

History A

Advanced GCE

Unit **F966/01**: Historical Themes Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

Mark Scheme for June 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs
2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

	A01a	A01b
IA	18-20	36-40
IB	16-17	32-35
II	14-15	28-31
III	12-13	24-27
IV	10-11	20-23
V	8-9	16-19
VI	4-7	8-15
VII	0-3	0-7

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Candidates will demonstrate synoptic skills by drawing together appropriate techniques, knowledge and understanding to evaluate developments over the whole of the period

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 60	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly. <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) relevant to analysis in their historical context • Excellent synthesis and synoptic assessment • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations and supported judgements • May make unexpected but substantiated connections over the whole period <p style="text-align: center;">36-40</p>
Level IB	<p>Level IB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context. • Answer is consistently focused on the question set • Very good level of explanation/analysis, and provides supported judgements. • Very good synthesis and synoptic assessment of the whole period <p style="text-align: center;">32-35</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Good explanation/analysis but overall judgements may be uneven • Answer is focused on the issues in the question set • Good synthesis and assessment of developments over most of the period <p style="text-align: center;">28-31</p>
Level III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses relevant evidence but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a sound understanding of key concepts, especially continuity and change, in their historical context • Most of the answer is focused on the question set • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also description and narrative, but there may also be some uneven overall judgements; OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin • Answer assesses relevant factors but provides only a limited synthesis of developments over most of the period <p style="text-align: center;">24-27</p>
Level IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy will vary. • Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections • Mostly satisfactory level of communication <p style="text-align: center;">10-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Satisfactory focus on the question set • Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events, and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained • Makes limited synoptic judgements about developments over only part of the period <p style="text-align: center;">20-23</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and basic historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material • Often unclear and disorganised sections • Adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic and not address the question set OR provides an answer based on generalisation • Attempts an explanation but often general coupled with assertion, description/narrative • Very little synthesis or analysis and only part(s) of the period will be covered <p style="text-align: center;">16-19</p>
Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answers may have little organisation or structure • Weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • Limited perhaps brief explanation • Mainly assertion, description/narrative • Some understanding of the topic but not the question's requirements <p style="text-align: center;">8-15</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little relevant or accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response • Very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context • No explanation • Assertion, description/narrative predominate • Weak understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements <p style="text-align: center;">0-7</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>The importance of royal officials in central government increased as their functions expanded. The proto-type of the chief justiciar developed under William I with Ranulf Flambard and continued with Roger of Salisbury in Henry I's reign until it reached its height in Henry II's reign. This official was responsible for running the country in the king's absence and the development of the role was a direct answer to the problem of how to govern the country while the king was abroad, sometimes for long periods. It is clear that, without very competent men able to fulfil this role, it would have been more difficult to deal with absenteeism. By the late twelfth century the chancellor, Hubert Walter, was running the country during Richard's prolonged absence and set in motion the most far reaching administrative, judicial and financial investigation then seen. Kings also developed machinery to enable them to maximise their finances from taxes and justice and this too depended on competent men who could make the system work; people who ran the Exchequer effectively, making sure that sheriffs rendered their accounts regularly, local justiciars in the shires, men who could enforce the judicial reforms of Henry II and also those who could carry out the inquests of sheriffs in 1170, 1194 and 1213.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates could argue that kings were more important to the development of government since it was they who recognised their needs and were prepared to implement innovative methods to meet them. It was also kings who were responsible for the appointment of the highest officials, so successful development depended on their choosing men who were up to the job, especially Flambard, Roger of Salisbury and Hubert Walter. In addition, Henry II gave the impetus to the judicial reforms of his reign and William I was responsible for the introduction of feudal government. Some candidates may wish to emphasise the importance of other main factors in the development of central government such as absentee kingship itself or the continental possessions of the crown which led to that absenteeism.</p> <p>Weaker responses are likely to describe the role of officials in producing governmental developments and to assert their importance. Better answers will set the contribution of officials in the context of other factors, reaching a supported conclusion. The best responses might well deal with several factors, comparing their importance, using examples from across the period in support, and reaching a clear conclusion on the relative importance of competent royal officials.