



A-level HISTORY 7042/2E

Component 2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 E / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the execution of Charles I in 1649.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2*

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the provenance of the Remonstrance as a document is of value with regard to Charles' execution as it was produced by the chief theorist of the New Model, and son-in-law and close political ally of Cromwell, indicates an influential view, if not the most influential view, in the New Model in November 1648. This may be linked to Ireton as an author and his role in the politics of settlement from his July 1647 Heads of the Proposals negotiation with Charles I
- some may comment on the provenance as representative of broader opinion in the Army regarding what should be done to Charles, as indicated by the Putney Debates of November 1647 and the Windsor Prayer Meeting of April 1648 but also that Ireton was more driven to bring Charles to execution by his bible republicanism than some of more moderate opinion in the Army, for example, even the 'reluctant regicide' Cromwell
- the tone can be commented on as bitter with regard to Charles I's as a cause of the war, the continuation of war and source of bloodshed with use of terms such as 'blood' or 'Charles Stuart' as part of placing the emphasis on his guilt to justify his execution and this may be also linked to provenance through Ireton's relationship with Charles since July 1647. The tone sets Charles' actions against those who have fought against him to protect freedom and the people thus establishing another reason for his execution.

Content and argument

- war fought for freedom in reaction to Charles' religious policies and reference can be made to Puritans and especially millenarians being the most active in fighting for Parliament as well as the core in County Committees
- Charles Stuart seen as responsible for the war and its continuation and reference can be made to his failure to negotiate terms of settlement in 1643 but particularly in 1646 (Newcastle Propositions) and 1647 (Heads of the Proposals) before sparking further conflict through his Engagement with the Scots
- Charles' capture by the Army at Holdenby House, under direction from Ireton, and refusal to negotiate and subsequent escape from Hampton Court can be referenced to further support his continuation of the war and his role in causing the 1648 revolt in the provinces
- the call for fixing of exemplary justice can be seen in the context of the stance taken by Ireton and Fairfax at the siege of Colchester with the execution of the royalist leaders as an example that prefigured Ireton's drafting of the Remonstrance with its call for justice on Charles.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- for provenance, Lilburne, as a leading figure in the Leveller movement, can be expected to produce a pamphlet attacking any regime that did not agree to his platform
- that Lilburne was in the Tower when he produced this pamphlet can be used in relation to his track record since 1638 of agitation through print
- Lilburne's emphasis on how he had tried to shape the political narrative and blame on those who led the regicide can be seen as self-justification as well as an attack on the army leadership
- Lilburne's tone can be seen as typically combative, justifying himself and attacking those in authority and this may be linked to the post-regicide date for his overall argument that fits with Leveller tracts since 1646.

Content and argument

- Lilburne defends himself against claims he was involved in the regicide and reference can be made to him not being named as one of the 135 commissioners for the trial of Charles I and the Leveller ambivalence over the process of regicide at the time they were pushing the officers on their Agreement of the People
- Lilburne's reference to Windsor can be supported by reference to this as the key meeting in April 1648 for the army leadership with regard to declaring Charles Stuart as a man of blood and that the Levellers did not support the army line that Charles as the cause of the bloodshed of the wars deserved to be executed
- Lilburne's reference to repeated calls for the army to change its policy can be supported by reference to the discussions over the Agreement of the People and other discussions he had with Thomas Harrison in particular
- Lilburne's charge that the officers and new Council of State are no better than Charles I could be supported by reference to the nature of Pride's Purge, the trial and subsequent crushing of the Levellers and this could be linked to other pamphlets he produced such as England's New Chains and can thus be seen as of value in illustrating the Leveller response to the New Model, the Rump and the immediate post-regicide regime.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- from provenance, while the specific author is not known their approach can be seen from the title of their pamphlet and then the content as being against the regicide, for example the reference to the 'martyr king'. Some may comment on most pamphlets of the period 1658 to 1660, when there was another explosion of printing, with the majority being anonymous works
- as a pamphlet produced after the Restoration the author had an interest in attacking the regicide but also freedom to produce such work with looser printing laws in 1659–60
- the purpose of the author in centring blame for the regicide on Cromwell and Ireton can be seen as part of a broader theme in 1660 of shifting the broader complicity of more of the Political Nation in the regicide and the regimes that followed as part of the re-imposition of monarchy in 1660
- the tone and emphasis is to portray Cromwell and Ireton as underhand and plotting the regicide as a self-interest event against broader moderate opinion as represented by Fairfax. The pamphlet has value as part of the reshaping the image of responsibility for the regicide to a small minority that was a crucial part of the re-imposition of monarchy in 1660.

