

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F961/01**: British History Period Studies.
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1035-1642

Mark Scheme for January 2011

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	0-3	0-5

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 50	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">21-24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links. <p style="text-align: center;">24-26</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high. <p style="text-align: center;">22-23</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<p>Level III</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments. • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087**1 How effective was the government of Edward the Confessor?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some may argue that Edward's government was not effective as his period in exile meant that he was out of touch with developments and lacked a power base in the country. In order to support this they might consider the power of the Earls and many may focus on the position of the Godwins and Edward's failure to manage them, particularly with reference to events of 1051 and 1052. Administration continued and taxes were collected as two tests of effective government. His capabilities as a military leader might also be considered as it was an important mark of kingship and was a disadvantage when dealing with troublesome and ambitious earls. Some candidates might mention his piety and artistic interests which were admired, but for their ideals rather than for their practical relevance to kingship. Many may conclude that Edward lacked the strong qualities needed for an effective king as he was often rash and unwise in his judgements. There might also be mention of the problems that followed from his continuing patronage of Normans.

2 To what extent was Edward the Confessor to blame for the disputed succession at the end of his reign?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a number of reasons why Edward might be blamed; these include his failure to produce an heir and the confusion over the nomination of both William and Harold. Harold became head of the Godwin family in 1053 but the period to 1066 showed his problems in maintaining his primacy among the nobility. However, some candidates might argue that while Harold was widely accepted as king in England there was not universal acceptance. Harold would face problems establishing himself on the throne. The near simultaneous challenges from William and from Harold Hadrada and Tostig did not give Harold time to secure himself on the throne. Candidates may suggest that there were others with claims and point to Tostig and Harold Hadrada, who mounted a powerful challenge. The reasons for the rival claims will probably be examined, with better answers explaining why each of these did not represent an unchallenged claim. William's claim, allegedly substantiated by Harold's promise, Edward's nomination and papal approval, was rejected by the Anglo Saxons who preferred Harold. Edward might have changed his preference on his deathbed and this added to the dispute. There is no need for candidates to look at the outcome of the dispute but it will be possible to take the argument to Hastings because this effectively ended the dispute over the succession. Some answers might consider Edgar the Atheling, but this would be a bonus and his omission should not be regarded as a gap.

3 How successfully did William I deal with opposition to his rule?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question and better answers should focus on the issue of 'how successful'. The death of Harold at Hastings deprived the Anglo Saxons of their major leader and it frequently meant that opposition was both divided and weak making William's task that much easier. The defeat at Hastings had also broken the military strength of the Anglo Saxon fyrd and earls. Important Anglo Saxon nobles from Mercia and Northumbria had promised allegiance, which also made his task easier. Candidates may consider the policies that William followed such as castle building and how effective it was or the 'Harrying of the North', which would have given a clear warning to those who might oppose his rule. Many of the risings were localised, for example Kent, Northumbria, the south west and the Welsh Marches, which made their suppression much easier. Many of the risings also arose from local grievances, rather than dissatisfaction with William's rule. The rebellions often lacked leadership. In dealing with the problem in the north in 1069, and with intervention from Scotland and Scandinavia, William enjoyed clear military advantage, which made his job easier as his forces were

superior to anything the rebels could gather. William moved swiftly to put down trouble before it had a chance to develop, he acted decisively and used harsh methods which may have deterred others, all of which could be used to suggest he was effective. The swift manner in which he took England and the armed forces on which he could rely negated the opposition.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509

4 How effectively did Edward IV control the nobility after 1470?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might approach this by comparing Edward's control of the nobility in his second reign with that in his first to argue that he was more successful, and this approach is acceptable provided the emphasis is on the second period. If candidates take this approach they are likely to argue that Edward had not been successful in his dealings with the nobility in his first reign and did much to create problems, therefore it was an important concern after 1470. They may point to his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville, which did much to alienate many nobles as the family was promoted to positions of importance through advantageous marriages. The outbreak of Civil War in 1470 may also be used by candidates to show that Edward had not been successful in dealing with them. Although Edward appeared more secure in his second reign as he did not face rebellion, he did create 'super nobles' who, it could be argued, had too much power and he was only able to control them because of his personality. Edward continued the tradition of allowing magnates to rule more or less independently in the peripheral regions. However, some may argue that he gave too much leeway to potentially troublesome nobles such as Richard. This might be balanced against the fact that he was far less tolerant this time and removed those who might seek to usurp him; Henry VI was put to death immediately, Clarence, who had conspired with Warwick in 1469 was arrested in 1477 and finally killed in 1478. He was able to curb the power of the nobility, but he did not destroy their power. He was a generous patron of his supporters and allowed some, such as his brother Richard Duke of Gloucester to become very powerful in the north. He did allow nobles to retain their private armies of retainers, relying on mutual interests to curb any inclination to use them against him, which was a risky policy. There might be mention of Edward allowing former adversaries the opportunity to redeem themselves and between 1472-5 30 attainders were reversed. It might be noted that Edward did not control old feuds and that the clash between the Harringtons and Stanleys continued. Although some might argue that he was successful as full scale civil war was avoided temporarily there were regular bouts of localised provincial lawlessness and bloodshed. It might be argued that the ability of the king to manage the nobility depended too much on his personality and that this is shown most clearly after his death, with Richard Duke of Gloucester being able to seize the throne.

5 'The most important reason why Richard III lost the throne in 1485 was lack of support from the nobility.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should consider his relations with the nobility, including the execution of Buckingham. The distrust that surrounded Richard was a key factor in explaining why he was unable to create a wide section of support. His betrayal by Stanley at Bosworth might be interpreted either as justified or as the actions of an unscrupulous noble who wanted to come out on the winning side. Some answers might also argue that Richard's promotion of northern nobles alienated a large number of southern nobles, which would be crucial. Although many answers may focus on Bosworth, without earlier events and developments he would not have alienated many who either supported Henry Tudor or waited to see the outcome. The Lancastrians always opposed him, and Henry Tudor was the most dangerous

challenge. Candidates might go on to consider some of Henry's strengths as they helped to remove Richard; these might include being a clever opponent, avoiding a direct confrontation with Richard until he had a large enough force. Candidates may consider Richard's character arguing that he was untrustworthy, ambitious and even murderous. Many answers are likely to consider the circumstances of his seizure of the throne and argue that this was the start of his troubles as it raised doubts about his character and alienated some. It will be relevant to discuss the probable murder of the princes in the Tower, but this must be linked to loss of support.

6 How successful was Henry VII in achieving his foreign policy aims?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may start by considering Henry's aims and then go on to consider how far they were achieved; this might include issues such as security, finance and England's position in Europe and the prevention of foreign states from undermining his kingship. Many may argue that Henry was very successful. He was able to gain recognition for the Tudors through a series of marriages to Spain and Scotland; he was able to ensure pretenders to the English throne were not given sanctuary, although this was not achieved immediately and some answers may point to the support given to Simnel and Warbeck by Margaret of Burgundy. As Henry's position was not secure at the start of the period he was keen to avoid expensive wars and this was largely achieved; although he went to war against France over Brittany it was short-lived and Henry actually gained money through the French pension, however he was unable to prevent the French acquisition of Brittany which might be seen as a threat to English security. It might also be argued that Henry's foreign policy was beneficial for trade with the Treaty of Medina del Campo and Magnus Intercursus. Security was improved as England was allied to Spain, a powerful nation in Europe, and security on the northern border had also been achieved, which also weakened the Auld Alliance.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-1558

7 How significant were the reforms of Thomas Cromwell in changing the government of England by 1547?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is a wide range of issues that candidates might consider and it should not be expected that all will be addressed, what matters is the quality of analysis, although examiners should expect to see a range. There may be consideration of the changing role and regularity of parliament and its increased competence as it became involved in religious issues and some might raise the issue of the importance of statute law or point to Henry's comment about power in the time of parliament. There might be some consideration of the financial courts that were established, although it should be noted that most were short-lived. Candidates might consider the issue of Wales and the Act of Union of 1536, with the establishment of the county system etc. Some answers might raise the Elton 'Tudor Revolution' debate, but this is not to be expected as historiography is not a requirement at AS and examiners should also be aware of answers that simply describe the Elton thesis and do not use it to answer the question.

