



**General Certificate of Education
January 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS2C

Unit 2C

The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

Final

Mark Scheme

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

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

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

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

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

January 2011

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

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

Question 1

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

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the peasant uprisings in 1593–1594. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| L1: Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. | 1-2 |
| L2: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. | 3-6 |
| L3: Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. | 7-9 |
| L4: Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. | 10-12 |

Indicative content

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

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

- Source A suggests that expectations of taxation was significant, whereas Source B indicates that some leeway was given and taxes in arrears were not to be collected
- Source A suggests that serious uprisings were largely confined to the South West, whereas Source B indicates that peasants were assembling in large numbers everywhere
- Source A suggests that the levels of violence might have been greater than Source B implies.

Explaining the differences through own knowledge:

- the degree of opposition from the peasants varied from place to place according to the impact of taxation levels in that area
- Henry needed taxes desperately to compensate his noble supporters but was keenly aware that he could not afford to lose the support of the lower classes
- Henry wanted and needed the support of both town and country, although their needs were different
- Henry had to resolve the problem quickly. His position as an 'outsider' would be untenable if he could not assert his authority.

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

- Source A indicates that peasants were prepared to use violence to achieve their goal i.e. 'destroying nobility' and in Source B 'they organised for violence'
- both sources agree that taxation was the key to the potential confrontation
- both indicate rebellions provided a 'test fire' for Henry IV's government that direct taxation had a clear limit given the limits of production in the peasant economy.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important were the nobles in enabling Henry IV to establish himself as king by 1598? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**

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

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

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

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** the nobles are suggested to be an obstacle because they caused friction with the peasants because of their privileged status; taxes would be taken from the peasants and so they were 'paying for the favours assigned to others.'
- **Source B:** the peasants were angry that the nobles were making excessive demands for money and betraying their role as 'good seigneurs' i.e. they were not behaving in a civilised manner and this was likely to lead to violence. Peasants not only made their views known to the king but were also prepared to fight if Henry was not prepared to fight. This possibility reflected badly on the king's authority and his relations with the nobles.
- **Source C:** in this source, the nobles are seen to be supporting Henry as King because he is working to maintain order. Henry also won over the towns; both rich and poor supported him.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting ways in which the nobles were important might include:

- they rallied to the support of the crown in most instances when needed
- they could oppose the crown if they chose; plots were frequent
- nobles had 'clients'; i.e. lesser lords who would support and fight with them for the king if required
- Henry was prepared to give the nobles pensions, positions of importance such as governorships and create new nobles to increase support for his rule; many of these were encouraged to stay at court rather than live on their lands; their other main role was to fight and thus Henry 'allowed' duelling whilst also issuing edicts against it
- many were noble because of their birth and so the institution continued and was seen as important
- they could antagonise some of the population because they tended to prosper whilst peasants and townsfolk did not.

Factors suggesting ways in which the nobles were not important or other factors were more important might include:

- some nobles had a declining income as the value of pensions dropped and so were less able to pay for titles, positions etc or were in debt
- nobles were encouraged to build splendid homes and spend time on their estates away from Paris
- nobles could be excluded from the king's council and there were ultimately fewer of them
- Henry appointed his own lieutenants rather than nobles to work in the provinces; they usually came from the lower nobility and were likely to be more loyal and possibly better educated; they were known as the 'noblesse de robe'
- Henry was prepared to impose the ultimate punishment on those who opposed him, e.g. Biron

- nobles were encouraged to continue their education; this again could keep them away from court
- Henry's own personality and self promotion
- agreement to the religious settlement (Edict of Nantes, 1598) and protection for Huguenots
- improvements in the financial situation
- the defeat of Philip II and the Treaty of Vervins 1598 enabling Henry to focus more on internal issues.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the nobles who rallied round Henry IV gave him invaluable support especially at the beginning of his reign when he was at his most vulnerable, but that their importance appeared to decrease as he consolidated his position. An undercurrent remained of how important genuine peace and recovery were nevertheless to preserve French society.

Question 2

03 Explain why the French monarchy was heavily in debt in 1589. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the legacy of the Wars of Religion; income from the *taille* was reduced but the expenses of war increased
- it was difficult to increase taxation to resolve the debt; Henry would lose support
- Henry already owed money to other European monarchs, e.g. Elizabeth I and German princes.

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

- the monarchy had substantial debt of approximately 1.8 million livres outstanding from the period before the wars and Henry's challenge for the throne
- inflation had reduced the real worth of income from taxation
- corruption amongst financial officers was at its highest level.

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

- the cost of war
- military governors and towns levied taxes without permission of the crown
- the need to maintain the perception of a strong monarchy.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. Candidates might suggest for example that, the effects of the war made it difficult to deal with corruption in the short-term; Henry IV was an unknown quantity and was not trusted and so had to tread carefully; it was difficult for him to get loans. Corruption, however, might be identified as the main factor, particularly the spending and acquisitions of previous superintendants of finance.

Question 2

- 04** 'In economic terms, Henry IV's reign was a "golden age".'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- general economic recovery was evident within two years of the accession, e.g. growth of population
- agriculture recovered quickly; prices for grain fell and good harvests satisfied the internal market
- industry also revived although more slowly, e.g. the silk trade, ship-building, cloth making began trading and exporting
- Sully's work on the infrastructure encouraged more production and more ease of communication, e.g. building roads, canals.
- Sully's financial reforms were also beneficial, e.g. control of interest rates, protectionist policies, encouragement of new industries and new techniques
- devaluation of the currency enabled France to export and be more competitive in external trading
- a Council of Commerce/Trade was set up to oversee and support trade and financial developments; it was headed by Laffemas; it held meetings examining suggested projects and reported to the Council; the silk trade was one result of this collaboration
- entrepreneurs were encouraged, e.g. Dagon who devised a new method of silk weaving to create fabrics of more than one colour; goods such as carpets and ceramics became popular
- new proposals were examined and encouraged to support the infrastructure, e.g. mining, drainage schemes
- imports, e.g. textiles from England, were prohibited to protect internal production.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- there was corruption in some areas, e.g. sales of offices, bribes to magistrates – so not everyone benefited
- some towns did not fully recover from the devastation of the wars
- export duties still had to be paid in the early years of the reign, e.g. when sending goods to Spain; this was useful for the government but allowed the recovery
- the coinage was not stable; there was some debasement and a scarcity of gold. Sully devalued the coinage at various points but it was not always enough to ensure that French exports had the competitive edge
- an increase in lawyers and clerks (who required fees/wages) to support the financial and legal aspects of trade and commerce.

Good answers are likely to conclude that despite the difficulties, France did begin to make a recovery from the previous very unsettled period. Henry IV himself supported Sully and was a supporter of 'conspicuous consumption' both to support industry but also to bolster the monarchy and restore confidence generally. Such as the construction of a Mediterranean fleet and economic trade treaties with the Levant and Sultan, new ports were encouraged in the Atlantic trade, St Malo, Brest, La Rochelle exploiting valuable trade with Spain, these became major currency earners for France.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Cleves-Jülich affair was a threat to the French Crown. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Cleves-Jülich affair over a duchy situated between the United Provinces and the Empire was a threat to the French Crown.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- following the death of the Duke of Cleves without an obvious heir and the appearance of there were 2 claimants, a Lutheran Protestant and others; there was concern that the area might be annexed by the Holy Roman Empire, bringing the threat of the HRE closer to the United Provinces and France. The duchy was situated between the United Province (Netherlands) and the Empire
- German Protestant princes were initially hesitant about taking action
- Catholics in France were uneasy about the political situation in the Empire
- Henry's council was divided and Henry wanted to avoid war if possible
- when Henry IV was assassinated, the French were left even more vulnerable.

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

- there was a degree of rivalry between the Holy Roman Empire and France, although the religious upheavals in the Empire (largely Lutheranism) and the subsequent internal conflict, together with the French Wars of Religion, had limited confrontation between the two powers
- Henry IV had been given loans by the German Protestant princes to help him gain the throne of France, and as a consequence, they saw him in the mould of a 'protector'
- Spain saw this as an opportunity to create difficulties for a Henry IV whose conversion was never fully accepted and who was building a strong monarchy next door to Spain
- the link between Spain and the Holy Roman Empire was strong through the Habsburg family connections and the reign of Charles I and subsequently his brother as Emperor.

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

- Henry IV issued an ultimatum demanding that Spanish administrators (also involved through the Habsburg connection and the desire to remove Henry from the French throne) be removed from Cleves-Jülich
- he eventually threatened to invade the Netherlands as a warning action. (However, Henry was assassinated before he could take action, although a French army did go to Jülich and a compromise was eventually reached about the succession.)

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might emphasise the religious problem and the possibility that he had never really become a sincere Catholic to explain the threat. They might also recognise that Henry might see this as an opportunity for Spain to invade France.

Question 3

- 06** 'The Treaty of Vervins in 1598 successfully resolved conflict with Spain.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

*(24 marks)**Target: AO1(a), AO1(b) AO2(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree/disagree with the view that the treaty brought an end to conflict.

Points/factors/evidence which agree(s) might include:

- France received territory from the Treaty of Vervins, e.g. Calais, Toul, Metz and Amiens; these were all territories which bordered on the Holy Roman Empire and therefore strengthened France's defences
- Henry's 'Grand Design' was aimed at supporting the Protestant cause in Europe was intended to counterbalance the influence of Spain and Catholicism and to prevent war. This was achieved
- Henry's own conversion and support of Catholicism had already informally resolved the religious conflict with Spain before 1598. The treaty helped confirm this.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- France remained surrounded by Spain and Spanish held territory. The Empire had strong links to Spain through the Emperor Charles V and his descendants. Spain retained Saluzzo in exchange for Bresse
- all French frontier provinces were mapped and fortresses built/stores of food created to enable resistance to Spain in the event of an invasion
- France encouraged the Moorish/Morisco populations in Spain not to co-operate with the authorities
- Birons' revolt in 1600 was partially supported by Spain
- Henry prepared to challenge Spain on several occasions, e.g. against Savoy in 1600–1601 and regarding the Cleves-Jülich succession in 1609–1610
- subsidies continued to be paid by Henry to the Dutch to fight the Spanish Regents of the Netherlands
- Henry resisted Spanish control of the Valtelline pass to Austria and the Rhine, except for a short period from 1603–1607 when the Spanish were in control
- France built up a fleet at Toulon to patrol the Mediterranean; this was useful in regard to both Spain and the Turks.

Good answers are likely to conclude that although open conflict was much reduced, suspicion remained and both states were more guarded in their actions. It is likely that neither state actually wanted an open conflict. However, the most dangerous issues occurred in the early years of the reign when, e.g. Spain captured Amiens in 1597.