



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1E

Absolutist States:

The Reign of Louis XIV, 1661–1715

Mark Scheme

2010 examination – January series

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 © 2010 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 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1E: Absolutist States: The Reign of Louis XIV, 1661–1715

Question 1

- (a) Explain why, in 1661, Louis XIV decided to rule without a principal minister. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic 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 Louis XIV decided to rule without a principal minister.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the principles of Divine Right and the assumption that the King alone had the authority to rule was the theoretical basis of the Personal Rule

- after the instability of the minority and also of the Frondes, there was a need for clear, central authority that would humble the nobility and ensure that stability was returned to domestic politics
- it seemed that Fouquet might reasonably expect to have been appointed as Principal Minister. The humbling of Fouquet had much to do with the personal ambition of Colbert and also Louis XIV's desire to establish his authority in opposition to the influential nobility. In addition some candidates might suggest that Louis XIV's personal rule was motivated by the desire to tackle corruption
- Louis XIV's view that central rule was possible was based less on experience than on theory. The fact that Louis XIV believed he was capable of ruling alone was possibly a consequence of his inexperience as monarch and of his youth
- Louis XIV's personal ambition and his desire for renown might reasonably be considered to have played a significant role.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might suggest that Louis XIV's motives were various but that the most significant was Louis' own youthful desire for prestige at home.

- (b) How successful was Louis XIV in maintaining the authority of monarchy within France in the years 1685 to 1715? (24 marks)

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

Generic 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 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 will show some understanding of the focus 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.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest Louis was successful against others which do not.

Issues that may illustrate a failure to maintain authority:

- the attempt to establish religious uniformity, especially in relation to the Huguenots and also the issue of Unigenitus

- candidates might well suggest that the revocation of the Edict of Nantes illustrates the exercise of authority, but that the failure to conclude the issue actually weakened the position of the crown. The subsequent Huguenot revolts provide evidence of the failure of Louis XIV to exercise complete authority
- the attempted introduction of Unigenitus illustrates a reliance from Louis XIV on papal authority. Not only was this in contrast to a formally Gallican position, but was in itself a failure due in part to obstructionism from Parlement. That the Bull was not introduced during the period might be used as evidence of the inability of Louis XIV to exercise his own authority
- despite the expense of Louis XIV's later wars, he was unable to introduce a more equitable taxation system. The Capitation and the Dixième were little more than emergency taxes, that failed to address the exemptions of the privileged and the long term problems of finance. This failure to resolve the fiscal crisis resulted not only in Louis XIV's letter patents of 1709 but also the melting of the silver at Versailles. Such a direct appeal to a burgeoning public sphere illustrates the weakening of divine right authority
- Versailles had lost much of its effectiveness. The role of Maintenon should not be underestimated, with many of the nobility and the elite preferring the distractions of Paris in Louis XIV's later years.

Factors that illustrate success in maintaining authority:

- despite fighting a series of expensive foreign wars, economic distress and dealing with internal revolt of the Huguenots, the domestic stability of France was never seriously jeopardised
- emergency taxation in the form of the Capitation and Dixième, whilst only temporary in nature, did tap the wealth of the privileged. It is unlikely that Louis XIV ever had the objective of a fundamental reform of the fiscal system
- Parlement remained constrained by the removal of pre-registration of remonstrance. Despite Parlement's opposition to Unigenitus, it was Louis XIV's death, rather than their effective opposition that accounts for the Bull's initial failure
- revolt in the Cévennes was reasonably easily suppressed
- Louis XIV's confidence in his authority may be illustrated by his Will and its attempt to dictate the terms of the subsequent Regency.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that such success changed during the course of a lengthy reign.

Question 2

(a) Why did Louis XIV begin the War of Devolution? (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic 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 for the War of Devolution.

Candidates might include some of the following:

- it remained a long-term objective of French foreign policy to secure the North-Eastern frontier. This was especially true considering the lack of natural frontiers and previous territorial incursions in this theatre
- the death of Philip IV of Spain had left the ailing Charles on the Spanish throne. It seemed an ideal opportunity to exploit this temporary vulnerability
- Louis XIV may have genuinely believed, or been convinced, that Maria Theresa had an authentic claim to territory. To have ignored this claim, might have given reason to suggest that Louis XIV lacked the willingness to defend his dynasty
- the desire to use the reformed military machine should not be underestimated. The need to demonstrate the abilities of the armies, even if in wars of limited scope, was significant.

- Louis XIV's personal motives, including those of glory and his very youth may well be considered significant.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might suggest that the reasons given by Louis XIV for this war were simply the excuse for the fundamental objective of securing natural frontiers.

- (b) How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV's foreign policy in the years 1672 to 1688? (24 marks)

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

Generic 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 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 will show some understanding of the focus 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.

In 'how important' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points supporting importance against others which do not and the answer could be exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors supporting the role of glory:

- Louis XIV had clearly established a desire for personal renown in the construction of Versailles and also the manipulation of imagery. This might be used as general commentary to support the statement
- The Dutch War, 1672–1679 had few discernable motives beyond those of revenge and glory. Louis XIV's desire to teach the Dutch a lesson whilst simultaneously furthering his international renown may be considered the prime motive for war
- the pursuit of the Dutch War further supports the motive of glory. Even though Louis XIV had realised his initial objectives by June 1672, and despite the generous terms offered by Jan de Witt, Louis refused to cease hostilities
- the Wars of Reunion were conducted under the premise of legality, yet Louis' triumphant entry to Strasbourg in 1681 clearly illustrates a desire for renown
- the Nine Years' War was to a degree brought upon Louis XIV by himself. It was the fear that Louis XIV's previous foreign policy had engendered that explains to some extent the union of powers against him. Louis XIV's previous triumphalism, especially whilst the siege of Vienna was being conducted, was the very thing that convinced Europe of his desire for a universal monarchy and continental domination.

Factors contesting the statement:

- whilst the desire for personal renown and glory is difficult to dismiss, it is equally difficult to maintain that Louis XIV's only desire was for prestige. Whilst the defence of national frontiers and the extension of territory certainly brought prestige, this may be seen as a consequence of, and not the motive for, foreign policy in this period
- The Dutch War, 1672–1679 was motivated from a desire for revenge, not necessarily glory. In addition, the economic benefits of defeating so powerful a maritime nation was not lost on Colbert whose support for the war suggests motives other than Louis XIV's personal renown
- the Reunions did have a legal basis, which whilst dubious, may well have been one that Louis XIV eventually became convinced of. To have allowed such claims to pass uncontested would have damaged Louis XIV's international position
- the Reunions were motivated at least in part by opportunism. That many of the European powers were occupied by Vienna provided Louis XIV with the chance to strengthen his weak eastern border
- Louis XIV was suspected of having religious motives, especially as a consequence of the Te Deum held in Strasbourg cathedral. This was a common charge levelled at Louis XIV by contemporaries and may have some validity.
- by the end of the period, Louis XIV had much less interest in conducting an aggressive foreign policy. The Nine Years War may be seen almost purely in defensive terms. In this respect, glory had little if any role to play.

Question 3

- (a) Why did the death in 1700 of Carlos II, King of Spain, increase international tension?
(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic 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.

- the death of Carlos II had been widely anticipated due to his sickly nature. This was potentially a danger due to the lack of a direct heir to the Spanish throne. It was clear that the Great powers of Europe were prepared for this as there had been a series of partition treaties drawn up before 1700
- Spain, and especially her empire in the Americas, was a rich prize and it was clear that possession of her territory would be a source of conflict in an increasingly mercantilist age
- the prestige of possessing the Spanish throne was not lost on any of the great powers.
- Louis XIV would certainly wish to establish a position in Spain as this would not only strengthen his border over the Pyrenees, but also that with the Spanish Netherlands
- the death of Carlos was made much more significant by the content of his Will. The ceding of all of the Spanish possessions to Louis XIV was unexpected and led Louis to rescind the previous partition agreements. It was Louis XIV's opportunism that fed the crisis.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example that the death was not unexpected, but the Will was. Louis was therefore motivated by a range of factors to make his claim, but this was merely a reaction to a genuinely unexpected event.

- (b) How far was the failure of French foreign policy in the years 1688 to 1715 due to the over-confidence of Louis XIV? (24 marks)

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

Generic 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 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 will show some understanding of the focus 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.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest Louis was over confident against others which do not.

Confidence as a factor:

- it was the over confident reaction to chance events that in part determined the outcome of Louis' foreign policy in this period
- Louis XIV's recognition of James may certainly have been diplomatically a mistake, and Louis' continued support for James may be ascribed to an over confidence combined with mis-placed loyalty
- the array of foreign powers ranged against Louis XIV and so essential in determining the defensive nature of Louis XIV's foreign policy in this period, was a consequence of Louis XIV's previous arrogance and of his religious policy, especially his actions against the Huguenots
- whilst the death of Carlos II may have prompted war, it was Louis XIV's subsequent actions and especially his determination to pursue dynastic objectives, that determined the outcome
- Louis remained convinced of the superiority of the french forces, and in his ability to defeat the range of powers allied against him. The diplomatic approach of the Partition Treaties quickly gave way to unilateral action.

Other factors:

- the ending of the siege of Vienna might reasonably be considered to have represented a stroke of great misfortune for Louis XIV. The great powers were now able to concentrate on the perceived threat represented by Louis XIV. The success of Louis XIV's previous foreign policy was due in part to the pre-occupation of other powers. In addition, the recovery of the great powers, although expected, might be ascribed to chance
- the impact of trade recessions and poor harvests that struck France particularly hard during the Nine Years War meant that Louis could afford much less on preparations for war
- the success of William of Orange in England might be attributed to chance, and certainly accounted for the positioning of English forces against Louis XIV in subsequent years.
- the content of Carlos II's will was unforeseen, and one that dramatically affected the outcome of Louis XIV's foreign policy
- the death of the Archbishop of Cologne in 1688 and the disastrous outcome for Louis XIV was clearly attributable to chance
- the death of many of France's great generals before the outbreak of the War of Spanish Succession seriously affected the outcome of the war
- the chance reversal of fortune during the War of Spanish Succession, and especially the removal of Marlborough and the return of the Tories were important. In addition, the death of Emperor Joseph I in 1711 removed the justification of the great powers allied against the fear of the domination of the continent by one power.