



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

AS History 1041

HIS1E

Unit 1E

Absolutist States:

The Reign of Louis XIV, 1661–1715

Final

Mark Scheme

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

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

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

Copyright © 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

June 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

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

Question 1

01 Explain why Fouquet was removed as *Surintendant des Finances* in 1661. (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.

General type responses may concentrate on the weaknesses of the royal finances in 1661 and suggest that Fouquet's replacement by Colbert was the result of financial failure. However, more specific responses may recognise that Colbert was himself in part responsible for the financial system, having previously come to the attention of Mazarin. There were thus more specific reasons for Fouquet's removal that may include:

- Fouquet had clearly enriched himself at the expense of the state, having profited from the widespread corruption at court

- Fouquet was certainly not alone in having profited from corruption, however Louis and Colbert were keen to set a high profile example
- Fouquet was the victim of Colbert's ambition. Colbert's almost vindictive prosecution of Fouquet was in part motivated by a desire to replace him as surintendant of finances
- there was a genuine difference of opinion between Fouquet and Colbert on the direction of policy. Fouquet opposed Colbert's advocacy of state bankruptcy
- Louis XIV was keen to assert his authority. Fouquet's assumption that he should replace Mazarin as the new King's chief minister rankled with Louis XIV who had already professed a desire to rule alone
- Fouquet's considerable personal wealth, if confiscated by the Crown, would serve as a substantial boost to state coffers.

Question 1

02 How important were the overseas trading companies to the economic reforms of Colbert? (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.

The overseas trading companies – East India Company; West Indies Company; Northern Company; Levant Company – were in themselves disappointing and failed to achieve their economic objectives. However they might be considered to have at least achieved some success:

- they established the principle of state intervention in economic and financial affairs and as such reinforced Colbert's mercantilist ideals
- they acted as a trigger to the substantial private enterprise that followed the companies
- they established the primacy of maritime trade and stimulated the domestic economy associated with ship building and especially the development of ports such as Brest
- they encouraged overseas exploration and settlement. Whilst the companies failed, the French trading settlements did not.

However, the companies failed as:

- they failed to effectively challenge the hegemony of Dutch or British trade
- they failed to increase state income through taxation, and may actually have proven a drain on the state coffers
- the lack of a national French Bank ensured that the companies would never achieve the primacy that the merchant nations of Holland and Great Britain would
- State direction of trade, especially in the domestic industry, but stemming from the experimentation of the Companies, failed to stimulate industry and instead stifled innovation
- the companies simply prompted retaliatory measures from other countries and reflect the misdirection of Colbert's mercantilism.

Other factors that might have been considered important include:

- the encouragement of state guided industry, such as the Gobelin works, seemed at least initially to have some success. Indeed, if the luxury market alone is considered this was a very successful area of Colbert's economic reforms
- mercantilism and the notion of protectionism assisted some nascent industry, however most candidates are liable to identify the negative international consequences of this policy
- the development of standardised weights and measures
- the improvements to infrastructure and especially the canal system
- the attempts to establish a postal service
- the attempts to seize resources, especially in the Dutch War
- the development of a merchant marine.

Question 2**03** Explain why in 1688 France became involved in the Nine Years War. (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 Nine Years War, 1688–1697, has been considered a turning point in Louis XIV's foreign policy, marking as it does the shift from offensive to defensive. The war was thus to some degree thrust upon an unwilling France. A number of factors might be identified:

- the European balance of power had shifted. The weakness of states emerging from the Thirty Years War had been replaced by more confident states fearful of an apparently aggressive France. The creation of the League of Augsburg was in part evidence of this
- the end of the siege of Vienna freed European states to consider threats closer to home. Louis' apparent exploitation of the siege to embark on his policy of Reunions further convinced other states of the untrustworthy nature of the French king
- the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had possibly added technology such as the bomb-ketch to European armies. More significantly, the revocation convinced states of a religious dimension to Louis' foreign policy
- the seizure of the papal state of Avignon and the election of the Archbishop of Cologne provided more short term reasons.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was Louis XIV's foreign policy in increasing the security of 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.

Candidates should consider reasons in favour and against success. In addition, there should be some attempt to define security. The very best responses may in addition differentiate or explain links between the security of France and other forms of security such as dynastic and religious. However, there should remain a clear focus on the security of France within the set period.

Factors in favour of success:

- if Louis XIV's later foreign policy is interpreted as one of self defence against aggressively minded neighbours, then he must be credited with at least maintaining the integrity of France's borders despite temporary incursions
- the major treaties of the period and especially Ryswick did apparently weaken France's territorial hold, effectively reversing all of France's territorial gains since Nymegen, but Strasbourg did remain in his hands
- the War of Spanish Succession can be seen as having increased France's security, especially in breaking the possibility of Habsburg encirclement. In addition, the presence of a Bourbon on the Spanish throne created the potential of a Bourbon dominated Europe
- the very fact that Louis XIV proved willing to defend the terms of Carlos II's Will increased France's security in the face of a European threat from powers that had recovered from the ravages of the Thirty Years War many decades before
- the security of France may not have been the foremost motive of Louis XIV's foreign policy; certainly this nationalistic motivation was slow in developing. However, France remained strong in 1715. The very events of 1685 to 1715 may be interpreted as evidence of the concern that an increasingly secure France was causing the major powers.

Factors against success:

- territorial loss was substantial and France's north eastern border remained vulnerable; key positions such as Luxembourg had also had to be sacrificed. Moreover, the gains that foreign powers made at France's expense were substantial and went beyond the more territorial. For example, Louis XIV's forced recognition of William of Orange as William III
- Louis XIV's foreign policy might be considered to have actively damaged France's security. The alignment against protestant powers did nothing to convince Europe that Louis was not bent of the aggressive pursuit of religious uniformity. Louis XIV's pursuit of the unrealistic Will of Carlos II may have provoked the very war that damaged France's position
- it was more than material losses that did so much damage. The Nine Years War proved that France could be stopped and that her armies could be defeated. Louis XIV himself convinced Europe that in this period that it was necessary to stop France
- the damage to France's security may well have been felt most at home. The immense cost of the wars of the period clearly put huge strain on an inequitable taxation system. It was largely this period that accounts for the large debt bequeathed to Louis XV. The subsequent domestic instability was therefore directly linked to Louis XIV's foreign policy.

Question 3**05** Explain why Louis XIV wanted religious uniformity. (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.**

Candidates might reasonably be expected to identify a range of factors:

- Louis XIV's own religious beliefs and his genuine belief in his accountability for the souls of his subjects
- the coronation oath and especially the 'extirpation of heresy'
- a personal distrust of the Huguenots especially after his experiences during his minority.
- a desire for absolutism and a belief that uniformity within the realm served to strengthen his authority
- the influence of Madame de Maintenon
- a personal desire, especially after his failure to support the Christian monarchs at Vienna, to prove his worth as 'the most Christian monarch of Europe'
- experience of the Huguenot risings later in his reign.

Question 3

- 06** How far did Louis XIV's religious policies achieve his objectives in the years 1661 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.

Conclusions might very well depend on definition of objectives. These might include: the desire for a united church; the wish to fulfil coronation oaths and the extirpation of heresy, to be the 'Most Christian King'

- Louis XIV's Huguenot policy failed to eradicate the Huguenot's from France. Indeed if this was his intention, then revolts during the Spanish War of Succession proves how

many isolated communities of protestants remained in France. Worse, Louis XIV's policy had alienated foreign powers and led to the flight of a number of well connected Huguenots

- the apparent persecution of religious minorities did not elevate him to the title of 'Most Christian king', the Pope was said to comment that even Christ did not convert at the point of a sword'. Louis lost out to the Emperor who had sprung to the defence of Christian Europe whilst Louis embarked on the policy of Reunions
- one of the most damaging legacies of Louis' reign was the unresolved position over Jansenism. The failure to fully implement the papal bull Unigenitus and the decision to wait for a full meeting of the Church Council, simply left Louis XV with a troublesome legacy. The Jansenists were, like the Huguenots, not a threat to domestic security but were considered an affront to Louis XIV's desire to uniformity
- it was therefore Louis XIV's irrational objectives that possibly had little hope of ever being realised that meant his religious policy failed. Ironically the earlier period was one of much greater success and certainly the Huguenot policy of gentle coercion would have led to the eradication of the Protestants from France within a few decades.