

93403A



934031

S



For Supervisor's use only

# TOP SCHOLAR



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY  
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

## Scholarship 2009 History

2.00 pm Saturday 28 November 2009  
Time allowed: Three hours  
Total marks: 48

### ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

There are two topics. Choose ONE topic and complete the task concerning that topic, using the documents and resources provided in Question Booklet 93403Q. Write your response in this answer booklet.

**EITHER:** Topic One: England 1558–1667

**OR:** Topic Two: New Zealand in the Nineteenth Century

Write the number of the topic you have chosen in the box below.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–24 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

**YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.**

- Agenda (contemporaries) USE THIS PAGE FOR PLANNING

- how it relates sources

- leading you? POV

Marxist

Whig

revisionist - Gentry controversy

modern.

Long

Aminianism  
Finance esp 1630s.

Charles personal qualities - define.

Was Charles the catalyst for the failure to reach a political settlement?

Intro

Traditional Parliamentary role.

Charles' childhood, circumstance, etc.

Source A.

Also use B, G1.

"~~the~~ monarchy need not so much speak as just "be" "

1690-42. crises

Short/Long

Ir/Scot.

Disinert

45 members

Opinion swaying

② Source C leading us in direction of 'no' with regard to importance of personal role, which represents idea that ~~up~~ up to 1640 Charles was acting w/in right?

Finance long term.

Finance Source (H) too. pattern + trends.

③ Source D takes an interesting perspective

Scottish Kirk - united peerage & Kirk against him.

"though" - ~~Charles~~ historians' writings do not grant Charles as having been powerful enough to "create" but - vely accords him possible blame

~~The~~ "few wanted to compromise" while they distrusted, they respected.

## USE THIS PAGE FOR PLANNING

④ long term cause of religion

Thomas Shirley's 1611 woodcuts → Laud attacked, executed 1645.  
Godly.

hell is seen as ready.

Court of High Commission abolished Long Parl 1641 - Laud's instrument  
sun-dinne providence. spears of justice. "belly of the beast"  
Arminianism - Henrietta Maria - discuss

E2 Satire against Laud, who was widely believed a newspaperist  
Charles' shared news, beauty of worship.

link "sea of Rome" w/ hellish beast.

banet exploding?

Religion pushed people  
to fight.

Speaker

⑤ → points not toward personal rule but to short term consequences  
C, D.

Speaker "Privilege of Parliament!"

Impotent / tyrannical.

Pym had been offered Treasurer - too much beef.

Charles agreed to Long Parliament's impeachment of Strafford  
to appease his opponents.

Specific and general. - relationship

⑥ Distrust of Charles which he did nothing to negate.

People thought 1640-12 Charles would use his parliamentary army  
multiple kingdoms Ireland + Scotland.

En

(D)

"Judging King Charles I" J.

cond. mention Charles executed outside Banqueting House.  
only exacerbate people's understanding of Charles as.



By the time Charles I ~~was~~ acceded the throne of England in 1625 the Houses of Lords and Commons had been pushing for more power with fervour since ~~for~~ before even the reign of his father James. An understanding of ~~the~~ Charles I's role in the initiation of change within early modern England is best ~~the~~ approached with first an understanding of Charles' own characteristics as a monarch at a time when 'personal monarchy' was an instrumental aspect of government. The qualification of England in 1625 as a 'failed state' does ~~little~~ <sup>much</sup> to dispose traditional generalisation of Charles I's political ~~unexpect~~ insensibility. <sup>as an inexcusable provocation at least of parliamentary</sup> The British Civil Wars, so <sup>disquiet.</sup> called because of the necessary consideration of the involvement of Charles' separate kingdoms of Scotland and Wales, can be attributed to a number of short and long term ~~causes~~ <sup>factors</sup>: different eras of historical interpretation have chosen to discredit the relevancies of former views over time. The "unsummountable" financial, religious and political problems" Charles inherited upon his ascent to the throne cannot however be understood as ~~an~~ entirely responsible for causing the war independent to Charles' own actions. ~~Charles I is seen as~~

The traditional role of Parliament had been changing, if not radically, <sup>in practice,</sup> then with fundamentally far-reaching intentions over the reign of James I: In 1621 the Protestation of the Commons was met with James' stoic and hell-bent Erastianism in renouncing them for meddling in matters "far above their reach." As a committed ~~Erast~~ Erastian James I believed in the divine right of kings, of the precedence and will of God that had



placed him upon the throne of England and entrusted him with the spiritual and temporal welfare of his subjects. "The privileges of princes most easily and do daily grow" he wrote, "while those of Parliament's Houses remain effectively constant. The psychological analysis of Charles I designed to ~~address~~ justify Charles' later problems as being caused, as many would claim, by the imprint of actions in his childhood upon his psyche and development. Charles became the Prince of Wales in 1610 when his brother Henry, by all accounts the 'perfect Christian prince', died. Charles made up for his father's referral to him as 'baby Charles' up until ~~the~~ his mid-teens by placing within himself the "superego" that so negatively connotes a mistaken sense of self importance in Source A1. It is interesting to note the description of Charles' "outward self certainly" as being engendered only by ~~intense~~ "intense inner doubt" in Source A1 as it is immediately followed in Source A2 which includes a description by Charles' contemporary the royalist Earl of Clarendon as having a "modesty of nature" that "made him believe that others discerned better". Such ~~an~~ an inclusion shows ~~the possible~~ subtle ~~reference~~ reference to Buckingham's precedence and ineffectualities and compounds with the inclusion of Source ~~A~~ K, an excessive list of titles and honours granted George Villiers that only serves to illustrate the loyalty and uncompromising dedication that he so willingly showed to friends and favourites but so grudgingly ~~enclosed~~ enclosed to Parliament.

Charles I was shy and diffident, saying that monarchy "need not so much speak as just be." He regarded any slight on government and policy as a personal attack and prized ~~at~~ his friends above all others. An aesthete and huntsman, Van Dyck's "Charles I à la Chasse" included as Source B displays the historical relationship between past and present that has allowed propaganda to remain a dominant and enormously influential - not to mention constantly



evolving - facet of modern life. As Charles' Court Painter as of 1632 Van Dyck would essentially have been a propagandist with a brush. Charles is the picture's focal point, his height and stature on the horse representing his dominance over nature as represented by the animal and his subjects as a reflection of him looking down on them from the height that "divine providence" has granted him. St Steven's Chapel as representative of Parliament and Whitehall in London are seen in the far background, which illustrates explicitly the importance that Charles saw Parliament as having: he was a believer in the absolute monarchy illustrated by the French relatives of his wife Henrietta Maria, and expected "as great and painful a loyalty" (Source A1) ~~as~~ he himself was not willing to give an inch. The ~~benefits~~ bonds of 'mutual benefit and obligation' so textbook (literally) to the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I were missing from Charles' agenda <sup>for his governing class</sup>. It was this that was to create so fervent a debate between historians: to what extent were these politically sensitive bonds able to be stretched, and once broken, does all culpability fall to the monarch?

While Source C links personal rule as "essential for an understanding of the crisis", it is what appears to be ~~only~~ the only source provided that alludes to any lack of responsibility on Charles' part by presenting the 1630s, often incorrectly referred to as the "eleven years' tyranny", ~~as~~ and the tensions within them as never having "stymied government nor threatened revolt." While Charles' policy of not calling Parliament between 1629 and 1640 was not unconstitutional or illegal, it was politically stupid and reflected his "autocratic personality" (Source A1) in having an "obsessive concern with order" that may or may not have transcended to the gentry elites' enforcement. The oppositions and grievances that resulted from the imposition of Charles I's financial means of raising revenue in the 1630s - namely the restraint on



those who had failed to be knighted upon his accession, the revival of 'forest fines' that had not been enforced since the 1200s, ~~and~~ extra customs excises and of course the perennially opposed 'ship money' — help to explain the extent to which Charles catalysed change over the period of his reign. Parliamentarians' vested interests in their own power lay in dispute as Charles continued to levy taxes like the customs duties on tonnage and poundage, granted him temporarily in 1625, without parliamentary consent. At this stage the ~~meta~~ elasticity of his subjects' willingness to pay is reflected as "the legality might have been questioned" [upon Charles' extending ship money from the maritime counties which its revenue traditionally protected to the country at large] but "only 2.5% of the sum requested failed to come in. As a result the historian is able to excise part of the reason for Charles' unwillingness to compromise in matters financial between the period 1640–42 <sup>on being</sup> a direct consequence of the fact that ship money, while presented here as ~~being~~ recording objections "almost never" before 1637, was in fact a success. <sup>The governing elite</sup> ~~Parliament~~ displays some of the contrary behaviour so often attributed to Charles: in paying "more than ninety percent" of the money asked for in 1637 while having common law judges vote 7-5 — a narrow margin gives what was <sup>generally</sup> ~~an~~ automatic loyalty to the king — in Charles' favour in the Hampden case.

Source H reiterates with a differing perspective the substantial increase in food pricing over the rule of Charles I — from 58.5 to 68.7 percent of those of 1471–75 and up another 36% between the years of 1641 and 1650. The financial burden that was undoubtedly levied on Charles' subjects before and during the Civil War negates ~~the~~ any sympathy talked of in source C. ~~As a~~



The revisionist historian Conrad Russell talks in Source D with what is the ~~the~~ frankest conclusion offered within the sources, acknowledging bias but saying "with Charles dead, I find civil war without him almost impossible to imagine." Early 20<sup>th</sup> century Marxist historiographical interpretations saw the Civil War as having been a bourgeois revolution: an uprising of the middle classes caused by their rising self-importance. ~~and while~~ The 'gentle controversy' is now widely presumed dead and the 'revised' interpretation of the Civil War shows it as having been the result of a struggle between king and parliament to determine exactly where the balance of power lay, while ~~the king~~ neither was willing to show ~~any~~ any real compromise.

By acknowledging Charles as "unfit to be king" within the source's first line Source D directly challenges Source J, the latter drawing on Charles' 'early life and influences' to suggest that he was neither 'unfit' nor 'unadequate'. Source J's description of Charles as "matching up well to what contemporaries expected" is reiterated in source A2, ~~however~~ with contemporaries like the fall of Carendon, however it differs to D in that the former details ~~Charles~~ the difficulties historians face in determining Charles as the sole cause of the Civil War.

Russell draws on Charles' personality as have many others in his desire to Anglicanize the Scottish Kirk with the inclusion of Laud's modified Anglican prayer book in 1637. Charles' lack of understanding of Scotland - he was after all English born and raised - set in motion the chain of events that would eventually result in his alienation of the Kirk and Council (whose advice Charles should have allegedly taken more of) and the Bishops' Wars, which compounded his need to call Parliament in 1640 for money.

Historians like Russell, while acknowledging the possible - and often personal - blame of Charles for the Civil War - and his confirmation of him as a catalyst for change over the period 1625-49, do not grant a single person as being powerful enough to "create" the Civil War. As Russell



says that "few wanted to push those divisions to the point of war", we are forced to consider the weighing of Charles' "great contribution to the division of England into parties" in the short term ~~consequences~~ causes of the Civil War.

Over the period 1640-42, upon his calling of Parliament, Charles I proved himself a catalyst for change and consequently the Civil War. MPs' opinions swung in Charles' favour with the Long Parliament's passing of the Triennial Act, their abolition of prerogative court and Charles' appeasement of his critics by the impeachment of the hated Strafford in early 1641. Source 12's title is very telling as it recalls "the people's happiness" and jubilation upon Laud's execution: the "army in Ireland" that Laud would have given Charles access to to "reduce this kingdom" of dissenters was a main cause of the distrust against Charles that the early 1640s so characterised. When Charles went to Scotland in 1641 with the hope of canvassing the support of Scottish royalists who believed demands on Charles' prerogative had gone far enough, he many ~~indicated that he viewed differences~~ at home were satisfied with the demands made on Charles to confine his prerogative power. They did not see themselves as having the right to influence Charles to any further extent. But it was the massacre of Protestant settlers by a Catholic rebellion that exploded in Ireland in late 1641 that compounded fears that an <sup>English</sup> army Charles would or would not be accorded control of ~~could be~~ <sup>being</sup> overpowered by Wentworth's Irish Roman Catholic army. The overriding fear of popery meant that when this combined with an "incident" that questioned Charles' involvement in a plot against the Earl of Argyll, distrust of the king was at an all-time high. His governing élite were unsure on how to ensure the permanency of their securities in 1641 with the Long Parliament and it was this more than anything else that led to ultimate distrust and the coming of war.



By the time Charles attempted to arrest the Five Members - Pym, Hampden, Hyde, Holles and Bedford in the House of Lords, he proved himself tyrannical and in his failure impotent. It is this that so underlies the 19<sup>th</sup> century Whig interpretation of the civil war as being primarily Charles' fault: the liberties and privileges of Parliament, while perhaps not in accord with the extent that they wished, were not ~~so~~ <sup>yet so</sup> encroaching upon Charles as to merit such tyranny, as Charles found when he "rode back to Whitehall amid shouts of 'Privilege of Parliament!'" Source C, in its negation of the impact of personal rule, and source D, with its acknowledgement and highlighting of Charles' position <sup>as</sup> being the only one through which "This urge [to compromise] could have been overcome," both point towards the short term 'causes' of the war as being more important than long term grievances at canvassing support ~~for~~ for or hostility against Charles. It is certainly true that Charles' substantial army (that allowed the Battle of Edgehill in 1642 to be fought with an army of 19,000 against parliamentary forces of 15,000) was only built <sup>up</sup> between his attempted arrest of the Five Members <sup>in January</sup> and his raising of the Standard at Nottingham in August 1642. That if nothing else illustrates the ~~reluctance~~ reluctance of many to Pym's "revolutionary" Nineteen Propositions of early 1642 that would have effectively made the king's government to Parliament. As a result Charles as a catalyst for change is seen through his unwillingness to concede not even the Propositions but anything at all - while this is understandable and perhaps absolves some of the negative "blame" many place on Charles, it does not make it any less a consequence of his personal actions.

The long term cause of the civil war as being the "innovations in religion" that Pym's parliament in 1641 so attacked is perhaps the second most viable answer after Charles I himself. Source E, Thomas Shirey's 1641 woodcuts, reflect the imminent attack of the governing classes upon Laud



and his eventual execution in 1645. A sea-beast labelled "hell" is ominously waiting to swallow the "Church and Commonwealth of England". The "Court of High Commission" as mentioned on the ship in Emblem 1 was Laud's use of Charles' ability to use prerogative courts to enforce the changes to religion he made upon his elevation to Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. The "belly of the beast" approach, that Laud, who shared with Charles an appreciation of "the beauty of worship", has unleashed upon England is seen in Emblem 2 as divine providence blows the wind of change unto the boat and spears of justice hail down upon Laud and his followers.

~~Source E2~~ · Laud's promotion of Arminian ideas cemented his place in the minds of many as a neopapist and combined with Charles' influential and openly French Catholic wife Henrietta Maria to further exacerbate the distrust many felt in him. The "sabbath against Laud" shown in Source E2 · Laud's ejection of the "oath" from this "sealed" canon illustrates the overriding fear of Catholicism that in the end prompted many to fight who would have otherwise found it much harder to take sides. The residual importance of the "Sea of Rome" mentioned in Source E2 being linked to the lurking beast of Source E1 states in no uncertain terms the importance of a consideration of Laud's behaviour and Charles' views upon the fate of England with regard to civil war. To this end it was not solely Charles personally who catalysed such widespread discord however his part in the lack of explanation for any change is not to be underestimated.

Charles I as a catalyst for change in England between 1625 and 1649 can only be evaluated with an understanding of the personal circumstances of the King as well as the political intrusions upon him that he deemed so inappropriate. While religion ultimately pushed people to fight it was the period of 1640-92 that illustrated to the fullest extent Charles' inability to compromise.



The short term causes of the Civil War in England were those most defined by the kingship of Charles I - opinion swayed between that time but eventually lines were drawn. ||