

GCE

History A

Unit **F966/01**: Historical Themes

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

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 the Exchequer was the most significant change in English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>The Exchequer is known to have existed from the reign of Henry I. Sheriffs regularly had to render account there meaning that it helped to bring them under royal control. Its transparent and understandable methods meant that accounts could be seen to be dealt with openly and fairly so enhancing royal authority and it ensured that the king’s revenues were collected and spent appropriately. It was a fundamental part of the mechanism by which kings maximised their finances in order to deal with their increasing financial needs caused by the growing costs of warfare and government. It was the foundation of the bureaucracy which flourished in medieval government and a great medieval English institution. Candidates need to examine its importance.</p> <p>However, there were other changes which candidates might regard as equally or more significant and they need to examine a range and compare their importance to reach a supported conclusion. Some may argue that the development of the role of chief justiciar was more important. Originating in the role played by Ranulf Flambard, who could be seen as a prototype chief justiciar, in the reign of William II, and developing in the hands of Roger of Salisbury under Henry I, the office of chief justiciar became a great office of state under the Angevins, presiding over the Exchequer and running the country on a day to day level. It reached its apogee under Hubert Walter from 1193 to 1198 who ran the country during Richard’s long absence and set in motion the most far-reaching investigation then seen into administrative, judicial and financial practices. The development of the office was a direct response to the problems posed by absentee kingship; it enabled the government of the country to run smoothly without the need for the king’s presence.</p> <p>Another contender might be the chancery. It had functioned from the beginning of the period but the office of chancellor underwent much development under the Angevins, especially in the reign of John when Hubert Walter presided over a considerable increase in chancery documents. Others could argue for the development of justice, especially its increased centralisation under Henry II with his innovations such as the Grand and possessory assizes, Mort d’ancestor, Novel disseisin, Assize Utrum, Darrein Presentment, and the use of the standardised writ. These increased the potential for profits from justice by standardising procedure and attracting more business to the king’s courts. Earlier in the period, candidates could point to the importing of Norman ideas under William I, especially feudal government which helped to reinforce the centralisation of the state, or to the acquisition of the continental possessions of the crown from William I’s time on, as these led</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p> <p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, considering both the Exchequer and some other developments such as the justiciar, chancery, justice, feudal government, acquisition of continental possessions or centralisation. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for AO1b. Stronger answers will also consider both sides of the proposition.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	<p>to absentee kingship and thus the developments which came from it. Some may argue that centralisation itself was the most significant change and that the development of the Exchequer was, like the other major changes, part of the whole growth of centralisation and increasingly bureaucratic government in the period.</p> <p>‘Developments in English common law under Henry II and his successors (1154-1216) were more important than those under previous kings from 1066 to 1154.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Much of the increased standardisation, systematic approach, bureaucratization and recording of things in writing which were essential to the development of common law, date from the reign of Henry II. His introduction of the Grand and possessory assizes, ie Novel Disseisin, Assize Utrum, Darrein Presentment, Mort d’ancestor, and the standardised returnable writ, and his use of general eyres and professional justices standardised practice and, by bringing more cases into the king’s courts, meant the spread of a more uniform way of dealing with them. Although there was no formal written code of the customs of England, decisions taken on the bench at Westminster began to be recorded so that these judgments created precedents which could be referred to. Practice was further standardised by the publication of Glanvill, the treatise on the rules of the king’s court. Moreover, criminal law was tightened up with the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, so allowing for greater uniformity there too. Reforms continued under Henry’s sons. Among other things, under Hubert Walter the Assize of Measures became a further extension of royal government into people’s ordinary lives. General eyres continued, cheap and easily available writs were issued and coroners appeared in 1194. John in particular was very keen on the administration of justice, wishing to make it cheap and enjoying hearing cases in person. This, plus his use of the writ praecipe to transfer a case from the feudal to the royal court, meant the increased centralisation of justice and thus the potential for more standardisation. In addition, the judicial clauses of Magna Carta helped bring more common practice. By 1216, although there were still inconsistencies and not everyone had equal access to law, common law was available to a wide range of people across the country.</p> <p>However, candidates must look at both periods and compare importance before reaching a substantiated conclusion. Some may wish to argue that the developments under Henry II’s predecessors were even more important as they laid the foundations for the work done in the later period. Already in 1066 there was a tradition of strong kingship over the whole country which William I continued and this was a prerequisite for the development of common law. The Anglo-</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p> <p>Stronger responses will consider the importance of developments from 1154-1216, even if they want to argue these were not the most important. The strongest answers which will consider developments under Henry II, Richard and John and those of the earlier period, such as the Anglo-Saxon inheritance in 1066, growth of feudalism and work of Henry I and will make regular synoptic comparisons between them throughout the essay should be rewarded in the higher levels for</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	<p>Saxon network of hundred and shire courts also continued and was used to dispense justice in the localities. Moreover, the growth of feudalism under William could be seen as fundamental to the development of common law: common feudal custom and the tendency of seigneurial courts to follow common practice helped lead to standardisation. Feudalism's emphasis on landholding also led to the classification of different types of land holding which again helped develop the standardised common law for land holding cases. With Henry I, the 'Lion of Justice', cases between different tenants were being heard in shire rather than seigneurial courts which helped encourage the growth of common practice, as did the use of local justiciars and general eyres. Strong kingship and the interrelationship between the king and the localities, Saxon traditions and feudalism all helped to establish in the Anglo-Norman period the essential elements of common law on which the Angevins could build.