

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2F The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2F The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715

Section A

0	1	With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Louis XIV's foreign policy.	[30 marks]
----------	----------	--	-------------------

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5:	Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.	25-30
L4:	Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.	19-24
L3:	Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.	13-18
L2:	The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.	7-12
L1:	The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.	1-6
	Nothing worthy of credit.	0

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- This was written during the Nine Years War and so it is influenced by these events, although at this stage (1694) the war was not yet disastrous for France in terms of military setbacks.
- The Archbishop was well-informed as he was in the royal court as a leading churchman and as the tutor to who was now Louis' heir. In this sense, the Archbishop's views will be well-founded.
- The book was written privately which indicates that the Archbishop only wanted to influence the grandson not directly offend Louis. It also suggests that this is his own private view. However it is intended to persuade the reader which means it lacks neutrality.
- Its subsequent publication at a time of peace (1699) does indicate that there were those in France who were critical of Louis' foreign policy and did not want further conflict in the anticipated crisis pending on Carlos II's death.

Content and argument

- Although *Télémachus* was written about Greek history, the content was clearly meant to be applicable to Louis.
- The Nine Years War was ruinous for France and Louis had to sue for peace soon after in 1698. Although his armies were generally victorious because of the war's impact on the French economy and Louis' finances.
- Fortune, as Fénelon wrote, played a part in this war; for example the deaths of Louvois, Louis' minister for war in 1691 and of his leading General, Luxembourg in 1695 were factors which severely weakened the war effort.
- The book was written at a time of famine in 1693–4 where perhaps 2 million people (roughly 10 percent of the population) died. This could be ascribed in part to Louis' choice to fight which "dis-peopled" the country and led to land being "uncultivated".
- The cost in terms of casualties was on a greater scale than before because of the size of Louis' armies which forced his enemies to do the same.

- Usurp what belongs to another; this could refer to the policy of Reunions, the right to appoint the Archbishop of Cologne or to seize the Palatinate although it could be claimed that Louis had claim to his ownership of each of these.

Tone and Emphasis

- The source is really an allegorical fable. Thus its style is meant to educate by language, reason and example but it is not neutral.
- The language of the source is clearly hostile to conflict. The negative reference to glory is a clear reference to Louis XIV as is “usurp what belongs to another”.
- The tone is hostile to a policy of warfare, only stressing negatives and the loss of positives.

Source B: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- The source is not what it purports to be; although allegedly published in Paris it was in fact published in London at a time when England had been in conflict with France for a year in the War of the Spanish Succession. Weaker students may assume that this completely weakens its value; stronger students may identify its value in showing the lengths that the English were willing to go to in order to attack Louis and his policy because of its perceived danger.
- The author is unknown; it can be assumed to be an apologist for the English government and so it will reflect the English view of Louis XIV’s foreign policy.

Content and argument

- The source reflects the opinions of Louis’ opponents about his policies and although it is exaggerated subsequent historians have echoed these views. It is accusing him of pursuing expansionist policies and of attempting to dominate Europe under a “universal monarchy” instancing the Spanish Netherlands (in which he had gained territories in each of his three previous wars from 1666). However the counter point could be made that seizing the Spanish Netherlands would not in itself make him a universal monarch.
- It accuses him of mounting “unjust” wars – the case of the attack on the Palatinate in 1688 could be instanced by candidates here, based on his sister-in-law’s claims, in order to launch a more general war before his enemies were ready to defeat him.
- It is accusing Louis of being unfaithful in making peace. This could be confirmed by several treaties – the relinquishing of Catalonia for example in 1697 to try to catch the bigger fish of the Spanish kingdom; however this also could be questioned in the context of the Austrian’s failure to confirm the second Partition Treaty.
- It claims Louis was “wholly” under the influence of his second wife, Madame de Maintenon. There is some truth that she had influence on policy but Louis had other advisers such as de Torcy who carried great influence on foreign policy, for example in the War of Spanish Succession.
- The seizure of territories “adjoining” France may be viewed not as an aggressive move but a defensive one; most of the territories such as Franche Comté or Lorraine were extending Louis’ borders to the natural frontiers of the Alps and the Rhine with the exception of Louis’ invasion of the Palatinate to the east of the Rhine.

- Its final point about the “troublesome English” is one for a domestic audience; England was not the major force confronting France in the Nine Years War; but English troops played a more prominent role in the War of the Spanish Succession at the two battles mentioned and the Duke of Marlborough was vitally important in later French defeats. Certainly Louis’ inability to retain England as a sympathetic power was a major blow to his foreign ambitions.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone in terms of language is clearly not balanced – for example his virtues are to “oppress” and “threaten”. Louis’ activities in the Palatinate in 1688 could be seen as oppressive and threatening as could his acceptance of Carlos’ will which would allow the Bourbons to threaten to dominate Europe.
- The emphasis as a catechism is on Louis’ religious Catholicism and implies his bigotry – this would particularly be significant to an English Protestant audience after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Louis’ religion did influence his foreign policy, but his use of the Turkish assaults on the Austrian Empire to pursue expansionist policies questions the significance of religion in his policies.
- The source is written in the form of a satire – the use of the word “catechism” indicates this as well as the description of the source. This will lead points to be exaggerated due to its form.
- The source is written as propaganda against Louis XIV’s policies. Again this will lead points to be exaggerated to encourage support within England.

