

## **History A**

Advanced GCE

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

## **Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs

**2 answers: Each maximum mark 60**

	<b>AO1a</b>	<b>AO1b</b>
<b>IA</b>	18–20	36–40
<b>IB</b>	16–17	32–35
<b>II</b>	14–15	28–31
<b>III</b>	12–13	24–27
<b>IV</b>	10–11	20–23
<b>V</b>	8–9	16–19
<b>VI</b>	4–7	8–15
<b>VII</b>	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.

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

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

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

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
1		<p>Examples from across the period support the idea that rebellion was a reaction to strong government. It was particularly true in 1215 when rebellion was at least in part a reaction to sixty years of Angevin rule with its increased royal control and systematic intervention in many spheres of life and to John's methods of control including use of foreign mercenaries and huge fines. It could also be seen in 1075 when Roger of Hereford reacted to the growth of royal control in the Marches, in 1095 when Robert of Mowbray resented royal interference in his fief and in the Great Rebellion of 1173–4 when tension built up during twenty years of strong government spilled over.</p> <p>However, to reach a judgment on whether this was the main reason for rebellion, candidates need to set it against other reasons and compare. Tensions created by the continental possessions helped to create rebellion: under Stephen the English situation deteriorated while his attention was focused abroad. In addition, in 1088, after 1144 and again after the loss of Normandy in John's reign, barons wished to limit the difficulties of having two overlords. Moreover, John's attempts to raise money to fight his futile Norman campaigns bred baronial resentment which helped to lead to rebellion. Disputed succession could also be a cause of rebellion. In William I's case this was resentment against the invader, seen in the Northern Rebellion. By 1088, Odo of Bayeux was supporting Robert of Normandy, the eldest son of the Conqueror, against William II who had been awarded the English inheritance. Disputed succession between Stephen and Matilda also lay at the heart of the civil war in Stephen's reign. Some candidates may point out that underlying most of these reasons is baronial self interest. Real or perceived threats from royal government led to a sense of personal grievance throughout the period. Territorial and financial problems caused by the loss of Normandy and even support for Young Henry in the Great rebellion could all be argued to be caused by this. Some may also argue that most rebellions were multi causal.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
2		<p>Some candidates may wish to stress the variety of reasons for changes in local government. In the earliest years it was the Conquest and the import of Norman ideas, especially feudalism, which produced change with the fief and the honorial court taking their place alongside the already existing shire and hundred. Later there was the need to make local government more efficient and accountable, and more profitable, leading to the decline in the importance of the sheriff, including their rendering account at the exchequer from at least Henry I's reign, and the inquests of sheriffs in 1170, 1194 and 1213. Some may point to the government's desire to extend royal justice to the shires through the itinerant justices and the recognition that they could be useful in number of ways, from itinerant justices going on general eyre and reporting local information to the exchequer in the Norman period, to being used to investigate all royal officials in the shire under the Angevins. However, candidates are likely to argue that through most of the period, at least from the reign of William II, the main reason for change was the same: the government's desire for centralisation, bringing finance, justice and administration firmly under control so that profits could be maximised in order to meet the costs of government and warfare. They may argue that the underlying reason for local government changes was the financial needs of kings, or that the changes resulted ultimately from the various pressures created by the continental possessions and their loss.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
3		<p>Candidates may confine their answers to the archbishops mentioned in the specification: Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton and they should not be penalised for this. However, if candidates make appropriate reference to other archbishops they should be rewarded.</p> <p>In some ways Lanfranc seems different from the other archbishops of the period. He enjoyed a particularly good relationship with William I which worked in the interests of both of them. Lanfranc was able to use the church to help William to establish Norman rule. He and William agreed over the desirability of refusing the pope's summons to Rome and over keeping England out of the Investiture Contest. With William's support Lanfranc was able to institute church reform and he gained personal recognition of his primacy. Lanfranc then was successful both in developing the church in England and in helping the secular state. This is in marked contrast to Anselm whose relations with William II over a range of things from the quality of the Canterbury knights to the recognition of the pope were so poor as to lead to his exile, and to Becket who quarrelled so long and bitterly with Henry II. Neither of these archbishops actively supported the development of the state. Both were maintaining the claims of the church against the traditional rights of the monarch: Anselm through his realisation of the full meaning of Gregorian Reform which resulted in Henry I agreeing to relinquish investiture with the ring and staff in 1107, and Becket through his stand on ecclesiastical justice, in particular the trial of criminous clerks. Lanfranc contrasts too with Langton whose relations with John were so bad that he was unable to enter the country for a while. This prevented him even from attempting to strengthen the English church or his own authority.</p> <p>However, candidates might also argue that there are also similarities between Lanfranc and other archbishops. The most obvious comparison is with Hubert Walter who, like Lanfranc, had a good relationship with his monarch, and contributed to the well being of both church and state by acting on Richard's behalf during his absence abroad and using councils to improve church discipline, but there are other similarities too. For example, Langton was involved in matters of state, taking a role in the 1215 rebellion and Magna Carta. Lanfranc and William I had set England on the path to separate ecclesiastical justice which Becket was to defend so strongly. Lanfranc was interested in church reform as were Anselm and Becket, albeit concerned with different aspects. Candidates need to weigh up similarities and differences and reach a judgment.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
4		<p>Candidates are expected to assess the extent to which rebellions were caused by religious change. Most are likely to argue that from 1534 to 1603 rebellions in Ireland and from 1536 to 1570 rebellions in England had religious causes but that in some of these cases religious change was a minor cause and that outside these periods religion played no part at all. Better candidates should distinguish between disturbances that were principally caused by religious change, notably the Pilgrimage of Grace, Western and (debatably) the Northern Earls' rebellions, and rebellions where religion was a subsidiary cause eg Kildare, Kett, Wyatt, Shane, Munster, Geraldine and Tyrone rebellions. Religious changes or fear of change which underscored these rebellions should be assessed and some, perhaps better, responses may organise their arguments according to the impact of Protestant and Catholic reforms in England and Ireland. Candidates are likely to argue that several rebellions during the period had no religious elements. Simnel, Warbeck and Essex rebellions were political and dynastic; and the Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable and Oxfordshire rebellions were economic and social in origin. Some answers may stress the issue of the succession, which was a key cause of disturbances in England in 1486, 1487, 1497, and 1553. Others may suggest that political factions were a major cause of rebellion, such as those led by Lincoln, Warbeck, Kildare, Northumberland, Wyatt, the Northern Earls, Tyrone and Essex. The best responses should examine a range of English and Irish rebellions from across the period and focus their arguments on relative causation. Weaker responses may afford little or no consideration of Irish rebellions. A judgement is expected although some candidates may prefer an open verdict, perhaps suggesting that after 1534 religious change was often used as a cloak to disguise personal, political and non-religious motives. This was apparent in the Northern Earls' rebellion and in most Irish rebellions.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
