

GCE

History A

Unit **F966/01**: Historical Themes

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2014

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 2014

Annotation	Meaning
BP	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
F	Factor or Theme
DET	Description/Narrative
C	Continuity/Change
X	Error/wrong
S	Synthesis
AN	Analysis
EXP	Explains
SC	Simple comment, basic
A	Assertion
J	Judgement
IRRL	Irrelevant or not answering the Question
EVAL	Evaluation

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

MARK SCHEME:

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	<p>‘The development of English central government owed more to the crown than to any other factor.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1066 to 1216?</p> <p>Developments in English central government are perhaps unlikely to have taken place without the active involvement of the crown. Strong kings of the period not only recognised the problems facing them but gave impetus and support to the development of machinery to deal with these, machinery which came to characterise English central government in the period. William I established Norman control effectively, including feudal government which helped to reinforce the centralisation of the state, and began that involvement with continental lands which was to have such an effect on the development of English government. William II, Henry I and Henry II in particular recognised the need to develop mechanisms to allow the country to function effectively in their absence in their continental possessions. The prototype of the office of chief justiciar, who came to run the country on a day to day level in the king’s absence, appeared with Ranulf Flambard under William II, then developed with Roger of Salisbury under Henry I, and reached its height under Henry II and Richard. Kings were responsible for choosing these great officials, not only the chief justiciar but also the chancellor who rose to new heights with Hubert Walter. Kings also recognised their changing financial needs, the rising costs of warfare and administration, and these prompted them to introduce reforms which would centralise and systematise government, so that there could be tighter control over finances and the judicial system, so enabling the efficient exploitation of both. Sheriffs had to render regular account at the Exchequer from Henry I’s reign, business being recorded in the Pipe Rolls which date from at least 1129. Henry I’s interest in justice led to the use of itinerant justices and eyres. Henry II gave the impetus to the judicial reforms of his reign, the Grand assize and possessory assizes of Novel disseisin, Mort d’ancestor, assize Utrum and Darrein presentment, and the standardised writ which standardised procedure and attracted more business to the royal courts, so increasing the potential for increased profits from justice. From 1170 there were far reaching inquests of sheriffs and other financial, judicial and administrative officials.</p> <p>However, candidates need to consider a range of other factors and compare their importance to reach a supported judgment. These include the success of officials themselves, eg Flambard, Roger of Salisbury, Hubert Walter, in fulfilling their roles which enabled government to develop, and in being flexible enough to perform an expanding range of duties. The needs of kings, rather than kings themselves, might be regarded as the main factor: the need to find an answer to the problem of absenteeism, and growing financial needs. Some may argue for the importance of the continental</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	<p>possessions which not only brought about absenteeism but also the increased costs of government, including military costs incurred through both acquiring and attempting to protect them, thus necessitating the maximising of finances.</p> <p>Assess the contribution of feudalism to the development of English common law in the period from 1066 to 1216.</p> <p>Candidates may well argue that the rapid growth of feudalism after the Conquest was fundamental to the development of common law. With its emphasis on the distribution of land in return for service it led to the classification of different types of landholding and this was a prerequisite to the development of a standardised common law for cases involving land holding. Moreover, the increased standardisation essential to the growth of common law was promoted by common feudal custom and the tendency of seigneurial courts to follow common practice.</p> <p>However, to assess the contribution of feudalism to the development of common law candidates need to examine a number of factors and compare their importance. Some may argue that its development depended mainly on Anglo-Saxon foundations: the pre-existence of Anglo-Saxon strong kingship enabled royal authority to be effective over the whole country; a common network of shire and hundred courts existed and the Anglo-Saxon writ was in general use. Henry I's work could also be examined. For example, his use of local justiciars and general eyres and the redirecting of some cases from the honorial to the shire courts helped to develop a common enforcement of the law. Some candidates are likely to argue that the work of Henry II played a greater part than feudalism in the development of common law. He had Anglo-Norman foundations on which to build, but he provided much of the stimulus to the growth of common law and much of the machinery which made it effective. His use of the standardised returnable writ, Grand Assize and possessory assizes ie Novel disseisin, Mort d'ancestor, the Assize Utrum and Darrein presentment, professional justices and general eyres not only brought more business into the royal courts, which in itself meant that more cases were being treated in a uniform manner, but also led to more standardised and systematic practices. In the absence of a formal written code of the customs of England, law was made by judicial decision on the bench at Westminster. During Henry II's reign justices began to keep records of their judgements so that these created precedents. The treatise on the rules of the king's court, Glanvill, which helped to standardise practice, also dates from Henry II's reign as does increased use of the jury, another characteristic of common law. Moreover, the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton helped to tighten up the criminal law so that there was less variation there too.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	<p>Assess the view that Anselm managed relations with the crown better than any other Archbishop of Canterbury in the period 1066 to 1216.</p> <p>Only Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton are mentioned in the specification and candidates will not be penalised for confining their answers to these. However, appropriate reference to other archbishops should be rewarded. Anselm certainly managed relations with Henry I effectively in the discussions which led to the Compromise of Bec, by which bishops would do homage and the king relinquished the right to invest them with the ring and staff. After this, the Investiture Contest was no longer a cause of conflict in England and Anselm enjoyed good relations with Henry. This was certainly in contrast to Becket's handling of relations with Henry II. Determined to play to the full his new role of archbishop, insisting on the rights of the church over the treatment of criminous clerks and on the power of ecclesiastical courts, Becket soured for ever relations with the king whose point of view he could never understand. Becket and Henry engaged in negotiations, almost reaching agreement at Montmartre, and apparently succeeding at Freteval, but Becket then insisted on retribution and offered only conditional absolution to those who had supported York, so setting in train the events which led to his murder. Even if candidates take a less critical view of Becket's role in the affair and point out Henry's lack of tact, for example in having York crown Young Henry, it would be difficult to conclude that Becket managed relations well. Langton's position was difficult from the beginning since John felt unable to accept an archbishop foisted on him, but he was not comfortable with the political situation he found on his return to England. On the other hand he did attempt to mediate between John and the barons.