

Candidate Marks Report

Series : 6 2018

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	Y108
Candidate No :	Component Code :	01
Candidate Name :		

Total Marks :

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

Question Part

Both Source A and Source B agree that Cromwell rejected the crown because of opposition from the army. However, in Source B William Bradford believes that ~~it~~ it might be the divisions among the army which Cromwell should be fearful of. Source C and Source D both do not believe that Cromwell rejected the crown because of opposition from the army. Source C argues that Cromwell believed he holds more power as current Lord Protectorate; and Source D argues that he doesn't rank higher of other titles and that he greatly values the authority of parliament.

Source A argues that Cromwell would to "a great extent alienate himself from the nation", thus Peter Julius Coyek believes that "assuming] the title of king" would ~~create~~ ^{create} a rift between Cromwell and the army; which arguably was his main source of power to begin with, through battles such as Preston on the 19th August 1648 which gain him and his men the nickname "Ironsides". ~~and~~ ^{however,} ~~but~~ ~~Angels~~ ~~defusion~~ this does not reflect clearly the views of Oliver Cromwell himself as it is written by Peter Julius Coyek (Ambassador of Sweden) to



Question Part

Charles X of Sweden in June 1655, which is before the Petition with even drawn up in March of 1657. Thus, Coyne is just speculating that either Cromwell will "try to get the laws altered by consent" or that he will "very shortly assume the title of king" without any supporting knowledge; Coyne only gives his own opinion of why Cromwell shouldn't become king.

Source 2 is agreed with Source 1 and the question. In Rob Bradford argued that "the greatest part of the army now near you are against it", this being Cromwell's kingship. William Bradford then goes on to ~~believe~~ ^{say} that "those that are for a monarchy I fear you have little experience of them"; here Bradford is saying that Cromwell has little experience of monarchy for this "kingship" and that maybe it is not for an elite who "trained" attended "great hazards", free also being "risk of them". Finally, Bradford ~~writes~~ writes about the "divisions amongst [them]" and how they make them "unhappy". Thus, overall the source that the majority of the army oppose the vote for Cromwell's "kingship" and that the divisions among the army are likely to make them unhappy. However, arguably, it is quite reliable.



Question Part

as it was written by William Bradford, and
 told soldiers himself to Cromwell directly -
 possibly influencing his decision. Bradford
 arguably has a ^{reliable} greater insight
 to the army's support or opposition. However,
 Bradford seems to be "against" Cromwell
 becoming king and this might be over-
 emphasising the size of opposition within
 the army. We know that there is a
 strong belief that Cromwell was fearful of
 opposition from the army and thus rejected
 his kingship on the 8th May; However,
 there is evidence that during the period
 after the ^{Humble} Petition (March 1657)
 Cromwell often met with the army and
 generally received positive support, such
 as one meeting at Essex.

Source C, however, disagrees with
 the question and argues that Cromwell
 "didn't accept the crown" because "he
 wouldn't have more authority in his present
 position than he would as king", with
 Francisco Ginesian believing that "he would
 be obliged to concede and renew many
 privileges and jurisdictions to parliament".
 However, we know this would not necessarily
 be the case as a monarch during this
 period would follow the ideology Divine Right



Question Part

of kings & thus giving the king immediate and
 greater power. Moreover, this belief might well
 be passed into Cromwell as throughout the
 first and second civil war Cromwell
 emphasised God being on their side, even
 stating that it was the "Hand of God"
 which dictated the battle of Marston on
 19th August, where Cromwell's army had
 9,000 men. However, Cromwell did hold
 a tremendous amount of power as
 Lord Protector of the first Protectorate
 Parliament. One of the main propositions of
 Cromwell was that parliament would be a
 single chamber under the authority of
 one single person (Cromwell), and although
 Cromwell said he had not previously seen
 this proposition, it is unlikely
 that he would have seen it.

