in the years 1642 to 1649. The development of political division can be seen as driven by the nature of Charles' views of monarchy as it shaped the imposition of his policies during the Personal Rule of 1629 to 1640 and his responses to the political crisis after 1640. The increasing division of 1640 to 1642 came from moderates reacting to both religious and political division and Charles' views of monarchy prevented him from engaging in political compromise to end division and create a settlement. Other reasons also brought division in the period, notably religion or the political ideas of some of the Political Nation. Furthermore, the civil war itself generated more radical ideas and groups which made attempts at settlement more difficult and escalated political division. There were other sources of division, such as the distrust of some of the leading politicians of the period. Ultimately, the main source of political division was Charles I's style of rule, based on his views of monarchy, as it created religious and political radicalism and in turn a conservative reaction as part of political division. In a time of Personal Monarchy, the views of the monarch shape the political agenda. Charles' provocative application of his views on monarchy was not only the root cause of political division but also prevented compromise.

0 4 ‘Neither Cromwell, as Lord Protector in the years 1653 to 1658, nor Charles II, as King in the years 1660 to 1678, provided stability in England.’

Assess the validity of 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 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**

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 neither Cromwell, as Lord Protector in the years 1653 to 1658, nor Charles II, as King in the years 1660 to 1678, provided stability in England might include:

- Cromwell's inability to secure a Parliamentary settlement, as illustrated by the dissolution of 22 January 1655 of the First Protectorate Parliament and the political divisions in the Second Protectorate Parliament, are illustrative of the lack of political stability
- the use of the Major-Generals by Cromwell in 1655–56 was in reaction to royalist unrest and provoked further political problems reflected in the election of September 1656
- Cromwell's search for a godly reformation led to a lack of clear religious settlement and tensions in Parliament and in the localities with the Political Nation
- Charles II failed to deal with the structural issues of finance and religion through the Restoration Settlement and they remained sources of instability through his reign, as shown by the impact of the Dutch Wars or division between Anglicans and Dissenters
- Charles II failed to establish a consistent working relationship with Parliament, as shown by the 1662 and 1673 clashes over religion, concern by Parliament at foreign policy or distrust of his ministers, especially the Cabal and Danby.

Arguments challenging the view that neither Cromwell, as Lord Protector in the years 1653 to 1658, nor Charles II, as King in the years 1660 to 1678, provided stability in England might include:

- in the context of the regicide and the Rump Parliament, Cromwell's Protectorate brought a more stable political regime underpinned by the Instrument of Government
- Cromwell's Protectorate church was broad and loose enough to encompass most moderate Protestants and only the development of extremists, notably the Quakers, were a real source of religious instability
- Cromwell's acceptance of the Humble Petition and Advice moved the regime more in line with more of the conservative Political Nation
- Charles II's pragmatic approach to ruling meant that division with Parliament was managed so that instability was short term and limited and this can be seen by his acceptance of the Clarendon Code or the Test Act
- Charles' use of ministers allowed him to maintain the stability of his own authority which was his primary aim. This can be seen in his sacrificing of Clarendon or policy of using the Cabal to strengthen his authority.

In the context of the Civil War and revolution both rulers can be seen as bringing more stability to England through their strong and pragmatic approach to ruling. While some fundamental issues remained with regard to finance, religion and relations with the Political Nation, the approach of both meant that they managed the tensions these brought during their reign without solving them. Some may question the success of either ruler by referencing the political instability of 1658 to 1660 or 1678 to 1681. Others could set their success with regard to the structural issues of religion, finance and Parliament in the context of the Stuart century and lack of real resolution until after 1688. Students are not expected to make a direct comparison between the two rulers but any valid comment made can be rewarded appropriately.