</p> <p>However, candidates need to recognise that even Anselm did not always manage relations well. He had a particularly bad relationship with William II, quarrelling from the start, over a range of issues from the quality of the Canterbury knights supplied by Anselm, to taxation and recognition of the pope, and predating Anselm's exposure to the full force of the papal reform movement. Choosing to go into exile was perhaps not indicative of well managed relations. Candidates may well conclude that Lanfranc managed his relations with William I better than any other archbishop. They were particularly harmonious as they worked together for the establishment of effective Norman rule and English church reform, and ignored the pope's summons to Rome and thus contact with papal reform. On the other hand, some candidates may argue that, as William and Lanfranc apparently saw eye to eye on so many things, little management of their relations was required.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	<p>'Social issues were the main cause of rebellion in Tudor England.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Candidates are expected to assess the extent to which rebellions in England were caused by social issues. A working definition of 'social issues' will be helpful. We can expect candidates to discuss some of the following: landlord-tenant relations (especially those affected by unlawful enclosures, rack-renting and high entry fines), conflict between gentry and commoners (such as attempts to re-impose feudal dues or deny customary practices), famine and disease (which could result from poor harvests and food shortages), unemployment and price inflation (a consequence of trade depression and debasement), vagrancy and poverty (that resulted from a growth in population), and the impact of the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries. Illegal enclosures provoked protests in Lincolnshire, Cumberland and Yorkshire in 1535-36, in most English counties in 1549, and in parts of Oxfordshire in 1596. Some candidates might focus on Kett's rebellion to illustrate how complaints against enclosures were often linked to poor tenant-landlord relations at a time of bad harvests and high wheat prices. Rack-renting, arbitrary entry fines and the revival of feudal taxes were complaints made against landlords in the 1536 and 1549 disturbances, and underlay the tension between the gentry and commons. The Pilgrimage of Grace, Western and Kett's rebellions offer good examples of social issues playing a prominent part in causing disorder on a large scale. Candidates could cite the 1520s as a period when poor harvests, coupled with a trade depression and the introduction of new government taxes, brought famine, unemployment and poverty to many villages in the south-east, east and central counties of England. The result was the Amicable Grant rebellion. In general bad harvests and famine rarely resulted in rebellion but food riots, high prices and comparatively low wages could lead to social disorder, as occurred in some areas in the 1530s-1550s and 1580s-1590s, and to open rebellion in 1536 and 1549. Rising population levels, especially after the 1540s, may also be discussed. Pressure for work and demand for food, when added to a shortage of fertile land, placed the popular spotlight on enclosures although interestingly rebels never identified this factor as a source of discontent. Some candidates are likely to argue that rebellions were not always caused by social issues but by economic and financial grievances, for example the Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable and Oxfordshire rebellions, although it might be argued that at times it is impossible to separate social from economic issues. Religious changes could be usefully assessed as they figured prominently in the Pilgrimage of Grace, Western, and Northern Earls' rebellions. On the other hand, not all rebellions were caused by social issues: Simnel, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, the Northern Earls and Essex were political and dynastic, and opposition to 'evil councillors' surfaced regularly - in the rebellions of 1497, 1525, 1536, 1549, 1569 and 1601. Some answers may argue that the issue of the succession was a key cause of disturbances in 1486, 1487, 1497, and 1553, and these were</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
5	<p>unaffected by social issues. Most candidates are likely to assess social and other factors, in part to illustrate the complex nature of causation but also to demonstrate the importance of non-social factors as a cause of rebellion.</p> <p>Assess the reasons why most rebellions under the Tudors ended in failure.</p> <p>Tudor rebellions failed for a number of reasons. Some candidates may argue that weak organisation was an important factor: the Simnel, Warbeck, Western, Wyatt, Northern Earls, Oxfordshire, Essex and most Irish rebellions can be cited as evidence. Once a rebellion was underway, its effectiveness often depended on the quality of leadership. Most leaders displayed weaknesses and better candidates should be aware of them. For instance, Warbeck lost his nerve when confronted with government forces; Wyatt wasted valuable time in besieging Cooling castle rather than advancing on London; the Northern Earls revealed their objectives in advance of starting their rebellion, and Essex forewarned the Court of his intentions to rebel and was arrested after 12 hours in revolt. Irish chieftains frequently quarrelled among themselves e.g. in the O'Neill, Munster and Geraldine rebellions. Most rebellions, and especially those in Ireland, were provincial in origin, actuated by local grievances and the leaders had no desire to link up with other disaffected areas. Thus the Western rebellion was confined to Cornwall and Devon, Kett's rebellion to Norfolk and Wyatt's rebellion to Kent. Unless a rebellion reached the capital, it was going to fail provided the government held its nerve. Only the Cornish, Wyatt and Essex rebellions reached the outskirts of the city and each failed when challenged by government troops. The government nearly always had better weapons, more cavalry and financial resources, more experienced soldiers and the knowledge that it was fighting on behalf of a divinely appointed monarch. Thus some rebel leaders, such as Warbeck, Aske, Kett, Arundel and Northumberland avoided battle; and when rival armies did meet, as at Stoke (1487), Blackheath (1497), Carlisle (1537), Dussindale and Clyst (1549), and Naworth (1570), royal troops outnumbered and defeated the rebels. Royal armies in Ireland defeated all uprisings apart from Tyrone's. Rebellions also failed because they did not usually engage the support of nobles and clergy. These were society's natural leaders and often they were able to dissuade the gentry from supporting peasants and urban workers. The latter's objectives were quite different from those of their social superiors and where gentry were involved as principal supporters in 1536 and 1549, fear of class betrayal and social disunity soon