

History A

Advanced GCE

Unit **F966/01**: Historical Themes Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

Mark Scheme for January 2013

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 2013

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>The continental possessions of the crown in Normandy and later in the Angevin Empire, including efforts made to hold onto or regain them, can be seen to have been a significant factor in the development of English central government. They necessitated a form of government which could function effectively in the absence of the king, which led ultimately to the development of the post of chief justiciar who exercised vicegerent authority by the later twelfth century and whose antecedents lay in the roles performed by Ranulf Flambard under William II and Roger of Salisbury under Henry I. The increasing costs of warfare needed to maintain those lands, and of the more complex administrative system which developed, also led kings to wish to maximise their finances and the profits of justice. This led to the development of the Exchequer in Henry I's reign and more control over sheriffs, first through their rendering regular accounts and then through the great inquests of sheriffs in 1170, 1194 and 1213. It could also be argued to have played a part in the introduction of more control over justice with the introduction of eyres and itinerant justices and, in Henry II's reign, the possessory assizes, Grand assize and standardised writs. All of this machinery made the government more systematic, bureaucratic and therefore able to function in the king's absence, as well as more profitable. Some might also argue that the loss of Normandy created some of the tensions which lay behind the rebellion of 1215 which resulted in the dismantling of much of Angevin government, so producing further change. However, in order to reach a judgment on the main factor behind the changes candidates need to set the continental possessions against other reasons and compare. Kings and/or their officials played an important part in recognising the need for the development of government and in activating measures to bring about change. As leading officials were also often churchmen – Flambard, Roger of Salisbury, Hubert Walter – the role of the church could also be considered. Some might argue that the main reason for change was the Conquest which imported Norman ideas to build on Saxon foundations and led to feudal government. Arguably some of the main changes came in the reign of Henry II and were prompted at least in part by his desire to re-establish firm government after Stephen's reign.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Candidates should not be penalised if they limit their answers to Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton, the archbishops mentioned in the specification. However, credit should be given to those who make appropriate reference to others such as Walter or Theobald of Bec.</p> <p>There is considerable similarity between the poor relations experienced by Anselm with William II and to some extent Henry I, Becket with Henry II and Langton with John. In each case relations were the result of clashes between archbishops keen to uphold the growing power of the church resulting from the papal reform movement and monarchs equally keen to maintain their traditional rights. Anselm quarrelled with William II over a range of things including recognition of the pope and with Henry I over investiture, Becket quarrelled with Henry II over ecclesiastical jurisdiction and Langton's election was itself an expression of the church's disregard for kings' traditional rights. However, there were also differences. Anselm was able to reach a compromise with Henry I over investiture in 1107, despite having become fully aware of its implications during his exile. He had not managed to compromise with William II even over lesser matters.</p> <p>Henry II got on well with his archbishops before and after Becket. Most significantly, at the beginning of the period. Lanfranc enjoyed particularly good relations with William I. He helped William to use the authority of the church to establish Norman rule, agreed with William in refusing to accede to the pope's requests and keeping the Investiture Contest at bay and got William's support over the primacy. Similarly, towards the end of the period, Hubert Walter enjoyed good relations with Richard, running the country for him in his absence. Some candidates may wish to point to similarities in relations between those archbishops who were prepared to do the monarch's work and those who were determined to uphold ecclesiastical claims in the face of monarchical rights.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Candidates may confine their answer to the archbishops mentioned in the specification, Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton and should not be penalised for this. However, appropriate reference to other archbishops should be rewarded.</p> <p>Some archbishops' actions increased their control over the English Church. Although Lanfranc acted in conjunction with William and his authority depended on what the king would allow, nevertheless he established his authority over the church through his use of synods and created a sense of leadership through his monastic reforms, the beginning of separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction and his firm control over his bishops. The recognition of his personal primacy produced order and structure in the church. The association of the church with the establishment of Norman rule helped to enhance Lanfranc's prestige and resisting the pope's call to Rome also seemed to imply that power over the church in England rested with him. Anselm enhanced his power over the church by reaching a compromise with the king over investiture in which the king agreed to give up investiture with the ring and staff. Becket stood up to royal authority and defended the independence of the church over the trial of criminous clerks. Hubert Walter was able to hold councils to improve discipline in the church and restored its stability to some extent.