8 How successful were the governments of Somerset and Northumberland in dealing with the problems they faced?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates' understanding of the range of problems may be a determining factor in the quality of the answer. It is likely that many answers will focus on the rebellions of the period: Western and Kett, although the Lady Jane Grey affair may also receive mention. Candidates may argue the unrest of 1549 was at least a contributory factor in the downfall of Somerset. However, they may also argue that ultimately both the Western and Kett rebellions were crushed. Some answers may take a broader approach and consider economic and social issues, such as vagrancy or the problems created by the collapse of the cloth trade, and this is acceptable. Neither Somerset nor Northumberland was able to solve the problems created by the minority, particularly the issue of faction which did much to destabilise the period, particularly under Somerset. They shared the disadvantage of being regents and how well they handled the problem of their relationship with other members of the Council. The death of Edward created a succession crisis that Northumberland did not solve. The problem of religion and the promotion of Protestantism can be examined, although it is not a requirement of answers in any level. How well they handled the problem of inflation might also receive attention.

9 'Economic problems were the greatest challenge facing the government of Mary I.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were a large number of problems, including economic, faced by Mary and it is not expected that candidates will cover all of them, what is important is the quality of analysis, although answers at the higher levels must consider the named factor even if they conclude it was not the greatest problem. Although contemporaries were not aware of the population rise some answers may refer to this as the basis of other problems; it was important because it fuelled the price rise and was also the underlying cause of the rise in poverty and vagrancy. The price rise is likely to be the centre of many answers. Better answers might suggest that one of the serious social problems was a growing class divide. Candidates may consider the problem of bad harvests and disease, particularly towards the end of Mary's reign. Some answers may focus on the problem of securing the throne and argue this was the most serious issue, using Lady Jane Grey and Wyatt to support their argument, suggesting both came close to toppling her. Although coverage of religion is not expected some may argue that this and her marriage was the greatest concern for Mary.

Church and State 1529-1589

10 How serious was opposition to Henry VIII's religious charges?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is a wide range of material available to candidates and it is not expected that all areas will be covered, but what matters is the quality of analysis. It is likely that many will argue that opposition was not serious, but candidates might suggest that the numbers in the Pilgrimage, contrasted with the size of the royal army, were a threat and that Henry was fortunate that the rebels were naïve and did not advance on London. Some might argue that opposition to the changes largely came from individuals and that this limited the threat. However, some might balance this against the quality of the individuals; there might be discussion of the impact of More and Fisher's opposition. There might also be some consideration of the seriousness of Catherine of Aragon's unwillingness to agree to go into a nunnery. There were groups of monks, Carthusians and Franciscans who were much respected. At the same time some abbots resisted the closure of monasteries, but Henry was willing to treat these brutally and crush opposition. It might be noted that he did have

the ultimate weapon available: death. There were other individuals such as Anne Askew and John Lambert who denied transubstantiation and although their opposition was not serious they might be used to show that there were opponents on both sides of the religious divide. There was little opposition in parliament and there could be some discussion of how potential opposition was managed by Cromwell.

11 How much support was there for Puritanism in the years from 1558 to 1589?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might explain what Puritanism was and use this as the basis to explain how much support the different groups had. There might be some discussion of how much support there was for Puritanism within parliament and this might lead to a discussion of Neale's 'Puritan choir' and it might be concluded that support was limited. This view might be supported by their failure to bring about changes to the religious settlement. In parliament there were a number of more radical puritans and there might be reference to individuals, but in some cases it was parliament itself that silenced them, again suggesting a lack of support. There were a significant number of moderate puritans, who were willing to work within the church to change it, but failed. However, they were realistic enough to see that it was better to have Elizabeth on the throne rather than a Catholic monarch. Some candidates might consider how much support there was for Puritanism at court and suggest that with Leicester etc their influence more than made up for their lack of numbers. There might be some discussion of support for prophesyings and how far support for this was aided by Grindal's unwillingness to suppress them. However, Whitgift was able to deal with the threat quite easily and this again suggests that support was limited.

