

**GCE**

**History A**

Unit **F966/01**: Historical Themes

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2016**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

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

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

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	<p><b>'The impact of the Crown's continental possessions on English central government was most significant from the reign of Henry I.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the period from 1066 to 1216?</b></p> <p>The continental possessions of the crown had two effects on English central government which underlay much of its development in the period: the need to develop a long term system of government which could deal with the effects of absentee kingship, allowing government to function effectively in the prolonged absences of the king, and also a need to control and exploit royal finances in order to have the resources available to deal with the increasingly complex administrative system and to meet the increasing costs of warfare needed to maintain those possessions. Both of these could be said to date from the reign of Henry I who conquered Normandy from Robert in 1106. Under Henry, Roger of Salisbury's role developed in importance, a prototype of the chief justiciars of the Angevin period and the key to the effective functioning of government with an absentee king. Henry's reign also saw the development of the Exchequer, with the first extant Pipe Rolls dating from 1129. Sheriffs rendering regular account at the Exchequer ensured increased royal control over both them and finances. Moreover, there was increasing control over justice, at least in part to maximise its profits, with the use of eyres and local justiciars. In all, this represented much more royal control over the localities.</p> <p>To reach the higher bands, candidates need to assess other possible turning points and compare the importance of the developments under Henry I with these. Some may argue that the real turning point came in William II's reign with his acquiring Normandy as a mortgage in 1096. Ranulf Flambard's role could be seen as the forerunner of that of chief justiciar, and his work in investigating the king's finances and overseeing their efficient collection could be seen to foreshadow the role of the Exchequer. Some may wish to argue that the main turning point came under Henry II with the acquisition of the Angevin lands, a large empire with large costs. This prompted the growth of government centralisation and of rigorous royal justice. The chief justiciar developed into a great officer of state who ran the country in the king's absence and controlled the Exchequer; the standardised royal writ and the possessory assizes developed to increase the effectiveness and thus the profits of royal justice. Inquests of sheriffs ensured tighter royal control over royal officials, including over their financial work. Some candidates may feel that the main turning point lay early in the period in the reign of William I, when possession of continental lands led to the importing of some continental ideas, particularly the growth of feudalism which remained, in some form, throughout the period. Others may see the main turning point in John's reign with the loss of the continental lands and the tensions created by the attempts to win them back, resulting in high taxation and, eventually, rebellion and the overthrow of much of the Angevin system of government.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p>



Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	<p><b>‘Characterised by conflict.’ How far do you agree with this view of the relations between archbishops of Canterbury and York in the period from 1066 to 1216?</b></p> <p>Only Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton are mentioned in the specification and candidates will not be penalised for confining their answers to these. However, appropriate reference to other archbishops should be rewarded. Periods of conflict between archbishops of Canterbury and York occur across much of the period and this would tend to lend substance to the idea that it characterised their relationship. There was no permanent resolution of the primacy issue which thus remained a bone of contention on both sides. Furthermore, papal intervention could, at any time, fuel the acrimony between the two archbishops. William I and Lanfranc had wanted the subordination of York to Canterbury but had failed to achieve this. Thus trouble could flare up, for example in 1115 when Thurstan of York refused to profess obedience to Canterbury. In Stephen’s reign, Henry of Blois , Bishop of Winchester, was made papal legate thus reducing Canterbury’s authority and so arguably making more difficult its relations with York. During the Becket controversy, relations were especially bad: papal intervention gave York privileges exempting him from Canterbury’s jurisdiction, Henry II had the Young Henry crowned by York instead of Canterbury, thus very publicly undermining Canterbury’s traditional position, and Becket’s publication of papal bulls suspending York made the whole situation much worse.</p> <p>However, the period was not one of consistent conflict. For much of Lanfranc’s time as archbishop relations with York were peaceful; York recognised Lanfranc’s personal supremacy in 1072 which took the heat out of the debate for the time being. In 1125, papal granting of legatine authority to the archbishop of Canterbury gave him superiority over York, even though the primacy issue was not solved. Moreover, there were periods when one or other archbishop had other things to worry about and so was not in conflict with the other. Anselm, for example, was more exercised about trying to resolve his difficulties with the king over lay investiture than in arguing with York. In Stephen’s reign, problems over appointing a successor to Thurstan led to a schism in York, so undermining the authority of the archbishop there and so reducing any likelihood of conflict with Canterbury. Langton’s problems were with John and Pope Innocent III rather than York. Indeed, being unable to enter England and later being suspended from office made conflict with York very unlikely and anyway, by this time, both archbishops’ attention was more focused on their own diocesan authority.</p> <p>The best answers will probably assess whether the bursts of conflict were more characteristic of the period than times when there was not conflict.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	<p><b>How important was the growing power of the Church in determining relations between kings and their archbishops of Canterbury in the period from 1066 to 1216?</b></p> <p>Only Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton are mentioned in the specification and candidates will not be penalised for confining their answers to these. However, appropriate reference to other archbishops should be rewarded. The growing power of the church lay at the base of relations between church and state in the period. It enabled popes and archbishops to feel justified in standing up for ecclesiastical rights, even newly expressed ones, in the face of traditional royal prerogative, in order to free the church of all vestiges of royal control. Examples of this influencing relations between kings and archbishops are seen through much of the period. Anselm's exile gave him the opportunity to experience the full force of the investiture contest so that when he came back he was determined to uphold the cause of church reform in the face of Henry I's traditional rights. Becket's refusal to accept the trial of criminous clerks in royal courts, which undermined Henry II's insistence on the just punishment of clergy and which destroyed any hope of good relations between them, stemmed from his determination to take a stand on the separation of ecclesiastical justice in line with the current trend in the church. Innocent III felt secure enough and powerful enough after such a long period of church reform to dictate to kings and ride roughshod over their traditional rights: hence his determination to insist on an archbishop elected in line with his ideals of church reform which led to John's refusal to accept Langton or even to allow him into the kingdom.</p> <p>However, the growing power of the church did not always sour relations and candidates may conclude that personality played a part in determining them. William and Lanfranc saw the advantage of working together for church reform and the furtherance of the establishment of Norman rule. Rather than allow their relationship to be damaged by the growing power of the church they refused to pander to it, Lanfranc refusing the papal summons to Rome and William refusing to be a papal vassal. Anselm wished to follow the principles of church reform once he had been exposed to them, but both he and Henry I were prepared to reach a compromise in the Compromise of Bec by which Henry gave up the right to invest with the ring and the staff . Further substance could be given to personality as a factor by the example of Anselm and William II. Their relationship was poor for reasons that had nothing to do with the power of the church, including the quality of the Canterbury knights supplied by Anselm, taxation or the question of the recognition of the pope. Other examples could be the good working relationship between Hubert Walter and Richard or Henry II's good relations with archbishops before and after Becket. Some candidates may wish to argue that principle was the main factor determining relations: whereas Anselm and Henry I and Becket and Henry II could be said to be standing up for their respective principles of upholding the cause of church reform or that of traditional royal rights, Lanfranc and Walter were arguably upholding their principles of the importance of working with the king and seeing themselves as servants of the state as well as the church. The best answers are likely to assess the importance of the growing power of the church in the light of other possible reasons for changing relations and reach a supported conclusion.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	<p><b>‘Political faction was a more important cause of rebellion than religious change in Tudor England.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b></p> <p>Candidates are required to consider the relative importance of political faction and religious change as a cause of rebellion in England. Rebellions that occurred in Ireland are not relevant in this question. Some essays are likely to support the premise, others will disagree but candidates are not expected to consider causes other than political factions and religious changes unless they throw light on these issues. Thus, a discussion of economic and social causes is unlikely to be relevant. They can be expected to determine the ways in which political factions were more important than religious change as a cause of rebellion. It may be argued, for example, that attempts to change the political leadership in England by rebellion had a potentially more destabilising effect than religious change. In assessing the importance of political factions, rebellions such as Simnel (1486-7), Warbeck (1491-97), Northumberland (1553), Wyatt (1554), the Northern Earls (1569-70) and Essex (1601) are likely to figure. These were led by or supported by political factions intent on advancing their own status and power, and often on altering the line of the English succession. Some factions such as the Aragonese and Stuart in 1536 and 1569 respectively were subsidiary elements. Several royal councillors were the target of political factions, for instance Morton and Bray in 1497, Wolsey in 1525, Cromwell, Audley and Rich in 1536, Somerset in 1549, Northumberland in 1553, William and Robert Cecil in 1569 and 1601 respectively, though again this factor was arguably of secondary importance. Political factions appeared throughout the Tudor period and their close proximity to the crown and court may be deemed a distinctive feature. In contrast, religious changes did not occur before the 1530s and were largely concluded by the 1560s. Their impact was nevertheless equally if not more dramatic than the impact of factions, affecting more common people and a greater geographical area than political factions. It may be argued that political factions were evident in rebellions that were primarily religious in causation, notably the Pilgrimage of Grace, Wyatt and Northern Earls’ rebellions but less so in the Western and Kett’s rebellions. It may also be argued that religious reform was sometimes used as a cloak to disguise personal, political and non-religious motives, notably in the Western and Northern Earls’ rebellions. Candidates can be expected to determine the ways in which political factions were more important than religious change as a cause of rebellion. It may be argued that attempts to change the political leaders in England by rebellion had a potentially more destabilising effect than religious change.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
5	<p><b>'The Tyrone rebellion (1595-1603) presented a greater threat to Tudor government than any other rebellion in the period 1485 – 1603.'</b> How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Tyrone O'Neill led a rebellion against Elizabeth I for over eight years, longer than any other Tudor rebellion, and his followers came from the whole of Ireland (it was a 'national uprising') and included members of the clergy and nobility. He had the backing of the Papacy and received military support from Spain, with whom England was at war. It occurred at a time when the English government was short of money and resources and cost in excess of £2 million. And Elizabeth's wavering strategies and poor appointment of administrators and generals in response to the rebellion led to English armies suffering a defeat at the only battle in 1598 at Yellow Ford. Indeed if Tyrone had not been persuaded to accept a truce in 1603, the rebellion may have taken even longer to suppress. Candidates may consider these reasons justify the description: 'the greatest threat to Tudor government'. Some essays might argue that although Tyrone presented problems for Elizabeth and her government, his rebellion did not constitute a serious threat. The Dublin administration was able to withstand the challenge and survived the threat partly because Tyrone was primarily interested in his own status and power in Ulster and not in regime change and, while English armies struggled to contain the threat to order in Ireland, he never had the resources or support from Spain to achieve a decisive victory. Moreover, no one in England supported Tyrone and any threat to Tudor government was at best indirect. Significantly Elizabeth only took a more pro-active commitment to dealing with the rebellion once the threat of Spain intervening in Ireland materialised. Candidates are likely to challenge the premise and argue that rebellions that sought to overthrow the monarch or threatened to occupy London were a greater threat. Simnel, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, the Northern Earls and Essex, all aimed to change the Tudor government and in each case had to be defeated by troops. Moreover, some candidates may claim that Wyatt's entry into London with an army presented the greatest threat to any Tudor monarch. Many essays will claim that the Pilgrimage of Grace posed the greatest threat due to its size of over 30,000 rebels, its geographical spread covering most of the northern counties, the support given to it by several lesser noble and gentry families and members of the clergy, and the ineffectual measures initially taken by Cromwell and Henry VIII to deal with it. Of the English based rebellions, it was the longest, largest, best organised, disciplined and socially most diverse, yet crucially the rebels never advanced further south than Doncaster in Yorkshire and none of its leaders wished to harm the king. In comparison none of the Irish rebellions, including Tyrone, challenged the government in London or the ruling monarch. Candidates can therefore be expected to assess the nature of threats presented by rebellions in terms of proximity to the government in London, direct challenges to the safety and security of the Tudors, the length of rebellions, and involvement of foreign powers and English nobility. They should compare the threat of Tyrone with other rebellions from the period before arriving at a judgement.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	<p><b>How important were local authorities in maintaining order in Tudor England?</b></p> <p>Most candidates are likely to begin with an assessment of local authorities and agencies, notably the role of JPs, lords lieutenants, sheriffs, and perhaps village constables, town officials, corporations and guilds, before comparing their work in maintaining order with that of central government and the crown. Most examples of disorder concerned social, economic and religious changes, and these were initially managed locally by the diocesan and parish clergy, JPs, mayors, aldermen and town authorities. The role of the clergy, gentry and nobility may be usefully considered. Many served as royal councillors and commissioners in the counties. As leading landowners nobles were expected to arm their tenants and servants to suppress disturbances. The upper clergy also headed royal commissions, acted as councillors, presided over diocesan courts and enforced royal proclamations. The parish clergy were generally loyal to the crown though some supported rebels in 1536 and 1549 over religious grievances. Regional authorities such as the councils of the North and Wales may be included as important means of maintaining order in the borders, especially in the aftermath of the rebellions in 1536 and 1569. Some candidates may view central authorities to be of greater importance. The role of the monarch, notably adult rulers compared with the boy-king, Edward, could be assessed, together with the role of state propaganda and patronage, the use of parliamentary acts and royal proclamations, the growth in litigation of common law courts, and the competence of government ministers and royal policies designed to maintain order, particularly in the wake of a rebellion. Policies that alleviated economic and social grievances were likely to be effective methods of maintaining order - as evident from Elizabethan legislation after 1570, and the absence of major rebellions even during periods of economic depression. Candidates may well conclude that order was upheld by both local and central authorities working together. Only when rebels advanced beyond their locality and moved on regional centres to voice their grievances did central authorities act positively. Examples of how order was maintained before, during and after rebellions occurred would be valid evidence.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	<p><b>How important were dynastic factors in shaping Tudor foreign policy?</b></p> <p>Candidates should assess and compare the importance of dynastic factors with other aims, methods and influences that shaped Tudor foreign policy to reach a comparative judgement. Securing the Tudor dynasty was a vital objective; most of the Tudors pursued this aim and used marriage as a means of conducting their foreign policy. Only in the case of the unmarried boy-king, Edward VI, were dynastic issues less prominent. Henry VII made European alliances, treaties and marriage agreements with the aim of strengthening his position as king, and of securing England's status in Europe. Marriage alliances with Ferdinand of Aragon led to Arthur (1501) and Henry (1509) marrying Catherine of Aragon, which cemented Anglo-Spanish relations until the 1570s. Margaret Tudor's marriage to James IV laid the foundations for better Anglo-Scottish relations after 1503. Henry VII also offered himself in marriage to relatives of Philip of Flanders in order to further his foreign policy goals. Henry VIII sought to marry his children into the French and Scottish royal families – Edward was offered to Mary Stuart in the 1540s to appease the Scots and Mary was offered to Charles V and Francis I in the 1520s though nothing came of these moves. Mary Tudor's marriage to Philip II consolidated England's relations with Spain but led to war with France and the subsequent loss of Calais. While Elizabeth played the marriage card to good effect in her relations with France and Spain, she never married and relied instead on these countries giving her protection from the other. Her failure to marry ensured that the Tudor dynasty would not survive her death and it may be argued that dynastic factors were of less importance to her. Some candidates may claim that national security was a more consistently pursued objective and the main influence in shaping Tudor foreign policies. Political alliances with Spain and the Empire down to the beginning of Elizabeth's reign and with France thereafter were the bedrock of foreign affairs and state security. Economic issues may also be considered as important factors. Financial issues such as the cost of maintaining armies and navies in peace and at war, had implications for the conduct of foreign affairs. Trade and commercial agreements were important to Henry VII and Elizabeth, both in respect of their aims and methods, and rather more so than the other Tudors. Under Elizabeth, religious factors assumed a more important influence, supporting Calvinist states in revolt against Catholic Spain, France and the Holy Roman Empire, and assisting Presbyterians to expel the French faction from Scotland. Candidates might argue that dynastic factors were most important under the early Tudors and that thereafter issues of national security, trade and religion assumed greater prominence.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