</p> <p>Assess the importance of royal support in strengthening the authority of archbishops of Canterbury over the English church in the period from 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. Lanfranc's success in strengthening his authority over the English church would certainly suggest that royal support was very important to archbishops. With William's support he augmented his authority by holding reforming councils of the church which helped to create unity, by bringing the English church into contact with the mainstream of European Christianity, and introducing monastic reforms which created a sense of leadership. He was able to begin to develop separate ecclesiastical justice and had firm control over his bishops. He and William were at one over Lanfranc's refusal to obey the Pope's summons to Rome so that he was able to keep England out of the Investiture Contest and also created the impression that authority over the church in England lay with him. He had William's support over the primacy issue and the recognition of his personal primacy not only produced structure and order in the church but enhanced his authority over it. Moreover, he worked with William to establish Norman rule which helped to enhance his prestige. Royal support was also useful to Anselm. By reaching agreement with Henry I in the Compromise of Bec he was able to enhance his power over the English church and to reduce royal power over it since Henry agreed to renounce investiture with the ring and staff. He could also take the credit for the Investiture Contest playing no further part in the affairs of the English church. Candidates may point out that there is also evidence which indicates that lack of royal support hindered archbishops' authority. Lack of support from William II drove Anselm into exile, a position from which it was difficult to exercise any authority. Langton, whose appointment</p>	60	<p>AO1b. Stronger candidates might also define 'more important'.</p> <p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p> <p>The strongest responses will adopt a Thematic approach, considering royal support and other themes such as papal support, or reputation of the archbishop. Such an approach, with regular synoptic comparisons between the importance of different periods and themes throughout the essay, should be rewarded in the higher levels for</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p>John could not countenance, could not even enter England until 1213 which meant he had no opportunity to establish his authority over the church, a situation not improved when the king sequestered church property. Becket's quarrel with the king not only led to his exile and the dent to his authority sustained by being out of the country, but also gave Henry the chance to reassert royal control with the Constitutions of Clarendon and to bring the bishops under his control instead of Becket's. This was particularly true of the influential Foliot. Moreover, Henry undermined Becket's prestige and authority by having York instead of Becket crown Young Henry.</p> <p>However, royal support was not the only factor in archbishops being able or not to strengthen their authority and candidates need to compare importance in order to reach a supported conclusion on the importance of royal support. Papal support or lack of it could be crucial. Papal suspension of Langton and his placing England under an interdict while Langton was archbishop did nothing to enhance the archbishop's authority. Making Henry of Blois papal legate helped to reduce Canterbury's authority as did the failure of the pope to recognise Canterbury's primacy, as in 1161-2 when the pope weakened Canterbury's power by giving York privileges exempting him from Canterbury's jurisdiction, and papal determination to undermine all metropolitan power. On the other hand, Hubert Walter was given legatine authority which helped to bolster his control over the church and he was able to hold councils which improved church discipline. Other factors could play their part too. Archbishop Theobald's promotion of canon law enhanced the independence of the church from royal authority and thus helped his authority and Anselm's reputation as a theologian meant he was much respected. In addition, Anselm's time in exile, in which he was exposed to the full meaning of Gregorian Reform, meant he was able to uphold the rights of the church on his return to England in 1100.</p>		<p>AO1b.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	<p>Assess the importance of disputes over the succession to the English throne as a cause of rebellion in Tudor England.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to assess the Yorkist rebellions under Lovel, Simnel and Warbeck that threatened the throne of Henry VII; the Aragonese faction in the 1530s that supported the Pilgrimage of Grace to get Mary restored to the succession; Northumberland's revolt in 1553 against Mary Tudor in favour of Lady Jane Grey; the Northern Earls who championed Mary Stuart's claim to the throne; and Essex who hoped to see James VI usurp Elizabeth I.</p> <p>Some candidates may differentiate between causes in which disputes over the succession were the primary motive for rebellion and those that were a secondary source of conflict. Most of Henry VII's rebellions were politically and dynastically motivated but he also faced two tax rebellions. Taxation also figured in 1525, 1536 and 1549, and wider economic causes such as enclosures (1536, 1549 and 1596), rack-renting (1536 and 1549), unemployment (1525 and 1554), and famine (1596) could be usefully compared with disputes over the succession. Both succession and economic rebellions occurred throughout the Tudor period although economic issues were often linked to social grievances.</p> <p>Religious reforms and changes were the main cause of disorder in the Pilgrimage of Grace, Western and Northern Earls' rebellions and secondary issues in Kett's and Wyatt's rebellions. Unlike the succession, religious causes were confined to the middle years of the Tudor period (1536-70) and candidates may assess their relative importance accordingly.</p> <p>Some candidates may cite political causes such as factions and ambitious nobles who sought to overthrow royal councillors and change the dynamics of Tudor governments. For instance, rebellions aimed at toppling Bray and Morton (1497), Wolsey (1525), Cromwell, Rich and Audley (1536), Somerset (1549), Northumberland (1553), and the Cecils (1569 and 1601).</p>	60	Candidates are expected to assess the relative importance of issues concerning the English succession as a cause of rebellion in England before comparing its importance with other causes of rebellion. The best essays should examine a range of English rebellions (Irish disturbances are not relevant in this question) and compare their importance (main/secondary), and frequency.