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>By 1154, much of the groundwork essential for the development of English common law had been done. William I had inherited from the Saxons the strong kingship which was an essential prerequisite to the king exercising authority effectively over the country, shire and hundred courts and the Anglo Saxon writ. To this he added feudal law with its classification of different types of landholding which was necessary for the development of a common law relating to land cases. The growth of feudal custom and the tendency of seigniorial courts to adopt common practices led to more standardisation. Henry I's insistence on cases between different tenants being heard in shire rather than honorial courts also helped to encourage this and his use of local justiciars helped to promote common enforcement of law in the localities. Moreover, canon law and the development of church courts helped to develop common practice and this was under way before 1154.</p> <p>However, candidates need to set the pre-1154 developments in the context of those in the reigns of Henry II and his successors and compare their importance. Henry II provided much of the impetus for the growth of common law and established much of the machinery which made it effective. The assizes of Northampton and Clarendon tightened up criminal law and the introduction of possessory assizes, returnable writs, general eyres, and professional justices all helped to standardise procedure and ensure more cases were heard in the royal courts which itself meant less variation in justice and a more systematic approach. The judicial clauses of Magna Carta also helped to bring about common practice.</p> <p>Less successful responses are likely to describe developments in either the pre- or post-1154 period, or both, and assert the greater significance of one. Most candidates are likely to examine developments in both the earlier and later periods and compare their significance, typically comparing the importance of laying the foundations with that of creating much more developed machinery. The best responses will probably compare both periods using a wide range of evidence and reach a supported and clear conclusion on the significance of developments before 1154 in relation to those after 1154.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Most candidates are likely to confine their answers to the archbishops named in the specification ie Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton, and this is quite acceptable for the highest marks. However, credit should be given to relevant reference to other archbishops of Canterbury. In some ways Becket seems a very atypical archbishop of Canterbury. Relations between archbishop and crown reached their nadir with Becket's murder, ostensibly as a result of at least the king's attitude if not his comments. Becket's subsequent martyrdom, canonisation and Henry's penance at his tomb were not typical ways of strengthening the reputation of the church. There is a great contrast here with the work done by Lanfranc to strengthen the church by using reforming councils and by reforming monasticism, all with the support of William I. While Becket's stand on principle over criminous clerks and ecclesiastical justice led to conflict with Henry II which, at least in the short run, undermined the church by leading to Becket's exile and Henry's opportunity to increase his control over other bishops, Lanfranc brought unity to the English church and closer contact with Europe while avoiding the Investiture Contest. While Becket refused to accept the political role Henry had mapped out for him, Lanfranc cooperated with William to make effective the establishment of Norman rule. There is a contrast with later archbishops too. Hubert Walter acted in a political role for Richard, effectively running the country in his absence, and Langton was prepared to intervene in the struggle between John and the barons.</p> <p>However, candidates also need to examine the similarities between Becket and other archbishops. His work to establish the independence of the church had been begun, albeit using very different methods, by Lanfranc when he got William's agreement to a degree of separation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It is seen also in Anselm's period as archbishop, most notably over the Investiture Contest which led to the Compromise of Bec in 1107 and the king's relinquishing of investiture with the ring and staff. To an extent, Langton was a victim of the growing power of the church as he was a papal appointment made against the king's wishes. Becket's clash of principle with Henry II was similar to that of Anselm with Henry I over investiture as both concerned the growing desire for independence of the church from royal control. In both cases the archbishop was determined to uphold the new demands of the church against the traditional rights of the monarch. Becket's periods in exile were not unique either as Anselm was in exile in both William II's and Henry I's</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>reigns, and Langton's relations with John were so bad that he could not even enter the country in the first place. Nor were Becket's poor relations with the pope atypical. Popes sometimes deliberately undermined archbishops' powers, as when Henry of Blois was made papal legate in Stephen's reign and Langton was suspended by Innocent III. Other archbishops had poor relations with York too, eg when Thurstan refused to accept Canterbury's superiority.</p> <p>Weaker answers are likely to describe Becket's work as Archbishop of Canterbury, probably dwelling at length on the quarrel with Henry II, and to assert whether or not he was typical. Better responses will probably compare Becket's archiepiscopate with that of others, possibly at the lower end adopting a chronological approach. The best answers are likely to look at both similarities and differences across the period and reach a clear and well supported conclusion on whether or not Becket was typical of the period.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Candidates need to focus on economic rebellions, namely Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable Grant, Pilgrimage of Grace, Western, Kett and Oxfordshire rebellions. They are likely to argue that taxation was the main cause of the Yorkshire, Cornish and Amicable Grant disturbances, though there were political undertones in evidence against Henry VII and his policies in 1489 and 1497, and against Wolsey's administration and policies in 1525. Thereafter taxation was not a major issue but still figured in several rebellions. Candidates may explain these developments and, by inference, go on to assess economic factors in later rebellions. Rebels in the Pilgrimage of Grace for instance objected to the 1534 subsidy and rumours circulated in Lincolnshire in 1536 that indirect taxation would be imposed on white meat and horned cattle. Cornish and Devonian rebels in 1549 protested at the sheep and wool tax that Somerset had introduced. In each of these rebellions, religious grievances were the main cause and better responses should set