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.
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. ‘Parliament showed remarkably little opposition when carrying through major changes in religion in the years 1547–59.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2. ‘Elizabeth clearly sought to avoid confrontation with Spain in the years 1559–85.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)


Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3. To what extent was Parliament’s control of London the decisive factor in the defeat of the King in the First Civil War?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4. ‘Despite its obvious power, the Army showed itself to be remarkably reluctant to take control of the country in the years 1646–53.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Section A continued)
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 the Northern Rebellion in 1569 posed a serious threat to Elizabeth'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 royal management of parliament in the years 1566–88 was very effective?

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 local quarrels and rivalries were 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 the Protectorate faced serious threats from its opponents 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 Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*, published 1994)

1 Just as their numbers were probably diminishing, Catholics were increasingly perceived as a threat to the security of the realm. This was largely because of changes in the political situation in England and abroad. Deteriorating relations with Spain after 1568, and Mary Stuart’s flight to England in the same year, raised the spectre of Catholic plots and conspiracies at home, supported by Spanish military power. Pope Pius V, soon after his election in 1566, referred to Elizabeth publicly as one ‘who pretended to be queen of England’. This raised anxieties that he would soon call for a crusade to depose Elizabeth. Fears of the Catholic threat seemed vindicated when the Northern Rebellion broke out in 1569.

SOURCE 2

10 Many men in this Northern world were still traditionalist in their outlook. Some still gave their loyalties first to a Percy or a Neville, and only afterwards to the Crown. In religion most of them adhered more or less firmly to the ancient faith. But in the generation since 1536–37 change had penetrated even here. The disasters of that time were by no means forgotten, and there had now been thirty years of strong royal government, embodied in the Council of the North. All observers agreed that the new faith had made little penetration anywhere within the ecclesiastical province of York, but attachment to the old faith, although firm, was passive. There was no leadership, clerical or lay, to give direction; the seminary priests had yet to arrive; the impulse of the Counter Reformation was yet to be felt here. And in politics the power of the great families had shrunk; it barely encompassed their own dependants and did not provide regional leadership. Most important of all, the gentry, who played so large and active a role in the Pilgrimage of Grace, now warily held back, waiting on events, or even, in many instances rallying behind the Lord President of the Council of the North.

SOURCE 3

It is misleading to see the Northern Rising as arising from a simple assertion of local power. Its inspiration came from events at Court, and the rebels numbered 5,700 at most, of whom 140 to 180 were personal followers of the Percy or Neville families. But the result was that the earls were as outmanoeuvred regionally as Norfolk had been at Court. Elizabeth and Cecil therefore seized their opportunity to subdue the north and enforce compliance, acting with a degree of severity that reflected their insecurity in the region.
A study of the position of the Speaker of the Commons serves to confirm the notion of the influence of the Privy Council in the Commons and to give clues to the methods by which that influence was maintained. It was one of the Councillors who rose in the House at the beginning of the session and suggested a nominee for Speaker; it was perhaps a friend of the Councillor who started applause for the suggestion, which was almost at once approved. In most cases the Government had groomed a candidate who was believed by them to be dependable. He was in a position to be of use. It was still the Speaker's almost undisputed right to determine the order in which bills were read, even their chance of being read. He could in an excited and confused House pick out the Bill which met his liking and put it to the vote. His decision as to whether the 'ayes' or the 'noes' had carried the vote was likely most of the time to go undisputed.

Peter Wentworth made a remarkable speech in 1576 on the theme of liberty, which the House of Commons interrupted and for which the House, rather than the council or the Queen, committed him to the Tower. The next session, of 1581, began with a motion by his brother Paul in favour of a public fast and daily preaching, 'so that God might the better bless them'. There was a debate and, exceptionally, a division, with 115 for the fast and 100 against. Arrangements were accordingly made, only to be interrupted by the Queen who refused to allow the fast to take place.

