A-level
HISTORY
7042/2E

Component 2E The English Revolution, 1625-1660

Mark scheme

June 2021

Version: 1.0 Final

216A7042/2E/MS

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 © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

0 1 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying reasons for the restoration of monarchy in 1660.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5: Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**

L4: Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**

L3: Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**

L2: The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**

L1: The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. 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 deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- for provenance, comment can be made on the later production of the Memoirs, at least 20 years after the events he is referencing
- for provenance, comment can be made on Reresby being in London during the events he is referencing. His Memoirs could be seen as useful in showing the view of someone outside of these events and thereby reflecting how others in the Political Nation might have viewed them
- for provenance, comment can also be made on his focus on the years 1658 to 1660 and seeing this as the key period for the Restoration, thereby placing emphasis on the importance of Cromwell's death
- the tone and language can be commented on in terms of his reference to Cromwell's cause in a negative light and negative terms in relation to the officers of the army.

Content and argument

- Reresby clearly regarded Cromwell's death as being significant in the process of the Restoration but initial reactions to Richard Cromwell were positive
- comment may be made that the overview nature of the summary makes it appear as if there was a rapid transition to Restoration in these years but the Restoration was not inevitable and there was limited muted reaction to the death of Cromwell
- reference may be made to the influence of the army officers in these years suggested by Reresby's references. The army removed Richard Cromwell, removed the Rump they recalled and established a Committee of Safety
- reference may be made to the apparent weakness of Richard Cromwell from the treatment of him in the source and his key weakness was support from the army.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- for provenance, comment can be made on Ludlow's political position as a republican
- for provenance, comment can be made on the later production of the Memoirs
- tone and emphasis reinforce Ludlow's political agenda by the positive reference to the Commonswealthmen as trying to construct a settlement with the army
- the negative view of Cromwell from Ludlow's republican perspective is also shown by reference to rejoicing or negative tone with regard to manipulation of opinion at Richard Cromwell's elevation.

Content and argument

- Ludlow regarded the death of Cromwell as significant in the process leading to regicide, whereas there was relatively limited reaction
- reference is made to the divisions of the different groups that opposed monarchy and this was a key reason for the weaknesses of the post-Cromwell regimes
- Ludlow's view of the army is a hostile one as a republican as he had been in the Rump in 1653
- Richard Cromwell is portrayed as little more than a figurehead and, despite initial support, he struggled to build a working relationship outside a small group of supporters.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- for provenance, comment can be made on the time of its production in April 1660 and the immediacy this gives the report, but also the limited perspective
- provenance can be commented on as a report from an outsider, with the advantages and disadvantages of this, as seen in some of the generalisations of judgement in the content
- for provenance, comment can be made on an Ambassador being expected to report on events as accurately as possible, being expected to find out information, have contacts in the government but also perhaps being limited to a London perspective. Comment may also be made on Venice being a republic
- tone and emphasis can be commented on in terms of a neutral tone to the events and emphasis is clearly on the support in England for the restoration of monarchy.

Content and argument

- reference is made to the elections proceeding rapidly and there had been a qualification for those elected, meaning the much likely return of MPs favouring a restoration
- the attitude of the people had changed rapidly to favouring Charles Stuart
- lower classes are commented on as previously main supporters who are now favouring monarchy. Support in London is also referenced
- more specific information is included in the lack of terms as part of any settlement and the move of some previous supporters of the Interregnum to support a change of regime to protect their position.

Section B

0 2 To what extent was the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, due to the character and aims of Charles I?

[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 deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, was due to the character and aims of Charles I might include:

- in a time of Personal Monarchy, the character of Charles I was key in shaping the nature of Kingship from which all political and religious institutions and debates took their lead
- Charles' character led to him overstressing his prerogative as a defensive reaction but this led to his escalating issues to more serious points of tension with Parliament, for example, over Montagu
- Charles' aims in foreign policy, specifically his war with Spain and reversal of policy with France, clearly had a negative impact on his relationship with Parliament
- Charles' aims in religion clearly had a negative impact on his relationship with Parliament. This can be seen in the Three Resolutions of 1629 or concern at Laud's role in the opening of Parliament. It can also be seen in relation to undermining Buckingham's attempts to establish links to potential opponents in Parliament through Warwick.

Arguments challenging the view that the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, was due to the character and aims of Charles I might include:

- finance was a factor in the deterioration of the relationship. This can be seen with issues over tonnage and poundage, debates over foreign policy costs, the Forced Loan and the Petition of Right
- the role of Buckingham was a factor. This can be seen in concerns with regard to his position as favourite or, more specifically, his role at the York House Conference or as Lord High Admiral
- parliamentary radicalism had a role in damaging the relationship with the Crown. This can be seen in relation to the Five Knights' Case or the Petition of Right, as well as the Three Resolutions. The idea of a Bill of Rights may also be raised
- parliamentary obstructiveness to subsidy requests, attacks on Buckingham or foreign policy could all be seen as examples of MPs being self-interested. They could be seen as being led by a minority of MPs rather than reflective of broader opinion. Reference to Charles I's Declaration of March 1629 in relation to this could be used.

Students should argue that Charles' character, in a time of Personal Monarchy, shaped his approach to Kingship. Charles' character also shaped his aims. Some will stress that Charles' inferiority complex drove him to provocatively overstress his Divine Right and prerogative. From this, his aim was for uniformity and conformity. His character did not allow him to communicate effectively with the Political Nation and Parliament could not function as an effective point of contact. There can also be stress on the concern and opposition to Charles' policies being less important than his determination to impose them, derived from his character and aims that was at the heart of why he damaged his relationship with Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.

0 3 'The financial policies of Charles I, in the years 1629 to 1638, were a success.'

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 the financial policies of Charles I, in the years 1629 to 1638, were a success might include:

- the Crown debt in 1629 was £2 million but had been reduced to £18 000 in 1635. In this period, Charles had also been able to finance the purchase of the collection of the Dukes of Mantua
- Charles I was able to avoid calling for parliamentary subsidies in this period, effectively 'living off his own'
- the various measures of prerogative income, used during the years 1629 to 1638, raised funds for Charles as he effectively exploited feudal measures such as forest fines, monopolies
- Ship Money produced considerable sums of money for Charles I, approximately £200 000 pa in contrast to a parliamentary subsidy of £70 000. It also became a regular rate and was extended from coastal to national. Charles' financial management can be seen as creative
- the end of intervention in the Thirty Years War, through the treaties of Susa and Madrid, brought significant saving for the Crown.

Arguments challenging the view that the financial policies of Charles I, in the years 1629 to 1638, were a success might include:

- the various methods of fiscal feudalism, apart from Ship Money, raised relatively limited amounts
- Ship Money was seen as an example of Charles' absolutist intentions and was exposed by Hampden's Case
- Charles was not financially secure enough to cope with the Scottish Rebellion without the need to recall Parliament
- there was no attempt at significant reform to address the fundamental structural issues with Crown finances
- a range of underlying discontent was created by Charles' financial policies among the Political Nation and was part of the collapse of his authority after 1637.

Many may argue that, financially, Charles could be seen as successful in these years as he achieved his main aim of avoiding the need to recall Parliament. There is some scope in the argument that he was creative in dealing with the problems of the finance system and the vested interest of the Political Nation by exploiting his feudal prerogative sources of income. Some will stress that Charles' finances were not strong enough, however, to give him an independence of policy and the limits of his finances were exposed by the Scottish Rebellion. Others may also point out that the financial policies of these years also contributed to a growing underlying discontent among the Political Nation.

0 4 To what extent was the development of political and religious radicalism, in the years 1646 to 1653, due to weaknesses in government?

[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 development of political and religious radicalism, in the years 1646 to 1653, was due to weaknesses in government rule might include:

- the development of New Model radicalism was fostered by the weakness of the Political Presbyterians' position and, from 1646–8, the examples of New Model intervention shows the weaknesses of the rulers of the state
- emergence of groups like the Ranters or Muggletonians or the actions of individual radicals like Thomas Tany was due to the inability of the state to deal with them
- the New Model Army was engaged in Ireland and Scotland from 1649 to 1651 and was not in a position to support Parliament as effectively against radical threats
- the political vacuum following the removal of the Rump allowed the seizure of the initiative by some millenarian radicals to influence Cromwell and the Council of Officers to construct the Nominated Assembly
- the lack of clarity in the religious settlement before 1653 allowed greater freedom for religious groups to develop.

Arguments challenging the view that the development of political and religious radicalism, in the years 1646 to 1653, was due to weaknesses in government rule might include:

- religious and political radicalism was fostered in the New Model Army as well as having its own dynamic, as seen in the experience of spiritual journeys of individuals like Laurence Clarkson
- the Leveller and Digger movements and their demands could be regarded as a reaction to the strength of the state and the desire to change it
- after 1647, it could be argued that radicals such as Cromwell became part of the state. This can also be seen by the Nominated Assembly and the influence of Fifth Monarchist millenarians like Thomas Harrison
- the regicide encouraged the development of more radical millenarianism, particularly a more formal Fifth Monarchist grouping from 1650
- the threat from radicals was actually relatively limited and, in some cases, deliberately exaggerated to encourage the development of state power. The state also responded to radicalism with various measures, such as the Adultery and Blasphemy Act.

It can be argued that political and religious radicalism continued to develop in this period, even though some groups, like the Levellers and the Diggers, faced severe repression. Some may indicate that the context of the regicide and the influence of the New Model also provided further encouragement for radicals. It can also be pointed out that the range of issues being dealt with by the post-1649 states made it more difficult to deal with radicalism. Some may stress that radicalism also had its own dynamic. It can also be argued that the state and the New Model kept radicalism confined and that some radicalism was overstated by contemporaries.