

History

Answers and commentaries

A-level (7042)

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

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Question 1	3
Question 3	17

Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 2F The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

Question 1

With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Louis XIV's policy of Reunions.

[30 marks]

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**

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2F – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

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**

Student responses

Response A

01) source A.

The authorship of the source is valuable because as written by Vauban, military engineer, it reflects the ^{strategic} defensive and ideas surrounding territorial gains that underpinned the military pursuit ~~to~~ within Louis XIV's or Reunions which Vauban personally configured. Also, the date of the source is valuable because as written ^{during} after the treaty of Nijmegen it indicates how the post negotiations ~~from~~ and territorial gains from Nijmegen influenced Louis' policy of 'creeping annexation' to further extend French victories. However, the source must be treated cautiously as written by Vauban it is subjective to his narrow perceptions of the primary intentions in warfare. Indeed as Vauban ~~disliked~~ disapproved or disapproved and over-assertion of the king he advocated for defensive objectives that are unrepresentative of Louis' wider aims for the reunions.

The claim of the 'control of 'domaine' is valuable because it highlights how defensive intention for the reunions could be reallocated to other 'vulnerabilities' of France, dictating the direction of the reunions. For example, as Louis had obtained control of 'domaine' in 1679, he deprived the Holy Roman Emperor Leopold of his 'Spanish Road' and capacity to invade France. Therefore, the source is valuable as it highlights how the primary focus of France's security in the Polys or

Vauban was the North Eastern Border and individual towns that ~~were~~^{threatened} France's position. Also, the claim that the 'frontier is weakened' without the towns, Vauban intended to obtain is valuable in depicting the vulnerability of the ~~frontier~~ French border to invasion in 1678 which then inspired the ~~goals~~^{intentions} of the reunions. Indeed, the France feared invasion from Hapsburg troops from Metz, Toul and Verdun as her enemies ~~so~~ had heightened strength after the treaty of Nimesen (with Leopold and William of Orange allied). Therefore, overall the source is valuable in depicting how the policy of reunions was significantly motivated by Vauban's defensive intentions to fortify and consolidate the frontiers.

However, the source is limited in value as it distorts the defensive allude towns (Germans) and the frontier as Vauban's ideas of warfare are unrepresentative of Louis and Louvois during the reunions. Indeed, the Minister of War Louvois depicted a lack of restraint in the reunions, prioritising destruction of 20 villages in the Low Countries (including the bombardment of Genoa in 1684) over the defence of 'border' in ~~front~~ locations such as Germany. Therefore, the source must be treated cautiously as it distorts the wider aggressive priorities of the Sun King in asserting his political dominance in the reunions by overplaying defensive objectives.

In conclusion, the ~~source~~ source is valuable. Although limited by the subjective perspective of Vauban after his

~~examined~~ primarily focused on the ~~five~~ security or France's obligations, it is valuable overall in depicting the significance of France's weaknesses on the ~~frontier~~ frontier in 1678 and the subsequent motives for increased security in the policy or reunions.

Source B

The authorship of the source is valuable because it ~~indicates~~ provides an ~~accurate~~ ^{form} interpretation of France's ~~own~~ policy objectives as the Brandenburg diplomatic ~~is~~ nations are less influenced by the absolutist propaganda that directed the French ~~own~~ diplomats regarding ~~how~~ ^{despite having witnessed the sun king's domestic misdeeds} policy or reunions. Also, the date is valuable as it ~~implies the source was~~ ^{produced in the} ~~the~~ ~~author's~~ knowledge of the outcome of the Reunions. Therefore, the diplomat was knowledgeable of the extent of French policies and their impact on the stability of ~~the~~ Europe.

