Question 4

Analyze how the political and economic problems of the English and French monarchies led to the English Civil War and the French Revolution.

9–8 points
• Thesis statement/paragraph is explicit and accurately addresses all four components (political and economic problems in both England and France).
• Organization is clear, consistently followed, and effective in support of the argument.
• Essay is well balanced; it analyzes political and economic components in both England and France.
• Essay provides one or more specific pieces of evidence for each of the four components.
• Essay may contain minor errors that do not detract from argument.

7–6 points
• Thesis is explicit and accurately addresses all four components, although it may address one country or component in greater detail.
• Organization is clear and effective in support of the argument, but perhaps not consistently followed.
• Essay is balanced; all major topics suggested by the prompt are covered at least briefly, although one country or component may be analyzed at greater length.
• Essay provides at least one piece of relevant evidence for each of the four components. (Political and economic problems may be discussed together.)
• Essay may contain a major error or several minor errors that detract from argument. (Examples: English peasants revolted because they were hungry; French peasants demanded political representation.)

5–4 points
• Thesis is explicit but may not be fully responsive to the question; it may accurately mention only one country or only one component.
• Organization is clear and effective in support of the argument but may not be consistently followed.
• Essay shows some imbalance; may discuss France in detail but England minimally or vice versa.
• Supporting examples are present but may be less detailed.
• Essay may contain a few errors that detract from argument.

3–2 points
• Thesis may be confused, implicit or vague or merely repeat or paraphrase the prompt.
• Organization may be unclear, ineffective or both.
• Essay shows serious imbalance; may discuss only one component in any relevant detail.
• Only one or two major assertions are supported by relevant evidence.
• Essay may contain several errors that detract from argument.

1–0 points
• There may be no discernible attempt at a thesis, or essay may merely repeat or paraphrase the prompt.
• Essay may have no discernible organization.
• One or none of the major topics suggested by the prompt is mentioned.
• Little or no supporting evidence is used.
• Essay may contain numerous errors that detract from argument.
England

Political problems

Charles I’s political difficulties stemmed in part from his wish to be absolute monarch and the perception of him as a Roman Catholic sympathizer. Charles’s rocky relationship with Parliament resulted in the Petition of Right (1628), which condemned forced loans, reiterated the right of habeas corpus, declared that soldiers and sailors could not be housed in private homes without the homeowner’s consent, and said that civilians should not be subjected to martial law (all of which Charles had done in 1626 to pay for a war with Spain that Parliament refused to finance). Irritated by Parliament, Charles did not call it into session from 1629 until 1640; this period was called the Personal Rule. When he called the Short Parliament (April–May 1640), he did not want to listen to the grievances that had built up during the Personal Rule. However, he was forced to listen to these grievances when the Long Parliament opened in November. Almost immediately the Long Parliament passed bills that repudiated Charles’s Personal Rule, including the Triennial Act (1641), which declared that Parliament had to be called at least once every three years. The final straw in this tumultuous relationship came in January 1642 when Charles attempted to arrest the five members of Parliament (MPs) who were key figures of the opposition. This action was a violation of parliamentary sovereignty.

Economic problems

The English crown’s reliance on the House of Commons for grants and taxes (the power of the purse) often made relations between the monarchy and Parliament difficult, as Charles I discovered. His first Parliament, in June 1625, granted him tonnage and poundage for only one year, rather than the customary lifetime grant. Charles collected these taxes anyway, without parliamentary approval, in subsequent years. This flouting of the law made MPs angry and contributed to Charles’s reputation as a potential absolutist.

During the period of his Personal Rule (1629–1640), Charles revived old taxes. These included distraint of knighthood (fining eligible people who had not applied for knighthood), enforcing the ancient boundaries of royal forests, collecting ship money (traditionally a levy in the form of money or ships from coastal towns in time of emergency, but expanded by Charles during the Personal Rule), and using the Court of the Star Chamber to raise money by collecting fees and fines. Charles also collected forced loans. In addition, during the Personal Rule Charles’s minister Thomas Wentworth implemented the highly unpopular policy of Thorough, which aimed to strengthen the monarchy, to collect money owed to the crown, and to make government more efficient.

Charles’s need for money to finance an army against the Scots following the First Bishops’ War (1638) forced him to call the Short Parliament (April–May 1640). The Second Bishops’ War (August–October 1640) ended with an agreement that the English would pay the Scots a large sum. To get this money, Charles had to call Parliament again in November (the Long Parliament). It was the members of the Long Parliament who eventually led the rebellion against the king.
France

Political problems

Louis XVI was not an impressive monarch. He was not educated to rule, was physically unprepossessing, and was preoccupied with hunting and his privileges. He was also faced with increasing resistance from the local parlements, which in the 1750s and 1760s joined the Paris parlement in its traditional role of defending local privileges against the king. In 1771 Louis XV’s chancellor, René Nicolas de Maupeou, began to abolish the parlements. This unpopular action was seen as replacing local control with central control. Wanting to be popular, Louis XVI dismissed Maupeou and recalled the parlements at the end of 1774. However, the parlements now saw how fragile their power was, which explains their later resistance to the king.

Under Louis XVI the parlements became increasingly resistant to royal decrees, particularly new taxes. The parlement of Paris refused to register a tax and said that only the Estates General could approve such a tax. Local parlements also refused to register new taxes, forcing the crown to resort to the lit de justice, the ceremony to force the parlement to register the tax. There were riots and calls for the Estates General (First Estate, clergy; Second Estate, nobility; Third Estate, commoners). As they voted by Estate, the First and Second Estates could combine to outvote the Third Estate — the unequal voting structure was a source of political friction.

Abbé Sieyès’s pamphlet, What Is the Third Estate? (January 1789), was one of the most famous pamphlets of this period and foreshadowed the power of the Third Estate.

Economic problems

France was relatively prosperous for the middle half of the eighteenth century, although some textbooks draw a line of continuous debt from Louis XIV or Louis XV to Louis XVI. All textbooks note the inequality of taxation. The clergy paid no taxes but gave a yearly “gift”; nobles paid few taxes (only 10 percent of all taxes collected by the 1780s); tax collectors were corrupt and inefficient (kept 60 percent of all taxes collected by the 1780s). France also had a large debt, which increased after its support of the United States in the American Revolution. In 1788 almost half the national income went to pay the principal and interest on the debt.

France also experienced bad weather, poor harvests and high food prices in the 1780s, all of which contributed to unrest among the peasantry and the urban poor.

Louis XVI had several finance ministers in five years (Anne Robert Turgot, Jacques Necker, Charles Alexandre de Calonne, Étienne Charles Loménie de Brienne and Necker again). All but Necker, who glossed over the financial problems, proposed financial reforms, including abolishing sinecures, internal customs barriers and guilds; instituting new land taxes; abolishing the salt tax (the gabelle), requiring money instead of services from the peasants, replacing the inequitable taille with a land tax that the rich as well as the poor would have to pay, and abolishing the vingtième and replacing it with a direct tax levied on all landowners. However, the parlements and the Assembly of Notables opposed these reforms. Facing revolt by the privileged groups, Louis XVI reluctantly called the Estates General.
Historical Background (continued)

Key Dates in the Buildup to the English Civil War

1603: James VI of Scotland became James I of England (d. 1625).
1625: Charles I succeeded his father as king of England (r. 1625–1649).
1628: Parliament passed the Petition of Right.
1638: First Bishops’ War took place (first war for which the monarch did not have parliamentary approval).
1640: Second Bishops’ War occurred.
1640: Short Parliament took place (April–May).
1640: Long Parliament opened.
1641: Long Parliament passed the Triennial Act, prohibited arbitrary taxation and abolished the prerogative courts (Court of High Commission, Star Chamber).
1642: Charles attempted to arrest five MPs (January).
1642: Fighting broke out between Royalist and Parliamentarian forces (September).

Key Dates in the Buildup to the French Revolution

1771: Parlements was abolished by Louis XV.
1774: Louis XVI succeeded his grandfather, Louis XV (r. 1774–1793); reestablished parlements.
1774–1776: Turgot served as French finance minister; proposed ambitious reforms.
1786: Assembly of Notables convened (for the first time in 160 years) to approve Calonne’s plan to reform finances, but it refused to do so.
1787: Calonne was dismissed; increasing intransigence of parlements.
1788: French government was bankrupt.
1788: Louis XVI was forced to call the Estates General (which had last been convened by Louis XIII in 1614).
1788–1789: Massive inflation occurred; food prices rose dramatically.
1789: Meeting of the Estates General opened (May).
1789: Tennis Court Oath (June 20).
1789: Bastille was stormed (July 14).
1789: Privileges were renounced (August 4).
With the beginning of the 17th century, both France and England saw a rise in central authority of the state. With rulers such as James I and later Charles I, the British Parliament had little say in government decisions. A similar situation was present in France where a set of Absolutist monarchs starting with Louis XIV had total control over their subjects. Economic problems such as the Famine in 1700's France and the high taxes without Parliament consent in Britain greatly influenced the revolutions that were to come.

With the arrival of the Stuarts as the ruling family of England also came a set of problems. The fact that James I was a Catholic and strong believer in the idea of divine right had a great effect on the old tradition of balance of power seen in England from the writing of the Magna Carta. With the belief of divine right, one may believe he is appointed by God to rule over his subjects. This concept can only imply that a ruler is to have total, unquestioned control over his subjects. When followed, the arrival of Charles I to the English throne did nothing but worsen the situation already present.
Just as his predecessor did, Charles hoped to be able to rule his kingdom without any involvement of the Parliament. The Star Chamber, originally created by Henry VII (during a time of chaos), aided the absolutist monarch in trying any opponents without the consent of the Parliament. Economically, to support his various wars, Charles I imposed heavy taxes on the population again without consent from the Parliament. This angered the crowds and only intensified the fire growing within the nation. In hopes of regaining its status, the English Parliament imposed the "Petition of Right" which was signed but later ignored by Charles who kept doing things his way. The people, however, had enough and when Charles called for Parliament to support his wars, the civil war exploded.

Due to the power of its monarchs, France during the 1600s-1700s saw little reform in its political affairs. Kings such as Louis XIV, the French Estates General had no say in the country's policies. The keeping of aristocrats at Versailles lowered their power. When a weak ruler came to power, however, they saw an opportunity in redressing their complaints and improving their situation. With the calling of the
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.

(States General) Louis looked to find a way to overcome the economic depression that was plaguing the country. Instead, the "cabiers" were filled with complaints about his policies, representation in government, heavy taxation and many more. With an increase in the price of bread in the late 1700's due to the heavy famines that plagued the country, many peasants could not sustain themselves. This, combined with the heavy taxes, made life practically impossible in 1780's France. All problems started in the Estates General, combined with the anger in the population due to the economic problems, lead to the French Revolution of 1789.

Concerning the fear of taxation and the price of bread.
The English Civil War and the French Revolution both were a result of several issues building up in the lower class and bourgeoisie. Both of these events were caused because the growing middle class demanded representation in parliament, the taxation system was unjust, and both were ruled by incapable rulers.

As the middle class rose, economically in status, they began to demand more political equality between them and the aristocrats. In France, it was the Third Estate demanding one vote per man in the Estates General instead of one for each estate, which the Third Estate was always out voted by the clergy in the First Estate and the nobles in the Second Estate. The Third Estate made up ninety-seven percent of the population and was only represented by one vote. In England, it was very similar, the middle class wanted universal male suffrage. Not only did they want better representation or better representation, but also they wanted the unfair taxation system fixed.

