Edexcel GCE
History
Advanced
Unit 3
Option A: Revolution and Conflict in England

Tuesday 12 June 2012 – Morning
Time: 2 hours

You must have:
Sources Insert (enclosed)

Instructions
• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• There are two sections in this question paper. Answer one question from Section A and one question from Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided – there may be more space than you need.

Information
• The total mark for this paper is 70.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
• The quality of your written communication will be assessed in all your responses – you should take particular care with your spelling, punctuation and grammar, as well as the clarity of expression.

Advice
• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Keep an eye on the time.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over
SECTION A

Answer ONE question in Section A on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section A on page 3.
Section B begins on page 11.


Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

EITHER

1  ‘Personal ambitions rather than religious differences explain the bitter factional rivalries of the Tudor Court in the years 1539–53.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2  To what extent was the privy council the centre of political power and government in England in the years 1540–53?

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)


Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3  ‘It was only in the last three years of his personal rule that Charles I faced serious opposition to his wishes and policies.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4  ‘Despite its name, the Cavalier Parliament proved very difficult for the King to manage in the years 1661–67.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

(Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS
SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer. If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box.

Chosen Question Number:

- Question 1
- Question 2
- Question 3
- Question 4
SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section B on page 13.


Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.
Answer EITHER Question 5 OR Question 6.

EITHER

5 Use Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that Wyatt's Rebellion in 1554 posed a very serious threat to Mary’s hold on the throne?

Explain your answer, using Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 5 = 40 marks)

OR

6 Use Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that the influence of parliament in the years 1566–88 was very limited?

Explain your answer, using Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 6 = 40 marks)

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.
Answer EITHER Question 7 OR Question 8.

EITHER

7 Use Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that respect and reverence for the monarchy was the decisive issue in side-taking in 1642?

Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8 Use Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that Cromwell was a force for political stability in the years 1654–58?

Explain your answer, using Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 8 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer √. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ❌ and then put a cross in another box √.

Chosen Question Number:

- Question 5  √
- Question 6  ❌
- Question 7  ❌
- Question 8  ❌
Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.


Sources for use with Question 5

SOURCE 1
(From Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, Tudor Rebellions, published 2004)

The crown always had reason to be sensitive to the rise of powerful families in Kent, strategically placed as it was between London and the Continent. Partly for reasons of security, the crown tended to reward its servants and administrators with lands there. Sir Thomas Wyatt came from a family who had served the first two Tudors loyally. The estates he inherited in 1542 made him one of Kent’s largest landowners. His leadership helped to collect a force quickly when the need arose in January 1554. His success, compared with the dismal failure of Carew and Suffolk, was remarkable. Arriving home at Allington Castle, near Maidstone, on 19 January, he spent the next few days coordinating his plans with a small group of friends. The government was uncertain of the connection between the news it heard of unrest in Devon and in Kent. However, it was bound to treat seriously a threat so near the capital, when there was no army to defend it.

SOURCE 2
(From Judith M. Richards, Mary Tudor, published 2008)

Of the leading conspirators, only Wyatt remained [in January 1554] to offer any serious threat. He raised enough Kentish forces to set out for London. At Maidstone, however, he invited the townspeople to join him, promising that ‘before God we seek no harm to the Queen but better counsel and Councillors’, but still had disappointingly little response to his recruiting. In the meantime, London raised some 500 troops from its citizen militia, and Mary put the aged Duke of Norfolk in command. What neither the Duke nor any other London officials knew was that some leaders of the Whitecoats, as the London trained bands were known, had already agreed to join Wyatt.

SOURCE 3
(From John Guy, Tudor England, published 1988)

A rebellion was planned in November 1553. Four risings were timed for the following March: one in Devon to be led either by Courtenay or Sir Peter Carew; one in Leicestershire led by the Duke of Suffolk; one in Kent led by Sir Thomas Wyatt; and one on the Welsh borders led by Sir James Croft. But when news of the plan leaked in January, the rebels were forced into premature action. Only Kent succeeded in putting a force into the field: Wyatt, a military expert, raised three thousand men. London wavered but, partly through Mary’s resolve, partly because of his own delays, and partly because the citizens feared a sack*, Wyatt failed. The revolt collapsed after Wyatt found Ludgate shut against him.

*sack – violent destruction of the city
Parliament met to vote money to the Crown and to make legislation. The views and interests of the contending regional and local interests were reconciled to produce laws. Each parliament was summoned and dismissed at the will of the sovereign. The Queen vetoed an average of just over five bills for each parliamentary session. The House of Lords included peers and bishops. The House of Commons at one session included three hundred and forty-one gentlemen, lawyers and merchants. The total time of sitting was not great. Parliaments were only called for short periods, which amounted to only three years in total during the whole of Elizabeth's reign.

Some members of the House of Commons became deeply dissatisfied with the pace of the Queen's programme of religious reform, and kept up a barrage of exhortation and criticism which Elizabeth found profoundly irritating. Her intermittent attempts to silence this onslaught were probably mistaken, in that they raised issues of privilege which united the Commons behind a group which was probably never more than a vocal minority. Other matters, such as the Queen's marriage, the succession, and the fate of Mary Queen of Scots, also drove members of the Lower House to offer Her Majesty a lot of unsolicited and unwelcome advice. Whether this should be classed as opposition is debatable, because it nearly always took the form of attempts to introduce measures which the Queen was forced to stop, rather than the obstruction of bills which she wished to see passed.

In the Parliaments of 1584–5 and 1586–7 Presbyterians introduced the most radical of bills, proposing to erect a godly discipline and bring in the Genevan service book as official liturgy. The presbyterian platform threatened not only the established Church, but also the campaign of moderate puritans for a preaching ministry. It failed. The Presbyterians were accused of anarchy: there was nothing anarchic about their discipline nor the ordered lives of their godly community, but their subversion of royal authority and their constitutional challenge were undoubted.
Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.


Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 7
(From David Cressy, England on Edge, published 2006)

Although most of Parliament was against him and he had lost control of London, King Charles still had substantial assets. Most important was the vague but real advantage of Kingship. Kings of England, even if disliked and mistrusted, commanded deep reserves of loyalty and respect. Kingship was among the powers ordained by God, and monarchs were answerable only to their creator. Whereas conservative clergymen upheld royal authority, there were many among the gentry who thought it a matter of honour to serve their sovereign. Many commoners also clung to the magic of royalty. The King was the defender of the faith, the preserver of hierarchy, the embodiment of order and tradition. He was also, however, a growing target of scorn.

SOURCE 8
(From John Adamson, The Noble Revolt, published 2007)

There is no question about the central importance of religion, either in the personal ‘godliness’ that characterises so many of the noble opposition leaders, or as a force for creating nation-wide opposing parties in the spring and summer of 1642. Both sides exploited those polar opposites of Puritan and Papist and eventually Roundhead and Cavalier, to portray (and in the process caricature) their opponent as a mortal peril to the Church. The king’s party depicted their opponents as men intent on destroying the bishops. Parliament tended to cast the king’s party as plotting the introduction of Popery.

SOURCE 9
(From Roger Lockyer, The Early Stuarts, published 1999)

The debate on the Grand Remonstrance began at noon on 22 November 1641 and lasted until the early hours of the following morning. It pitted ‘conservatives’ against ‘radicals’. Those who believed (in Wentworth’s phrase) in ‘treading the ancient bounds’ were against the need to go beyond the restored old boundaries in order to ensure that their restoration was permanent. Had Charles been suddenly removed from the scene, the number of radicals would no doubt have diminished considerably. As it was, the radicals consisted essentially of those who were not prepared to trust him. In the event the radicals won, for the Grand Remonstrance was carried by 159 votes to 148, a majority of eleven, but the closeness of the result showed that the House of Commons, like the country as a whole, was split down the middle. Up to this point, Charles had been a relatively isolated figure, with few supporters. Now, however, by distancing himself from innovation and emerging as the defender of the constitution, he had won back the allegiance of many of his subjects.

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From Blair Worden, The English Civil Wars 1640–1660, published 2009)

As Protector, Cromwell sought to reduce the political temperature and restore a sense of stability. The Rump’s ‘engagement’* was quickly repealed. Parliamentary elections in 1654 and 1656 brought back into politics MPs who had not sat since Pride’s Purge. Always averse to ideological rigidity, Cromwell promoted flexible-minded men, some of them ex-royalists, to office. Of the twenty men who sat on the executive council of the Protectorate, none had been regicides.

He was in favour of flexibility on other fronts too. He tacitly permitted private Anglican worship, knowing he would never win national acceptance so long as Anglican sentiment remained hostile.

SOURCE 11
(From Derek Hirst, ‘The Lord Protector’, in Oliver Cromwell, edited by John Morrill, published 1990)

Oliver may have allowed himself to be persuaded into courses about which he had reservations. But he certainly could not be taken for granted, and his capacity for impulsive action on occasion dumbfounded those around him. His gathering impatience with the Rump in 1653, which finally propelled him into furious action, is neatly paralleled by his dissolution of his second parliament in February 1658. Then, ostentatiously consulting none of his council, commandeering ‘the nearest coach’, and with only a handful of attendants, he hurried to Westminster, where he brushed aside Lord Commissioner Fiennes and the hapless Fleetwood, angrily invoking ‘the living God’ against councillors and parliament. He was capable of calmer initiatives too. And most important of all, on the question of the Crown, Oliver at last made his own decision.

SOURCE 12
(From Mark Kishlansky, A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603–1714, published 1996)

Cromwell accepted the ‘Humble Petition and Advice’ in May 1657 but the ‘Humble Petition and Advice’ did not provide for vetting the elected members of the Commons, and when Parliament reconvened in 1658 many of those who had been excluded in the first session took their seats and attacked the new settlement. Frustrated and disgusted, Cromwell dissolved Parliament.

By now it was apparent that the regime was held together by Cromwell alone. Within his personality resided the contradictions of the Revolution. Like the gentry, he desired a fixed stable constitution; like the zealous, he shared their millenarian vision of a more glorious world to come. As an MP from 1640, he respected the fundamental authority that Parliament represented; as a member of the Army, he understood power and the decisive demands of necessity. In the 1650s, many wished him to become king, yet he refused the crown, preferring the authority of the people to the authority of the sword.
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