

# **Mark Scheme for June 2010**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 2010

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Maximum mark 120 for this unit.

2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

	<b>A01a</b>	<b>A01b</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: - 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
<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> <p><b>18-20</b></p>	<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> <p><b>36-40</b></p>
<b>Level IB</b>	<p><b>Level IB</b></p> <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> <p><b>16-17</b></p>	<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> <p><b>32-35</b></p>
<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><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><b>28-31</b></p>

<p><b>Level III</b></p>	<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><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><b>24-27</b></p>
<p><b>Level IV</b></p>	<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><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><b>20-23</b></p>
<p><b>Level V</b></p>	<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><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><b>16-19</b></p>

<p><b>Level VI</b></p>	<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><b>8-15</b></p>
<p><b>Level VII</b></p>	<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><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><b>0-7</b></p>

**English Government and the Church 1066-1216**

- 1 'The king's absence abroad was the most important factor in the development of English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]**

The possession of the continental lands, first in Normandy and then in the Angevin Empire, led throughout the period to absenteeism by English kings and the need to devise a system of government which could function in their absence. The office of chief justiciar developed as the answer to this. Originating in the role played by Ranulf Flambard, developing under Roger of Salisbury in the reign of Henry I, and reaching its height in the Angevin period when chief justiciar was a great office of state, the chief justiciar effectively ran the country in the king's absence, exercising vicegerent duties. Absenteeism led to increased bureaucracy, and the development of the chancery in its support, the chancellor being the greatest official in the later Angevin period.

However, candidates should evaluate the importance of absence abroad in relation to other factors in the development of central government. Some may argue that financial needs were more important. Increased costs of warfare and administration made kings keen to maximise their revenues through the systematic exploitation of finances and the development of the machinery to enable this. Ranulf Flambard's investigation of the king's revenues and supervision of their collection, the development of the Exchequer in Henry I's reign, sheriffs rendering regular account and the records kept in the Pipe Rolls are all examples of this. To ensure the efficiency of the system, sheriffs were repeatedly brought into line under the Angevins through the great inquests of 1170, 1194 and 1213. Justice could also be profitable and Henry I's and Henry II's judicial reforms can be seen partly as an attempt to maximise finances through centralised justice. Responses could also include the Conquest, as this led to a fusion of Norman ideas, including feudal government, and Saxon foundations, Henry II's desire to reassert control after Stephen's reign, the success of officials in carrying out their roles so that central government was able to develop, or the role of churchmen as leading officials. It is likely that less good responses will describe some of these changes or deal only with the king's absence. Most candidates will probably deal with absence and at least one other factor and attempt some comparison. Better answers are likely to deal with a wider range of evidence, compare and reach a conclusion.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 2 To what extent was the development of English common law in the period from 1066 to 1216 dependent on the work of Henry II? [60]**

Henry II established much of the machinery which made English common law effective and provided much of the impetus for its growth. The Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton which tightened up criminal law, the use of returnable writs, possessory assizes, general eyres, professional justices, juries all helped to standardise procedure and to bring more cases into the royal courts so that there was less variety in the justice on offer, and a much more systematic approach. Less good responses might simply describe the work of Henry II in developing common law and assert its importance. However, most candidates will probably recognise the need not only to examine this but to place it in the context of other factors and evaluate.

Developments essential to the growth of common law happened before Henry II. William I inherited strong Anglo-Saxon kingship which enabled the king's authority to be exercised effectively over the country, a prerequisite for the exercise of a common law, shire and hundred courts across the country and the writ. The growth of feudalism under William led to his classification of different types of land-holding which was essential to the

development of a common law for land-holding cases. Standardisation was also encouraged by the growth of feudal custom and seigniorial courts tending to adopt common practices. Henry I also contributed to common law by his use of local justiciars which promoted common enforcement of the law and his insistence on cases between different tenants being heard in the shire courts rather than honorial courts. Canon law and church courts also helped to develop common law as did the judicial clauses of Magna Carta. Candidates might well argue that Henry II was only building on the foundations already laid. The best answers are likely to pick up on the idea of 'dependent' in their evaluation and comment on it.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**3 Assess the view that archbishops of Canterbury had better relationships with the papacy than with the crown in the period from 1066 to 1216. [60]**

Most candidates will probably limit their answer to Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton as these are in the specification and this is perfectly acceptable. However, credit should be given to relevant reference to other archbishops eg Theobald or Hubert Walter.

There is certainly evidence of archbishops enjoying much better relations with the papacy than with kings. Anselm argued with William II over a number of things including the quality of the Canterbury knights and recognition of the pope and went into exile because of it. He also argued for a while with Henry I over investiture and the power and authority of the church. By contrast he was supported by Urban II. Becket's archiepiscopacy was dominated by his quarrel with Henry I over the trial of criminous clerks in royal courts while he was supported, at least initially, by the pope who even threatened to place England under an interdict in an attempt to bring the quarrel to an end. Innocent III was so determined to have Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury that he was prepared to excommunicate John and place England under interdict. Since John could not accept this rejection of his traditional rights it was impossible for Langton to enter England until 1213. Langton's difficult relationship with the king was later exemplified by his support for the barons. It is possible that weaker responses will simply describe a range of examples to illustrate archbishops enjoying better relationships with the papacy than with the crown, or possibly vice versa.

However, most candidates will probably show that there are also examples of relations being better with the king than with the pope. The most obvious example is that of William I and Lanfranc who worked harmoniously to promote both Norman rule and church reform, as well as Lanfranc getting William's backing over his claim to the primacy. Lanfranc resisted Gregory VII's summons to Rome and kept England out of the Investiture Contest at a time when the papacy was keen to promote its view of the relationship of church and state. Theobald of Bec supported Stephen and thus helped him to become king. Richard and Hubert Walter enjoyed very good relations. Even Anselm managed to reach a compromise with Henry II in 1107, after which the Investiture Contest ceased to be a contentious issue in England. In contrast, popes sometimes deliberately undermined archbishops such as giving support to Henry of Blois instead of Canterbury, or to York instead of Becket. Innocent so changed his position regarding Langton that he suspended him while Langton's relationship with John improved as he released him from excommunication and tried to mediate between John and the barons. The best responses will examine a range of evidence from across the period and evaluate, reaching a supported conclusion.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**4 How far do you agree that rebellions with foreign support posed the most dangerous threat to Tudor governments? [60]**

Candidates should assess the overseas support that some rebellions received to determine what (if any) difference this made to the overall threat. Candidates could point out that not all rebellions sought to threaten the government. In fact, most rebellions were local demonstrations against unpopular policies and/ or ministers. These only became a threat to the government if they were mishandled (eg Wolsey in 1525, Somerset in 1549) but the rebels' motives did not include seeking to overthrow the crown. Of those rebellions that did aim to remove the monarch or change the dynasty, the most dangerous occurred in Henry VII's reign. Simnel had support from Burgundy and Ireland (strictly speaking it was not foreign) and Warbeck had the backing of Scotland, France and Burgundy, though in practice very few troops materialised. Candidates might compare these threats to the Northern Earls and Irish rebellions in 1580 and 1601, which hoped to receive or actually did get help from Spain. The latter made Tyrone's rebellion particularly dangerous as England was at war with Spain and the earl was hoping to achieve a measure of independence from England. Foreign interventions usually came in the form of military aid and money but, as Henry VII discovered, diplomatic support added to the threat. Candidates might argue that there were examples of rebellions presenting a dangerous threat which had no foreign support at all. Northumberland's attempt to secure the accession of Lady Jane Grey and Wyatt's march on London against Mary Tudor were very threatening. In contrast Essex's rebellion was effectively nipped in the bud and the Pilgrimage of Grace, which raised over 30,000 rebels and lasted for 2 months, never endangered Henry VIII's throne. The best essays are likely to focus on what constituted a 'dangerous threat' and set foreign support in the context of other factors before reaching a judgement. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**5 'Tudor monarchs maintained the obedience of their subjects in the same way.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]**

Tudor governments kept control of their subjects in a number of ways and the best answers should examine a range of methods to focus on both continuity and change during the period. Each method should be assessed to show why it was applied and why modifications or reforms came to be implemented. The best essays are likely to suggest that the Tudor period saw a mixture of continuity and change. The ways that are most likely to be discussed are: the leadership and unity which the monarchy gave to effective government, and the use of patronage and propaganda to enhance its image. Here there was much continuity though Henry VII, Henry VIII and Elizabeth applied propaganda more skilfully than either Edward or Mary. Legislation was increasingly important and both the Privy Council and parliament were used to overcome potential sources of disorder. Long periods of stability under Elizabeth could be explained by government intervention. The role of regional councils, in Dublin, York and Ludlow, and reforms to improve their performance, changes in law enforcement (eg extension of JPs' powers, creation of lords lieutenant, reform to the militia) and developments in legal procedures (eg the use of treason and martial law) could be discussed. Some consideration might be given to the landed groups who gave continuous support to the crown as councillors, administrators and military leaders, and kept order in the counties. The Church also played a constant role in preaching obedience to the crown. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 6** 'Disputes over the succession to the English throne were the most common cause of rebellion in the period from 1485 to 1603.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Disputes over the succession were a recurring cause of rebellion in England and candidates are likely to agree with the proposition. They are likely to refer to Lovel, Simnel and Warbeck, who championed Yorkist claimants and led rebellions against Henry VII, to the Aragonese faction in the Pilgrimage of Grace that wanted Mary restored to the succession, to Northumberland who tried to exclude Mary from the throne, to Wyatt who favoured Elizabeth's premature accession, to the Northern earls who backed Mary Stuart and to Essex who hoped to see James VI displace Elizabeth. Better essays may point out that disputes over the succession were not always the prime motive behind a rebellion, although this was true in most of Henry VII's rebellions and that of 1553, and better candidates will show an understanding of not only differences between rebellions but within rebellions. Continuity and change are likely to be discussed and, in this respect, candidates should refer to rebellions where disputes over the succession played no part. The Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable Grant, Kett and Oxfordshire rebellions were primarily the result of taxation and/ or economic grievances, and the Western rebellion was mainly a response to the Edwardian Reformation. Indeed, religious issues were the cause of several other rebellions, notably the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Northern Earls, and several rebels in Kett's and Wyatt's revolts were dissatisfied Protestants. Irish rebellions may be cited as examples of disturbances that owed much to political, social and religious issues and, apart from Simnel and Warbeck who both sought help in Ireland, were not affected by disputes in England over the succession. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 7** How far was personal ambition the main influence in shaping Tudor foreign policy? [60]

Candidates should assess in what ways the personal ambition of Tudor rulers and ministers influenced foreign policy making and compare its impact with other characteristics before reaching a conclusion. Personal ambition may be seen as the aim of rulers such as Henry VII to secure his dynasty, or Henry VIII to emulate Henry V in war against France, or Somerset's desire to defeat the Scots and secure the northern border. In contrast, the foreign policies of Mary and Elizabeth could be argued to have been less affected by ambition. However, some may argue that advancing the country's interests cannot be separated from the Tudors' pursuit of personal ambition. Candidates should also assess other possible influences such as political considerations eg national security, maintaining at least one strong ally, ensuring that the Netherlands did not fall into the hands of an enemy. Financial, economic and trade issues influenced each of the Tudors' policies and might be usefully considered. Essays are likely to stress the importance of finance which restricted the conduct of all administrations, though less so in the 1540s and 1580s. Limited finances resulted in defensive and prudent foreign policies and the increasing importance of continental allies. Better answers could examine trade issues, particularly in the reigns of Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth, and some candidates may reflect on England's industrial and commercial interests that were adversely affected by Henry VIII and Edward. Defending the Church was never a principal factor in shaping foreign policy but England's break from Rome did influence policies in the 1530s and its Protestant condition affected relations with Spain and Scotland after 1558. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 8** 'Continuity rather than change characterised England's relations with France in the period from 1485 to 1603.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