5		<p>Tudor rebellions failed for a number of reasons. Candidates should assess the importance of rebel leaders and probably consider their ability to control different social groups who had different objectives; their capacity to organise rebels when marching to a county town or when setting up a protest camp; their decision-making when faced with government responses; and their skill in drafting articles of complaint and negotiating with government officials. Some rebel leaders, notably Aske and Kett, were very competent and it may be argued that their rebellions failed as a result of other factors. Most leaders, however, displayed weaknesses and better candidates should be aware of them. Simnel, a boy, was a cipher in the hands of more ambitious nobles and clergymen, who in turn relied on German and Irish troops, which alienated many Englishmen from joining in. Warbeck, allowed spies to infiltrate his supporters, misjudged the support he would get from Cornwall and deserted his followers at Taunton when confronted with a royal army. Wyatt was a good strategist but poor tactician who unwisely wasted time besieging Cooling Castle in Kent. The Northern Earls revealed their objectives in advance of starting their rebellion and had insufficient money to pay their troops. The Oxfordshire rebels raised no more than a handful of supporters due to their radical aims which were revealed days before the revolt began. Essex had no clear strategy or tactics, forewarned the Court of his intentions to rebel and was arrested after 12 hours in revolt. The best answers should consider 'poor leadership' alongside other factors, and are likely to suggest that measures taken by the government, the strength of royal armies, a lack of support from the nobility, gentry and clergy, a reluctance by commoners to risk life and livelihood, unrealistic rebel aims, and the long distance from London, are more significant explanations for failure. Indeed some candidates might argue that the most successful rebellions, notably the Amicable Grant revolt and Mary Tudor's rebellion against Northumberland, owed their success not to good leadership but to other factors. Weak responses may well have few examples of good and poor leadership and focus their essays on one or two other factors.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
6		<p>Most candidates are likely to agree with the premise and consider some of the following features of the Pilgrimage of Grace: its large size of nearly 40000 rebels, which greatly outnumbered government forces sent to subdue it; its geographical spread covering most northern counties and initially Lincolnshire, which were noted areas of disaffection; its outbreak in October 1536 when the government was short of money and resources to counter a rebellion; the support from some important social groups in the north, especially lesser nobles, gentry and clergy, upon whom the government usually relied to maintain order; the variety of measures taken by the government to deal with it, reflective of wavering strategies and hesitancy.</p> <p>Better responses may suggest that in spite of its apparent threat, the rebellion had severe limitations. The northern aristocracy did not support it, other areas in the country did not join in, the main cohort never advanced further south than Doncaster in Yorkshire which was 200 miles from the government in London, its main aim was restoration not revolution and, if Henry VIII stayed resolute, the rebels were always likely to fail. Candidates need to compare the Pilgrimage with other rebellions and may do so sequentially or thematically but the latter approach is likely to produce a more synoptic comparison. Arguments should be supported by references to a range of rebellions which may include Irish (especially Tyrone) as well as English rebellions across the period but not all rebellions need to be assessed. Criteria for 'serious threat' would be helpful and may well appear in the better essays. Some might argue that rebellions, such as Simnel and Warbeck, which aimed to depose the monarch were potentially the most serious, or if the monarch had to fight a battle, which happened at East Stoke (1487) and Blackheath (1497), or defend London from attack, as occurred in rebellions led by Wyatt (1554) and Essex (1601), then these were more serious threats to the government. In this respect, none of the Irish rebellions presented a serious threat to the government in London. The best answers should analyse the Pilgrimage and present a synthesis of other rebellions that threatened Tudor governments 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
7		<p>Some candidates may argue in support of the premise and suggest that, in the course of the period, Anglo-Scottish relations underwent a sea change. In 1485, and for much of the early years, Scotland was England's 'postern gate' that French troops readily exploited. In response English armies invaded Scotland in 1513, 1542, 1547 and 1560, and threatened invasion in 1497 and 1522. Much of this hostility was traditional but under Henry VIII and Somerset, war was a result of personal ambition. The personality of rulers was often the key to their foreign policy and perhaps also to the argument in favour of change. Henry VII, Mary Tudor and Elizabeth in contrast to Henry VIII and Somerset adopted a more diplomatic approach towards Scotland. A major and permanent turning point in Anglo-Scottish relations was the Protestant rebellion and subsequent expulsion of the French court and troops in 1560. As a consequence, relations between England and Scotland became more stable as Cecil tried to use Moray and Morton as English agents at court and so build up a Protestant and pro-English faction in Edinburgh. Elizabeth also cultivated friendly relations with the French regent, Catherine de Medici, which further weakened the Guise influence in Scotland. Between 1560 and 1603, there were no further wars between England and Scotland. A <b>counter argument</b>, however, should be made. Many of the key features that underpinned Anglo-Scottish tension in 1485 remained for most of the Tudor period. Border clashes were a regular feature of life in northern England even during times of peace and no one was sure exactly where the border was located. Claims to the 'debateable lands' were never resolved and Scotland tried to but never recovered Berwick. Scottish kings often had a high opinion of their power and persisted in goading their southern rulers. Henry VII had to threaten war in 1497 to discourage Scottish support for Warbeck, Henry VIII waged war on two occasions and was always spoiling for a fight, and Somerset and Elizabeth sent troops into Scotland to try to secure their northern border. After 1560, clan rivalry continued to dominate Scottish politics and the Scottish crown remained weak and unstable. Even when James VI became king, Anglo-Scottish relations were never easy, partly because Elizabeth was reluctant to acknowledge him as her heir and partly because the young king seemed to lack the will and means to keep the Scottish clans in check. Matters were only resolved in the 1580s when he sent his cousin Esmé Stuart back to France, Elizabeth executed James' mother and he promised to keep out of English</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>politics in return for a pension. In 1603 James became king of England as well as Scotland, although it would be another hundred years before parliament approved an Act of Union that politically united the two countries. Candidates are likely to find more arguments in favour of change than continuity but both sides of the argument need to be considered.</p>		

