



A-level HISTORY 7042/1D

Component 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 1 D / M S

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** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the development of religious divisions in the years 1625 to 1645.

[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 in Extract A is that the approach of Charles I made the tensions already existing in 1625 over religion worse
- Charles' approach to the power of the Church and especially the bishops was a key reason for increasing religious tension, not Arminian theology
- the tension from Charles' use of his prerogative to support the power of the Church increased the tension as his reign proceeded
- in response to Charles' approach there was a reaction by Protestants that escalated from suspicion to anger across the period.

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

- there was religious tension at the end of James' reign as a result of the interrelated issues of his foreign policy with religion, namely the Spanish Match, but also his support for Arminian preachers like Lancelot Andrewes who supported his foreign policy
- Charles' more dogmatic style of rule and use of his prerogative did increase the tension with the Political Nation, and especially Puritans, with regard to religion. This led to some open opposition such as Puritan pamphleteers attacking his policy and the Root and Branch Petition
- Charles did remodel the episcopacy and with them made much more invasive use of Visitations and the Court of High Commission to enforce his approach, albeit thereby creating more of a reaction by Puritans in particular as the period progressed, for example, St Gregory's Case or emigration
- the process took time as Charles needed to replace Jacobean bishops, for example, Laud was not made Archbishop until 1633
- the influence of Arminianism was important as the promotion of Montagu or Laud, or the message from the York House Conference, was part of why some acted with suspicion to Charles' approach to supporting the power of the bishops.

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

- the overall argument in Extract B is that the impact of Laudianism from 1628 created tension, opposition and conflict to 1645
- Laud had a very clear policy that he enacted that focused on creating in the parishes a shared sense of religious practice
- Laud's policy was enforced through the ecclesiastical structure, for example visitations and the use of the church courts, but financial restraints put some limits on what could be achieved
- that Puritans came to increasingly challenge the imposition of Laudianism throughout the 1630s until they could destroy it after 1640, eventually executing Laud as its symbol in 1645.

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

- with the appointment of Laud in 1628 to the important position of Bishop of London, he was able to speed up the imposition of Arminianism that came to be redefined as Laudianism due to his central role
- the 'beauty of holiness' was central to the Laudian vision and the remodelling of the fabric of the Church was the most visible element for parishioners of the new direction given to Church policy
- visitations, Star Chamber and the High Court of Commission were used to prosecute examples of opposition, such as Bishop John Williams
- Puritan opposition can be seen in high levels of emigration, the organisation of the Providence Island Company to act as a centre of opposition, St Gregory's Case or various pamphlets produced to attack Laudianism. This accelerated in the years 1640 to 1645 as seen in the Root and Branch Petition of 1640, the Grand Remonstrance, Militia Bill, the iconoclasm of 1640 to 1642 and the trial and execution of Laud
- Puritans were a minority and a majority of the population in parishes welcomed the less demanding visual nature of Laudian services in comparison to Puritan preaching and focus on the word of God.

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

- the overall argument in Extract C is that Caroline policies reinvigorated the Puritan movement through the 1630s to create an activist minority
- Puritanism under James as a result of his 'Jacobethan balance' had lost its militant drive
- from 1625, Puritans came under a planned attack by the new regime as Laud equated them as opponents but they themselves saw the world as divided between them as the godly or elect and everyone else
- while there was no overall Puritan shared manifesto or beliefs, they did have a shared negative pessimistic reaction to the threat of Catholicism, especially in the 1630s, to which some reacted passively but others seized the initiative, especially after 1640.

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

- James I's pragmatic approach to religion had meant that there was little Puritan agitation during his reign, even after the development of Arminianism from 1618, so that in 1625, religious divisions were limited
- Laud's policy and approach has been seen as revolutionary with the Puritan position being seen as more in line with the majority Calvinist view
- there did develop through the 1630s an increasingly binary mindset over religion as Crown policy destroyed the 'Jacobethan balance' and this was in the context of the removal of Parliament as a point of contact and the closing off of the Court from those who were not regarded as supporters of royal policy

- the pessimism of the Puritans in reaction to Laudianism, perhaps resulting in emigration as a defeatist response by some, can be balanced by the energy of those who directly opposed Laudianism like John Lilburne or John Bastwick, as well as the iconoclasm of the years 1640 to 1642, or the increasingly militant response of Puritan activists like Cromwell that came out after 1640
- Puritans were bound by their shared anti-Catholicism and this was the belief that most defined Puritanism and reference to the general unity of MPs in 1640 with regard to the removal of Laudianism and Laud illustrates this.

Section B

- 0 2** 'Parliamentary opposition was the main reason for the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604 to 1625.'

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 parliamentary opposition was the main reason for the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604 to 1625 might include:

- the immediate raising of constitutional issues at the start of James I's first parliament in 1604, namely the Buckinghamshire election dispute, Shirley's Case and the production of the Apology and Satisfaction
- the vocal and aggressive opposition to James' plan for a Union in Parliament in 1606 shaped James I's attitude to Parliament
- the opposition to the Great Contract in 1610 led James to refer to the Commons as a 'House of Hell' and prompting him to dissolve Parliament
- the production of the Commons' Protestation of 1621 leading to James ripping the document out of the Commons Journal and dissolving Parliament
- the pressure on James in the 1624–25 Parliament to intervene in the Thirty Years' War was against his desire to continue as Rex Pacificus.

Arguments challenging the view that parliamentary opposition was the main reason for the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604 to 1625 might include:

- other reasons caused a deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, for example, James' use of Impositions (1610 and 1614) or his foreign policy
- the handling of Parliaments by James was a source of tension as seen, for example, by James' approach to their privileges in 1604 or 1621
- the attempted Union of 1606 was the main reason that undermined James' relationship with Parliament and coloured his approach to all future Parliaments. Their opposition was in response to how he proposed and proceeded using his prerogative
- factional division from the Court taken in to Parliament in 1614 or in 1621, for example, Bacon and Coke, was a source of tension between Crown and Parliament.

Parliamentary opposition was an element of the tension in the relationship between Parliament and James I. This can be seen in issues in 1604, 1606, 1610, 1621 and throughout in terms of how James interpreted the actions of the most vocal MPs, for example, Eliot in 1621. The opposition of some MPs was constitutional in terms of trying to define their privileges but was also, in most cases, in response to immediate issues before them. It was the handling of the issues before Parliament by the monarch that, however, determined how serious a clash developed with MPs. James, being willing to compromise, normally deescalated tension as can be seen with the Subsidy Act of 1624. The unwritten constitution could be seen as a strength and weakness of the relationship.

0 3 To what extent did religious issues weaken royal authority in the years 1660 to 1681?

[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 religious issues weakened royal authority in the years 1660 to 1681 might include:

- Charles' rule was weakened because of Catholic influences within Charles II's court, including the prominence of his mother Henrietta-Maria, his wife, Catherine of Braganza and the adoption of a Baroque style. Alongside this there was the prominence of Charles' Catholic mistresses, most notably Louise de K rouaille that heightened the fear of the influence of Catholics around Charles II
- the Clarendon Code, passed by the Cavalier Parliament against the wishes of Clarendon and Charles II had the potential to make the loyal, disloyal, especially moderate Presbyterians and thereby weakened Charles' rule by alienating an increasing number of nonconformists
- the nature of the Cabal, including two Catholics but also Shaftesbury as a Freethinker, or Lauderdale as a Presbyterian, a group of ministers that was brought down by the Test Act of 1673 that also saw the removal of James, Duke of York, as Lord High Admiral, weakened Charles' rule
- Charles' Francophilia, that included his continuing ties to his cousin Louis XIV and the modelling of Hampton Court in line with elements of Versailles, or the 1670 Secret Treaty of Dover, the two wars against the Dutch rather than an anti-French policy all weakened Charles' rule and was recognised by him in not declaring his Catholicism until on his deathbed, despite the terms of the Treaty of Dover
- the conversion of his brother, and heir, James, Duke of York to Catholicism and his public refusal to conform to the Church of England from 1669, sparking the Exclusion Crisis in the years 1678 to 1681 was, probably, the biggest crisis of his reign and was centred on religious issues.

Arguments challenging the view that religious issues weakened royal authority in the years 1660 to 1681 might include:

- the radical challenge, based in religious belief, was crushed by show trials and executions as well as ongoing persecution, fines and imprisonments. This can be seen in the October 1660 trials, the 1662 trials, the crushing of Venner's rising or the range of executions after the 1663 Yorkshire rising as well as ongoing persecution of surviving radicals from the 1650s, for example, the mass arrests during 1665
- the 'experience of defeat' and the choice of exile lessened the threat from religious radicals as can be seen with groups like the Quakers or individuals like Milton
- the development of latitudinarianism, reflected in the breadth of the Cabal, or the internalisation of faith by radical Protestants meant that religion was gradually becoming less an active political dynamic across Charles' reign
- Charles II's decision not to declare his Catholicism, as he agreed to by the terms of the 1670 Treaty of Dover, until on his deathbed, was a pragmatic choice that avoided more profound questions over his authority in state and Church
- other factors, such as his own dissolute nature, lack of control of ministers, failed foreign policy and bankruptcy by 1672, were more damaging to the Crown than religious issues.

Religious issues had a part in weakening the rule of Charles II. The Clarendon Code kept moderate Presbyterians as non-conformists and the lack of breadth in Charles' Church saw Dissent increasingly grow as a political problem as his Declaration of Indulgences could not overcome the growing Tory Anglicanism of an important element of the Political Nation. Despite the harshness of the religious settlement through the Act of Uniformity, Quaker Act and Five Mile Act, most non-conformists avoided active political radicalism and the brutality of oppression employed by the Restoration state crushed a number of religious-based risings with radicals from the 1650s subject to persecution and long periods of

imprisonment. The Catholic style of the court and key Catholics at court and in Charles' government were a source of tension. Anti-Catholicism came to a head after 1678 with the Exclusion Crisis.

0 4 How successful was the Political Nation in asserting its influence over the Crown in the years 1681 to 1702?

[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 the Political Nation was successful in asserting its influence over the Crown in the years 1681 to 1702 might include:

- the Glorious Revolution of 1688 was a foreign invasion but was triggered by a coup by the Political Nation in response to fears over the succession as a result of the birth of son to James II in June 1688, thereby indicating their ability to exert their influence against the Crown. The subsequent changed coronation oath and Declaration of Rights led to a greater constitutional element to the nature of monarchy deriving its power from the Political Nation in Parliament after 1688, reflective of the influence the Political Nation had wielded in removing James II but also the willingness of William III to accept this in the context of his position as Stadtholder in the Dutch Republic where the Dutch elite had more influence than an English monarch would be accustomed to
- the passage of the 1701 Act of Settlement by the Political Nation in Parliament saw them enact legislation to shape the succession and elements of foreign policy through Parliament as a result of concerns about the succession after Anne but linking back to the Exclusion Crisis
- the increasing factional division of the Political Nation that led to the development of political parties, the Whigs and Tories, across the years 1681 to 1702. This helped those most influential in the Political Nation use Parliament to direct government more by making policy more a matter of open parliamentary debate and, after 1688, using the levers of government as ministers, for example, the Junto Whigs under William III
- in the years 1681 to 1685, Charles II had to accept that he would have to follow the conservative outlook of the Tory-Anglicans who had emerged as the dominant group in the Political Nation as part of the reaction to the radicalism of some Whig Exclusionists. Tory-Anglicans set the agenda despite him appearing to be free of Parliament
- the financial revolution and transformation of the state after 1688 was driven by the development of new interests within the Political Nation as it evolved to include a monied interest rooted in London. Working with elements of the old elite both groups through use of Parliament, for example the Commission of Public Accounts, were able to shape Crown policy more than before 1688.

Arguments challenging the view that the Political Nation was successful in asserting its influence over the Crown in the years 1681 to 1702 might include:

- in the years 1681 to 1685, Charles II was in a very strong position because of the support of the Political Nation. The Tory-Anglican reaction after the defeat of the Exclusion Crisis left Charles II in the years free from Parliament and more powerful than before 1678 and was rooted in the reaction to arguments about the succession from the Whigs
- the Political Nation did not prevent James II's accession to throne in 1685 in a powerful position having defeated Monmouth, having a standing army and a strong financial position, and was accepted because of a desire to support the line of succession
- the financial controls Parliament was able to exert over the monarchy through the Commission of Public Accounts, the Civil List or key taxes, such as the Land Tax or Window Tax, could actually be regarded as limited in terms of the actual shaping of Crown policy after 1688. William was able to pursue his main aim of war against France. From finance provided by Parliament, William was the head of a developing fiscal-military state and thus had more real power than any previous monarch
- the evolution of a monied elite in London could be regarded as a threat to the traditional Political Nation that William's ministers were able to exploit by connecting financiers to the developing fiscal-military state through involvement in administration

- for William, as Stadtholder of the Dutch Republic, the increased role of the Political Nation did not appear to be a threat to his power in his context of authority, especially as it created a more powerful working relationship between Crown and Political Nation that allowed him to pursue his main aim.

The Political Nation did assert its influence more directly at certain points. From 1681 the monarchy, due to the Exclusion Crisis, was weakened by an aggressive Whig campaign, but Charles' pragmatic defeat of the process saw him emerge as, on the surface, the most powerful Stuart monarch because of the support of Tory-Anglicans in the Political Nation. In 1685, the Political Nation did not assert its influence to intervene to prevent the succession of the Catholic James II and only did so in 1688 as a last resort. The political coup of the Immortal Seven to facilitate a Dutch invasion was an example of the Political Nation successfully asserting its influence. Post-1688 change was also driven more by the monarchy than the Political Nation, by the European priorities of William of Orange whose focus was on defeating Louis XIV. This focus led him to work more with Parliament and recognise he needed it, rather than a clash between the two institutions. His role as Stadtholder also saw him view the prerogative and powers of the English monarchy differently and therefore be more accepting of the role of the Political Nation through Parliament. It was the financial revolution because of the war that brought the real change by institutionalising the real power the Political Nation had always possessed, even in 1603, through the greater role of Parliament and the creation of a new financial class but the Crown also became more powerful by working more directly with the Political Nation.