
A-level HISTORY 7042/2F

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

Mark scheme

June 2021

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

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.

Copyright © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the causes of tension in Europe in the years 1688/89.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Source A is taken from a statement issued by Louis XIV and addressed to Emperor Leopold, where the French King outlines a series of aggressive actions which adds value to the source as this statement would only work to increase tension in Europe
- the source was issued on 24th September 1688, the day before Louis XIV crossed the Rhine. This is valuable as it is issued on the eve of war, when tensions were very high
- the source is specifically addressed to Emperor Leopold, despite tensions also existing between France and the other members of the League of Augsburg which could limit the value of the source. Alternatively, students may argue that this is valuable as it indicates Emperor Leopold as the key cause of tension from the perspective of Louis XIV
- the grossly exaggerated tone of the source seems to condemn the previous actions of the Emperor in order to imply that the King of France has been left with no other choice but to declare war, which could limit the value of the source.

Content and argument

- the source outlines a series of actions Louis XIV plans to take, all of which are considered to be aggressive moves by other European countries and lead to a dramatic increase in tension which adds value to the source
- Louis XIV carries out all the aggressive actions suggested in the source, which is valuable as it details events that actually happen
- Louis also outlines the reason for these actions, which gives a valuable insight into the cause of tensions from the French perspective
- Louis XIV blames the cause of tension in Europe on those who 'question the sincerity' of his desire for 'tranquillity', which is a very exaggerated claim and could limit the value of the source
- however, the need for Louis to justify his actions in this way could be valuable as it suggests that he is fully aware of how his plans will be perceived by others and he is, therefore, attempting to deflect blame.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the marquis de Chamlay was a French diplomat and worked closely with Louvois, so would be a well-informed source and would provide a valuable insight into growing tension in Europe
- it is a private letter between a diplomat and Louis XIV's War Minister, making the source a valuable insight into some of Louis XIV's leading generals' foreign policy plans which did cause further tension in Europe
- the source is dated 27 October, 1688 which is after the French invasion of Phillipsburg in September of 1688. Tensions in Europe were already very high but war has not been officially declared by the Grand Alliance which could limit the value of the source
- the purpose of the source is to suggest the destruction of a series of German towns regardless of whether or not the Emperor accepts the terms stated in Louis XIV's manifesto so they cannot be used against France in future wars, which would do nothing other than heighten tensions in Europe, adding value to the source.

Content and argument

- the source refers to territory Louis XIV has recently gained on the north-eastern frontier, which is valuable as it portrays a key source of tension in Europe in 1688
- the source implies that the territory Louis XIV has invaded so far (for example, Phillipsburg) may be enough to encourage the Emperor to agree to Louis XIV's peace terms, which might limit the value of the source as it underplays the gravity of the situation in Europe at this time
- Chamlay suggests that that the Emperor is likely to accept Louis XIV's peace terms, which also limits the value of the source as the King's demands are far too ambitious
- the source details a plan to destroy a series of German towns – which is valuable as this does happen and causes an increase in tension in Europe
- the source does not suggest these towns should be completely devastated, however, Louvois did later decide to devastate the Palatinate using scorched earth policy, which could be misleading and could limit the value of the source.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is an address made to the King of England by leading members of the English parliament, providing a valuable insight into the cause of tension in Europe from the English perspective
- the source is valuable as it informs the reader of how high tensions had become for a parliamentary committee for the French War to have been set up to decide whether or not England should declare against Louis XIV
- the source is dated 19 April, 1689, which is valuable as it is after Louis XIV has lent his support to James II, which further heightened tensions in Europe
- the tone of the source grossly exaggerates the danger from France, for example by blaming Louis XIV for war in Ireland and suggesting that the French king threatens Europe with 'slavery', which limits the value.

Content and argument

- the source makes reference to Louis XIV's earlier acts of aggression, both at home and abroad. This is valuable as Louis XIV had used violence against the Huguenots and had acted aggressively towards other European countries earlier in his reign, which explains why his actions in 1688 and 1689 were condemned internationally
- however, the source also condemns Louis XIV as the key cause of tension in Europe, which could limit the value of the source as Louis XIV is not the only aggressor in Europe at this time
- the claim that Louis XIV was using James II as a pretence to make war in Ireland and thus creating further tension is questionable and could limit the value of the source. Louis XIV believed in the divine right of kings so it was natural for him to support the usurped James II
- the source confirms parliamentary support of a war with France, which suggests that a war is highly likely. War is declared and tensions are heightened even further in Europe as a result, adding value to the source
- the source also references the tensions caused in Europe as a result of the Glorious Revolution and the attempted comeback of James II, which adds further value to the source.

Section B

0 2 'Colbert's financial and economic reforms, in the years 1665 to 1672, were successful.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that Colbert's financial and economic reforms, in the years 1665 to 1672, were successful might include:

- Colbert made reforms to the tax system, such as deriving more from indirect taxation, which continued to hit the poor but at least obliged the rich to pay something
- Colbert reformed tax collection and reduced the annual cost of collecting revenue from 52 million livres to 24 million livres
- in 1669, Colbert persuaded Louis XIV to end the law that prohibited nobles from participating in trade and industry
- royal lands sold by Colbert's predecessors were recovered and the financial yield increased up until 1672 – by which date the annual budget showed a surplus
- Colbert invested in French industry by subsidising businesses, such as lace-making and setting up new factories such as the Van Robais at Abbeville.

Arguments challenging the view that Colbert's financial and economic reforms, in the years 1665 to 1672, were successful might include:

- Colbert failed to understand the backbone of the French economy was agriculture – many of his policies damaged the peasants, for example, his withdrawal of copper coinage on which their trade depended
- he lowered the taille, but that was so that peasants could pay promptly – he did not actually reform the taxation system and there was no direct attempt to tax the nobility, those who were in a better position to pay
- Colbert failed to convert French men to his own beliefs – most men concerned with the prosperity of their own district rather than the country and Colbert lacked the imagination and sensitivity to realise this
- Colbert never appreciated that projects lacking local support would fail
- Colbert was defeated by class prejudice – the aristocracy seemed to take this cue from the Crown and resisted Colbert's encouragement to show an interest in commerce.

Students need to consider both sides and reach a judgement. They might acknowledge that Colbert made a great number of reforms to the French economy, but conclude that he focused on the wrong industries. Students may also suggest that by failing to fully appreciate the importance of agriculture to the French economy and inadequate reforms to the taxation system, there is a limit to how far Colbert's actions can be classed as successful. Alternatively, students may consider the context of the time and conclude that, under the circumstances presented by 17th Century France, Colbert's achievements were quite remarkable.

0 3 'It was desire for glory which led Louis XIV to go to war with the Dutch Republic in 1672.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that it was desire for glory which led Louis XIV to go to war with the Dutch Republic in 1672 might include:

- Louis XIV believed the conflict would be a 'lightning war' – he believed he would be able to defeat his enemy quickly, which would demonstrate the French army as a formidable force and thus bring glory to France and to himself, without causing the country economic ruin
- the Dutch were seen as an 'honourable enemy' – they were strong enough that their defeat would bring glory to France and to Louis XIV, but without the complication of involving either the Spanish or Austrian Habsburgs
- Lionne had successfully isolated the Dutch so their lack of allies would make them seem like a good target to defeat quickly
- Louis XIV had invested heavily in his army since 1661 and wanted to showcase his strength on the international stage
- Louis XIV believed that glory was brought by acquiring new territory and, by defeating the Dutch, he could extend his north-eastern borders to the Rhine, thus achieving glory for France and himself.

Arguments challenging the view that it was desire for glory which led Louis XIV to go to war with the Dutch Republic in 1672 might include:

- Louis XIV wanted revenge on the Dutch as they had supported the Spanish during the War of Devolution and were part of the Triple Alliance which agreed to limit France to its 1659 borders
- Louis XIV felt particularly betrayed as France had previously supported the Dutch in their wars against both the Spanish and the English
- the Dutch were a major commercial rival and their domination of trade was damaging to France
- Colbert was not opposed to this war as a quick victory was seen as less harmful than a long tariff war
- Louis XIV disliked the Dutch because they were Protestant and he was Catholic – Louis wanted to live up to his title as The Most Christian King by defeating heretics abroad.

Students need to consider both sides and reach a judgement. Students might consider that glory was the ultimate aim in 1672, as other factors such as economic supremacy would also result in boosting the prestige of France anyway. It can also be argued that Louis' desire for revenge after the War of Devolution was because French pride was wounded, which could also be linked to a need to defeat those who have betrayed France in order for Louis XIV to achieve glory over his enemies.

- 0 4** To what extent did Louis XIV's decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes weaken France at home and abroad, in the years 1685 to 1695?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that Louis XIV's decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes weakened France at home and abroad, in the years 1685 to 1695 might include:

- revoking the Edict of Nantes led to violent means of enforcing the Edict of Fontainebleu, damaging Louis' reputation further among the protestant community. This was encouraged by Louvois who authorised public executions and defiling heretics' corpses
- Louis' decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes and the violent methods he used to enforce the Edict of Fontainebleau damaged the reputation of France abroad. The Pope stated that 'even Christ did not use soldiers to convert followers'
- protestant preachers actively encouraged opposition, which can be seen as a threat to Louis XIV's desire to be an absolute monarch. For example, in remote areas such as the Midi, Protestant congregations continued to worship
- some 200 000 Huguenots fled France which deprived the country of some of its wealthiest and loyal subjects, contributing to economic stagnation post-1685. These workers went to England, Holland and Brandenburg – areas that would later fight against France during the Nine Years War
- the violence shocked and offended many in France and led to some division between Catholics.

Arguments challenging the view that Louis XIV's decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes weakened France at home and abroad, in the years 1685 to 1695 might include:

- it delighted most Catholics in France who made up the majority of the population and was supported by senior members of the Clergy
- the support of men so possessed by Louis XIV's effort to extinguish heresy assisted with the royal missionary effort
- the Revocation's reputational and economic damage have been exaggerated – Louis XIV and Louvois had already shocked and offended international opinion, war did more economic damage than the Revocation and most Protestants stayed in France
- not all emigrants were Huguenots – most emigrants arriving in England were Catholic. A number of Catholic weavers fled Normandy for better pay and employment possibilities
- not all industries suffered: no large wool manufactory failed due to Revocation. Languedoc and Normandy cloth production did not seriously decline and the Protestant drapery production enjoyed royal protection and thrived at Abbeville.

Students need to consider both sides and reach a judgement. Students might consider the different reaction to Louis' decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes caused at home and abroad. Whilst his actions added further damage to his international reputation, it seems convincing to argue that domestically Louis XIV's decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes did not weaken France between the years 1685 to 1695 as it was celebrated by the majority of his subjects, making it one of his most 'democratic' decisions.