The claim that the French Scissors used 'vague clauses' is valuable as it illustrates how France used manipulation and ~~manipulation~~ fabrication to support the claims in the policy or reunions. For example, the Chambre de Reunions was established in Metz with extensive legal experts to exploit the 'vague clauses' or clauses within the Treaty of Münster in ~~1648~~ 1648 and Treaty of Nijmegen in 1679. Therefore, the source is valuable because the author exposes the reality of French ~~its~~ dubious claims to territories in ~~order~~ ~~to~~ ~~support~~ the attempt to ~~validate~~ ^{validate} the claims to the reunions territory. Also, the claim that 'Metz' was

employed is ~~valuable~~ ^{becomes} to secure territories 'sovereign to France' is ^{valuable} ~~correct~~ because it ^{alludes} ~~implies~~ the King's seizure of Luxembourg. Indeed, between 1681-1684, Louis claimed through the council in Metz that the county of Luxembourg was within Luxembourg depended ~~on~~ ^{and blockade} France which enabled Louis' jurisdiction to attack the ~~spanish~~ ^{improve} cities. Therefore, the source is valuable because it highlights how Louis employed his 'alleged dependancies' to secure territories that would ~~secure~~ ^{improve} France's boarder ^{secure} ~~as Luxembourg was~~. ~~within Luxembourg~~ Overall the source is valuable because it underlines the fabrication employed by French ministers to ~~exploit~~ ^{employ} Louis' claims to further his own interests or defence and domination.

However, the source must be treated cautiously as the source ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~subject~~ ^{distorts} the 'close alliances with Europe' as it also depicts the intentions of ^{de Croisy} ~~author~~. Indeed, ~~in reality~~, the ~~author's~~ ^{sarcastic} ~~subjective~~ ^{distorts the} ~~tone~~ ^{reunions} ~~to~~ ^{success} the interests of de Croisy' in his ~~per~~ pursuit of the reunions. For example, in reality, the ~~alliances~~ European nations were outwitted at French aggression as the Swedes broke diplomatic relations and the German Princes appealed to the Imperial diet. Therefore, the source's ^{sarcastic} ~~subjective~~ ^{time and author's hostility} ~~negative~~ ^{emphasis} on de Croisy's intentions limits the value of the source as it underplays the actual result of his ambitious and selfish plans to enable French ^{achievement of} ~~ambitions~~.

In conclusion the source ^{is valuable} ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~valuable~~ although slightly

distorted by the authors sacrosanct time, it effectively outlines how the French techniques in the politics of religion were outrageously offensive and immoral as they ~~used~~ doctored reality to forward their own agenda.

Source C

The authorship of the source is valuable because ^{Louvois} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ ^{was} ~~not~~ on the frontline, personally directing the pursuit of ~~territory~~ in the reunions therefore provides a direct insight into the ideas and perceptions of French kings as they obtained Strasbourg. Also, the ^{form of the} ~~letter~~ ^{is} source is valuable because the letter depicts the direct communication of the king with his minister in Germany, ^{illustrating} ~~depicting~~ the information and ideas held by the king as he believed his army was obtaining Strasbourg. However, the source must be treated cautiously as it is subverted by Louvois political agenda to justify ~~the~~ and confirm the king's ambitions for the pols. Indeed, the only positive tone indicates Louvois was attempting to achieve validation and congratulation from his ^{praised} absolute king and friend.

The claim that 'people seem very happy indeed' is valuable because it implies how the king's perceptions of the response of the people in Strasbourg mirrored the extensive propaganda that was flashed in France as a result. Indeed, commemorative medals were produced depicting the Catholic victors whilst the Gato of Paris depicted Louis as the Greek God Hercules. Therefore, the source is valuable because it implies how the positive response of Strasbourg to Louis' rule (what was emphasised by

depicting the Catholic victory whilst the Gate of Paris depicted Louis as the Greek God Hercules. Therefore, the source is valuable because it implies how the positive response of Strasbourg to Louis' rule (that was emphasised by Louvois) fuelled the extensive iconoclasm of Glorie domestically in France. Also, the claim that the Strasbourg secured the North 'Eastern frontier' with 'no threat or 'power in Europe' is valuable as it highlights the significance of the gain of Strasbourg in 1681. Indeed, as Louis' acquisition of the Free Imperial City reaffirmed his Catholic supremacy as 'The Most Christian King' Louis endeavoured to retain Strasbourg throughout the entirety of his subsequent years. Indeed, securing Alsace the territory was a key victory in France's policy of reunions that did indeed comprise her stronghold. Overall, the evidence is valuable as it depicts the successful contribution of Strasbourg to Louis' reputation and security.