</p> <p>By contrast, some actions of archbishops reduced their power over the church. Anselm's and Becket's periods of exile and Langton's inability to enter the country undermined their power, as did Henry II's use of York to crown Young Henry. Becket lost control over some of his bishops during his quarrel with Henry, especially Foliot. The primacy issue was never entirely settled. Moreover, power over the English church at times seemed to be more in the hands of the pope than the archbishop of Canterbury. For example, there was an increase in appeals to Rome under Stephen and popes intervened to reduce the metropolitan power of Canterbury, eg making Henry of Blois papal legate and, particularly, suspending Langton.</p>	60	Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Some candidates may answer this question sequentially but a more effective and synoptic approach would be to look at the respective objectives thematically to identify similarities and differences or to organise their essays according to differences and similarities. Irish rebellions were generally motivated by political and religious objectives but each rebellion was also riddled with factional nobles who had personal ambitions and political objectives in Ireland. Irish nobles increasingly opposed English rule in Dublin and the O'Neill (1558–67), Munster (1569–73), Geraldine (1579–83) and Tyrone (1595–03) rebellions had political and self-serving undercurrents. Similarly in England, rebellions such as Lincoln, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, the Northern Earls and Essex, were led by or were strongly supported by factions, often intent on advancing themselves politically or even altering the English succession. This latter objective however was never the intention in Ireland. In Ireland there was growing discontent with English rule and most rebellions sought to alter or remove the Dublin administration. Similarly in England several rebellions aimed to remove royal councillors eg Morton and Bray (1497), Wolsey (1525), Cromwell, Rich and Audley (1536), Somerset (1549), Northumberland (1553) and the Cecils (1569 and 1601). Social and economic objectives were never the main cause of Irish rebellions though opposition to plantations and policies such as surrender and re-grant was evident in the O'Neill, Munster and Tyrone rebellions. In contrast in England, economic grievances such as unfair taxation, rack-renting and illegal enclosures, were more frequent and significant causes of rebellion. This is a key difference which better candidates should identify and explain. Several rebellions after 1534 had religious grievances as their main cause and the restoration of the 'true faith' as a key objective: in Ireland in the Munster, Geraldine and Tyrone rebellions and in England in the Pilgrimage of Grace, Western, and Northern Earls' rebellions. Better responses, however, could point out and explain why religious objectives ceased to be evident in England after 1569 whereas in Ireland they remained a key objective throughout Elizabeth's reign. A range of comparative assessments across the period that is focused on objectives covering both England and Ireland is expected of the best answers.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>This question is concerned with the speed taken by Tudor governments in tackling rebellions and candidates should be rewarded for evaluating particular measures and specific rebellions in both England and Ireland. If discussion of Ireland is ignored or marginalised, then the answer is likely to be unbalanced. Credit should be given to candidates who assess 'generally slow' thematically rather than chronologically, and who focus on actual disturbances. Better essays should compare the effectiveness of government responses to rebellion. Henry VII and Elizabeth acted quickly to counter rebellions in England, Henry directing operations against the Simnel, Yorkshire and Cornish revolts and being pro-active in defeating Lovel, Stafford and Warbeck. Elizabeth entrusted her councils in London, York and Dublin to deal with disturbances, and generally acted quickly and decisively in handling her rebellions in England. The Northern Earls, Oxfordshire and Essex rebellions are likely to be cited. Henry VIII was slow to react to both the Amicable Grant and Pilgrimage of Grace uprisings, and neither Wolsey nor Cromwell was in full control of the crises. Somerset also failed to take appropriate measures to suppress the Western and Kett's rebellions quickly and Mary was badly advised by her council about Wyatt's revolt. Better essays are likely to assess the reasons for the varied government reactions: the size of rebellion, distance from London and Dublin, support in the localities and information and resources at the crown's disposal are relevant factors that may be usefully considered. In most cases advisers were consulted, and information gathered and assessed, before instructions were sent to officials and nobles in affected areas, all of which took time. Most Tudor administrations bought time, issued propaganda against the rebels and tried to avoid a military conflict until the government forces were large enough to be certain of victory. Henry VII more than any other ruler resorted to an army to defeat his rebels but his successors tried other strategies first. Mary and Elizabeth were generally more effective than Henry VIII and Edward in their deployment of troops but the latter rulers faced longer and larger rebellions. It may be pointed out that Irish rebellions presented a different challenge to Tudor governments and few were able to suppress them quickly. The innate hostility felt by the Irish towards the English as rulers and landowners, clan rivalry, unreliable nobles and limited resources made the quick suppression of rebellions hard to achieve. Only Henry VII can be regarded as having been successful and even in his case, any claim to victory should be qualified. Elizabeth on the other hand dealt with each of her four Irish rebellions slowly and ineffectively. Expect the best essays to look at a range of rebellions in England and Ireland in support of their argument.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Most candidates are likely to argue that the Crown was the most important element in the maintenance of stability. A source of unity and authority, divinely appointed and guardian of the common law, the monarch was the embodiment of order. It was not enough, however, to assume that all subjects would obey their ruler and the Tudors understood the need to apply propaganda, patronage and appropriate policies. Propaganda was used to strengthen their image and enhance the mystique of monarchy. The dispensation of patronage through grants, honours and appointments also built up a key link between central and local government. Policies that alleviated social and economic distress also reduced the likelihood of disorder and the absence of rebellions in England for much of Elizabeth's reign in part reflects the growth in legislation. The character of rulers was also important. Strong, adult monarchs such as Henry VIII and Elizabeth were more readily obeyed, whereas the boy-king, Edward, experienced many rebellions. Some candidates may focus on the role of central government in developing respect for the monarchy, the growth of parliament as a vehicle for voicing discontent, the use of regional councils, crown courts and popular royal policies taken to reduce the potential for political instability. Thus Henry VII used parliament to deal with retaining and strengthen the crown's authority; Henry VIII extended the treason and heresy laws and Elizabeth introduced recusancy and penal laws but applied them sparingly. In addition to the Crown, candidates should examine other factors by which the Tudors kept control. Consideration may be given to the work of JPs, lords lieutenant and sheriffs, most of whom were gentry and nobles, who dealt with local grievances through hard work, diplomacy and common sense. Mayors, aldermen and town officials also assisted local clergy and nobles in resolving economic and social problems, usually before they got out of hand. The importance of the clergy and nobility may also be considered. Many nobles served as royal councillors both in London and in a regional capacity, as sheriffs, JPs, lord lieutenants, and special commissioners in the counties, and candidates could suggest how these officers upheld political stability. As leading landowners, nobles were also expected to arm their tenants and servants to suppress disturbances and, when necessary, fight in royal armies. The upper clergy also played a key part in the administration of the country. They headed royal commissions, acted as councillors, presided over diocesan courts, enforced proclamations and delivered sermons in support of the establishment. The parish clergy were generally loyal to the crown though candidates may point to clerical support for rebels in 1536 and 1549 concerning religious grievances. The best answers should compare the importance of the Crown with other factors in maintaining political stability in England.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Candidates should set the importance of royal finances against other factors to reach a judgement. Weak answers are likely to have few details of royal finances or fail to recognise how they may have affected the aims and conduct of foreign policy. Better responses could usefully discuss the implications of both limited and extensive financial resources on the objectives and implementation of foreign policy, and assess the cost of maintaining armies and navies in peace-time as well as war. They might argue that limited finances resulted in a defensive and prudent foreign policy, a characteristic of Henry VII's reign. A full treasury made more options available and, for instance, enabled Henry VIII to wage war in 1512–14 and 1542–46, and enabled Elizabeth to be more aggressive towards Spain in the 1580s. Royal finances restricted all administrations, for instance Henry VIII's desire for war in the 1520s and for much of Edward's and Mary's reigns, and resulted in more neutral and cautious foreign policies and the increasing importance of continental allies. Other factors, however, need to be considered for higher marks. The best essays should assess the relationship between financial and other factors before determining which factor was the most important. Trade and commercial factors, for instance, could be usefully considered. Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth recognised the advantages of expanding overseas trade. Some candidates may argue that trade was always of secondary importance when compared with financial and political factors but it became increasingly important under Elizabeth. This was due to the collapse of the Antwerp market for English woollen cloth, the search for new overseas markets, the conflict with Spain over American trade and the impact of the Dutch Revolt on English merchants. Political, dynastic, personal and religious factors are other possible areas for consideration. Some may argue that political interests, such as national security or the welfare of the Tudor monarchy, were consistently influential; some may suggest dynastic factors were of major importance under Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary. Others may see personal or religious factors as being of major importance particularly in Mary's and Elizabeth's reigns. Personal ambition may be seen as the aim of some rulers: Henry VII wanted to secure his dynasty, Henry VIII sought to emulate Henry V in war against France, and Somerset was eager to defeat the Scots and secure the northern border. In contrast, the foreign policies of Mary and Elizabeth could be argued to have been less affected by ambition. Some candidates may conclude that financial considerations were of primary importance in influencing Tudor foreign policy but others will disagree.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	<p>For much of the Middle Ages, England and France had been traditional rivals, competing for the throne of France, lands in France, continental trade and commerce, and influence in Scotland. Each of the Tudors went to war with France but for different reasons. Henry VII tried to avoid war but felt the need to restrain Charles VIII from overrunning Brittany and threatening England, and so declared war in 1489. Henry VIII went to war on three occasions. He wanted to extend English lands in France and perhaps acquire the crown itself but was rebuffed by the equally ambitious Francis I, who used the Scots to the advantage of France. The Protestant inclined Edward VI had to contend with the war-minded Henry II, who was determined to recover Boulogne, and Mary, loyal to her Spanish husband, was forced to surrender Calais to France in 1558 after a brief war. Elizabeth was keen to recover Calais and sided with French Protestant nobles at war with the French government in 1562 before she declared peace in 1564. Candidates could usefully assess the main reasons for these fairly consistent developments: France's growing military, naval and financial power, its desire to reclaim land held by England, the Tudors alliance with Spain from 1489, the dynastic and territorial ambitions of Henry VIII, and England's move towards a Protestant faith. A turning point, however, was reached in the period from 1558 to 1564, and an assessment of key changes at this time may figure in better essays. Candidates are likely to assess the personality of Elizabeth, who was eager to avoid financing a war and sought a rapprochement with France after 1564. She was aided in this by the expulsion of French troops from Scotland in 1560 and the conversion of England's northern neighbour into a Protestant state. Developments in Scotland were crucial in changing the dynamics of England's relationship with France. Thereafter, Elizabeth did her best to befriend the French while preventing the renewal of the Auld Alliance. By 1558 neither France nor England was financially strong enough to consider war a viable policy and each came to regard the growing power of Spain under Philip II to be a greater threat to their security. France's recovery of Calais in 1558, depleted royal finances and the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion in 1562 greatly reduced the threat of a French invasion of England and made a durable Anglo-French alliance (signed at Blois in 1572) more feasible. Elizabeth preferred peaceful diplomacy to aggression and her counterpart, Catherine de Medici, focused on domestic rather than foreign affairs. In assessing the reasons for the changes, we can expect candidates to prioritise key developments and contrast elements present at the beginning of the period with the situation at the end. Some will view the rise of Spain as seminal; others may regard events in Scotland and France as crucial; and some will see the personalities and policies of Elizabeth, Philip and the Valois kings (together with Catherine) as all-important.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>England was affected in a variety of ways as a result of its foreign relations. Candidates might distinguish between dynastic and political affairs but some will treat the two elements as part of the same issue and inter-changeable, which is fine. They may argue that, to an extent, the Tudors could have done more to protect their dynasty from outside interference but at least three of the Tudors made dynastic alliances to safeguard the country's security. Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary had close relations with the Spanish Habsburgs, as did Elizabeth until the 1570s, based on the 1489 Treaty of Medina del Campo. Despite the Anglo-Scottish Treaty of Ayton of 1503, which saw the marriage of Margaret Tudor to James IV, further attempts to establish dynastic links, notably between Edward VI and Mary Queen of Scots, failed. Similarly Anglo-French ties, established in 1514 by the marriage of Mary and Louis XII, were not extended, despite attempts in the 1530s and 1540s to secure dynastic settlements and Elizabeth's toying with Anjou and Alençon in the 1570s. Candidates may also assess how and why foreign powers attempted to influence the English succession. Burgundy and France aided pretenders to Henry VII's throne, Charles V pressurised Henry VIII not to divorce Katherine of Aragon, and France and Spain supported Mary Queen of Scots' claim to Elizabeth's throne by encouraging plots and rebellions, and by sending troops to Ireland. Foreign relations also had an important impact on English political affairs: some ministers fell from office, and the privy council and parliament became more involved politically without ever having control of policy making. Thus Wolsey, Cromwell and Somerset fell from power as a result of pursuing misguided foreign policies. Relations between the privy council and monarch were often tested by overseas events and though the council was usually supportive of royal policies, divisions arose between councillors eg Somerset and Warwick in Edward's reign, Paget and Gardiner in advising Mary, and Leicester and Burghley in Elizabeth's reign. Candidates may well explore the rivalry among Elizabethan councillors concerning policies towards the Dutch Revolt, the French Wars, war with Spain, Elizabeth's marriage and the fate of Mary Queen of Scots. Parliamentary relations were also affected by foreign developments. MPs and peers rarely challenged the royal prerogative to determine policies but they increasingly questioned some of the decisions eg Mary's wish to marry Philip, Elizabeth's reluctance to name a successor, get married or raise money for war with Spain. The crown's reliance on parliament to subsidise its foreign policy led to regular sessions after 1571 and was an important political development in the history of parliament. The best essays should assess a range of developments that affected English dynastic and political affairs before reaching a judgement on their relative importance.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	<p>Candidates are likely to suggest that there are arguments that the Catholic Church owed a great deal to the growth of Protestantism and that developments after 1517 were essentially a response to it; but also that the Catholic revival began before the advent of Protestantism and that some features developed independently of it. Some candidates may assess the nature of the Catholic Church and reforms that were taking place before Luther's outburst, and so refer to the Fifth Lateran Council of 1512–17, monastic observant reforms, the creation of new orders and lay groups, the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, and biblical humanists and early Catholic reformers such as Erasmus, Savonarola, Cisneros, and Lefèvre. They are likely to set any changes from 1492 against the failure of the Papacy to lead by example, the ineffectual reforms resulting from the Lateran Council, the limited impact that reformed orders had outside Italy and the tendency for the Church to be conservative and introspective. It can however be argued that the Protestant Reformation after 1517 changed the speed, character and outcome of the Catholic Reformation. Candidates do not have to be familiar with the theological beliefs of Protestant reformers but they should be aware of the impact of reformers such as Luther, Zwingli and Calvin. They could discuss how Protestants brought about a reform of clerical abuses and perhaps unwittingly produced a clearer and unequivocal definition of doctrine at Trent. They might discuss the importance that the Catholic Church later attached to preaching and sermons, both of which were key traits of Lutheranism, or the role of the confessional and consistory to achieve greater obedience and uniformity in the Catholic Church, which reflected the influence of Calvinism. Some might examine the importance of education and the growing attention given to meeting the social and spiritual needs of the Catholic laity, which in part reflected the influence of Luther and Calvin. Some candidates may suggest that not all features of the Catholic Reformation after 1517 should be attributed to Protestant reformers. For example, new orders such as the Oratorians, Ursulines, Barnabites, Theatines, Jesuits and Discalced Carmelites owed little to the Protestant Reformation; and the work of the Inquisition in Spain was more concerned with conversos, moriscos and levels of morality among the Catholic laity than with the persecution of Protestant heretics. A balance between Protestant and Catholic Reformation elements is expected of better essays, with specific focus given to 'transformed'. Of course, some essays may claim that the premise is hypothetical but there is enough evidence to argue that, though the Catholic reform movement began before 1517, it was subsequently affected by Protestant reformers in many ways.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	<p>Candidates can be expected to evaluate the role played by the Papacy in the Catholic Reformation and compare its contribution with other factors and influences. Most candidates are likely to claim that the Papacy was essential as leader of the Church and unifier of various Catholic movements, and contrast the work of popes before and after Paul III. How a reformed Papacy aided the Catholic Reformation should figure among better responses – Paul III commissioned a survey of the Church to discover the extent of clerical abuses, he opened the first session of the Council of Trent, founded the Roman Inquisition and Index, and authorised the foundation of the Jesuits. Paul IV revised the Index and supported the Inquisition but opposed Trent, the Jesuits and Spain. Pius IV issued the all-important Tridentine Decrees. Pius V reformed the Curia and catechism, breviary and missal. Gregory XIII refurbished Rome and encouraged missionaries to travel to Protestant countries. Sixtus V reformed the Curia, established 15 ‘congregations’, rebuilt St Peters and enforced episcopal residence. Clement VIII revised the Vulgate, issued a new Index and ordered a general visitation in Rome. These contributions may be compared to the negative contributions of earlier popes such as Alexander VI (corrupt and secular minded), Julius II (warrior pope and patron of the arts but convenor of the Lateran council), Leo X (simoniac and nepotist who banned Luther but to little effect) and Clement VII (failed to stop the spread of Lutheranism and Zwinglianism, the invasion of papal lands and the sack of Rome). A counter view is that other institutions and events were more vital to the Catholic Reformation. Candidates may usefully assess the new orders such as the Oratories, Ursulines, Barnabites, and Theatines; the reformed monastic orders such as the Observants; the revival of the inquisition in Spain in the 1480s; the work of clerics in Spain, France, Florence and England; Erasmus and Luther who identified areas of reform in the Church; and the appeal of Luther and Calvin that forced the Papacy and other Catholic leaders to implement reforms. Candidates may argue that institutions such as the Council of Trent, Jesuits and Roman Inquisition contributed more to the Catholic Reformation than did popes and the Papacy. This is a wide-ranging question and candidates will need to select their comparative synthesis from a range of alternative factors before reaching a judgement. They cannot, however, be expected to produce a comprehensive assessment of all factors but should produce a solid evaluation of popes and the Papacy.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Candidates may agree or disagree with the premise. Arguments in favour of the statement may discuss some of the following: Protestantism was well established and appealing, especially Lutheranism in northern Germany and Scandinavia, Zwinglianism in several Swiss cantons, and Calvinism in Scotland, northern Netherlands and parts of France. The Emperor had limited influence in Germany and the Pope outside the Papal States; other secular rulers exerted a greater influence over the Church in their states eg England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, the Spanish Netherlands, northern and western Germany, and Scandinavia. The political condition of a state could limit its readiness to reform (eg civil war in France, political revolt in the Netherlands, the attitude of nobility and princes in Germany, the opposition of secular rulers such as Elizabeth I and James I). The prevailing social conditions hindered progress eg rural communities in Spain, France and Germany were conservative in their attitudes towards reform and reluctant to abandon traditional practices. Anticlericalism was inherent in more urbanised states that resented papal taxation and the influence of the Church in municipal affairs; such states were more receptive to Protestant ideas and propaganda spread by the printing press. There was resistance to the Jesuits and other missionaries in northern and western Europe. The inquisition and index also had a limited impact outside Spain and Italy; the 'black legend' reflected the antipathy felt towards Spain in particular, and even found expression in Catholic states governed by Philip II and Philip III. The Church was slow to clarify its aims: not until the Papacy had been revitalised, the Jesuits formed and the Tridentine Decrees published did a counter-attack begin.</p> <p>A counter-argument, however, is required that focuses on areas of, and reasons for, some successes in Europe. Some of the following points may be made: the Catholic Church stopped the spread of Protestantism in the southern Netherlands, areas of France, southern Germany and east European states due to the work of the Jesuits and Catholic missionaries, the leadership of German emperors and Catholic princes, the determination of Philip II of Spain, and the resistance of the Catholic League in France. The Council of Trent also strengthened the Church and Papacy, and Italian cardinals implemented reforms in Italy in the post-Tridentine period.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>A comparative assessment of French rulers is expected. Some candidates might approach the question thematically and, with reference to individual monarchs or periods, define 'nation state' before discussing the development of a more efficient and centralised administration, financial and religious reforms, papal relations, legal codes, suppression of over-mighty nobles, and the expansion of lands. Some candidates may focus their answer on periods of reform in 1515–17, 1522–24 and 1542–44 in the reign of Francis I. Candidates may consider issues such as the Concordat, the persecution of Protestants and humanists, the defeat of rebellion by Bourbon, the gaining of the Duchy of Brittany, the result of conflict with Charles, the Ordinance of Villers-Cotterets. Through legal and administrative reforms, he strengthened the internal condition of France, the political power of the monarchy, and the authority of the state in relation to the Church but weakened its finances and standing as an international power. The reign of Henry II also saw several key developments. In 1559 the long-running Italian wars ended and France made peace with Spain, which held until 1595. Cateau-Cambresis acknowledged Spain's supremacy in Europe and finally ceded French claims to lands in Italy. Royal finances were pronounced bankrupt in 1557, which made the crown vulnerable to the nobility and estates for the foreseeable future. Rivalry between the Montmorency, Bourbon and Guise families also surfaced, which coloured French politics for the next 40 years. After 1559 many nobles lost their <i>raison d'être</i> and turned instead to domestic violence. The reign also witnessed a steady growth in Calvinism and Henry II's response was to persecute Huguenots through the <i>Chambre Ardente</i> but with only limited success. His unexpected death in 1559 left four young sons and an Italian queen mother in charge of France, which proved a recipe for disaster. Candidates should be aware that the power of the monarchy had been steadily growing since 1498 and with it many centralising features. Henry, however, lacked interest in administration and much resentment developed as a result of his heavy-handed dealing with the <i>Paris Parlement</i>, nobles and provincial estates. Candidates should focus on the main developments of Francis's reign, and set them alongside alternative reigns or periods. They could compare the reign of Francis I with that of Louis XII, who codified the laws, kept taxes and expenditure low, improved the administration of justice, created new <i>parlements</i> and was a popular ruler in spite of an unsuccessful foreign policy. It is unlikely that candidates will view the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III as periods of positive contributions to the development of the state but they could be regarded negatively. The reign of Henry IV, especially after 1598, could be usefully assessed. He began the rehabilitation of the country domestically (resolving religious and social divisions, laying sound economic foundations and restoring the crown's political authority) and internationally (in respect of Spain, Savoy, the Valtelline, United Provinces and Cleves-Julich).</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>Candidates should attempt to define how French subjects' lives might have been improved and they might consider various themes, such as their living and working conditions, religious freedom, economic and social prosperity, and political stability. Some responses might focus on particular groups of subjects, such as the nobility, clergy, merchants, and peasantry, but a more common approach may be to examine the main French rulers and assess how their reigns affected their subjects' welfare across the period. Henry IV brought internal peace to France after more than 30 years of civil war. He reconciled conflicting religious groups and treated the peasantry sympathetically. The nobility not engaged in civil war benefited politically and financially from the restoration of a strong king and Henry rewarded loyalty and obedience. The economy flourished and as such many merchants and most townspeople prospered. However, urban living conditions were less attractive due to the rising population and movement of labour from the countryside to the towns and cities. Candidates are likely to make a strong case for Henry IV but Louis XII and Francis I may provide useful comparisons. Louis XII was known as 'Father of his People'. He was fair-minded in justice and in imposing taxation, was a devout Catholic, and pursued an active foreign policy which pleased his nobles. Francis I was a strong ruler who raised the profile of France internationally but who also clashed with most groups in France at some stage of his reign: the clergy over his sympathy for humanists and Huguenots (until 1534), the <i>parlements</i> over the Concordat of Bologna and attempts at centralisation, the nobility if they resisted his financial reforms or challenged Francis's authority, the merchants who saw their trade interrupted by war, and the peasantry who suffered in times of economic depression (plague and famine) and were particularly hit by sharp rises in indirect taxation. The nobility under Henry II fared better than the clergy in so far as France enjoyed a period of successful foreign warfare but the king's attempts to eliminate Calvinism from his country alienated many nobles and actually led to a growth in Calvinism which displeased Catholic clergy and nobles. Arguably subjects' lives were most adversely affected in the reigns of Charles IX and Henry III when civil war destabilised towns and decimated communities. Neither ruler is likely to challenge the reputation of Henry IV.