these differences in context and perhaps go on to discuss economic rebellions caused by non-tax issues. For instance, poor landlord-tenant relations lay behind several issues in the Pilgrimage and Western rebellions, and were a major cause of Kett's rebellion. Illegal enclosures were also the main economic complaint of Kett's and the Oxfordshire rebellions, and also caused disturbances in the north in 1536 and in many central and southern counties in 1549. Some candidates may discuss famine as a cause of rebellion and good answers should be aware that the most serious harvest failures in the 1550s and 1590s produced no widespread disturbances, and that good harvests occurred in 1535-36 and 1548-49. The impact of price inflation may also be assessed as a cause of the 1536, 1549 and 1596 rebellions. Certainly when food prices rose, economic conditions for disorder intensified. However, this argument should be qualified since the price of foodstuffs continued to rise throughout the century but there were no economic rebellions between 1549 and 1596. The best essays are likely to differentiate between economic causes and set taxation against these other factors. Reasons in support of a comparative evaluation may be given and perhaps an explanation why taxation was not a major cause after 1549 even though parliamentary taxation increased in Elizabeth's reign.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>For economic rebellions, can include 'social' where there is a relevant link between economic and social.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>This question is concerned with the measures taken by Tudor governments in tackling rebellions and candidates should be rewarded for evaluating particular measures and specific rebellions in both England and Ireland. If discussion of Ireland is ignored or marginalised, then the answer is likely to be unbalanced. Credit should be given to candidates who assess 'effectively' thematically rather than chronologically, and who focus on actual disturbances rather than on government measures that were taken during periods of stability. Better essays may compare the effectiveness of government responses to rebellion and link them to the conduct of different administrations. Henry VII and Elizabeth acted quickly to counter rebellions, Henry directing operations and Elizabeth entrusting her council in London and Dublin. In contrast Henry VIII was slow to react to the Amicable Grant and Pilgrimage of Grace uprisings, and neither Wolsey nor Cromwell was in full control of the crises. Somerset failed to take appropriate measures to suppress the Western and Kett's rebellions quickly and Mary was badly advised by her council about Wyatt's revolt. Reasons for the varied responses may be considered: the size of rebellion, distance from London and Dublin, support in the localities and information and resources at the crown's disposal are relevant factors. Most Tudor administrations bought time, issued propaganda against the rebels and tried to avoid a military conflict until government forces were assured of victory. Henry VII more than any other ruler resorted to an army to defeat his rebels but his successors tried other strategies first. Mary and Elizabeth were more effective than Henry VIII and Edward in their deployment of troops but the latter faced longer and larger rebellions. Irish rebellions presented a serious challenge to Tudor governments and few handled them effectively. The innate hostility felt by the Irish towards the English as rulers and landowners, clan rivalry, unreliable nobles and limited resources made the quick suppression of rebellions hard to achieve. Henry VII dealt most effectively with Irish support for Simnel and Warbeck; Henry VIII mishandled the Kildare rebellion and Edward and Mary used native Irish as well as a small number of troops to quell their disturbances. Elizabeth, however, was very ineffective in handling each of her four Irish rebellions and the Tyrone uprising lasted over eight years and cost £2 million.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>Reward candidates who refer to details of specific rebellions.</p> <p>At lower levels 'successful' may replace 'effective'.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Candidates should provide a solid evaluation of the role of the clergy in maintaining political stability before considering it alongside other factors. Bishops were nominated (and after 1533 appointed) by the crown and played a key part in administration of the country. They headed royal commissions, acted as councillors, presided over diocesan courts, enforced proclamations and delivered sermons in support of establishment. Cranmer's Homily on Obedience may be cited as illustrative of the official condemnation of rebellions, which all clergy had to include each year in one of their sermons. The parish clergy were generally loyal though candidates may point to clerical support for rebels in 1536 and 1549 concerning religious grievances. Elizabethan bishops and clergy were ordered not to rigorously enforce the recusant laws to minimise opposition to the Church Settlement, and parish clergy oversaw the distribution of poor relief which reduced the likelihood of civil disobedience during times of dearth. In addition to the clergy, candidates should examine other means by which the Tudors kept control. Consideration may be given to the work of JPs, lords lieutenant and sheriffs, most of whom were gentry and nobles, and who dealt with local grievances through hard work, diplomacy and common sense. Mayors, aldermen and town officials assisted local clergy and nobles in resolving economic and social problems, usually before they got out of hand. Some candidates may focus on the role of central government in developing respect for the monarchy, the growth of parliament as a vehicle for voicing discontent, the use of regional councils, crown courts and popular royal policies taken to reduce the potential for political instability. Thus Henry VII used parliament to deal with retaining and strengthen the crown's authority, Henry VIII extended the treason and heresy laws and Elizabeth introduced recusancy and penal laws but applied them sparingly. The best answers should set the importance of the clergy in the context of political stability and make relative judgement.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>At highest levels must include the wider context.