



**General Certificate of Education
January 2012**

AS History 1041

HIS2C

Unit 2C

The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2012

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

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

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Henry's conversion to Catholicism in 1593. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4:	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

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 levels scheme.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Pitt's view in Source A sees it as a necessary action 'the king of France had to be a Catholic'. Whilst in Source B Greengrass contends that Henry was doing this for personal gain
- Source A refers to Henry's actions as a genuine act of faith. Whilst Source B suggests that it was not about genuine religious belief
- Source B refers to Henry's lack of 'good Faith' whereas Source A shows Henry's dedication to be a good king and his hard fought fight

-
- Source A contends Henry's decision was in response to the welfare of the people of France yet the view in Source B contends that there was a question mark over a false conversion
 - Source A also suggests that Henry would never harm his Huguenot subjects whilst the view expressed in source B would indicate that were dangers to a false conversion pointed out by his enemies.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- interpretation is the key to understanding Henry's decision. The abjuration and subsequent conversion was a pragmatic decision Henry had little realistic choice of avoiding. He could not be a Huguenot in a Catholic state
- he sought to reconcile Catholics and Protestants in the context of the Wars of Religion and begin a process of rapprochement. There remains the issue of the genuine nature of Henry's conversion. Was he a Catholic? Most historians agree that Henry was a pragmatist and a 'Man for all seasons' a *politique* who could adapt as necessary to secure a political future. Any judgment will be informed by questions over the genuine nature of Henry's motives in the context of the period and the dangers he potentially faced.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both views acknowledge the uncertainty the conversion generated. In Source B it says 'there was a question mark over Henry's good faith' and in Source A, it rings a note of caution that the 'king must not be compromised'
- both views also acknowledge Henry was above all acting pragmatically; 'Paris was worth a Mass' (Source B) and 'Whatever Henry IV's deeper beliefs' (Source A) indicate pragmatic and cynical action on Henry's part.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important was Henry's conversion to Catholicism in bringing religious peace to France in the years 1593 to 1610? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** is unequivocal in its contention that Henry's conversion was important in order to begin a process of religious co-existence, even reconciliation. That whilst the King of France had to be a Catholic it was his intention never to harm the Huguenots and this is stressed further into the source with the reference to Henry's desire to be a King of France and not a Huguenot one which speculatively in the context of the period would not secure Henry the throne. He stresses the importance of the act of abjuration as politically vital to prevent further conflict and perhaps the destruction of France.
- **Source B** is grounded in the traditionalist vein that the conversion was a cynical and pragmatic act based on ulterior motives. It is hostile to Henry's act of conversion and reveals the lack of trust even hostility which existed between Catholics and Huguenots. It is suggesting that religious reconciliation was always going to be problematic.
- **Source C** is thoroughly optimistic and supportive of the success of the act of abjuration for France and for Henry IV. Paris receives Henry, consolidating and validating his position and potential authority. His enemies are undermined and their power mitigated. By 1595 Henry has behind him a united country, politically and nationally, the bitter rivalries and antagonisms have evaporated, the wars were over. A rather optimistic interpretation of the significance of the abjuration. This brings into question the factors of the declaration of war with Spain as perhaps an alternative reason for religious peace based on national feeling against a perceived common enemy, Huguenots and Catholics alike rallied to the royal standard.

From students' own knowledge:

- the religious position in France within this period was a consequence of over thirty years of civil war and religious conflict
- the wars had led to Spanish intervention and the Catholic League. Henry's conversion created a clear national focus which he was able to exploit
- the position of Huguenots was compromised by Henry's conversion, whilst Catholics remained potentially sceptical
- the Edict of Nantes was more an opportunity for Henry to seek peace rather than greater toleration within France
- the terms of the Edict reveal a multiplicity of concessions, rights, privileges, disappointments and unresolved issues which had the potential to rekindle religious war in the future
- Huguenot concessions were seen by Catholics as too much of a compromise, whilst Huguenots saw the terms as not going far enough. Their position was arguably of a 'state within a state' and a religious sect which depended on the good will of the king for its survival
- 1598 became a pivotal year in which Henry was able to end the fighting in the short term and bring temporary unity in the longer term. There was no long term solution to the religious divisions. Henry never withdrew his concessions to settle a degree of toleration, personally reflected in his actions, in the appointment of Huguenots and Catholics and in his bestowal of impartial patronage

- the main reasons for religious peace were Henry's abjuration and conversion to Rome, the Edict of Nantes, Henry's personal support for what he saw as its essential ability to secure long term future unity and systematic use of patronage and national appeal not just religious co-existence
- that peace ironically saw the assassination of Henry IV in 1610 by the Catholic Ravillac
- it is possible to argue that that peace was never achieved. There were never any guarantees beyond the rule of Henry IV and this was ended by his assassination.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the conversion was instrumental in weakening the divisions between Catholics and Huguenots, religious peace in 16th century Europe stemmed from the religion of the monarch. The Edict of Nantes was crucial but it was by no means the unifying agent whilst it ended the Wars of Religion it left Huguenots exposed to intolerance after Henry's death. Henry personally was a key factor in religious peace. It is similarly possible to offer the contention that religious peace was not achieved and that it remained an illusion.