However, the source must be treated cautiously. The source is limited by the fact Louvois' political agenda to exaggerate the limited resistance of the 'Strasbourg Mass'. Indeed, in reality, ~~less~~ Louvois was forced to employ excessive force with 30,000 soldiers, possibly assisting the glory of the French occupiers by instructing soldiers to sing the Te Deum. Therefore, the source is limited in value as it distorts the ~~success~~ effectiveness and ease of the occupation of the Free City with strict Catholic control that compromised the inhabitants' previous rights.

In conclusion, the source is valuable. Although it does detract the happiness and loyalty immediately ~~being~~ sworn to Louis because of Louvois' political agenda to please the king, it is valuable in understanding how Starbuck came to be the most gloried success in Louis' ~~French~~ the policy of Reunions and indeed foreign policy as a whole.

This is a Level 5 response

This script employs a systematic approach. It shows very good understanding of the content and the provenance of all the sources and uses the historical context to produce a balanced assessment. The provenance of the sources is discussed, with good use being made of both the given attribution and contextual knowledge to provide an assessment of the value of a particular viewpoint, in both time and place. For example, Source A is recognised as being written during the treaty negotiations and represented Vauban's personal viewpoint. This source is seen as valuable in highlighting the defensive intentions of the Reunions policy, but also limited in downplaying Louis' aggressive motives. The comments on the tone of Source B are pertinent. The propagandist nature of Source C is also identified, with the suggestion that, in writing the letter, Louvois was attempting 'to achieve validation and congratulation from his absolute King and friend.'

Response B

Source A is from a diary entry, discussing the negotiations which led up to the Treaty of Nijmegen, which put a stop to the war between France and the Dutch Republic. This diary was written by Marshal Vauban who was in charge of fortifications and travelled along the frontier, which suggests he was about to witness the treaty first hand. This source is a diary entry which will be spoken from Vauban's perspective, therefore it will be informal and will produce a biased response. This war had to happen because of security reasons, as the north-east border was the most vulnerable border, due to the French's history with the Dutch. Louis was desperate to be the most successful Sun King, hence his glorie. "In the event of war in the future, it is clear that a weakness might be found on the north eastern border." This quote ~~is~~ ^{is} very ~~can~~ convenient, especially as Louis does go back to war due to the Nine Years War and the Spanish Succession. Further on in the text, it discusses how their main aim is to take Strasbourg away from the HRE as well as Spain, this has to happen because their national security is not strong enough and Louis has made too much enemies, which is not needed as

France does not have a strong enough ally to defend them. England and Sweden were France's allies throughout the Franco-Dutch war, but England dropped out. The Treaty of Nijmegen may have prompted Louis to propose his policy of Reunions so he can not just take Strasbourg, but also his other surrounding lands, which France may have control over due to past treaties. This source may be valid as it is credible, because of the factual information hence France's control over Lorraine and the foreshadowing of the military force of Strasbourg, however diary entries can be seen to be unreliable as they are private and many has opinions which may be irrelevant to the policy of Reunions.

Source B is from a memoir written about the breakdown between France and Brandenburg diplomat in Berlin in the 1690s. The diplomat also had experience living in Versailles in the 1680s. As the experience is not stated, we could assume it was not the best as he is the opposition in the scenario. Versailles was known to have horrid living conditions in the 1680s due to diseases easily being spread by many of the Nobles. Due to how expensive Versailles was, Louis had to take away some of his design, which suggests the decline in Versailles. The

Memorial states about the effect of the Reunion policy so France can take Alsace and other surrounding land so Louis can expand his French power. In a past clause, it was stated that Metz once had control of Alsace. The policy was considered and was strengthened so France can legally take Alsace. The memoir states how intelligent the French secretary of state was, and how he had an impact in the policy. Croissy was also in control of negotiations with allies and opposition, therefore he had to deal with the weight of Leopold and Charles II of Spain, who were known for their conflicts with Louis. In my opinion, the French secretary wanted to keep peace for France, after the Franco-Dutch War and the War of Devolution, however Louis had an absolutist personality, which meant Louis wanted dominance and he wanted control over Europe, ~~the~~ which may Louis was the problem in the negotiations. To conclude, I believe this source may be inaccurate, because the memoir came from the 1690s, a decade surrounding the Nine Years War, in contrast to the Reunions Policy happening in the late 1670s and was concluded with a Treaty.

