
AS
HISTORY

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

Mark scheme

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 sources is more valuable in explaining why Louis XIV wanted to lessen the power of the nobility? | [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

- it should be noted that Source A was written by an outsider and might reflect some of the imagery which was presented by Louis' court where he was portrayed as the 'Sun King'
- the source was written in the early period of Louis' reign, when he was in a strong position with regards to his nobility. This position did decline further in his reign
- the style of the source is overwhelmingly in praise of Louis and details the extent of his power. The language used perhaps suggests a less than partisan view.

Content and argument

- this source is primarily discussing the extent of Louis' power and control over his governments and nobility. From this historians can infer that this situation was new and unusual compare with the precedent from before his reign
- the best way for Louis to exercise this control was to be fully in control of his government so that all decisions and all patronage came through him as explained in the source
- the source highlights the extraordinary ability of Louis, his command of detail and the fear that he instilled in his ministers.

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

- the extent to which Louis was able to control all the complexities of government as suggested
- the limitations that are evident in the characterisation of Louis; there were some less flattering aspects to his personality and the influence of mistresses may be referred to
- reference may also be made to such authorities as the Church which acted as a restraint.

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

Provenance and tone

- the author of this source was a member of the old nobility, the duc de Saint-Simon, who was personally affected by Louis' policy of relying heavily on new men in his government. He was bitter about this and this is reflected in his account
- Saint-Simon was writing towards the end of Louis' reign, when the relations between Louis and the nobility were becoming more difficult, as a result of attempts to increase taxes from the nobles, for example
- the source is a clearly critical view of Louis' relationship with the nobility, the language used makes this clear
- the criticisms of Louis' ability as a ruler would make historians question the accuracy of the source.

Content and argument

- this source talks about Louis' distrust of the nobles of the sword and his desire to rule, with the assistance of selected nobles of the robe
- this source suggests that the nobles of the robe manipulated Louis by flattery for their own gain.

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

- to corroborate and/or challenge this view of the relationship between Louis and the nobles of the sword
- evidence that suggests that at least some ministers were able men dedicated to France but loyal to Louis without manipulating him
- the degree to which it is reasonable to characterise Louis as intoxicated with authority.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) Source A, written by a foreigner, may have an objectivity that Source B lacks and that whilst not comprehensive, it gives a more balanced view of Louis and his relations with the nobility. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

0	2	'Colbert's economic and financial reforms were a complete success.'
----------	----------	---

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.

Evidence of success in Colbert's reforms might include:

- Colbert invested state capital in various industries which helped to improve the French economy. Notable examples would be in lace making or the Gobelins tapestry works. Other industries that improved generally, as a result of encouragement from Colbert and his protective tariffs, included the woollen factory at Abbeville. The quality of products produced was so high that they could compete in foreign markets
- Colbert helped to stimulate domestic trade by attempting a uniform system of weights and measures and by building new canals. This, combined with a new postal service, did improve France's economy
- Colbert reduced the levels of direct taxation that he was collecting, but also cut down on corruption by fining corrupt financiers and instructing his intendants to supervise tax collection in the provinces. This actually meant that revenue from the taille went up, despite a lower levy in the first place
- Colbert placed more indirect taxes on goods such as salt and luxury items. This enabled him to tax those who were exempt from the taille
- by 1672 Colbert had managed to balance the books, which indicates that he was successful. Louis was also able to engage in whatever wars or building projects that he liked in this period, which hints at success.

Evidence that Colbert's reforms were unsuccessful might include:

- despite much enthusiasm from Colbert, there was little independent industrial entrepreneurship. This was partly because of snobbery; wealthy merchants or craftsmen would rather purchase noble status than reinvest their profits into their industries. Colbert was unable to change this attitude as it was one that was also firmly held by the King
- there was still, especially after the start of the Dutch War, a heavy reliance on loans and the selling of offices. This brought a lot of money in originally but increased debts and also reduced the taxable population
- Colbert failed to appreciate that France's economy was predominantly agricultural. He made no attempt to improve agriculture and, therefore, those who had the burden of the taille to pay tended to struggle because of outdated and inefficient farming techniques
- Colbert's trading companies were largely a failure as they could not compete with the Dutch.

Students are likely to conclude that Colbert improved the situation, but that Louis' financial demands were always outstripping what he was capable of collecting. His changes in the economy were somewhat short-sighted and did not have lasting significance on a wide scale.

0 3 'Reducing Habsburg power in Europe best explains Louis XIV's actions in foreign policy in the years 1672 to 1685.'

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.

Factors suggesting that the main motive for Louis XIV's foreign policy was to reduce the power of the Habsburgs might include:

- Louis can be seen to be continuing the policy of his old Principal Minister Mazarin, who had long sought to deal with Habsburg encirclement of France.
- attempts to grab the Spanish Netherlands and the Franche Comte (e.g. Dutch War) can be seen as part of a general policy of trying to isolate Spain as a threat to the French borders
- the policy of Reunions is probably the best example of Louis attempting to strengthen the borders which were vulnerable to Habsburg invasion, especially in the east. Taking key entry points such as Strasbourg and Luxembourg would enable Vauban to extend his system of defensive fortresses. If Louis XIV had been purely after land/glory he might not have settled with the Peace of Ratisbon, that he was happy to do this speaks volumes
- in 1687–1688 Louis XIV was increasingly concerned about the Austrian Hapsburgs and so tried to force them into making the Truce established at Ratisbon in 1684 permanent. This desire to reinforce French security explains events such as the devastation of the Palatinate
- Louis' failure to help the Emperor against the Turks suggests that he was trying to keep a potential opponent occupied.

Factors suggesting other motives might include:

- Louis XIV was almost obsessive about the glory of himself and of the French monarchy (see his building of Versailles as indicative of this). Glory can also be seen as a motive in foreign policy; for example, war against the Dutch seems to have been primarily about getting revenge on them for abandoning a former ally. Louis XIV had achieved most of his territorial objectives by 1672, but he still refused to cease hostilities
- Dynasticism was also possibly a reason. Louis XIV was perhaps convinced that the French had legally valid claims to parts of Europe affected by the Reunions
- the Dutch War could have also been provoked for economic reasons
- religion could have been a motivating factor; illustrated by the Te Deum held in Strasbourg cathedral or his desire to defeat the Dutch.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that it is difficult to assign one single motive for Louis XIV's foreign policy as it was often partially determined by the domestic situation (especially in terms of finance) and was sometimes opportunistic (e.g. taking advantage of the Turkish invasion). However, the fact that Louis XIV did reach agreements with the other powers and did not continually push to extend France at the expense of others suggests that defensible borders in relation to the Habsburgs were a very important consideration.

