



A Level History

7042/1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603-1702

Report on the examination

Published: August 2024

Contents

The below table is interactive. You can press the control button click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Contents	Page
General guidance about question types	3
Individual questions and exemplification	5
Further support	26

General guidance on question types

Question 1: The 'Extract' Question

- Identify, understand and evaluate arguments in each extract in relation to the focus of the question.
- Deploy contextual knowledge selectively and relevantly to assess how convincing the arguments are.

Qualities seen in more successful responses

- Evidence of careful reading of each extract before committing pen to paper.
- Identification of key arguments in each extract in relation to the question set.
- Contextual knowledge deployed appropriately to challenge or corroborate the arguments in relation to the question.
- Balanced assessment with focus on the extent to which arguments are convincing in relation to the question.
- Focus on omissions/ what is not in the extract is very limited - or is avoided altogether – and is only referred to if directly relevant to an argument identified in the extract.

Qualities seen in less successful responses

- Limited understanding of the arguments expressed in each extract, often showing little evidence that the whole extract has been read fully before beginning the answer.
- Tend to either paraphrase the extract with limited evaluation, or to focus on random sentences or phrases.
- Where it is offered, evaluation of arguments may not be focused fully on the question.
- Contextual knowledge sometimes deployed without focus on the question, or without linkage to arguments in the extracts.
- May contain inappropriate and irrelevant references to author provenance and tone.

Questions 2-4: Essay questions

- Demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the question and its demands.
- Provide a balanced, analytical response which reviews the issues raised by the question.
- Provide appropriate and full coverage of the breadth of the question, with appropriate supporting evidence.
- Substantiate judgements on the issues, throughout the answer and/ or in an extended conclusion.

Qualities seen in more successful responses

- Evidence of careful planning seen in the structure and organisation of the answer.
- An analytical approach which avoids lengthy narrative passages.
- Appropriate range, both in relation to chronological coverage and of issues to be considered.
- Balance of treatment, used to advance an argument and with appropriate judgement of the issues.

- Use well selected supporting information.
- Provide an effective introduction which sets out the argument to be advanced and an effective conclusion demonstrating overall judgement.

Qualities seen in less successful responses

- Limited evidence of effective planning and structuring.
- Tendency towards partial responses to the question asked, either in terms of chronology or range of issues to be considered.
- Inclusion of descriptive passages not clearly linked to the question.
- Over-lengthy introductions which do little more than provide contextual information.
- Inclusion of conclusions which repeat points already made
- Issues with, or an absence of, sustained analysis and judgement.
- Occasional use of inappropriate language, such as over use of first person etc

Individual questions

Report on Question 1

Students showed good engagement with the extracts and the majority were able to achieve Level 3, providing at least some supported comment on how convincing the interpretations were in relation to millenarianism in the years 1640 to 1660. Deployment of contextual knowledge from across the years 1640 to 1660 linked to the extracts was impressive, with students able to use this in relation to their understanding of millenarianism but also the other elements of that the extracts touched upon that related to it. Those who had a clear grasp of the concept of millenarianism were able to deploy a wide range of context as part of their evaluation of all three extracts. The majority of the students ably isolated the overall argument of each extract at the start of their answers by focusing on the opening sentence of each extract, including picking out key phrases.

Extract A: Students identified that Coward in the extract argued that millenarianism ‘flourished with the political events of the 1640s and 1650s’ with some also isolating that it was ‘a central belief of Protestantism’. With a sound grasp of the concept of millenarianism students were confident in providing their own contextual knowledge to support the idea of millenarianism flourishing in the 1640s and 1650s, for example, referencing: the Windsor Prayer Meeting of April 1648; Major-General Thomas Harrison; the act of regicide or the Nominated Assembly (Barebones Parliament or the Parliament of Saints). Others linked the development of millenarianism more generally in the context of the issues or questions raised by the civil wars, regicide and republicanism that allowed radicalism to flourish. Many commented on ‘Protestants believed that a war between the forces of Christ and the Antichrist’ in relation to the civil wars, radical views of Charles I held by millenarians or general anti-Catholicism for ‘most Protestants,’ with the most radical Protestants being the most radical in their millenarianism. Students also identified Coward’s argument that Fifth Monarchists should be seen within mainstream Protestant ideas about millenarianism, but their uniqueness came from ‘their plans for a temporary government controlled by a minority.’ Many linked this last part of Coward’s argument to the Nominated Assembly with some excellent reference to the work of Woolrych who isolated that it could be argued that there were only 12 Fifth Monarchists in that Parliament or more generally about how the Nominated Assembly came about through Cromwell’s own millenarian thinking and relationship with Harrison. In questioning how convincing Coward’s argument was many commented on Fifth Monarchists as still a minority, including referencing Harrison’s isolation once the Protectorate was established or the nature of the coup led by Lambert and the moderates to remove the Nominated Assembly and establish the Protectorate under the Instrument of Government. Some even used referenced to Harrison’s show trial and execution in October 1660 or Venner’s two attempted risings as part of their linked context.

Question 1 - Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

In Extract A, Coward argues that Millenarianism was a common and widespread Protestant belief that particularly thrived during the 1640s and 1650s, and that the Fifth Monarchists, while unique in their desire for a minority religious rule, were ~~in line with~~ not unusual in their Millenarian beliefs.

Coward's claim that Millenarianism was 'part of the mainstream of Protestant intellectual life' is convincing to some extent, as the 1650s saw an explosion in the number of religious radicals - especially Quakers and Baptists - and in the number of published pamphlets, likely a result of the relaxation of censorship, ~~and~~ the ~~increased~~ Toleration Act of 1650, and the disorder created by ~~the Civil War~~ the violent conflict of the Civil War. This increased prevalence of radicals, many of whom emphasised Millenarian beliefs, convincingly suggests Millenarianism had become part of the Protestant 'mainstream' to some extent. However, it perhaps ~~over~~ places too much weight on Millenarian ideas within the country. While some level of Millenarian sentiment may have been common, it is necessary to emphasise that in the 1650s, the vast majority were moderate Protestants, many of whom wanted a return to stability after the Civil War's upheaval. The imposition of the Blasphemy Act and Adultery Act in 1650 are evidence of a more religiously conservative

perspective ~~being~~ ~~driving~~ the King's policy, a reflection that, ~~although~~ the amount of dissenters never rose above 5%. ~~During~~ the 1650s, and so despite a convincing rise in prevalence, ~~any~~ ~~it would~~ there are limits to

the centrality of Millenarian thought during the 1650s.

Coward also suggests the Fifth Monarchists' views were 'well in line with those held by many people', at least in regards to their millenarian ~~views~~ view of Charles' I's execution.

~~to~~ Many Puritans, including a significant part of the New Model Army, did believe in Providence, and so had seen ~~to~~ Charles' execution as part of God's plan, in line with the Fifth Monarchists, a convincing suggestion they were not alone in their beliefs. The New Model Army's reference to itself as 'God's Instrument' against Charles at the Windsor Prayer meeting in 1648 demonstrates their ~~shared~~ shared belief that the Civil War had been fulfilling God's will. However, to the extent to which 'many people' in the country adhered to this view is ~~of~~ more limited; Puritans were still a minority, and, as seen by the support for Charles in the ~~second~~ the Restoration in 1660, and retreat to monarchy, ~~with~~ even offering Cromwell the Crown, during the 1650s, it is clear that many still adhered to the subscribed to the Divine Right of Kingship, as such, did not see the Civil War from the ~~same~~ perspective as the ~~the~~ Millenarian perspective, instead only seeing the bloodshed and disorder.

Overall, while Coward convincingly argues that Millenarian views ~~took on~~ to were prevalent and significant in the 1640s and 1650s, he is not entirely convincing in his argument that they

were central to a majority

The student offers a balanced assessment of the interpretation in Extract A. Coward's overall argument is immediately isolated and then other aspects of the argument are selected. Contextual knowledge is deployed to examine how the interpretation suggests millenarianism was a feature of the years 1640 to 1660. In doing this the student references the context of the development of radicalism generally with Quakers, Baptists and the collapse of censorship with an increase in pamphlets published. The student appropriately deploys the concept of providence to set the New Model's approach in a millenarian

context and links this to the Windsor Prayer Meeting. In questioning the interpretation, the student links the limits of millenarian radicalism to the Rump passing the Blasphemy and Adultery Acts. They also suggest the limits of millenarians by stressing that Puritans were a minority but also the Restoration of 1660 as a 'retreat' in reaction to radicalism by those of a conservative perspective, referencing belief in Divine Right. Overall, the student is direct in making a judgement about how the extract is convincing and less convincing linked to their use of well selected contextual knowledge. The student is clear that on balance they are more convinced about Coward's interpretation of millenarianism than not.

