



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

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

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges 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 students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

June 2012

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 Edict of Nantes. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

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

- the view in Source B maintains the edict fell far short of what many Huguenots would have liked, whereas the view expressed in Source A states; the edict was robust in tackling a range of sensitive issues between the two religions
- Source B maintains that Huguenots could only worship in certain well-defined places, whereas Source A says Huguenot worship was allowed anywhere where Huguenots could prove they had openly practised there in 1596 and 1597

- the view expressed in Source B maintains that the contention that the edict solved the religious problems of France was false, whereas in Source A it says that ministers and Catholic clergy were encouraged not to preach treasonous sermons, forced conversions were forbidden suggesting a level of toleration
- the view expressed in Source B maintains that the edict did not put the Huguenot Church on the same footing as the Catholic one, yet Source A contends clause 27 of the edict satisfied the Huguenots by removing the religious qualification needed to hold or inherit any public office.

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

- the Catholics firmly believed the edict gave too many concessions to the Huguenots. Huguenots conversely felt the edict left them essentially vulnerable and safe only as long as Henry IV protected them. They became a protected religious sect, a “state within a state”. They were forced to return land, church wealth taken from the Catholics and accept limitations on where they could preach yet they were similarly free to apply for and inherit public office which Henry rigorously enforced through conspicuous impartiality.

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

- both Sources A and B maintain that there was provision for the building and rebuilding of religious houses and churches, the restoration of Catholic ceremonies such as feast days, funerals and marriages
- both Sources A and B maintain that the edict was a success; it allowed for the edict to adjust to local conditions of the Protestant movement and Source B says that it could be counted a success for open war had been replaced by uneasy peace, both acknowledging that the potential for conflict had been replaced by greater co-existence in the regions.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that the edict was a device to seek short-term toleration and not longer term unity. The concessions were meant to offer a clear degree of religious freedom through carefully managed state intervention, itself a political device to end the Wars of Religion. The extent to which this happened requires some discussion.

Question 1

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

How important was the religious settlement of 1598 in explaining the domestic stability of the years 1598 to 1610? (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

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

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** the Edict of Nantes brought an end to the religious wars which had devastated France from 1562 and had led to foreign intervention. The edict offered the opportunity for peace and domestic stability. It maintained that the edict offered clear concessions to the Huguenots whilst seeking to resolve a range of sensitive issues between the two religions. It also allowed for the terms of the edict to adjust to local conditions minimising antagonisms and encouraging peaceful co-existence.
- **Source B:** yet the edict fell far short of what the Huguenots would have liked. Their right to worship was restricted. It did not give religious parity with Catholics. In this sense it did not solve the underlying religious problems or heal the religious divisions. The idea the edict had solved the religious problems of France was questionable. Yet there was an acknowledgement that the edict contributed significantly to the domestic stability of France. Open war between Catholics and Huguenots had been replaced by an uneasy peace.
- **Source C:** acknowledges the importance of the edict in bridging the country's religious divisions and bringing domestic stability. Yet offers alternative reasons to help explain domestic stability: importantly the restoration of finances, a period of developing economic prosperity and relative peace in international affairs, the contribution made by Henry's overt policies for the restoration of royal authority throughout the realm are also important.

Factors suggesting domestic stability:

- the Edict of Nantes officially ended the Wars of Religion which had led to years of civil war and internal foreign intervention, destabilising the French state and undermining any attempts at peace
- the edict offered the opportunity for peaceful co-existence and a degree of mutual toleration through its secret articles and brevets
- importantly a major part of the Edict was devoted to *the removal of past disorders*, an attempt to remove sectarian memories of the past in time of war
- the edict allowed Henry to attempt to win the support of the Catholics after years of civil wars whilst also attempting to gain the loyalty of many of the Huguenots after that loyalty had been tested by his conversion
- Henry was able to balance the religious factions in peace with each other acknowledging Catholic dominance whilst offering royal protection to the Huguenots
- the importance of the edict in explaining its contribution to domestic stability in part can be seen in its alternative name of the pacification of Nantes
- the controversial article allowing the Huguenots limited military capability contributed to the uneasy nature of the peace

- the importance of the edict can also be seen in the wider context of other factors.

