



A-level HISTORY 7042/2E

Component 2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



2 4 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 E / 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** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the influence of the Duke of Buckingham in 1625/26.

[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

- as an Ambassador the author had a role, to find out information and report it as clearly as possible to his superiors. As an Ambassador he had access to the Court and the political elite and used this to find out information. As an Ambassador he still was, however, an outsider and would not have had access to the most private elements of the Court
- as the report is in April 1625, just after the death of James I, this is a useful commentary on the transition of Buckingham's influence from one monarch to the next, but this also limits the range of the source to that period
- the audience of the Ambassador's report wants as detailed and factual an account as possible. While as an outsider the Ambassador may misinterpret elements of events and not have as full a picture as someone with more direct access to Charles and Buckingham, but he would have been a skilled observer and reporter making his account a useful representation of how Buckingham had influence with Charles
- the Ambassador's tone and emphasis very much focuses on Buckingham's influence and stresses how this was based on Buckingham's proximity to Charles, for example, he can come and go 'whenever he pleases'. This is valuable as it links to the nature of power in early modern England and is in line with other evidence of Buckingham being the key influence with Charles.

Content and argument

- Buckingham, despite the loss of James I who had promoted him, should be confident that he will be retained in his elevated position, even extended, through the favour of the new monarch, Charles I, which can be seen in his appointment as Lord High Admiral
- Charles' favour to Buckingham was immediately obvious through him being allowed to travel with Charles to London, illustrating to all the favour shown to Buckingham
- Charles' favour to Buckingham was clear by the access to the royal person that Buckingham was granted, access to the inner chambers of Charles' Court, especially the Bedchamber, the central part of the court only accessible to those in the monarch's favour and this would have been clear to all others at the Court
- Charles' favour to Buckingham and the access Buckingham had was reinforced for those at Court by Buckingham being given the 'golden key', therefore access to all areas and was seen as significant given that Charles was re-ordering the Court to restrict access for others.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author, as an opponent of Buckingham, would present a negative view in order to portray Buckingham as negatively as possible and in doing so early in the reign illustrates that Buckingham's influence with the new king was immediately recognised by others
- the audience of the House of Commons was chosen as the forum for this attack on Buckingham in 1626 as more likely to have a wider range of negative views of Buckingham's influence than in the House of Lords where Buckingham could exert more influence directly
- the tone and rhetorical device are designed to place emphasis on how much Buckingham was already at fault for a range of issues and can be seen as valuable for how influential Buckingham was seen by his opponents with reference to his roles in all aspects of government. Reference to 'exorbitant and immense' illustrate condemnatory tone.

Content and argument

- Turner blames Buckingham for problems with foreign policy that has damaged the reputation of the King and specifically references the failure at Cadiz in question 6 where a number of the English died from alcohol poisoning rather than actual conflict
- Turner blames Buckingham's corruption and nepotism for the problems with Crown finances and reference could be made to the granting of monopolies to members of Buckingham's family
- Turner blames Buckingham for the mismanagement of government as a result of the offices he and his family had secured. This may be countered with reference to Buckingham actually being quite an effective administrator, for example, his management of office since 1620
- Turner accuses Buckingham of corruption with regard to sales of honours and places. Buckingham was known to have promoted a number of clients to posts, such as Bacon.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Buckingham, as the author, was clearly going to present his view and defend his position to the impeachment charges he was facing and while his speech was within the Lords he was aware it had a wider audience, the Commons in particular, but also a wider public, hence reference to the delays caused to foreign policy and the negative impact on England's Protestant allies. That he felt he had to take this action in 1626 shows that there had been immediate criticisms of him under the new monarch
- Buckingham chose the immediate audience for his defence deliberately. As a member of the House of Lords, but also due to the attack on him coming predominantly from the Commons, Buckingham would have used the Lords as a more sympathetic audience but one which he could also address in person
- Buckingham's tone, while defending himself, is more apologetic with an emphasis on the Commons being at fault for bringing proceedings that have no basis but have also prevented government business. The value of the source lies in Buckingham having to defend himself and thereby focus on the matters that he was attacked for. Reference could be made to 'I freely confess' as illustration and understanding that the House of Commons might have good intentions could be linked to the phrase, 'zealous affection to do their King and country service', but that Buckingham was arguing they were acting in ignorance.