For Extract B in part of their response, another student used their contextual knowledge on the Diggers well, but also made a balanced comment from this about Digger support to make a judgement about the extract.

respite in millenarianism. Extract B also supports this as it states that 'groups like the Diggers' obtained respite based on these issues. This is evidenced by the Diggers' Communes spontaneously in this period, such as the St Georges Hill Commune, where inhabitants lived in a proto-~~socialist~~ Communist state, with proto Marxist ideals, based on total equality. Whilst this Commune was crushed by forces, and ordered to disperse, it is clearly evidence of the instability of the 1640s/50s leading to the growth of millenarianism. However, Extract B can be limited as it suggests that the Diggers had an 'obvious appeal', when other millenarian groups had more of an appeal in reality. Groups such as the Levellers were more popular and more powerful, evidenced by their presence in the Whitehall and Putney Debates, where they discussed suggestions for a new constitution / regime. Whilst the Diggers were somewhat popular, Extract B ~~seems~~ exaggerates their popularity and

In response to Question 1 and Extract C the following student used excellent selected knowledge on the Fifth Monarchists, the focus of the extract, to make a clear and balanced assessment of the argument.

Extract C sees Bradstock argue that Millenarianism's impact in the years 1640 to 1660 was based in their absolute commitment, allowing them influence beyond their size. This is initially evident as Bradstock notes 'their commitment to make their ideas a political reality at any cost, including by force' - also suggesting it was this that gave them their 'central place'. This is convincing to a reasonable extent, with prominent Millenarian figures proving demonstrably motivated to enforce their ideas to make them a 'political reality'. This was evident in the work of Thomas Harrison, a prominent Millenarian in the New Model Army who, as a consequence of his Millenarian beliefs, was one of the foremost proponents of regicide. Indeed, Harrison attended every session of Charles II's trial in 1648 - 49 - a conviction showed by very few, with the majority seeking to disassociate themselves from regicide. This was reflected in the subsequent Rump Parliament, where of the 44 members of the Council of State, only 22 were willing to swear an oath approving of regicide - thus demonstrating Harrison's conviction, and strengthening Bradstock's argument for

the 'commitment' of Millenarians to make their ideas a political reality at any cost. Harrison's conviction was further made clear as he was the first regicide to be executed in 1660 after the Restoration of the Monarchy. Bradstock's argument is weakened by implying the Millenarian's succeeded in achieving their 'political reality'. Indeed, beyond the brief 'Parliament of Saints' in 1653 religious radicals failed to make much of an impact during the period, falling away notably after the Restoration in 1660. Furthermore, Bradstock is also perhaps weakened in suggesting that all Millenarians demonstrated such keen convictions as Harrison - indeed, if they had, they would have perhaps made more of an impact. Bradstock is, however, strong in noting that 'their critics often overestimated their size'. This is an accurate observation, as demonstrated by the 'Nominated Assembly' in 1653, which is said to have involved as few as 12 Fifth Monarchists. This group was, however, well organised and did make some impact - reflecting perhaps why it was that opponents overestimated the size of this group of Millenarians. Overall, Bradstock's interpretation is a convincing to a reasonable degree, appreciating that some Millenarians such as Harrison showed a complete conviction to their cause, and that their presence was felt to a degree beyond their actual size in instances such as the 'Nominated Assembly'.

In commenting on the value of extract C another student in their opening placed more focus on the link between the Fifth Monarchists and the power of the army. While there may be some confusion over the position of the religious radical Henry Vane, who was close to Harrison in 1656-7, in relation to the Fifth Monarchists more broadly the general point about Major-General Thomas Harrison and the religious nature of the army, and its political role is valid context to make use of.

Extract C is very convincing as it ~~details~~^{exposes} the radical sect of millenarians, the Fifth Monarchists. The extract's ~~argues that~~^{what} main argument is that 'this group's' commitment to making their ideas a political reality at any cost' made them the most radical [✓] group. The strength of the Fifth Monarchists can be seen in their influence over the New Model Army (NMA). 'Several army officers' were 'among their leaders', such as Colonel Thomas Harrison and Henry Vane, key individuals who stressed the importance of ~~the~~ this group within the New Model Army. The army became to be viewed as [✓] a devout instrument, a highly devout force who fasted regularly and had many chaplains and priests within army corps. This is significant as it heightened the NMA's capabilities and powers. They became a highly powerful military [✓] force which was feared by the Political Nation as during the 1650s, they believed Cromwell used this army as a

way to rule by military dictatorship. Their radical nature made their political demands a highly notable, such as their declaration stating that they were much more than a mere fighting force and held strong political sway. Such as their 1647 Heads of Proposals and late 1650s Major-General's Rule. Furthermore, exact Lewis-argument is that they formed a broad oppositional alliance by negotiating with other groups. This may be reference to

