

AS
HISTORY
7041/1D

Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702
Component 1D Absolutism challenged: Britain, 1603–1649

Mark scheme

June 2023

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

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 © 2023 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 extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the impact of the development of Arminianism in the years 1618 to 1629?
----------	----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[25 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:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. 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 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 interpretation of Brice in Extract A is that Charles' clear support for Arminianism from the start of his reign had a negative impact on relations with the Political Nation and was a marked change of direction from James' approach to Arminianism from 1618
- James promoted Arminians but was aware of the need to keep this limited. Charles' open support for Arminianism can be seen in his selection of Arminians for high profile roles, for example, preaching the opening sermon to his first parliament or appointment as royal chaplain and such appointments and influence were consolidated by Laud becoming Bishop of London in 1628 and appointments thereafter
- Charles' open support for Arminianism can be seen in his policy with his bishops of altering the fabric and the beliefs of the Church and the branding of any opponents of this as Puritans.

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

- the selection of William Laud, a noted Arminian cleric to preach the opening sermon to his first parliament can be seen as a deliberately provocative act to the majority Calvinist view among MPs. This can be contrasted with James' unwillingness to promote Laud in the years 1618 to 1625. By 1625 Laud was even noted among Arminians as a divisive character with even James I consigning him to the bishopric of St David's in 1624 rather than giving him a central post as requested by Prince Charles and Buckingham
- Charles' handling of the dispute over Montagu's pamphlet, *Appello Caesarum*, in 1625–26 showed not only his open support for Arminians but also his aggressive intent to promote them despite the opposition of Parliament. His appointment of Montagu as royal chaplain in the face of MPs' calls for Montagu's impeachment made a religious issue a constitutional one as well. This could be compared with James' appointment with the Puritan leaning Abbot being Archbishop until 1625 despite James' promotion of the Arminian Lancelot Andrewes, Charles' support of Montagu can also be contrasted with James' approach to Montagu in 1624 of more limited support for his tract, *A New Gagg*
- Buckingham's attempt to reach out to the Puritan Earl of Warwick and the organisation of the 1626 York House Conference indicates that, along with Abbot still being Archbishop of Canterbury until 1633, there was still some breadth to the early Caroline church before 1629.

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

- the overall interpretation of Coward in Extract B is that the 'concern aroused by Arminianism after 1618 and by 1629 can be exaggerated'
- moderates were still anxious for agreement with the King but failed due to more radical MPs, but their focus was not on Arminianism in the years 1618 to 1629 but more immediate issues of foreign policy and finance thereby suggesting the impact of Arminianism was limited
- there was a reaction against radical MPs in 1628–29 and in 1629 it was not clear that Charles' character and his support for Arminianism would lead to a fundamental breakdown of relations with the Political Nation and it could be argued that the impact was felt later after 1629.

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

- MPs in 1621, 1624, 1625 to 1628 were focused on problems in foreign policy, James' approach as Rex Pacificus and the Spanish Match, at Cadiz and La Rochelle, the financing of the wars, only giving Charles two subsidies and attempts to impeach Buckingham as Lord High Admiral as a means of removing him as the royal favourite. Some Puritan MPs would, however, have viewed James' foreign policy through the lens of his developing support for Arminianism in these years as seen by the promotion of Lancelot Andrewes and Montagu
- in 1628 even Thomas Wentworth, a vocal radical critic of the years 1625 to 1628, was willing to enter Charles' government as President of the Council of the North indicating the limited impact of previous opposition
- the level of open opposition to Charles and his policies can be overstated. Only 76 people refused to pay the Forced Loan and attacks were directed at Buckingham, the Petition of Right of 1628 was an attempt at compromise and there was no direct attack on Charles until the Three Resolutions of 1629.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might conclude that Extract A overstates the impact of Arminianism in the years 1618 to 1629 whereas Extract B underplays the impact of Arminianism by focusing on the impact of other factors and not their interrelation to religion. Relations between the first two monarchs and the Political Nation were shaped by a range of factors in the period that were interlinked, foreign policy, finance, favourites and religion. For more Puritan minded MPs such as Pym the development of Arminianism did take more precedence in why they were concerned with royal government after 1618 but even they naturally linked it with developments in other areas. Both extracts suggest that the greater concern from 1625 was because Charles' approach to Arminianism was more dogmatic as he sought to impose it and break the broad church James still maintained despite his support for the development of Arminianism after 1618.

Section B

0 2 'James I's extravagance was the most important reason for the financial weaknesses of the Crown in the years 1603 to 1625.'