The focus of the question is on continuity and change and candidates should be rewarded where they are able to pin-point and explain moments of change as well as account for more consistent trends. Each of the Tudors went to war with France but for different reasons. Henry VII tried to avoid war but felt the need to restrain Charles VIII from overrunning Brittany and threatening England. Henry VIII liked war and wanted to extend English lands in France but was rebuffed by the equally prickly Francis I, who used the Scots to the advantage of France. The Protestant inclined Edward VI had to contend with the war-minded Henry II, who was determined to recover Boulogne, and Mary, ever loyal to her husband, was forced to surrender Calais to France in 1558. Elizabeth, eager to avoid financing a war, sought a rapprochement with France after 1564, and was aided by their expulsion from Scotland in 1560. Thereafter, she did her best to befriend the French without ceding to their demands. Long-standing rivalry, France's support for and interest in Scotland, and England's possession of Calais gave the generally hostile relationship from 1485 to 1558 more continuity than change but the period was not one of continuous enmity. The loss of Calais and outbreak of the French Wars of Religion, however, reduced the threat of a French invasion and made an alliance (signed at Blois in 1572) more feasible. The growing power of Spain under Philip II, the decline of the Guises and the rise of Henry of Navarre led to more continuity in the later years of the period. Candidates are likely to agree with the proposition but should discuss changes as well as examples of continuity. Anglo-French relations were affected by a number of factors, such as the personality of English and French monarchs and ministers, changing political circumstances, and the outbreak of civil disturbances eg 1549 in England and 1562 in France. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 9** Assess the importance of the Netherlands in England's relations with the Burgundian and Spanish Habsburgs in the period from 1485 to 1603. [60]

Candidates should be aware that Burgundy and then the Netherlands were important to England throughout the Tudor period for economic, military and political reasons, and their answers should focus on the importance in Anglo-Spanish relations rather than for England internally. Henry VII established trade links with Burgundy, which grew stronger as time passed and held firm in spite of later interruptions, until the Dutch Revolt in 1572. The subsequent decline in relations led to a re-assessment of overseas markets and the Elizabethan interest in transatlantic trade. Burgundian support for the Yorkists and its close proximity to London brought political security to the fore in Henry VII's reign but Henry VIII's friendship with Charles V (who was also Archduke of Burgundy), and Mary's marriage to Philip, lessened its political significance until the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt. This necessitated Leicester's intervention in 1586-7, which hastened war with Spain. The growth of Calvinism in the Netherlands in the 1550s onwards brought religion as an issue – Elizabeth's implicit support for the Sea Beggars and Dutch rebels (explicit after Nonsuch) ensured the Netherlands after 1572 was central to Tudor foreign policy and remained important enough for Elizabeth to secure Dutch cautionary towns in the 1590s. Better essays should compare the Netherlands with other factors (eg responding to the more powerful states of France and Spain, securing dynastic alliances, the changing political circumstances in Scotland, the effects of English privateers). Weaker essays are likely to offer a chronological narrative and comment, which might assess the Netherlands and other factors but not in the context of Anglo-Spanish and Anglo-Burgundian relations. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 10 'Reform of the Catholic Church was the main aim of the Catholic Reformation in the period from 1492 to 1610.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]**