5	<p>'Tudor rebellions in England failed mainly because of a lack of support.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>A lack of support for rebellions against the Tudors was apparent in most disturbances</p>	60	The focus of this question concerns the reasons why rebellions in England failed. Candidates may well refer to

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>although candidates would do well to define what they understand by ‘a lack of support’. This could mean the size of rebel armies which ranged from a handful in the Oxfordshire rising in 1596, to disparate groups in the armed bands of Yorkists in 1486, a few hundred supporters in 1553 and 1601, and to several thousand supporters in the rebellions of 1487, 1497, 1525, 1536, 1549, 1554 and 1569. None of these rebellions exceeded the Pilgrimage of Grace in size and all of its support came from the northern counties of England. It failed for other reasons although by December 1536 the king had persuaded the rebels to return to their homes.</p> <p>Perhaps of greater significance was the lack of support from the English nobility, gentry and clergy in most rebellions and the reluctance of commoners to risk their lives and livelihoods as rebellions moved from local to regional centres and in a few cases to London. Significantly the city of London never gave its backing to any rebellion against the Tudors. Support of the English nobility was also essential if a rebellion was to carry any chance of success and most aristocrats refrained from active involvement while some led armies under the crown against rebellions. Most of the clergy refrained from supporting rebels; the Pilgrimage of Grace and Western rebellions were notable exceptions. Most rebellions were local and confined to one or two counties and rarely gathered support outside their centres of origin. For example, the Western rebellion was centred on Cornwall and Devon, Kett’s rebellion on Norfolk, and Wyatt’s rebellion on Kent. These threats could be contained and defeated more easily.</p> <p>However, rebellions failed for a number of other factors and these should be compared with the support they received. Some essays may assess the quality of leadership which seriously undermined Warbeck, Western, Wyatt, the Northern Earls and Essex rebellions. Weak organisation could be cited as another reason: Simnel, for instance, relied heavily on German and Irish troops who were unpopular among English sympathisers; neither the Western nor Wyatt’s rebellions had coherent objectives and the earls of Northumberland, Westmorland and Essex revealed their rebel plans in advance.</p> <p>Government measures taken to deal with rebellions certainly explain why many failed: most administrations played for time, offered pardons and promises to rebels until they dispersed and then dealt summarily with the rebel leaders. The government did not always have a larger army but its weapons, cavalry and resources were always superior and every dynastically motivated rebellion ended in military defeat for the rebels. Ironically apart from</p>		<p>the relatively small size of rebel armies, the role of the nobility, gentry, clergy and localism, rebel leadership, organisation and government responses.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
6	<p>dynastic rebellions, most rebels proclaimed their loyalty to the crown and, provided the Tudors held their nerve in the face of armed rebellion, the threat could be outlasted and defeated. Most rulers acted decisively: Henry VII raised and led armies himself, Henry VIII and Elizabeth despatched large armies to contain threats in the northern counties, Mary refused advice to leave London, and Elizabeth confronted Essex before he could get enough support in the capital. The promise of foreign support e.g. from Burgundy, the Papacy, Spain and France, rarely materialised and if it did, e.g. in 1487, it was defeated on the battlefield.</p> <p>‘Henry VII dealt with the problem of rebellion more effectively than any other Tudor monarch.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Most essays are likely to assess Henry VII before considering other rulers; some, perhaps better, responses will compare Henry VII’s methods and measures taken against rebellions thematically. He faced more rebellions in England than any other Tudor and dealt with them very effectively. He personally directed military operations against Simnel, Yorkshire, Cornish and Warbeck rebellions, and was pro-active in defeating the Lovel and Stafford disturbances. None of the rebellions reached London and most were suppressed quickly. Only Irish backed rebellions took time to defeat but both Simnel and Warbeck, who had Irish support, succumbed to government forces, and after 1494 the Kildare clan refrained from backing pretenders and proved loyal until the 1530s. All of the dynastic threats failed partly due to Henry’s skilful foreign diplomacy and support of the Papacy. Though he took reprisals in the wake of each rebellion, these were proportionate to the involvement of rebels and the absence of rebellion in the second half of his reign in previously disaffected areas is a measure of his success.</p> <p>Elizabeth I may be favourably compared to Henry by some candidates, particularly in dealing with English rebellions. Her councils in London and York acted decisively to counter rebellions in 1569, 1596 and 1601. None was allowed to gather support or momentum and once defeated appropriate measures were taken to prevent a recurrence. The Council of the North was reformed, the northern borders re-garrisoned and leading rebels executed. In Ireland, however, Elizabeth was less successful; each of her four rebellions took several years to suppress, cost many lives and was a heavy burden on the Exchequer.</p> <p>In contrast with Henry VII and Elizabeth, Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary under-estimated the threat that their rebellions presented, were slow to respond and generally handled</p>	60	<p>This question is concerned with the measures taken by Henry VII and other Tudors in tackling rebellions. Candidates should be rewarded for evaluating particularly effective methods and focus on actual rebellions and their aftermath rather than on government measures taken in times of stability. If discussion of Ireland is ignored or marginalised, then the answer is likely to be unbalanced in its coverage.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
7	<p>them less effectively. Henry VIII in particular conceded defeat to the Amicable Grant rebels and was slow to deal with the Lincolnshire, Pilgrimage of Grace and Irish disturbances. Each rebellion presented serious problems most of which were of his own making, relying mainly on his ministers but also occasionally intervening in a heavy-handed manner. Edward VI's minister, Somerset, failed to take appropriate measures to suppress the Western and Kett rebellions quickly and it fell to other nobles to deal with them militarily. Mary was poorly advised by her council in dealing with Wyatt's revolt and unlike the other Tudors failed to prevent rebels from entering London. Most Tudors bought time, issued propaganda and avoided military resolutions until they were certain of victory and other options had been exhausted. Henry VII differed in his preference for military solutions and readiness to confront his rebels head-on.</p> <p>'Security was a more important objective than economic gain.' How far do you agree with this view of Tudor foreign policy?