



A-level HISTORY 7042/1D

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



2 4 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.

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** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Millenarianism in the years 1640 to 1660.

[30 marks]

Target: A03

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 interpretations/arguments/views.

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

- the overall argument of Coward in Extract A is that Millenarianism was a central element in Protestant belief that flourished in the context of the political events of the 1640s and 1650s
- Coward argues that most Protestants saw the world in terms of a struggle between the forces of Christ and the Antichrist
- Coward argues that the Fifth Monarchists as Millenarians should not be dismissed but seen within mainstream ideas about Millenarianism and even their view of the civil war and Charles I was within a broader Protestant narrative of how the events of the period were interpreted
- Coward stresses that what made the Fifth Monarchists unique was their plans for a temporary minority government until the Millennium.

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

- Millenarianism was an accepted part of English Calvinist Protestantism with its narrative of the end of days, linked to interpretation of the Bible, a well-known in a period when church attendance was compulsory
- anti-Catholicism was a fundamental aspect of English Calvinist Protestantism and ingrained in the broader culture since the Reformation
- Millenarianism had different strands that are not brought out in Coward's broad overview. While Millenarianism was central to English Calvinism, only the most radical Puritans thought the end of the world was imminent. For most people the end of the world was a more abstract idea and something that did not impact on their daily lives as much as it did for radicals with a more providential mindset
- the Fifth Monarchists did develop from mainstream Millenarianism but their response was still a minority position, seen by the limited numbers in the movement and the attacks on them. However, at the height of the English Revolution, 1648 to 1653, they did have influence beyond their numbers, seen in the position of Major-General Thomas Harrison or, on the surface at least, the shaping of the Barebone's Parliament (Nominated Assembly/Parliament of Saints) from the contribution of Millenarian congregations
- the Fifth Monarchists did stand out from other Millenarian groups in being able to produce a clearer idea of how central government might work but this could be seen as a result of the influence of Harrison with Cromwell from 1648 to 1653 and that across the movement there were differences in approach between Fifth Monarchists. Other groups that could be classed as Millenarians, such as the Diggers, could be said to have articulated plans for a different society, shaped by economic and social ideas more than political, but were more easily dismissed because they were seen as even more radical and were even more of a minority limited to Gerard Winstanley's community.

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

- the overall argument of Capp in Extract B is that popular Millenarianism had a broad appeal that derived from the hope it offered for ordinary people with their economic and social problems
- Capp argues that the appeal of popular Millenarianism from groups like the Diggers was because they appeared to answer the economic problems ordinary people faced
- Capp places emphasis on the ways popular Millenarianism presented a new world where, especially in the context of the issues of 1640–60, everything would appear much better after the Millennium and they could do this by using cheap print
- Capp stresses that Millenarianism appealed not just to the elite but had a widespread popular appeal.

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

- Millenarianism was part of contemporary religious culture but Capp's emphasis on popular Millenarianism having a broad appeal is supported by the number of groups in the period for which Millenarianism was a theme, for example, the Muggletonians, the Diggers, the Ranters, even the Levellers, but it is also seen in the documents produced by the New Model Army, sermons preached and published or individual Millenarians
- the appeal of Millenarianism linked to the hope it offered can be seen in the focus on the greater stress on utopian ideas in the period, again seen in the various movements and literature of the period, for example, the Levellers or the Diggers
- the civil wars and regicide were triggers for the development of radicalism but also a greater focus on Millenarianism as such upheaval was viewed in the context of their conception of the end of days. This view was very clear in the work of Millenarian authors but also a theme in the declarations of the New Model Army and pamphlet literature of the Fifth Monarchists in the 1650s
- the apocalypse as a concept was a central part of contemporary culture but more of a focus of elite culture than at a mass level where most of the population had more immediate concerns that are stressed in Capp, their economic and social problems
- the most rapid developing group of the 1650s, the Quakers, placed much less emphasis on Millenarianism and while Millenarianism was part of popular culture the numbers who joined the Diggers or the Fifth Monarchist movement were quite limited, especially compared to the development of Quakerism.

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

- the overall argument of Bradstock in Extract C is that the Fifth Monarchists were more dangerous than other Millenarians because they were determined to take action to achieve their goals and use force
- Bradstock argues that the events from 1640 helped Millenarians, but specifically the Fifth Monarchists, to be disruptive
- Bradstock argues that they were concentrated in specific areas, especially London, and the breadth of their members across society was part of why they were such a threat
- Bradstock stresses that a key element of the threat of the Fifth Monarchists was the discontent they sowed in the New Model Army but also the alliances they formed with other disaffected groups.