Other factors suggesting domestic stability:

- the Treaty of Vervins with Spain effectively ended the ambitions of the Catholic League, Spanish intervention and occupation of French soil. Peace was doubly achieved allowing for the subsequent restoration
- the influence of Sully in restoring finances contributed significantly to investment, banking, royal income and infrastructure
- the growth of economic prosperity and the rapidity with which it was able to progress both in the countryside and the urban centres
- the spread of royal authority and the curtailment of the feudal power of the traditional nobility
- control of the regions of France after rebellion had been suppressed by 1596
- the development of an elite social class which was able to challenge the rights and privileges of the nobles and who maximised their new prosperity often through investment
- foreign policy was important in the development of domestic stability, peace in international affairs encouraged further investment and confidence
- Henry also promoted the image of prosperity and his personal involvement in and support for public works
- the inability of Protestantism to flourish after 1598 and its subsequent decline is important for the ending of religiously motivated domestic conflict and may be significant in helping to explain domestic stability.

Good answers are likely to conclude:

The importance of the Edict of Nantes in explaining domestic stability is crucial yet other factors do need to be considered and links made which help to explain their relative merits. Good answers will be able to select appropriate evidence to offer an evaluation which should lead to an effective judgement.

Question 2

03 Explain why offices were sold by the Crown during the reign of Henry IV. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

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

Students might include some of the following factors:

- offices were originally loans granted to the Crown and were used as a means of raising additional revenues
- offices were a lucrative means to augment royal revenues such as the *tailles* as the need to finance the wars of religion became more and more expensive and later the war against Spain
- increasingly bidding for offices became an additional source of income and the sought after reversions or inheritance of an office for a son, heir or relative
- the *Paulette* was introduced by Sully to off set the cost of office holders salaries and their lucrative 'at source' deductions. The *Paulette* was designed to make up for this loss ensuring a regular flow of income
- the *Paulette* was used to attack the noble clientage system by making it compulsory for hereditary office holders
- there was a growing sense that an element of social engineering was taking place. The Crown was actively selling offices to an emerging professional elite in the regions which

were replacing the traditional power and privileges of the nobility. Monarchical authority was being strengthened.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of a range of the reasons given. For example, offices originally brought in necessary income for the Crown in time of war. The eventual cost of such offices and the corruption associated with them then led to the Crown creating the *Paulette* as a means to off set such costs and losses. The office holders became an increasingly powerful and privileged social, judicial and political elite which the Crown was able to use to counter traditional noble power.

Question 2

- 04** 'Sully successfully restored the economic prosperity of France.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not: that there are clear distinctions between economic and financial issues. The focus is primarily economic prosperity though there will be some overlaps **which could be rewarded within context.**

Evidence which agrees might include:

- economic prosperity was the result of the work of Sully from 1597
- he gained control of finances, kept meticulous records and aimed to impose some kind of uniformity of taxes across France in an attempt at economic reconstruction
- taxes were either direct such as the Taille or indirect taxes such as the Gabelle and later taxes such as the short-term Pancarte and the later Paulette. These raised considerable revenues through effective methods of collection, the rooting out of corruption and the method of tax farming Sully maximized
- he was also *Grand Voyeur*, responsible for the infrastructure which covered roads, canals, bridges and the planning of towns supporting economic prosperity
- local tolls were abolished to make longer distance travel more profitable
- systems were put in place to support this regeneration, such as accurate book keeping and annual budgeting
- a range of officials were appointed to report back to Sully on work done
- diversification in industry was encouraged, spinning wool promoted through the Council of Commerce established in 1602 by means such as imposing taxes on imports and removing them on exports
- the Council also under Sully's guidance provided business advice and financial assistance to many noble and middle class entrepreneurs anxious to take advantage of the country's economic recovery under Sully
- the establishment of new industries such as silk at Lyon and tapestry making
- Henry IV too, actively encouraged and supported Sully's work, realising his potential and giving him a great deal of freedom to develop the economy after years of decline and neglect
- Sully was equally successful in restoring the finances of France, currency reforms, taxation, revenues and the liquidation of France's massive debts, the writing off of most of the foreign debt and loans which contributed to further investment in the economy
- Sully oversaw the development of 'mercantilist' theory: the best way to increase national wealth was for government to expand imports, while simultaneously encouraging self-sufficiency at home. In this Sully was actively supported by Henry IV.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- whilst taxation was considerably improved it never reached its maximum potential and some taxes led to rebellion and others were so unpopular such as the Pancarte that they had to be withdrawn after only a couple of years. Their contribution to the inward investment of the economy is questionable
- in some respects Sully was able to take advantage of this and he exploited the ten years of peace which his appointment largely coincided with. The treaties of Vervins and Nantes respectively ended Henry's costly war against Spain and the Catholic League. Reconstruction was possible as a consequence of this rather than Sully's direct influence
- Sully was also responsible for the military, artillery, fortress maintenance and construction and the navy
- not all of the Council of Commerce's projects were successful. The French East India Company set up in 1604, was able neither to overcome competition with the Dutch nor open up the passage to the Far East
- the New France Company established to trade with Canada was similarly limited and unprofitable
- Sully disliked merchants and manufacturers and opposed many of Henry IV's more entrepreneurial ventures

- Henry IV believed in direct state intervention and took steps to fix wages, prohibit strikes and illegal combinations of workmen rather than Sully
- Henry IV directly promoted advances in textile production especially silk and wool rather than Sully
- Henry also concluded trade treaties with both England and Spain, increasing the volume of French trade and stimulating exports of grain, cattle and wine rather than Sully
- arguably most of the advances remained a result of the calm following the Treaty of Vervins in 1598 and not just the innovation of Sully.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Sully was incredibly hard working and single minded though he did maximise his own opportunities whilst trying to maximise France's economic reconstruction. There are links between finance and the economy but the focus of the question is economic prosperity. Students will recognise the contribution made by Sully to the restoration and prosperity of France but that there were limitations to that success.

Question 3

05 Explain why Henry IV fortified the French frontiers. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

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

Students might include some of the following factors:

- French preoccupation with Habsburg encirclement was a traditional anxiety and despite the Treaty of Vervins remained a fundamental aim in French policy the need to defend the vulnerable frontier zones
- French territory had been attacked before 1595. Saluzzo was invaded just before Henry succeeded to the throne, Provence and Dauphine were invaded in 1589 and 1593 with Spanish consent and Toul was overrun in 1589 again with Spanish encouragement. Philip's intentions were clearly displayed even before war was declared and served only to encourage defence of the frontiers. Spain maintained a force of 60 000 troops on France's border in Flanders, Lyon was still controlled by Charles Emmanuel and Toul in the hands of the Duke of Lorraine. These were direct threats to the French borders and again underlined the need for defence in order to help stabilise internal peace, encourage economic prosperity and strengthen Henry's authority
- fortification of the frontiers included buffer states such as Savoy; protecting Alpine passes into Italy which were controlled by France including the Simplon Pass

- Henry would, having seen the impressive fortifications constructed by Maurice of Nassau in the Netherlands, invest in similar defensive fortifications overseen by Sully for the strategically important north western frontiers in the light of the Dutch Revolt.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might consider the nature of threat to Henry from Habsburg ambition and Philip's support for the Catholic League not just on the frontiers but within France. Defence of the frontiers was a vital strategic policy especially in the north-west. Defence would promote internal stability, economic prosperity and strengthen royal authority.

Question 3

- 06** 'The Treaty of Vervins satisfactorily resolved the tensions between France and 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 students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that the Treaty of Vervins resolved the tensions which existed between France and Spain but that conversely the tensions were by no means resolved as a consequence of the treaty.