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
8		<p>Candidates should assess Elizabeth's handling of relations with Spain to determine the extent to which she can be described as 'skilful', before comparing her with the other Tudors and reaching an overall conclusion. Arguments that she lacked skill may focus on her relationship with Philip II and its consequences for England's relations with Spain.</p> <p>The outbreak of the Dutch Revolt from 1566 and the presence of Spanish troops in the Netherlands created a problem that saw the queen prevaricate over strategy and tactics, claiming neutrality but offering moral and subsequently physical aid to the rebels, which provoked Philip into retaliation. Another key development was the conflict between rival merchants in the Americas, perhaps citing the San Juan de Ulúa incident in 1567 which led to reprisals from Elizabeth and a worsening in relations when she endorsed but disavowed Drake's expeditions in the 1570s and 1580s. Similarly her support for the Portuguese claimant, Don Antonio, did little to endear her to Philip at a critical time in the 1580s. Candidates can, however, argue that Elizabeth was forced into taking retaliatory measures to safeguard her country from an increasingly hostile Spanish king. She tolerated Spanish ambassadors' involvement in espionage until a stand had to be made, hence the expulsion of de Spes and Mendoza for treason. She was not prepared to see English merchants have their goods seized or be interrogated by the inquisition, and she fully realised the implications if the Low Countries became a military base for Spanish troops. As a result the queen skilfully bided her time, built up state finances, militia and naval defences, won over France as an ally and tried to persuade Philip by diplomatic niceties not to invade. An assessment of the other Tudor rulers needs to be made. Some may see Henry VII as the most skilful Tudor: he negotiated the Treaty of Medina del Campo which was the bedrock of English foreign policy for 80 years and the foundation of good relations with Spain. Henry VIII for all but two years (1527–8) was at peace with Spain, though he was often outmanoeuvred by Ferdinand and Charles I, fought wasteful wars as an ally, angered Charles over the divorce and achieved few of his foreign objectives. Edward VI had few dealings with Spain but his minister, Northumberland, in making peace with France in 1550, alienated the Spanish king. Mary in contrast failed to put her marriage to good effect as far as diplomatic relations were concerned. Philip had little affection for her, did not enjoy living in England and his courtiers were often abused by Londoners.</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
		War with France was unpopular and unsuccessful, and the prospect of marriage precipitated Wyatt's rebellion, angered parliament and convinced many that Spain would have a deleterious effect on the state of the Church in England. Some candidates may view Mary as being 'less skilful'; others may well concur with the premise.		

