

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2C: The Reign of Henry IV of France,  
1589–1610



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2C Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS2C: The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the threat posed to the government of France by the Nobles after the Wars of Religion. (12 marks)

Source A shows that, due to the nature of his predecessors Henry IV, he was faced with Waring nobles. The previous monarchs, with perhaps the exception of Henry III had been young, weak and dominated by their Italian mother Catherine de Medici, this had left the nobles without a firm hand to keep them in line. Consequently the nobles became very self important and began using their private armies to create personal wars with neighbouring noble rivals. Source A however, suggest that although this was the case it posed little threat to the government. They wanted it to stop so they passed an edict and it did leading to a more educated nobility. Therefore Source A suggests that they posed only a small threat.

Similarly Source B suggests they posed 'little danger' to the government. Collins states that rather than fighting to destroy government they were fighting for the control of government. To an extent this is true, the majority of people were never fighting to destroy the goverment it was a power struggle, the one to win would control government. As Greengrass says faced with the prospect of social anarchy people turned back to the monarch, showing as much as they fought against it, given the choice of society falling apart or a strong king people prefered the King.

Therefore although Sources A and B talk of different aspects of the nobility and the threat they had they are similar in the fact that neither would suggest a major threat was posed by them post the Wars of Religion.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer was rewarded at Level 4, although at the low end of the mark range. There is a good level of contextual understanding and evidence of own knowledge as well as an understanding of the extent of difference.*

*The first paragraph of the response supplies some effective contextual understanding of previous monarchs and identifies the limited control of the nobles by government in previous reigns as a serious threat, particularly in the reign of Catherine de Medici. It also provides an analysis of Source A which is well linked to the problem of the noble threat to the government of France on Henry IV's accession e.g the specific reference to the noble's right of private war. This is then connected to the work of Henry IV in prohibiting duelling via an edict; however, the effect of this and of 'academies' promoted to 'tame' the nobility and educate them in the softer arts is not fully developed. The suggestion is made that, overall, the nobility were only a 'small threat'.*

*The second paragraph, derived from Source B, shows some agreement with Source A, suggesting that the nobles overall were never a serious military threat to the crown and government in terms of bringing it down. Nevertheless, there is also an emphasis placed on the idea of a power struggle; there is a clear understanding that the nobles did want some involvement and control, which could*

*still be a severe political threat to the independence and authority of Henry IV's government even if not leading to war. This therefore both agrees and disagrees with Source A and is usefully supported by a link to the candidate's own knowledge of Greengrass's suggestion that although the nobles wanted power, they also did not want to destroy government.*

*The conclusion refers to the concept of similarity and difference with reference to the sources and some own knowledge; it makes a simple, but relevant, point that neither source suggests there was a major threat posed by the nobles; but there was a limited threat which had to be countered. The suggestion that the struggle was about control of government and not destruction was understood. This therefore led to an award just into Level 4 for comparison, some own knowledge, understanding and evaluation of the issues. It could not be given more marks in this level without more contextual support. Level 4 – 10 marks.*

## Candidate 2

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the threat posed to the government of France by the Nobles after the Wars of Religion. (12 marks)

Both sources refer to conflict amongst the nobility. Source A shows this as duelling was about upholding honour and bringing about the opponents downfall. 'In the first 6 months...it had saved the lives of 300 noblemen' suggests the extreme extent to which duelling was a problem, as with so many noblemen dying, the government could be disrupted due to unexpected deaths. Source B also expresses the conflicts of the nobility 'struggles among three great noble families – Bourbon, Guise and Montmorency.' This conflict led to disruption in government as other problems in the country couldn't be successfully addressed due to the fighting.

However, the sources express explicit differences. The duelling in source A is fighting for personal gain and defeating an opponent as a result of an insult or injustice which has been committed. On the other hand, source B expresses that the conflicts were for the good of the country and government 'The struggles...concerned control of the central government'. This suggests there was a reason behind the fighting, which was to secure control to assist the running of government.

Overall, both sources express the problems of fighting nobility. However source A is a threat to government due to the dying nobility whereas source B shows an attempt to secure government.

## Principal Examiner's Comments

*The first paragraph of this response is clear in its comparison of Sources A and B making reference to conflict 'amongst the nobility'. and agreement that this led to disruption. There is some good contextual references to the extent of conflict; reference to the consequences is less well developed. The second paragraph considers a difference in terms of motivation for the participants; for example, those in A are fighting for personal gain whereas B stresses the good of the state as the motive. The further idea of threats to government in Source A as opposed to attempts to secure it in Source B is appropriate but needed more development and support from own knowledge to be convincing.*

*Overall this was a source based response with little attempt to link to specific own knowledge. The deciding factor in awarding a mark at the top of Level 2 was that both similarity and difference had been accessed. Level 2 – 6 marks.*

### Candidate 3

- 1 (b) How important was Henry's treatment of the nobles in enabling him to establish his authority in France during the 1590s? (24 marks)

The wars of Religion (1562-1598) had caused great upheaval in France and the nobility had been able to prosper because of a weak Monarchy that allowed them to build up power bases and use the spread of Protestantism to gain support or Catholicism.