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

- the activism of the Fifth Monarchists can be seen in the example of Venner in 1657 or Harrison's influence in 1648 to 1653 and the continuing concerns of the governments to 1660 with Fifth Monarchist opposition
- Millenarianism was not a new phenomenon but the apparent breakdown of order from 1640 did give it more emphasis as seen in the growth of Millenarian movements
- St Anne's in Blackfriars, London, was the acknowledged headquarters of the Fifth Monarchist movement but the movement had a strong following in parts of Wales, but also had other key centres such as in Norfolk. The movement had included key figures in the army but also followers from lower in society
- while the 1657 rising indicates the threat Fifth Monarchists continued to pose after Cromwell removed Harrison, the Fifth Monarchist influence on central affairs was limited. The concern of the regime at the movement is still clear, however, in the reports of Cromwell's Secretary of State, John Thurloe
- Fifth Monarchist influence in the army was important in shaping events at the Windsor Prayer Meeting in 1648 or in the removal of the Rump in 1653, as well as in opposition to the offer of the crown to Cromwell.

Section B

- 0 2** How significant were James I's views on monarchy in the conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1603 to 1625?

[25 marks]*Target: AO1*

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that James I's views on monarchy were significant in the conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- James' views on monarchy, specifically his firm belief in the theory of Divine Right, clear to the Political Nation from his Basilikon Doron and 1610 speech to Parliament, were a concern for MPs due to their fear of absolutism, heightened by the European context of the diminution of representative bodies on the continent
- the tensions at the start of James' first parliament in 1604 were based on ideas of the constitution and rooted in MPs' fear of absolutism and desire to defend their privileges against any encroachment by the Crown's prerogative. This was seen in 1604 in the Buckinghamshire election dispute, Shirley's Case and the Apology and Satisfaction
- finance was also perceived as a constitutional issue in that James used his view of monarchy to deploy prerogative income and thereby be less reliant on Parliament, giving him the scope to be absolutist. This created tension in Parliament, for example, over Impositions in the years 1606–10 which also ended the 1614 Parliament, or over Monopolies and subsidies in the 1621 and 1624 Parliament
- the conflict over the Union for many MPs derived from James' aggressive use of his prerogative to try to force the Union through in 1606. James deployed his powers of prorogation and then royal proclamations to try to advance the Union after meeting opposition in Parliament
- the dispute over the 1621 Commons Protestation linked back to James' belief that it was within his prerogative to shape foreign policy, whereas Parliament believed their privileges allowed them the freedom of speech to discuss foreign policy.

Arguments challenging the view that James I's views on monarchy were significant in the conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1603 to 1625 might include:

- other factors, such as finance, foreign policy and favourites created tension between Crown and Parliament throughout all of James' four Parliaments. This can be seen with the Treaty of London in 1604, impositions in 1614, the responses to the Spanish Match in 1621 and 1624, the impact of Carr or Buckingham, as well as concern about the Great Contract in 1610
- despite the tensions in 1604 James was willing to make compromises over the issues raised that indicated he was flexible when it came to the reality of his powers, this can be seen in the decision to run another election in Buckinghamshire rather than impose his own candidate. Similarly, Parliament decided not to deliver the Apology and Satisfaction and seek to work with the new monarch, an indication of the innate conservatism of the Political Nation that also helped tension to not escalate
- the debates over the Union also created tension from practical issues raised by any such union, such as finance, but these tensions were also rooted in an anti-Scottish agenda from English MPs, rather than solely being about constitutional issues
- the 1624 Subsidy Act and shift in James' foreign policy during the 1624–25 Parliament indicates that tensions between Crown and Parliament over issues could change in each Parliament as James' change of policy meant a source of conflict in 1621 was not so problematic in 1624
- the second part of James' 1610 speech to Parliament indicated that he was willing to express a difference between the theory and reality of his view of monarchy and, in most cases, this was how he dealt with issues that arose in Parliament.

Some students may argue that given that James I had a very clear belief in the theory of Divine Right and his own prerogative powers from this, his views on monarchy were the main reason for conflict. Alternatively, other students may focus on other factors that were sources of tension linked to this and in

many cases were interlinked for MPs, for example, finance, the Union or favourites. Some students, in relation to significance, may stress that most sources of tensions also first derived from the practical element of foreign policy, finance or the abuses of favourites, and both James and Parliament were anxious not to let such tensions escalate.

0 3 To what extent was Charles II personally responsible for the problems of the restored monarchy 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**
- 0** Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Charles II was personally responsible for the problems of the restored monarchy in the years 1660 to 1681 might include:

- Charles' personal extravagance, especially seen at his Court, undermined the restored monarchy by damaging not only the finances of the Crown, seen in his 1672 Stop the Exchequer, but also his working relationship with Parliament and image with the wider Political Nation
- Charles' personal links to Catholicism seriously undermined his monarchy. This was seen in his shaping the culture of the court to mirror the baroque style of France, his general Francophile approach as Louis XIV's cousin, and the prominence of Catholics around him with direct access, for example, his wife, his mother and his mistresses
- Charles' management of his ministers was a continuing source of political instability from Clarendon, the Cabal through to Danby
- the debauched nature of Charles' court, which Charles encouraged, undermined the image of the restored monarchy and was part of the collapse in support for Charles by 1665 compared to how he was viewed in 1660
- Charles' personal laziness allowed a drift in policy and management that undermined the restored monarchy. This can be seen in his limited priorities and lack of interest in reform.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles II was personally responsible for the problems of the restored monarchy in the years 1660 to 1681 might include:

- the restored monarchy was undermined by the limited finances of the Crown from the lack of reform that restricted what Charles could achieve and allowed Parliament influence over him through the power of taxation as seen with the 1673 Test Act
- the mistakes of ministers undermined Charles' restored monarchy, for example, Clarendon's negotiation of Charles' marriage or his sale of Dunkirk, the lack of direction from the Cabal or Danby's mishandling of Parliament
- anti-Catholicism could be seen as the main factor undermining the restored monarchy as it shaped the perception of many in the Political Nation more negatively towards Charles' court, his foreign policy or the issue of the succession than the reality of the threat posed by Catholics and in doing so heightened the tension between Parliament and Crown
- the actions of James, Duke of York, was a key source of tension and resulted in a crisis for Charles with the Exclusion Crisis. Other factors that damaged Charles' restored monarchy could also be said to be even more outside of his control, such as the plague and fire or elements of the failures in the wars against the Dutch
- Charles' personal successes helped over the problems of the restored monarchy, for example, his sacrificing of Clarendon as a scapegoat in 1667 or how he used his prerogative and compromises to manage the early years of the Exclusion Crisis.

Some students may argue that Charles' lazy approach to kingship in a time of personal monarchy was an element of the problems of the restored monarchy. It may be argued that his approach meant that some issues, finance, religion and Crown-Parliament relations, remained sources of tension. Alternatively, some students may argue that many of the problems of the restored monarchy could be said to be structural, for example the limited nature of the state. Some may also argue that Charles in his limited aim of wanting to stay on the throne, rather than being a reforming monarch, could be said to have avoided increasing the political tension.

0 4 In the years 1681 to 1702, to what extent were changes in the relationship between the Crown and the Political Nation due to fear of Catholicism?

[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 in the years 1681 to 1702, changes in the relationship between the Crown and the Political Nation were due to fear of Catholicism might include:

- the Exclusion Crisis of 1681 to 1685 was driven by the Political Nation's fear of the consequences of the succession of the Catholic James, Duke of York as monarch, and changed the relationship between Crown and Political Nation through the direction questioning of Divine Right and the succession but then also by Charles II's use of the Tory-Anglicans to impose a form of absolutism from 1681
- James' policies in the years 1685 to 1688, specifically the promotion of the position of Catholics, was a source of concern for the Political Nation, for example, *Godden v Hales*, and seemed to herald a stronger Crown through James' policies
- the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and a change in the relationship between Crown and Political Nation was triggered by the birth of James' son and thereby the prospect for the Political Nation of the establishment of Catholicism over time so that it could be embedded after the death of James II
- the Toleration Act and approach of William III to religion was shaped to counter Catholicism and reassured the Political Nation that the constitutional basis of the religious settlement was more securely Protestant and thereby led to a more co-operative relationship between Crown and Political Nation
- the Act of Settlement specifically removed any Catholic from being able to be monarch and thereby was a change to the constitution and thus the relationship between Crown and Political Nation.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1681 to 1702, changes in the relationship between the Crown and the Political Nation were due to fear of Catholicism might include:

- the changing relationship between the Political Nation and Crown was shaped by a political struggle between Whigs and Tories during the Exclusion Crisis about their political influence rather than being focused on the issue of Catholicism
- the financial revolution in the years 1688 to 1702 was the main factor in shaping the relationship between Political Nation and Crown by giving Parliament more influence over the Crown through, for example, the Committee of Public Accounts, the influence of a new monied class in London and the institutionalisation of Parliament from William's needs for taxation. William's context of being Stadtholder in the Dutch Republic meant he regarded Parliament as less threatening than the Stuart monarchs and thereby more willing to engage with them in shaping policy
- the increasing powers of parliament in the years after 1688 underpinned the development of constitutional monarchy, seen in the Triennial Act or the shift of Parliament from being an event to an institution from the demands of taxation
- the attitude of the Political Nation in seeking to work with William as a result of their acceptance of the Glorious Revolution shaped a more collaborative relationship between Crown and Parliament in the years 1688 to 1702 and can be seen in support for William's wars by the Whigs
- William's wars and focus on the European context of his territories most shaped the relationship between the Political Nation and Crown as it made him willing to accept cabinet government and the entrenchment of a party system.

Some students may argue that anti-Catholicism was the driving force throughout the period as it shaped the Political Nation's view of all events and for them was linked with the threat of absolutism. Alternatively, some students may argue that while the financial revolution resulted from William's wars it could be argued that it was the financial changes that most drove change. William's willingness to accept a different position from previous monarchs, shaped by his experience as Stadtholder, also

changed the relationship between Crown and Political Nation. Some may stress that ultimately the changes from 1688 were as a result of a combination of factors, with anti-Catholicism, as across the whole early modern period, being a constant theme and subtext to all issues.