Content and argument

- the source argues that Cromwell was driving the regicide by his manipulation and underhand methods and reference could be made to claims by some regicides that they were forced to sign the death warrant by Cromwell. Ireton was a key accomplice of Cromwell in bringing about the regicide behind Fairfax's back. The importance of Ireton and Cromwell in the politics of settlement from July 1647 to January 1649 in comparison to Fairfax's limited role can be commented on
- Fairfax was unaware of the proceedings against Charles I and was prevented from taking action by being controlled and deceived by Cromwell could be questioned by Fairfax being complicit by remaining as commander-in-chief of the New Model Army even if it is pointed out that he refused the position of one of the Commissioners for the trial of Charles I. Reference can be made to Fairfax not resigning until June 1650 or his position in 1659–60 in helping Monck remove the New Model leadership to path the way for a return of monarchy which was part of the 1660 representation of regicide being driven by Cromwell and Ireton with Fairfax their unwitting victim
- that Cromwell had agents like Ireton through which he was exerting his influence over proceedings and reference could be made to Ireton's organisation of Pride's Purge, his writing of the charge on which Charles I was tried and part with Thomas Harrison in bringing Charles I from the Isle of Wight to Windsor and then to London
- Cromwell eventually justifies the regicide by Providence and that royalist contemporaries regarded Cromwell as a religious hypocrite, using it as a means to excuse his political ambition but Cromwell's career, private letters and speeches indicate the depth of his religious belief. Providence was an established Puritan mindset.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The religious policies of Charles I met with no significant opposition in England during his Personal Rule.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the religious policies of Charles I met with no significant opposition in England during his Personal Rule might include:

- the legal judgement in favour of Charles I's altar policy in the St Gregory's Case of 1633 established a legal precedent for him in support of the altar policy and thereby limited the scope for opposition
- the continued promotion of Arminians within the Church, including Juxon, Wren, and Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, allowed, over time, the dominance of the episcopacy by Arminians through which policy could be enforced thereby limiting opposition
- the introduction of 'beauty of holiness' as a policy across the country and the organisation of checks through Visitations to ensure the changes to the fabric of churches was processed enabled the spread of the programme across churches and also acted as a check on opposition
- the limits of open opposition to the changes in the Church from Puritans meant that Laud and Charles did not feel there was widespread or serious opposition to their policies that was also prevented by the action taken by Laud against the Feoffees of Improvements that limited Puritan influence
- the acceptance of the new forms of service and fabric by the bulk of the population as a less demanding form of worship to that favoured by Puritans focusing on preaching indicated that their opposition was limited.

Arguments challenging the view that the religious policies of Charles I met with no significant opposition in England during his Personal Rule might include:

- there was opposition to the policies from groups, and individuals, of committed Puritans, for example, in the parish of St Gregory's, Lilburne or Bastwick, Prynne and Burton and as a committed minority this could be regarded as serious opposition
- there was opposition from within the hierarchy of the Church, for example, Bishop John Williams, or Abbot up to 1633, and while they might have been only a few individuals easily isolated by Charles and Laud, as members of the Church hierarchy this made their opposition serious and made them potentially a rallying point for others with similar concerns
- Puritan emigration can be seen as a form of opposition to the Laudian measures, with up to 20 000 Puritans emigrating to the Netherlands or New England and while it removed the problem directly from Charles it was a visible sign of discontent
- the organisation of emigration through the establishment of companies like the Providence Island Company, established a structure that allowed networking for Puritans to oppose Laudianism, as seen in the actions of Pym and Warwick, and could therefore provide the framework for organisation of oppositional cells
- the record of Visitations and Presentment Bills shows opposition to the religious changes in parishes at a local level and while a minority vocal opposition was seen as serious.

Charles I regarded his religious policies as a success during the Personal Rule because the opposition they faced was very limited and isolated in terms of numbers and obvious immediate impact. Other contemporaries also commented on the peace and calm of the 1630s. The bulk of the population did accept the less demanding Laudian form of religion passively. What Charles did not recognise, however, was the growing underlying discontent and that the Puritans prepared to express open opposition represented a broader spectrum of Calvinists alienated by his religious policies. The collapse of Charles' authority from 1637 may also be regarded as evidence of the problems created by his religious policies and that the opposition that there was should have been regarded as more serious as representative of broader discontent.

- 0 3** To what extent was Charles I in a stronger position in August 1642 than he had been when he called the Long Parliament in November 1640?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Charles I was in a stronger position in August 1642 than he had been when he called the Long Parliament in November 1640 might include:

- the December 1640 Root and Branch Petition alienated moderates and thereby contributed to a developing 'royalist' party strengthening Charles' position increasingly over time to allow him to have a 'side' by August 1642 that he did not have in November 1640
- Charles' acceptance of the removal of Ship Money, Star Chamber and the execution of Wentworth suggested to some moderates his willingness to work with Parliament and made them seek settlement and work with the King. This strengthened Charles' position from the opening of Parliament by also encouraging moderates to move in to a 'royalist' party
- the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion made some focus on that issue and being willing to delay focus on constitutional issues in England and thus more willing to compromise with Charles I as the Irish Catholics seemed a more pressing concern and thereby strengthened his position
- the Militia Bill, the content of the Grand Remonstrance and Exclusion Bill alienated moderates in the period November 1641 to February 1642 and sped up the development of the 'royalist' party
- the development of the process of Constitutional Royalism as a reaction to the need of Pym to take an increasing radical position led to the development of a 'royalist' party in 1642 and can be seen in the vote on whether to publish the Grand Remonstrance, the number of MPs who left London and the attitudes in the House of Lords.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles I was in a stronger position in August 1642 than he had been when he called the Long Parliament in November 1640 might include:

- in 1640 while there was general unity to ensure no repeat of the abuses of the Personal Rule there was no consideration of a war against the monarch as was the case in 1642 when a group in Parliament were prepared to launch a war against Charles I and therefore there was a much greater direct threat to Charles' authority in August 1642 than in November 1640
- Charles' attempted Five Members' Coup in January 1642 undermined his support with moderates and thereby set back the development of a 'royalist' party as well as allowing the passage of the Exclusion Bill and from that the Militia Ordinance. Both weakened Charles' prerogative and left his authority weaker than in November 1640
- the apparent complicity of Charles I in the October 1641 Irish Rebellion undermined his support with moderates and led to debate on the militia and the Grand Remonstrance with MPs directly questioning his fitness to rule for the first time
- the passage of the Militia Ordinance presented the development of an armed threat to Charles' authority from March 1642 by allowing the organisation of opposition and thereby weakened Charles' position
- the actions of millenarian activists in the period March to August 1642 was a direct attack on Charles' authority justified by religion.

In November 1640, Charles faced a generally united Political Nation seeking to use the Long Parliament to ensure there could be no repeat of what they regarded as the abuses of the Personal Rule. Through late 1640 and 1641 the apparent parliamentary radicalism, focused around Pym, moved some more moderate MPs to regard Charles as less of a threat and move to a constitutional royalist position, thereby leading to the formation of a royalist party and strengthening Charles' position. While from this, Charles had more support in August 1642 than he did in November 1640, it could be argued that in 1642 he faced a more radical and military threat which he did not face in 1640. Therefore, Charles' position

had improved by August 1642 in terms of the support he, or rather monarchy had, even though the threat to him was actually more serious.

- 0 4** 'The main weakness of Oliver Cromwell's rule as Lord Protector, in the years 1653 to 1658, was his religious radicalism.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the main weakness of Oliver Cromwell's rule as Lord Protector, in the years 1653 to 1658, was his religious radicalism might include:

- Cromwell allowed his religious radicalism, that was the central feature of his personality, to shape his approach to government and this, at times, created political instability, for example his dissolution of the First Protectorate Parliament over Biddle's Case and army funding
- Cromwell's decision to launch the Western Design shaped by his religious radicalism, against the advice of his main Councillor, put undue pressure on the finances of the state and led to a political crisis and the establishment of the system of the Major-Generals, again shaped by his desire for religious reform, adding instability to his approach to government
- Cromwell's religious radicalism balanced against his political conservatism meant that he was increasingly unable to balance the different factions he had introduced as part of his approach to government, the 'civilian' Cromwellians and the 'military Cromwellians', as seen in the debates on Nayler or the Decimation Crisis
- Cromwell's religious radicalism was key to his indecision over Kingship and this created instability and tension at the heart of his regime and his ultimate decision to accept the Humble Petition and Advice without the Crown did not position the regime decisively for the next stage of attempted settlement and increased the divisions between his Councillors and alienated the army
- Cromwell's unwillingness to be more directive in his approach to Parliaments allowed them to develop a greater oppositionist stance was partly based on his religious radicalism, specifically his reliance on providence rather than being over-directive with Parliaments or his Council.

Arguments challenging the view that the main weakness of Oliver Cromwell's rule as Lord Protector, in the years 1653 to 1658, was his religious radicalism might include:

- as a relative political conservative, Cromwell's approach to government as Lord Protector did allow some of the Political Nation to reach a compromise with his rule in the years 1653 to 1658 and royalist plotting was very limited thus indicating strengths to his rule from his conservative political instincts balancing out his
- the establishment of the Instrument of Government and Cromwellian Church structure provided a stable system of government and church for the five years of Cromwell's rule and can thereby be seen as a success in context of the period as a whole and that his religious policies were not always radical and could strengthen the regime
- Cromwell's over-reliance on the New Model Army could be seen as the main weakness of the regime, especially when he established the system of the Major-Generals. The alienation of the Political Nation was also linked to the higher taxes they associated with the maintenance of the New Model
- the financial problems of the regime, heightened by the need to occupy Ireland and Scotland, as well as war against Spain, were the main weaknesses of the regime
- the main weakness of Cromwell's Protectorate could be seen as its over-reliance on him personally to act as a binding force between the disparate elements of the remaining parliamentary alliance.

Cromwell as a religious radical but also a political conservative, through bringing these competing impulses to his approach to government, introduced instability to the attempt at settlement in the years 1653 to 1658 and this was a central weakness of his rule as Lord Protector. This instability was seen in the pattern of shifts in political direction from more conservative to more radical forms from December 1653 to September 1658, such as the dissolution of his first Parliament in 1654, the Major-Generals scheme or the consideration of Kingship as part of the new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice. Cromwell's Protectorate was also weakened, however, by other factors. The strain on finances limited

the action the regime could take and was a key factor in the tension with Parliaments and the wider Political Nation. Cromwell's need to rely on the New Model Army was a key factor in alienating the Political Nation whose support he needed if a lasting settlement was to be achieved. It could be argued, however, that while there were weaknesses Cromwell's success in providing government and a form of settlement can also be seen as a success in the context of following the civil wars and regicide.