Report on Question 2

There were some very strong responses to this question. Students were, on the whole, very knowledgeable about the tensions between Crown and Parliament under James I, and James I's general views on monarchy. Successful responses were more adept at illustrating how issues over the balance between the Crown's prerogative and Parliament's privilege caused tension in Parliament rather than in general. In relation to this, students used appropriate elements from a range of their contextual knowledge, for example: the Buckinghamshire Election; Shirley's Case; Apology and Satisfaction; the Union; the Great Contract; Impositions and the Protestation of 1621. Students also balanced their answer by considering other factors that caused tension between Crown and Parliament, for example, favourites, finance and foreign policy. Strong responses also made supported comment on James' pragmatic approach to his relationship with his Parliaments that meant that despite the tensions relations between James and his Parliaments did not break down completely and some referenced the Monopolies and Subsidy Act of 1624 to illustrate this. Some also used James' speech to Parliament in 1610 as illustration of his appreciation of the difference between his theoretical belief in his Divine Right and the reality of needing to rule with the Political Nation as represented in Parliament. This was sometimes used to balance James' reference to the Commons as a 'House of Hell' in 1610 when meeting his Privy Council. Some students referenced religion as a source of tension but the best responses made use of this more directly in relation to how religion was an issue in Parliament through, for example, further context for the tensions over foreign policy when MPs saw the development of Arminianism in light of James' Spanish Match plans.

Question 2 – Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

James I was a firm believer in the ~~the~~ Divine Right of Kings, which caused conflict between crown and parliament because it made him ~~to~~ extremely defensive of his prerogative, ~~was~~ ~~was~~ hostile to opposition and expect support from parliament. However, ~~was~~ ~~was~~ James did also believe that the monarch should co-operate with parliament, and there were other sources of conflict between crown and parliament such as ~~James' financial irresponsibility~~ ^{James'} financial irresponsibility and religion.

~~James' financial irresponsibility~~ James I's view of himself as a Divine Right monarch ~~was~~ certainly caused conflict with parliament because it made him defensive of his prerogative, which he sometimes defended

aggressively. An example of this is in 1621, when the ~~Commons~~ Commons protested the Spanish Match, as they did not believe that England should be forming an alliance with Catholic Spain. James' response was to rip the Protestation from the Commons' Journal and dissolve Parliament. This shows that his views on monarchy caused conflict between crown and Parliament because ~~they~~ they meant that he would respond aggressively and defensively to anything which he saw as an attack on his prerogative. This hampered his ability to communicate with Parliament, and therefore created conflict between crown and Parliament. However, it can be argued that this conflict was not caused by James' views on monarchy but rather his religious policies. For example, his refusal to enter the 30 years war raised questions on his stance on religion, as he was ~~the~~ head of the Church of England and ~~the~~ therefore defender of the Protestant ~~faith~~ faith. Additionally, in 1624, James did not censor the publication of the ~~Arminian tract~~ ~~Arminian tract~~ Arminian tract 'A New Gag for an old Goose' by Montagu. and Arminianism was viewed as Catholicism. This shows that conflict between crown and Parliament actually owed more to James' religious policies and his ~~views~~ believed sympathy to Catholicism. The Commons' protestation against the Spanish Match originated from religious tensions, which in turn forced James to act defensively, and so, while his views on monarchy did play a large role in this conflict, the factor of religion cannot be discounted.

~~Further~~ Furthermore, James' views on monarchy meant that he did not expect to face resistance from Parliament to his policies. This is demonstrated in ~~his~~ his announcement of his proposed union in 1606 with Scotland. James faced severe backlash, as the MPs were ~~the~~ fervently anti-Scottish and also opposed the creation of new laws

which James would introduce to govern his new kingdom. James' response was to dissolve parliament, and until 1610, he attempted to gain support for the Union, which shows that his views on monarchy created conflict because he was insistent on the union, despite knowing about Parliament's anti-Scottish sentiments, leading to major questions on whether he was attempting to become absolute through creating new laws for the ~~the~~ joint kingdom. However, James' pragmatic and communicative nature can be displayed on ~~many occasions~~ many ~~occasions~~ occasions, showing that his views on monarchy were not significant in the conflict between Crown and Parliament because he was able to ease tensions. An example is the Buckinghamshire election in 1604, when he responded to ~~Parliament's~~ Parliament's opposition with a compromise, by suggesting that instead of keeping Forrescue as MP, ~~the~~ a new election should take place instead. This shows that James was able to de-escalate situations, and understood the importance of maintaining a working relationship with Parliament. Overall, even ~~his~~ James' attempt to introduce the Union in 1606 was gradualist, and so it is clear that his understanding that the Crown had to govern with Parliament helped ease tensions, and so his views on monarchy were ~~not~~ ^{Partly} significant in conflict between Crown and Parliament.

Finally, James' view ~~that~~ that the monarchy was above the law meant that he expected ~~the~~ support from parliament. This is clearly shown through the conflict over the Great Contract, in 1610, and the failure to reform finance. ~~Throughout~~ Throughout his reign, James struggled financially, with a period of rising inflation causing his income from crown lands and feudal dues to prove insufficient. This was also exasperated by his own

financial irresponsibility, as he doubled royal expenditure in comparison to what it had been under Elizabeth. To overcome this, he exploited his income from impositions, which was a serious source of tension, and eventually proposed the Great Contract to help reform finances and give the Crown a steady annual income. However, this caused conflict with Parliament because his financial extravagance and exploitation of impositions made him untrustworthy, and the plan failed because Parliament did not want to compromise. This shows that James' view on monarchy caused conflict between crown and Parliament because he believed that he could still gain Parliamentary co-operation, despite the fact that his irresponsibility and illegal collection of impositions had proven otherwise. However, it can be argued that it was simply his lack of financial control, and inability to assess the economic situation which created conflict. He exploited the sale of monopolies, leading to there being over 100 monopolies in 1621 and also abused the sale of honours and peerages, leading to greater tension with Parliament. This shows that it was his financial irresponsibility, which was not affected by his view on monarchy, which led to conflict because it caused him to be distrusted by MPs and alienated them through his exploitation of prerogative and ignoring the economic state of the country.

To conclude, while James' view on monarchy played a significant role in the conflict between crown and Parliament, there were many other, interwoven factors that also affected the relationship, such as finance and religion. Therefore, James' view on monarchy were only partly significant to the conflict between crown and Parliament.

The student's introduction immediately shows a very good understanding of the specific question asked, using the words of the question but also shaping a clear outline of the argument to follow by indicating James' balanced approach to his relationship with his Parliaments as well as indicating other factors that will be considered in the essay. In the introduction the student's use of terminology also suggests some

conceptual understanding. The student immediately illustrates the constitutional implications of foreign policy in 1621, referencing the Commons' Protestation, but also sets this against the impact of James' approach to the Arminian cleric Montagu. While there is limited development of the constitutional questions raised by James' approach to Union the student references prerogative/privilege issues in Parliament and continues to illustrate James' pragmatic approach to kingship. Finance is also dealt with well, including the structural issues rather than just James' extravagance. Overall, there is well developed evidence to substantiate the judgement about James' views causing tension in the context of other factors also contributing but that James' pragmatic approach maintained a working relationship between Crown and Parliament.

Report on Question 3

There were, in general, two approaches adopted to this question. Most answered by a focus on how Charles II could be considered personally responsible for the problems of the restored monarchy balanced by what else caused problems. Others took a more chronological approach, splitting the reign into sections and assessing each in terms of what Charles did and other factors/themes or individuals that were problems for the restored monarchy. When done well both approaches proved successful.

The strongest responses set Charles' approach to the problems of 1660 to 1681 in the context of his primary aim to stay on the throne, and the difficulties of addressing the more structural problems that beset all early modern monarchs before 1688. Problems such as: the limited financial system, religious division and the limits of the state. Many commented well on how Charles, with the co-operation of Parliament, managed the immediate issues of the Restoration. In this was reference to his pragmatic acceptance of the Clarendon Code. Most students focused on Charles' extravagance, pro-Catholicism, foreign policy and management of ministers as examples of his personal failings. Most answers appreciated the Exclusion Crisis as a key feature at the end of the period of the question and many students used this well as an illustration of problems beyond Charles' control e.g. James' Catholicism, but how he managed the crisis well through a combination of compromise and selective use of his prerogative. For many, Charles, given the problems he faced, managed his reign with some skill and certainly achieved his one overriding aim of staying on the throne. Others placed more emphasis on Charles' lazy pragmatism and pro-Catholicism as the fundamental cause of the problems of the years 1660 to 1681.

Question 3 – Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

In the years 1660 to ~~18~~ 1681, Charles II caused many issues through his favouring of Catholicism, expensive foreign policy and supposed attempt at absolutism. However, Charles ~~II~~ was pragmatic in his handling of the Exclusion crisis, and ultimately many ~~issues~~ problems of the restored monarchy originate with the inadequate settlement in 1660, such as financial issues and an unwritten constitution. Therefore, Charles II is only partly responsible for the problems of the restored monarchy.

~~However~~ Charles II caused ~~issues~~ tensions with the political nation through his favouring of Catholicism and dissent. This is evident in his Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, which suspended penal laws against dissenters. As ~~the~~ Parliament and the rest of the political nation were mostly conservative Anglicans, this sparked outrage and Charles was forced to repeal it. ~~These~~ These tensions re-emerged in ~~1679~~ 1679, when the Popish plot caused rife anti-Catholic feeling in England, and Charles' ~~defense~~ defense of ~~his~~ his brother, the Duke of York, during the ~~Exclusion crisis~~ Exclusion crisis caused ~~further~~ further suspicion towards Charles' religious sympathies. This shows that Charles is personally responsible for the problems of the restored monarchy because ~~his~~ his religious sympathies, which he showed very clearly in 1672, ~~caused~~ caused tensions with the political nation, and more significantly, allowed the frenzy of the ~~Popish~~ Popish Plot and Exclusion crisis to accelerate. However, Charles handled the Exclusion crisis pragmatically, using his powers of proroguing parliament and dissolution to ensure that the Exclusion Bills did not pass. He

secured funding from Louis ~~XIV~~ XIV, which ensured that he did not have to call parliament ~~after~~ after 1681, and so committing massively to the success of the restored monarchy, as ~~he~~ he was in a financially stronger position than any other Stuart monarch.

Additionally, Charles II's expensive foreign policy caused financial problems for the monarchy. For example, Charles was involved in both the second Dutch war (1665-67) and the Third Dutch war (1672-74), but he required significant expenditure on the army and navy. ~~He~~ He had to resort to taxation, such as the Hearth Tax in 1662, ~~to~~ to raise sufficient ~~AA~~ funds, however this did not achieve its target in raising enough money and caused tension with the Political Nation due to the high taxation. ~~By 1666~~ By 1666, his income was only £647000, and Parliament blamed crown mismanagement. Further, another method to secure funding was the Treaty of Dover in 1670, which caused greater conflict with the Political Nation as it was essentially an alliance with the Catholic Louis XIV. This shows that Charles II was personally responsible for the ~~problems~~ problems of the restored monarchy because he ~~was~~ ~~chose~~ chose an expensive foreign policy, which he did not have the funds for, and ultimately alienated the Political Nation because of it, losing their ~~en~~ future cooperation. However, it can be argued that ~~the~~ Charles' ~~problems~~ problems originate from the inadequate financial settlement of 1660. Parliament deliberately granted him insufficient funding, as it wished to prevent the monarchy from becoming absolute. Charles only had to resort to using prerogative methods because Parliament was acting in its own self interest, by deliberately granting him a limited ~~annual~~ annual subsidy of £1.2 million, and so Charles is not personally responsible for the problems of the Restored Monarchy.

Finally, Charles II's attempt to secure parliamentary support, ~~alongside~~ alongside his advisor Danby, created problems for the Restored Monarchy. ~~From 1674~~ From 1674, Danby built in the Royalist groupings in parliament. ~~For~~ For

example, ~~the~~ select MPr would receive personalised letters before sessions, urging them to support the crown. By 1675, Danby had 30 MPr on Crown pensions, ~~the~~ and in 1675 he attempted to introduce the Test Bill, which would force MPr to swear loyalty to the crown and never take up arms against the crown or try to change the government of state. This shows that Charles was personally responsible for the ~~problems~~ problems of the Restored Monarchy because his attempt to ~~build~~ build support for the crown was viewed by many as ~~an~~ a royalist attempt to impose absolutism, and eventually resulted in the attempted impeachment of Danby. However, again it can be argued that the seeds of absolutism originate from the ~~unwritten~~ unwritten constitution in 1660, and the fact that because the desire for the return of the monarchy was so strong, Parliament accepted charters based on his vague promises in the Declaration of Breda. Whilst Charles' actions certainly caused tensions, he is not personally responsible for the problems of the Restored Monarchy as the inadequate settlement failed to address constitutional issues, and therefore left many underlying tensions, and so Charles is not personally responsible for the problems of the Restored ~~Monarchy~~ Monarchy.

To conclude, Charles certainly has some responsibility for the problems of the Restored Monarchy, as his religious sympathies were ~~undoubtedly~~ undoubtedly a large ~~source~~ source of tension between him and the Political Nation. However, his ~~pragmatic~~ pragmatic attitude towards dealing with these tensions show that he cannot be entirely personally responsible. It is clear that ~~Charles~~ Charles was ~~given~~ ^{given} left with an inadequate Restoration settlement, which left ~~many~~ underlying tensions, and ultimately caused many problems for the Restored Monarchy. Therefore, ~~Charles~~ Charles is only partly responsible for the problems of the

Restored Monarchy

The student opens with a very good introduction that addresses the specific question, illustrates a balanced approach with a line of argument to be followed and clear conceptual understanding. The student supports how Charles' approach to religion caused problems but balances this with how he still managed the climax of these religious tensions to come out of the Exclusion Crisis in a relatively strong position. In their next section the student focuses on foreign policy and similarly uses the selective support they have, appropriate for a breadth study, to make a balanced comment in relation to the wording of the specific question.

Report on Question 4

The majority of responses to this question placed more weight on post-1688 developments to illustrate change. All good responses did, however, ensure they covered the range of the dates in the question, 1681 to 1702. Some structured their responses around examples of the impact of the fear of Catholicism balanced by other factors whereas others took a more chronological approach.

In considering the last years of Charles II's reign most were able to explain the Exclusion Crisis in the context of the fear of Catholicism and had a good grasp of how Charles' actions did much to help him manage the crisis. Some linked the post-Exclusion crisis period to the developing fear of absolutism, linked to anti-Catholic attitudes and concerns at the positive contacts of Charles and James II with Louis XIV. There was also good comment on the influence of the Tory Anglicans in the years 1681 to 1688 as a limit on the actual power of the monarchy. James II was obviously addressed in the context of his Catholicism but stronger answers illustrated the fear of Catholicism through the measures James took to attempt to embed Catholicism and then specifically the reality of a Catholic succession after June 1688. Most were able to explain the Glorious Revolution as a response to the fear of Catholicism. The constitutional changes after 1688, most notably the Act of Settlement formed a key part of comment in many essays on change at the end of the period, including in relation to the question of Catholic succession. Many balanced change from the fear of Catholicism with a focus on change being driven by the financial revolution as a result of William's war against Louis XIV's Catholic and absolutist France. As part of this stronger responses were able to support this with specific evidence, for example, the Commission of Public Accounts, the Land and Window Tax or the creation of the Bank of England to help manage the National Debt. Some students commented on Parliament moving from being an event to become an institution, as a result of the financial demands of the wars, and thereby changing the relationship between the Crown and Political Nation. In a few answers there was also comment on the motivation of William III not only from his focus on war against Louis XIV, but also from his experience of being Stadtholder of the Dutch Republic and a more willing acceptance of the influence of Parliament as an institution and the key source of finance for his wars.

Question 4 – Exemplification of Level 5 qualities

Throughout 1681 to 1702 ~~changes in the relations~~ power shifted from ~~the crown~~ towards ~~Parliament~~ ^{the political nation}. This change in the relationship between crown and ~~Parliament~~ ^{the political nation} was underpinned by religious issues - mainly the fear of Catholicism. However, there were other considerations such as the interests of Whigs who were linked to 'monied interests' ~~and~~ and the influence of the ~~the~~ Anglicans in the Political Nation.

~~In the years 1681-88 the political nation can be seen~~

In the years 1681-88 the change in the relationship between the crown and ~~Parliament~~ ^{the political nation} can be seen as being caused by the fear of Catholicism. During the last years of Charles II's rule in 1681-85, he relied on Tory Anglican support after the defeat of the Exclusion crisis in 1681. This highlights how the fear of Catholicism as seen in the Exclusion crisis meant that Charles II was reliant on Tory Anglican support, which shows how religious fears had led to a change in relationship between crown and Parliament. Then later on in James II's short reign the fear of Catholicism also ~~had~~ had a major role. This can be seen as James II's reissuing of the Declaration of Indulgence in 1688 led to backlash from ~~his religious~~ ^{the} Bishops such as Sancroft. James II's ~~aim~~ ^{aim} to have aim for religious toleration for Catholics meant that when Mary of Modena gave birth to a son, the Political Nation took action by inviting William to invade England. Therefore, the Glorious Revolution of 1688 can be seen as being caused by a fear of Catholicism, as the Political Nation was concerned about ~~to~~ how a Catholic line of succession ~~was~~ would negatively impact Protestantism in England. ~~Therefore,~~ ^{Therefore,} The Political Nation's actions in 1688 due to a fear of Catholicism ~~marked a shift in~~ ^{marked a} change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament by highlighting how the Political Nation was ready to take drastic action against the crown in order to secure Protestant interests. Overall, the crowning of William and Mary as ~~the~~ monarchs and the influence of Tory Anglicanism highlight how the fear of Catholicism ~~played a role~~ was significant in changing the relationship between crown and the Political Nation.

Fear of Catholicism can also be seen as causing a change in the relationship between crown and the Political Nation by examining the Nine Years War (1688 - 1697). ~~The~~ Parliament ~~largely~~ supported William's war, to the point that around £36 million was spent on this war.

