



GCE AS/A LEVEL

2100U20-1



S18-2100U20-1

HISTORY – AS unit 2

DEPTH STUDY 2

Royalty, Rebellion and Republic c. 1625-1660

Part 1: The Pressure on the Monarchy and the Drift to Civil War c. 1625-1642

TUESDAY, 22 MAY 2018 – AFTERNOON

1 hour 45 minutes

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

A WJEC pink 16-page answer booklet.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Use black ink or black ball-point pen.

Answer **both** questions.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The number of marks is given in square brackets at the end of each question.

You are advised to spend around 50 minutes on answering each question.

The sources and extracts used in this unit may have been amended or adapted from the stated published work in order to make the wording more accessible.

UNIT 2**DEPTH STUDY 2****Royalty, Rebellion and Republic c. 1625-1660****Part 1: The Pressure on the Monarchy and the Drift to
Civil War c. 1625-1642**

Answer both questions.

QUESTION 1

Study the sources below and answer the question that follows.

Source A

Please find herein contained my opinion upon the case and question concerning Ship Money. In my opinion when the good and safety of the kingdom in general is concerned, and the whole kingdom is in danger, His Majesty may, by Writ under the Great Seal of England, command all his subjects to render their accounts of Ship Money so as to provide and furnish such number of ships with men, victual and munition, and for such time as he shall think fit for the defence and safeguard of the kingdom. His Majesty may also by lawful means and without consulting Parliament compel the paying of Ship Money in cases of refusal or opposition. I affirm that in such cases His Majesty is the sole judge of those who may be brought to the King's court on refusal to pay the said tax. His Majesty alone is the judge of both of the danger to the kingdom and when and how it is to be prevented and avoided.

[Sir Thomas Trevor, a Welsh high court judge, in a confidential report to the King on being asked for his opinion on the legality of extending the collection of Ship Money (1637)]

Source B

Many days have been spent in maintenance of the impeachment of the Earl of Strafford by the House of Commons, whereby he stands charged with High Treason; and your Lordships have heard his defence with patience, and with as much favour as justice would allow. We have given our evidence, and the result of all this is, that it remains clearly proved, that the Earl of Strafford hath endeavoured, by his words, actions and counsels, to subvert the fundamental laws of England and Ireland, and to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government. It cannot be for the honour of the King, that his authority should be used in the practice of injustice and oppression; that his name should be applied to patronise such horrid crimes, as have been represented in evidence against the Earl of Strafford.

[John Pym, a leading radical MP, in a speech delivered in the Commons regarding the trial of the Earl of Strafford (1641)]

Source C

I try to persuade myself that our gracious Sovereign never intended to offend or hurt his loving subjects, but by the suggestion, information and instigation of malignant and disaffected spirits that do surround His Majesty, the tranquillity and peace of his Kingdom is put in peril. We do not oppose the King: the King doth oppose himself. He causes anger and opposition by his stubborn resistance to the good advice offered by his faithful subjects. Common sense must prevail but, in truth, we who have suffered at his hands know that we cannot accept anything upon the King's bare word. His words are conjured up by those who seek to make much mischief and do threaten those of us who are of an honest disposition.

[William Strode, an MP and opponent of the King, writing in a private letter to Arthur Haselrig, a fellow MP (1642)]

With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the drift to Civil War 1637-1642. [30]

QUESTION 2

Study the extracts below and answer the question that follows.

Interpretation 1

The Petition of Right was enacted in 1628 because of the stubborn attitude and arbitrary policies of Charles I. The King had so frustrated and angered Parliament that many MPs were prepared to openly defy the King. The accelerating political tension concerning the power of Parliament and the rights and liberties of the subject forced a reluctant House of Commons to draft the Petition. The Petition complained, among other things, about the illegality of taxation without parliamentary consent, the unbridled power of the prerogative courts of law, especially the notorious Star Chamber, and of arbitrary imprisonment. Although Charles reluctantly accepted this curtailment of the royal prerogative and grudgingly consented to the petition becoming an Act, he refused to admit that these were new rights. This episode marked an important step on the road to the King's experiment in ruling without Parliament.

[Richard Cust, an academic historian and specialist in seventeenth-century political history, writing in his specialist text book, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626-1628* (1987)]

Interpretation 2

The Petition of Right of 1628 had nothing to do with the attitude and policies of Charles I and everything to do with the naked ambition of radical MPs in the Commons. Radicals such as Pym and Hampden were determined to enhance the rights and liberties of MPs by limiting the power and authority of the Crown. They deliberately provoked the king into arbitrary acts of aggression that made him appear dictatorial and unyielding. This provided the excuse they needed to convince a largely sceptical parliament to pass the Petition of Right. The Petition was the first step in a long term plan to dismiss the royal favourites, reject the notion of Divine Right and to control the powers of the Crown. The radicals sought to establish the notion of king and parliament ruling the country in equal partnership.

[B. W. Quintrell, an academic historian and specialist in social history, writing in a political biography, *Charles I 1625-1640* (1993)]

Historians have made different interpretations about the attitudes and policies of Charles I. Analyse, evaluate and use the two extracts above and your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that Parliament's decision to enact the Petition of Right in 1628 was motivated mainly by the attitude and policies of Charles I? [30]

END OF PAPER