</p> <p>National security and trade agreements were pursued by most Tudors. The defence of Brittany in 1489, opposition to pretenders in 1492, the defence of Boulogne in 1549, and Calais in 1558, pre-emptive strikes against France in 1512, 1522 and 1542, defence against Spanish invasions from 1585, and support for the Dutch in 1586 and French Huguenots in 1589, may be discussed in many essays. Henry VII believed that making foreign alliances and treaties complemented his domestic policy of securing the throne and so sought allies against England's long standing enemies, France and Scotland. Aragon and Castile served his purpose and although trade agreements were also reached with the Levant, Hanse, France and the Netherlands, if there was a conflict of interest as in 1493-6 and 1503-6, trade benefits yielded to political security. The strong military, naval and financial power of France, its desire to recover land held by England, the long-standing rivalry and its commitment to the Catholic faith, might suggest that it posed a consistent threat to England's security, and every Tudor ruler went to war against France at least once.</p> <p>Henry VIII viewed political security alongside personal glory as a justifiable aim in his wars against France and Scotland; trade and economic gain were less important. Scotland supported Warbeck's claim to the English throne, invaded northern counties at will and had a long-standing arrangement with France of embarrassing English governments. The deaths of James IV and James V after military conflicts weakened Scotland but left it open to a French presence and capacity to intrigue against England, which was not removed</p>	60	<p>Candidates should focus on comparing the relative importance of security (which most candidates will take to mean 'political/dynastic' security and economic aims before reaching a judgement. Weaker answers are likely to consider a narrow range of objectives, possibly only assessing wars fought in defence of the throne or commercial treaties aimed at improving trade. Some responses may focus too much on the outcome of policies rather than the aims behind them, and will probably score less well. Candidates might conclude that whenever there was a conflict between attaining security and economic gain,</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
8	<p>until 1560. Thereafter, Scotland did not present a serious threat to England's security and trade had never been of much importance in its relationship with England. However, expanding trade between England and Spain and, from 1515, Burgundy and the Netherlands which were ruled by Charles V, was a key objective in Anglo-Spanish relations for much of the period. Henry VII negotiated trade treaties with Ferdinand of Aragon and the emperor Maximilian, Henry VIII continued to trade with Charles I (in spite of a trade embargo in 1528), and Mary with Philip II, and Elizabeth I protected English merchants during the Dutch Revolt. The strategic importance of the Netherlands to English security nevertheless was paramount and when Dutch liberties along with trade conditions were jeopardised by Spain in the 1560s, England's trade in wool and cloth was badly affected. It led to Elizabeth supporting the search for new overseas markets and threatening the country's security by challenging Spain over its monopoly of the American trade.</p> <p>Assess the reasons for the changing relationship between England and Scotland in the course of the period from 1485 to 1603.</p> <p>In 1485, and for much of the early period, Scotland was England's 'postern gate' that French troops readily exploited. In response English armies invaded Scotland in 1513, 1542, 1547 and 1560, and threatened invasion in 1497 and 1522. Much of this hostility was traditional but under Henry VIII and Somerset, war was a result of personal ambition. The personality of rulers was often the key to their foreign policy and also a reason for change. Henry VII secured a truce and marriage agreement with James IV that had long-term if unforeseen consequences for Anglo-Scottish relations. Mary Tudor and Elizabeth also adopted a more diplomatic approach towards Scotland. Mary did little to upset Mary of Guise's regency in the 1550s and Elizabeth cultivated friendly relations with the French regent, Catherine de Medici, which further weakened the Guise influence in Scotland. In contrast, Henry VIII made little use of Margaret his sister who was regent in the 1520s and instead, having failed to secure a marriage between the infants, Edward Tudor and Mary Queen of Scots, he sent armies into Scotland and Somerset continued this aggressive strategy.</p> <p>A second reason for change was the Protestant rebellion in Scotland and subsequent expulsion of the French court and troops in 1560. Thereafter, the 'Auld Alliance' was severed and, despite attempts by the Guise to recover their influence in Scotland, Anglo-</p>	60	<p>the former objective prevailed.</p> <p>Candidates can be expected to assess a range of reasons why Anglo-Scottish relations changed before arriving at a judgement concerning the most important. The personalities of rulers, rise of Protestantism, border security and dynastic stability might be considered.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
9	<p>Scottish relations changed forever. As a consequence, Cecil tried to use Moray and Morton as English agents at court and so build up a Protestant and pro-English faction in Edinburgh; between 1560 and 1603, there were no further wars between England and Scotland. This was a major and permanent turning point in Anglo-Scottish relations.</p> <p>Thirdly, border skirmishes were a regular feature of Anglo-Scottish relations at the start of the period. While these continued to be a problem, the scale and frequency declined largely due to the improvements made to the border garrisons, the Tudor settlement of lands between Carlisle, Newcastle and the border by English farmers and a better administration of the northern counties during Elizabeth's reign.</p> <p>Finally, as the Tudors became increasingly secure on the throne, there were fewer opportunities for the Scots to support pretenders and exploit English problems concerning the succession. Whereas James IV endorsed Warbeck in the 1490s and so exacerbated relations with Henry VII, there was little Scottish support for Mary Stuart's claim to the English throne. Indeed, James VI's desire to assert his own claim to the throne was a key reason why he did not intervene in England or seek to free his mother from captivity after 1568. Thus relations remained stable thereafter between England and Scotland in spite of Mary's execution in 1587. Candidates should assess a range of reasons before arriving at a judgement concerning the most important ones.</p> <p>'The personalities of rulers were the main reason why England's relations with Spain changed in the period from 1485 to 1603.' To what extent do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Henry VII was a shrewd, prudent, calculating monarch who managed his relations with Aragon and Castile very skilfully. He and his contemporary Ferdinand of Aragon saw France as a potential threat and at Medina del Campo forged an alliance that lasted for nearly 80 years. Their objectives, however, differed: Henry sought recognition as the true king of England and hoped to marry his son Arthur and later Henry to Catherine of Aragon; Ferdinand sought to embroil Henry in his struggle with France and, once he had achieved his goal of lands in the Pyrenees, abandoned Henry and Brittany to France. Henry was, however, astute enough to avoid any commitment to the Italian wars and tried to befriend Philip of Flanders against Ferdinand. The Aragonese king was ambitious, duplicitous and militarily set upon continuing wars against France.</p>	60	<p>This question is concerned with why Anglo-Spanish relations changed during the period with its main focus on the personalities of rulers. Candidates are not expected to know in detail much about foreign rulers except in so far as their impact on Tudor policies and policy-makers.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
10	<p>Ferdinand found in Henry VIII a suitable foil whom he inveigled into attacking France before abandoning his ally in 1514. Their nemesis, Francis I, brought together three kings whose personalities and ambitions were matched by Charles V. Henry VIII loved the idea of waging war and outdoing his peers on the continental diplomatic scene, and promptly nailed his colours to the Spanish mast. Good relations with Spain, though strained in the early 1540s, held throughout Edward VI's reign, in spite of Northumberland making peace with France and turning the English church even more Protestant. Under Mary and Philip relations began to decline. She was broody, insecure and besotted, but childless; he displayed little affection towards her, and openly resented living in England and the abuse he and his courtiers received from Londoners. His desire to bring England to war with France and the subsequent loss of Calais seriously damaged relations.</p> <p>The main change however from ally to enemy occurred in Elizabeth's reign. Her personality and that of Philip II may be seen as key reasons for the ultimate outbreak of war in 1585. Her acts of deceit, intrigue and denial, infuriated Philip, while his devotion to the Catholic faith, steadfast aim to defeat the Dutch rebels and convert England to Catholicism alarmed her.</p> <p>Other reasons for the change should also be considered. Charles V disapproved of Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon and subsequent changes to the English church. Edward VI's Protestant reforms hardened attitudes and, though relations improved under Mary, her introduction of the heresy laws, seemingly with the approval of Philip and his clerical advisors, created a 'black legend' that darkened under Elizabeth.</p> <p>Changing trade relations also had profound consequences. In 1551 the market with Antwerp collapsed and trade with Spain declined. Though there was a brief recovery, the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt in the 1560s turned English merchants away from Europe and into conflict with Spain in the Americas. War on the high seas was accompanied by war in the Netherlands as Elizabeth backed rebels and sent aid to counter the threat of invasion. Finally, as England's relations with France improved in the 1560s, the way was set for an alliance in 1572 when Philip embarked on his imperialist ambitions.</p> <p>To what extent was the Catholic Reformation in Europe a 'counter reformation' in the period from 1492 to 1610?</p> <p>Arguments in favour of a Counter Reformation may include: the absence of effective reform before Luther's outburst in 1517 and a need to respond to it; the Catholic Church</p>	60	Expect candidates to argue that on the one hand the Catholic Church owed a great deal to the Protestant Reformation and that

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
11	<p>later attached considerable importance to preaching and the sermon, both of which were key traits of Lutheranism; after 1563 the Church placed greater emphasis on education and recognised the need to rival the quality of sermons and lectures evident in many Protestant churches; the consistory and consistory were given higher status as a way of achieving greater obedience and uniformity which reflected the influence of Calvinism; Luther, Zwingli and Calvin had highlighted the need to reform clerical abuses and establish a clearer and unequivocal definition of doctrine which were finally acknowledged by the Catholic Church at Trent; the Church gave more attention to addressing the social and spiritual needs of the laity, in part a response to the welfare programmes instigated by Protestant towns in the 1520s and 1530s.</p> <p>Some candidates will claim that the Catholic revival began before the advent of Protestantism and that several elements of a revival occurred independently of 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 were all present 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 if anything 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 <i>conversos</i>, <i>moriscos</i> 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 Catholic 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.</p> <p>'Institutionally, the most important advances of the Catholic Reformation were made by the Council of Trent.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1492 to 1610?</p> <p>The main arguments in support of Trent are that it re-asserted papal authority after a long period of weak leadership and uncertain doctrinal beliefs; it stressed the pastoral role of bishops and the unique authority of the clergy; it acknowledged that confessionals,</p>	60	<p>developments were essentially a response to it; but also that the Catholic revival began before the advent of Protestantism and so to an extent developed independently of it. Candidates are likely to assess Counter and Catholic Reformation arguments sequentially. A balance between Counter and Catholic Reformation elements is expected of better essays.</p> <p>Catholic institutional reforms and not the contribution of individuals or particular countries is the focus of this question. The Specification identifies several institutions and we can expect</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
12	<p>seminaries and a better educated clergy were the way forward; it began a drive to eliminate clerical abuses after many years of failed councils and empty decrees. Between 1563 and 1610 much progress was made in Europe to revive the Church as the Papacy and secular rulers endeavoured to implement the Tridentine reforms but better candidates will also be aware of Trent's limitations – not all secular rulers adhered to or applied the decrees in their states (France is a good example); reforms needed time and money to be effective; some contentious issues such as the Breviary, Missal and Catechisms were not resolved during the sessions at Trent; and little was said about the role of the Inquisition, Index, regular orders and women.</p> <p>Candidates should compare Trent's significance with other institutions and are likely to evaluate the role played by the reformed Papacy. It may be claimed that it was an essential institution as leader of the Church, and unifier and patron of various Catholic movements. Improvements in the quality of papal leadership, the administration of the Curia and support for Trent may figure among essays and better responses should also be aware of the Papacy's limitations, especially in the earlier years of the period.</p> <p>The Jesuits among the new orders could be considered as an alternative line of argument. As papal agents, they fulfilled diplomatic tasks and went on missions around the world spreading Catholicism. Catholic rulers in Europe e.g.in Poland, Austria and Styria, invited them to assist in their state's reformation and the quality of the Jesuits' education was widely admired and influenced seminaries, schools, colleges and universities. By 1610, over 3000 Jesuits schools had been founded in European cities. They were also the Church's main weapon to combat Protestantism and achieved outstanding results in southern, central and eastern Germany and in eastern Europe.</p> <p>Some candidates might assess the role of the Inquisition and Index. It was particularly effective in Spain, Portugal and the Italian city states in strengthening the Catholic faith, silencing Protestantism and raising standards of Christianity. Unlike Trent, inquisitions operated throughout the period though they too had limitations: many areas resisted attempts to impose orthodoxy and the Indices had a stifling effect on liberal Catholic thinking.</p> <p>'The revival of the Catholic Church in Europe owed more to Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros than to any other individual in the period from 1492 to 1610.' How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Cisneros played a vital role in initiating reforms in Castile between 1495 and 1517 and</p>	60	<p>candidates to assess the work and legacy of Trent and that of the Papacy, Jesuits and other new orders, and the inquisition and Index, before reaching a judgement.</p> <p>The focus of this question is on 'revival' and how far Cisneros and others actually 'revived' the Church. Candidates are expected to</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>arguably laid the foundations for Spain to lead the Catholic Reformation before and after the advent of Protestantism. As archbishop of Toledo, he showed what could be achieved at a time when the Papacy had little interest in reform. Under the patronage of Isabella and Ferdinand, he wrote several devotional works, produced a new liturgy for the Castilian clergy and forced the secular clergy to reside in their parishes. As a Franciscan friar, he forced ordained friars to give up their concubines, attend confession and preach every Sunday. These reforms were later extended to all religious orders in Castile. He established the university of Alcala for the education and training of priests, and authorised the creation of the polyglot which confirmed his support for humanist teaching. As the confessor to Isabella from 1494, he supported the forced conversion of <i>mudéjares</i> in Granada in 1499-1500, and from 1507 as Grand Inquisitor, used the Inquisition to investigate cases of suspected heresy among <i>conversos</i> and <i>moriscos</i>, and personally funded military expeditions to North Africa to capture Moorish settlements. Reforms to the inquisition's practices were also implemented that established a fairer set of procedures, and he successfully defended its existence on the accession of Charles I in 1516 when it seemed that it might be disbanded. Thus the ethos of the Spanish Church was firmly set by Cisneros and later developments under Charles I and Philip II owed much to his influence. However, there were limitations to his work and legacy. His spiritual authority applied only to Castile and the Aragonese provinces remained largely unreformed. His reputation as a scholar and humanist was not as great internationally as Erasmus and his impact outside Spain quite limited.</p> <p>Candidates might argue that other individuals contributed more to the revival of the Catholic Church. Erasmus, for instance, exposed many abuses in the Church between publishing the 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. Paul III was an outstanding pope who investigated clerical abuses and obliged Italian bishops to reform their dioceses; he recognised the Jesuits, established the first Roman Inquisition and Index and called the first general council of the Church for more than a century. Loyola, as the founder of the Jesuits, may be suggested. His guiding principles and leadership shaped the order and paved the way for successful missionaries around the world, and their confrontation with Protestants in the European heartlands. Philip II could be cited. He was the first European ruler to implement the Tridentine Decrees, made extensive use of the Spanish Inquisition to eradicate heresy and re-enforce orthodoxy, oversaw the creation of 20 seminaries, 12 Franciscan convents, 17 monasteries in Madrid, and spearheaded the Counter</p>		<p>assess the work of Cisneros and to compare it with other individuals before reaching a judgement. No particular alternative to Cisneros is expected but candidates may consider Erasmus, Paul III, Loyola, Philip II and possibly Luther.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13	<p>Reformation in Europe.</p> <p>To what extent were the French provinces the main factor that limited the power of French kings in the period from 1498 to 1610?</p> <p>The provincial estates and their <i>parlements</i>, which protected their legal, fiscal and political rights, consistently opposed crown attempts at centralisation and defended their right to register, modify or reject royal edicts. They were a constant obstacle to French kings extending their power and the <i>Parlement of Paris</i> was a particular thorn in the side of French monarchs. Clashes with Francis I occurred in 1516 over the Concordat of Bologna (only registering the treaty two years later), in 1523 over Bourbon's trial (Francis seized disputed land before <i>parlement</i> had reached a verdict), and in 1525 over royal fiscal and religious policies (<i>parlement</i> submitted remonstrances accusing the king of protecting heretics) but was finally brought to heel in 1527.</p> <p>The Breton estates laid down four demands to the king to respect their rights and privileges before agreeing to a union with France in 1532 and Rouen was particularly awkward delaying the registration of edicts and showing reluctance to act against heretics. Francis invoked <i>lits de justice</i> to overturn unfavourable judgements, and Henry II created new courts (e.g. <i>Chambre Ardente</i>) to weaken <i>parlements'</i> authority but the <i>parlements</i> in 1552 objected to the establishment of <i>présidiaux</i>. Between 1560 and 1598 many provincial <i>parlements</i> applied laws indiscriminately against royal orders, especially in respect of religious toleration, as Charles IX discovered in 1565. The older provinces – the <i>pays d'états</i> - resisted new taxes in 1522-24 and 1542-44, and consistently refused to let <i>élus</i> collect crown taxes in their lands. Thus Languedoc, Provence, Burgundy and Dauphiné estates resisted Sully's attempts to remove their fiscal and political privileges. As a result, royal attempts at establishing a more centralised fiscal administration were frustrated.</p> <p>Noble families also exercised their power and patronage in the provinces, often to the detriment of the crown. As royal governors, law enforcers, administrators and councillors, most served the state very loyally but a minority flouted the king's justice, lined their pockets and disobeyed the crown, most obviously during the years from 1562 to 1594, when the monarchy was weak and the country divided.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that factors other than the provinces were more important obstacles to the growth of royal power. For example, the poor condition of the royal finances</p>	60	<p>This question concerns the factors that limited the power of French kings and a comparison of the importance of the provinces with other factors, such as royal finances, administration, the role of religion, the personality and ability of rulers. Some candidates may treat the <i>Paris Parlement</i> as a distinctive element rather than as a 'provincial' factor.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
14	<p>weakened most administrations. A slow, corrupt and inefficient system handicapped the crown, and inadequate revenue and excessive expenditure restricted its ability to raise troops to fight wars abroad or maintain peace and stability at home. Sources of revenue were often inadequate to meet the crown's requirements; debts were a feature of all administrations; and the system of tax assessment, administration and collection, remained largely unreformed in the period. As a consequence, French kings had limited finances with which to reward their subjects and distribute patronage.</p> <p>Calvinism might also be considered: it tested the monarch's coronation oath to protect the Christian church and raised doubts about the kings' authority when they failed to deal with it effectively. The personality and ability of French rulers especially after 1559 might also be considered.</p> <p>'Francis I had a better relationship with the nobility than any other French king.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1498 to 1610?</p> <p>Francis was a strong monarch who stood up to the quasi-independent power exercised by some nobles, for which he earned the respect of the majority. His treatment of Charles, Duke of Bourbon, and Baron de Semblançay may be cited. He continued to appoint aristocrats and nobles as governors, councillors and generals, and most served France and the king loyally and competently. He consulted nobles in the 1527 Assembly of Notables and made no attempt to force direct taxation upon them or interfere with their customary privileges. However, some noble families, such as the Montmorencys and Bourbons, sought to advance Huguenot beliefs and candidates might conclude that Francis stored up trouble after 1547 and with the Guises in particular. Much of Francis's reign was devoted to war and to campaigning in Italy. Success at Marignano in 1515 at the beginning of his reign won him the support of many younger nobles who were duly rewarded, and the many years spent at war enabled the military ambitions of the nobility to be realised. He created 183 titles of nobility, though most were sold by the state, and rewarded those nobles who were supportive during his imprisonment in Madrid in 1526. Thus on the king's return, Chabot was made Admiral and Montmorency became Grand Master of the Household. Under Francis the royal court expanded and nobles were encouraged to join him as he progressed around the country dispensing patronage.</p> <p>Francis I is likely to be compared with Louis XII, Henry II and Henry IV in particular, and</p>	60	Candidates should seek to compare Francis I with other French kings in managing their relationship with the nobility. Some candidates may present a chronological review of the period; others might compare and assess Francis directly with other rulers, especially Louis XII, Henry II and Henry IV.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
15	<p>less likely with Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III. Louis XII was a successful king who used and rewarded his nobles accordingly. None challenged his authority and most served him loyally. Henry II in contrast allowed aristocratic rivalries to surface politically and religiously, and his limited success in fighting the Italian Wars and ultimate state bankruptcy made the crown vulnerable to French noble ambitions. His Valois successors struggled to manage the nobility who surpassed the crown in respect of their military and financial resources. But even under Henry IV the nobility presented problems that were not effectively solved. Many resented his attempt to recover alienated crown lands, opposed his support for Huguenotism and questioned his legitimacy to be king of France e.g. the Biron conspiracy, and the Bouillon and Auvergne rebellions.</p> <p>Between 1559 and 1589 disaffected princes of the blood became the focal point of ambitious nobles and relations between the crown and its regents, especially Catherine de Medici, became particularly strained. Henry III further alienated the greater nobility by restricting their access to him at court and he only went on four progresses to French towns in the course of his reign (cf. 108 by Charles IX).</p> <p>Assess the reasons why financial and economic problems in France were difficult to solve in the period from 1498 to 1610.</p> <p>In finance, the main problems were: an inefficient and unequal tax system, widespread use of tax farming that resulted in most revenue failing to reach the Treasury and thus insufficient revenue to meet the crown's requirements. Little attempt was made to reform the basic system - the clergy and nobles remained exempt from direct taxation – and although Francis I tried to centralise the administration, tax farming continued as it was a guaranteed if imperfect method of collection. Short term expedients especially high-interest foreign loans became the customary solution to systemic problems, and the burden of any new taxes fell on the third estate which was least able to pay them. Corruption, nepotism and simony were embedded abuses, and representative bodies, such as provincial <i>parlements</i>, estates and the Estates General were resistant to fundamental reforms. Long periods of foreign warfare further disrupted fiscal administration and increased crown debts, and intrinsic financial problems such as price inflation were exacerbated by over-indulgent court expenditure and royal patronage. Only Henry IV tackled the basic issues: he cancelled royal debts, raised revenue through new taxes such as the Paulette, negotiated foreign loans and cut down on court expenses.</p>	60	<p>Most candidates are likely to focus on the problems concerning royal finances in this period but better responses should assess the way wider economic problems facing France and French governments were managed in trade, commerce, industry, agriculture and transport, and identify synoptic links between them.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
16	<p>In trade the main problem was trying to get the middle class office-holders and nobles to invest their wealth in commerce and industry when there was more money to be made in government stocks, bonds and pensions. Trade for much of the period was dominated by foreign merchants who received preferential conditions and whose profits tended to leave the country rather than be re-invested in the French economy. Industry relied heavily on cloth production but the quality of wool was inferior to that of Spain and England and foreign imports were generally preferred for luxuries. There was little real progress until Sully's administration (1598-1611) when private investors began to support state initiatives such as the silk and textile industries.</p> <p>Agriculture remained depressed for much of the period. The nobility and clergy showed little interest in developing new farming techniques, and many landowners preferred to hunt over their fields. The peasantry as a result stayed largely subsistence and tenant farmers. A rising population in the first half of the period put pressure on crop production and led to land reclamation schemes, a restriction on pastoral farming and a rise in food prices, which added to the economic problems.</p> <p>Transport saw few changes until Henry IV's reign. Local and regional opposition to a more unitary system saw roads, canals and rivers burdened with tolls that increased costs and slowed down the movement of goods. All of these problems were adversely affected by the outbreak of civil war in 1562. Merchants were less inclined to invest or travel round the country, lands were destroyed and traditional centres of commerce e.g. Lyon were unable to hold their fairs or do as much business.</p> <p>Assess which minister of state was most responsible for the development of absolute monarchy in France in the period from 1610 to 1715.</p> <p>Some candidates will argue in favour of Richelieu. His contemporaries, 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 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</p>	60	Candidates are likely to focus on the contributions of Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert, who appear in the Specification. Though each made a distinctive contribution, and comparisons will not be exact, it is important that candidates tie the work and legacy of ministers to the concept of absolute

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
17	<p>Estates General ever met.</p> <p>However, a counter argument is that Richelieu's successes flattered to deceive, 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 actually developed as a result of civil war.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Some candidates might argue that no minister succeeded in effectively curtailing the authority of provincial governors, regional estates and the <i>parlements</i>, all of whom obstructed royal edicts, and that absolute monarchy remained a myth. Towns and cities, like Marseilles, protected their chartered customs and privileges, nobles resisted attempts to extend taxation to their estates and remained potentially independent, and seigneurial and church courts impeded the establishment of a uniform legal system.</p> <p>Assess which religious issue most hindered the development of France in the period from 1610 to 1715.</p>	60	<p>monarchy as it developed in 17th century France. Exactly how policies of ministers helped or hindered the development of absolute monarchy could be the key to a good answer.</p> <p>Candidates should examine a number of religious issues to determine how far they</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>The main religious issues likely to be discussed are: Gallicanism, from <i>dévots</i> who questioned Richelieu's policies to political and clerical groups who pressured Louis XIV into defending French liberties in the Four Gallican Articles of 1682. Louis XIV was less effective because he used his claim to the <i>régale</i> for financial and political gain before abandoning it in the face of papal and Jesuit pressure. Candidates could refer to the Paris <i>parlement's</i> fierce defence against Ultramontanism, especially in the wake of Unigenitus (1713-15). This issue divided the country politically, legally and religiously.</p> <p>The government's relations with the Papacy and Jesuits often caused tension. Louis XIII and Richelieu managed relations well, supporting the Jesuits and endorsing monastic and lay orders and a popular religious revival. Urban VIII was more critical of Richelieu's foreign policy and war against the Habsburgs, a view repeated at Westphalia when the Papacy was largely ignored by Mazarin and other statesmen. Louis XIV, however, was less consistent. He opposed papal authority in France in 1681-82 but requested papal support to deal with Jansenism and Quietism, thereby compromising the authority of the French Church and angering Gallicans and the Paris <i>parlement</i>.</p> <p>Most candidates are likely to assess the Huguenots and might contrast Richelieu's statesmanship at Alais with Louis XIV's reckless Revocation of Nantes that arguably damaged France's economy and international reputation. The Huguenots were a problem in an age that rejected toleration or coexistence but better essays could usefully assess how far Louis XIV solved the problem by 1715.</p> <p>Jansenism became a serious issue and embarrassed the government in Louis XIV's reign, partly because support grew among influential Catholics but also because the king mishandled the problem. Richelieu had imprisoned its leaders and censored its ideas but Mazarin unwisely requested papal condemnation of the Five Propositions in 1653 which opened up Gallican issues. Louis XIV denounced nuns at Port Royale for their views, retracted allegations in 1668, only to re-open the debate in 1713 when he requested papal condemnation of Quesnel's <i>Reflexions</i>. The Jansenist movement survived Louis' final assault in spite of papal and royal condemnation.</p> <p>Some candidates might examine Richerism and Quietism. Richelieu forced the abbot Richer in 1629 to recant his views that <i>curés</i> should possess more authority than bishops but the ideas survived and many <i>curés</i> went on to support Jansenism. Louis XIV's view of</p>		<p>hindered the development of France. Some essays may assess the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV consecutively; some may look at issues thematically before reaching an overall judgement. Candidates may conclude that religious issues caused many difficulties and on balance hindered rather than helped the development of France.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
18	<p>Quietism and of bishop Fénelon who practised it was to disregard its unorthodoxy. But influenced by bishop Bossuet who believed it encouraged heresy, the king solicited the support of Innocent XII to condemn the mystical movement, which further angered the Gallicans. It also survived well into the 18th century.</p> <p>‘France was a greater European power in the period from 1610 to 1660 than it was from 1661 to 1715.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Candidates could contrast France’s international standing between 1610 and 1635, which had been limited to supporting Sweden and the United Provinces against the Habsburgs, obstructing the Valtelline and contesting a relatively minor dispute at Mantua-Montferrat in 1628-31, with gains made between 1648 and 1659. In 1648 France gained Metz, Toul and Verdun which secured the eastern border; the bishopric of Lorraine, most of Alsace, Rhine bridgeheads, and the Italian fortress of Pinerolo. These possessions presaged French influence in Germany, the humiliation of the Emperor and the fall of Spain. Victories by France and its allies during the Thirty Years’ War at Rocroi, Lens, Fuentarrabia and the Dunes revealed the difficulties Spain faced in holding on to its overseas empire and position as the dominant European power. By 1659 France had acquired lands in Luxemburg, Artois and towns in the Spanish Netherlands, secured the Pyrenees, and agreed to the union of Louis XIV and Maria Theresa, the Spanish Infanta, which occurred in 1660 and gave French kings a claim to the Spanish throne and empire. Louis XIII and his minister Richelieu had had few resources and serious domestic problems for much of the early period, and were defensive and prudent in their policies but Mazarin was more ambitious and during Louis XIV’s minority he and Lionne oversaw the rise of France as a major European power.</p> <p>After Mazarin’s death in 1661, Louis assumed control of foreign policy and his aims became even more ambitious and eventually less successful. War against the Dutch for religious, economic and political motives assumed priority and brought France into conflict with England. In the War of Devolution 1667-68, France acquired St Omer, Lille and Douai in the Spanish Netherlands but not Franche Comté; in the Dutch War 1672-78, France gained Franche Comté, annexed Flemish border areas and occupied Lorraine, which linked Luxemburg with Alsace and secured a valuable border buttress with Germany. Though French frontiers were extended into the Spanish Netherlands, Luxemburg and Lorraine in the 1680s, Louis had offended the major European powers, and in the 1690s</p>	60	Candidates are required to assess the relative strength of France as a European power in the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. Many responses are likely to be sequential and chronological but some candidates might approach the question thematically, perhaps organising their argument according to foreign achievements.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>the English, Dutch, Spanish, Germans and Austrians united against him. His pursuit of the Spanish throne and empire led to military defeat and bankruptcy and by 1715 Louis had lost most of his gains acquired since 1661. However, for much of the period between 1661 and 1715, France had the largest army in Europe, a competent navy, the best central administration, a strong economy and the capacity to interfere in the affairs of most other countries if it so wished. Thus, in spite of military and naval defeats at the end of the period, it was still a major international power in 1715.</p> <p>Candidates might conclude that France's standing as a European power rose and fell in the course of the whole period. In the first 20 years it was relatively weak but became steadily more powerful; whereas in the last 20 years though still strong, it was in decline. Arguably 1660-61 was a seminal moment.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2015