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
9		<p>Candidates are likely to argue that the measures taken by the Tudors were very effective in England and Wales, less so in Ireland and not at all in the defence of Boulogne and Calais. Better responses should be aware that each of the Tudors had to repel foreign attacks or invasions and perhaps assess why some administrations were more effective than others or why some areas could be more easily defended. They might organise their answers sequentially (effectively/ineffectively), chronologically (by ruler), or thematically (by territory). Henry VII, without a standing army, relied on his nobles and their retainers to defend his kingdom but Lancashire and Cornwall were invaded by German and Flemish supporters of the pretenders, Simnel and Warbeck. A series of diplomatic alliances, particularly Medina del Campo, may have strengthened Henry's hand and treaties with France, Burgundy and Scotland undoubtedly helped to secure England's borders. Henry VIII and Wolsey relied on Spanish and Imperial support when at war with France and Scotland in 1512–14, 1522–24 and 1542–46, and though Surrey defeated a Scottish army at Flodden (1513) and repelled an invasion of Northumberland, the northern counties were consistently invaded by Scottish raiding parties in the 1530s and 1540s. Victory at Solway Moss (1542) repelled an invasion by James V's troops but Henry's presence at Portsmouth in 1545 could not prevent a French fleet from attacking the south of England and occupying the Isle of Wight. Somerset's war with Scotland in 1547 led to the entry of France and although the northern English border remained secure and Berwick stayed English, the recently captured town of Boulogne was surrendered in 1550. Mary's alliance with Spain, it may be argued, did little to protect English interests and led to war with France and the loss of Calais in 1558. Elizabeth relied on diplomacy, naval superiority and luck to defend England from Spain in the 1580s and was very effective in defeating the Armada and repelling attacks on Ireland in 1580 and 1601. Her alliance with France, treaty with the Dutch rebels and support for English privateers weakened Spanish plans at invasion though good fortune in 1588 may best explain her eventual success and survival. Candidates should draw their examples of Tudor management from across the period before reaching a judgement on 'how effectively'.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
10		<p>Most candidates are likely to argue that the Church was actually much stronger in 1610 than in 1492 but how effectively they evaluate the changing 'condition' of the Church may differentiate between good and less successful essays. The following themes are likely to appear: In 1492 the Church lacked an effective and respected leadership: Pope Alexander VI and his immediate successors left much to be desired. Although Paul III introduced some significant initiatives, Paul IV demonstrated that, during the sessions of Trent, the quality of the Papacy was still variable. However the quality of headship thereafter improved and by the end of the period, the Papacy was more respected and generally acknowledged as the undisputed leader and sole interpreter of the Catholic faith and doctrine. In 1492 the Church was riddled with corruption at all levels with few signs of improvement. Progress was subsequently made in the education and quality of the clergy but not uniformly; Spain and Italy alone stood out as examples of key developments. Malpractices proved difficult to eradicate and some states, notably France, did not see a sustained degree of reform until the end of the period. Overall, however, by 1610 the education and quality of the Catholic clergy was much improved. In 1492 some religious and a few lay orders were reforming their practices to make them more relevant to society's needs, and this trend continued. The Oratorians and Brethren of the Common Life might be cited as examples of lay orders; and many regular orders such as the Franciscans, Benedictines, Augustinians, Carthusians, and Cluniacs, had become more 'observant' of rules governing their order. By mid-period, there were many more orders and missionaries, notably the Theatines, Ursulines, Barnabites, Capuchins and Jesuits, whose quality of education and preaching had strengthened spiritual understanding. In the later period, the Discalced Carmelites in Spain became a role model for women dedicated to spiritual devotion, 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. Overall, the Catholic Church had acquired many high quality orders in the course of the period. In 1492 biblical humanists questioned some of the Church's beliefs and threatened to implement reforms independently of the Papacy.</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>In the course of the next 50 years, Protestants split Christendom and Europe remained theologically divided in 1610. Much of Germany, Switzerland, Scandinavia, Scotland and England, became Protestant but from the 1560s the Catholic Church stemmed the tide and by 1610 its faith had been restored or strengthened in much of southern and eastern Europe. Arguments should be made for and against the premise before a judgement is reached.</p>		