Source C: In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance

- Like Source B, the source is clearly a piece of propaganda, in this case from Louis XIV, and would be heard by most Frenchmen. The vehicle for doing this, the church, would give the message extra credibility as it would be associated with religious endorsement of the plan.
- It was published in 1709 when Louis was in severe financial problems and seeking to make peace; this might suggest that Louis’ foreign policy was being determined increasingly by his financial position.

Content and argument

- Louis sought to portray his objectives to the public. It was true that he was prepared to make concessions in 1709 to make peace and that the allies failed to do so because they had their own competing claims.
- Louis’ willingness to make concessions was not due to his generosity of which he was trying to persuade the public but his weakness. He was seeking to buy time. In 1709 he had even instructed Torcy to agree to withdraw Phillip from the Spanish throne; Louis’ concessions were far less as the price of peace in 1713 when he was in a stronger position due to the divisions among his enemies.
- The “Princes of the Empire” refer to the Hapsburg claimants to the Spanish throne who would seek to maximize their “rewards” for relinquishing their claim to the throne.

- The Duke of Savoy had changed sides during the War in the hope of gaining territory from any dismemberment of the Spanish Empire. Thus Louis does not attack him as directly as an enemy, possibly in the hope of regaining his support.
- The border territories where France's enemies sought to be strong – like the Spanish Netherlands – would need to be strengthened in the light of Louis' aggressive wars – he had declared was to extend his territory in 1666, 1672 and 1688. Some justification for Louis could be achieved by the argument for defensible borders.

Tone and Emphasis

- Louis is adopting a defensive tone; his enemies are using concessions to demand more and in a famous claim Louis is gathering popular support to oppose “conditions so contrary to justice and honour of Frenchmen”.
- Louis was now 70, and knew his death could not be far away as well as the fact that his country was bankrupt and faced defeat. Thus he adopts a more moderate tone towards war and stressing his care for his people - France had sustained huge casualties in the war and had suffered a harsh winter in 1709 with 24000 people dying of cold in Paris; this suggests that Louis' foreign policy does involve the well-being of his people.
- Nevertheless, Louis is clear that it is “my” kingdom and dominions which were under threat – Louis' main concern in foreign policy is his interest.
- The emphasis is on justifying his unwillingness to make peace at any price and that right is on his and his people's side – he talks about “justice” and “honour”.

Section B

0 2 'The Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659 was the most significant event in French foreign policy between 1643 and 1661.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the Treaty had great significance might include:

- it marked the end of conflict going back at least to 1635 in a direct sense and France's entry into the Thirty Years War. These 24 years of war had nearly crippled France in terms of resources and had led to heavy taxation and were a leading cause of the Fronde
- it led to France finally securing the Pyrenees as its southern border by the acquisition of Rousillon
- a secure southern border led to customs duties being enforced more easily and limited the movement of goods and workers across the frontier
- progress towards a more secure northern border was made with the acquisition of "French Flanders"
- it led to the marriage of Louis XIV and Maria Theresa. Although its immediate significance was limited due to Louis' renunciation of his family's claims to the Spanish throne; the non-payment of the dowry invalidated the treaty and led to Bourbon hopes of Spanish territory recognised as early as 1668 in a partition treaty. This may have been a deliberate calculation on the French side
- its terms showed the weakness of Spain and encouraged Louis to plan for his next target – the Spanish Netherlands in 1667
- part of the Treaty was Louis' reacceptance into his court of the Prince of Condé; this showed the continued significance of the haut nobility in France (after all Condé had been a prominent opponent of the state in the Fronde and had taken arms against France which would usually be considered treasonable in countries such as England.) Condé was to mastermind the invasion of Franche Comté in 1667.

Arguments challenging the view that the Treaty had great significance might include:

- the treaty may have marked the end of a period of warfare but it certainly did not mark an end of war in Louis XIV's France – for the majority of Louis' reign France was to be at war and the Treaty of the Pyrenees did not provide a permanent solution to France's need for territory
- although it secured its southern border, the main issues for France lay along the northern and eastern borders to secure the River Rhine and to a lesser extent the Alps as frontiers. French Flanders was a move in the right direction but more was left to be achieved
- the marriage should not have been significant of itself; it was the non-payment of the 500,000 écus which was really significant
- Spain's weakness was already well-known; the treaty was not significant of itself
- the cost in terms of trade were not really significant.

Good students will draw attention to both kinds of points and will seek to draw a balance between them by direct comparisons, for example, that the treaty created a secure southern frontier but left the issue of the north open; the marriage was to be significant but it was Spain's inability to pay the dowry which was more significant as it showed Spain's weakness and left the door open to Bourbon claims.

- 0 3** 'The movement of the court to the Palace of Versailles in 1682 transformed Louis' relationship with the nobility in France.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the moving of the court to Versailles transformed Louis' relationship with the nobility might include:

- the movement of the court to Versailles meant that Versailles could operate as a “gilded cage” for Louis' nobility
- the court etiquette and the imposing size and grandeur of Versailles could also be mentioned as a form of propaganda and to reinforce his stature as the “Sun King”
- the need to be at Versailles to participate in government or to gain royal favours meant that aristocrats had to try to be in attendance. All the leading nobles were intended to be close to him
- plots against Louis and his government were far more difficult to organise; noblemen were kept away from their provincial bases of power
- there was no repeat of the Fronde or any significant challenge from the nobility unlike in Louis' youth.

Arguments challenging the view that the moving of the court to Versailles transformed Louis' relationship with the nobility might include:

- while the court moved to Versailles, these were only the leading nobility; even Versailles could only accommodate in itself 4000 of France's 100,000 noblemen; many noblemen bought houses in the adjoining settlement for their servants and families. This did little to increase royal authority over the provinces of France especially in the Estates General in the pays d'état which were dominated by the provincial nobility
- any transformation was temporary; almost as soon as it was built, Versailles lost its attraction to many noblemen
- Louis' relationship with the nobility was based on other things than Versailles; in a system based effectively on privilege, monarchy and the nobility were mutually dependent and so the fundamental basis of the relationship did not change. Neither wanted to see challenges to the state so the nobility supported the King in dealing with internal rebellions
- things other than Versailles did change Louis' relationship with the nobility. For example the invigoration of the intendant system gave some more control over provincial nobles; the professionalization of the army weakened noble influence over that vital institution; Louis even taxed the nobility directly with the capitaition and dixième, although these were temporary measures.

Good students will consider both views and probably will see that although Versailles had some impact on Louis' authority especially in the short term over the highest ranks of the noblesse de robe and the noblesse d'épee, its influence on the lesser nobility and churchmen and the third estate in general was much weaker. Others may recognise that if the relationship did change it could be due to other factors but that the mutual dependency of the King and nobility meant that the fundamental relationship was little altered.

0 4 'Colbert's successors as finance ministers broadly followed his economic and fiscal policies between 1699 and 1715.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Colbert's successors followed essentially similar policies might include:

- neither Colbert nor his successors changed the essential element of French finance policy, that the major burden should still fall on the third estate
- they did not oblige the first estate to pay taxes but, like Colbert, successfully put pressure on the Church to increase the don gratuit
- nevertheless, like Colbert, they continued to find ways to increase royal revenue
- they followed mercantilist policies of central intervention to an extent try to encourage trade. For example the Conseil de Commerce of 1700 was a revival of Colbert's 1664 government initiative; however the involvement of merchants in 1700 indicated a partnership, not centralised dictation as in Colbert's many regulations
- however Colbert's pattern of centralised regulation of trade and industry was not challenged, indeed regulation increased and more inspectors were appointed
- they continued to increase indirect taxes although more inventively and faster
- neither Colbert nor his successors tried to modernise France's largest industry, agriculture. Most of France was based on a subsistence peasant economy.

Arguments challenging the view that Colbert's successors followed essentially similar policies might include:

- there was little attempt to maintain Colbert's trading companies or his support for colonies, Louis sacrificed colonies in 1713 as part of the general settlement
- there was no attempt to invest in capital projects such as the Canal des deux Mers or manufactures royales
- free trade was encouraged unlike Colbert's protectionism; instead of using war to try to strangle their trading rivals, French merchants were allowed to continue to trade with Scotland and England especially during the War of Spanish Succession
- the exigencies of war created the necessity for innovation such as the dixième which did involve a direct tax on the second estate, albeit on a temporary basis
- an attempt was made to establish paper money which Colbert never did. However this was essentially a mercantilist policy
- they also introduced new indirect taxes for example on playing cards, wigs and oysters
- although they resorted to the expansion of the number of offices for sale, Colbert himself had been forced to revert to this policy after 1672 for the same reasons as Chamillart and Desmarets – the demands of war.

Better students will achieve a balanced judgement; for example they might argue that the core of the policies remained the same but the pressures of war led to some precedents; however these were seen as temporary and the essential thrust of policy remained the same; to retain the system of privilege in France and maximize the King's income. They may also distinguish between the policies of Desmarets and Chamillart and argue that one or other was closer in thrust to Colbert's policies.