This was because of fears that Louis XIV might establish a 'universal monarchy' which fed into the general fear of Catholicism. Therefore, fear of Catholicism meant that William's war was supported by Parliament, leading to the financial revolution where Parliament took on more power relating to foreign policy. This can be seen in the 1693 Million Loan Act and the 1694 ~~the~~ establishment of the Bank of England. Both these acts were significant as they meant that the Political Nation, represented ~~through~~ ^{by} Parliament, had more power as ~~the~~ Parliament underwrote national debt. Therefore, the relationship between Crown and Parliament changed in the sense that the Crown was now completely reliant on Parliament financially. However, rather than a fear of Catholicism ~~was~~ motivating England's intervention in the Nine Years War, it could be argued that the married interest linked to the Whigs were more significant. This is because Whigs had become more influential due to the growth of the City of London, so they supported the war due to the opportunity it gave them to make money. Despite this, the fear of Catholicism and desire to protect England against ~~the~~ Catholic France's expansion served as an important motivation for Parliament's support of the war. Parliament's support of the war ~~then~~ led to a change in the relationship between crown and the Political Nation as ~~the~~ the Crown now relied on Parliament for 97% of its revenue by ~~the late 1700s~~ early 1700s.

The 1701 Act of Settlement further highlights how fears of Catholicism changed the relationship between ~~Crown and~~ the Crown and the Political Nation. After Anne's last ~~child~~ male child died and William was childless, Parliament presented the 1701 Act of Settlement. This ~~shows how~~ ^{which prevented Catholics from being monarchs} Parliament ~~was~~ was motivated by the fears that a Catholic monarch might come to England's throne once again. The Act of Settlement changed the relationship between Crown and Parliament because it meant

that Parliament essentially had control over foreign policy through the clause that stated any monarch had to receive Parliamentary consent to engage in war. This marked a change in the relationship between Crown and Parliament because control over foreign policy had traditionally been ~~a~~ the Crown's prerogative. Furthermore, with the Act of Settlement William III had to accept the need to have ministers that could win Parliamentary support, as well as ~~the~~ how he needed to allow impeachment ~~proceedings~~ proceedings against the Junto Whigs. Therefore, the ~~1701 Act~~ fear of Catholicism led to the 1701 Act of Settlement which changed the relationship between the Crown and Political Nation by transferring some of the Crown's powers to the Political Nation.

However, it could be argued that the changes in the relationship between ^{the} Crown and ~~the~~ the Political Nation were also caused by the Political Nation's desire to protect its interests. For example, despite William's belief in latitudinarianism, the religious settlement in England was not as tolerant as he would have wanted. The power that the Political Nation had over the religious settlement highlights how the relationship between the Crown and Parliament had changed as the monarch had traditionally been in charge of religion. The Political Nation's lack of toleration for dissenting Protestants was largely due to the Political Nation wanting to protect its influence from ~~non-dissenters~~ ~~who~~ the increasing importance of ~~class~~ 'monied men' who were often dissenters. Therefore, although fear of Catholicism ~~is~~ was significant, the Political Nation's desire to maintain its influence was also a factor in the changing relationship between ~~the~~ the Crown and the Political Nation.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ Catholicism was linked to absolutism in the ~~mind~~ view of the Political Nation and the

English population as a whole. Therefore, fear of Catholicism can be seen as being the main reason for the changing relationship between ~~the~~ the Crown and Political Nation, ~~especially~~ especially throughout the reign of William up until 1702. Although there were other factors such as 'monied' interests and the desire of the Political Nation to maintain its influence, fear of Catholicism was a longer standing factor that influence the relationship between the Crown and Parliament and was therefore significant.

The introduction, while relatively general, suggests a range of factors will be considered and shows an understanding of some key terms. The student immediately addresses the fear of Catholicism across the reigns of Charles II, James II and as a cause for the Glorious Revolution. This is clear and well argued, if it could benefit from some selection to support, but the student does refer to specific actions of James II linked to the Glorious Revolution. The student provides a lot of well selected precise own knowledge in the next long section of their essay that continues to address the fear of Catholicism and other elements

linked to it through William's wars to the changes in the relationship between Crown and Parliament. Key to this passage is a clear illustration by the student of the importance of finance for the influence of Parliament. The student uses the Act of Settlement well in relation to the specific question and as through all other parts of the essay makes direct comment in relation to the question. The student provides balance and has a rounded conclusion to stress their argument.

Further guidance

Our reports on the exams are part of a suite of support we offer to enhance your understanding of our assessments and your students' performance.

Mark ranges and award of grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [results statistics](#) page of our website.

Enhanced Results Analysis (ERA)

Use our exam results analysis tool to create and customise different reports to help understand your students' performance.

ERA is our free online service for you to gain a detailed insight into your students' results. You can:

- analyse your students' scores for each exam question
- identify topics, skills and types of question where students may need further support
- compare your students' performance with those of other classes and with students in other AQA schools nationally.

For more information on ERA, log in through Centre Services.

Professional development

Attend one of our feedback [courses](#) where you can review example responses from students and commentaries from our examiners.

Contact us

Our friendly team will be happy to support you between 8am and 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 0161 958 3861

Email: history@aqa.org.uk

[aqa.org.uk](https://www.aqa.org.uk)