

# 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 : **29 / 50**

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

<b>Paper:</b> Y108/01		
<b>Paper</b> 29 / 50		
<b>Total:</b>		
Question	Total / Max Mark	Used In Total
1	17 / 30	✓
2	NR / 20	
3	12 / 20	✓

Question Part

		Both Source A and Source B agree
	V	that Cromwell rejected the crown because of opposition from the army. However, in Source B William Bradford believes that it might be the divisions among the army which Cromwell should be fearful of. Source C
	V	and Source D both do not believe that Cromwell rejected the crown because of opposition from the army. Source C argues
	EXP	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.
	F	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"
	EXP	would <del>create</del> <sup>create</sup> a rift between Cromwell and the army; which arguably was his main source of power to begin
	KU	with, through battles such as Preston on the 19 <sup>th</sup> August 1648 which gain him and his men the nickname "Ironsides". <del>and</del> <sup>however,</sup> <del>but</del> <del>Angels</del> <del>defeat</del> 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

	<p>Charles X of Sweden in June 1655, which is before the Petition was 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 is only giving his own opinion of why Cromwell shouldn't become king.</p>
P	
	<p>Source 2 is agreed with Source 1 and the question. In fact, Bradford argued that "the greatest part of the army now near you are against it", this being Cromwell's kingship.</p>
EXP	
	<p>William Bradford then goes on to <del>state</del> <sup>say</sup> 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 one who has "attended your great hazards", this also being "most of them". Finally, Bradford <del>writes</del> <sup>says</sup> about the "divisions amongst [them]" and how they make them "unhappy".</p>
EXP	
	<p>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</p>
EXP	



Question Part

		as it was written by William Bradford, and P old soldier himself to Cromwell directly - possibly influencing his decision. Bradford arguably has a <sup>reliable</sup> greater insight
	EXR	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
	KU	his kingship on the 8 <sup>th</sup> May; However, there is evidence that during the period after the <sup>Humble</sup> Petition (March 1657)
	KU	Cromwell often met with the army and generally received positive support, such as one meeting at Essex.
	E	Source C, however, disagrees with the question and argues that Cromwell didn't accept the crown because "he would lose 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".
	EXP	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 plus 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 "only" hand  
 of 9,000 men. However, Cromwell did hold  
 a tremendous amount of power as  
 Lord Protector of the first Protectorate  
 Parliament. One of the key propositions of  
 the first parliament was that parliament should be a  
 single chamber under the authority of  
 one single person (Cromwell), and although  
 Cromwell said he had not previously seen  
 this proposition, this is unlikely  
 to be a coincidence.

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~~ <sup>he</sup> believes



Question Part

greatly on the authority of Parliament, and that he did not take the Lord Protectorate with parliament, than 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 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		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.
		Firstly, and most importantly, is
	F	the role of parliament in the lead up
		to the king's personal rule parliament
	EXP	was increasingly testing the king's prerogative
		and questioning the freedom of speech. During
		the periods of 1625-29 the king was
	EXP	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
	EXP	parliament only granted the king 2
		subsidies in 1625 - worth only roughly
		£120,000. This obviously wasn't enough
		to fund a war against France and
	AW	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



Question Part

		"poisoned the air from the outset". Following
		in the Parliament of 1628, during the
	EXP	second sitting (1629), MPs such as
		Sir John Eliot wrote the 3 rebellions,
		which being anyone who is an innovator
		of religion is a capital enemy, a ruinous
	EXP	and capital enemy, and anyone who
		supports the use of tonnage and poundage
		is a capital enemy. This was a
	AN	clear attack on the king and his
		prerogative and that 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
	AN	not have solely caused the shift to
		civil war as the situation was
		exacerbated by Charles' beliefs and
		actions.
	F	Charles had a strong belief in
		his Divine Right of kingship and royal
	EXP	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
	EXP	right of the king, but the parliament
		of 1626 only allowed it for one year.





Question Part

F	In addition, Charles' foreign policy
	had a role to play in the lead up
	to his personal rule. These actions
EXP	abroad led to parliament not <del>granting</del> <sup>granting</sup>
	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, <del>apparently</del> <sup>apparently</sup> they were extremely
	ill-disciplined and ended up drunk the
	night before and <del>begin</del> <sup>begin</sup> to fire
	amongst themselves. This also led to
EXP	a dislike towards Buckingham who was
	once called the "grievances of grievances".
	Furthermore, in 1627 Buckingham once again
	led a <del>expedition</del> expedition, this time to
EXP	La Rochelle. Here Buckingham left with
	80 ships and 6,000 men and <del>was</del> had
	another disaster with reports of ladders
	being too short to scale the wall. The
	<del>Hugonots</del> Hugonots were surrendered in
	1628 and Buckingham was stabbed in
	1628 by John Felton, where Parliament
	was heard to rejoice to the king's
AN	great anger. This then played an
	important role in the lead up to the
	personal rule as it influenced <del>parliaments</del>
	parliaments <del>of</del> actions to a large