8	<p><b>'The outbreak of the French Wars of Religion in 1562 was the main turning point in Anglo-French relations in the period from 1485 to 1603.'</b> How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>Candidates are likely to begin by assessing how the outbreak of civil war in 1562 in France affected relations with England. Several issues may be considered: the civil war lasted for over 30 years, greatly weakened France financially and politically and led to thousands of Calvinist refugees entering England. Instead of viewing England as a threat to its security, French kings after 1562 were pre-occupied at trying to secure internal peace and unity. Political relations with England therefore improved after 1562, in spite of Elizabeth's failed attempt to recover Calais in 1563-4, and there were no further outbreaks of war between the two countries. Indeed the 1572 Treaty of Blois endured for the rest of Elizabeth's reign and both Henry III and Henry IV assisted England in its war with Spain from 1585. This period was in marked contrast to the early Tudor period down to 1562 which had been characterised by personal rivalry between monarchs, six Anglo-French wars and each country experiencing an occupation by rival armies and navies. Though there were periods of peace and détente, notably in 1492-1512, 1529-42 and 1550-57, not until the outbreak of civil war in France did a permanent peace arise. Candidates should compare the events from 1562 with alternative turning points. Some might regard the deaths of Henry VIII and Francis I in 1547 as a significant moment. Henry had consistently pursued an aggressive imperialistic policy towards France, laying claim to the throne, personally invading France, seeking to outdo Francis I and going to war on three occasions between 1512 and 1546. His father, Henry VII, had also viewed France as a threat to his position and prepared for war in 1492. Edward VI was less inclined to wage war and his chief ministers from 1547 focused more on Scotland. However, Francis I's successor, Henry II, set out to recover Boulogne and Calais, and a spirit of animosity between England and France was evident throughout the 1550s. During this period, France and Scotland grew closer together and neither Edward nor Mary Tudor could break the Guise influence in Scotland as Anglo-French relations worsened. Some essays might focus on the loss of Calais in 1558 as a more significant turning point. After its fall and formal cessation in 1564, relations markedly improved. Some responses might suggest the rise of Spain under Charles V and in particular the accession of Philip II in 1556 which saw Spain emerge as a major European power, had a profound effect on Anglo-French relations. Between 1485 and the 1570s, France felt increasingly threatened by the resurgent Habsburgs and sought solace from England. Until Elizabeth's reign, this rapprochement was unattainable due to the attitude of French kings towards England and the close dynastic links between the Tudors and Spanish Habsburgs. However, both Elizabeth and Catherine de Medici were keen to avoid isolation and feared the imperial ambitions of Philip, which resulted in a rapprochement in 1572.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	<p><b>'Scotland presented a greater threat to England's security than Spain in the Tudor period.' How far do you agree with this view?</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to focus on a comparison of Scotland and Spain as threats to England's security before reaching a judgement. Weaker essays are likely to describe or narrate events sequentially without making appropriate synoptic comments and assessments. Better responses are likely to assess the threats thematically, perhaps chronologically, according to English monarchs but nevertheless synthesising developments over the whole period. As far as <b>Scotland</b> is concerned, its proximity to the northern counties of England saw Scottish rustlers regularly plunder the border and war-parties try to recover Berwick, and the Scots' reliance on the Auld Alliance increased their potential to cause trouble. James IV supported Warbeck and his troops threatened to invade Northumberland in 1496-97, and in 1512/13 in alliance with France, the border was again crossed. James' death at Flodden reduced the threat until the 1540s when, in Henry's view, James V acted provocatively. Arguably this period was the most threatening since Henry VIII's and Edward VI's armies were unable to inflict decisive victories, in spite of Solway Moss and Pinkie, and French armies supported the Scots militarily. Scottish victories at Ancrum Moor (1545) and Haddington (1549) also demonstrated their infantry's prowess. The regency of Mary of Guise (until 1560) and arrival of Mary Queen of Scots (in Scotland from 1561-68 and in England from 1568-87) presented a different sort of challenge to England's security and remained a problem until the maturity of James VI in the 1580s. However, the decline of the Guise faction in Scotland in the 1560s and the impact of the French wars of religion reduced Scotland's potential threat for much of Elizabeth's reign. <b>Spain</b> on the other hand did not present a threat for much of the period but when it did, it might well be argued that the threat was far greater than that posed by Scotland. Until the reign of Philip II, Spain had been a useful if not always reliable ally and a counter-weight to France and Scotland. Only in 1527 and briefly in the 1530s did Charles I threaten to disrupt diplomatic relations and Cromwell's fears of a joint Franco-Spanish invasion in 1538 were exaggerated. It could be argued that Mary's marriage to Philip put England at risk and indirectly resulted in the permanent loss of Calais. From 1560, and especially after 1585, Spain presented a very serious threat which was borne out by its support for Catholic conspirators and Mary Queen of Scots, two armed invasions of Ireland and three attempts to invade England. The Armada presented a very real challenge to the Elizabethan government and, though its defeat was universally celebrated, war continued for the rest of Elizabeth's reign and the country remained on alert for possible invasions throughout the 1590s. Candidates may well conclude that Scotland and Spain presented rather different threats, which changed in intensity over time, before deciding in favour of one of them. Most essays may argue in favour of Spain but for most of the period this was not the view of English people living in the northern counties.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>



Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