surfaced to weaken the rebellion. Candidates could also consider the role of government strategy, which was to play for time and to offer pardons and promises if the rebels agreed to disperse. Once this occurred, as in 1536 in Lincolnshire and 1549 in Devon, divisions in rebel ranks appeared, food supplies ran out and rebels began to desert. Political and dynastic rebellions, such as Simnel,</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	<p>Warbeck, Wyatt, Northern Earls, Essex, Munster and Geraldine, failed because they lacked foreign and native support to combat government troops and there was no substantial desire for regime change. The Tudors also acted decisively at critical moments: Henry VII used diplomacy and force to defeat his Yorkist threats; Mary withstood the challenge of Wyatt by rallying her supporters in London; Elizabeth dealt with the Northern Earls by arresting Norfolk, moving Mary Stuart away from advancing rebels, and despatching a large army to the north, and she confronted Essex with a show of force before he could get the backing of Londoners. Weak responses are likely to offer a narrative/ commentary on why rebellions failed; better essays should analyse the reasons for failure and look for common features; the best candidates are likely to supply a good range of examples and assess a variety of reasons before reaching a judgement as to the most important.</p> <p>‘Rebellions in England presented a greater threat to government ministers than to Tudor monarchs.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Criteria for ‘greater threat’ would be helpful and may well appear in the better essays. Most candidates are likely to assess the seriousness of the threat posed by rebellions in respect of numbers of rebels, location, leadership, objectives, and how close each rebellion came to achieving its aims. No Tudor government was overthrown and it may be argued that however great a threat appeared at the time, in reality the monarchs were not seriously threatened. However, it may also be argued that rebellions which aimed to depose the monarch (e.g. Simnel, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, Northern Earls, and Essex) posed a very serious threat, and 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 they presented an even more serious threat to both the monarch and ministers. In spite of his numerous difficulties, Henry VII dealt effectively with the threats to his throne posed by Yorkist claimants, and faced no serious threat from the Yorkshire and Cornish tax revolts. His ministers Morton and Bray survived calls for their resignation in 1497. Henry VIII in contrast under-estimated the popularity and size of the Amicable Grant rebellion and was just as slow in dealing with the Lincolnshire and Pilgrimage of Grace revolts. Limited resources and the king’s reliance on nobles to suppress the threat, as well as his own heavy-handed interventions, made the threats more serious. Neither of these rebellions threatened the king’s life (it was not their objective and neither intended marching on London) but his ministers’ position was brought into question – Wolsey in 1525, Cromwell, Cranmer, Audley and Rich in 1536 – and they only survived because they retained the king’s backing. Some might suggest that Wolsey’s and Cromwell’s relationship with the king was seriously harmed. Edward VI was never threatened by rebellion but his ministers were: Somerset seriously misread the depth of feeling voiced by regional complainants in 1549 and failed to</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	<p>take appropriate measures to suppress the Western and Kett's rebellions quickly. He fell from office soon after Warwick had dealt with the Norfolk rebellion. Mary was badly advised by her council about the nature and extent of Wyatt's threat, and could not prevent the rebels from entering London. As a result both she and her ministers were in danger in 1554 though in practice Wyatt made critical mistakes which lessened his chances of success. Elizabeth, in contrast, acted decisively to weaken the threat presented by the Northern Earls' conspiracy in 1569. Their aim was to depose the queen and supplant William Cecil and his court circle. In Mary Stuart they had a legitimate heir to the throne but the rebels never advanced south of Yorkshire, Mary remained a prisoner and Cecil took measures to strengthen his authority. In 1601 both Elizabeth and Robert Cecil faced a potential danger but Essex's challenge to her throne and to Cecil never gathered momentum due to pro-active measures taken by the privy council. Weak responses are likely to know little about government ministers and to assert rather than assess the nature of the threat presented by rebellions. Better essays should focus on 'greater threat' and apply it to a range of rebellions before reaching a judgement.</p> <p>To what extent did continuity characterise the methods by which the Tudors managed their foreign policy?</p> <p>Candidates can be expected to assess a range of methods used by the Tudors in implementing their foreign policy. Methods such as political alliances and treaties, marriage negotiations, trade agreements and embargoes, the threat and declaration of war, the use of diplomacy, ambassadors and overseas agents are likely to appear in many essays. The means by which the Tudors conducted their foreign affairs was flexible in that there was no methodological blue-print or diplomatic protocol that had to be followed. Instead rulers applied whatever methods seemed at the time to yield the best results. Change may therefore appear to be the main characteristic but most rulers were conservative in their behaviour and continuity of action underlay many policies. For example, most of the Tudors preferred peaceful diplomacy to acts of aggression, and candidates could usefully consider some of the more important political alliances, trade treaties and matrimonial agreements to illustrate this feature. Medina del Campo (1489) is likely to appear in most essays. Political pressure was most effective when it was backed up with the threat of military action and preferably as part of a broader allied agreement. Henry VII for instance made alliances with Spain and Brittany before going to war with France, and Henry VIII signed alliances with Ferdinand and Charles V before launching attacks on Scotland and France. For most English rulers with the exception of Henry VIII, war was the last resort. His reign, however, illustrates a change in methodology. But even when war was declared, efforts were usually on-going to reach a truce or to agree terms of conciliation. If circumstances</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