Content and argument

- Buckingham argues that the impeachment proceedings have delayed the business of foreign policy in particular and links this to the religious dimension of the European war. This could be linked to him taking the initiative to help the Protestant Huguenots against the French crown
- Buckingham places blame on the Commons for the delay in foreign policy and that if the Commons had communicated more directly with him he would have had to respond in such a way in the Lords. This may be linked to the tensions in the Commons with the Crown over the funding of foreign policy, specifically the Commons' limited vote of 2 subsidies
- Buckingham implies that the Commons attack may be unfair with reference to 'envy of my reputation' and the destruction of his 'fortune' indicating that he believed it derived more from factional infighting and others looking to replace his influence with their own, for example, the Earl of Pembroke
- Buckingham defends himself that he had been promoted rather than seeking out honours and profit and reference can be made to ultimately Buckingham's position coming from the authority of Charles I but balanced by the promotion of many of his family.

Section B

- 0 2** How important was the role of Pym, in the years 1640 to 1642, in the outbreak of the Civil War in England in August 1642?

[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 role of Pym, in the years 1640 to 1642, was important in the outbreak of the Civil War in England in August 1642 might include:

- Pym's role in the December 1640 Root and Branch Petition was a factor in making moderates worried about his radicalism and religious radicalism more broadly. This contributed to division in Parliament that resulted in the formation of a royalist party
- Pym's leading role in the trial of Strafford in May 1641 alienated moderates and caused division in Parliament and strengthened a royalist reaction
- Pym's use of the 'London mob' raised the spectre for moderates of him seizing power as a demagogue, illustrated by him being referred to derisively by moderates as 'King Pym'
- Pym's use of the Grand Remonstrance of November 1641 and his calls for it to be reprinted, reinforced the impression for moderates of his radicalism and him being more of a threat to the constitution than Charles I, thereby strengthening the reactive process of Constitutional Royalism. The division in Parliament caused by Pym's use of the Grand Remonstrance can be seen in the 159-148 vote to publish the Grand Remonstrance
- Pym's use of the Recess Committee illustrated the threat he posed to moderates from his ability to manage the affairs of the Commons and thereby made them consider Charles' prerogative as less of a threat to the constitution than parliamentary power in the hands of Pym and his 'junto'.

Arguments challenging the view that the role of Pym, in the years 1640 to 1642, was important in the outbreak of the Civil War in England in August 1642 might include:

- the impact of the Irish Rebellion on the politics of Parliament from November 1641 was crucial in dividing the Political Nation, specifically over the issue of the Militia Bill
- the actions of Charles I were important in dividing the Political Nation, for example, the 'incident' or his attempt to arrest the five members
- the actions of Millenarian activists were crucial in the outbreak of civil war in England after the passage of the Militia Ordinance of March 1642
- Pym was part of the attempt to prevent a civil war, alongside the Earl of Bedford, in attempting a settlement through 'bridging appointments'
- the role of Puritans and the people of London also had an impact on dividing the Political Nation, for example, through the impact which acts of iconoclasm had on moderates.

Some students may argue that the role of Pym was important in the outbreak of the Civil War in England because he led the radicals in Parliament and through his visible and vocal role in the key events that divided Parliament was crucial in leading moderates to coalesce in a royalist party as part of the reactive process of Constitutional Royalism. Alternatively, it could be argued that it was the impact of the Irish Rebellion that radicalised the debate in Parliament and Pym responded and used this, but he did not create the issues. It could also be argued that the actions of Charles I, especially his attempt to arrest five members, alienated enough MPs in Parliament to ensure that bishops could be excluded from the Lords and the Militia Ordinance passed. It could also be stressed that despite the formation of two sides by March 1642 the civil war was only triggered in August 1642 by the skirmishes provoked by the actions of Millenarian activists triggering responses from royalists. Civil War was a result of a combination of factors.

0 3 'The outcome of the First Civil War in England was decided more by the weaknesses of the Royalists than by the strengths of Parliament.'

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 outcome of the First Civil War in England was decided more by the weaknesses of the Royalists than by the strengths of Parliament might include:

- Charles I's faults as king were exacerbated by the pressures of war and he was limited in how he could command respect and indecisive in his decision making and the divisions in the Royalists over their approach to the war, for example the different approaches of Prince Rupert from Hyde, hampered the royalist war effort
- the geographical divisions of the royalist armies, in the north, Oxford and the west, were more of an issue than the separation of Parliament's armies
- the Royalists could call on fewer resources than Parliament, their support being predominantly limited to the north and west, areas of fewer economic resources
- the limits of the foreign support provided to the Royalists and the amateur culture of the approach of some cavaliers undermined their war effort
- Charles I's attempts to gain support from Ireland and France allowed him to be attacked as pro-Catholic and absolutist. Parliament exploited this in propaganda attacks on Charles.