10	<p><b>‘A typical sixteenth-century pope.’ How far do you agree with this view of Paul III when compared to other popes of the period 1492 – 1610?</b></p> <p>Key themes under discussion may include the character of popes, their qualities of leadership of and contribution to reforming the Catholic Church, and their Italian and foreign policies. This question concerns the typicality of Paul III (1534-49) as a sixteenth-century pope. Candidates who assess and compare his character and contribution to the Catholic Reformation should score well. Weaker responses may well describe/assess Paul III’s work without making appropriate synoptic judgements on sixteenth-century pontiffs and pontificates. Most essays are likely to challenge the premise and focus on Paul III’s positive contributions to the Catholic Reformation. Unlike popes from the pontificate of Alexander VI to Clement VII, Paul III made a sustained effort at reform. He called the first general council of the Church for more than a century, established a Roman Inquisition and Index, investigated clerical abuses and encouraged Italian bishops to reside in and reform their dioceses, and he recognised the Jesuits and other new orders. However, he was also typical of many sixteenth-century popes. He was very interested in patronising the visual arts (like Julius II), fathered illegitimate children (like Alexander VI), practised nepotism (like Leo X and Paul IV) and appointed his teenage grandsons as cardinals. His daily routine was also typical of many Renaissance popes and not as ascetic as later popes such as Paul IV and Sixtus V. He failed to stop the spread of Protestantism (like Leo X, Adrian VI and Clement VII), he argued with Charles V about the location of a general council and how discussions at Trent should proceed, which slowed down its implementation, and much of his reform work remained unfinished at his death. Candidates could argue that the period from 1492 to 1565 and the accession of Pius V was characterised by materialistic popes, who put the welfare of themselves and their families before church reform, and most were more interested in Italian politics. Alexander VI, Julius II, Leo X, Adrian VI, Clement VII, Paul IV as well as Paul III, had good reason to fear the occupation of the Papal States by foreign armies. Their relations with successive Spanish, German and French rulers portrayed them as secular princes who talked about church reform but wished to safeguard their own spiritual authority, feared what reform of clerical abuses might do to their privileged position and lacked the determination to reform the curia root and branch. At least Paul III was untypical in that he made a start at reform. His successors were more uniformly reformist and effective in implementing reforms. Pius V practised nepotism and fathered illegitimate children but he completed one of Paul III’s main initiatives, issuing decrees of the Council of Trent in 1564. Later popes like Pius V, Gregory XIII and Sixtus V were more personally ascetic and implemented administrative reforms to the Church to eliminate abuses in the curia, enforced residence among bishops and improved the quality of life in Rome. They were also more active in taking the Catholic Reformation to Protestant states in Europe and beyond. Candidates might argue that Paul III was unique rather than typical but he had several qualities and weaknesses to be found in popes across the sixteenth century.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
11	<p><b>‘Emperor Charles V contributed more than any other secular ruler to the revival of the Catholic Church in Europe in the period from 1492 to 1610.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to assess the work of Charles V as Emperor and are most likely to compare him with Philip II, and probably Isabella and Ferdinand. Candidates should not discuss non-secular rulers. Charles was instrumental in pressing the Papacy to call a general council to reform abuses and define church doctrine, which finally occurred at Trent in 1545. Though a second session took place in 1551-52 that made further progress, the final session and publication of decrees occurred after Charles’ death. He was initially a strong supporter of Erasmus and humanism in the 1520s but saw the impact of heresy in Germany and backed the Spanish Inquisition and Index in their attempts to extirpate Erasmianism, Lutheranism, mysticism and illuminism in the 1530s. Charles also banned Luther from the Empire and backed Ferdinand’s attempts to curb the growth of heresy. However, candidates should be aware of his limitations: he failed to suppress Lutheranism in the Empire or to stop powerful German princes and several towns from adopting it. Zwinglianism and Calvinism continued to spread and Anabaptists, Lutherans and Calvinists were still flourishing in the Netherlands in the 1550s. Charles was consistently suspicious of the Papacy, Jesuits outside Spain and the Roman Inquisition, which led to arguments with the pope. He persistently clashed with Francis I and the Papal States, invaded Italy and was responsible for the Sack of Rome and the humiliation of the Papacy. Candidates are also expected to compare Charles with other secular rulers, and most will assess Philip II. He was the first European ruler to implement the Tridentine Decrees, made extensive use of the Spanish Inquisition to eradicate heresy and re-enforce orthodoxy, oversaw the creation of 20 seminaries, 12 Franciscan convents, 17 monasteries in Madrid, and spearheaded the Counter Reformation in Europe. Candidates should also be aware that Philip had limitations too. He argued with the Papacy, only implemented the Tridentine Decrees conditionally, resented Italian dominance of the Jesuit order, failed to stop the spread of heresy in the Spanish Netherlands, and made limited advances in propagating Christianity in his own kingdom. Isabella and Ferdinand are also likely to be cited. They revived the Spanish Inquisition, began the drive to purge Spain of <i>moriscos</i> and <i>conversos</i>, encouraged Cisneros in his diocesan and monastic reforms, as well as the polyglot Bible and establishment of the university of Alcalá which improved the quality of priests. Philip III, Ferdinand of Styria, Sigismund of Poland, Rudolph II of Austria, and Albert, William and Maximilian of Bavaria, could also be examined as secular rulers who advanced the Catholic Reformation in their own lands. Candidates might argue that some Catholic secular rulers, who were in a position to implement improvements, did little to advance the Church’s revival. Most German princes, Henry VIII, Mary Tudor, Francis I and the later Valois kings may fall into this category.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