Source C is a formal letter written by Louvois, who was the war minister at the time, where he discusses his military force on Strasbourg. Louvois was in charge after Colbert, who died in 1661 and he had to step up due to Colbert's reputation for France's stability. Louvois became a problem for Louis as he was damaging Louis' reputation to be the Sun King. Louis nearly got physically aggressive with Louvois, and he disregarded him. Louvois died instantly from a heart attack. Louvois lacked intelligence and in the source, it appears he had a conversation with a woman, who had no power in the equivalence of the Reunions policy. Strasbourg was a free city, but had connections with the HRE and Spain. Strasbourg could not be defended by Leopold as he was dealing with bigger situations such as the Great Ottoman War, the same can be applied to the military force on Luxembourg, hence why Louvois may feel confident they will not be attacked in the city of Strasbourg. Some civilians may protest, because they would prefer to be independent, especially as Strasbourg does have a population of few huguenots. This source is ~~see~~ supposed to be only seen to Louis as it is ~~only~~ addressed to him, ~~however~~ therefore this

source is credible and trustworthy. This source also suggests the effectiveness of the policy of Reunions, because Louis strengthened his national security with the invasions of Strasbourg and Luxembourg as well as the bribery of Casale.

This is a Level 3 response

This script shows an understanding of some of the content of each of the sources and is able to make reference to some historical context. The provenance tends to be described rather than evaluated. There is description based on the given attribution and then quite general comments on value. For example Source A 'is a diary entry...and will produce a biased response.' There is a slightly stronger provenance to Source C, which is judged to be 'credible and trustworthy'. There is also an understanding of the context. Contextual knowledge is prompted by the source content, although the focus of the issue is not always tight, for example there are comments on the living conditions at Versailles, prompted by Source B. The tone of this source is not recognised. Overall, the provenance has been acknowledged for each source, there is some grasp of source content and some relevant contextual knowledge.

Question 3

'There were significant changes in Louis XIV's religious policies in the 1670s.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

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**

Student responses

Response A

03) The final years of Louis XIV were characterised by the punishing war of Spanish succession between 1701-1714 in which the French king ~~to~~ stimulated a ~~foreign~~ ~~policy~~ war through his consistent aggression. Although there was antagonism by his opponents, the sun king ultimately was responsible for the outbreak because of his blunt offensive objectives. This essay will focus on the king's breaking up his terms at Ryswick, the ~~an~~ exacerbation actions of the allies and the ultimate intransigent nature of Louis' policies up to 1701 to show that overall the sun king fundamentally was responsible for the outbreak of war.

The ~~sun~~ sun king's responsibility in the outbreak of war can be depicted in his fundamental disregard for the terms of the peace of Ryswick in 1697. Indeed, the king immediately ~~de~~ exhibited his disregard for the Dutch's rights, heightening the probability of re-igniting war. For example, ~~to~~ in 1700, he sent French soldiers to the Spanish Netherlands to occupy the Dutch garrisons and force the Governor of the ^{Spanish} Netherlands to submit to the ~~the~~ new Spanish king Louis ~~to~~ prevent what to military intimidation compromised his promise to respect Dutch neutrality and therefore encouraged anti-French feelings to re-emerge

(Monsieur of the Dutch War 1672-1677). Moreover, the king's introduction of economic restrictions on foreign imports encouraged outrage amongst Europe as they opposed Louis' disregard for economic privileges agreed at Ryswick. For example, banning Dutch imports and such as beer and placing high tariffs on other foreign goods in order to encourage mercantilist ideas within France directly compromised 'article V' of Ryswick that ~~settled~~ negotiated relaxing relaxed trade. Therefore, Louis undoubtedly, prompted war through his ignorance of the rights of Europe that he had previously acknowledged. Furthermore, the Louis was responsible for the outbreak of war because of his disregard to the English dynastic rights. Indeed, by declaring James III King of England before James II had died, he directly undermined his recognition of William of Orange by 'the Grace of God' and highlighted his longstanding attempts to interfere ^{with the} English Monarchs (as he had done with Charles II). Overall therefore, the evidence ~~has~~ underlines how Louis XIV was responsible for the outbreak of war because he undermined his momentary peaceful compromises at Ryswick when presented with opportunities in 1700, therefore, he reaffirmed the offensive nature of France and the need to subdue his ambition.

