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SECTION A

Read the two passages and then answer Question 1.

1 Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing as an explanation of the impact of the Fronde.

[30]

Passage A

The conflict swung each way, with Mazarin having to retreat into exile again in 1652, but returning victorious in 1653. With the young King Louis having been declared of age as early as 1651, clearly Mazarin could claim to have right on his side. The Frondes failed to destroy Mazarin or to humble the monarchy for several reasons. Perhaps, most importantly Queen Anne supported Mazarin. She felt, correctly, that he was the only way to ensure a powerful throne for her son. The horror which spread across Europe after the execution of Charles I of England worried many men who were basically royalist (but anti Mazarin and taxation). This led them to thinking about the possible consequences of a rebellious course of action. In a sense the message of Richelieu was not totally lost on all men and many were convinced that absolutism was the best form of government for France. By 1654, with the young Louis XIV crowned, the intendants were back, and a new finance minister, was back trying to raise money for the war. Little had changed. There were the usual revolts in 1656 and 1657 in the provinces against high taxation, which were repressed with a force that Richelieu would have admired. Apart from a deep impression on Louis, the Frondes appeared to have achieved little. Perhaps they demonstrated the futility of rebellion. They seemed negative and futile; a rash protest against forces over which they seemed to have no control. Some have seen them as a failed revolution, but they had no revolutionary aims. The tactlessness of Mazarin regularly made things worse. In some ways the crown benefited as even moderate reformers were now discredited.


Passage B

In the negotiations that followed [the Fronde], both parties had to give in. While Parlement did not have to humble itself as the crown wished, it was also unable to dictate Mazarin’s removal. The treaty signed at Rueil was a compromise that met the government’s needs of the hour; it would be several years before the crown became strong enough to reverse the whole program of the Fronde. The Fronde left a mark on the King that was never to be erased. Perhaps this is not surprising when we recall the barricades, the talk of rebellion, the demands of the Frondeurs to ‘see’ that the King had not been spirited away, the flight from Paris – all came while he was still a young boy, at a time when he could not defend himself or even understand the forces that seemed to be governing his life. Louis never really trusted Paris again; he never really trusted the Parlement; and he never forgot that the greatest misfortune that can come to a king is the loss of his power to govern his kingdom. In his Memoires, in his letters, and in his conversations for the rest of his life, traces of the fears and terrors caused by the barricades and rebellion always remained. His experience in these years with men – both those who joined the rebellions and those who remained at his side but secretly corresponded with the rebels – made him suspicious of everyone, and this was to remain a firmly established trait of his character until the day he died. The Fronde taught lessons in statecraft so vividly that they could not be forgotten.

Adapted from J. Wolf, Louis XIV, published in 1968.
SECTION B

Answer TWO of the following three questions.

2* ‘Louis XIV was no more absolute in practice than Louis XIII.’ How far do you agree with this view? [25]

3* How far did religion divide rather than unite France in the period from 1610 to 1715? [25]

4* ‘The peasantry was affected more than any other social group by the rising power of France in the period from 1610 to 1715.’ How far do you agree? [25]
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