In England and France, the lower classes were taxed, while the wealthy weren’t or hardly were. The French lower and middle classes were hit hard with taxes, and the aristocrats had none.
Louis XVI saw the nobles as a threat, so he wanted to keep the happy and on his side because they were rich and well educated. The peasants and working class went through harsh work hours and working conditions only to give most of their salary to pay taxes. Also, taxes on goods increased. For example, in France, flour became more expensive causing bread prices to increase to prices that was almost a month's salary for the working class. Bread was a big part of the French diet, so this caused several issues that eventually lead to the women's March to Versailles. Besides taxes, the lower and middle classes dealt with terrible rulers. Both countries faced bad and incapable rulers in different ways. Charles I was huge on the divine right theory, which meant parliament did not have a say. This was an issue that all the people, except those loyal to the king, had a problem with and would not stand for. Louis XVI was just oblivious to the major issues in Paris, since he was in his fantasy world at Versailles; it was almost like out of sight out of mind. Him and Queen MarieAntoinet went on in their normal routines. She would shop when bored and play dress up.
The rulers were unfit for what they wanted and needed. Overall, with all these issues that built up for years, the revolts and fighting was inevitable. Both the revolutions came from the bottom, and middle class where the rulers least expected it.
Both the English and the French had political and economical problems leading up to wars. In France, there were high taxed peasants who were starving. In England there were Kings who wouldn't listen to their lower classes needs, and in both there was extreme lack of patience.

In England, peasantry was dissatisfied with the amount of attention their king was paying to them. They wanted more rights, less taxes, and more involvement. Gradually, revolts started breaking out and sure enough, an English civil war was the only solution.

In France, King Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were lavishly living while 76% of France's population was eating one meal a day. The price of bread had almost tripled.
the last year and hungry peasants 
took matters into their own 
hands when their king wouldn't 
listen. So came about the 
French Revolution.

The obvious lack of patience 
in both England and France during 
these two events is partially 
reason for such harsh wars. 
Also, though the monarchs were at 
fault for not listening to their 
people.
Question 4

Overview

This question required students to analyze four factors: the political and economic problems of both England and France in the periods before, respectively, the English Civil War (1642–1649) and the French Revolution (1789–1799). The question did not require, but allowed for the possibility of, comparing and contrasting the causes of the two political upheavals. The question also did not specify whether long-term or short-term problems should be discussed.

Sample: 4A
Score: 8

The thesis addresses all four components of the question. The essay provides several examples of political problems in England (the theory of divine right, the abuses of the Star Chamber, the Petition of Right) and one example of economic problems (Charles’s heavy taxes, noting also the political fallout of the monarch trying to impose taxes without the consent of Parliament). The essay discusses both political and economic problems in France — the failure to call the Estates General, a weak aristocracy, a weak monarch, cahiers’ complaints about lack of political representation, and, on the economics side, famine and heavy taxes. The essay did not earn a score of 9 because, although it offers multiple examples for three of the four components of the question (all except economic problems in England), these factors are for the most part not discussed in sufficient detail. On the other hand, the essay earned a score of 8 because it offers multiple examples for three of the four components and the discussion of political problems in England is particularly strong.

Sample: 4B
Score: 4

The thesis addresses all four components of the question, mentioning at least one political problem (incompetent rulers) and one economic problem (“unjust” taxation system) that applied broadly to both countries. Although the essay is clearly organized into political and economic factors, there is a significant lack of balance in the coverage of the two countries, with the discussion of both political and economic problems in England being very brief and partly incorrect (in claiming that the English middle class wanted universal male suffrage). The evidence for problems in England is minimal — only the brief references to Charles I using divine right theory to limit the power of Parliament and the middle class wanting the “unfair taxation system fixed” are creditable. Thus the essay did not earn a score of 5. On the other hand, the presence of a valid thesis and the discussion all components of the question, albeit unevenly, earned a score higher than 3.

Sample: 4C
Score: 2

The attempted thesis addresses only economic issues in France (the mention of economic issues in England is erroneous). There is no relevant information presented on problems in England, and the discussion of problems in France is vague and unconnected to the revolution. The essay did not merit a score of 3 because it is very unbalanced in its coverage of the two countries and it discusses only economic problems, at an insufficient level of detail. The essay earned a score higher than 1 because it at least addresses one of the four components of the question, with some valid evidence.