
A-LEVEL

History

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

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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

June 2017

A-level

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

Section A

- 01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons for the outbreak of the Dutch War in 1672. **[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

- the source has value as a personal letter between mother and child, the author can be expected to be telling the truth as they see it
- it is valuable as the author had the ability to know what was going on and probably was actually present as a courtier
- the tone is factual; although it praises Louis as ‘wonderfully majestic’, which shows probable prejudice in Louis’ favour, it also shows his behaviour as being rather condescending which strengthens its value in suggesting Louis’ responsibility for the war.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that Louis was keen for the war but that the Dutch were not, as they were willing to offer concessions but Louis would not even consider them
- Louis claimed that the Dutch ‘were stirring up his enemies’; although they had formed the Triple Alliance against France in 1667, Louis had stirred up enemies against the Dutch, for example with the Treaty of Dover with England
- Louis claimed that he had strengthened his armed forces for his own defence. However, it was Louis who actually launched the attack and the source accepts that the Dutch were trying to find a peaceful solution
- Louis had increased the size of his own army over the previous years
- Louis acknowledged the role of personal *gloire* albeit in a defensive sense; *gloire* is often interpreted as the desire to show off the strength of his armed forces in an offensive way.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this was written by Louis himself, or at least at his direction, and so he should know what his intentions were
- Louis was writing for the benefit of his son and so was probably writing what he actually thought
- Louis is probably writing around ten years after the event so he has had chance to consider and review his actions which may undermine the value of the letter
- the tone is self-justifying in acting in a personal way.

Content and argument

- Louis freely admits that his main motivation was ambition and *gloire* and many of Louis' actions reflect that this was a key motive for these actions
- Louis claims that success in war is more the product of reputation than the actual strength of the army. While Louis did create a reputation, this was produced by the success of his armies which dwarfed those of the Dutch. However, the ease with which he defeated the Dutch and their willingness to settle may suggest that reputation had undermined their willingness to fight
- Louis overlooks all other motives for the war – but clearly they did exist. Louis had been engaged in a trade war with the Dutch conducted by Colbert who had advocated the war as a cheaper alternative
- Louis also overlooks his hatred of the Dutch 'maggots' as Protestants and republicans.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Temple may not be seen as wholly neutral as he is English and England was allied with the French against the Dutch in the war
- Temple was certainly well-placed to draw his opinions as he had lived in the Dutch Republic
- he was also considered by Charles II as knowledgeable as he used him as an adviser
- the source is a published book which means that it is being written for a British audience; the tone is measured but does seem to eulogise the 'genius' of the French King.

Content and argument

- Temple blames the Dutch for their own disasters because of their trade and culture. Such an argument is difficult to prove
- Temple's evidence reflects their overconfidence from the Triple Alliance and that Louis had previously focused on the Spanish Netherlands
- Temple's opinion of Louis seems to reflect Source B in that he seems to be impressed by the King as much as his forces
- Temple points out the rising naval strength of the French which was the product of Colbert's naval reforms
- Temple overlooks other reasons for France's decision to invade; he hints that Dutch wealth and Louis' desire for great achievements were motives but Louis' distaste for their republicanism and religion is overlooked.

Section B

- 02** 'The Frondeurs had failed by 1653 mainly due to the personal ambition of the Prince de Condé.'

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 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/factors suggesting that the Frondeurs had failed by 1653 mainly due to the personal ambition of the Prince de Condé might include:

- the Fronde of parlement had been successful before Condé and his personal ambitions complicated matters
- Condé was the premier prince of the blood and was ambitious to replace Mazarin in the regency. This provoked his arrest and consequent Fronde of the nobility which ultimately would divide the Frondeurs
- Condé's personal ambition led to the alienation of leading noblemen like Turenne after the initial success of the Fronde of the nobility
- Condé's ambition, when he set up his own arbitrary government in Paris, alienated many Parisians; the divisions his ambition provoked can be seen as damaging to the Fronde.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Frondeurs had failed by 1653 mainly due to the personal ambition of the Prince de Condé might include:

- the failure of the Frondeurs may be put down to Mazarin's decision to go into voluntary exile twice; this removed the one thing which united the Frondeurs at key moments
- the coming of age of Louis XIV in 1651 meant that the Frondeurs were no longer opposing the regency but the Crown itself; this perception of treason was made worse by the alliance of the Frondeurs with an external enemy, Spain
- the Frondeurs had differing aims; parlement aimed for greater centralisation under their control whereas the nobility wanted less centralisation to allow them to retain their local authority
- growing discontent with the dislocation of government due to the Fronde had led the French to want strong government to restore order.

Students should recognise that there were a range of reasons for the failure of the Frondeurs in 1653, of which the ambition of the Condé was only one. They could decide that his ambition was the critical factor which meant that the two groups could not work together; alternatively they could argue that the two groups could only work together due to Mazarin. Once he had changed his strategy, the division of aims between parlement and the nobility would lead to their movement breaking down.

03 To what extent was Louis motivated by political factors in his struggle against Jansenism?

[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/factors suggesting that Louis was motivated by political factors in his struggle against Jansenism might include:

- the Jansenists had been involved in the Fronde – in his majority, Louis may have seen them as a potential political threat
- their heretical ideas meant they – like the Huguenots – were not part of the absolutist state
- the Jansenists criticised Louis' extravagant style of government at Versailles. This annoyed Louis who sought to repress his critics on political grounds
- the Jansenists had powerful allies in the Church in the Gallicans – acting against them showed that Louis would not tolerate alternative centres of power in France, as shown by his banishment of Church leaders to their sees to enforce Unigenitus in 1713.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Louis was motivated by political factors in his struggle against Jansenism might include:

- Louis believed that Jansenists were heretics for their views on issues like predestination and so there were religious reasons for his action
- Louis was greatly influenced by his Jesuit confessors, like La Chaise, to act against the Jansenists; thus he was motivated to act in part by those around him
- Jansenism had religious and moral aims not political goals and so was no political threat of itself, especially after the Fronde
- the criticism of the Jansenists on Louis' lifestyle was a personal affront on his personality and character. Thus repressing was a purely personal issue rather than a political one.

Good students will probably realise that in Louis' France there was much overlap between political, personal and religious motives. For example, the Jansenists' heretical views were not just a challenge to Louis' religious views but also his political goal of absolutism. Moreover, the passage of time could be considered. The Jansenists had constituted a threat to the state earlier in the reign but they were not really a political organisation and thus its closure did end what had been a dangerous threat to the state, permanently. Moreover, in an absolutist state, the personal and political overlap. Louis' personal animosity could easily be seen as a political issue.

04 ‘The Treaty of Utrecht completely transformed the balance of power in Europe.’

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 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/factors suggesting that the Treaty of Utrecht completely transformed the balance of power in Europe might include:

- a Bourbon king on the Spanish throne meant an end to the Habsburg encirclement of France and strengthened France
- it greatly weakened the power of the Habsburgs by the loss of Spain and its American empire which seemed to strengthen the power of the Bourbons
- it marked the decline of the Dutch Republic, which contributed much to the war but gained little from the treaty, and the rise of Brandenburg which gained territory and became the Kingdom of Prussia. This would lead to major changes in the balance of power in Europe
- Britain was transformed into a leading international player and was finally recognised as a Protestant state by France at Utrecht. This clearly transformed the balance of power in Europe.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Treaty of Utrecht completely transformed the balance of power in Europe might include:

- France was not left as dominant as may appear. It had lost much of its defensive barrier in the north and east and the Habsburgs had retained control of what was now the Austrian Netherlands and much of Italy
- although Utrecht gave the Bourbons control of more territory, this potential transformation was offset by the estimated 3 billion livres debt and huge loss of manpower caused largely by the War of Spanish Succession
- the growing strength of what was now firmly a Protestant and powerful United Kingdom, augmented by colonies gained from France and Spain at Utrecht, was a makeweight for the growing territorial extent of the Bourbons in Europe and South America
- it could be argued that Utrecht left France where it was before the war. France had been reckoned to be the most powerful country in Europe in 1700; it still was in 1713. It had fought virtually the whole of the rest of western and central Europe alone and had still been undefeated and achieved its main goal.

Good students will observe that the question needs to be applied to the whole of Europe, not just France. Moreover, the answer should focus on the concept of the balance of power rather than simply recording alterations in the power status of nations. Moreover, while on the largest issue, the Bourbons won and the Habsburgs lost. The idea of maintaining a balance of power was a major influence on diplomats at Utrecht and that the gains and losses of each side aimed to preserve the status quo. Other students may argue that the ruinous effect of the war on France had already altered the balance of power in Europe which the Treaty could not rectify. Others may argue that such financial problems could be overcome, whereas the placing of a Bourbon on the Spanish throne was a permanent change to the balance of power.