12 'The Catholic challenge to Elizabeth in the years from 1558 to 1589 was never serious.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may identify the nature of the Catholic challenge and consider how it changes over the period. Answers may look at the threat from home and abroad and suggest that at the start of the period it was the threat from home that was the strongest, given the strength of Catholicism, and suggest that it was serious, pointing to the problems in passing the Settlement and the ease with which Mary had restored Catholicism. However, they may argue that Elizabeth handled this well ensuring it was not serious; there was no serious unrest, the moderate nature of the settlement and her avoidance of creating martyrs might be mentioned. Some answers may also consider the Catholic challenge of the Northern Earls. This rebellion failed to raise the large scale support that had been seen in 1536. There may also be consideration of seminary priests and their effectiveness and Elizabeth's ability to limit the seriousness with the avoidance of creating martyrs, but executing for treason. The foreign threat appeared serious at the start of the period, although some may argue that Philip needed her support just as much and would not support Mary Queen of Scots to increase French influence in England. There may be some who argue that the threat was greatest at the end of the period with the Armada and that this could have led to Catholics at home rising.

England under Elizabeth I 1558-1603**13 How successfully did Elizabeth I handle factions in her court and government?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to show a basic understanding of the concept of faction in order to answer the question, but many find this difficult and it should be remembered that this is an AS examination. Some answers might interpret faction too broadly and include Puritans and therefore discuss their impact on the effectiveness of government. Candidates can examine Elizabeth's methods and policies in dealing with factions. They might examine the struggles between the Cecil/Burghley and Leicester groups and then between Robert Cecil and the Essex groups. There were few problems until the Essex rebellion, which left Cecil unchallenged. Elizabeth tried to use patronage to create loyalty to herself and to avoid the emergence of an over-mighty minister. William Cecil was eminent but not pre-eminent. At the top level candidates might point out that some factions co-operated against the Queen; Cecil and Leicester were not always rivals. Elizabeth was sometimes isolated, for example over Mary Queen of Scots. Candidates might conclude that Elizabeth was mostly but not always successful.

14 Assess the reasons why the issue of Elizabeth I's marriage and the succession caused disputes during her reign.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It was expected that Elizabeth would marry on her accession, but the problem was whom to marry? Candidates are likely to be aware of many of the suitors but each of these presented insuperable difficulties of religion, age and even mental stability. Some may argue that proposals from Philip of Spain and the Dukes of Anjou and Alencon had to be handled very carefully because of the power of their countries and therefore Elizabeth's foreign policy had to be careful. Candidates may also discuss the issue of Elizabeth's prerogative and her unwillingness to allow parliament to discuss the issue. The succession was an important issue because of the claim of Mary Queen of Scots as it raised major problems concerning religion and relations with both France and Scotland. Her French links proved a threat, whilst she was also a possible centre of opposition for Catholics both at home and abroad. There was the problem of the suitability of any domestic suitors, particularly following the death in suspicious circumstances of Dudley's wife. If Elizabeth married at home it would raise the issue of faction and the dominance and rewards that would go to the family. In the same way there was concern that an overseas marriage would lead to influence and dominance from abroad: memories of Mary's marriage to Philip and the French war still influenced many.

15 How successfully did Elizabeth I handle the financial problems she faced?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may consider the financial problems that Elizabeth faced, discuss the methods she adopted and assess their success. At the lower end candidates might focus more on general economic issues such as the slump in trade and the poverty of the lower orders. Candidates can explain the sources of royal income – crown lands, justice fines, levies on trade- these could not easily be increased and it was a time of inflation. Parliament did grant additional taxation but Elizabeth was reluctant to call it as some members demanded concessions as the price of grants and taxes were unpopular. She was reluctant to introduce financial innovations. Her court and personal expenses might seem to be extravagant but in fact they did not represent a heavy expense. Many of her clothes and much of her jewellery were presents. She was economical, even mean, in spending money and hated commitments that would involve expense, such as aid to the Dutch rebels. By 1588 she had, unusually in Europe, accrued a small surplus but the expenses and her consequent financial problems grew in the 1590s because of war and the worsening

economic situation that affected her sources of income. There was considerable debt when she died. Credit candidates who contrast the success of the early period with later failures.