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
11		<p>Candidates need to assess the role of the Council of Trent in the reformation of the Catholic Church and compare it with other factors, focussing in particular on their role as 'turning-points' during the period. The main arguments in favour of Trent are likely to be that it re-asserted papal authority: the period from 1492 had seen the prestige and leadership of the Papacy ridiculed and brought into question. After 1563 the Papacy's headship was not challenged. Candidates may also consider that Trent also redefined the Catholic doctrine: biblical humanists and Protestant evangelists had challenged traditional teaching and offered alternative interpretations. After 1563 Protestant beliefs were rebutted and rejected, and several regions and states that were lost to Protestantism were subsequently regained. Some may argue that it stressed the pastoral role of bishops and the unique authority of the clergy: Protestants had criticised worldly bishops, claiming that 'all men were priests'; the Catholic clergy thus recovered their status vis-à-vis secular society. Other responses may acknowledge the importance of confessionalists, seminaries and a better educated clergy: until the Reformation, clerical and lay education had been under-valued; after 1563, greater priority was given to education, teaching and preaching. There may be some consideration that the drive to eliminate clerical abuses was begun: until 1563 there had been much talk but little action; after 1563 much progress was made in Europe to revive the Church, as the Papacy and secular rulers endeavoured to implement the Tridentine reforms.</p> <p>Better essays, however, should also be aware of Trent's limitations. Not all secular rulers adhered to or applied the decrees in their states; reforms needed time and money to be effective; some contentious issues such as the Breviary, Missal and Catechisms were not resolved at Trent; and little was said about the role of the Inquisition, Index, regular orders and women.</p> <p>Essays should also compare Trent's significance with other turning-points to establish a comparative argument. Alternatives could include: the role of individuals (such as Luther's attack on the Church's beliefs and Papacy), events and institutions (such as the sack of Rome and the establishment of the Jesuits), papal leadership (notably the pontificates of Paul III), the contribution of humanists (such as Erasmus), all of which preceded the Council of Trent's decrees.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
12		<p>Candidates need to assess the contribution of Philip II and compare him with other secular rulers before reaching a judgement. Essays are likely to be quite full on Philip II and perhaps Isabella and Ferdinand but knowledge of other rulers may be limited and a good differentiator. Candidates should not focus their arguments on non-secular rulers, such as popes. Philip II was the first European ruler to implement the Tridentine Decrees. He made extensive use of the Spanish Inquisition to eradicate heresy and re-enforce orthodoxy, oversaw the creation of 20 seminaries, 12 Franciscan convents, 17 monasteries in Madrid, and spearheaded the Counter Reformation in Europe. Under his guidance, Archbishops Quiroga in Toledo and Ribera in Valencia founded seminaries and raised the level of priestly education and spirituality in their dioceses, and he protected the welfare of Teresa of Avila who established a highly respected female order of Discalced Carmelites that became the model for other Catholic orders outside Spain. Better answers should be aware that Philip had serious limitations too. He argued with the Papacy, only implemented the Tridentine Decrees conditionally, resented Italian dominance of the Jesuit order, failed to stop the spread of heresy in the Spanish Netherlands, and made limited advances in propagating Christianity in his own kingdom.</p> <p>Candidates also need to consider alternative secular rulers. Isabella and Ferdinand are likely to be cited. They revived the Spanish Inquisition, began the drive to purge Spain of moriscos and conversos, encouraged Cisneros in his diocesan and monastic reforms, as well as the polyglot bible and establishment of the university of Alcalá which improved the quality of priests. Charles V may also be considered. He pressed the Papacy to convene a general council, condemned Luther and tried to find a compromise that would heal the schism in Christendom. He had only limited success however. Philip III, Ferdinand of Styria, Sigismund of Poland, Rudolph II of Austria, and Albert, William and Maximilian of Bavaria, could also be examined as secular rulers who advanced the Catholic Reformation in their own lands. Their successes could be attributed to the use of patronage, military influence and political authority. Candidates might argue that some Catholic secular rulers, who were in a position to implement improvements, did little to advance the Church's revival. Most German princes, Henry VIII, Mary Tudor, Francis I and the later Valois kings may fall into this category. Candidates should evaluate the contribution of a number of secular rulers to the Catholic Reformation and decide whether any of them deserves greater credit than Philip II of Spain.</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
13		<p>Candidates are likely to consider political and geographical unification, central (and possibly) local administration, the crown's relations with <i>parlements</i>, and social and religious factors that acted as unifying agents. Candidates may focus on features of centralisation, which is fine provided they are relevant to an assessment of 'a more unified state'. <b>Geo-politically</b> in 1498 France lacked well-defined frontiers, a common language and a single legal system. The Emperor claimed lands in the east, Dauphiné and Provence in the south did not recognise the French king as their ruler, Brittany in the west was still independent, and in the north Artois and Flanders owed suzerainty to Burgundy. There were also some foreign enclaves, such as Calais and Orange. France did however become more unified in the course of the period: Burgundy (1531) and Brittany (1532) were added to the kingdom; Rhenish towns were acquired (1552) and Calais recovered (1558) but claims to Artois, Flanders and Tournai were lost. By 1610 the frontier stretched to the Rhine, Pyrenees and Alps. However good responses should point out that in several peripheral provinces, such as Dauphiné and Bearn, where traditional privileges were respected, the monarch's authority remained limited. <b>Linguistically</b> France was far from unified in 1498. <i>Langue d'oeil</i> was spoken in the north and <i>langue d'oc</i> in the south, but steadily the northern dialect spread south becoming the official court language and a more uniform practice prevailed. In respect of the <b>law</b>, customary law prevailed in the north and Roman law in the south, but attempts were made to create a more unified system. The Ordinance of Blois (1499) established a commission to write down customary laws in northern France and further judicial reforms were considered in 1539 but attempts to set up a uniform system were not enforced. Francis I and Henry II reformed their central <b>administration</b> in the face of resistance from their <i>parlements</i> and <i>pays</i>, especially in Provence, Burgundy, Languedoc and Guyenne. The Epargne in 1542 established 16 districts with their own treasurer and the expansion of <i>élus</i> and royal officials developed a more centralised bureaucracy but the co-existence of two systems of financial administration highlighted an absence of unification. Under Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, much of the impetus towards unification was lost and not until the second decade of Henry IV's reign did the crown begin to strengthen the central administration. However, there was still resistance in Provence, Languedoc, Brittany, Burgundy and Dauphiné. Some candidates may focus on religious divisions in society which widened as the period advanced.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