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Candidates should set the importance of economic issues against other factors to reach a judgement on the premise. Weaker answers are likely to consider a narrow range of economic factors, possibly either finance or trade. Few candidates are likely to look at agriculture and industry though both would be relevant issues. Better essays should assess financial and trade factors: limited finances resulted in defensive and prudent foreign policies, a characteristic of Henry VII's reign. A full treasury made more options available and, for instance, enabled Henry VIII to wage war in 1512-14 and 1542-46, and Elizabeth to be more aggressive towards Spain in the 1580s. Candidates could usefully discuss the implications for the conduct of foreign policy of both limited and extensive financial resources, the cost of maintaining armies and navies in peace-time as well as war, and the political and economic consequences. Candidates may well conclude that financial considerations were of primary importance in influencing Tudor foreign policy. Trade and commercial factors could be considered in better answers. Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth recognised the advantages of expanding overseas trade; Henry VIII and Edward attached less importance to it. Treatment of the Hanse may be cited as an example of different government attitudes towards trade and commerce. Candidates may argue that trade was always secondary compared with political and financial factors but it became increasingly important under Elizabeth as a result of the collapse of the Antwerp market for English woollen cloth and search for new overseas markets, the conflict with Spain over American trade and the impact of the Dutch Revolt on English merchants. Candidates who write an essay based entirely on non-economic factors and do not even by inference discuss the key element in the question should score low marks. Better answers should compare economic and other factors. Political, dynastic, personal and religious issues are possible areas for consideration. The best essays should assess the relationship between economic and other factors before determining which factors were the most important. Some may argue that political interests, such as the security of the country or the welfare of the Tudor monarchy, were consistently pre-eminent; some may suggest dynastic factors were of major importance under Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary; others may see personal or religious issues a key feature particularly in Mary's and Elizabeth's reigns.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>Candidates are expected to focus on a comparison of Scotland and France as threats to England's security before reaching a judgement. Weaker essays are likely to describe or narrate events sequentially without making appropriate synoptic comments and assessments. Better responses are likely to assess the threats thematically, perhaps chronologically, according to English monarchs but nevertheless synthesising developments over the whole period. Some answers might compare the Scottish and French military threat, and support given to English pretenders, claimants and rebels, or the impact of making alliances against England. As far as Scotland is concerned, its desire to recover Berwick and secure the border lands was an initial issue, and a reliance on the Auld Alliance increased its potential to cause trouble for England. James IV supported Warbeck and his troops threatened to invade Northumberland in 1496/97, and again in 1512/13 in alliance with France. James' death at Flodden reduced the threat until the 1540s when James V, in Henry's view, acted provocatively. Arguably this period was the most threatening since Henry VIII and Edward VI's armies were unable to inflict decisive victories, in spite of Solway Moss and Pinkie, and French armies supported the Scots militarily. The regency of Mary of Guise (until 1560) and return of Mary Queen of Scots presented a different sort of challenge to England's security and remained a problem until the maturity of James VI in the 1580s. The decline of the Guises faction and the impact of the French wars of religion further reduced Scotland's potential threat. France on the other hand was a more powerful country than Scotland. Its strong military, naval and financial power, its desire to reclaim land held by England, its long standing rivalry with England and its commitment to the Catholic faith might suggest to candidates that it presented the greater threat. Every Tudor ruler went to war with France. Better responses, however, might point out that there were longer periods of peace between the two countries eg 1492-1512, 1527-42, 1564-1603, and that when war did occur, England was usually the aggressor. Candidates may conclude that each country presented a different kind of threat which changed over time. The end of the Auld Alliance was a seminal event; thereafter France and Scotland posed separate problems for Elizabeth but neither was again such a serious threat to England's security.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>The question is about Scotland and France, not about Spain and Burgundy.</p> <p>Highest marks will demonstrate synthesis.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Candidates should focus on assessing Mary's relationship with Philip II and its consequences for England's relations with Spain under Elizabeth before comparing Mary's reign with other key periods or moments. Until Mary's reign, Anglo-Spanish relations had been generally good. Dynastic, economic and political factors bound the countries together since Henry VII's treaty with Ferdinand at Medina del Campo in 1489. Each of these factors was tested in the period from 1489 to 1553: dynastically, Charles V disapproved of Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon; economically, Wolsey had imposed a trade embargo on the Netherlands and Spain in 1527/28; and politically, Ferdinand and Charles used England as a counter-weight against France, usually for their own gain, and relations were frequently strained in the 1540s. However, it may be argued that after Mary's reign, Anglo-Spanish relations declined before finally breaking down irreparably. Candidates might address England's entry into a war with France that resulted in the loss of Calais. Philip was held responsible by the Privy Council for failing to protect or recover it in 1558/59 and negotiated it away. Secondly, Mary's implementation of heresy laws seemingly with the support of Philip and his own clerical advisers created the feeling that Spain was set upon eliminating Protestantism in England. This 'black legend' gained further credence with stories of the Spanish Inquisition's treatment of English merchants working overseas, a picture that was repeatedly painted in Elizabeth's reign. Thirdly, English merchants began to search for markets not centred on Flanders after the 1551 collapse of Antwerp, and trade with Spain declined. Moreover, merchants resented their exclusion from the Spanish-Portuguese monopoly of the American colonies which Mary had condoned. Finally, Mary's marriage to Philip was a disaster. He clearly had little affection for her, they had no children, he did not enjoy living in England and his courtiers were often abused by Londoners. Candidates also need to assess alternative turning points. Some might suggest Henry VIII's divorce in 1533 that adversely affected relations until Mary's reign. Others might consider the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt from 1566 and the presence of Spanish troops in the Netherlands which threatened English security. Another turning point could be the conflict between rival merchants in the Americas, perhaps citing the San Juan d'Ulloa incident in 1567 which led to reprisals from Elizabeth and a worsening in relations or Drake's exploits in the 1570s. The best responses should assess several turning points, and compare them with Mary Tudor's reign before reaching a conclusion.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	<p>Candidates can support or refute the proposition by examining a range of features that contributed to the Catholic Reformation. It may be helpful to define 'continuity' eg retaining or restoring key features, beliefs and institutions of the Catholic Church and faith. The Inquisition and Index might be assessed to show how they repressed liberal ideas and censored unacceptable views, such as those of Illuminists, Erasmians, Protestants, conversos and moriscos. Attempts to reconcile Catholics and Protestants at Regensburg in 1541 resulted in victory for the reactionaries led by Carafa who was opposed to change. Even the new orders struggled to gain respect and recognition from traditional monastic orders and much of their work was rooted in medieval practices. In education, biblical humanism, which was encouraged by Erasmus, Ximenes, Lefevre and others, was rejected in favour of scholasticism. The management of Trent's three sessions by Jesuits and Dominicans demonstrated the desire to defeat Augustinianism, Lutheranism and Calvinism in order to preserve orthodox ideas, which was underlined by the Tridentine Decrees. No provision was made for lay administrators and female reformers, and reforms to the Curia were slow to take effect and very conservative. There are examples, however, of the Catholic Church innovating and better responses should evaluate these changes. It learned from Protestantism the value of preaching and the sermon in developing the spiritual condition of ordinary people, and the benefit of advocating social welfare, the use of the consistory in keeping discipline, and the role of seminaries in educating the clergy. Candidates could refer to individual popes to suggest that the Papacy was capable of change. The Jesuits might also be cited as a novel order that brought about fundamental changes and the Index assessed as a new method of dealing with Protestant publications. On balance, candidates are likely to argue that the Church tended to look back rather than forward and that continuity not change was its main characteristic.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	<p>The Jesuits are likely to be viewed by most candidates as having made the greatest contribution of all the religious orders. Unlike the other orders, the Jesuits did not live in common which enabled them to travel, often internationally. Their organisation had a clearly defined structure, leadership and objectives, and they were supported by wealthy and influential patrons. As papal agents, they were sent on diplomatic tasks, while their missionary activities brought them international recognition. The quality of their training and education was widely admired and their influence in schools, colleges and universities had a lasting effect on the Catholic Reformation. Although they were not originally founded to combat Protestantism, the Jesuits became the Catholic Church's principal weapon and achieved outstanding results particularly in Eastern Europe. Better essays should be aware that the Jesuits were not uniformly successful eg they were expelled from England, France and the United Provinces and were not welcomed in Philip III's Spain. The importance of the Jesuits should be compared with the contributions of other religious foundations. From the 1490s new religious orders were established in Italy to perform social and charitable roles. The Oratorians, Theatines, Ursulines, Barnabites and Capuchins might be cited as examples of orders that were created by the laity to improve the spiritual and moral condition of the people. Some orders focused on educational needs, some on medical; some were exclusive to women, some established international houses. Lay orders such as the Brethren of the Common Life interacted with communities but were also subject to rules governing their order. The Discalced Carmelites in Spain became a role model for women dedicated to spiritual devotion, the Capuchins – a splinter group from the Franciscans – became an international order, Philip Neri in 1564 set up the Congregation of the Oratory in Rome and Naples and in 1610 de Sales set up the Visitandines in France. Yet none rivalled the Jesuits in popularity, prestige and achievement. The best responses will not confine their answers to the Jesuits and other new orders. Existing regular orders in 1492 included the Franciscans, Benedictines, Augustinians, Carthusians, and Cluniacs. Candidates should be aware that some had been 'reformed' in the 15th century and had become more 'observant' of rules governing their order. None however was in touch with the needs of society and their subsequent dissolution in several Catholic states is evidence of their perceived obsolescence. Travelling friars practised pastoral work but were conditioned by their spiritual rules and traditional education. Candidates should evaluate the work of the Jesuits, compare their contributions to other religious orders and not digress into other features of the Catholic Reformation.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>Needs to be a balanced response for higher levels.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Candidates are likely to begin by identifying and assessing the obstacles to reform during this period. Foremost amongst them were: the need to elect popes who would inspire confidence and morality, convene a general council and enforce clerical reforms to overcome the widespread apathy, corruption and incompetence. Until the pontificate of Paul III from 1534, the Papacy had been a major obstacle to reform. Secondly, most regular clergy were isolated from the mainstream of society, contributed little to the spiritual and moral welfare of the people, were lampooned as corrupt clerics, and yet presided over substantial estates and incomes. Thirdly, the major secular powers – Spain, France and the Holy Roman Empire – were impatient at the lack of papal initiative yet more interested in territorial gains from fighting wars in Italy than in supporting Church reform. Charles V and Francis I moreover were anxious to stem heresy in their own lands and sought reform of doctrine ahead of clerical abuses. The Papacy, keen not to cede any authority to the secular powers, disagreed. Fourthly, the Church would not yield any ground to Protestantism and persisted in the defence of scholasticism over humanism but refused to tackle doctrinal issues and clerical indiscipline raised by the Protestant reformers. Fifthly, apart from the Spanish Inquisition, the Church had allowed the medieval inquisitions to lapse and lacked the means to censor or control heretical beliefs. Candidates may well argue that many of these obstacles had been overcome by 1610. A general council had been called which re-affirmed the orthodox Catholic faith, emphasised the importance of a better educated clergy and assured the authority of the Papacy. Seminaries were established in some Catholic countries, priests were better educated and corruption and incompetence among the clergy were addressed. Several monastic orders became ‘observant’, new orders worked more closely with lay people and the Jesuits combated Protestantism. The Papacy was served from 1534 by reform-minded cardinals who led by example and improved the image and condition of the Vatican and city of Rome. Secular powers took a more direct role in implementing reform, most notably Philip II in Spain, Maximilian I in Bavaria, Henry IV in France. In several Italian and Spanish states, the inquisition proved an effective means of stifling heresy and implementing reform. Better responses should be aware that some obstacles still remained in 1610. Some states saw few reforms to monastic and episcopal wealth while parochial salaries stayed disproportionately low. The cost of establishing seminaries meant that few had been established outside Spain. Religious wars in France and the Spanish Netherlands impeded religious reforms and secular rulers protected their temporal and spiritual rights from papal interference and</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	were reluctant to introduce the Tridentine Decrees. Rural people in most countries remained indifferent to change and desired traditional unenlightened beliefs much to the consternation of missionaries and the inquisition. Candidates need to evaluate the changes and determine how far obstacles still remained in 1610.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Candidates may begin with an assessment of administrative, political, financial and judicial developments in Francis I's reign before comparing them with other periods and rulers. Most essays are likely to agree with the premise but better answers should focus on 'turning point' and justify their argument in the context of the whole period. Essays should consider how Francis handled the Paris (in 1518 and 1527) and regional <i>parlements</i> (eg Rouen 1527, 1540), the <i>pays d'états</i> and <i>pays d'elections</i>. Reforms were undertaken in 1515/17, 1522/24 and 1542/44 but he met resistance from his <i>parlements</i> and <i>pays</i>, especially in Provence, Burgundy, Languedoc, Guyenne who rejected new taxes, and in Dauphiné, Bearn, Navarre, Foix and Périgord where his authority was limited. The creation of the Epargne in 1542, which established 16 districts with their own treasurer, marked one important change in government finances, and the expansion of <i>élus</i> and royal officials developed the bureaucracy but two systems of financial administration co-existed which highlighted an absence of centralisation. Francis also called an Assembly of Towns (1517) and Notables (1527) but not an Estates-General. He ruled through the <i>Conseil des Affaires</i> but there was no uniform central and regional administration. Judicial reforms were considered in 1539 but attempts to establish a uniform system were not enforced. Instead common law prevailed in the north and centre, and Roman Law in the south of France. Better essays should be aware of continuity with Louis XII and Henry II in respect of judicial reforms. The Ordinance of Blois (1499) reorganised the <i>Grand Conseil</i> as a court of appeal and established a commission to write down customary laws in northern France, and Henry II gave the central courts of law greater authority eg the <i>Chambre Ardente</i> (1547) by-passed ecclesiastical courts to hear heresy cases and the Edict of Chateaubrian gave <i>parlements</i> and <i>presidial</i> courts the right to investigate cases of lay heresy. These developments need to be contrasted with other turning points. Under Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, much of the impetus towards centralisation was lost. The 16 provincial governors, regional <i>parlements</i> and local administrators became more powerful during a period of weak royal rule. Attempts to restore royal authority were made in 1561 by the Ordinance of Orleans and in 1566 by the Ordinance of Moulins but reforms were not enforced. Not until the second decade of Henry IV's reign did the crown begin to reassert itself and strengthen the central administration. Local assemblies had their power reduced, <i>intendants de justice, police</i> and <i>finance</i> were increased, fiscal courts established to end abuses, <i>élus</i> were sent into Guyenne, and more control was imposed over</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	military governors and major towns eg Lyon and Nantes. However, there was still resistance to centralisation in Provence, Languedoc, Brittany, Burgundy and Dauphiné. Candidates should produce a balanced essay although their knowledge of Francis I's administration may well be greater than that of other monarchs.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>Candidates may well start by assessing the ways in which the French nobility contributed to or hindered the development of the state, and the best essays are likely to offer a balanced evaluation. The nobility held key offices in Church and state and not only served the crown but also themselves if allowed. Aristocratic families such as the Bourbons, Montmorencys and Guises expected to receive royal preferment and patronage at court and built networks of political and social power in the provinces. Nobles led and raised troops during the Italian Wars, which served the state positively, but some of the same troops turned against the crown and state during the wars of religion. Thus nobles without a cause to fight after 1559 could be an unstable force in the kingdom. Some nobles became royal governors, law enforcers, administrators and councillors, and most served the state very loyally. A minority flouted the king's justice, lined their pockets and disobeyed the crown, most obviously during the years from 1562 to 1594, when the monarchy was weak and the country divided. Candidates may use these years to draw examples of how much harm the nobility could do. Candidates should be aware of the changing relationship between the crown and nobility, most notably during the reigns of Francis I and Henry II. When the crown was assertive and the country faced external and internal threats, the nobility was supportive and relatively subdued; during the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, the nobility exercised considerable political influence to the detriment of the crown and state. Fraternal discord among members of the royal family meant that princes of the blood were always focal points for discontented nobles. Some nobles were motivated by religious zeal, some by political ambition, and some by a desire to administer their estates peacefully and lawfully in the absence of a strong central government. Candidates might discuss the economic condition of the nobility. Some had to sell lands to offset debts and inflation and all defended their right not to pay direct taxation but the nobility as a class were not in a state of crisis. Few engaged in trade, industry or commerce but adapted to the changing economic conditions, and by shrewd estate management many grew richer. Better responses may be aware that traditional noble families did resent the entry of the bourgeoisie and crown appointed officers to financial and judicial offices, which led to the 'malcontents' in the wars of religion period. Even when the wars had ended, the aristocracy and nobility still remained a potential source of political trouble eg the Biron conspiracy, and Bouillon and Auvergne rebellions against Henry IV.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>What the nobility did in a wider context requires some form of comparative assessment.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>Candidates should consider the nature and condition of French royal finances in this period to decide how far they weakened/strengthened the monarchy. Good essays should focus on the idea of 'consistently' and argue for and against the premise. A chronological or thematic approach can be taken although the latter may well produce a more effective synthesis. Arguments in support of 'consistently weakened' might include: sources of revenue were inadequate to meet the crown's requirements; debts were a regular feature of all administrations – 1.4 million livres in 1515, 6 million in 1546, 43 million in 1561, and 147 million in 1598; the system of tax assessment, collection and exemptions remained largely unreformed in the period. As a consequence, French kings had limited finances with which to reward their subjects and distribute patronage, and some nobles were wealthier than the crown which lessened the respect and loyalty felt towards the monarchy. Attempts to use the Estates General to reform the situation proved uniformly unsuccessful and only served to highlight the crown's vulnerability. A slow, corrupt and inefficient system prevented the crown from fully centralising its administration, and inadequate revenue and excessive expenditure restricted the crown's ability to raise troops to fight wars abroad or maintain peace and stability at home. France was invaded on numerous occasions and the lengthy civil wars were in large part a result of the crown's weak financial condition. From 1562 to 1598, the crown could only afford to pay an army for two months at a time and control of much of the country fell to the nobility and local estates. A counter-argument, however, can and should be offered. Such essays are likely to argue that royal finances did not consistently weaken the monarchy. Indeed, in the first half of the period Louis XII and Francis I had enough money to wage war, and to keep the nobility in check and the country internally stable. Reforms by Francis saw an increase in revenue, greater centralisation in administration and both the <i>parlements</i> and nobility kept in order. Henry IV similarly resolved the debt crisis by re-scheduling the repayments, raised revenue and cut expenditure. Indeed it was the strength of the royal finances after 1598 that enabled him to restore domestic and foreign peace, and enhance the authority of the crown. Some candidates may argue that royal finances did not consistently weaken the crown. The character of the king, political ambition of the nobility, religious divisions, and the threat of foreign powers all undermined the power of the monarchy in the course of the period, and may have been more significant factors than finance. This approach is legitimate provided royal finances are evaluated and other factors are used by way of comparison.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p> <p>Key phrase is 'consistently weakened' and answers that pick that up should be rewarded.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	<p>Candidates are not expected to assess every domestic problem during this period but a range sufficient to focus on the key element of the question ie 'solved', and to compare the main developments in the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. Candidates are likely to suggest that Louis XIII and Richelieu solved some but not all of France's domestic problems and Louis XIV and his ministers solved few inherited problems and managed to create some new ones. The main areas of discussion are likely to be religious, political and economic. In religion, Louis XIII and Richelieu managed issues concerning the Huguenots, Jansenists, Jesuits and Papacy very well. The Huguenots were satisfied with the Peace of Alais in 1629 and stayed loyal to the crown thereafter. The early Jansenists were silenced and Richelieu worked well with the Jesuits to oversee a religious revival. There were no serious disagreements with the Papacy. In contrast Louis XIV mishandled the Huguenot issue, and candidates could usefully discuss new problems created by their expulsion. Louis also allowed Jansenism to become a problem, first by ignoring it and then by invoking papal assistance in trying to silence it. He failed to eliminate Jansenism and incurred the wrath of Gallicans. Jesuits were shown increasing favours by Louis which also alarmed Gallicans and may have affected his judgement on religious issues. In particular by seeking the pope's support on several matters, Louis provoked his <i>parlements</i> into condemning Ultramontanism and sympathising with Jansenists and Quietists. In politics, Louis XIII and Richelieu reduced the power of the princes of the blood and nobility after the regency period, subdued the Paris and regional <i>parlements</i>, and strengthened the authority of the monarchy. Candidates may question how far these problems were solved, however, since during Louis XIV's minority, the nobility and the <i>parlements</i> rose in rebellion. Louis XIV went some way towards solving the nobility question by creating Versailles and assuming personal rule that did not include governing through traditional noble families. This policy however may be seen to be creating new problems since the nobles retained their wealth and influence in the provinces and resented attempts at domestication. The <i>parlements</i> also resented the crown's attempts to bully them into submission eg over Unigenitus, and fiercely contested several of Louis' edicts. Louis XIV far more than his father tried to increase the power of the state and this created increasing opposition. In the economy, Louis XIII never solved the crown's financial difficulties and Richelieu's foreign policy worsened the royal debts. Though Richelieu encouraged overseas trade and colonies, he was largely unsuccessful. Mazarin also tried to tackle the crown's</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>financial difficulties but his policies precipitated the Fronde, and he took little interest in the wider economy. In contrast, Colbert implemented several reforms and by 1672 had balanced the budget. He pursued mercantilist policies at the expense of the Dutch and English, regulated industries, founded trading companies, established colonies in Canada and the West Indies, and expanded the royal navy, maritime fleet, arsenals and naval stores. But after Colbert's death in 1683, the same economic problems surfaced because the drive to sustain change was missing and the basic economic system was still unreformed. Louis XIV's later wars and the king's munificence reflected in Versailles created new problems for his treasurers to overcome, and by 1715 there was economic meltdown.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>Candidates should focus on assessing the role of the economy in the context of France's rise to prominence domestically and in Europe, and the economy's importance relative to other factors in the development of France. Most answers are likely to assess some of the following: the state of the crown's finances, especially under Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert, which enabled the monarchy to elevate its status and undertake expansionist policies and were vital in the development of France's armed forces; the expansion of trade, industry and commerce, which developed the natural resources in France's rise to prosperity and led to France challenging the economies of England, the United Provinces and Spain. Better essays should be aware of the economic failings and limitations, such as an unequal taxation system which kept France a divided society, an inefficient, corrupt and venal financial administration, inadequate agricultural produce to feed an increasingly large population, and insufficient ships to rival those of the Dutch and English. All ministers faced financial difficulties, which was key to the country's development. All tried to cut expenditure, increase taxes, borrow money, sell offices, and reform the system but fundamentally little changed. As a result, France's economy never fulfilled its potential and inherent weaknesses remained throughout the period. Some candidates may approach the question by assessing the contributions of different ministers, especially Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert. Richelieu had limited success in keeping finances in order and, though he encouraged overseas trade and colonies, he was largely unsuccessful. Mazarin also tried to tackle the crown's financial difficulties but his policies precipitated the Fronde, and he took little interest in the wider economy. In contrast, Colbert in the 1660s cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming, reclaimed royal lands, increased the taille paid by landowners and by 1672 had balanced the budget. Colbert also had a far wider view of the economy. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. He regulated industries, founded trading companies, established colonies in Canada and the West Indies, expanded the royal navy, maritime fleet and arsenals and naval stores. None of his predecessors since Sully and Henry IV had developed the economy so broadly. As a result, he enabled Louis to wage wars in the 1670s and to become the most powerful man in Europe by 1683. Candidates may argue that there were more significant contributions to the</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			development of France, and compare them to the economy. The personal qualities of the French kings, for instance, administrative and bureaucratic changes, the role of the nobility and clergy, French armies and navies which enabled Louis XIII and Louis XIV to eclipse the power of Spain and bring greatness to France in Europe, may be considered.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	<p>Candidates should consider the condition of France in 1659 as an international power at the Treaty of the Pyrenees and compare its standing with other dates/periods. The Pyrenees saw France acquire lands in Luxemburg, Artois and towns in the Spanish Netherlands, confirm gains made at Westphalia that secured the Pyrenees, and agree to the union of Louis XIV and Maria Theresa, the Spanish Infanta, which gave French kings a claim to the Spanish throne and empire. The treaty climaxed French dominance in Europe over Spain, its longstanding rival, enabled it to compete with Dutch and English for overseas trade and commerce, seize more Spanish territories and intervene in German politics over the next thirty years. The Treaty was the culmination of 24 years of fighting and, though its military and naval victories over Spain could have brought more territorial gains, peace was needed and the terms seemed fair and reasonable. The financial and political situation in France in 1659 needs to be considered and the condition of other European states assessed by way of comparison. England was in political disarray, Spain bankrupt and vulnerable, and the United Provinces and the Holy Roman Empire eager for peace. The periods before France entered the Thirty Years' War (1610-35) and after the start of the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-13) should be assessed to set France's standing in Europe in a wider context but the events immediately following 1659 should be given particular attention. Candidates may well consider some of the following by way of a comparison with 1659: 1648, 1668, 1678, 1684.</p> <p>In 1648 Mazarin negotiated the treaty of Westphalia that gained Metz, Toul and Verdun which secured France's eastern border; the bishopric of Lorraine, most of Alsace, Rhine bridgeheads such as Breisach, and the Italian fortress of Pinerolo. These possessions presaged French influence in Germany, the humiliation of the emperor and the fall of Spain. Westphalia was also the first European treaty to be conducted in French. In 1668 France acquired lands in the Spanish Netherlands, especially St Omer, Lille and Douai but not Franche Comté. In 1678 France gained Franche Comté, annexed Flemish border areas and occupied Lorraine, which linked Luxemburg with Alsace and gave France a valuable border buttress with Germany. In 1684 at Ratisbon the emperor confirmed France's previous gains and possession of Luxemburg, Strasburg and Kehl. However, Louis had offended the major European powers, and thereafter the English, Dutch, Spanish, Germans and Austrians united against him. The best essays should assess 1659 and other moments during the period to decide when France was at the height of its power in Europe.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2012

