

A-level HISTORY 7042/2F

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version1.0 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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aga.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 @ 2024 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 beginning of Louis XIV's personal reign in 1661.

[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.
- 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.
- 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.

Nothing worthy of credit.

0

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

- as the source is written by the King himself it provides a valuable account of Louis XIV's priorities at the beginning of the personal reign
- Louis XIV's memoirs aimed to instruct the future heir therefore, the King would want to provide accurate advice
- however, students could also argue that the nature of the source limits its value as this is a public declaration of Louis XIV's priorities so he would be careful not to include a negative portrayal of the beginning of the personal reign
- the tone is formal, as Louis is setting his agenda for government. This is valuable as the need for Louis XIV to address the advice given by Mazarin provides an insight into the situation in France at the beginning of the personal reign.

Content and argument

- the source details Louis XIV's decision to limit the power of the parlements and therefore is a valuable exploration of power at the start of the personal reign
- Louis XIV also states that he needs eyes and ears in the provenances, which is something he establishes at the beginning of the personal reign via his deployment of Intendants
- Louis XIV states that only he alone should be in a position of power, which is something he acts upon via his decision not to appoint a Chief Minister
- however, there are limitations to this claim as, in reality, there were those who questioned his authority at the beginning of his personal reign, such as Fouquet.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is from a Dutch observer at the French court so would be valuable in providing an outsider's perspective into France at the beginning of Louis XIV's personal reign
- the source is a private account taken from a diary entry which is valuable as there is no clear agenda about what he has observed of the personal reign so far as this was a time of peace between the Dutch and France
- however, as a court observer the author would only be privy to the state of France as presented by Louis XIV. Even in 1661, the court of France prioritised positive propaganda which would have impacted the view of the author when commenting on the early years of Louis XIV's reign

• the tone of the source is very complimentary, for example, when the author declares that Louis XIV 'wins people's hearts'. This is valuable as it suggests that those on the outside of government are impressed with the young King's establishment of power.

Content and argument

- the source states that Louis XIV entrusted only a small number of advisors at the beginning of the personal reign and this is therefore valuable in understanding the beginning of the personal reign as Louis made the decision to set up the Conseil d'en haut. The Council d'en haut membership was limited by the King and he alone decided on policy
- the source states that the King has deviated from the government style of Mazarin in a deliberate attempt to re-centralise power. This is valuable as Louis XIV made the decision not to appoint a Chief Minister in 1661 following the death of Mazarin
- however, the claim that Louis conducts his business with gentleness seems to suggest a softer approach from the King, which is not something Louis XIV would have wanted to encourage at the start of the personal reign
- the source also states that it is clear that the country is prospering, but France was suffering from enormous debt. It seems that the author is limited by his experience only at the court of Louis XIV.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is written by a doctor in Blois, which is valuable as it is providing an account of the beginning of Louis XIV's personal reign from someone living in the provinces and witnessing the state of France first hand
- he is writing to a courtier about the devastation Blois is experiencing, which is valuable as it shows the level of desperation faced by those in the provinces so that they resort to writing to Louis XIV's courtiers for assistance
- the tone of the source is desperate, critical of the King and very emotive. The author claims that he is witnessing 'desolation' and that the people feel 'abandoned'. The use of such a critical and desperate tone is valuable as it demonstrates the extent of suffering in one of the provinces
- however, the motive of the source is to seek tax exemption, which could explain the emotive language used and could limit the value of the source when studying the start of the personal reign.

Content and argument

- the source details the situation in Blois following the end of the Franco-Spanish War, giving an insight into the cost of war on the provinces. This is valuable as it outlines a key challenge faced by Louis XIV at the start of the personal reign
- the source states that they require a reduction in the taille, which is valuable because it becomes one of Louis XIV's priorities at the start of the personal reign as Colbert reduces the yield of direct taxation
- the source states that the people of Blois feel desperate and abandoned by those in Paris, which
 provides a valuable insight into the realities of the beginning of the personal reign for those in the
 provinces
- the source also states that a young boy was forced to eat his own hands, which does limit the value of the source as this level of emotive language questions the validity of the claims made by the author about the true condition of France at the start of the personal reign.

Section B

0 2 'In the years 1665 to 1675, Colbert's most significant economic reforms were those promoting trade and commerce.'

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.
- 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.

Nothing worthy of credit.

0

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 in the years 1665 to 1675, Colbert's most significant economic reforms were those promoting trade and commerce might include:

- Colbert wanted to make France more self-sufficient and to increase state control. He revitalised
 French industry, for example by establishing the Van Robais textile factory in 1665 and the Tourlaville
 mirror workshop in 1667. The goods made in these factories rivalled imports making them financially
 important for France
- Colbert encouraged overseas investment and established trading ports in the 1660s and 1670s.
 These were significant as their initial success enabled trade of sugar, French wine, textiles and promoted French ship building at the expense of France's rivals
- Colbert modernised French roads and canals which was significant as it increased commercial
 profitability and strengthened internal trade. This meant that more French goods were traded and
 French people were less reliant on foreign trade
- Colbert had some success in attracting skilled immigrants, including Dutch tapestry makers and dyers and Italian silk workers. This meant that the quality of French exports increased and were prized over Europe.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1665 to 1675, Colbert's most significant economic reforms were those promoting trade and commerce might include:

- Colbert's reforms of taxation may be considered more significant. Colbert increased the efficiency of tax collection through close supervision. This led to increased yields
- Colbert's use of indirect taxation to ensure that the rich paid some tax and to reduce the tax liabilities of the poorest may be thought more significant
- Colbert's trade initiatives had many failures making them less significant than they may initially appear. Private investment in transport was inadequate and his attempts to improve roads and canals consumed taxpayer money at a time when many peasants faced starvation
- Colbert's showpiece industries were costly and resulted in less development for private industries and no investment for agriculture
- Crown funding for trade and commerce mainly ceased during the Dutch War, suggesting any significant impact they may have had between 1665 and 1675 was short lived.

Overall, students may argue that trade and commerce were the most significant economic policies implemented by Colbert during 1665–1675 as they were successful in boosting French finances, at least in the short term. However, it may be argued that the changes to the tax system were more significant as Colbert reduced expenditure and increased the tax yield.

0 3 'In the years 1685 to 1695, Louis XIV's religious policies strengthened his authority in France.'

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.

Nothing worthy of credit.

0

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 in the years 1685 to 1695, Louis XIV's religious policies strengthened his authority in France might include:

- in 1685 the Edict of Fontainebleau revoked the rights given to Huguenots by the Edict of Nantes. This move was widely praised by Catholics and Louis was seen to be living up to his title of 'Most Christian King'. This strengthened his authority
- after 1685 Louis pursued a policy of Gallicanism. By challenging the authority of the Pope in France he pleased the Paris Parlement. Louis challenged Pope Innocent XI over French diplomatic asylum in Rome in 1687. This renewed Gallican zeal and demonstrated an authoritarian response
- Louis sought to reduce heresy in the Church through his anti-Jansenist policies in the 1690s. Louis
 wanted religious conformity to strengthen his authority. For example, in 1693 Louis put pressure on
 the Pope to issue another papal bull against Jansenism, and Louis had the nuns removed from
 Port Royal again
- Louis XIV demonstrated a zero-tolerance approach to the Quietist, arresting Madame Guyon in 1695. This further strengthened his authority as it proved that no religious sect was too small to evade his desire to unite France under 'one faith'.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1685 to 1695, Louis XIV's religious policies strengthened his authority in France might include:

- the violent way in which Louis' anti-Huguenot policies were conducted post-1685 led to criticisms within France and abroad. 200 000 Huguenots left France post-1685 rather than converting to Catholicism, which weakened Louis' authority
- the Edict of Fontainebleau weakened Louis' authority because of the economic consequences. France lost industrious and skilful workers and there was economic stagnation
- Louis failed to root out heresy. Both Protestantism, Jansenism and Quietism remained in France despite Louis' policies targeting both groups post-1685. This did not strengthen his authority
- Louis' Gallican policies led to conflict with the Pope in the 1680s, for example over the Cologne election in 1688. Louis lost influence, which led to him seeking the Pope's support in the 1690s
- in his religious policies Louis was increasingly under the influence of Mme de Maintenon, particularly in the suppression of Quietism. This weakened his authority.

Overall, students may argue that Louis' religious policies succeeded in strengthening his authority post-1685. He revoked the Edict of Nantes, which fulfilled his coronation oath of challenging heresy and led to praise amongst Catholics in France. Similarly, he was seen to take a no tolerance approach towards Jansenism, Quietism and the Pope post-1685. However, students may also argue that these polices weakened Louis' authority as he was not able to fully eradicate heresy and even those who were supportive of his religious decisions criticised him for the way they were carried out.

0 4 To what extent was the Treaty of Utrecht a disaster for France?

[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.

Nothing worthy of credit.

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 the Treaty of Utrecht was a disaster for France might include:

- Louis XIV had to abandon his claims to land on France's north eastern frontier, including Luxembourg, Philippsburg, Kehl and Bresiach. France also lost land in Italy and surrendered Nice
- Louis had to accept the loss of French influence in the Spanish Netherlands with Menin, Ypres, and Namur all surrendered
- Louis XIV had to accept that Philip d'Anjou could not be king of France. This was especially disastrous as Louis XIV had lost the Dauphin and his son during the course of the war
- Britain also gained from the Treaty as it received Newfoundland, Arcadia, and St Kitts from France, weakening France's power in North America.

Arguments challenging the view that the Treaty of Utrecht was a disaster for France might include:

- France retained strategically important territory such as Strasbourg, Alsace, Franche Comte and Dunkirk, preserving French national integrity and security
- 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
- Louis XIV gave little away to the Dutch, aside from the right to some garrison forts but these could easily be over run.

Overall, students may argue that the treaty was a disaster for Louis as it changed the balance of power in Europe against France and strengthened its enemies. France had to make concessions in North America and its north eastern frontier remained vulnerable as a result of the treaty. However, students may also argue that Louis defied the odds during the Spanish Succession War and was not fully defeated by its enemies. This is reflected in the strategically important territory Louis XIV retained and how the treaty ensured that Philip D'Anjou remained the King of Spain.