		<p>There was one official faith in 1498 but two were widely practised from the 1550s and by 1610 Huguenotism was officially acknowledged as a legitimate religion. The co-existence of two faiths demonstrated an absence of uniformity in France.</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
14		<p>Candidates need to contrast the period before 1562 when civil war began and the years that followed down to 1598 to explain the marked differences. Four main areas of explanation are likely: the character and condition of the French monarchy; the emergence of Calvinism; the power of the French nobility; and the end of the Italian Wars, and the subsequent economic crisis.</p> <p>From 1498 to 1559 the <b>monarchy</b> had built up sufficient power to earn the respect of its subjects to have its orders implemented. There was occasional resistance eg Bourbon in 1523 and residual opposition from the <i>parlements</i> but Louis XII, Francis I and Henry II were generally obeyed. These strong kings kept their nobility in check, defended the Catholic faith and through greater centralisation established a more unitary and cohesive nation state. After the death of Henry II, France was ruled by a succession of weak kings. Catherine de Medici emerged as the dominant force in state politics until 1589 but she was despised as a foreign female and her sons lacked credibility and respect. Not until the accession of Henry IV did the monarchy begin to restore and regain some authority but even then regicide was considered by some to be a legitimate course of action. The emergence of <b>Calvinism</b> in the 1550s and 1560s as an alternative belief to Catholicism was a major development. Before 1562 attempts were made by Francis I and Henry II to suppress its growth; and Francis II and Charles IX in 1560 and 1561 respectively tried to achieve a compromise between the two faiths. The Catholic Church however was unwilling to yield any ground, and the Huguenots though a minority were well organised, armed and led by prominent noble families. Theological differences were the prelude to military conflict. French <b>nobles</b> served the state as royal governors, law enforcers, administrators and councillors, and had 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 the Guises, Bourbons and Montmorencys in particular took up arms to serve their own ambitions. 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. The <b>Italian Wars</b> gave many nobles a taste of war and when the wars ended in 1559 their military instincts and personal armies remained.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
		<p>The wars had also bankrupted the state and after 1559 the crown lacked the patronage to retain the loyalty of its subjects and to readily defend its country. Moreover, foreign armies, especially Spanish and German, were in a position to intervene in French affairs from their bases nearby, which only served to prolong the French civil wars. The best essays should assess these main reasons before reaching a judgement.</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
15		<p>Most candidates are likely to know more about the state of royal finances during this period but higher responses (Levels I and II) should explain some of the economic difficulties in industry, trade, commerce and agriculture as well. In <b>finance</b> the main problems were the inefficient and unequal tax system, tax farming and insufficient revenue to meet the state's requirements; long periods of foreign war and civil wars, which disrupted administration and increased crown debts; and inflation that was exacerbated by court affluence and patronage. Francis I implemented reforms that went some way towards centralising the financial administration but did not tackle issues of corruption and tax exemption. Henry IV could only begin to solve the difficulties caused by civil wars by cancelling debts and gradually initiating reforms after 1598. Sources of revenue were consistently 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. Thus the system of tax assessment, collection and exemptions remained largely unreformed in the period. Attempts to use the Estates-General to reform the situation proved uniformly unsuccessful and only served to highlight the crown's failure. The nobility and <i>officiers</i> had the wealth and potential to invest in <b>trade and industry</b> but throughout the period showed little interest as long as <i>rentes</i>, crown pensions and from 1604 the Paulette proved more profitable. <b>Trade</b> was in the hands of merchants who were heavily taxed and disadvantaged when competing with foreigners. There were few improvements in <b>agriculture</b> due to the depressed condition of the peasantry and lack of interest among landowning nobility who preferred to hunt over the crops. There was little investment in industry and agriculture until Henry IV and Sully began to encourage state subsidies, and examples of the latter's work may figure in better essays.</p> <p><b>Population</b> levels rose to 17 million by 1610 (the largest in Europe), which put pressure on urban employment and food supplies, and increased the likelihood of plague, poverty and revolts. Local and regional opposition to a more unitary <b>transport</b> system and an excessive number of tolls further impeded the movement of goods. Overall the economy and royal finances remained a weakness in the nation state though there were some improvements, notably under Francis I and Henry IV. A balanced assessment of the solutions applied to economic and financial problems is required; and a range of examples and depth of supporting evidence are likely to characterise the best essays.</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
16		<p>A definition of 'absolutism' would be helpful. Better essays are likely to distinguish between the theoretical and practical features of royal authority and assess the monarchy's limitations. Polemicists like Le Bret and Loyseau wrote of Louis XIII's absolutism, when Richelieu succeeded in controlling and weakening the nobility, and recalcitrant estates and Huguenots lost their privileges. Royal officials especially <i>intendants</i> grew in number and authority, the Paris <i>parlement</i> was told to register edicts without delay or amendments, uncooperative bishops were dismissed and a political tribunal – the <i>chambre de l'arsenal</i> – operated from 1631 to 1643. But the monarchy was hedged with practical limitations. Louis XIII and Richelieu could not do as they wished; magnates remained strong and the Estates-General showed their power in 1614 during a royal minority. Richelieu failed to raise revenue to meet war costs or stop corruption among tax farmers; he had to negotiate with the <i>pays d'état</i> to extend taxes, and they resisted his use of <i>élus</i>.</p> <p>Candidates may suggest that the French monarchy became 'more absolute in practice' under Louis XIV, whose power was celebrated in the writings of Bossuet. Louis XIV's demi-god status at Versailles; his control over national and regional assemblies, <i>parlements</i> and royal councils; his highly developed administration, salaried <i>intendants</i> (agents of absolutism) and bureaucracy of <i>officiers</i>; his command of the largest standing army in Europe; state censorship; the treatment of Fouquet, Huguenots, Gallican Articles may be cited as illustrative of his absolute authority. However, better essays should point out that his power was also limited by corrupt officials and a failure to reform royal finances; by Paris and regional <i>parlements</i> that obstructed royal edicts; by religious dissenters such as Jansenists who survived persecution; by aristocratic governors that still acted independently; by corporate bodies that retained privileges; and by seigneurial and church courts that impeded a uniform legal system. Raising troops and revenue to meet war costs and defence expenses proved inadequate, the financial system was largely unreformed and the <i>pays d'états</i> opposed the introduction of <i>élus</i>. Towns and cities were also protective of their chartered customs and privileges. The size of France, its large population, undeveloped transport links and isolated communities made effective administration from Paris hard to achieve throughout the period.</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>

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
		Candidates should use examples from across the period to support an argument for and against the concept of French absolutism before arriving at a judgement. They are likely to be more knowledgeable of practical examples than theories in support of absolutism.		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
17		<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 'dealt effectively', and to compare the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. Such responses are likely to include an assessment of Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert, and occasionally Louvois and Le Tellier. The main areas of discussion are likely to be religious, political and economic. In <b>religion</b>, 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. Neither Mazarin nor Colbert faced religious problems but Louis XIV mishandled several issues concerning the Huguenots, Gallicans, Jansenists and Papacy. In <b>politics</b>, Richelieu was supported by Louis XIII, especially after 1630, and 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 against the policies of Mazarin. His successful handling of the Fronde crisis however also showed his skill as a politician. Colbert managed to steer clear of court politics and retained the support of the king until his death. Louis XIV took a more pro-active part in keeping the nobility obedient and pre-occupied at Versailles, and largely succeeded in controlling the <i>parlements</i>. In the <b>economy</b>, Richelieu never solved the crown's financial difficulties 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 was far more successful. In the 1660s he cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming, reclaimed royal land, and increased the taille paid by landowners. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. Better essays should be aware that 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.</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>Thus Louvois and Le Tellier pursued expensive military reforms and Louis XIV spent lavishly at home and abroad and left France with very high debts. Candidates may thus conclude that political problems were well handled by Louis XIV and religious problems by Louis XIII but neither ruler effectively resolved France's economic and financial problems.</p>		