Candidates could begin by considering the main aims of the Catholic Reformation. These were to reform clerical abuses as highlighted by Savonarola, Erasmus, Colet, More, Luther and others; to restore public confidence in the clergy; to resolve doctrinal disputes arising from humanists and reformers such as Luther, Zwingli and Calvin; to issue a clear statement of faith that would re-affirm the Papacy's headship; to counter Protestant challenges, convert non-Christians and heal the schism in Christendom. Better candidates may well prioritise these aims and could do so by looking at how much attention was given to them by the Church. Reform of abuses, doctrinal issues and Church organisation were discussed in the Lateran and General Councils and pronouncements made at Trent in 1563, which were implemented down to 1610. Reunion and responding to the threat of Protestantism and a schism in the Church were not considered until 1541 at Regensburg and finally at the 1551-52 session at Trent which German Lutherans attended. Failure to achieve (or indeed earnestly seek) a reconciliation or compromise with the schismatics suggests that reunion was not a main aim of the Catholic Reformation. No attempt was made after 1541 to reunite the Christian faith in Europe. Candidates could point out that 'reform' was on the Church's agenda for most of the period: dealing with the legacy of Protestantism was not. Some essays might explain why this was the case, and point to the leading personalities involved at critical moments eg Luther, Calvin, Charles V, Paul III, Carafa, Pius V, and their differing objectives. All of the Church's agencies worked towards reform. They believed that a revived Catholic Church would weaken its Protestant rivals and in time see heretics return to the orthodox faith. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 11 'Erasmus contributed more than any other individual to the revival of the Catholic Church in Europe in the period from 1492 to 1610.' How far do you agree? [60]**

Erasmus was one of many who had a major impact on the revival of the Church and candidates can be expected to assess his contribution alongside others in the context of the period. He exposed many abuses in the Church between publishing *Enchiridion* (1504) and translating the New Testament into Greek, Hebrew and Latin (1516). He called for a general council and sought a reformation under a united Church through humanist self-education. Candidates may point out that his criticisms encouraged later reformers, notably Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, to challenge the Church more purposefully. Their formation of separate churches shook the Church out of its lethargy in a way that Erasmus failed to achieve. It could be argued therefore that Erasmus had a negative as well as a positive effect. A good evaluation of Erasmus is needed for Levels 1-III but so too is an assessment of other individuals in the context of the whole period. Candidates have a range of individuals to draw upon and the following is not an exhaustive or prescriptive list. They might refer to the contributions of popes and contrast the Renaissance popes who were the target of Erasmus' satires and ignored his pleas to reform with others, such as Adrian VI and Paul III, who responded. Later popes owed little if anything to Erasmus and persisted in proscribing his works. Some attention could be given to members of the new orders especially the Jesuits, who owed something to Erasmian ideals. Secular rulers notably Charles V and Philip II might be assessed but the former did little to revive the Church and even less to protect Erasmus from his critics. Note that the question is about 'individuals' and not 'factors' or 'institutions'. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**12 Assess the reasons for the varied impact of the Catholic Reformation in different parts of Europe in the period from 1492 to 1610. [60]**

Candidates may assess a number of explanations for the varied impact and it is important that they focus on explaining the reasons with examples from different areas of Europe rather than describing or narrating the main developments in particular countries. The following explanations are likely to be considered:

- (1) the success of Protestantism, especially Lutheranism, Zwinglianism and Calvinism
- (2) proximity of the Papacy to the state concerned (eg. more successful in France, Germany and the Italian states)
- (3) political conditions of a state (eg. instability of France, attitude of nobility, support of secular rulers)
- (4) prevailing social conditions: rural communities were conservative in their attitudes towards reform and reluctant to abandon traditional practices
- (5) economic conditions: more urbanised states resented papal taxation, and were more receptive to Protestant ideas and propaganda spread by the printing press
- (6) extent to which Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries were well received (resistance in northern and western Europe; welcomed in southern and eastern Europe).
- (7) the influence of secular rulers: states where the reformed Catholic Church had the greatest impact were Spain, Portugal, Italy, Poland, Hungary, southern Germany and Austria. The least successful were England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, the Spanish Netherlands, northern and western Germany, Scandinavia. Candidates may well conclude that states where the Catholic Church had most success throughout the century had already begun to reform their church before the emergence of Protestantism. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**13 How effectively did the French Crown deal with the impact of humanism and Protestantism in the period from 1498 to 1610? [60]**

