

AS

History

Paper 2F The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe 1643–1685
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2F The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1685

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context which of these two extracts is the more valuable in explaining Fouquet's role within France between 1654 and 1661? | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

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 must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- The source is written by the key character involved and at the time of his arrest (1661). Thus the events it describes are fresh in the mind of the writer.
- The source is a letter written to Le Tellier, a leading minister of Louis, asking him to intercede on Fouquet's behalf. Thus the content is probably accurate in terms of known facts but is clearly prejudiced as he is seeking to avoid punishment.
- The tone is justificatory.

Content and argument

- Fouquet is making the case that his actions had saved France in 1654 when on the verge of bankruptcy and that he had worked hard and well.
- He is refuting the argument that he has exploited Louis for his own ends; he had used the resources of himself and his banking "friends" to restore France's credit.
- He has maintained France's financial position since this point.
- He does acknowledge that he has done "blameworthy things" but this was the only way forward in the dire financial position he encountered.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the context was 19 years of continuous warfare and more recently the Fronde which had ruined the French economy. Certainly no-one else, such as Servien (Fouquet's predecessor) or even Mazarin, appeared able to resolve these financial problems
- his methods included borrowing on his own credit rather than that of the Crown at times of emergency. However this did enable him to defraud the Crown subsequently

- he did secure much needed loans and payments from tax farmers which were also desperately needed. However he charged commission to the Crown on both of these and allowing himself and his friends to take advantage of the King by securing generous rates of interest. Thus the King's credit rating was low which meant that he was being overcharged for his money
- the finances were in a state of disorder which meant it was hard for anyone to prove fraud until Colbert meticulously did so.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- This source is from Louis XIV who arrested and dismissed Fouquet.
- It was a memoir and so the events were not necessarily fresh in the King's mind.
- This account was checked over by the King's ministers and so should be accurate; however they may also be finding ways of presenting the evidence in a more positive way for Louis.
- The document was meant to be private, a source of advice for his son; in this case, there is little likelihood of Louis being deceitful except perhaps to give his son a good impression of his father's competence or to write the account in such a way as to lead the Dauphin to adopt a particular course of action as ruler.

Content and argument

- The source shows that there was a two stage process to the dismissal of Fouquet; first his admission of his crimes, Louis' forgiveness of them and employing Colbert alongside to monitor him; then the arrest after Fouquet had continued his crimes.
- Fouquet's continued crimes are outlined here; first continuing his conspicuous consumption and indeed fortifying a home (Belle Ile); second forming political groups against the royal interest by using his position to benefit his friends, hoping to repay their support when he achieved the position of chief minister.
- Louis claims that all of France was in agreement with his actions and knew of Fouquet's actions.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- certainly Colbert was appointed to assist Fouquet once he assumed his personal government but he reported to Louis not Fouquet. The two stage process is confirmed in Drazin's biography of Fouquet. This suggests Louis was planning further action and was gathering evidence
- Fouquet certainly built a magnificent palace at Vaux le Vicomte and some historians claim it was envy which provoked Louis' response
- the second set of claims about Colbert were flimsy – the fortification of Belle Ile was not substantial and there is no real evidence of Colbert plotting against the King in any serious sense
- Colbert's case against Fouquet had to be carefully constructed and the trial conducted carefully as Mazarin had been involved in the frauds and Colbert had been closely involved in this

- Louis had decided in 1661 just a few months before Fouquet's arrest to rule without a chief minister; Fouquet had been the obvious candidate. Fouquet's arrest and punishment may be related to Louis' suspicions and his desire to impose himself; after all the other bankers were not punished anywhere near as severely for the same basic crime
- not all of France supported Louis' actions; many were critical of Mazarin and the care taken in the prosecution of Fouquet to prevent other allegations emerging showed that Louis was at least concerned about public opinion over his actions.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that both Sources A and B have direct vested interest. While the author of Source A is pleading for his freedom and thus has great vested interest, Source B seems to have less reason for deceit as it is written for a private audience. Source A may be marginally more reliable from its provenance than B as it was written at the time not several years after and was one person's view not a committee's. Source A does construct a defence with some validity from our other knowledge of France's situation but Source B's accusations in the first instance were effectively right as Source A admits. Source A is probably more reliable in terms of its provenance but Source B is more reliable in terms of lack of vested interest.