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>Candidates should address a range of religious issues facing French governments in the period and evaluate the extent to which they were effectively handled. Some candidates might assess issues thematically and probably evince synoptic judgements; others might treat religious issues reign by reign, an approach that may require more explicit cross-referencing. The main religious issues that are likely to be considered are the rise of humanism and its implied heresy, a development which received royal patronage, condemnation from the Sorbonne, and created political difficulties for Francis I that were never satisfactorily dealt with. More overt heretical groups, such as the Waldensians and Huguenots, presented further problems. The former were largely suppressed but all French governments struggled with the Huguenots. Candidates could usefully assess different measures undertaken, such as reconciliation, toleration, victimisation, extirpation, and explain why a minority group could prove so difficult to manage. Henry IV partially solved the problem at Nantes but not to everyone's satisfaction and religious wars recurred in the 17th century. Another issue concerned the crown's relations with the Papacy. The Concordat of Bologna was a pragmatic compromise over the issue of the royal <i>régale</i> and satisfied most groups, though the Sorbonne and Paris <i>parlement</i> had reservations and later in 1561 welcomed the Ordinance of Orleans. Papal relations remained sound until the Gallican crisis of 1551/52 and threat of a French council being convened, until Henry II backed down. Further problems concerned the Council of Trent's agenda and these differences were not resolved. The French delegates objected to the council's unwillingness to countenance toleration and the government refused to implement the decrees. Henry IV appeased the Papacy but could not persuade his <i>parlements</i> to register the decrees. For most of the period, there was little progress in the reform of the French Church and the spirituality of the people. The 1561 Council of Poissy agreed that a programme of reform should be implemented but apart from individual efforts there was no coherent government support until Henry IV's reign. Better essays might be aware that after 1598 there was a new religious vitality, aided by the re-introduction of the Jesuits from 1603, the foundation of new orders, such as the Visitandines for girls and the introduction of Carmelites from Spain. This spiritual revival would continue well into the 17th century. Candidates are likely to conclude that by 1610 some issues had been handled effectively but the fate of the Huguenots, the crown's relations with the Papacy, the condition of the clergy and spiritual welfare of the people were lasting and unresolved problems.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	<p>Candidates may suggest that Mazarin's greatest contribution to the development of an absolute monarchy was ensuring that he and the monarchy survived the Frondes. It might be argued that afterwards Louis was old enough to assert himself and make the kind of progress towards absolutism that Louis XIII could only have dreamed of. It might also be argued that Mazarin was crucial in the defeat of Spain and that Habsburg power had been ended in both central Europe and Italy. Although Mazarin had propped up an inefficient and ageing regime, and probably did not benefit the people of France, he certainly helped it on the road to dominance. Some may argue that the Frondes were more important. Until 1648 royal absolutism in France had been limited by powerful nobles, <i>parlements</i> anxious to protect the Estates and local privileges, weak royal finances, and crown <i>officiers</i> who wavered in their loyalty to the government. The Frondes brought these groups to the surface. Candidates could argue that as a result of the civil war (1648–53), royal absolutism increased. They may suggest that fear of anarchy produced a stronger and more absolute monarchy when Louis subsequently moved his court to Versailles. Louis also saw the need to resume sole political control (accomplished after Mazarin's death), and to take the army away from nobles like Condé and Turenne (whose private retainers were clearly an obstacle to the development of an absolute monarchy) and place all troops under state control. The Frondes also demonstrated the need to expand the administration, suppress the <i>Parlement</i> of Paris and increase royal revenue without jeopardising the <i>officiers</i>, all of which was attempted in the years between 1653 and 1715. However, an argument can be made that the Frondes had little impact and other factors were more important in developing French absolutism. There was after all considerable continuity after 1653. The <i>grandeues</i> remained very influential in the provinces, the <i>pays d'états</i> kept their independence, there was still resistance to tax increases and continuing self-interest among state servants, all of which reduced Louis' absolutism. <i>Intendants</i> were not strong enough to control the provinces, <i>parlements</i> remained a powerful body and judges retained their independence. The king moreover still relied upon small committees and a handful of advisers. Some candidates might argue that factors other than the Fronde were indeed more important. These might include the expansion of the administration under Richelieu and the growth of royal power during Louis XIII's reign, which laid the foundations of royal absolutism; or the importance of military reforms due to France's entry to the Thirty Years' War, which were further developed by Louvois in Louis XIV's reign; or the personality and ambitions of Louis XIV, in particular the creation and culture of Versailles. Better responses should provide a balanced assessment that sets the role of Mazarin against a range of other factors in accounting for the development of royal absolutism.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>Candidates should examine a number of religious and economic issues, however candidates may conclude that either was more important, although it is likely that they will also suggest that both factors limited the development of France as there were weaknesses and issues in both areas. Some essays may assess the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV consecutively; some may look at issues thematically before reaching an overall judgement. The main religious issues likely to be discussed are: Gallicanism, from <i>dévots</i> who questioned Richelieu's policies to political and clerical groups who pressured Louis XIV into defending French liberties in the Four Gallican Articles of 1682. Candidates could refer to the Paris <i>parlement's</i> fierce defence against Ultramontanism, especially in the wake of Unigenitus (1713–15). This issue divided the country politically, legally and religiously. The government's relations with the Papacy and Jesuits often caused tension. Louis XIII and Richelieu managed relations well, supporting the Jesuits and endorsing monastic and lay orders and a popular religious revival. Louis XIV opposed papal authority in France in 1681–82 but requested papal support to deal with Jansenism and Quietism, thereby compromising the authority of the French Church and angering Gallicans and the Paris <i>parlement</i>. Most candidates are likely to assess the Huguenots and might contrast Richelieu's statesmanship at Alais with Louis XIV's reckless Revocation of Nantes. The Huguenots were a problem in an age that rejected toleration or coexistence but better essays could usefully assess how far Louis XIV solved the problem by 1715. Jansenism became a serious issue and embarrassed the government in Louis XIV's reign, partly because support grew among influential Catholics but also because the king mishandled the problem. In discussing economic issues candidates are likely to consider some of the following: the state of the crown's finances, especially under Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert, which enabled the monarchy to elevate its status and undertake the expansionist policies and were vital in the development of France's armed forces; the expansion of trade, industry and commerce, which developed the natural resources in France's rise to prosperity and led to France challenging the economies of England, Spain and the United Provinces. However, better answers will see the limitations to these developments and may point to the unequal tax system, an inefficient, corrupt and venal financial administration, inadequate agricultural production and insufficient ships. Financial difficulties were never overcome and as a result France never fulfilled her economic potential and weaknesses remained throughout the period.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	<p>The key to a good answer could rest on which factors candidates believe enabled France to become a major European power and how well they evaluate Colbert's work in comparison with that of other ministers and kings. Colbert's main claim lay in his management of the economy, which provided the basis for France's military achievements under Louis XIV and the creation of Versailles. Revenue increased 400%, taxes rose 40%, corruption was reduced in administration and by 1672, the budget was balanced. Unlike Richelieu, he built up an effective navy of 300 ships and 4 new dockyards, improved road and canal transport and revitalised textile industries. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. He regulated industries, founded trading companies, and established colonies in Canada and the West Indies. However, like Richelieu and Mazarin, he failed to reform the fiscal system, his law codes could not be enforced and attempts to establish permanent trading companies failed. His period of influence, however, from 1661-83, coincided with France's most successful years in foreign affairs and warfare. Colbert should be compared with other ministers, most probably Richelieu and Mazarin, and possibly Louvois, and kings. It may be argued that Richelieu strengthened the monarchy at the expense of the nobility, developed a more centralised administration, pacified the Huguenots, began to build up naval bases and overseas colonies, and laid the foundations for victory in war against Spain. Louis XIII also played an important part in directing the war efforts and supporting Richelieu in the face of domestic critics. Mazarin's main contribution lay in negotiating beneficial terms at Westphalia and the Pyrenees, which gained France lands in Savoy, Alsace, the Netherlands and the Rhineland (1648) and lands in Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the Pyrenees and acquired a claim to the Spanish throne (1659). A negative feature was the Fronde, which was partly a result of his own unpopularity and financial mismanagement. Better candidates may point out that important changes also occurred in Louis XIV's reign. Louvois and Le Tellier strengthened the administration, resources and size of the armed forces, without which France would not have become the dominant power in Europe under Louis XIV. Louis also modified his foreign policy as events unfolded and as coalitions against him were created, and it may be argued that France's ascendancy as a European power owed most to his leadership and ambition. Candidates need to compare Colbert's achievements with the contributions of other ministers and monarchs during the period before reaching a conclusion.</p>	60	<p>Candidates are expected to demonstrate understanding of the issues in each of their selected questions over a period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period.)</p> <p>Candidates are reminded of the synoptic nature of the Unit. Answers are required to demonstrate understanding of the processes of historical continuity, development and change across the full breadth of the period studied.</p> <p>Assessors 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

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 2013