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 James I's extravagance was the most important reason for the financial weaknesses of the Crown in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- James' extravagance put added pressure on the financial system through his spending on himself and his friends. For example, before 1607 he spent significantly on gifts and pensions and lost money in debts owed to the Crown. By 1612 he also spent large amounts on jewels. Even at the end of his reign, 1621–1624, his spending on pensions increased by 22%
- James' extravagance on his Court put added pressure on the financial system. For example, the ante-supper, by 1610 he spent much more on servants and courtiers than Elizabeth I had spent and the overall running costs of his Court were 33% higher than Elizabeth
- James ignored, or did not fully carry out, the advice he received from a range of financial ministers across his reign, for example, Robert Cecil, Julius Caesar and Lionel Cranfield. He also ignored advice from the Archbishop of York as early as 1604, as well as ignoring policy constructed to limit his spending like the 1608 Book of Bounty
- an important negative impact of James' extravagance was not just his spending but the influence it had on MPs and the Political Nation. His spending made it harder for them to appreciate that the whole system needed reform in the context of his ability to continue to spend but also that if they reformed the system he would just waste the money they then provided under a more efficient system.

Arguments challenging the view that James I's extravagance was the most important reason for the financial weaknesses of the Crown in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- James inherited a £400 000 debt from Elizabeth I, but this could also be set against his redirection of foreign policy in 1604 through the Treaty of London and reinforced by his Rex Pacificus approach and the Spanish Match after 1618 that removed the main burden on Crown finances
- James had extra costs with his need to provide for and establish courts for his wife and children, especially Prince Henry
- the underlying problem was an antiquated system in need of reform. This was partly recognised by the attempt, under Cecil, to negotiate the Great Contract in 1610 but it could also be argued that the exploitation of methods like Impositions or the New Book of Rates opened up new prerogative income streams of money that could be exploited
- James as a new king, but also one from Scotland, needed to establish a working relationship with the English political elite and had to use finance as part of this and this could be seen not as extravagance but necessary political management.

James' extravagance worsened his financial problems but it did not cause them. The underlying problem was an antiquated financial system that was in need of reform. The vested interests of Crown prerogative and Political Nation tax avoidance made such reform problematic. James' extravagance did, however, make it harder for the majority of MPs to appreciate the underlying problem or be prepared to countenance reform that would mean they would be assessed more fairly for taxation. James' approach to foreign policy meant that the major costs of war were avoided and this was a key part of keeping the monarchy solvent during his reign alongside the exploitation of new revenue streams such as the selling of titles.

0 3 'The political divisions in England in the years 1640 to 1649 were due to 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 the political divisions in England in the years 1640 to 1649 were due to Charles I might include:

- Charles' approach to religion led to an open reaction from 1640 by Puritans but had also alienated moderate Calvinists and this division can be seen, for example, in the December 1640 Root and Branch Petition or removal by Parliament in 1640 of the Court of High Commission. It can also be seen in fears of Charles' actions in relation to the Irish Rebellion of October 1641 and the willingness of MPs to consider the Militia Bill or in Pym's production of the Grand Remonstrance
- Charles' actions in attempting the Five Members Coup radicalised some MPs allowing the passage of the Exclusion Bill and Militia Ordinance
- Charles' failure to negotiate in the years 1642 to 1646 allowed the war to continue and alienated moderates. The increase in radicalism can be seen by the development of a war party in parliament or by the creation of the New Model Army
- Charles' dismissive approach to attempts at settlement in the years 1646 to 1649 radicalised the army, particularly millenarians and bible republicans, leading to the Windsor Prayer Meeting and Ireton's Remonstrance, both of which underpinned the justification for regicide and made reluctant regicides like Cromwell accept the necessity of the act.

Arguments challenging the view that the political divisions in England in the years 1640 to 1649 were due to Charles I might include:

- some Puritans, as the 'hotter sort of Protestants', moved to a more radical position from their faith, independent of the impact of Charles' policies and can be seen in the development of the Baptist movement in the years 1640 to 1646 which, in turn, was regarded as the 'font of all heresy', ie a root for other more radical positions to develop from
- once Parliament was recalled in 1640 or even after 1646, the majority of the Political Nation remained conservative and wanted a settlement centred on Charles I as monarch. Even the New Model Army in 1647 negotiated directly with Charles I through Ireton's Heads of the Proposals and therefore there were attempts to prevent division
- division was caused not by Charles but the collapse of Charles' authority from 1640 and the civil war led to the development of radicalism through the breakdown of censorship, church and royal courts, all of which allowed the publication of radical pamphlets challenging the establishment in state and church and increased division
- Parliament's armies were a source of division as a font of religious and political radicalism enabling the development of groups such as the Levellers and Fifth Monarchists that were also able to flourish in the greater freedoms of London with the breakdown of royal authority.

Charles' policies and style of kingship were a source of division throughout the years 1640 to 1649. In Parliament in the years 1640 to 1642 division was caused by the attempt to set up a system to control his kingship but this in turn created further division as some MPs were seen as too radical. The development of constitutional royalism as a reaction to parliamentary radicalism thus created more division. The civil war created division and the division also came out of radicalism in Parliament's armies in religion and politics. Charles' unwillingness to negotiate seriously in the years 1646 to 1649 developed further division and radicalism but in turn in reaction to his approach there was an increasing division between the groups he faced, for example, Parliament, the New Model Army and the Levellers. Ultimately, Charles in a time of Personal Monarchy was the source of division.