Section B

0 2 'The most important consequence of the War of Devolution of 1667–8 was the Dutch War of 1672–9.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the most important consequence of the War of Devolution was the Dutch War, might include:

- the intervention of the Dutch in the Triple Alliance which forced Louis to surrender many of his gains – for example Franche Comté from what had been a very successful war
- this angered Louis XIV because the French had given vital assistance to the Dutch in the 80 Years War which led to their independence from Spain and this did not seem an appropriate response from the Dutch
- Louis' actions showed that this war led to the Dutch War; he isolated the Dutch by forming his own alliances with England, Sweden and several German princes
- although gains had been made, to conquer further territories in the area, the Dutch would have to be dealt with
- that it was a war of revenge is indicated by Louis' continuation of the Dutch War despite early territorial gains.

Arguments challenging the view that the most important consequence of the War of Devolution was the Dutch War, might include:

- there was a five year gap between the two wars
- the Dutch War had other more important causes such as the trading rivalry between France and the Dutch Republic as well as religious hostility
- the War of Devolution allowed the border of France to be extended northwards and broke the ring of forts on the northern border which were quickly turned by Vauban into forts to defend France
- the War of Devolution led to countries becoming concerned by Louis' aggression. He lost allies such as Brandenburg and the League of the Rhine and found states being ready to form defensive alliances against him or assist countries like the Dutch when he attacked them in 1672
- the War of Devolution brought gloire to Louis XIV and encouraged further aggression because of its success
- the war showed that Spain was severely weakened and required support from other nations to be able to defeat France
- the War of Devolution could be argued that the war acted as a catalyst in bringing countries to the negotiating table to decide how to deal with the Spanish Succession question.

Better students can show balance by comparing the outcomes of the war and determining which was the most important one, for example, the ring of defensive forts eventually would save France from utter defeat in the War of Spanish Succession which could be argued to be more significant than causing another war of aggression. The case that the Dutch War was not caused in part by the War of Devolution could also be compared; for example the time lag between the two could be instanced although this could be countered by the need for time to isolate the Dutch.

0 3 'The death of Colbert in 1683 was highly significant for the government of France.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the death of Colbert in 1683 was highly significant for the government of France, might include:

- Colbert had been Louis' finance minister since 1661 and Controlleur General since 1665. Clearly the loss of such a person would be highly significant for France
- Colbert had been able to increase the revenue for Louis
- Colbert had been able to reduce Louis' debts, from 700 million livres in 1661 to 250 million in 1683
- Colbert had been a brake on Louis' expansionist aims; he was the last to be persuaded on pursuing a Dutch War in 1672
- Colbert's departure and replacement by Louvois has been linked to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes
- Colbert's support of trading companies and direct investment in the economy generally stopped with his death
- Colbert's replacement, Louvois, was the author of the Dragonnades policy and a prominent opponent of the Huguenots.

Arguments challenging the view that the death of Colbert in 1683 was highly significant for the government of France, might include:

- the importance of Colbert can be exaggerated. He was not Louis' chief minister and many of his fiscal and economic achievements were short lived
- Colbert had not tackled the fundamental problems of France – the wide scale poverty of the peasantry, the unfair tax system and many of the impediments to trade such as local customs and tariffs. There was no attempt to do so before 1685 (or indeed afterwards)
- Colbert's successors like Louvois continued to increase Louis' revenue before 1685
- Colbert's success with the reduction of debt had stopped after the start of the Dutch Wars; from this point on he too had faced increasing debt – in 1683 the debt was added to by 28 million livres
- Colbert was reluctant but nevertheless fell into line with Louis' policy to invade the Dutch (a cheaper option than commercial warfare) and to spend gloriously on Versailles (in part because it would act as a showcase for French manufactures)
- Louvois continued Colbert's policies of centralised regulation
- there had been continued pressure on the Huguenots – the Dragonnades policy had been started in 1681, before Colbert's death and Colbert used intendants to pressurise Huguenots to convert
- moreover Louis had other reasons for the revocation which had nothing to do with Colbert, such as the growing influence of Madame de Maintenon and the fact that Huguenots were now fewer in number and therefore it was easier to revoke the edict.

Good students will tend to compare these factors and come to a balanced judgment; for example, although Colbert had achieved a good deal, many of his policies were already changing because of Louis' decisions to pursue an aggressive foreign policy.