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Section A

01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining Laudianism? [25 marks]

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

L5: Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. 21-25

L4: Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. 16-20

L3: The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. 11-15

L2: The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. 6-10

L1: The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. 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 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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- William Laud is defending his own policies and therefore will present them positively
- Laud’s tone is to justify his actions in the light of the problems he is trying to address
- Laud places stress on how much work he has done to establish a more positive tone to his actions
- Laud’s tone is illustrative of his perception that the Puritans were the radicals out of step with the majority.

Content and argument

- Laud places stress on order and fabric and the ‘beauty of holiness’ focused on, for example, altars, stained glass windows and general repair to churches which he believed had been neglected. For him this was a form of reformation
- Laud’s reference to ‘external’ worship is in line with his stress on ceremony and performance of rituals
- Laud had used Visitations to report on the ‘indigences’ in the Church so that they could be addressed
- Laud believed that the Church had been allowed to decline and had been undermined by the ‘indigences’ it had been subject to
- Laud wanted conformity across churches as he believed that the lack of this had led people away from the Church.

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

Provenance and tone

- this will present a deliberately negative view of Laudianism as it comes from the impeachment articles against Laud
- language and tone are used deliberately to shape a more negative reaction to the charges against Laud, for example, reference to ‘papal’ and ‘popish’
the tone is also shaped to establish the idea of Laud plotting to undermine Charles and Protestantism in the interests of the Church of Rome.

Content and argument

- there was a political need for the charges to focus on Laud subverting Charles to avoid a direct attack on Charles
- Laudianism, especially the ‘beauty of holiness’, was regarded as Catholicism, particularly by Puritans
- the argument is put forward that Laud’s ultimate goal was a reconciliation with the Church of Rome
- Laud enforced the imposition of Laudianism through the church courts, fines and imprisonment.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might reach a conclusion which indicates which source may be of greater value, with reason to support this, accepting that any supported argument will be fully rewarded.

Both sources are valuable in explaining Laudianism in that they present the views of different perspectives, that of Laud himself and those who were most opposed to his policies. In the language and tone both have value in showing the self-perception, presentation and justification for their respective views. In presenting their arguments in such a way, both sources can be seen as valuable in their desire to present their argument and justification to a broader audience.
Section B

02 ‘The deterioration of relations between Crown and Parliament, in the years 1625 to 1629, was due to Charles I.’

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

- Charles’ strong belief in Divine Right saw him determined to impose his prerogative
- Charles’ character in a time of Personal Monarchy led to tension with Parliament due to his inability to communicate effectively with Parliament; Charles was defensive of his prerogative
- Charles’ court was less engaged with the Political Nation and his limiting of the points of contact with the Political Nation increased political tension
- Charles’ promotion of Arminianism was a source of tension.

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

- impact of foreign policy failures, notably Cadiz and La Rochelle. These led to financial pressures and a focus of anger on Buckingham as Lord High Admiral
- finance can be seen as a source of tension, with reference to tonnage and poundage or Forced Loan
- role of Buckingham as the favourite enabled MPs to seek to use him as a scapegoat
- role of parliamentary radicalism seen through Bill of Rights, consideration or Three Resolutions.

Charles can be seen as the root of the tension in the period as he was the source of the issues with the other factors of religion, foreign policy and finance. He can also be seen as the source of tension in that by his reaction to Parliamentary criticism on these areas he escalated disputes into constitutional tension. Parliamentary radicalism also had a part in the deterioration of the relationship, although it can be questioned to what extent the relationship had broken down by 1629.
'It was events in Ireland in October 1641 that led to the outbreak of civil war in England in August 1642.'

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 suggesting that it was events in Ireland in October 1641 that led to the outbreak of civil war in England in August 1642 might include:

- as a result of the 1641 Irish Rebellion, MPs discussed the Militia Bill and, as a consequence, produced the Grand Remonstrance and the vote on its publication. This provoked more of a royalist reaction in response to debate on a key element of the prerogative, i.e. control of the armed forces
- Irish Rebellion created a more tense atmosphere at Westminster through anti-Catholic hysteria and the fear of invasion
- Irish Rebellion consolidated the position of Pym as the most prominent proponent of the need to face the threat of Catholicism, and this further provoked a royalist reaction as he appeared even more radical in his calls for increased parliamentary powers.

Arguments challenging the view that it was events in Ireland in October 1641 that led to the outbreak of civil war in England in August 1642 might include:

- other events had contributed to the development of a royalist party, before and after 1641, for example, outbreaks of iconoclasm or the positioning of Charles as a constitutional monarch by Hyde through the Answer to the 19 Propositions
- the actions of religious radicals, particularly millenarians in the period March to August 1642, was key in provoking conflict, for example Oliver Cromwell
- Charles’ inability to compromise and his actions, such as the Five Members’ Coup, was another trigger for war.

The Irish Rebellion was a turning point in forcing MPs to make active decisions about allegiance, but it was only one part of the process of Constitutional Royalism that allowed the development of two sides necessary for a civil war to happen. Despite the Militia Ordinance of March 1642, the majority of the political nation still wished to avoid war and it was mainly the actions of millenarians that sparked actual conflict.