Question 2

03 Explain why King Henry IV supported the reconstruction of Paris. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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 might include some of the following factors:

- to some extent this development was part of the general rebuilding which took place in other cities at the end of the Wars of Religion: Henry IV's support for such civic programmes was important for his reputation. Lyons rebuilt itself as a centre of the silk industry; La Rochelle became an important naval base, Paris as the capital and a centre of conflict needed considerable redevelopment etc.
- Henry was able to channel the interests and fortunes of the nobility away from traditional sources of income. A consequence of the revival of the economy and the work of Sully; would see France become more peaceful, financiers, nobles and gentlemen saw the possibilities of investment through regeneration
- it helped to oil the financial wheels and was also a means of advertising Paris as the centre of France after years of destructive religious war which had divided and factionalised the country. This too would strengthen the image and power of the King, not just a warrior, bringer of stability and religious peace but an iconic monarch and the capital would reflect this

- the element of display was important in demonstrating Henry IV's authority. The Louvre, the Place des Vosges, the Pont Neuf and the Place Dauphine are examples of this state propaganda and the revival of French power which Henry was enthusiastic to cultivate
- yet while Henry supported reconstruction this needs to be balanced by the fact that such display was more pragmatically economic than simply 'show' but nevertheless added to the city's development and improved surroundings: improvements to pavements, drainage, water supplies and rubbish collection, though by no means wholly effective.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationships between the factors given and to demonstrate some discrimination between them in terms of their influence on the decision to expend huge sums on rebuilding.

Question 2

- 04** 'Sully single-handedly achieved the financial recovery of France by 1610.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not. Sully is credited for 'single-handedly' achieving financial recovery in France by 1610. Yet it is equally important to consider the influences of events and other individual whose contribution was significant.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- the Duke of Sully who was appointed superintendant of the royal finances in 1598 at a time when Henry's financial position remained desperate and there were severe limitations to financial recovery. These were well understood by the Duke of Sully
- Sully's greatest achievement was to single-handedly transform the royal finances from a condition of paralysis and debt to one of solvency by the end of Henry's reign
- Sully was a strong supporter of both monetary and economic reform in France. He believed the two were connected and together could bring about a revival of French fortunes
- Sully in his role as Superintendant of finances was able to stabilise the currency in 1602 easing the financial situation at the time
- he introduced systematic indirect taxation rather than direct taxation through tax farmers transferring the burden of taxation from the third estate to the privileged classes
- he promoted indirect taxation rather than the traditional direct taxation. Taxes such as the Gabelle increased. The Pancarte was a 5% tax on all goods bought and sold at market, the Paulette was designed to tax office holders who had risen to power and influence during the previous years
- Sully single-handedly addressed tax abuse and the ways in which taxes were collected
- Sully's personal involvement led to the dismissal of officials and new ones appointed
- Sully single-handedly demanded that local treasurers were efficient in their duties and thought nothing of written admonishments if seen to be less so
- Sully oversaw control of tax farmers who were closely supervised to prevent years of systemic fraud, embezzlement and corruption. Consequently Sully with single-handed determination was consequently responsible for the millions of livres returned to the royal coffers
- Sully single-handedly reduced court expenditure, the biggest expense which remained was the maintenance of the army
- Sully's single-handed response to the heavy debts incurred from foreign loans was simply to in effect inform the governments involved that they would receive payment only if they could be afforded.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- whilst there is general recognition of the work of Sully other influences and individuals contribute directly and indirectly to Sully's success
- Sully's successful review of taxes and tax collection was partially due to the diligence and enthusiasm of Giles de Maupeou especially in Brittany who was particularly successful in collecting taxes
- the Paulette successfully introduced in 1604 by Sully was the inspiration and invention of the financier Charles Paulet
- it is clear that Henry IV was also involved in the attempts to restore France's finances
- Henry out of necessity began the process of cutting courtly expenditure to help reduce expenditure
- Henry IV summoned the Assembly of Notables to discuss a remedy for the financial crisis in 1596
- the resulting 5% tax the Pancarte was largely the creation of Henry IV as an emergency means to increase income
- Sully was helped enormously by the survival of the apparatus for tax collection, ironically the vested interest of the local elites had maintained the structures which Sully would later ruthlessly exploit
- under Henry IV's direction, the prestige of the crown and its financial basis were secured
- end of internal and external war during Henry IV's reign.