The parliamentary session of 1566–67 was not a happy one. The Commons held up, or drastically amended some important government Bills, and, among other things, expressed its discontent about the administration of the criminal law, and the Queen's proposals for improving it. Towards the end Cecil wrote a little memo to himself noting the very limited business done. Elizabeth did not part with this parliament in a particularly friendly spirit, but she retained the basic affection of MPs and, equally important, their respect.
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 R. N. Dore, The Civil Wars in Cheshire, published 1966)

1 North-western issues and local quarrels certainly affected side-taking in 1642. It is surprising what little influence the Irish Catholic rebellion seems to have had. Far more Cheshire families closely connected with Irish affairs were royalist rather than parliamentarian, despite the constant propaganda that Charles had had an understanding with the rebels. Those inclined to royalism were easily persuaded that the quickest way to deal with the rebellion was for the King to recover his authority in England. Cheshire was riddled with feuds and the protagonists frequently took opposing sides in the Civil War. Of the few pro-parliament Chester aldermen, Radcliffe had an old feud with the Bishop over the brew-house in the Bishop’s palace yard, and William Edwards with Sir Francis Gamull, a leading royalist, over the Merchant Adventurers Company. Sir William Brereton, the parliamentary leader in the county, had lengthy law-suits with the city of Chester, which had culminated in his humiliating ejection from the city in August 1642. There had also been trouble between him and the Welsh agents of the leading royalist, Lord Derby, over Brereton’s netting of wild fowl.

SOURCE 8
(From Conrad Russell, The Causes of the English Civil War, published 1990)

15 The division of parties worked along very different lines in the two Houses of Parliament. In the Lords, only Brooke, Saye and perhaps Warwick truly qualify as godly peers. The Parliamentarians in the Lords were largely a court-based group, many of whom seem to have decided that politics was too important to be left to kings. For the Earl of Northumberland, one of the best documented of this group, it seems to have been the King’s decision to persist in the Second Bishops’ War, without money and in the teeth of parliamentary opposition, which convinced him that Charles needed to be forced to listen to advice. It is likely that this was a very common attitude among the King’s opponents in the Lords. In the Commons, it was a different story: there the Parliamentarians, with a few exceptions, were in favour of further reformation of religion.

SOURCE 9
(From Jack Binns, Yorkshire in the Civil Wars, published 2004)

25 For some Yorkshiremen the issues were clear and the choice simple: their allegiance was determined by their religious convictions. In particular there are correlations between Puritans and Parliament on the one side and Catholics and Royalists on the other. In his analysis* of the county’s Puritan families, Dr Cliffe found that 64 were actively Parliamentarian and only 24 Royalist, and of Yorkshire’s Catholic families 86 joined the king and only ten Parliament.

* This is a reference to a famous academic study of side-taking amongst the Yorkshire gentry.

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From Austin Woolrych, Penruddock’s Rising 1655, published 1955)

Many who had fought for a parliament would not raise a finger for a Protector and might even help overthrow him. Pride’s Purge and the King’s execution had outraged the great right wing, which for want of a better name was called Presbyterian. To the left, the levellers might be destroyed as an organised party since the suppression of the 1649 mutinies and the failure of John Lilburne’s last challenge, but the spirit of their teaching was to feed opposition to the Protectorate down to its end. More recently the expulsion of the Rump had raised the implacable opposition of the parliamentary republicans, while later still the replacement of Barebones’ Parliament by the Instrument of Government had roused the more fanatical brethren to even shriller heights of abuse. To them Cromwell had not so much usurped but committed a religious betrayal. He had taken the crown from the head of Christ and placed it on his own. Not much of this motley opposition could be expected to join hands with Charles Stuart, but in their mingled discontents might lie his opportunity.

SOURCE 11
(From Blair Worden, The English Civil Wars 1640–1660, published 2009)

The regime exaggerated the royalist threat so as to scare parliamentarians into compliance with the protectorate, but it also feared it. In the wake of Penruddock’s rising, the country was divided into twelve military zones, each with a major–general at its head. Fourteen thousand royalists were required to give bonds for good behaviour and a register of royalist movements was kept.

SOURCE 12
(From Stephen Coote, Royal Survivor: A Life of Charles II, published 1999)

Small bands of hot-headed Royalists were also prepared to foment problems for the Protectorate. Charles’ involvement with these men – particularly his policy of apparently listening sympathetically to all but committing himself to none – was to prove disastrous. The position had already been made difficult by problems of communication and the fact that the Royalists were divided amongst themselves. During the summer of 1654, the Sealed Knot had been unable to stamp out two pathetic Royalist plots which had quickly been suppressed. Now a splinter group, which Charles and his advisers referred to as the ‘new council’ or the Action Group, planned a major uprising for the following spring. Charles threw his weight behind these men but still regarded the Sealed Knot as the principal force in English Royalism. Such confusion was made worse by the fact that the ‘new council’ despised the members of the Sealed Knot for being over-cautious, while members of the Sealed Knot dismissed the ‘new council’ as fanatics embroiled in dangerous fantasy.
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