12	<p><b>'The difficulties facing the Catholic Church from 1564 to 1610 were greater than those it faced in the period from 1492 to 1563.' How far do you agree with this view?</b></p> <p>Candidates should assess a range of difficulties evident in the years from 1564 to 1610 and determine how far they were greater than those in the earlier period. Among the problems that were 'greater' in the later period are: the disunity within the Christian Church caused by the differences in Protestant and Catholic faiths and the possibility of more states becoming Calvinist since the 1555 Peace of Augsburg ignored the existence of Calvinism in the Holy Roman Empire; the Papacy could no longer rely upon the Emperor or secular powers to stamp out heresy beyond their frontiers; the Church in France and the Netherlands saw a growth in Protestantism that divided their countries and led to civil war; the Jesuits caused resentment among traditionalists due to their unconventional rules, popularity and success; censorship of heretical ideas became increasingly problematical due to the widespread use of the press; and the decrees of the Council of Trent proved slow to implement e.g. the high cost of setting up seminaries meant few were established outside Spain. A <b>counter argument</b> is likely to suggest that many of the difficulties after 1563 were less evident or essentially the same as before, namely: the wide disparity between the quality and salary of parish clerics and episcopal and diocesan authorities; the protectionist attitude of secular states, especially France and Spain, towards the Papacy; the distrust and envy among the older Catholic orders towards the new ones, particularly the Jesuits; the continuing failure of monastic and conventual orders to contribute towards the spiritual wellbeing of most people; the lack of colleges to train and improve the education of the clergy; the reluctance of many rural groups to embrace the Catholic faith and their widespread ignorance of Christianity. It may also be argued that some difficulties in the period from 1492 to 1563 were 'greater', namely: the authority of the pope's headship of the Catholic Church was questioned; there was a widespread call for a general council; the doctrine of the Catholic faith was challenged by humanists and Protestants; until the pontificate of Paul III, the Papacy was a major obstacle to reform; most regular clergy were isolated from the mainstream of society, contributed little to the spiritual and moral welfare of the people, were lampooned as corrupt clerics, and yet presided over substantial estates and incomes; the image of Rome was in urgent need of reform; the major secular powers – Spain, France and the Holy Roman Empire – were impatient at the lack of papal initiative yet were more interested in gaining lands from fighting wars in Italy than in supporting Church reform. Most of these difficulties did not exist after 1563. The best answers should present a balanced argument that uses evidence from across the period to support a comparative evaluation of the Church's difficulties before and after 1563/64.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
13	<p><b>'Henry IV was France's most effective king.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1498 to 1610?</b></p> <p>The key to a good answer probably lies in how candidates interpret/define 'effective king'. Those who identify particular issues and problems and assess how far Henry IV and other kings overcame them to achieve their objectives, are likely to score well. Some may tackle the question thematically looking at, for instance, Henry IV's and other rulers' relations with noble families and religious groups, how they managed their financial and economic problems, and whether they achieved their foreign policy aims. As far as Henry IV is concerned, it may be argued that he resolved religious and social divisions that had beset the country for half a century, brought internal peace to France and began the rehabilitation of the state. He and Sully laid sound economic and commercial foundations, restored the crown's finances and went some way internationally towards curtailing the rising power of Spain in Europe. A counter-argument, however, is that Henry IV did not achieve most of his aims: he failed to unite a deeply divided nation, many groups resented the Edict of Nantes, and even the Huguenots were unsure about the king's spiritual allegiance. His financial solutions ruined creditors and in the Paulette he created a measure that burdened the administration for generations to come; some nobles rebelled against his attempt to recover crown lands and extensive bribes were needed to win over disaffected nobles and towns, especially members of the Catholic League. <i>Parlements</i> opposed royal edicts, the <i>pays d'états</i> refused to accept the <i>élus</i>, and his foreign policy over the Cleves-Julich issue took France to the brink of war that was only averted by his assassination. At his death he left an 8 year-old king and queen mother as regent and the problem of aristocratic disloyalty remained unsolved. Candidates are most likely to compare Henry with Louis XII, Francis I and Henry II, and regard the last Valois kings (Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III) as consistently ineffective rulers. Louis XII codified the laws, kept taxes and expenditure low, improved the administration of justice, created <i>parlements</i>, laid many foundations of the nation state, and pursued an aggressive if ultimately unsuccessful foreign policy in Italy and Burgundy, that resulted in the loss of Naples, Spanish Navarre and the occupation by foreign armies of much of France in 1513-14. Francis I strengthened the political power of the crown over the nobility, <i>parlements</i>, provincial estates and church, implemented centralising reforms in 1515-17, 1522-24, and 1542-44, but had a largely unsuccessful and expensive foreign policy in Italy and Burgundy. Henry II, on the other hand, though strong in temperament and spirituality, lacked the political skill to manage his <i>parlements</i>, nobles and estates effectively. He allowed Calvinism to flourish in France and failed to suppress the rivalry between the Guises, Bourbons and Montmorencys. His foreign policy resulted in the loss of Italian lands and heavy debts but he did secure Burgundy and recovered Boulogne and Calais from England.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
14	<p><b>‘The French nobility helped rather than hindered the development of France in the period from 1498 to 1610.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Candidates may well assess the ways in which the nobility helped and hindered the development of France before reaching a judgement. Arguments in support of the nobility making positive contributions are likely to include: their role as councillors and advisers to the crown, holding major offices of state and church, and serving the crown loyally and effectively; their work as governors, law enforcers and administrators in the provinces which was a vital link between the regions and central government; their role as generals and commanders of armies in the service of the crown and their contribution in raising France to the pinnacle of military prowess among early sixteenth-century European states. Without the nobility’s leadership, wealth and sacrifices, France would not have expanded geo-politically to acquire Navarre, Bearn, Foix, Brittany, Burgundy, or to recover Calais from England. A counter-argument, however, can be made that the nobility often hindered the development of France. Candidates could cite the involvement of nobles in beginning and perpetuating the wars of religion from 1562 to 1598. Some used their own servants and retainers as troops to the detriment of the country and governed their provinces as states within a state. As captains in the <i>gendarmerie</i>, they held great powers of patronage which was used against the crown at various times. A minority of nobles throughout the period flouted the law, lined their own pockets and disobeyed the king when it suited them. This behaviour was most apparent during periods of royal minorities and weak government when noble families, such as the Guises, Montmorencys and Bourbons, revealed their political and religious ambitions. Most nobles opposed administrative reforms that might strengthen the position of the crown e.g. the introduction of new social groups as judicial and political administrators. At no time did the nobility try to help the crown overcome its financial problems, standing firm as an estate against the introduction of direct taxation and few nobles engaged in trade or commerce, which would have helped the economic development of France. Princes of the blood were a particular hindrance to the welfare of the state: in 1536-42, 1574-76, and from 1598, they attracted noble factions eager to advance their political ambitions at the expense of the king. Candidates might conclude that when the crown was strong, assertive and effective, notably during the reigns of Louis XII, Francis I, Henry II and Henry IV, and the country faced external as well as internal challenges, the nobility was generally subdued and obedient. However, when the monarchy lacked strength and leadership, notably under Francis II, Charles IX, Henry III and the regency of Catherine de Medici, the nobility put their own interests first in the conviction that this would be in France’s best interest.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
15	<p><b>'The Catholic Church in France consistently destabilised the nation state in the period from 1498 to 1610.' How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Candidates need to assess in what ways and to what extent the Catholic Church in France destabilised the nation state. Some may view 'destabilisation' to mean 'impeded' or 'hindered' the development of the state, and better responses may understand that it implies a more destructive impact that could lead to civil strife and religious disorder, as was apparent in the Wars of Religion from 1562 to 1598. The key to a good answer is whether candidates focus on 'consistently' and so demonstrate continuity and change in the Catholic Church's role in the period. Candidates are likely to argue that while the Church did cause instability at times, it did not do so consistently, and that for much of the period the Church was a pillar of strength to the crown, people and development of the nation state. The Catholic faith was the state's official faith and, as such, a powerful unifying force in a society beset with conflicting beliefs and factions. All French kings took an oath to defend the Christian faith and kings who were consistently loyal to the faith, received unqualified support from the Catholic Church. However, if the Gallican Church and the theological arm of the University of Paris (the Sorbonne) believed that if the crown fell short of its defence of the true faith or showed tolerance towards heretical groups to the detriment of the state, they could justifiably pressure the crown to uphold orthodox practices and traditional beliefs. Thus Francis I was obliged to condemn heretical practices by leading a procession of the most powerful groups of people in Paris in 1535, and in the period 1560s-80s, devout Catholics condemned the idea of toleration, established militant Catholic Leagues and some even advocated regicide. Candidates are likely to interpret the sectarian massacres and the assassinations of Henry III and Henry IV by Catholic fanatics as evidence of religious, political and social instability. Arguably the Church's rejection of mysticism, humanism, Huguenotism and Calvinism, which were popular beliefs if not practised by the majority, divided the nation state. Moreover, Gallican opposition to the Papacy and attempts by the crown to establish good papal relations led to criticism of rulers throughout the period: Louis XII's chief minister, Georges d'Amboise found his work was resented and opposed by those who felt he was primarily a papal agent; Francis I's acceptance of the Concordat of Bologna in 1516 was condemned by the <i>Parlement</i> of Paris, and attempts to enforce the Tridentine Decrees after 1564 were consistently rejected by the Gallicans. Some candidates might argue that the Church's failure to reform itself and improve the spirituality of the people further weakened the state. The Council of Poissy in 1561 agreed a programme of reform but could not get the support of the Gallican majority to enforce the clauses and there was no coherent government support for reform until the seventeenth early century.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
16	<p><b>To what extent was royal authority in France limited in the period from 1610 to 1715?</b></p> <p>This question concerns the nature of French royal power and the degree to which it was limited. Some candidates may want to turn it into a discussion of absolutism and a case can be made that the French monarchy became more absolute as its limitations diminished but the focus of the essay should be on limitations of royal authority rather than on notions of absolute power. Arguments which support the view that Louis XIII and Louis XIV had limited power as kings may include: the traditional theory that French kings held office as a duty and not as a right; though ultimately subject to God, they were answerable to the French people and their representatives i.e. Estates Generals and <i>parlements</i>. The French nobility remained strong throughout the period and resisted any royal attempt to extend taxation to their estates or the appointment of crown officials who might encroach on their jurisdictions, especially in the provinces, where, as governors many acted independently of the crown. The provincial estates and <i>parlements</i> obstructed attempts by the crown to impose unwelcome edicts and the Paris <i>parlement</i> consistently clashed with the crown in defence of its own rights and privileges, and what it perceived to be in France's best interests. Gallicanism was a strong bulwark that opposed any sign of royal weakness of faith, tolerance towards Huguenots or friendship with the Papacy. The financial system was largely unreformed and a significant limitation on the crown's authority. Towns and cities were protective of their chartered customs and privileges, and seigneurial and church courts impeded the establishment of a uniform legal system. The size of France, its large population, undeveloped transport links and isolated communities made effective administration from Paris hard to achieve. A counter-view is that royal authority became less hedged with limitations and more absolute as the period progressed. Early 17<sup>th</sup> century polemicists like Le Bret and Loyseau wrote of Louis XIII's absolutism, when Richelieu succeeded in controlling and weakening the nobility, recalcitrant estates and Huguenots lost their privileges, royal officials especially <i>intendants</i> grew in number and authority, the Paris <i>parlement</i> was told to register edicts without delay or amendments, uncooperative bishops were dismissed and a political tribunal – the <i>chambre de l'arsenal</i> – operated from 1631 to 1643. Candidates are likely to suggest that Louis XIV was even less restricted. Bossuet celebrated the king's divine authority, Versailles illustrated his god-like status, regional assemblies, <i>parlements</i> and royal councils were closely controlled and an Estates-General never called. Louis' treatment of Fouquet and the Jansenists, the use of <i>dragonnades</i> against the Huguenots, the growth of a centralised bureaucracy and state control of the press, arts and sciences, the expansion of the army, are all areas that might be usefully examined. Candidates might conclude that though kings could not do as they wished, the practical limitations as to what they could do declined in the course of the period.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
17	<p><b>‘Colbert contributed more to the growth of the French economy than any other minister.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1610 – 1715?</b></p> <p>Candidates may well discuss Colbert’s contributions to the developing French economy and compare his legacy with that of Richelieu, Mazarin and less possibly Louvois, all of whom appear in the specification. Colbert effectively managed both royal finances and the country’s economy. In the 1660s he cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming into one company, reclaimed royal lands, and increased the <i>taille</i>. By 1672 he had increased revenue by 400% and balanced the budget. Colbert also had a broad view of the economy. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. He regulated industries, revitalised old ones (e.g. textiles), founded trading companies, established colonies in Canada and the West Indies, and expanded the royal navy, maritime fleet, arsenals and naval stores. Nevertheless, although in many respects Colbert strengthened the economy, he did not change the fundamental basis of taxation which remained unfair and unequal, and the administrative system stayed largely unchanged, riddled with self-interest and inefficiency. There was also a limit as to how far the economy could sustain Louis’ wars, particularly after Colbert’s death in 1683. Gradually the French government lost control of royal finances, debts mounted and Colbert’s schemes, such as the development of overseas trading companies and colonies, collapsed. Tax collection became less rigorous, new taxes (e.g. the <i>capitation</i> and <i>dixième</i>) fell on the impoverished classes, the currency was debased and venality multiplied. By 1715 the fiscal system remained unreformed, the government had a debt in excess of 2000 million <i>livres</i> and the economy had been eclipsed by rival states such as England and the United Provinces. Richelieu had limited success in keeping finances in order; his advisers like Bullion and Bouthillier sold offices, debased the currency and levied new indirect taxes in an attempt to find new sources of revenue. Richelieu, however, introduced <i>élus</i> to the <i>pays d’états</i> and <i>intendants</i> oversaw tax assessment and collection which increased revenue, he encouraged overseas trade and colonies, established a royal navy and improved domestic canal and road transport. Overall, he was unsuccessful, failing to implement Marillac’s innovative economic reforms in the Code Michaud of 1629, and, in pursuing an active foreign policy, government costs trebled in the 1630s. Mazarin and d’Emery tackled the crown’s financial difficulties but their policies on extending indirect taxation and interfering with <i>rentes</i> and the Paulette precipitated the Fronde, which seriously disrupted Parisian commerce and state finances, and Mazarin took little interest in the wider economy. By 1661 government debts exceeded 700 million <i>livres</i>. Candidates may well agree with the premise - none of Colbert’s predecessors since Sully and Henry IV had developed the economy so widely or so effectively and after his death economic problems multiplied - but responses must compare Colbert with other ministers before reaching a judgement.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>



Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
18	<p><b>'The Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) was the main turning point in France's rise as a European power in the period from 1610 to 1715.'</b> How far do you agree?</p> <p>Candidates should consider the condition of France in 1659 as an international power at the Treaty of the Pyrenees and compare its standing with other dates/ periods to ensure they cover the required 100 years rubric. The Pyrenees saw France acquire lands in Luxemburg, Artois and towns in the Spanish Netherlands, confirm gains made at Westphalia that secured the Pyrenees, and agree to the union of Louis XIV and Maria Theresa, the Spanish Infanta, which gave French kings a claim to the Spanish throne and empire. The treaty climaxed France's dominance in Europe over Spain, its longstanding rival, enabled it to compete with the Dutch and English for overseas trade and commerce, seize more Spanish territories and intervene in German politics over the next thirty years. The Treaty was the culmination of 24 years of fighting and, though its military and naval victories over Spain could have brought more territorial gains, peace was needed and the terms seemed fair and reasonable. The financial and political situation in France in 1659 needs to be considered and the condition of other European states could be assessed by way of comparison. England was in political disarray, Spain bankrupt and vulnerable, and the United Provinces and the Holy Roman Empire eager for peace. The periods before France entered the Thirty Years' War (1610-35) and after the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-13) could be assessed to set France's standing in Europe in a wider context but the events immediately following 1659 should be given particular attention. Candidates may well consider some of the following by way of a comparison: 1648, 1668, 1678, and 1684. In <b>1648</b> Mazarin negotiated a treaty that gained Metz, Toul and Verdun which secured France's eastern border; the bishopric of Lorraine, most of Alsace, Rhine bridgeheads such as Breisach, and the Italian fortress of Pinerolo. These possessions presaged French influence in Germany, the humiliation of the emperor and the fall of Spain. Westphalia was also the first European treaty to be conducted in French. Candidates could contrast France's international standing between 1610 and 1635 when it entered the Thirty Years' War, which was limited to supporting other countries against the Habsburgs, obstructing the Valtelline and contesting a relatively minor dispute at Mantua-Montferrat in 1628-31. In <b>1668</b> France acquired lands in the Spanish Netherlands, especially St Omer, Lille and Douai but not Franche Comté. In <b>1678</b> France gained Franche Comté, annexed Flemish border areas and occupied Lorraine, which linked Luxemburg with Alsace and gave France a valuable border buttress with Germany. In <b>1684</b> at Ratisbon the emperor confirmed France's previous gains and possession of Luxemburg, Strasburg and Kehl. However, Louis had offended the major European powers, and thereafter the English, Dutch, Spanish, Germans and Austrians united against him. The best essays should assess 1659 and other moments throughout the period to decide if this was the main turning point in its rise to power in Europe.</p>	60	<p>Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team leader</p>

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

