

## SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

The actions of Charles I were a significant factor for the outbreak of civil war in 1642 - his ~~belief~~<sup>belief</sup> dedication to the idea of divine right exacerbated divisions between him and Parliament, while his ~~decision~~<sup>reliance</sup> on unpopular advisors such as Stafford and Laud worsened issues, as did his ~~decisive~~ actions during his personal rule. However, the actions of Parliament (such as ~~denying Charles's~~<sup>Passing military acts, the execution of Stafford,</sup> ~~Portsmouth and Burslem~~ and challenging his authority) and religious issues, such as Arminianism and the following Scottish Rebellion, all ~~led~~ led to the outbreak of civil war.

One way Charles's actions led to the outbreak of civil war was his unwavering dedication to his divine right, like his father James I. His belief that his position was given to him by God made him less willing to listen to and negotiate with Parliament - for example, he only ever called Parliament if he needed funding or taxation subsidies (such as in 1628, when he needed funding for the Bishop's wars). This unwillingness to compromise only worsened the power conflict between the two. By 1630, even the need to call Parliament for funding had gone, as his introduction of ~~the~~ old feudal taxes [such as court fees which got him £20,000 from Salisbury], monopoly licences, distraint of knight-hood and (most significantly) Ship Money gave him enough financial independence to separate himself from Parliament - which Parliament feared would decrease their power permanently. In addition, Charles's reliance on unpopular or feared advisors, such as Stafford ~~and~~, Laud, and the Catholic Henrietta Maria, also increased tensions, as they grew



(Section A continued) To have more influence over the king - for example, Henrietta Maria had her own Catholic Chapel and ~~pp~~ <sup>own</sup> ~~role~~ <sup>role</sup>, and her strong personality influenced many of Charles' positions (such as what actions he took during the civil war), and Laud's influence in court unsettled many MPs.

However, although significant, Charles' actions were not the only cause of the Civil War. For example, the actions of Parliament <sup>can</sup> be seen as a key factor, even if not ~~as a completely significant factor~~ as significant as Charles'. For example, some of the Puritan opposition after Charles' personal rule, such as Pym, try to set limits on the monarch's power that had never been seen before - such as the Militia Act ~~and Petition~~ of 1640, which put Parliament in control of the army, and later stated that Parliament had to give approval for any of Charles' commanders. This came to be seen by Charles as a personal ~~attack~~ <sup>attack</sup> on his right to rule - which was only worsened by the Act of Attainder Charles was forced to sign, legalising Stafford's execution. These attacks on Charles only made him less open to listening to and working with Parliament, at a time when compromise was ~~desperately~~ <sup>desperately</sup> needed. Rumours had also begun to spread about Pym issuing a warrant for Henrietta Maria's arrest. Although this was never verified, it still resulted in Charles issuing 5 arrest warrants for MPs (including Pym - who had fled London), and led to his standard being raised in 1640.

Perhaps none of these issues would have escalated to the extent of war if underlying religious issues hadn't resulted in so much ~~unresolved~~ <sup>unresolved</sup> tension since 1624. For example, the Puritan fear of Laudian reforms and influence in 1633-1646 had forced many into opposition of Charles (as many MPs and gentry were initially Puritan - before being forced



(Section A continued) out by 2000). For example, supernatural changes to the church (such as the introduction of organs, statues, coloured fonts, and the communion table being moved east) and ceremonial changes (such as the new focus on ritual and transubstantiation over individual prayer and study) frightened many Puritans, causing them to either flee <sup>such as New England</sup> to American colonies or go into opposition - such as Hampton, who challenged the legality of ship money in 1632. This opposition grew after the brutal punishment of Burton, Bachnick and Payne → 3 Puritan writers who had their ears cut off <sup>and tongue</sup> for opposing Charles. As their <sup>writing was also condemning American policies</sup> was entered by Laudian Ministers, discontent and opposition only grew <sup>as Puritan MP feared of the growing influence of his bill</sup> finally, if these reforms hadn't been imposed on Scotland (a strong Presbyterian country), ~~the~~ the 1638 Scottish Rebellion wouldn't have happened, so ~~neither~~ would the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Bishops Wars <sup>in 1638 + 1639 respectively</sup> and Charles wouldn't have had to recall parliament to pay the £800 a day ~~parliament~~ in Newcastle. The recalling ~~the~~ of parliament led to arguments <sup>breakdown of relations</sup> and, ultimately, the civil war.

In conclusion, although the actions of both Charles and Parliament were significant, if the underlying fear of a less Protestant King and country hadn't existed, and the imposition of the Church of England on Scottish Kirk had been prevented, Civil War may not have broken out in 1640 - religious fear was the most significant factor.

\* The forced loan Charles demanded from all taxpayers from 1627 left ~~the~~ unresolved tensions lay into the 1630s, with the legation of Charles whose actions being placed under more scrutiny → leading to Puritan recording of all of Charles mismanagement from 1629 up to 1640.



(Section A continued) \* Henrietta Maria's influence over Charles also caused discontent. For example, she had her own Catholic clergy and ministers, and often encouraged ~~other~~ others (including her children) to partake in Catholic <sup>worship</sup> ~~prayer~~. This Catholic influence was feared to have increased Charles' religious sympathies, as he frequently held Catholics in court, and his love for Arminianism was seen as a drastic shift to Catholicism - which was intolerable to his Puritan opposition.