8	<p>changed and relations became strained, then diplomatic pressure could be applied through a variety of channels: foreign ambassadors could be spoken to and English agents and envoys sent overseas. The number of diplomatic agents grew in the course of the period though England always lagged behind the continental states. Like all early modern rulers, the Tudors saw the benefits of dynastic marriages: formal agreements shaped and consolidated the policies of Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary, and negotiations were evident in Edward's and Elizabeth's reign though they were less effective. Tudor monarchs also played a central role in conducting foreign relations. They took advice from a variety of people – ambassadors, envoys, agents, merchants, councillors and ministers - but dealt with policy-making and its enforcement personally. They interviewed foreign ambassadors, met crowned heads of state and, in the case of Henry VII and Henry VIII, led their armies on military campaigns. They negotiated the terms of political and trade treaties, arranged matrimonial alliances for their relatives, and exercised the sole right to declare war and peace. Like other European rulers, they formed alliances not with permanence in mind but rather as a means to an end. If that end changed, then the alliance was broken. Candidates should be able to find examples of both continuity and change across the Tudor period and reach a judgement on their relative merits. Better responses should consider a range of methods; weaker essays are likely to be less knowledgeable and more descriptive in tone.</p> <p>How far did England pursue a consistent policy towards Burgundy and the Netherlands in the period from 1485 to 1603?</p> <p>National security, trade and, in Elizabeth's reign, religious issues were areas of concern to the Tudors and are likely to be discussed by candidates. Security was vital to each of the Tudors and in Elizabeth's reign the Netherlands became the fulcrum of policy making. It had many good harbours from which enemy fleets could set sail for eastern England just a few hours away. Henry VII defended his throne from Burgundian backed Yorkist pretenders and negotiated alliances with Maximilian and Philip I. Candidates might point out that the decline of Yorkist claimants and rise of Charles V altered Anglo-Burgundian relations. Indeed Henry VIII's friendship with Charles, the absorption of Burgundy into Charles' German Empire in 1548 and later Mary's marriage to Philip II lessened its significance to England. But England remained vulnerable and the transfer of the Netherlands to Spain in 1551 altered European political dynamics. Under Elizabeth, the need to keep the provinces friendly or neutral intensified as relations with Spain declined. The outbreak of the Dutch Revolt first in 1566 and</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	<p>more seriously in 1572 was a critical development. Elizabeth adopted inconsistent tactics which reflected her shift in strategy towards Spain although overall her policy stayed the same: to preserve England's security. An alliance with the Dutch rebels, war with Spain and the occupation of Dutch 'cautionary' towns in the 1590s bear this out. Economically Burgundy and the Netherlands were important to England. Henry VII was keen to expand the woollen cloth trade and imposed embargoes on Burgundian merchants in 1493 and 1503 for political and economic reasons - events that demonstrate that when there was a conflict of interest, trade yielded to political security. Henry VIII took little interest in trade but the collapse of the Antwerp market in 1551 had a most profound effect on Anglo-Burgundian relations. English merchants turned away from the near continent and sought markets further afield – a policy supported by Mary and Elizabeth – although Antwerp remained the hub for English commerce and trade until civil disturbances interrupted trade in the 1580s. Some candidates might suggest that Elizabeth also used trade for political ends, imposing a trade embargo on Antwerp between 1568 and 1573 in response to Spain's seizure of English ships in the West Indies. Religious issues affected relations with the Netherlands for the first time in Elizabeth's reign. As Calvinism took hold of several Dutch provinces and towns rebelled against Catholic Spain, Dutch leaders turned to Protestant England for assistance. At first Elizabeth tried to stay neutral and urged other rulers to intervene before finally offering the rebels aid in 1585. The result was war with Spain. How far religious, political and economic motives influenced her decision may be debated by candidates but Tudor policy had clearly changed from one of neutrality to one of intervention, and from amity to war. The best candidates are likely to focus on the consistency of policy making towards Burgundy and the Netherlands and by inference account for any changes and inconsistencies. Weaker essays may well be chronological/ narrative.</p> <p>'Henry VII and Henry VIII handled relations with Spain better than did later Tudor monarchs.' To what extent do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Candidates should compare the first two Tudors' handling of relations with Spain to determine the extent to which they can be described as 'better than the later Tudor monarchs', before reaching an overall conclusion. Arguments can be made for and against each set of rulers. Henry VII and Henry VIII established important matrimonial links – first Arthur and then Henry marrying Catherine of Aragon, though each king ran into problems following the death of Arthur in 1502 and the divorce of Catherine from 1527. Ferdinand refused to let her marry Henry and the king insisted a dowry was paid</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	<p>in full; Charles V later pressurised the king not to divorce Catherine but Henry VIII insisted. Each of the early Tudors established key trade agreements with Aragon and Castile although England was not allowed to trade with the Americas. Each formed important political alliances with Spain which served to keep the countries at peace throughout the period (with the brief exception of 1527-8) but it may be argued that the military alliances benefited Spain more than England. Ferdinand gained Pyrenean provinces and Charles secured Navarre, Milan and the Burgundian provinces without consulting their English allies. For their part, the Tudors threatened Boulogne in 1492 which was returned to France in the treaty of Etaples, and re-captured by Henry VIII in 1544 and retained at the treaty of Ardres. England under Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth was at peace with Spain until 1585, and each ruler managed Spanish relations with a mixture of success and failure. Edward VI had few dealings with Charles V but irritated him by allowing a Protestant reformation and making peace with France in 1550 but appeased him by ensuring Mary was given freedom to practise her Catholic faith. 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 resented his limited status as her consort. Mary's decision to go to war with France was unpopular and unsuccessful, and Philip was blamed for the loss of Calais. Most candidates are likely to dwell on Elizabeth's management of affairs. Arguments that she handled relations well may include: her personal relationship with Philip that remained cordial even after the prospect of a marriage faded and issues emerged that would bring their countries into conflict; her initial toleration of Spanish ambassadors' involvement in espionage; her skill at handling the Netherlands crisis - she bided her time, built up state finances, militia and naval defences, secured France as an ally and tried to persuade Philip by diplomatic niceties not to send an Armada. Criticisms of the queen's conduct could include: her prevarication over strategy and tactics following the outbreak of the Dutch revolt, first claiming neutrality but offering moral and subsequently physical aid to the rebels, which provoked Philip into retaliation; her disingenuous attempt to publicly censor and privately support English privateers in the Americas e.g. Drake's expeditions in the 1570s and 1580s; and her support for the rival Portuguese claimant, Don Antonio, at a critical time in the 1580s. Candidates need to offer a balanced evaluation of the respective sets of rulers before reaching a judgement.</p> <p>'The revival of the Roman Catholic Church in the period from 1492 to 1610 owed little to the influence of Protestantism.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Candidates are likely to argue for and against the premise. Some will claim that the Catholic revival began before the advent of Protestantism and several elements of a revival occurred independently of</p>	60	<p>Team leader.