

# A-LEVEL HISTORY

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

---

1041  
June 2014

---

Version 1.0 Final

---

---

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 2014

**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 reasons for the assassination of Henry IV in 1610. **[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 A reflects the personal motives of Ravailiac. He was ‘troubled’ by Henry IV’s failure. It was a ‘personal expression’ that Ravailiac ‘believed’ and ‘Ravailiac was motivated. Whereas Source B talks of a ‘wider conspiracy’, ‘few at the time believed he acted alone’. There is evidence of a Catholic conspiracy

- Source A reflects on Ravailac's pre-occupation that Henry was responsible for anti-Catholic views, 'Henry's duty was to force the Huguenots to abjure their faith', but he saw Henry's toleration of them as support. Whereas Source B claims wider issues beyond Henry's perceived religious culpability, seeking his death as a means to alter the succession of a political issue
- Source A is explicit of Henry's own failings whereas Source B does not target Henry specifically as a precipitate cause but rather a political conspiracy.

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

- Ravailac did not represent the majority Catholic view of the Edict of Nantes or of Henry's role within religious compromise. He had been rejected by the Catholic Church as a dangerous renegade; the Jesuits disassociated themselves from him. He effectively acted alone
- there is the suggestion by Greengrass that Ravailac was a dupe for a wider courtier-led aristocratic conspiracy involving the Duke of Epernon and the king's former mistress whose son by Henry would be proclaimed king on the death of Henry, thus representing the careful balancing act that Henry continually negotiated in order to maintain religious and political authority both domestically and internationally.

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

- both sources seem to suggest that Ravailac's decision to assassinate Henry was based on the king's own failings as a perceived true Catholic. Source A refers to his inability to forget the recent past whilst citing a sequence of important dates, whilst Source B contends that Henry failed to control Huguenot excesses and planned war against the pope; clearly both suggest Henry was pro-Huguenot
- they both reveal that tensions and religious differences remained within French society despite the Edict of Nantes.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that the sources, whilst they offer differences in terms of involvement and reasons for Ravailac's actions also reveal the religious and political climate in which these differences are placed.

**Question 1**

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

How successful was the Edict of Nantes in resolving religious differences in France between 1598 and 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** strongly suggests that Ravailiac’s dissatisfaction was based on his views, citing Henry’s failings, exploitation by Huguenots of perceived already generous concessions and the need to deal effectively and harshly with the Huguenots and even Henry who is seen as making war on the Pope and both rejecting his Catholic credentials and undermining the legitimacy of his rule.
- **Source B** contends that Ravailiac’s actions were, despite his claim ‘I acted alone...’, representative of widespread religious differences, and there was evidence of Catholic conspiracy to destabilise the state based on dissatisfaction with the terms of the Edict. There is the contention that despite his confession that he acted alone the speculation there was a dynastic conspiracy against Henry and the line of succession but there are no explicitly stated links to religious differences.
- **Source C** attempts to offer a clear assertion that the Edict was never intended to represent a solution to the religious divisions in France, certainly not a permanent settlement of religious toleration or of a Huguenot ‘state within a state’. If anything it offers a perception of Henry’s unwillingness to intervene in transgressions of the Edict and reveals that many of the Edict’s concessions were undermined well before Ravailiac’s actions and were dependent upon the personal protection of the king. Religious stability as a consequently remained tenuous.

From students’ own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that the Edict of Nantes was successful in resolving religious difficulties in France might include:

- an end to the Wars of Religion
- the slow disintegration of the Catholic League
- the Edict offered a raft of concessions and brevets to the Huguenots
- Huguenots were able to access the professions and membership of the Long Robe as outlined in Clause 27
- Catholics were forbidden to persecute or marginalise Huguenots within the terms of the Edict
- compensation was to be paid and restitution made to Catholic Churches desecrated by Huguenot iconoclasm. Both sides could claim advantages
- the Catholic Church and the Jesuits were able to disengage themselves from the more extreme elements of the radicals and fanatics such as Ravailiac.



---

Factors suggesting that the Edict of Nantes was not successful in resolving religious differences in France might include:

- Henry's abjuration and subsequent conversion left many Huguenots disaffected whilst similarly many Catholics felt Henry's conversion was nothing more than cynical political posturing. The Edict did little to reconcile the sectarian extremes. In 1605 there was an outbreak of sectarian violence in Paris and fears of another St Bartholomew's Day massacre
- there remained suspicion over the so called 'secret' articles
- the brevets ensured they remained judicially distinct from the rest of the pacification, issued as private letters from the king under his privy seal rather than under the great seal of the chancery – the king's personal promises to the Huguenots rather than acts of state. The stability was based firmly in the hands of Henry
- whilst this gave the Huguenots a guarantee of royal protection with the death of the king, this would change
- despite the concessions, the brevets, the secret clauses and the personal protection of the king, the Huguenots remained an estate on the margins and confines of traditional French society
- Henry's actions seemed to confirm Protestantism as a marginal religion by placing their churches on the outskirts of French towns
- religious stability remained tenuous within French society. The assassination of Henry left the Huguenots, whose security had been based on the whim of that king, seriously jeopardised by the actions of a Catholic fanatic who could not come to terms with the actions of the king and his inability to forget the recent past
- this action revealed Henry's failure to achieve religious stability.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the Edict was as much a political means to an end as a religious one; nevertheless it brought years of sectarian and bloody civil war to an end. Whilst never designed to seek religious unity it did optimistically offer peaceful co-existence and toleration offering an opportunity to promote stability. Ravaillac's actions represent those of a religious fanatic whom the majority of Catholics and the Catholic Church repudiated. Religious stability remained illusive for Henry IV and Sources A and C make this clear.