Religious dissent proved to be an on-going problem for French kings and some were more effective at dealing with it than others. Candidates might interpret 'deal with' as 'managing', 'controlling' or 'suppressing' unorthodox views, and they are likely to look at the impact of humanism, Lutheranism and Calvinism. Most candidates are likely to focus on the crown's reaction to humanism and Huguenotism and better responses should be aware of the broader picture of religious dissent. Louis XII was relatively indifferent to calls to reform the Church, and Francis I, in supporting humanists, unwittingly encouraged the growth of Protestant ideas which, once established, proved impossible to extirpate. Henry II, like Francis I, strengthened the legal armoury needed to tackle dissent but was unable to prevent the growth of Calvinism among nobles, towns and Paris. His sons were singularly ineffective and failed to stop the militarisation of religious dissenters and the wars of religion. Some candidates might discuss attempts by the crown to accommodate religious groups and could usefully analyse Catherine de Medici's views and those of the *politiques*. Finally, Henry IV's strategy before and after Nantes needs to be considered: many may judge him as being the most effective monarch though contemporary Catholics thought otherwise. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**14 Which French king did most to develop the French nation state in the period from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer. [60]**

Some candidates may well devote much of their answer to Francis I. He strengthened the internal condition of France through legal and administrative reforms, the political power of the monarchy, and the authority of the state in relation to the Church but weakened its finances and standing as an international power. Francis could be usefully compared with the contributions of Henry II, who will receive some complimentary judgements, and Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, who most probably will not. The nation state relied heavily on strong leadership, which the later Valois kings failed to supply. Some candidates may credit Louis XII, who codified the laws, kept taxes and expenditure low, improved the administration of justice, created new *parlements* and was a popular ruler in spite of an unsuccessful foreign policy. Henry IV, on the other hand, could be considered to have done most of all to further the nation state. He began the rehabilitation of the country domestically (resolving religious and social divisions, laying sound economic foundations and restoring the crown's political authority) and internationally (in respect of Spain, Savoy, the Valtelline, United Provinces and Cleves-Julich). Some candidates might approach the question thematically and, with reference to individual monarchs, discuss the development of a more efficient and centralised administration, financial and religious reforms, papal relations, legal codes, suppression of over-mighty nobles, and the expansion of lands. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**15 Assess the impact of the French Wars of Religion (1562-1598) on the development of the French nation state in the period from 1498 to 1610. [60]**

Candidates should examine the effect that the French Wars of Religion had on the development of the state in the context of the earlier and later years of the period 1498-1610. The main areas of assessment are likely to concern the following:

- (1) Political features: the role and status of the monarchy, its relations with the French nobility, and trends in centralisation (eg. administration, justice, provincial estates and *parlements*).
- (2) Religious developments: existing divisions in the Church between Catholics and Protestants hardened and became militarised but the emergence of *politiques* pointed the way towards a religious compromise that was achieved at Nantes.
- (3) Economic trends: improvements and progress in developing government finances, trade, commerce, industry, transport and agriculture were all severely affected by the wars and recovery after 1598 was consequently slow and erratic.
- (4) Social features: the divisive nature of the wars accentuated existing trends and ensured many remained after 1598.
- (5) International standing: France was no longer the dominant European power by 1562 thanks largely to the exhausting and unsuccessful policies of her rulers since 1498 but the Wars of Religion weakened France further and allowed Spain to become the superior power.

The better responses are likely to evaluate developments before 1562 and after 1598 in the light of the Wars of Religion and be aware that some developments were halted, some accelerated and some changed. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 16 'The French economy had more weaknesses than strengths in the period from 1610 to 1715.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Candidates can argue for or against the proposition but both sides of the argument need to be considered. Arguments in favour of weaknesses may include: unequal and high tax burdens, few administrative reforms, corrupt, inefficient and self-serving officials, rising debts; high royal expenditure due to cost of waging war, profligacy of the court at Versailles; inadequate agricultural production due to medieval methods of farming; insufficient maritime shipping to compete with the United Provinces and English merchants; rising population that increased levels of unemployment, poverty and disease in the towns. A counter-argument is that the economy was strong. State revenue increased (400% under Colbert) and the government was able to wage war successfully for much of the period unlike its rival Spain; trade and industry expanded (eg arsenals and naval supplies); internal transport improved; colonies were set up in Canada and the West Indies; reforms were implemented by Colbert who cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming practices, reclaimed royal lands, increased the *taille* paid by landowners, regulated industries and built up gold and silver reserves. Better responses are likely to comment on elements of continuity and change. For instance, Richelieu had limited success at reforming the economy and focused on realising its potential without making fundamental changes. Mazarin was primarily interested in raising revenue to meet war costs but neglected other aspects of the economy. Colbert showed what could be achieved in the 1660s and 1670s though he failed to reform the fiscal system or establish trading companies. Between his death in 1683 and 1715, ineffectual ministers, Louis XIV's munificence and the continuous pursuit of military glory, left the economy in a precarious condition. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 17 To what extent did royal authority in France from 1610 to 1715 depend upon the personality of the king? [60]

Candidates are likely to argue that the personality of kings was one of many factors that contributed to royal authority in France. They should link the role of Louis XIII and Louis XIV in advancing royal power eg their desire to rule without a regency council, their support for suitable ministers who increased royal authority, their patronage of the arts/sciences, their command of the armed forces, the cultivation of kingship especially at Versailles. Differences between the two kings might be used to demonstrate how royal authority could depend on their personalities eg Louis XIII's role at the Day of Dupes in support of Richelieu, or Louis XIV's arrest of Fouquet, which signalled the king's desire to rule personally. The Fronde might be cited to show what could happen to royal authority if the king was a cipher. In addition to the personality of the king, other factors should be assessed eg the contribution of ministers such as Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Louvois; administrators, especially the *intendants*, *officiers*, and provincial servants; the role of Versailles; support for the crown after 1653 of the nobility and *parlements*; with occasional exceptions the Catholic Church. It may be argued that royal authority was in fact limited by financial problems, independent *pays d'état*, ambitious nobles, awkward *parlements*, papal claims, administrative self-interest, corruption and inefficiency. Better essays will probably suggest that royal authority fluctuated: it was weak in the years 1610-17 and 1643-53, and increasingly strong under Louis XIV until the final years of his reign. It is likely that candidates will give more attention to Louis XIV but Louis XIII should not be disregarded as unimportant. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 18 **'France's involvement in the Thirty Years' War was the major factor in its development as a European power from 1610 to 1715.'** How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Whether or not candidates agree with the proposition, they should evaluate the significance for France and for other nation states of its participation in the war, and compare the consequences with other key factors in its development as a European power. Arguments in support of the statement might include: territorial gains at Westphalia, which benefited France, the United Provinces and Sweden, and by inference weakened Spain and the Austrian Habsburgs; military and naval defeats inflicted on Spain by France and its allies that revealed the difficulties Spain faced in holding on to its overseas empire and position as the dominant European power; and France's delay in entering the war (from 1635) which meant that it was financially better placed to continue fighting Spain after 1648 until the latter was forced to submit at the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659). Candidates could contrast France's international standing between 1610 and 1635 with that of 1648 and the importance of staying at war until 1659. Some arguments may stress the importance of Louis XIV's wars (eg the Dutch War 1672-78, War of the League of Augsburg 1689-97, War of the Spanish Succession 1702-14), and the king's role in pursuing war aims for much of his reign. Others might stress the appointment of a minister such as Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Louvois, as a key factor. A good sense of continuity and change in France's position as a European power resulting from an assessment of different factors including the Thirty Years' War should be well rewarded. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2010