Finally, although source D doesn't
 agree with source C as to why Cromwell
 rejected kingship, it does agree that
 Cromwell did not reject the crown because
 of opposition from the army. Bridges states
 that Cromwell said that he valued not one
 name more than another and that "he had
 rather have any name from his parliament
 than any name without it". Here, Cromwell
 believes that he doesn't value Lord
 Protectorate of king as ~~much~~ ^{he} believes



Question Part

greatly on the authority of Parliament, and
 that he'd rather be a hard Protectorate
 with parliament than a king without it.
 Arguably, this is a reliable representation
 of Cromwell's thoughts as it is written
 by John Bridges, an MP, who
 was present at the "conference with his
 highness" and is the only source which
 gives evidence of Cromwell's direct
 thoughts and words. However, as Cromwell
 announced this to lots of MPs, arguably
 he might be trying to almost just "butter
 them up" in order to get their support.
 In conclusion, I believe that
 source D is the most reliable as to
 why Cromwell rejected the kingship on the
 25th May. Moreover, although both A and
 B agree with the contention, they are
 both unreliable and seem to lack
 credibility.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN



Question Part

3	<p>Charles I embarked on the Personal Rule in 1629 for a number of reasons. The most important factor to consider is the role of parliament, particularly the parliaments of 1625, 1626 and 1628/9. This then is followed by Charles' beliefs and actions and then by his foreign policy.</p>
	<p>Firstly, and most importantly, is the role of parliament in the lead up to the king's personal rule. Parliament was increasingly testing the king's prerogative and questioning the freedom of speech. During the periods of 1625-29 the king was at war with both France and Spain and both roughly cost £1 million. Thus the king needed subsidies; however, for a number of reasons, such as the failure at Cadiz in October 1625 parliament only granted the king 2 subsidies in 1625 - worth only roughly £120,000. This obviously wasn't enough to fund a war against two fronts and just widened the rift between Charles and his parliaments. Moreover, after he was granted no money in 1626 he used other methods, such as the forced loan in 1627 and the use of tonnage and poundage which Roger Lockyer believed</p>



Question Part

		"poisoned the air from the outset". Following
		in the Parliament of 1628, during the
		second sitting (1629), MPs such as
		Sir John Eliot wrote the 3 rebellions,
		while being anyone who is an innovator
		of religion is a capital enemy, a ruinous
		and capital enemy, and anyone who
		supports the use of tonnage and poundage
		is a capital enemy. This was a
		clear attack on the king and his
		prerogative and thus the king acted
		by arresting Sir John Eliot and Sir
		Dudley Digges during the sitting of
		parliament and triggered the start of
		the personal rule. This, however, may
		not have solely caused the shift to
		civil war as the situation was
		exacerbated by Charles' beliefs and
		actions. Charles had a strong belief in
		his Divine Right of kingship and royal
		prerogative. This is why he acted very
		forcefully against parliament and believed
		they were attacking his royal prerogative,
		therefore exercising his ability to levy
		tonnage and poundage had been a
		right of the king, not the parliament
		of 1626 only allowed it for one year.



Question Part

In addition, Charles' foreign policy had a role to play in the lead up to his personal rule. These actions abroad led to parliament not ~~granting~~ ^{granting} Charles as much money and adding to their list of grievances, for example, the Cadiz expedition in October 1625 was a complete failure and only 5,000 men returned. Under the leadership of Buckingham, ~~apparently~~ ^{apparently} they were extremely ill-disciplined and ended up drunk the night before and ~~beginning~~ ^{beginning} to fire amongst themselves. This also led to a dislike towards Buckingham who was once called the "grievance of grievances". Furthermore, in 1627 Buckingham once again led an expedition, this time to La Rochelle. Here Buckingham left with 80 ships and 6,000 men and ~~was~~ had another disaster with reports of ladders being too short to scale the wall. The ~~Hugonots~~ Huguenots were surrendered in 1628 and Buckingham was stabbed in 1628 by John Felton, where Parliament was heard to rejoice to the king's great anger. This then played an important role in the lead up to his personal rule as it influenced ~~parliament's~~ ^{parliament's} actions to a large



Question Part

		extent, but it was a minor cause in
		itself of the cause of the personal rule.
		conclusion, I believe that
		Charles embarked on his personal rule in
		1629 primarily because of ^{parliamentary} political
		actions. However, lots of other factors
		influenced parliament standardised as
		a catalyst; Charles's beliefs for
		example, along with his foreign
		policy and the grievances of Buckingham
		and other nobles were also factors
		of his decision to embark on the personal
		rule. The personal rule was a
		response to the "Petition of Right" which
		demanded that the king should not
		imprison without trial, or fine without
		consent of parliament, or suspend the
		laws without parliament's approval.
		Charles's response was to ignore the
		petition and to rule without parliament
		from 1629 to 1640. This was the
		personal rule. Charles's decision to
		embark on the personal rule was
		influenced by a number of factors,
		including his beliefs, his foreign
		policy, and the grievances of
		parliament and other nobles.



