

AS
HISTORY
7041/1D

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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 financial weaknesses of the Crown in the reign of James I?

[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 interpretations/arguments/views.

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

- the overall interpretation of Coward in Extract A is that James' extravagance was the main reason for the Crown's financial weaknesses
- in the years to 1608, James' spending on his wardrobe and his giving of gifts and pensions had resulted in the Crown debt rising significantly
- the position of Crown finances continued to get worse because James refused to stick to his promises of controlling his extravagance and, as a result, after the failure of the 1610 Great Contract, he was willing to listen to those who suggested ways in which he could exploit his prerogative income.

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

- James' expenditure on his court, for example, the ante-supper or gifts, was clear very quickly and, even by 1604, the Archbishop of York wrote with concern of James' extravagance
- James did allow Cecil to produce the Book of Bounty in 1608 as an attempt to control his giving away of Crown lands
- after the failure of the Great Contract, James did start to use prerogative methods of income, such as the selling of titles, as a result of advice from a range of courtiers, some of whom sought to benefit as a result. This can be seen, for example, in the use of monopolies in the later stages of his reign.

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

- the overall interpretation of Smith in Extract B is that, while the problems with Crown finances were serious, this was not all James' fault and the main problem was inflation
- there was tension over the use of prerogative income and the fears of the Political Nation, represented in Parliament, on the freedom such fiscal feudalism gave to monarchs as well as James' reluctance to give up such form of income in any negotiation
- Crown finances had been impacted by inflation and the different context of James having a wife and children to provide for placed extra pressure on his finances.

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

- the structural problems of the Crown's finances could be seen as the underlying reason for the weak position of James' finances and that this was recognised is seen in 1610 by the Political Nation in Parliament and ministers even considering the Great Contract
- James was advised by his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Julius Caesar, that the £200 000 pa from the Great Contract and the payment of his debts was not adequate compensation for forms of prerogative income such as Impositions
- contemporaries recognised the problem of inflation and this can be seen in the 1608 issuing of a new Book of Rates by Cecil.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, some students might conclude that Extract B is the more convincing argument because, while Extract A points out the problems caused by James, the underlying fundamental problem was the structure of Crown finances which was made worse by the impact of inflation. Alternatively, some students could argue that Extract A provides a more convincing argument because James as monarch, in a time of Personal Monarchy, was the actual source of the problems and had the key influence over what happened with Crown finances.

Section B

0 2 'Arminianism was the main reason for the religious divisions of the years 1618 to 1629.'

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 Arminianism was the main reason for the religious divisions of the years 1618 to 1629 might include:

- Arminianism was a source of religious division from 1618 because its beliefs, for example on salvation by good works and not predestination, were held by a small minority, whereas the bulk of the population held to the broad Calvinist view of the importance of predestination. The attack on predestination was encouraged by James I through his support of the works of Montagu, specifically, Montagu's 'A New Gagg for an Old Goose', at a time when the Calvinist Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, was clearly being isolated
- Arminianism was a source of religious division as it came in the context of the Thirty Years War breaking out in 1618. Arminianism therefore increased the religious tensions already present from the idea of a developing war between the forces of Protestantism and Catholicism, in which many viewed Arminianism as a form of Catholicism
- Arminianism from 1618 was a source of religious division as it was seen as a form of closet Catholicism and anti-Catholicism was an entrenched element of Calvinist Protestant belief across the English population, one that was held more strongly by Puritans in particular. The increasing influence of the Arminians and then the high profile Catholics at Charles I's court reinforced this view
- Arminianism was a source of religious division in the period linked to high profile appointments by both monarchs of Arminian clerics in positions of influence, for example, Lancelot Andrewes, Richard Montagu and William Laud. For some, this appeared to suggest that Arminians were able to direct royal policy but also in the positions they were appointed to, they were able to use their authority to encourage and impose Arminianism. Even by 1625, 12 of the 24 English episcopates were already held by committed Arminians and the tutoring of Prince Charles was also in the hands of Andrewes' protégé, the ceremonialist hardliner Matthew Wren.

Arguments challenging the view that Arminianism was the main reason for the religious divisions of the years 1618 to 1629 might include:

- the religious tensions of the period were shaped by the different ways James, as Rex Pacificus, in contrast to Charles' disastrous interventions, responded to the European war rather than the European war itself or Arminianism
- Charles' methods of the imposition of Arminianism was the source of religious tension rather than the nature of Arminianism itself. This is seen in his response to calls for the impeachment of Montagu or the York House Conference, which made religious divisions more divisive as the focus was shifted to their constitutional dimension by the actions of Charles I rather than being focused on Arminianism
- James' management of Arminianism up to 1625 meant that it was not the main reason for religious tensions, for example, his placing of Laud at St David's away from the centre of power in London lessened the tension caused by Laud holding the position of bishop. In contrast, Charles' support for Laud making the opening sermon to Parliament showed that Laud had a lot of influence
- the increasing radicalism of a minority of Puritans escalated the religious tensions of the period. The radicalisation of some Puritans was in the context of their fears about the apparent increasing Catholic influence at Charles' court, symbolised by the growing influence of Henrietta-Maria or reports of the style of the court being re-modelled on Spanish lines. Anti-Catholicism, not Arminianism, was the root source of religious divisions throughout the early modern period, not just 1618–29.

Students may argue that Arminianism was a cause of religious division across the period. Its challenge to Calvinist theology and its links to Catholicism, and therefore absolutism, were all sources of concern. Alternatively, some students may argue, however, that the main reason for the religious divisions of the

years 1618 to 1629 was the differing ways each monarch responded to Arminianism in the context of the religious war in Europe. Some students may also argue that anti-Catholicism drove religious divisions in the period and the reaction to Arminianism, especially by Puritans, was part of that.

0 3 'The failure to reach a political settlement, in the years 1640 to 1649, was due to parliamentary radicalism.'

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 failure to reach a political settlement, in the years 1640 to 1649, was due to parliamentary radicalism might include:

- the actions of Pym, seen as the leader of parliamentary radicalism in the years 1640 to 1642, with regard to the Root and Branch Petition of 1640, or the Grand Remonstrance of 1641, or the Militia Ordinance of 1642, alienated the moderates in Parliament and created division across the Political Nation
- the more radical stance taken by Political Independents in Parliament from 1643 split the parliamentary alliance and prevented a united front in attempts to achieve settlement, as can be seen in 1643 and with the Newcastle Propositions of 1646 or the Newport Treaty of December 1648
- the alliance between parliamentary radicals and leading officers in the New Model prevented attempts at settlement through the coup to remove Political Presbyterians from Parliament in 1647 or Pride's Purge of 1648
- radicals in Parliament, supported by the New Model, prevented settlement by initiating the regicide through the Remonstrance and establishment of a parliamentary sanctioned trial of Charles I.

Arguments challenging the view that the failure to reach a political settlement, in the years 1640 to 1649, was due to parliamentary radicalism might include:

- Charles I was the main reason for the failure of settlement across the years 1640 to 1649 because his view of Divine Right, as well as his duplicity, prevented him negotiating seriously at all points. This can be seen most clearly over Charles' failure to negotiate with Ireton over the New Model's relatively moderate Heads of the Proposals in 1647
- the death of the Earl of Bedford in May 1641 ended settlement discussions based around the idea of 'bridging appointments'
- the development of radicalism within the rank and file in New Model, in response to Charles' duplicity, but also driven by religion, prevented settlement in the years 1646 to 1649 as it split the parliamentary alliance, alienated the Scots and prevented Charles and constitutional royalists considering a settlement on terms that a politicised army would find acceptable
- the role of the Levellers in the politics of settlement complicated the attempts at settlement, seen at Putney or Whitehall Debates, or in the actions of the agitators in the army or the petitioning campaign of the movement in London.

Students may argue that Parliamentary radicalism through the years 1640 to 1649 prevented settlement by dividing Parliament and the Political Nation. Alternatively, students may focus on Charles I who, throughout the period through his prerogative and his duplicity, could be seen as the main reason for the failure of settlement. Charles' approach, and the division in Parliament, radicalised the New Model and prevented settlement.