Arguments challenging the view that the outcome of the First Civil War in England was decided more by the weaknesses of the Royalists than by the strengths of Parliament might include:

- Royalists initially had the advantage in that many of them from the elite had been trained or had some experience of war on the continent, for example, Prince Rupert
- Parliament was able to exploit their control of London to provide resources for their war effort, for example, the population, merchants, manufacture and numerous Puritan activists
- Parliament's control of the south-east and East Anglia allowed them access to a great tax base to use to support their war effort
- Parliament controlled the navy and was able to use this to transport troops and materials
- Parliament's alliance with the Scots, the Solemn League and Covenant, gave them a military advantage in the war
- the religious drive of activists on Parliament's side, including in the New Model, like Cromwell, was crucial in shaping the outcome of the war in 1644/45.

Some students may argue that the outcome of the Civil War was shaped by both the weaknesses of the Royalists and the strengths of Parliament. Until 1644, both sides could still have won the Civil War but from that point the greater resources that Parliament was able to call upon, especially from their control of London, were more systematically deployed to assert the advantages they had. Alternatively, some students may also argue that it was the creation and use of the New Model Army that was part of this more directed approach by the Independents in Parliament and it was the religious drive of army leaders like Cromwell, Ireton and Harrison, as well as similarly minded men controlling Parliament's County Committees, that enabled Parliament to defeat the Royalists in 1645 and 1646.

0 4 'In the years 1649 to 1653, the political and religious radicals failed to achieve their aims because they had insufficient support.'

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 in the years 1649 to 1653, the political and religious radicals failed to achieve their aims because they had insufficient support might include:

- by their very nature as radical movements those who supported their ideas, but who were also willing to be activists, were limited in number to a relatively small proportion of the population and this limited the impact and influence the radicals could have to try to achieve their aims
- the lack of support for the radical groups was also an issue in that their support was particularly limited with the most influential group, the Political Nation. This limited their chances of achieving their aims. While some of the Political Nation were linked to radical movements there were not enough in any one of these groups to be able to put enough pressure on those who, even after the regicide, still essentially came from the upper strands of society
- the variety of aims across the differing groups of radicals limited the support they could draw on and therefore also limited the impact they could have in trying to achieve their aims; the divisions and different aims of the radical groups prevented them working together to put pressure on the regimes of the years 1649 to 1653 to achieve their aims, for example, the Diggers referring to themselves as the True Levellers, or how some radicals can be seen moving across groups
- while some movements, like the Levellers or Fifth Monarchists, did have significant support in the New Model they never had overwhelming support and also had limited influence with the grandees who managed to maintain control of the direction of the New Model and this limited what the radicals could achieve because of the influence of the New Model in the years 1649 to 1653.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1649 to 1653, the political and religious radicals failed to achieve their aims because they had insufficient support might include:

- the power of the New Model Army leadership was used to prevent radical groups achieving their aim, as can be seen by the action taken against the Levellers and the Diggers by soldiers directed by the New Model command, for example, at Burford
- those who held power in the years 1649 to 1653, while relatively radical themselves compared to pre-1646 rulers, were still against the extent of reform most radical groups were calling for and used the powers of the state against the radicals, as shown by the relative conservative policies of the Rump Parliament
- some of the radical groups, for example, the Fifth Monarchists, Muggletonians and Ranters, had very ill-defined aims and this made it harder to achieve them but also a number of their leading figures, for example John Lilburne, suffered long periods of imprisonment that hampered their activities
- the governments of the years 1649 to 1653 had different priorities from radical ideas of reform, for example, the wars in Ireland and Scotland and then the Dutch War. This could be seen in Cromwell's decision to remove Barebone's Parliament and focus on what the army regarded as more central issues than the radicals in that body looking to abolish tithes and Chancery.

Some students may argue that the various radical political and religious groups of the period failed to achieve their aims in these years because of insufficient support. The limited popular support for most of the groups, such as the Ranters and Muggletonians, also made it very difficult for them to achieve their aims. While other groups such as the Levellers and the Fifth Monarchists had more substantial support, including influence in the New Model Army, they never won over enough of the army, or more crucially its leadership to be able to use force to impose their aims on the Political Nation who still held economic and social power. Alternatively, others may argue that the radicals failed because the forces against them were too strong, they were too divided and that the regimes of 1649 to 1653 had more immediate priorities to deal with rather than initiate a reforming agenda.