

AS
HISTORY
7041/2F

The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715
Component 2F The Sun King, 1643–1685

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715

Component 2F The Sun King, 1643–1685

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the results of Colbert's trading policies towards the Dutch? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

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

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

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

Provenance and tone

- Colbert was the Controller General of finance under Louis XIV and the source's purpose was to review the state of the royal finances for the King in a policy document
- Colbert had been the King's chief financial adviser for nine years by 1670 and so was trying to justify his mercantilist trading policies
- the tone of the source is deferential and careful to recognise the role of Louis, but Colbert is the author of the policies 'Your Majesty supported', 'Your Majesty agreed'.

Content and argument

- Colbert argues that the balance of trade had been in favour of the Dutch which impoverished France. The Dutch were the dominant trading power in the world at the time and France's involvement in war until 1659 had allowed them to increase their exports, so that France was the largest overseas market for the Dutch. Colbert reckoned the Dutch gained 4 million livres a year from their carrying trade between French ports
- Colbert charts the increased tariffs which were used to protect and nurture French industries and to promote the French merchant navy by dominating the coastal trade. Students could mention the doubling and trebling of import tariffs in 1667 but counter by him only dividing France into three internal free trade areas, not one, and continued use of *traites* – internal taxes on goods – to raise revenue
- Colbert argues that there will be great advantages from this trade, in terms of employment and France's power which is Louis' key interest. While the first claim is probably exaggerated – 1 million would be 5% of France's whole population – certainly Louis' desire for power by the resulting '*guerre de commerce*' policy would help him in part into the Dutch War of 1672.

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

Provenance and tone

- the purpose of the source is to represent the views of the Dutch government to Louis XIV
- Pieter de Groot has a difficult task – he has to represent the wishes of his ‘masters’ but to persuade Louis ‘most respectfully’ to change his country’s economic policy
- De Groot’s tone is respectful and stresses the mutual benefits to states and peoples – ‘usefulness of trade between our countries’, ‘both our countries’ subjects’, ‘both our peoples’.

Content and argument

- De Groot argues that the tariffs on Dutch exports to France are reducing trade; this is because the Dutch were engaged in tit for tat tariff increases which increased prices and so clearly reduced the overall volume of trade
- as a consequence, relations between the two states are worsening; the two states would be at war within two years in 1672 after the Dutch had banned all French imports as a reprisal
- De Groot is arguing that mercantilism is dangerous to France as well as to the Dutch by limiting trade. For example, tariffs on imports increased inflation in France on imported items like oil and soap. He is effectively arguing for free trade.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might consider that while both sources are seeking to persuade Louis, Colbert’s report as a private briefing paper is probably more balanced than the more public Dutch letter. Unlike the second source, Colbert’s report gives a wider mercantilist justification of Colbert’s policies, to promote French industry and navigation. Colbert’s report does produce evidence and detail of his policy, whereas the Dutch memorandum merely attacks its impact. However, the Dutch report does reflect the clear intent of the policy to damage the Dutch, in particular by the policy, which also seems to be the key reason why Louis wanted to support the policy, more so than the economic benefits that it brought to the country.

Section B

- 02** 'Anne of Austria was a more important force in government than Mazarin during the Minority of Louis XIV.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that Anne of Austria was a more important force in government than Mazarin during the Minority of Louis XIV might include:

- it was Anne who overturned her husband's will and established herself as regent without the constraint of a regency council
- as regent, Anne was therefore head of state until Louis became an adult in 1653
- Anne appointed and could dismiss Mazarin, which she did in 1651 – albeit temporarily to maintain her power – and created an inner council herself to undermine the unity of the Frondeurs
- in 1644 and 1648 it was Anne who decided to have lits de justice to enforce the registration of unpopular financial measures.

Arguments challenging the view that Anne of Austria was a more important force in government than Mazarin during the Minority of Louis XIV might include:

- Mazarin had an enormous emotional influence over Anne of Austria, giving her jewels and signing letters 'Yours to the last breath'
- the Frondeurs clearly thought that Mazarin dictated policy as his removal was the object of their attacks
- the financial policies and general day-to-day management of the state were undertaken by Mazarin and Anne's key decisions, like offering Gondii the position of Cardinal in 1651, were through Mazarin
- Mazarin made some key decisions on his own initiative, such as the arrest of Condé and Longueville in 1650 and to go into exile a second time in 1652.

Students should draw a balance between the roles of Anne and Mazarin. They may well conclude that Anne was ultimately in authority as the regent and could appoint and dismiss Mazarin and was prepared to do so to maintain her own position; however, they could equally well decide that Mazarin was clearly the dominant force in influencing Anne's actions; his personal hold was such that Anne retained him for long periods, despite the hostility to him as a foreigner and a centraliser. While Anne ultimately decided policy, it was Mazarin who did the work.

03 'The Peace of Nijmegen of 1678–9 was a major success for France.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that the Peace of Nijmegen of 1678–9 was a major success for France might include:

- Nijmegen saw France make major territorial gains on the vulnerable north-east frontier like St Omer, Ypres, Cambrai and Mauberge
- France also protected its eastern border by acquiring Franche Comté and Freiburg and keeping control of Lorraine, moving it ever closer to the defensible Rhine
- the eventual northern border was much straighter and clearer with fewer salient territories like Ath, which were vulnerable to attack
- the Dutch had been considerably weakened economically by the war and France appeared to be the dominant force in Europe.

Arguments challenging the view that the Peace of Nijmegen of 1678–9 was a major success for France might include:

- France was forced to surrender territories captured from the Dutch at Maastricht and Philippsburg to the Emperor
- Nijmegen can be viewed as a failure as Louis could have gained a much better peace in 1674 when he had the Dutch at his mercy
- France had to withdraw the 1667 anti-Dutch tariffs which had been a major issue in the war and had been considerably weakened financially by the war
- Louis considered that the treaty was not a success for France as he dismissed his foreign minister, Pomponne, for not getting better terms.

Good answers will often tend to balance individual points; for example, although France lost territory like Ath in the north it did mean that it gained a more defensible frontier – a major aim – and secured other lands in compensation. Again, although he had to surrender land to the Dutch and backtrack on the issue of tariffs, the Dutch economy had been ruined by the war which was another major aim of the war. Louis certainly was disappointed with the treaty and he could have won a better result in 1674; however, Louis had unreasonable expectations and France did well to secure these terms when the war had come to a standstill and royal debts were rising alarmingly.