</p> <p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p>it. The Fifth Lateran Council of 1512-17, 15th century monastic observant reforms, the creation of several new orders and lay groups in Italy and the Netherlands, the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, and the work of biblical humanists and Catholic reformers, such as Erasmus, Savonarola, Cisneros, and Lefèvre, may be cited as illustrations of the revival owing nothing to Protestantism because they happened before 1517. They could also argue that not all features of the Catholic Reformation after 1517 can be attributed to Protestant reformers or the influence of Protestantism. For example, new orders such as the Oratories, Ursulines, Barnabites, Theatines, Jesuits and Discalced Carmelites owed little to the Protestant Reformation, although Jesuit missionaries travelled to Protestant countries to win back lost souls. Similarly the work of the Inquisition in Spain, apart from a brief period at the start of Philip II's reign, was more concerned with conversos, moriscos and levels of morality among the Catholic laity than with the persecution of Protestant heretics. It may also be argued that key elements of the revival concerned a reformed Papacy, implementing the decrees of the Council of Trent and the work of Jesuits, all of which were more influential than Protestantism. A counter-argument is that Protestantism played an important part in the revival of the Roman Catholic Church. Candidates are likely to be critical of attempts by the Church to effect reform from 1492 to 1517 and refer to the failure of the Papacy to lead by example, the ineffectual reforms resulting from the Lateran Council, the limited impact of reformed orders outside Italy and of humanists outside their own country (Erasmus was the only true 'international' reformer), and the tendency for the Church to be conservative and introspective. A key argument is that the Protestant Reformation after 1517 changed the speed, character and outcome of the Catholic revival. It brought about a reform of clerical abuses and obliged the Church to produce a clearer and less equivocal definition of doctrine at Trent. Subsequently the Catholic Church attached greater importance to preaching and sermons (which were key traits of Lutheranism), and to the role of the confessional and consistory (a reflection of the influence of Calvinism), which brought greater obedience and uniformity to the Catholic Church. Some candidates might examine the importance of education and the growing attention given to meeting the social and spiritual needs of the Catholic laity, which in part reflected the influence of Luther and Calvin but was also evident in lay orders preceding the advent of Protestantism. Candidates do not have to be familiar with the theological beliefs of Protestant reformers but they should offer a sound evaluation of the impact of Protestantism. A balance between Protestant and Catholic Reformation elements and influences is expected of better essays, with specific focus given to 'owed little' in the question's premise.</p>		<p>If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	<p>Assess the reasons why the Jesuits were more successful than other religious orders in the period from 1492 to 1610.</p> <p>Candidates should be aware of several reasons for the Jesuits' success, and assess them by way of comparison with other religious orders. The most likely reasons are: (1) the Jesuits, unlike the regular orders, did not live in common which enabled them to travel, often internationally, as papal agents. They were also released by the pope from fasting, wearing a clerical habit and the daily canonical routine, which gave them greater independence. Some of the regular orders had been 'reformed' in the 15th century and had become more 'observant' of rules governing their order but none was in comparable touch with the needs of society and their subsequent dissolution in several Catholic states is evidence of their perceived obsolescence. (2) Jesuits performed pastoral as well as missionary work e.g. they set up hospitals and almshouses in Italy, Portugal and elsewhere in Europe. Franciscan and Dominican friars also practised pastoral work but they were conditioned by their spiritual rules and traditional education. Most lay orders were also released from wearing clerical dress and interacted with communities but were more concerned with poverty, chastity, and self-redemption. (3) The Jesuit organisation had a clearly defined structure, leadership and objectives, which meant they were answerable to their superiors and bound by a self-denial that was more ingrained than in many other orders. The <i>Spiritual Exercises</i> disciplined both body and mind and was part of a 10 year training programme that was far more rigorous than in other orders. They were the only order to take a personal vow to the pope and, as papal agents, fulfilled diplomatic tasks e.g. they played a prominent role at the Council of Trent. (4) They were taught to think and act flexibly in performing their duties e.g. they embraced new ideas and technology such as the printing press and were excellent self-publicists; they could adapt to the slums of India and court life of Vienna. They thus acquired a profile that was far higher, more varied and more international than that of other orders. (5) Jesuit missionary activity, like that of Canisius, Xavier and Ricci, brought them international recognition e.g. in Germany, India, China, Japan, Malaysia and Latin America, whereas most new orders e.g. the Ursulines, Barnabites, Theatines, Discalced Carmelites, were largely confined to Italy and Spain. In Europe, Catholic rulers invited them to assist in the reformation of their state e.g. Austria, Poland, Styria, the Spanish Netherlands. (6) The quality of Jesuit education was widely admired and their influence in seminaries, schools, colleges and universities had a lasting effect on the Catholic Reformation. 3000 schools were founded in European cities by 1610. The quality of their education appealed to wealthy patrons and secular rulers who appointed them as confessors and tutors to their sons e.g. John III of Portugal, Emperor Rudolph II, William V and Maximilian I of Bavaria. (7) Although they were not originally founded to combat Protestantism, the Jesuits became the Catholic Church's principal weapon and achieved outstanding results in southern, central and eastern Germany and particularly in</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
12	<p>Eastern Europe. The best essays are likely to assess the reasons and decide which were the most important in explaining the Jesuits' success; weaker responses are likely to describe the work and successes of the Jesuits and other orders and so provide less effective assessments.</p> <p>'Sixtus V contributed more than any other pope to the development of the Catholic Church in the period from 1492 to 1610.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>This question requires candidates to compare the work of Sixtus V (1585-90) with other popes in the period 1492-1610 before arriving at a judgement. Sixtus V at 64 was much younger than most popes and showed his energy and enthusiasm in several ways to transform the Curia, the Catholic Church and the city of Rome. Reform of the Curia was long overdue: he established 15 'congregations' or departments of state to administer papal affairs – 6 were concerned with temporal business, including papal finances which were replenished, and 9 dealt with spiritual matters. He set the number of cardinals at 70 and insisted on episcopal residence. He eliminated banditry in the Papal States and established an effective diplomatic service. He revised the Vulgate text and encouraged more liberal thinking in the Curia. In Rome he drove forward changes that would revitalise the city e.g. new roads and waterways, opened a new Vatican library, erected an obelisk in St Peter's Square and built a new dome on the cathedral itself. He strongly supported the baroque style of architecture which led to a revival of religious art that soon spread to other European states. His dislike of Jesuits and hatred of Spaniards may be seen as negative features that handicapped the Catholic Church (especially his equivocal dealings in foreign affairs), and his revival of the sale of offices can be condemned but in 5 years he achieved far more than most longer-serving popes. Each of these features could be usefully assessed in respect of their development of the Catholic Church. Candidates however also need to set Sixtus's work against the contributions of other popes. Among those most likely to be cited are: Paul III (1534-49) who was the first pope to make a sustained effort at reform – he investigated clerical abuses and encouraged Italian bishops to reform their dioceses, he recognised the Jesuits, established the Roman Inquisition and Index, and called the first general council of the Church for over 100 years; Paul IV (1555-59) who revised the Index and supported the Inquisition but opposed Trent, the Jesuits and Spain; Pius IV (1559-65), who issued the all-important Tridentine decrees; Pius V (1565-72), who made reforms to the Curia and revised the catechism, breviary and missal; Gregory XIII (1572-85), an enthusiastic reformer, who improved Rome and encouraged missionaries to travel to Protestant lands; and Clement VIII (1592-1605), who revised the Vulgate, issued a new Index and ordered a general visitation in Rome. Most of these contributions may be compared favourably with the more negative legacy of earlier popes such as Alexander VI (1492-1503), a corrupt and secular minded pope, Julius</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
13	<p>II (1503-13), the 'warrior pope', patron of the arts and convenor of the Lateran council, Leo X (1513-21) a simoniac and nepotist who banned Luther but to little effect, and Clement VII (1523-34) who failed to stop the spread of Lutheranism and Zwinglianism, the invasion of papal lands and the sack of Rome. Candidates may judge Sixtus to be more important than other popes, and some may suggest Paul III deserves greater credit, but a sustained comparison of Sixtus and several popes across the period is needed for the top levels.</p> <p>'The French nation state developed more in the period from 1498 to 1559 than in the period from 1560 to 1610.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>A comparative assessment of the development of the French state before and after 1559 is required. Some candidates might approach the question thematically and, with reference to individual monarchs or periods, define 'nation state' before discussing 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. The period from 1498 saw a steady growth in the power of the monarchy and with it many centralising features. Louis XII started to codify the laws, kept taxes and expenditure low, improved the administration of justice, created new <i>parlements</i> and was a popular ruler in spite of an unsuccessful foreign policy. Francis I further strengthened the political power of the monarchy and internal condition of France, through legal and administrative reforms, especially in 1515-17, 1522-24 and 1542-44, and enhanced the authority of the state in relation to the Church, but he also weakened state finances and France's standing as an international power. Henry II's reign also saw several key developments. In 1559 France ceded claims to lands in Italy and acknowledged Spain's supremacy in Europe. Royal finances were pronounced bankrupt in 1557, which made the crown vulnerable to the nobility and estates in the future, and there was a steady growth in Calvinism which weakened the unity of the state. Henry also lacked interest in administration and much resentment developed as a result of his heavy-handed dealing with the Paris <i>parlement</i>, nobles and provincial estates. By 1559 many nobles hitherto fighting in Italy had lost their <i>raison d'être</i> and were ready to turn instead to domestic violence. Candidates are likely to suggest that the death of Henry II and succession of a series of weak rulers from 1559 was a key reason for problems emerging in the development of the state. Thus the long-standing rivalry between the Montmorency, Bourbon and Guise families surfaced after 1559 in the absence of a strong monarchy and civil wars from 1562</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
14	<p>impeded the status of the monarchy, its relations with the French nobility, and trends in centralisation (e.g. administration, justice, provincial estates and <i>parlements</i>). Existing divisions in the Church between Catholics and Protestants hardened and became militarised, allowed Spain to interfere at will in French affairs and displace France as Europe's major power. Developments in government finances, trade, commerce, industry, transport and agriculture were all severely affected by the wars and any recovery after 1598 was consequently slow and erratic. In contrast Henry IV could be considered to have done most of all to further the nation state and his reign could be used as a counter argument. He began the rehabilitation of the country domestically (resolving religious and social divisions, restoring the crown's political authority and, together with Sully, laying sound economic foundations), and he strengthened the state's international standing. Candidates need to cover Henry IV's reign to achieve an effective synthesis as the years from 1598 to 1610 stand comparison with any in the earlier period. Some candidates may comment on the continuity of the politique mentality which helped Henry IV restore and develop the nation state after the Wars of Religion.</p> <p>'The growth in the power of the French monarchy was hindered mainly by the poor condition of its finances.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1498 to 1610?</p> <p>Candidates should consider the nature and condition of French royal finances in this period to decide how far they hindered/helped the monarchy. Good essays should focus on the 'poor condition of the finances' and argue for and against the premise. A chronological or thematic approach can be taken although the latter may well produce a more effective synthesis. Arguments in support of 'hindered by poor finances' might include: sources of revenue which were inadequate to meet the crown's requirements; debts which were a regular feature of all administrations – 1.4 million livres in 1515, 6 million in 1546, 43 million in 1561, and 147 million in 1598; the system of tax assessment (self-assessed in many cases), collection (tax farmers were often corrupt and <i>élus</i> only operated in the <i>pays d'élections</i>) and exemptions (nobles and clergy paid no direct taxes), which remained largely unreformed in the period. As a consequence, French kings had limited finances with which to reward their subjects and distribute patronage, and some nobles were wealthier than the crown which lessened the respect and loyalty felt towards the monarchy. Attempts to use the Estates General to reform the situation proved uniformly unsuccessful and only served to highlight the crown's vulnerability. A slow, corrupt and inefficient system, partly the result of the selling of offices, prevented the crown from fully centralising its administration, and inadequate revenue and excessive expenditure restricted the crown's ability to raise troops to fight wars abroad or establish peace and stability at</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
15	<p>home. France was invaded on numerous occasions and the lengthy civil wars were in large part a result of the crown's weak financial condition. From 1562 to 1598, the crown could only afford to pay an army for two months at a time and control of much of the country fell to the nobility and local estates. A counter-argument, however, should be offered. Such essays might argue that royal finances were not in a consistently poor condition. Indeed, in the first half of the period Louis XII and Francis I had enough money to wage war and to keep the nobility in check. Reforms by Francis saw an increase in revenue and greater centralisation in administration (especially the creation of the <i>Epargne</i> in 1532). Henry II introduced the <i>Grand Parti</i> and raised loans to fund his wars, Henry IV similarly resolved his debt crisis by re-scheduling the repayments, introducing the <i>Paulette</i>, raising revenue and cutting expenditure. Indeed it was the strength of the royal finances after 1598 that enabled him to restore domestic and foreign peace, and enhance the authority of the crown. Some candidates may argue that royal finances were not the main factor that hindered the development of the monarchy. The personality of the king, political ambition of the nobility, religious divisions, the vested interests of provincial <i>parlements</i> and estates, and the threat of foreign powers, all weakened the power of the monarchy in the course of the period, and may have been more significant factors than finance. Royal finances should be assessed and compared with other factors before reaching a judgement.</p> <p>'Francis I managed religious problems better than any other French ruler.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1498 to 1610?</p> <p>Candidates should address a range of religious problems facing Francis I and other French rulers in the period and evaluate the extent to which he was the most successful. The main religious problems facing Francis were the rise of humanism and its implied heresy, a movement which received royal patronage from Marguerite d'Angoulême and condemnation from the Sorbonne, and which created religious and political difficulties for Francis I in the 1520s that were never satisfactorily solved. Heretical groups, such as the Waldensians and Huguenots, presented further problems. The former were wiped out in 1545 but the Huguenots presented a more formidable problem. Francis never tolerated heresy and after the Day of the Placards in 1534, he supported the <i>parlements</i> in a drive to suppress Huguenots. By 1547 they had been cowed but not beaten. The Papacy presented another problem. The Concordat of Bologna (1516), a compromise over the issue of the royal <i>regale</i>, satisfied most groups, though the Sorbonne and Paris <i>parlement</i> had reservations. Later popes were less</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
16	<p>pleased with Francis's opposition to the calling of a general council; and, when it did meet, he refused to send any delegates. Francis did little to reform the French Church of its endemic abuses and, apart from the work of bishops such as Meaux, it remained corrupt and materialistic. Francis's work could be compared with Louis XII who faced few religious problems. Humanism flourished (e.g. Lefèvre, Erasmus, Budé) until the Reuchlin affair of 1515; the king's chief minister Cardinal d'Amboise was papal legate and reformed the regular orders, despite considerable resistance; however, Julius II resented the king convening a general council at Pisa in 1511 and so called a rival council at Rome. Neither achieved anything significant. Henry II's relations with the Papacy fluctuated: he refused to send delegates to Trent and in the Gallican crisis of 1551/52 threatened to call a French council. Relations with Paul IV from 1555 were more cordial but the king's hard stance through his use of the <i>Chambre Ardente</i> towards the Huguenots led to a growth in Calvinism among French nobles and an increase in tension between Catholics and Protestants. For most of the period, there was no progress in the reform of the Church. Candidates could contrast these rulers with the monarchs from 1559-1589 (Francis II, Charles IX, Henry III), who handled religious problems badly. The 1561 Council of Poissy agreed upon a programme of reform but apart from individual efforts there was no government support, and attempts at finding a solution to the Huguenot problem resulted in civil war from 1562. Successive regimes pursued strategies of toleration and persecution, and the Massacre of St Bartholomew was a disaster for Charles. The crown lacked the authority to impose a lasting settlement and angered the Papacy by refusing to accept the Trent decrees. Henry IV appeased the Papacy by his own conversion but could not persuade his <i>parlements</i> to register the decrees. He partially solved the Huguenot problem at Nantes but not to everyone's satisfaction. After 1598 there was also a new religious vitality, aided by the re-introduction of the Jesuits and the foundation of new orders. Some candidates may consider Louis XII or Henry IV to have been more successful than Francis I.</p> <p>'Richelieu contributed more than any other minister to the development of absolute monarchy in France.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1610 to 1715?</p> <p>Some candidates will agree with the statement; some will suggest that other ministers, perhaps Colbert, were more important. Polemicists Le Bret and Loyseau wrote of Louis XIII's absolutism and praised Richelieu for controlling recalcitrant estates (the Paris <i>parlement</i> in 1641 had to register edicts without delay or amendments), for suppressing the Huguenots and curtailing their privileges, for weakening the nobility and using a political tribunal – the <i>chambre de l'arsenal</i>, operating from 1631 to 1643, - to execute 5 dukes, 4 counts and a marquis. Royal officials especially <i>intendants</i> grew in number and threatened the influence of <i>officiers</i>; <i>élus</i> were appointed to some of the <i>pays d'états</i>; all</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
17	<p>but one governor was replaced with more loyal <i>noblesses de robe</i>, uncooperative clergy were dismissed, the army grew from 20,000 to 150,000 and no Estates General ever met. A counter argument is that Richelieu was not that successful and that during Louis XIV's minority in the 1640s, the limitations of royal absolutism - a legacy of Richelieu - became all too apparent. Nobles revealed their political ambition, <i>parlements</i> anxious to protect the Estates and their own privileges obstructed royal policies, and crown <i>officiers</i> wavered in their loyalty to the government. Some candidates might argue that absolutism developed as a result of civil war. After 1653 Mazarin increased the role of <i>intendants</i>, took the army away from nobles like Condé and Turenne (whose private retainers were clearly an obstacle to the development of an absolute monarchy) and placed all troops under royal control. Le Tellier and Louvois introduced further military reforms in the 1670s and 1680s that doubled the size of the army, improved its resources, modernised weapons, and reformed recruitment and training, all of which strengthened the power of the king and enabled him to fight several successful wars and subdue revolts. Colbert brought more efficiency and uniformity to administration. He improved royal finances – he cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, amalgamated tax farming, reclaimed royal lands, and increased the <i>taille</i>. Finance had always been a limitation on the development of absolute monarchy but, as a result of his work, state revenue increased by 400%, Louis was able to build Versailles, which in turn illustrated the god-like status of the king and court, and long and expensive wars were fought, which enhanced his reputation outside France. Some candidates might argue that royal absolutism was an unattainable goal in France; no minister succeeded in effectively curtailing the authority of provincial governors, regional estates and the <i>parlements</i>, all of whom obstructed royal edicts. Towns and cities, like Marseilles, protected their chartered customs and privileges, and seigneurial and church courts impeded the establishment of a uniform legal system. The nobles resisted attempts to extend taxation to their estates and remained potentially independent. The financial system was largely unreformed and the <i>pays d'états</i> consistently opposed the introduction of <i>élus</i>. Raising troops and revenue to meet war costs and defence expenses often proved inadequate. Exactly how policies of ministers helped or hindered the development of absolute monarchy will be the key to a good answer; references to the kings' contributions will also be relevant if they are tied to particular ministers.</p> <p>How effectively did French governments manage economic and financial problems in the period from 1610 to 1715?</p> <p>Most candidates are likely to discuss some of the following problems: unequal and high tax burdens,</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p>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. Candidates are likely to assess the work of Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert. All governments were confronted with financial difficulties, and each tackled them in a similar way i.e. they tried to cut expenditure, increase existing taxation, borrow money, sell offices, introduce novel reforms. As a result, royal revenue increased but the tax and administrative system remained largely unchanged and lengthy wars ensured expenditure spiralled out of control. Louis XIII's governments had limited success in keeping finances in order; advisers like Bullion and Bouthillier sold offices, debased the currency and levied new indirect taxes in an attempt to find new sources of revenue. Richelieu introduced <i>élus</i> to the <i>pays d'états</i> and <i>intendants</i> oversaw tax assessment and collection, encouraged overseas trade, established a royal navy and improved domestic canal and road transport, but was largely unsuccessful e.g. for political reasons, he failed to implement Marillac's proposed reforms in the Code Michaud of 1629, and government costs trebled in the 1630s. Mazarin and d'Emery tackled the crown's financial difficulties but their policies on extending indirect taxation and interfering with <i>rentes</i> and the Paulette precipitated the Fronde, and Mazarin took little interest in the wider economy. By 1661 government debts exceeded 700 million livres. Colbert on the other hand effectively managed both royal finances and the country's economy. In the 1660s he cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming into one company, reclaimed royal lands, and increased the <i>taille</i>. By 1672 he had increased revenue by 400% and balanced the budget. Colbert also had a far wider view of the economy. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. He regulated industries, revitalised old ones (e.g. textiles), founded trading companies, established colonies in Canada and the West Indies, and expanded the royal navy, maritime fleet, arsenals and naval stores. None of his predecessors since Sully and Henry IV had developed the economy so broadly or so effectively. Nevertheless, although Colbert strengthened the economy, there was a limit as to how long it could sustain Louis' wars. After Colbert's death in 1683, the French government lost control of royal finances, debts mounted and schemes, such as the development of overseas trading companies and colonies, collapsed. Tax collection became less rigorous, new taxes (e.g. the <i>capitation</i> and <i>dixième</i>) fell on the impoverished classes, the currency was debased and venality multiplied. By 1715 the fiscal system remained unreformed, the government had a debt in excess of 2000 million <i>livres</i> and the economy had been eclipsed by rival states such as England and the United Provinces.</p>		<p>approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
18	<p>'The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) was the main turning point in France's rise as a European power in the period from 1610 to 1715.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Whether or not candidates agree with the proposition, they should evaluate the significance for France and for other nation states of the Treaty of Westphalia, and compare it with other turning points in its development as a European power. Arguments in support of the statement might include: territorial gains made at Westphalia, such as Metz, Toul and Verdun, the security of France's eastern border, and the possession of the bishopric of Lorraine, most of Alsace, Rhine bridgeheads such as Breisach, and the Italian fortress of Pinerolo, which gave France future opportunities to expand. France's delay in entering the war (from 1635) meant 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, which had been limited to supporting other countries against the Habsburgs, obstructing the Valtelline and contesting a relatively minor dispute at Mantua-Montferrat in 1628-31, with gains made in 1648. Others may stress the importance of staying at war until 1659 and the successful Treaty of the Pyrenees. As a result France acquired lands in Luxemburg, Artois and towns in the Spanish Netherlands, confirmed gains made at Westphalia that secured the Pyrenees, and agreed to the union of Louis XIV and Maria Theresa, which gave French kings a claim to the Spanish throne and empire. This treaty was the culmination of 24 years of fighting and climaxed French dominance in Europe over Spain, its longstanding rival. It was now able to compete with the Dutch and English for overseas trade and commerce, seize more Spanish territories and intervene in German politics over the next thirty years. Candidates may well consider some of the following turning points by way of comparison: the War of Devolution 1667-68, when France at Aix-La Chapelle acquired lands in the Spanish Netherlands, especially St Omer, Lille and Douai but not Franche Comté; the Dutch War 1672-78, when at Nijmegen France gained Franche Comté, annexed Flemish border areas and occupied Lorraine, which linked Luxemburg with Alsace and secured a valuable border buttress with Germany; the War of the League of Augsburg 1689-97, during which Louis lost his first military and naval battles and had to negotiate the treaty of Ryswick from a position of weakness. Some might argue that the Truce of Ratisbon in 1684 was the major turning point: the Emperor confirmed France's previous gains and possession of Luxemburg, Strasburg and Kehl. However, Louis had offended the major European powers, and thereafter the English, Dutch, Spanish, Germans and Austrians united against him. Some candidates might argue that non-military events proved decisive, such as the appointment of ministers (Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert in particular) or the importance of Louis XIV's majority rule and ambitious foreign policy. Candidates should compare Westphalia with alternative turning points in France's rise as a European power before reaching a judgement.</p>	60	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

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 2014