However, the antagonistic actions of the European

allies should not be ~~overly~~ undeplored as they significantly catalysed Louis' aggressive actions. Indeed, the Holy Roman Emperor pursued his own personal agenda in the claims for Spain and therefore exacerbated the probability of WW. For example, Leopold refused Louis' previous peace partition treaties in 1698 and 1700 as he aimed to pursue the claims for his son Archduke Charles. Therefore, as Louis' initial ~~peace~~ diplomatic negotiations were refused, partially Leopold was responsible for the escalation of debate over the Spanish succession and eventual outbreak of WW. Also, the Allies displayed an overt willingness for admission and military action, alluding to the threat to Louis and the resultant outbreak of WW. Indeed, by 1700, Hapsburg troops were marching in Italy and invaded the Spanish Italian Lands, including Lombardy whilst intending for Milan. Therefore, as ~~for~~ Leopold's enthusiasm for battle and invasion was illustrated to the French King, Louis' ^{aggressive} relations should not be ~~distorted~~ ^{he distorted}. Furthermore, the allies ~~to~~ and their national governments displayed an undoubted 'readiness' for war, ~~the~~ notwithstanding the treaties of WW. Indeed, as Leopold had concluded peace with the Ottomans at Karlowitz and the English Pro-War Whig Party had been elected within English government, unequivocally abolishing restrictions

on military spending, the threat to France from the reformed Grand Alliance seemed imminent, stimulating Louis's offensive policies to secure ^{his} France's grandsons' claims. Overall, the evidence highlights how although the European powers did play a significant role in catalysing Louis's actions after 1700, in reality the king's aggression dominated the period and ultimately stimulated warfare in Europe.

Furthermore, the ~~king's actions~~ ^{king's actions or blatant} ~~aggression~~ for French aggression after 1700 readily prompted the outbreak of war in 1701. Indeed, the ~~formation of the~~ ^{imminent} king's acceptance of Carlos' will displayed his extensive power and neglect for restraint or morality to his opponents. For

example, at the Duc d'Anjou's coronation in the 16th or November 1700 (34 days after the acceptance of the will) Louis stipulated that he would not renounce his claim to the French throne and thereby compromised Carlos' terms of the will. ~~and the~~ ^{thereby,} ~~the~~ Louis's ~~blatant~~ clear and outrageous provocation of French interests over the previous Spanish king's intentions underlined the ^{and unrelenting} ~~power~~ Louis now yielded. Additionally, the king's stimulated warfare by displaying a worsening economic aggression that alarmed the European allies. For example, he ~~forced~~ ~~forced~~ Philip to grant France the Asiento for slave trading ~~as~~ in ~~Guinea~~ ^{Guinea} and ~~Whist~~ ^{Whist} Trading houses in London and

Amsterdam Communicator that French vessels were guarding the Spanish port of Cadiz. Therefore, as the king exemplified his domination of European trade, exploring Spain, he prompted the outbreak of an economically unbalanced war by the allies. Moreover, ~~the~~ Louis XIV reaffirmed his enemies' fundamental fears of a unified Spanish and French Monarchy by displacing the collaboration of the two kingdoms. For example, Louis ~~planned~~ planned joint defence arrangements for Madrid in 1700 and bought the right to trade within the Spanish empire. Therefore, as it was feared the Bourbon dynasty was overpowering Europe, dictated by Louis XIV, the king's policies prompted defensive responses from discontented European powers. Overall, the evidence underlines how Louis XIV's offensive actions throughout the period established prominent Caution within Europe that he blatantly confirmed by 1701, causing War.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ Louis XIV was responsible for the outbreak of the War of Spanish Succession. Although he was initially prepared to negotiate peacefully (avoiding war) and therefore was prompted by the opposition from his ~~all~~ opponents (notably Leopold), in reality, Louis acted after receiving the will of Carlos correlated with his previous destructive and aggressive foreign policy as the 'French Atilla' and ~~therefore~~ his disregard for Ryswick symbolised the need for European intervention in War to curb French domination.

This is a Level 5 response

This is a fully analytical response which uses specific and precise supporting information to produce a well-substantiated judgement. In a well-organised argument, the script shows very good knowledge of the actions of Louis XIV as well as the provocations of the allies. It includes Louis' disregard for the Treaty of Ryswick, the occupation of the Spanish Netherlands, the acceptance of the will, the recognition of James III, the granting of the Asiento, and the retention of Philippe's claim to the French throne. This is balanced with discussion on the aggression shown by Leopold, the 'readiness' for warfare of the Emperor and the Whig government in Britain, and the formation of the Grand Alliance. Conceptual awareness is demonstrated by the recognition that Louis' aggressive actions throughout the period had provoked this response from the allies. The overall judgement of the essay is convincing.

Response B

Louis XIV was involved in the issue of Spanish Succession as he wanted territory in Spain and their control of other countries. It can be argued that Louis was responsible for the war, however Leopold and Charles II may have played a factor in it.

Charles II was on the brink of death, which left other royalists wanting control over Spain as Charles II did not have an heir. This was a great opportunity for Louis because he wanted to be an emperor and as Spain shared a border with France, it would grant him gloire in Europe. However, Louis would have to compete against Leopold for the control of the succession as he believed he had a better claim to the succession, although I disagree with him as Louis the Dauphin had the best claim due to his mother. Louis wanted and needed Spain, however he wants Spain without going to war. Louis was in his last few years and he did not want to break his peace. Louis may be responsible for the outbreak due to his reputation to become an emperor. Louis did not realise how much trouble he was in when it comes to his finances. He does not have enough, especially because

the impact of the 'Nine Years' War, and his military are exhausted. The taxation of capitation and dixieme were not successful enough, but provided some that Louis sent up to 200,000 military soldiers ~~up~~ to war.

To contrast, there is an argument that Louis did not provoke the war as Leopold had a problem with both partitions. In the First Partition of Treaty in 1698, his grandson Joseph Ferdinand was possibly going to be the emperor of Spain and its territories, as well as the Archduke Charles was about to have control over Milan. Louis' son Louis the Dauphin was about to gain Sicily, Naples and towns near the Pyrenees. This did not please Leopold due to France's access of the northern eastern border. Compared to Louis, he was fine with the partition. The Treaty of London had to be proposed in 1700, due to Joseph Ferdinand's early death in ~~1700~~ the late 1690s. Louis and William of Orange settled this by the Archduke Charles will become the next Spanish emperor, with the Spanish Indies, the Duke of Lorraine will receive Milan and Louis the Dauphin will have all Italian land, except Milan as well as Lorraine. Both treaties were disliked by Leopold. despite the benefits he

will earn, therefore he infuriated Louis. This led to invasions on both land and an attack in Italy. Leopold sabotaged Louis' only aim to keep peace, as Louis wanted no more war.

To conclude, the view of Louis* XIV was responsible for the outbreak of the war & is a neutral point as he threw the first punch physically, however from the partitions, it can be justified that Leopold was the reason of Louis and his sensitivity, therefore it was a valid point, however he was provoked to cause a war to achieve his key objectives before it will be too late.

This is a Level 3 response

This script shows an understanding of the issue and the question is addressed with some balance. The motivations of Louis regarding the succession are considered. There is balance with comment and support on the actions of Leopold and his view of the Partition Treaties. It is argued that Leopold's invasion of Italy 'sabotaged' Louis' aim to keep the peace, 'as Louis wanted no more war.' The answer is effectively organised and shows awareness of some of the key issues. Accurate information is offered, but it lacks development and is quite general and descriptive at times.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/7042

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: **0161 958 3865**

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