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1642

16 'The Thirty Years War caused the most serious foreign policy dispute between James I and his Parliaments.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some answers may claim that foreign policy was not a major cause of conflict between James and his parliaments when compared with other issues and this is a valid approach. James tried to maintain a balance between Protestant and Catholic powers, for example, marrying his daughter, Elizabeth, to Frederick of the Palatinate and making an agreement with the German Protestant Princes and attempting to establish good relations with Spain; trying in the early 1620s to marry his son Charles to the Infanta. However, for many in parliament his policy did not go far enough and they wanted England to actively intervene in the Thirty Years War. They saw Protestantism as under threat and believed that James should help to defend it. The marriage of Charles became an important diplomatic tool, but it also revealed further conflict. The king's reluctance to offend Spain led to unpopular developments, such as the execution of Raleigh and finally the embarrassment of Charles' failed venture to Spain to agree a marriage. The intervention in the Thirty Years War in 1624 was too late to save James from criticism. He was criticised for following policies which were seen at times to be basically wrong and other times right but ineffective. However some candidates might argue that there were other more serious problems over foreign policy although they were linked. James believed that foreign policy was an essential part of the royal prerogative whereas critics resisted the claim, especially parliament as they had to vote the funds to sustain the policy. Secondly, the practicalities of his foreign policy proved unpopular. The pursuit of a peaceful policy appeared to be an appeasement of catholic powers, which was not popular with parliament. James I soon made peace with Spain, the Treaty of London in 1604, and this was not popular with some who made money from the war and others who regarded Spain as the arch-enemy.

17 How effective was the policy of 'Thorough' in England and Ireland?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The policy of 'Thorough' does cause candidates at AS some difficulties and examiners should allow some latitude as to the definition. The policy is usually associated with the work of Strafford in Ireland and the north, but in broader terms includes the general increase in efficiency and uniformity of the government. The policy was unpopular, although without parliament there was little opportunity for grievances to be aired. In terms of increasing the hand of central government in the localities it was effective, most noticeably seen in the attempts to raise new revenue and secure financial independence from parliament. Candidates may make reference to the sale of monopolies, the revival of forest laws and feudal levies. It is likely that many will consider the effectiveness of Ship Money which was very successful at first and brought the government close to financial independence. The failure to use the king's financial needs to restrain Charles in this period is testament to the effectiveness of the policies. Candidates might also consider the success of Wentworth's policies in Ireland, but while it is not expected that they will demonstrate an equal knowledge of English and Irish policy, candidates at the top levels should make reference to the policies in Ireland. Perhaps the effectiveness of Strafford's rule is supported by Parliament's Act of Attainder to remove him.

18 How far was Charles I to blame for the outbreak of Civil War in 1642?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might argue that it was not the fault of Charles and focus on Parliament. However, for the higher levels candidates must write at least a good paragraph on Charles and explain why he was not to blame if they take this approach; they cannot simply dismiss his role. Other forms of alternative approach will be a focus on 1640-2, from the meeting of the Long Parliament to the outbreak of the civil war, or the longer term approach that shows that factors gradually built up. The problem with the second approach is that candidates might lose focus on the question and simply concentrate on telling the story. Developments before 1640 are relevant, but a civil war could not have been predicted then, nor was it possible. When considering Charles I they might consider his Arminianism, encouraged and enforced by Laud, which was very different from the religion of many and created problems. There were suspicions that Charles was too tolerant of Catholicism, even that he had sympathies with the religion. Laud was arrested and there were criticisms of the episcopacy. The Court of High Commission was abolished. Reference could be made to events in Ireland and how Charles handled them, which were strongly linked to religion. There were also suspicions about the influence of Henrietta Maria. However, candidates might consider political divisions, including Charles I's tendencies towards absolutism. His prerogative powers also caused disquiet and these were attacked. The arrest and subsequent execution of Strafford was a turning point, but how far was this due to Charles? Control of the army was also vitally important, Charles was distrusted personally, a feeling that was confirmed by his attempt to arrest the Five Members. Within parliament, the momentum gave impetus to the war party; there were divisions between those who would be reconciled to the king and those who sought to weaken his position further, and consideration should be given to Pym and how far his policies and outlook were to blame.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553