**Question 2**

**03** Explain why French Crown was in debt in 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 France was in debt in 1598.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the cost of years of the Wars of Religion and the war against Spain
- the corruption inherent in the collection and administration of direct taxes such as the *taille* at local level was endemic
- tax farming was inefficient and open to abuse tax farmers often provided money to the banks in advance based on estimates that often fell short
- Italian banks gave loans which had to be repaid.

*OR* Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- there was already debt in excess of 200 000 million livres when Henry became king; income was approx. 30 million livres a year, a consequence of the Wars of Religion.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- the Wars of Religion meant that some taxes were not regularly collected whilst expenditure on war was increasing.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might emphasise the context of war which had reduced income for the Crown extensively. Combined with existing debt both foreign and domestic and a systemic failure to collect taxes, corruption and incompetency in administration made the situation perilous.

**Question 2**

- 04** 'The improvement in communications made by Sully was the most important factor in the economic reconstruction of France in the years 1599 to 1610.'  
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 given against that which does not.

---

Evidence which agrees might include:

- Sully was responsible for infrastructure: roads, canals, bridges and the planning of towns and the relocation of new income generating industries such as the silk and tapestry industries
- he promoted the means to facilitate trade through better communications making long distance trade more profitable whilst also revising tolls
- in order to promote and finance communications Sully needed to increase revenues for inward investment
- Paris became an economic hub where communications, investment and entrepreneurialism came together
- by 1605 there were 3.4 million livres in reserve, rising to 7 million by 1607 and 11/15 million by 1610 used to finance the construction programmes required to transport goods
- infrastructure benefitted from renewed investment – a direct consequence of financial policies.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- it is argued that economic reconstruction was already happening before Sully was appointed and that he capitalised on this trend
- he was lucky that both the Wars of Religion and the Spanish war came to an end at an equally vital time and that income was to benefit from this
- resolved debt by withholding payments and reduced repayments
- Sully supervised royal expenditure in order to create revenues to strengthen the economy
- gained control of finances, departments by keeping meticulous records/accounts
- improved collection and administration of taxes and introduced new indirect taxes
- paulette 1604 provided regular income from office holders.
- reform of tax farming/corruption investigated
- Sully's financial policies were vital to economic reconstruction, especially the transfer of taxation from the Third estate to the more privileged orders.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Sully's reforms were essential and a significant factor in economic reconstruction, e.g. the means to transport goods efficiently, cheaply whilst providing new industries and locations in areas previously inaccessible. Nevertheless, investment and increased revenues enabled such programmes to be realised; roads, canals, bridges, the Reconstruction of Paris are a consequence of his work as Superintendent of finances not just his reforms.

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why, in 1589, Henry IV was concerned about foreign relations. **[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, in 1589, Henry IV was concerned about foreign relations.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- difficulties of Henry's accession, religion, rivalries linked to long legacy of domestic strife
- some neighbouring states like Savoy took territories such as Provence and fear of Spanish invasion into France from Netherlands in 1590
- divisions between Catholic League and Huguenots.

OR Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- France was effectively encircled by territories sympathetic to the Habsburgs
- finance remained a serious problem, troops were difficult to raise.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- Henry needed a secure relationship with the papacy for dynastic purposes.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might conclude that Henry needed good relations with both Catholic and Protestant states given the internal divisions within France. This was a difficult balancing act to achieve, compounded by serious financial constraints whilst Henry of Navarre was by no means secure on the throne.

**Question 3**

- 06** 'The main motive behind Henry IV's foreign policy was the maintenance of peace in Europe.'  
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 that supports the view given against that which does not.



---

Factors which agree might include:

- Henry's foreign policy was based on peace with Spain and Habsburg powers, especially out of a sense of war weariness and expense
- the need to defend the frontiers from the fear of encirclement and the threat of future war. By 1601 there was a delicate peace on the borders
- Henry sought alliances with both Catholic and Protestant states to secure peace and a lasting *detente* with Spain
- diplomatic relations with smaller states were followed in order to reduce the threat posed by Spain and help maintain peace and secure peace in Europe
- the Treaty of Vervins in 1598 brought peace with Spain for the rest of Henry's reign
- Henry's aims for peace in Europe assumed a French responsibility within a *Pax Gallicana*.

Factors which disagree might include:

- events proved by 1610 that Henry was fully committed to war, a consequence of the Cleves Jülich affair
- had Henry lived, the sequence of events would have resulted in war, underlining France's determination to be Europe's arbiter through a stronger assertion of French influence pursued through war
- the so called 'Grand Design', traditionally reflecting Henry's role for France as the leader of a 'United Nations' of European states, in a sense provoked potential future conflict
- the modern view that traditionally the Grand Design was about peace is false; the motives and purpose of French foreign policy was commitment to war.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Henry's foreign policy whilst not the product of a traditional Grand Design remained committed to peace and a strong France, 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 collapse and eventually dynastic necessity. It is possible to contend that Henry's foreign policy ironically relied on warlike posturing in order to secure continual peace by establishing French power in Europe.

### 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)