As shown in Source C, following the death of Cardinal de Bourbon in 1590, the Catholics were unable to find a "national candidate" to be their alternative to Henri. Henri's impeccable sense of timing, by announcing his conversion, won over the more moderate Catholics to his cause whilst leaving a big enough question-mark over his faith to keep Protestant support. This means that the Catholics had no-one else that they can count on, particularly after the Treaty of Vervins in 1598, which withdraws Spanish troops from France as well as Philip II's wish to pursue a more peaceful foreign policy.

This is an example of Henri limiting the power of the nobility but it also shows Henri's ability to win people over. Following his coronation on the 27<sup>th</sup> February 1594, the citizens of Paris were now willing to receive Henri as their king. This was a crucial moment for Henry and without it he could not have established royal authority.

His abjuration of Protestantism shows his willingness to balance principle with pragmatism. Henri may have remained Protestant at heart but in order to become king he had to convert to Catholicism. At the same time, Henri bribed both the Duke of Mayenne and the Duke of Joyeuse to stop fighting against him. This shows how dealing with the nobility is intrinsically linked to Henri's other actions to establish his authority because although Henri's military achievements against Mayenne in 1589, 1590 and 1591 were excellent, by effectively "buying the nobility off" he restores peace for longer.

This establishing of peace is aided significantly by the Edict of Nantes, the religious settlement. The Protestants had become disaffected as their high expectations of Henri had not been matched up to this moment. However, by granting them freedom of conscience, garrisons to protect themselves and allowing them public worship in the places established in 1586 and 1597, the Protestants believe Henri is still the right person to protect them. The Edict of Nantes was supported by 2 royal brevets showing its temporary nature. If Henri's will changed, the Huguenots would no longer be free, hence why they remain peaceful.

As shown in Source B, the power bases built up by the nobility were a problem for Henri and an obstacle to re-establishing his authority. However, the economic recovery changed all of this. For example, the municipalities had built up tremendous debt with towns like Marseilles owing 11.5 million livres. This is because they had borrowed from the nobility during the wars of religion in order to protect themselves. Henri had these debts written off because he had not granted



permission for these loans, which brought back the towns and cities back under his influence and ensuring the heritage system would now work from the Monarch downwards reducing the power of the nobility.

Henri also recovers his authority through the ending of the Peasant Unrest which had led to risings in Normandy (Gaultiers) , Burgundy and Brittany (Bonnets rouges -1591) and the Croquants risings of 1594. By giving them aid to remove the bands of troops who had robbed, tortured and imprisoned them, and allowing the Croquants to elect their own syndics, Henri ensured their interests were represented and that they were treated justly. By treating them for example in this way and shifting the burden of taxation from the poor to the Rich through the gabelle and Paulette, Henri wins the people of France over.

As shown in source A Henri's enforcement of an Edict banning duelling in 1602 which saved the lives of 300 noblemen and the creation of academies helped limit the "free rein" that the nobility had during the wars of Religion. At the same time, as shown in source B, the clientage system had been massive but Henri reduced this returning obedience to the king.

(In conclusion) lots of factors contributed to Henri's establishment of his authority. He ended the Wars of Religion through his conversion, the Edict of Nantes and the peace with Spain; the financial recovery helped reduce the peasant unrest and helped bring an end to the clientage system; Henri's willingness to balance with pragmatism and principle and winning people over was probably the main reason. Without the support of the French people he would not have become king in the first instance.

As show by source C however, Henri's treatment of the nobility brings all of this together. He wins over the catholic League, run by nobles, by converting, he bribes the Catholic nobles with pensions and Henri didn't quite forfeit the loyalty of Huguenot nobles.

The treatment of the nobles is significant but not as significant as Henri winning the French people over.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This essay was focussed effectively on the question and had a range of points for discussion, using all the sources and linking well to own knowledge. All the sources are accessed, some more than once, and successfully incorporated into the answer.*

*The answer begins by providing some brief context identifying the shift of power between crown and nobles which had resulted from the Wars of Religion and threatened the crown. The importance of Henry's treatment of the nobles is identified by reference to his use of both the 'carrot and the stick'. This is neatly exemplified by quoting his conversion to Catholicism which enabled Catholic nobles to support his bid for the throne but left enough doubt about his sincerity to appease the Protestants nobles. Not only this, but the answer clearly links this to a reduction in the threat to France from Philip II and a Catholic Spain and suggests that nobles will no longer be able to rebel on religious grounds or bring in foreign support.*

*Other issues with the nobles are also used effectively to support the view that*



*Henry IV established his authority e.g. regarding clientage, he deprived the nobles of this role by cancelling the debts owed to the nobles, for example, by the towns, thus also bringing the towns back under royal control. Good use is made of the ban on duelling issued in 1602, seen as a factor which saved lives and prevented generally lawless behaviour.*

*Understanding of the importance of Paris as the major city in France and the seat of the crown is also displayed through an understanding of the significance and impact of the coronation in 1594. Securing the support of the Huguenots is also dealt with through discussion of the Edict of Nantes. Economics and finance are also assessed; Henry is seen as the saviour of the towns as he wrote off their debts to the nobles: another action which reduced their influence. Awareness of the wider pacification of France is evident in the references to Henry's resolution of the peasant uprisings in the early 1590s.*

*In all, this response had both breadth and depth, although the latter is more variable; it clearly provided a discussion of the issues; there is an attempt to prioritise and to make links throughout. The sources were used as needed to support the answer rather than as a separate part of the response. A slightly weak ending, however, meant that although Level 5 was clearly appropriate, full marks were not. Nevertheless, the award of 23 marks was well deserved. Level 5 – 23 marks.*

#### **Candidate 4**

- 1 (b) How important was Henry's treatment of the nobles in enabling him to establish his authority in France during the 1590s (24 marks)

Source C shows how important it was that Henry IV was careful in his dealing with nobles for fear of angering either the Catholics or the Huguenots, this was important because the Wars of religion had just come to an end with his conversion, and if he angered either side he would risk the wars starting again.

It was important Henry IV did not anger the Huguenots as this was his main power base, and his conversion had already lost him extremist support, it was also important because Henry IV would need their support if the great noble families decided to rebel against him, as Source B shows, they wanted to change who was in control of the government so this was a threat.

Source A shows that Henry IV was wary in his handling of the nobles, as he did not pass the edict condemning duelling until 1602, this may have been because he did not want to risk angering the nobles so soon after the Wars of Religion or because he wanted to ensure that he had their support before trying to limit them, it could also have been because he needed to establish Royal Authority more, before attempting to control the nobles in this way, however when he did pass the edict the punishment was severe showing that he was not as wary as he had previously been, and as the edict was a success, saving 300 noblemen in 'the first six months, this would have helped to further establish Royal Authority.

Source B shows that whilst Henry IV was wary in his handling of the nobles they did not pose too great a threat to his government as it funded their clientage networks, and so were likely to obey him, had they not he could have limited this funding, however this would have risked further angering the nobles and causing another Civil War.

Henry IV had to be careful when establishing Authority and dealing with the nobles because he risked starting another civil war, this may have caused him to be more tolerant because of the power the great nobles held. Henry IV may also have been more tolerant because it was essential that he had their support during the war with Spain in 1595, without which the result may not have been as favourable as Vervins in 1598. Henry IV also had to be careful so that the nobles did not plot with foreign powers, posing a threat to Henry IV's power as well as France itself.

Had Henry IV not been as tolerant he could have faced another civil war or a loss of power, however it was also important for Henry IV to exercise control over them to help establish Royal Authority, and other situations such as the War with Spain helped unite them with him against a common enemy.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This response overall is rather thin and does not make as much use of own knowledge as it might have done. The discussion of the sources precedes the introduction of own knowledge and thus the essay lacks a level of integration which is needed for the higher levels, for example, the essay plunges straight into a link with Source C and makes a fairly general observation about the need to appease both religious groups, Catholics and Huguenots. However, there is an implicit link made with Source B in the second paragraph; Henry needed the support of the Huguenots if the Catholic nobles rebelled against him and he was wary of the prospect of civil war. Source A is also commented on, but once again, the links are not always clear. Although there are some references to external problems e.g. the war with Spain, there is little specific said on this point. Overall, the response lacks organisation and has limited focus and depth. Level 2 – 10 marks.*

### **Candidate 5**

- 3 (a) Explain why trade and industry in France were in decline at the beginning of Henry IV's reign. (12 marks)

Trade and industry were in decline at the beginning of Henry's reign due to many factors. The wars of religion with foreign support from German protestants, Spain and British had created trade link problems and favourism from other countries. Henry, also, at the beginning of his reign was almost 200 million livres in debt. With the regular monarchy income at around 30 million trade and industry were in decline as there was very little money going into the economy.

Agriculture was at an all time low, with many of those who worked in the farms fighting in the Hapsburg Valios wars and then the Civil Wars. The soldiers also ruined crops in the field and stole food from the farms, it had also been an incredibly bad harvest in the five years before Henry came to power, with no crops there was severe discontent and hunger and there were very little trade lines going on.

Industry had also broken down, with the lack of money from the monarchy, the feudalistic and clientage system meant the main industrial money was coming from the large nobility families. With the families in religious civil war against each other it was highly unlikely that there would be trade lines made between them.

### Principal Examiner's Comments

*This response offers a range of explanations for the decline in trade and industry at the beginning of Henry's reign. Issues connected to the Wars of Religion are quoted . e.g. loss of trade because with states such as Spain and England; the extent of debt inherited ; the destruction of arable land, fewer workers and some natural disasters which limited the harvest; a decline in industry and the loss of trade links.*

*This is a formidable list and credit is given for this in the mark awarded. However, to achieve the next level, more links could have been forged and greater depth included to offer a more developed explanation e.g. identifying areas where peasant unrest over time and in terms of scale had despoiled territory normally used for agriculture. Most importantly, this answer fails to look at the lack of government support for trade and industry ; a good, but necessarily brief comparison with the support given later by Sully would have identified this difference. External factors were also omitted e.g. the price rise which affected Europe in this period was widespread and affected both agriculture and trade; also social/medical factors such as outbreaks of the plague were responsible for limiting the work force. Level 3 – 8 marks.*

### Candidate 6

- 2 (b) 'Henry IV's foreign policy was entirely driven by religious motives.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

In many ways it can be argued that Henry IV's foreign policy was indeed driven by religious motives – alliances with so many protestant nations for example. However, it seems that it may not be the case that it was 'entirely' driven by religious motives.

In many senses the statement can be agreed with. 2 of the main aims of the war with Spain in 1595 were concerned with religious motives. Henry IV wanted to stop the Spanish aid of the Catholic League & henceforth draw the wars of religion to an end – ie. a religious motive. Also, the Huguenots were increasingly unhappy with Henry IV after his religious conversion in 1593, & so the war with Spain (a Catholic nation) had another religious motive – to please the Huguenots somewhat.

The statement can also be agreed with in the sense that Henry made foreign alliances with the German Protestant states, the protestant Swiss cantons & the United Provinces (which was protestant). This appears to be a key theme – of alliances with protestant nations, suggesting that foreign policy was indeed religiously motivated – allying up with protestant countries against the Catholic nation of Spain to counteract Catholic Spain.

Nevertheless, the statement can also be easily disagreed with. Arguably the war with Spain in 1595 was to try & bring about the end of the wars of religion, so that Henry IV could begin to establish his authority in France once more - & therefore foreign policy not being entirely driven by religious motives.

Additionally, other aspects of France's foreign policy were clearly not centred around religious motives & therefore the statement can once again be disagreed with. The war with Savoy 1601 – 02, was concerning France's want to regain the

area of land of Saluzzo, which France had lost to Savoy in 1588. This was a success in foreign policy for Henry IV, as in 1602 the treaty of Lyons meant that Henry was granted the area of land – Bresse, Bugey & Gex. This is a clear example of foreign policy motivated by territory & nothing to do with religion.

To conclude, it seems as though the statement whereby it is claimed that Henry's foreign policy was entirely driven by religious motives, cannot be agreed with. Although many aspects of Henry's foreign policy were religion related – ie. the war with Spain & the many protestant alliances, even these were not 'entirely' done so on religious grounds. There are even aspects of Henry's foreign policy – such as the war with Saluzzo which had nothing to do with religion or any religious motives.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The introduction is brief and merely states that there are two potential views on this issue- either religious motives were the driving force or there were other factors involved. However, the development of the answer provides a balanced response although the depth of the answer has some limitations..*

*Spain is the initial focus of the response. There is clarity on the need to prevent Spain aiding the Catholic League and the need to please the Huguenots, whose disappointment at Henry's apparent toleration of Catholicism and his own conversion had alarmed them. The answer also makes effective links to the alliances with Protestant states e.g. the protestant Swiss cantons*

*Disagreement with the premise of the question follows as the war with Spain was ended so that Henry could focus on his internal problems. Other conflicts such as with Savoy led to the acquisition of territory (Bresse, Bugey and Gex) and had no religious overtones. There are brief implied references to other factors such as prestige and protection from other states on the French borders, as in the case of Saluzzo.*

*This response clearly recognises the significance of 'entirely' in the title and has a good overview of policy and its motivation. It could be more detailed but the issues are understood and judgement is evident throughout the response. This level of understanding contributes to the mark awarded. L4 – 18 marks.*