Good answers are likely to conclude that whilst Sully is recognised as the man who restored royal finances and the financial recovery of France as Rady maintains: 'it may be tempting to identify the work of Sully as being of paramount importance' but nevertheless much was owed to the personality and character of Henry IV. There is a secure case to challenge the 'single-handed' achievement of Sully. Good answers will recognise the work of Sully but there is evidence to show that his work requires some further consideration by examining other factors and the contribution of other individuals such as: Giles de Maupeou, Charles Paulet and significantly Henry IV.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why King Henry IV was faced with foreign policy problems at the start of his reign. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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 might include some of the following factors:

- contextually French kings had seen the Habsburgs as the principal challenge to the kingdom's security
- Henry inherited his Valois predecessor's long term consequences of war and anxiety over the security of France's borders
- on Henry's accession war with Spain was ongoing both domestically and externally
- Spanish garrisons held the Pyrenees and Flanders, Luxembourg, Lorraine, Franche Comte, whilst Savoy remained under Spanish influence
- Spain similarly controlled much of northern Italy through a network of alliances and special relationships binding many of the principalities to Madrid
- finances similarly remained a problem at the start of the reign and Henry knew his resources were limited and unequal to a prolonged conflict with Spain

- the Catholic powers of Europe remained mistrustful of Henry and his former Protestant faith. He was considered as a threat to the security of Catholic Spain: a man who might well lead a Protestant coalition against the champion of Catholicism, Spain
- Henry consequently had to tread warily in case he gathered against him a hostile Catholic alliance.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link traditional Habsburg French rivalry inherited by Henry, the encirclement of France by Spain and the problems between financial consideration, war and the need to avoid war by diplomatic resolution.

Question 3

- 06** 'King Henry IV's foreign policy was dominated by the need for internal peace.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

Factors which agree might include:

- from Henry's accession in 1589 the need for internal peace was vital to establish his position and authority
- the real threat to internal peace was the conflict with the Catholic League and its Spanish and papal support

- in 1595 Henry declared war against Spain as a means to secure internal peace by breaking Leaguer support from Spain which was openly committed to more practical and direct support for Catholics in France, threatening Henry's efforts for internal peace
- Henry's decision was thought to rally national support against a foreign enemy. The Spanish war was a 'patriotic war' which might distract and heal the kingdom's domestic divisions – this would help the need for internal peace
- the result of the war was the Treaty of Vervins in 1598. This was a spectacular coup for Henry: Philip II returned to France all the frontier possessions which had been seized since the Treaty of Cateau Cambrasis in 1559. Its timing with the Edict of Nantes was designed to secure greater internal peace
- the decision to go to war was arguably deliberately planned at a time of domestic insecurity: Spain was believed to be planning an alliance of international support against France greater than supposed in the wake of Henry's conversion
- Henry's domestic position demanded internal peace: France was weakened by financial crisis, reaction in the wake of domestic rebellion by the Croquants and his own potentially tenuous authority over Catholic and Protestants many of whom remained sceptical over the Conversion
- war could be used to strengthen and reinforce the image of Henry and his authority as a national leader rather than a Huguenot king or a Catholic king rather as a French king
- war with Spain would placate the cynicism of many Huguenots who were sceptical even offended by the King's conversion to Rome
- internal peace remained elusive whilst Spanish troops still occupied areas of France in support of the Catholic League and had been used to raise Henry's earlier sieges of Paris, and Rouen occupying Picardy and fight battles such as Ivry (1590) and later Amiens in 1597
- Henry effectively used foreign policy as a means to secure greater internal peace and strengthen his domestic authority by offering himself as a national leader.

Factors which disagree might include:

- Henry's foreign policy followed the traditions of his Valois predecessor's and was directed at counteracting Spanish ambitions and the 'encirclement' of France by Spain and territories of the HRE
- the so called 'Grand Design' which Henry's foreign policy was said to be based around. The ambition of Henry to redraw the whole map of Europe and to establish a 'Council of Europe'
- Henry's foreign policy subsequent to 1598 was essentially a defensive policy based on alliances to strengthen French borders and counteract Spanish ambitions whilst securing international alliances should war resume
- various other neighbours tried to take advantage of the situation, e.g. Savoy seized Provence
- Greengrass talks of the Pax Gallicana the need for peace, the strengthening of France's borders and the diplomatic alliances with smaller states in a potential international alliance against the power of Spain, e.g.:
- rapprochement with Savoy
- seeking of wider international diplomatic missions to Constantinople 1597 and 1604 English trading privileges in the Levant, Sweden was approached to seek a Scandinavian ally to the Bourbon cause in Europe
- renewal of efforts with northern Italy, German states and Switzerland as former French allies
- French participation in the Dutch Revolt
- Henry's ambition to secure the borders, keep Spanish ambitions at bay and secure a new found role of France as the new arbiter of Europe

-
- Henry's foreign policy was directed towards greater international security against the threat of Spanish ambition.

Good answers are likely to discuss the domestic situation in France before the Edict of Nantes and the Treaty of Vervins in 1598 within the context of Henry's need to seek recovery and reconstruction in the aftermath of prolonged religious civil war in which Spain principally supported the Catholic League even fighting on French soil. The need to secure internal peace was vital to Henry's position and authority. Conversely French foreign policy was more focused on the wider so called 'Grand Design' and Pax Gallicana. There might be a discussion of the traditional 'Grand Design' attributed by earlier historians to Henry's foreign policy: the need for internal peace versus the wider response to the traditional fears of Habsburg ambitions.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion