

AS-LEVEL

# History

Unit HIS2C: The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

Mark scheme

---

1041

June 2015

---

Version V1: Final Mark Scheme

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

---

## Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

---

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

---

**Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level**

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2015

**GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change**

**HIS2C: The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610**

**Question 1**

**01** Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the reign of Henry IV in France. **[12 marks]**

*Target: AO2(a)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**

**L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**

**L4:** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

**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 levels scheme.**

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source B is positive about Henry IV as the source of positive change in France; Source A merely thinks he is 'lucky' and that improvements were mainly the result of economic circumstances
- Source B suggests absolute improvement ('By 1610, the King was obeyed by all, the treasury had a surplus and the civil wars were successfully terminated') while Source A

---

suggests that '[Henry] succeeded more in disguising the weaknesses of the Crown than in effectively reforming its administrative and financial machinery'

- students could also make contrast between Source A's reference to this being a reign of 'compromise' which brought renewed prestige to France, as opposed to Source B's reference to the uncompromising behaviour of the monarch whose word had to be obeyed – not simply respected.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- the pacification of the nobility and factions and extent of royal authority (perhaps with reference to the importance of Henry's acceptance of Catholicism)
- circumstances favouring economic recovery in aftermath of war and the degree of financial recovery
- characteristics of the 'Golden Age'.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both sources acknowledge Henry's personality as playing a part in revival: Source B 'Henry's personal qualities played an important part'; Source A – 'undoubtedly a vivacious and effective leader'
- both acknowledge a revival took place: Source B 'restoration of French Royal authority after almost 40 years of powerlessness and humiliation'; Source A 'a golden age in France'.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that whilst France appeared to enjoy a 'golden age', below the surface there were underlying problems which Henry failed to solve – or possibly made worse. Such an approach would help to reconcile the sources, showing them both to be accurate overviews, but looking at the reign from different angles.

**Question 1**

**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far did Henry IV succeed in restoring stability to France in the years 1598 to 1610?

**[24 marks]**

*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit.

**0**

**L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

**L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

**L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

**L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

**L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

## 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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** This suggests that Henry succeeded 'more in disguising the weaknesses of the Crown than in effectively reforming its administrative and financial machinery'.
- **Source B:** This believes that Henry's personal qualities were important for the restoration of French royal authority and points out that by 1610, the King was obeyed by all, the treasury had a surplus and the civil wars were successfully ended.
- **Source C:** This claims that Henry IV could not eliminate the forces of instability in France. but that he established a political consensus and kept opposition forces at bay. This speaks of 'a new confidence to contain instability'. The hierarchy was strengthened and contentious issues which divided social groups in France were avoided.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting Henry IV succeed in restoring stability to France in the years 1598 to 1610 might include:

- the significance of the death of Cardinal Bourbon in 1590 and Henry IV's conversion to Catholicism in 1593
- the importance of the Treaty of Vervins and Edict of Nantes 1598
- the use of the chambres mi-parties and garrison towns
- the use of bribes and territorial concessions to win over the nobility; the sale of offices
- the reduction of debt and restoration of royal finances under Sully; taxation and the elus
- the quelling of rebellion (Croquants/Biron revolt)
- the renewed strength of the military/artillery.

Factors suggesting Henry IV failed to restore stability to France in the years 1598 to 1610 might include:

- the continuing dissatisfaction of Huguenots and other opposition groups
- the limitations to financial reform and problems of venality
- the over-reliance on repression and creating royal absolutism so preventing constitutional development and masking problems.

Good answers are likely to conclude that whilst Henry IV's reign has been praised for the restoration of stability, this was largely because of the problems left by the Wars of Religion. Henry certainly left a far more stable France than he had inherited, but much of the stability relied on enforcing inequality and ignoring problems.



**Question 2**

**03** Explain why the economic recovery of most French towns was slow before 1598.

**[12 marks]**

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit.

**0**

**L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

**L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

**L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised.

**10-12**

**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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the economic recovery of most French towns was slow before 1598.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the wars of religion hampered recovery before 1598
- lack of investment in conflict areas
- some became victims of plague and famine
- elite control of some towns meant government attempts at reform often failed
- towns were often victims of inflation and corruption.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might emphasise the longer term reasons such as the Wars of Religion and the Leaguer Wars and their impact up to 1598 on the countryside and urban centres, links between

agriculture and trade, industry and commerce. Shorter-term reasons, famine and plague and elite political influences and government involvement.

**Question 2**

**04** ‘Sully’s main contribution to economic recovery in France was the development of transport systems.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[24 marks]**

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit.

**0**

**L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

**L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

**L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

**L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

**L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

**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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view that Sully’s main contribution to economic recovery in France was the development of transport systems against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- as grand voyer Sully extensively promoted an infrastructure which facilitated the funding of improvements oversaw both the construction and re-construction of bridges and waterways: canals and navigable river systems to facilitate the movement of raw materials and manufactured goods across France
- finances were strengthened and currency stabilized after years of decline to fund new transport systems
- he tried to encourage nobles into trade and capital investment in transport systems
- he similarly encouraged and supported merchant guilds and corporations in the new centres of industry
- advocate of the protection of domestic industries improved as a consequence of improved transport
- his time in office saw the establishment of powerful technocrats, civil engineers, cartographers, drainage specialists and surveyors
- infrastructure benefited from renewed investment a direct consequence of financial policies
- the relocation of industry and the creation of new ones as a direct consequence of improved transport system.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- Sully's financial policies as Superintendent of Finances were vital to economic reconstruction
- invented new methods of tax collection and administration of both direct and indirect taxes
- Paulette 1604 provided regular income from office holders
- reduced national debt and foreign debts were often simply written off
- payments of pensions and debts owed to officials and nobles were held off as long as possible
- revenues were reinvested in the economy through civic schemes such as the reconstruction of Paris, investment in changing industries from the traditional to the more entrepreneurial
- the relocation of industry and the creation of new ones
- infrastructure benefited from renewed investment a direct consequence of financial policies.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Sully's success in economic restoration was accomplished through his abilities as grand voyer in promoting improved transport systems, whilst equally it was his financial policies as Superintendent of Finances which were the most significant. Both are however important: in the reconstruction. Transport systems were vital to the economic reconstruction of France but equally economic reconstruction was a consequence of a combination of peace, coincidental economic improvement, other policies of Sully and the support that he received from Henry IV.

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why the Habsburgs posed a threat to Henry IV. **[12 marks]**

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

**L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

**L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Habsburgs posed a threat to Henry IV.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the Habsburgs did not recognise him as the rightful king after his conversion
- their support for the Guise and Catholic Leagues underlined the threat Henry faced domestically and internationally
- Spanish domination of the balance of power in Europe brought inevitable conflict which was historically unresolved
- France was effectively surrounded by Habsburg territories
- control of some sovereign territory such as Navarre further strengthened the threat to Henry.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might conclude that Henry was endangered by the seriousness of the threat posed by Habsburg imperialism domestically and internationally even the collapse of the Catholic League

after 1595 the Spanish maintained an army of 60,000 soldiers in Flanders and powerful Spanish supported nobles such as Charles Emmanuel and Lorraine remained a serious threat.

**Question 3**

- 06** 'In the years 1601 to 1610, Henry IV's diplomacy brought peace to France's frontiers.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **[24 marks]**

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

**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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree or disagree with the view that in the years 1601 to 1610, Henry IV's diplomacy brought peace to France's frontiers.

Factors which agree might include:

- Henry's diplomacy in foreign policy from 1601 was based on maintaining peace with Spain out of a sense of war weariness and financial necessity and led to a delicate peace on France's borders
- by 1609 real rapprochement had been secured through a combination of alliances and treaties which tied many of the smaller states, such as Lorraine, Savoy, Alsace and Franche Comte with France, in order to reduce the threat from Spain
- Henry's aims for peace in Europe assumed a French responsibility and became *Pax Gallicana* a clear attempt to safeguard the frontiers through French efforts to create a 'united nations' from which the Habsburgs would be excluded
- Henry was equally driven by a sense of religious caution and sought through diplomacy alliances with both Catholic and Protestant states to secure peace both on and beyond the frontiers and a lasting *detente* with Spain
- whilst Henry's assassination precluded any lurch to further war the position in 1610 was one of peace on the frontiers, given their extensive nature, geographically, politically and strategically.

Factors which disagree might include:

- France's frontiers were potentially threatened internally by external attempts to ferment domestic rebellion, such as Savoy's encouragement of Biron and Bullion to rise in revolt against Henry IV
- despite concerted efforts at *detente* with Spain in order to avoid France's isolation and vulnerability against Habsburg power in Europe France's diplomats found it difficult to make headway against Spanish influence in Northern Italy, the Spanish road
- control of the strategically important passes caused friction and uprisings which remained unresolved by 1607
- Cleves-Jülich became an issue by 1609
- events by late 1609 revealed the illusory nature of genuine peace on France's frontiers, and by May 1610 an army of 50,000 was prepared to invade the duchy backed up by further diplomatic activity to secure the support of Savoy to attack Milan with French assistance later in 1610
- by 1610 Henry IV's diplomacy had failed to maintain and secure genuine peace and events showed he was fully committed to war. Events revealed that diplomacy was illusory.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Henry's diplomacy sought to achieve peace and security for France along its frontiers within the period 1601 and 1610. A policy which was often a reaction to events rather than a planned coherent strategy with clear long term aims. Peace was vital after years of war, political and religious internal divisions, economic considerations and dynastic necessity. Certainly the Treaty of Vervins lacked the diplomatic clout to sustain genuine peace on France's frontiers, which events by 1610 revealed.

### Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

**UMS conversion calculator:** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)