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
18		<p>Candidates are required to assess the outcome of the foreign aims of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. Most responses are likely to be sequential and chronological but some candidates might approach the question thematically, perhaps organising their argument according to foreign policy aims. In some but not all respects the aims were similar: to limit Habsburg power and influence in continental Europe; to defend France's frontiers from Spain, the Holy Roman Empire and England; to curtail the trading power of the United Provinces; to expand borders to their natural boundaries; and to spread the Catholic faith in the face of Calvinism.</p> <p>Louis XIII and his minister Richelieu however were more defensive and prudent than Louis XIV. They had fewer resources and serious domestic problems for much of the early period. France's main rivals, England and Spain, were kept at bay by treaties and alliances and neither desired war. James I and Charles I lacked the finances and desire to engage in conflict (the war from 1626 was largely due to Buckingham). Spain was preoccupied with the Dutch Revolt and the Emperor with the Thirty Years' War. Thus Richelieu was able to intervene in the Valtelline and Mantua-Montferrat dispute in the 1620s without fear of retaliation, and effectively ended Buckingham's support for the Huguenots at La Rochelle. Richelieu was similarly successful in his handling of the Thirty Years' War, delaying entry until France was ready, allying with Sweden and the United Provinces, but with little intention of going to their assistance if required. Though he died before the war ended, by 1642 Spain and the Austrian Habsburgs had suffered heavy military and naval losses. Mazarin achieved most of Richelieu's aims at Westphalia and at the Pyrenees. In 1648 France gained Metz, Toul and Verdun which secured the eastern border; the bishopric of Lorraine, most of Alsace, Rhine bridgeheads, and the Italian fortress of Pinerolo. These possessions presaged French influence in Germany, the humiliation of the emperor and the fall of Spain. The Pyrenees treaty in 1659 saw France acquire lands in Luxemburg, Artois and towns in the Spanish Netherlands, secure 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.</p> <p>After Mazarin's death, Louis assumed control of foreign policy and his aims became more ambitious and eventually less successful.</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
		War against the Dutch for religious, economic and political motives assumed priority and brought France into conflict with England. Though French frontiers were extended into the Spanish Netherlands, Luxemburg and Lorraine, Louis had offended the major European powers, and thereafter the English, Dutch, Spanish, Germans and Austrians united against him. His pursuit of the Spanish throne and empire led to military defeat and bankruptcy. By 1715 Louis had lost most of his gains since 1661.		

**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 2013

