



GCE AS/A LEVEL

2100U20-1



Z22-2100U20-1

MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2022 – MORNING

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

1 hour 45 minutes

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

A WJEC pink 16-page answer booklet.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Use black ink or black ball-point pen. Do not use gel pen or correction fluid.

Answer **both** questions.

Write your answers in the separate answer booklet provided, following the instructions on the front of the answer booklet.

Use both sides of the paper. Write only within the white areas of the booklet.

Write the question number in the two boxes in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer,

for example

0	1
---	---

.

Leave at least two line spaces between each answer.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

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

You are advised to spend approximately 50 minutes on each question.

The sources used in this examination paper may have been amended, adapted or abridged from the stated published work in order to make the wording more accessible.

The sources may include words that are no longer in common use and are now regarded as derogatory terminology. Their inclusion reflects the time and place of the original version of these sources.

Answer **both** questions

0	1
---	---

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the impact of Personal Rule in the period from 1637 to 1641.

[30]

Source A John Burgh, a courtier, writing in a private letter to Viscount John Scudamore, English ambassador to France (1637)

All things are at this time so peaceful and calm that there is very little matter of novelty to write. There appears to be no change or alteration either in court affairs, for all business goes on quietly and undisturbedly at the present time. This quietness is due to the fact that all men, for the most part, submit to the King's rule. And although payments to the King's officials are great (considering the people have not heretofore been accustomed to paying them) yet they only breathe out a little discontented humour and open their purses, for I think that great tax of the ship money is so well accepted that I suppose it will become permanent. Indeed, if men would consider the great levies of taxes and monies in foreign countries for the service of the state, these impositions by our King would appear but a little burden.

Source B Sir John Culpepper MP, in a speech delivered in the House of Commons (1640)

Mr Speaker,

I stand not up with a Petition in my hand, I have it in my mouth; and have it in charge from them that sent me here, humbly to present to the consideration of this House the grievances of the County of Kent. I shall only sum them up.

First, the great increase of papists by the failure to apply those laws which were made to suppress them. The life of laws is application; without this, they become but a dead letter; this is wanting, and a great grievance.

The next grievance is the Ship-Money: This cries aloud, I may say, I hope without offence; this strikes the first-born of every family, I mean our inheritance. If the laws give the King [emergency] power in any danger of the Kingdom, whereof he is Judge, to impose what and when he pleases, we owe all that is left to the goodness of the King, not to the law. But does the law give the King this power?

Source C The Grand Remonstrance, a petition to Charles I, submitted on behalf of Parliament by John Pym MP (1641)

We the Commons in this Parliament assembled, have been necessitated to make a declaration of the state of the kingdom, both before and since the assembly of this Parliament, unto this time, which we do humbly present to your Majesty, without the least intention to lay any blemish upon your royal person, but only to represent how your royal authority and trust have been abused, to the great prejudice and danger of your Majesty and of all your good subjects.

For the space of twelve months we have wrestled with great dangers and fears from the Scots and Irish which have threatened the liberty, peace and prosperity of this kingdom and exceedingly weakened and undermined the foundation and strength of His Majesty's own royal throne. Yet we find a continuing malignity and opposition to us by those people, the King's favourites and advisers, who have been the cause of those evils and who foment [stir up] jealousies between the King and Parliament.

0	2
---	---

Historians have made different interpretations about **the reasons why the Civil War broke out in 1642**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations and use your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the King was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1642?

[30]

Interpretation 1: Derek Hirst, in this extract from his book *Authority and Conflict: England 1603–1658* (1986), presents a revisionist interpretation.

Parliament was certainly responsible for the outbreak of the civil strife that engulfed the kingdom in 1642. The more militant Puritan MPs regarded their cause as a religious crusade against the Antichrist (Pope). Others were involved in a more secular or non-religious struggle for parliamentary and legal liberties, for the Petition of Right and against the arbitrary fiscalism [inconsistent tax policy] of Charles's years in power. The war against the King was, after all, fought in the name of Parliament, not just the Godly people (Puritans). Yet in the face of a king corrupted by popish conspirators, a king who was clay in the hands of the queen and of a Romish god, it was easy to argue that it was their duty to resist the Antichrist.

Interpretation 2: Barry Coward, in this extract from his book *Stuart England: 1603–1714* (2000), presents a post-revisionist interpretation.

The King was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1642 because of his cynical disregard for Parliament's rights and privileges. Charles's own actions served to widen the credibility gap between himself and many of his subjects. In the light of what happened in Scotland, his attempt to arrest leading members of Parliament on 4 January 1642 was, to say the least, ill-advised. Even if it had succeeded, it is difficult to see any other outcome than the horror among MPs at Charles's use of force against the privileges of Parliament.

END OF PAPER