Factors which agree that the Treaty of Vervins satisfactorily resolved the tensions between France and Spain might include the following:

- the Treaty of Vervins ended the war between France and Spain which had begun officially in 1595. The tensions were satisfactorily resolved consequently
- the treaty ended Spanish involvement in France and its support for the Catholic League, which was already undermined by the conclusion of the Edict of Nantes
- the treaty demanded the return of French towns and fortresses such as Amiens
- the Treaty of Vervins restored the important fortresses of Metz, Toul, Verdun, and Calais maintaining France's north-eastern frontiers facing the Habsburg territories in the Netherlands
- France also agreed to papal arbitration over French claims to Saluzzo, previously seized by the Duke of Lorraine in 1588
- the map was redrawn to the position of the peace treaty of Cateau-Cambrisis in 1559. Henry's foreign policy turned from Spain to neighbouring states whom France felt threatened by
- the lack of papal arbitration over Saluzzo led to Henry declaring war on Savoy in 1600 though France and Spain remained at peace
- the resulting treaty saw Henry concede Saluzzo in return for various states which helped to strengthen his position, these included: Bresse, Bugey and Gex
- Henry had emerged from the peace with a clear sense of what had largely been something of a gamble had paid off, but he realised the financial constraints imposed upon him would restrict further aggressive foreign policy and lead to a more determined defensive policy. Such defensive policy satisfactorily helped to resolve the tensions between the two nations
- Henry would set out to construct a series of foreign alliances which would provide him with a body of foreign support should war be resumed and to counteract Spain's influence in European affairs
- the death of Philip II was a significant factor in the Franco-Spanish relationship after Vervins further reducing the tensions
- the Treaty had resolved the long and protracted war and Spanish support for the Leaguers. Tensions had been calmed but had by no means been eradicated.

Factors which disagree might refer to the following:

- whilst the power of Spain was in decline by the end of the century it was not apparent at the time and this contributed to the growing tensions which the Treaty of Vervins had not resolved
- after Vervins, Spanish garrisons still held the Pyrenees and Flanders, Luxembourg, Lorraine, Franche Comte and Savoy remained under Spanish influence. France was further threatened by a combination of alliances and special relationships which bound the states of northern Italy to Spain
- the Spanish influence in Italy was a real concern to Henry IV. Most of Italy was under Spanish influence, particularly in northern Italy and the Treaty of Vervins did nothing to resolve tensions over this
- the position of Milan; its strategic importance to the Spanish Road remained to threaten France and tensions here were not resolved – this became an area of tension which Vervins had not addressed
- Italy became an increasing area of tension. Henry worked hard to rebuild French power even marrying Marie de Medici, niece of the grand Duke of Tuscany, a powerful, wealthy ally in Italy against Spanish influence

- Henry similarly worked hard to secure papal approval and support from Venice. This alliance allowed Henry access to the Valtelline Alpine passes which controlled one of the routes of the Spanish Road, raising further tensions with Spain
- further west Henry raised the tension with Spain with his alliance with the Swiss Confederation applying pressure on Spain's Savoyard ally
- by the end of his reign Henry had re-addressed the earlier tensions that Vervins had resolved to his advantage
- Henry was able to encircle Habsburg forces in northern Italy, Switzerland, Savoy, Venice, Tuscany and Rome surrounded Spanish territories in northern Italy and threatened the Spanish Road at a time when the Dutch had secured the north Netherlands from Spanish control. Consequently the tensions between the two states were by no means satisfactorily resolved
- by 1609 tensions were exacerbated by the Julich-Cleves crisis which revealed that the Treaty of Vervins had merely postponed what was an inevitable confrontation between France and Spain.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Vervins did end the war between France and Spain, that the tensions had been satisfactorily resolved but that these were short-term and the strategic, political and personal rivalries would resurface, in this sense, the Treaty did not satisfactorily resolve the tensions between France and Spain.

Converting marks into UMS marks

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

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion