



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

---

# Mark scheme January 2004

## GCE

# History

## Alternative C: Units 1 and 4

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

---

**A: INTRODUCTION**

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS****Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

**Level 2:*****Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

**Level 5:**

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS**

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

**Level 1:***Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

*Or*

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

**Level 2:***Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

*Or*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations

- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**Level 5:**

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

**D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

***These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.***

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills**: generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

**Alternative C: Absolutist states in Europe 1640-1790****AS Unit 1: Absolutist States in Europe 1640-1725****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of “mercantilist theory” in the context of government regulation of the economy under Louis XIV. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. it was intended to supervise and promote industries and trade. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the theory was based on there being a “gold cake” and that France must gain the largest slice; the government, therefore, should direct the economy and overseas trade to this end; Colbert, in particular, imposed rules and regulation to ensure uniform commercial practice, and the promotion of trade and industry. 2-3

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source C** differs from the views put forward in **Source B** on the success of Colbert’s economic policies. (7 marks)

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. This may consist of bald assertion, e.g. Source B says that success was limited by external factors and by flaws in Colbert’s policies, Source C that all were successful. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge. Answers are likely to contain some summaries and the challenge will only be partially met, e.g. Source B concentrates on over-regulation, under-funding and problems which Colbert could not overcome, whilst Source C only concedes inattention to agriculture and stresses industrial and merchant navy success. 3-5

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. to show how Source C challenges the view given in Source B. 6-7

(c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge

Explain the ways in which Colbert's policies successfully strengthened the French economy. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. 1-4

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, whilst relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. 5-8

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. 9-11

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. 12-13

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. 14-15

### Indicative content

Evidence can be selected from the sources to explain success: Source A shows the determination of Colbert and the support of the King as well as the regulation of commerce; Source B acknowledges the Trading Companies, degree of government subsidy and peace-time success if focused on flaws rather than success; Source C points to the merchant marine, "vigorous" government support and success is measured by France's increased volume of trade and sustained pre-eminence. From own knowledge candidates might show appreciation of Colbert's Trading Companies opening up new markets; deliberate undercutting of foreign rivals' prices as well as tariffs; the determination to ensure quality of manufacture by regulation and inspection which ensured France's pre-eminence in luxury goods; the Academie des Sciences' research to improve production techniques. Balance may be offered by considering commercial against other economic policies or pointing to the weaknesses within these policies or the wider issues of "the economy", including the relative neglect of agriculture and the degree to which privilege and royal expenditure limited "strengthened".

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited offerings on some policies or empty assertion. There will be greater range and selectivity at Level 2 and descriptive answers will try to link with the question although judgement will be bland. Level 3 answers will display greater accuracy, range and depth. They may focus on either commercial or other economic policies but it will be clear that the question has been understood with the focus on success in strengthening the economy. Level 4 answers will look at both commerce and other economic policies and provide a more balanced case. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement and full explanation although judgement, even at this level, may still be implicit and partial.

## Brandenburg-Prussia 1640-1688

### Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by these “important territorial gains” in the context of the foreign policy aims of Frederick William, the Great Elector, after 1648. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. “important territorial gains” means he gained major areas which aided the rise of Brandenburg-Prussia. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Frederick William’s gains made Brandenburg the largest Imperial territory after Austria, East Pomerania and Kammin made Sweden a target for Frederick William’s ambitions because of his resentment at not gaining West Pomerania and Stettin; Halberstadt and, more importantly, Magdeburg promised control of the major Elbe crossing although he had to wait until 1680 for the death of its Archbishop for formal possession; Minden increased the size of Ravensburg and these territories furthered his importance along the Weser and lower Rhine. Not all are needed for a maximum mark. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William became involved in the Northern War of 1655-1660. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to strengthen Brandenburg-Prussia by increasing its territories. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. he had little choice as the Swedes surrounded Königsberg; Poland held suzerainty over East Prussia so he reverted to his loyalty when Sweden weakened; pressure from Vienna and France; Frederick William’s desire to gain West Pomerania; to gain independent rule of East Prussia. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. **6-7**

- (c) “Maintaining good relations with France was Frederick William’s main aim in foreign policy after 1661.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The initial focus should be on why Frederick William wished to maintain good relations with France, e.g. Brandenburg-Prussia’s weaknesses which gave Frederick William little chance of an independent foreign policy; French dominance of Europe making this a sensible policy; the need for subsidies and their pursuit; France’s earlier support for at least some of Frederick William’s aims at Westphalia; the hope that French rivalry with the Habsburgs and the United Provinces would aid Brandenburg’s advancement in the Empire and settle the inheritance dispute with the House of Orange. Other aims can be used to challenge the quotation, e.g. the desire to oppose Sweden and possession of West Pomerania; the aim of gaining overlordship of East Prussia from Poland; the aim to increase significance as an Elector in the Empire; to pursue subsidies wherever they were most profitable to build up military strength, hence Frederick William’s flexible loyalty in the changing balance of power in Europe; possibly Protestant loyalty motivated a shift in aim later in his reign.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on relations with France or another aspect of foreign policy, with assertion rather than proof. At Level 2 narrative is also likely to prevail but it will be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of bland statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical but unbalanced, perhaps concentrated on one or two aims, a limited period, or one-sided. Level 4 answers will examine a range of aims and answers will be more balanced with some limited assessment of “main aim”. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion.

**Question 3**

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “the Recess of the Brandenburg Estates” in the context of the power of the Great Elector and that of the Estates of Brandenburg.

(3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. “the Recess of the Brandenburg Estates” was an agreement made at the meeting which strengthened the power of Frederick William in Brandenburg. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. at the Landtag Frederick William gained a grant of 530, 000 thalers and agreement that the Estates would not meet for six years. This gave him time to build up his army and administration, thus strengthening his power. In return he formally recognised the nobility’s jurisdiction over the serfs and freedom from taxation, so he would face little opposition. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Estates of East Prussia were able to resist the authority of Frederick William before 1672.

(7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. possibly making use of material in the source; Frederick William had less room to manoeuvre than in Brandenburg. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. East Prussia’s relative wealth compared to Brandenburg in 1648; the power of the nobility and financial strength of the burghers of Königsberg; Polish sovereignty until 1660; Roth’s refusal to accept Frederick William as *absoluti domini* and Polish collusion; Frederick William’s leniency after Roth’s revolt; determination to resist a new military grant in 1669; Kalckstein’s leadership of revolt/refuge in Poland. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. **6-7**

- (c) “Frederick William the Great Elector succeeded in extending his power only by compromise with the nobility.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement.

(15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

Given the established predominance of the nobility in Brandenburg and East Prussia some compromise with the nobility was essential, such as that agreed at the 1653 Brandenburg Estates. In Cleves and Mark, although the burghers were more significant, Frederick William also gained noble loyalty by granting them tax exemption, which they had not held before. The relative poverty of the nobility in Brandenburg and East Prussia made them willing recruits for careers in the Great Elector's army and administration, although he did not reserve such careers for the nobility. It can be argued that the extent of compromise was limited as Frederick William used force against the East Prussian revolts and to quell resistance in Cleves and Mark; his wily involvement in the Northern War had gained him sovereignty over the Prussian Estates so they could no longer look for Polish support. Other factors which aided the increase of his power can be considered, e.g. Frederick William's wisdom in adopting an initially cautious approach and his determination to increase his power; the development of central administration; increasing military strength through foreign subsidies; the disparate nature of his territories which enabled them to be dealt with one by one; developing the extensive Crown lands provided revenue.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on Frederick William's extension of authority, with assertion rather than proof. At Level 2 narrative is also likely to prevail but it will be wider ranging on the specified issue with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical but are likely to concentrate on compromises made with the nobility with only slight consideration of any other factors. Alternatively they will concentrate on other factors which strengthened Frederick William's power.

Level 4 answers will examine both sides of the statement and answers will be more balanced between compromise with the nobility and other factors, but given the nature of the quotation, equal weight is unlikely. The clear focus should be on success and the reasons for this. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of significance of compromise.

**Russia 1690-1725****Question 4**

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “Russia’s traditional aims in foreign policy in the South” in the context of Peter’s attacks on Azov. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. “Russia’s traditional aims” means he, like his predecessors, wanted to gain a port. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the long-held Russian aim was to defeat the Ottoman Turks for both religious and strategic reasons. Azov was to be the base for Peter to build a navy with which he could take the Straits of Kerch and gain access to the Black Sea, thence to Constantinople. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter ended his war with the Ottoman Empire in 1700. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because he had successfully taken the port of Azov and held it for four years. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. because Peter had not been able to gain any other European ally against the Turks on his Great Embassy of 1697/8; Poland, Venice and the Holy Roman Empire made peace with the Turks at Carlowitz in 1699 leaving Russia isolated; the new Russian fleet on the Sea of Azov was, not yet, sufficient to tackle Ottoman control of the Straits of Kerch; to gain time to consolidate and ensure victory; to avoid war on two fronts; Peter’s desire for a secure outlet to the Baltic; from 1697 Denmark attempting to draw Russia into alliance; March 1699 defensive alliance with Denmark and Poland, by the end of 1699 had agreed on aggression against Sweden; peace with the Porte in August 1700 freed Peter to focus on attacking Ingria in September in what he anticipated would be a brief and victorious campaign. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. **6-7**

- (c) “Victory over the Swedes at Poltava in 1709, rather than defeat by the Turks in 1711, had the most important consequences for Russia’s position in Europe during Peter the Great’s reign.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

Poltava is likely to be argued of most significance but should be accompanied by some consideration of the war against the Turks. Examples to support Poltava may be: Charles XII had convincingly defeated both the Danes and Poland so that Russia, now completely isolated, short of money and facing rebellions, showed Europe its potential by the victory in 1709; Peter had vindicated himself after the embarrassment of Narva; turning the war against Sweden enabled Peter to complete the conquest of the Baltic provinces, taking the key fortress of Riga in 1710; building his Baltic fleet; renewing the alliance with Denmark and Poland; a Russian army in Poland; Russia was now feared in Europe as Sweden had been – as the Mecklenburg crisis of 1716/17 showed. It might be argued against Poltava that beginning to build St. Petersburg in 1703, in land still technically Swedish, had already signified Peter's determination to make Russia a significant power; Europe was not convinced that Poltava was of major significance, seeing it as a fluke, more the result of Swedish error than Russian strength; it took until 1716 to take the last Swedish fortress in Germany, only with the aid of Prussia and Hanover; France did not enter an alliance with Peter in 1717; it took until 1721 to finally defeat Sweden showing, perhaps, that Poltava was not as significant as Nystadt in demonstrating the security of Russia's significance as a western rather than Asiatic power, although Cape Hango in 1714 had aroused the concerns of the maritime powers. The defeat on the Pruth was seen by much of Europe as more typically Russian in 1711 and it signified the end of Peter's ambitious southern policy; Charles XII had been able to persuade the Turks to declare war on Peter; the support of Balkan Christians did not materialise as Peter had expected; it was a heavy defeat by superior Turkish forces, showing the weaknesses of Peter's much larger army; the humiliating peace treaty meant the loss of Azov and destruction of the fleet on the Sea of Azov.

Level 1 answers may consist of thin narrative on Poltava and the battle of the Pruth, with assertion rather than proof. At Level 2, narrative is also likely to prevail but it will be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical but are likely to concentrate on the significance of Poltava. Level 4 answers will examine both sides of the statement and answers will be more balanced, but given the nature of the quotation, equal weight is

unlikely. The clear focus should be “Russia in Europe”. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of both battles’ significance.

### Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “the importance of Russia’s mineral resources” in the context of Peter the Great’s economic policies. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. “the importance of Russia’s mineral resources” as a major factor in industrial development. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Peter was determined to develop the economy in line with Western Europe and had Sweden’s successful mineral exploitation/export as example; copper and iron ore were the foundation for Russia’s industrial and armament development. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great promoted Russia’s industrial development. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. making use of material in the source – because he used Russia’s mineral resources and was determined to succeed. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. his Great Embassy experience and recognition of western advance compared to Russia; Peter’s own practical interest; mercantilist intentions; the need for armaments; iron and lumber to build his fleets; he could provide Crown serfs as labour and brought in foreign skilled craftsmen; the need to encourage entrepreneurs. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance. **6-7**

- (c) “The size of Russia was the most important factor limiting the success of Peter the Great’s economic reforms.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.  
  
***Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The size of Russia certainly presented a serious challenge to the effectiveness of the reforms, e.g. communication problems; difficulties of enforcing central control; differing local conditions, people and resources. Other problems can be assessed and linked to this, e.g. the innate conservatism of the Russian people; tiny industrial base; shortage of capital and skilled labour; overwhelming agricultural inertia; noble control of serfs; the flaws in Peter's efforts and the major focus of finance on military needs. The quotation may be challenged to some extent by stressing the degree of success overcoming limitations, e.g. central direction was effective in expanding industry and its output, especially with direct State control of industries such as armaments and textiles; metal industries in the Urals; setting up of Colleges to develop skills; road improvements and canal building, especially effective in the newly acquired Baltic provinces; interest-free loans and subsidies; use of foreign experts; overtaking Sweden as major iron exporter; the tenfold increase in production; continuation of development after Peter's death despite less government interest.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on economic policies or generalisation on the size of Russia, with assertion rather than proof. At Level 2 narrative is also likely to prevail but it will be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of bland statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical but are likely to concentrate on the size of Russia or other factors limiting success. At Level 4 answers will examine both sides of the statement and answers will be more balanced. The clear focus should be on what the economic weaknesses were, and how far these were the major limitations on economic development as well as some consideration of the degree to which central direction was able to overcome them. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree to which the size of Russia was the main limitation.

**Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe 1640-1790****A2 Unit 4: Monarchy in the Age of Enlightenment****Section A: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688-1789****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain what was meant by “its assemblies were consulted over taxation” in the context of relations between the monarchy and the Church between 1688 and 1789.

(5 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. the king discussed Church taxation with its representatives. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. “its assemblies were consulted over taxation” indicates that the King sought the agreement of the Assembly of the Clergy on its financial contribution to the state and, as a Gallican Church, this was usually forthcoming. Own knowledge may detail the don gratuit; that the Assembly of the Clergy was the only representative institution which met throughout the period; the King’s role in high Church appointments and how far this ensured acquiescence. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. clearly placing it in the context of the ancien regime. Comparison of the Assembly’s attitude under Louis XIV with that in the eighteenth century; appreciation that finance was not the only issue affecting “relations” and how cordial these were. **4-5**

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Comment on the usefulness of these two sources in explaining the problems which the Church presented to the monarchy in the eighteenth century. Explain your answer.

(10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

## Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 may indicate by selection of simple statements some brief points on which the sources agree or disagree, e.g. Source B indicates internal Church dispute over Jansenism and tax-exemption, and Parlement's involvement; Source C the power of clerical opposition to taxation, but they will not link the two. Level 2 answers will examine the sources more thoroughly and by so doing show greater insight into them. They may include some summary/description from the sources but will indicate some limited knowledge, e.g. that both agree on the Church being under-taxed in relation to its income and effective in its resistance but only Source B indicates the Jansenist dispute which created further problems for the monarchy. By Level 3, candidates should be drawing conclusions about the utility of the sources in highlighting the problems and offering sound support from own knowledge. At Level 4 there should be supported understanding of the interpretations indicated in each source with comment on the greater range of Source B and the indication in Source C that the Church was a major underwriter of Crown debt which casts doubt on the degree to which it was "a problem" and that it had reason to resist the Crown's request for a greater contribution in 1788.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

Consider the extent to which the monarchy was undermined by privileged groups between 1688 and 1789. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. 1-4
- L2: ***Either***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. 5-8
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. 9-11
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. 12-13

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified in the indicative content.

Answers at the two lowest levels are likely to conform to the mark scheme. At Level 1 if narrative style answers occur they could be on one specific issue or period, e.g. the Church's tax-exemption. Alternatively they will rely on general assertions with quotation from the sources. Level 2 answers will cover a wider period though not necessarily the entire 100 years specified. Narrative answers are likely to have a limited reign-by-reign focus. In the analytical style answers there may be brief discussion of some of the issues such as noble tax exemption, the privilege of officers, resistance of Parlements over finance, divisions within the Church. Thus, although some implicit understanding will be in evidence, the focus of the question will not have been fully appreciated and the coverage will be uneven. At Level 3 answers will show some appreciation of the demands of the question. Ideally answers should place the initial focus on the problems presented to the monarchy by the privileged groups and show awareness of the differing degree of "undermining" with some awareness of other factors. They should range over the period using material from sources and own knowledge to support points. At Level 4 the full period should have been covered. In addition to the initial focus, answers will examine other factors which played a part in undermining the monarchy in the period such as its own shortcomings, the problem of royal debt, ministerial flaws and faction at Court, the character and commitment of the monarchs/Regent, the significance of the Enlightenment. Level 5 answers will show their quality by their precise selection of material used in a controlled answer which still ranges across the 100 year period and sustains judgement and relevance to the question. Material from Source D might be used in an effective conclusion.

### **Section B: The Practice of Enlightenment**

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 Levels of Response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

#### **Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

**Or**

Answer implies an analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

**L2: Either**

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

**Or**

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

**L3:** Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

**L4:** Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

**L5:** As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Option A: Brandenburg-Prussia under Frederick II, 1740-86**

**2** To what extent did his diplomatic opportunism rather than Prussian military skill explain the success of Frederick II's foreign policy between 1740 and 1763?  
(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Understanding of both aspects will clearly be essential – Frederick's exploitation of the European situation and military assets/skills need to be evaluated across the period; other factors may be made relevant as well as consideration of the degree of 'success'.

'Success' lay in gaining and retaining Silesia against massive odds as well as in establishing Frederick's reputation as a military genius, but at what cost to Prussia in the Seven Years War? In support of opportunism candidates might consider Frederick's exploitation of Maria

Theresa's weaknesses in 1740; the degree to which he was loyal to his allies; the 'truce' with Austria in 1741-42; re-entry in 1744 and settlement for Silesia in 1745. In disagreement – the suspicions of Prussia from other powers, especially France, and Kaunitz's outmanoeuvring of Frederick in 1754-46, isolating Prussia.

In support of military skill candidates might consider Frederick's pre-emptive strikes; his merits as a general; the oblique battle-order; battles such as Soor, Hohenfriedberg, Liegnitz, Torgau and, especially, Rossbach and Leuthen; the ability to maximise the effectiveness of vastly inferior numbers. In disagreement the degree to which Frederick relied on the military strength built up by his father, e.g. at Mollwitz; the military weaknesses of his enemies; their failure to co-ordinate attack on Prussia; military defeats such as Gross Jagersdorf; military exhaustion by 1762; the sheer luck of Peter III's accession in Russia.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of foreign policy with assertion on success. Level 2 answers are most likely to be narratives of foreign policy but with some slight attempt at the assessment of each aspect in the question or of success. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on either diplomacy or military skills, but it will attempt to assess success on the chosen aspect. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. Although the focus may be more heavily on a specific period, e.g. 1740-48 or 1754-63, there will be some consideration of both diplomatic opportunism and military skills.

Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will also be critical, showing some recognition of the need for definition and evaluation on both aspects, ranging across the period, as well as considering other factors such as the motives of other powers, especially in the Diplomatic Revolution, and their financial support for Prussia. Level 5 answers will sustain an argument both on the reasons for, and the degree of, success to reach a valid judgement.

- 3** How far were flaws in the administrative and legal systems which he inherited the reason for Frederick II's internal reforms? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

The question identifies one of the motives for reforms which should be the initial focus. Other factors can then be assessed to reach a reasoned judgement. A wide range of policies on both central and local government and Cocceji's work on the law and its continuation can be assessed. The question allows for consideration of other areas of reform but this is not essential. Candidates should consider the system Frederick inherited and the reforms made, but the reasons for them should predominate.

Flaws in the administrative system might be disputed as no change was made by Frederick in the formal structure of the General Directory, War and Domains Chamber and

town/rural/royal estate bodies. However it can be argued that he perceived flaws in the power of the General Directory and its slowness under his father as Frederick limited its meetings, dealt directly with individual ministers and appointed others outside the General Directory, thus increasing his autocracy, especially after 1763. At local level his father's policy was continued in the development of a loyal and hard-working, mainly middle class, civil service. "Flaws" of inefficiency and corruption can be argued to have been perceived by Frederick by pointing to his increasing use of Fiscals to spy on his bureaucrats, his personal inspections and resort to instant dismissal or imprisonment without trial.

Legal system flaws: the lack of a single system; corruption amongst the judiciary, although the point can be made that Cocceji's work was begun under Frederick William; Frederick wanted a uniform, efficient and cheap system which the Prussian General Code eventually established.

Other reasons for reform which might be considered for these aspects of policy and other reforms are Frederick's determined assertion of royal authority/autocracy; unified policy for all of his territories; desire to limit cost and maximise efficiency; the needs of war; supervision of the economy and conscription; Frederick's distrustful nature; any degree of enlightenment – "Laws must limit the liberty and rights of the citizen only in the interests of the general good", in economic and education policy.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited number of policies with assertion on success. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller range of policies with some slight attempt at the assessment of reasons but these will not be well defined. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on one or two reasons for changes in one or two areas. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be clear attempt to define reasons for changes in both law and administration although these will be unbalanced.

Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer assessment of reasons. Level 5 responses will sustain an argument on reasons for reform to reach a valid judgement.

- 4 “Frederick II’s interest in the Enlightenment was merely as an intellectual pastime; it had no influence on his economic and social policies.” How far do you agree with this statement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

The question has been worded to try to ensure a synoptic approach, and focus on two aspects of domestic policy should ensure a manageable question, as evidence also needs consideration on the enlightenment as mere interest. Both parts of the statement can be challenged.

Frederick’s “interest” can be supported from a range of aspects – correspondence with Voltaire and other philosophes, music, poetry, art, science, Sans Souci, his own words on “philosophe par inclination”; anti-Machiavel; in support of no influence: in economic policy Frederick remained a mercantilist rather than supporting Physiocratic free trade; in social policies, Frederick maintained the status of nobility and serfs rather than any attempt at equality; in education, loyalty to the state was the primary focus rather than the liberal approach advocated by the enlightenment.

To challenge the question – on economic enlightenment: immigration was encouraged by military exemption for three generations; reciprocal free trade with America; some easing of excise duties, e.g. on flour; on social policy – religious toleration, although this needs to be qualified as a continuation of the policy of his predecessors, thus merely coinciding with enlightened principles, Frederick did assert its importance “every subject shall have liberty to believe what he can or will” and supported Voltaire over Calas and de la Barre; humanitarianism – e.g. state granaries to stabilise prices and avoid famine, easing the burden of Crown serf labour from 6 to 3 days, compulsory primary education and school building; Frederick re-established the Berlin Academy and built the Berlin Opera House.

Level 1 answers are likely to be either bland assertion on whether Frederick was enlightened or limited description of a few of Frederick’s policies without links to the question. At Level 2, answers may offer a wider range of aspects of the enlightenment which interested Frederick or a range of relevant policies with slight links to the focus of the question. Level 3 answers will adopt a more analytical approach on both aspects of the question with an attempt to indicate the criteria for judging a policy as enlightened on both economic and social. The response will be unbalanced on “interest” and implementation and there may be some narrative. Some challenge may be offered but not sustained.

Level 4 answers will examine both parts of the statement and there should be clear development on enlightened criteria compared to both economic and social policies in practice. Challenge should be balanced. At Level 5, answers will draw conclusions on both aspects of the question.

**Option B: Russia under Catherine II, 1762-96**

- 5 To what extent did Catherine II's policy towards Poland achieve its objectives?  
(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question and should enable candidates to consider Catherine's intentions and how far her policy towards Poland changed or served Russia's best interests in the context of Catherine's overall foreign policy objectives.

Catherine's objectives can be defined in several ways, e.g. initially to maintain Russia's informal, but de facto, control of Poland through its elected monarch and influence over the major nobility; to continue the absorption of useful Polish territory begun in the seventeenth century; to keep a Russian army in parts of Poland; to keep disorder in Poland from distracting from her main focus on Turkey; to impose religious toleration. Her success in achieving these objectives can be supported – e.g. the use of force and bribery ensured the election of Poniatowski as Stanislas-Augustus 'the King we have made'; the use of force and coercion against the General Confederation and the Confederation of Bar; the value and ease of assimilation of the lands gained from the first two Partitions; the stifling of Polish discontent to enable Catherine to concentrate on war against Turks; European acquiescence to the Partitions; Catherine as the opponent of republicanism in 1792 and 1795.

Lack of achievement – Stanislas-Augustus did not prove to be fully the 'puppet-king'; religious tolerance; commitment of troops to Poland causing war and limiting success against the Ottoman Empire; Catherine's assertion that she had no intention of dismembering Poland; reasons for including Austria in Partition; the degree to which Catherine was the dupe of Frederick II, the Prussian alliance in 1764 to gain Poniatowski's election served Prussian interests far more than Russia's; the comparison of Russian gains from the Partitions with those of Prussia; Polish resistance – the Confederations, 1791 Constitution and Kosciuszko; the outcome of sharing rather than controlling Poland.

The weakness of Poland itself can be brought into assessment of both aspects.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of policy towards Poland, focused on Partition, with assertions on success. Level 2 responses will be either a fuller account of the partition or attempted analysis on objectives or achievement but with inadequate substance. At Level 3 there will be clear awareness of the focus of the question with some developed consideration of objectives and the degree of achievement across the period although this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced considering a range of objectives and the degree of achievement with sound support. Level 5 responses will draw conclusions based on sound evaluation across the period and range of aspects.

- 6 “Catherine II’s attempts to reform the legal and administrative systems of Russia failed.” How far do you agree with this statement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

The question has been worded to try to ensure a synoptic approach and directed to two specific areas of policy to aid manageability. The degree of failure in both aspects can be evaluated in light of Catherine’s intentions; strengthening of her autocracy; the expectations stimulated by the Nakas; benefit to her subjects; international reputation; how far both areas were improved in practice; corruption and inefficiency; the scale of the problems; the suppression of peasant unrest.

On the legal system: How far did Catherine genuinely wish to implement the radical proposals of the Nakas, thus how far was it a failure? The Legislative Assembly failed if its purpose was to agree to the Nakas or codify the laws; the Charter of the Nobility can be discussed as simply codification of existing rights rather than reform; the abolition of torture was a re-introduction of Elizabeth’s policy and not well-enforced. The Charter of the Towns, 1785, recognised the collective rights of townspeople but did not extend legal protection.

In administration greater success can be argued, especially where the purpose was to strengthen autocracy, if less effective where it was to improve efficiency. Examples might be drawn from: 1763 reform of the Senate; 1764 revision of the Table of Ranks; the 1775 decree on provincial government was a re-introduction/tightening of policies established under Peter the Great and Elizabeth, very slow in implementation but one of Catherine’s greater successes because it was well-prepared and pragmatic; noble provincial assemblies from 1785; the Charter of the Towns set up elected common councils; there was a large increase in the number of local government officials and allocation of finance but the overall authority of the centrally appointed officials was reinforced.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited number of administrative or legal policies with assertion of failure and no real link to the focus of the question. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller range with some slight attempt at the assessment of failure but this will not be well defined. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing on narrow definition of failure. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be a clear attempt to define criteria for failure and consideration of both law and administration but it will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer assessment with sound support for challenge to the assumptions in the quotation. Level 5 responses will sustain argument to reach a valid judgement.

- 7 To what extent did the geographic and economic weaknesses of the Russian Empire, rather than enlightened ideas, influence Catherine II's economic policies?  
(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question linking two major aspects of the Specification. Geographic and economic weaknesses will need to be detailed and some discussion on how far these were linked is possible, definition of 'enlightened ideas' on economics can then enable evaluation of these influences on Catherine's policies as well as other possible factors.

Geographic and economic weaknesses such as – the size of Russia; its disproportionately unproductive land and climate; communication weaknesses; the preponderance and backwardness of agriculture; reliance on foreign merchant ships for exports; lack of capital and internal demand; the noble market for luxury goods was served by imports; population increase from conquests was not an asset – Russia did not suffer from a shortage of cheap labour.

Some policy success was achieved, e.g. some road and canal building; development of a Russian merchant fleet; the opening up of ports such as Odessa; some expansion of industry e.g. cotton; encouragement of immigrant skilled workers, especially from Germany. All aided an increase in trade from 21 to 96 million roubles p.a. but this remained the export of raw materials rather than manufactured goods; nothing was done to remedy the weaknesses of agriculture and geographic weaknesses could not be overcome; serfdom was extended in new territories.

Enlightened ideas can be supported by Catherine's Physiocratic free trade policy – by the end of her reign all exports and many imports were duty free, the duty on luxury imports reduced from 200 to 20 per cent; reciprocal free trade agreements; Free Trade Society; abolition of state sales monopolies; the reduction of the Salt Tax and increase of liquor duties could be argued as a move towards fairer taxation between classes; foundation of the Mining Academy to aid education and stimulate innovation.

Other factors such as military and Court expenditure creating a pressing need for increased taxation can be considered as influencing Catherine's economic policies, and revenues did increase from 17 to 78 million roubles in her reign. Expenditure, however, continued to outstrip income; paper money led to inflation and increasing the Poll Tax meant greater poverty/even less internal demand. Military gains such as Black Russia did offer some better land.

Level 1 answers are likely to be either bland assertion on whether Catherine was enlightened in her economic policies or that Russia was weak without links to the question. At Level 2, answers may offer a wider range of geographic and economic weaknesses and/or what

constituted enlightened economic policy or narrate Catherine's policies with slight links to reasons. Level 3 answers will adopt a more analytical approach on both aspects influencing policies although these will be unbalanced and there may be some narrative. Level 4 answers will examine the range of factors indicated in the question with sound support and there should be clear development. Other factors/reasons might also be considered. At Level 5, answers will offer substantiated argument and draw valid conclusions.

### **Option C: Enlightenment in Theory and Practice**

- 8** To what extent did Rousseau's key social and political theories conflict with the concept of enlightened absolutism? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

The question focuses on a central aspect of the option. Candidates will need to establish a valid definition of enlightened absolutism and demonstrate a grasp of Rousseau's work.

Answers are likely to focus on *The Social Contract* but might also consider Rousseau's early essays, contribution to the *Encyclopaedia*, *Nouvelle Heloise* and the focus of *Emile* on progressive child-centred education, all of which might be used as support for the enlightened aspects of the concept, e.g. the cult of sensibility, virtue and culture but contrasted with the absolutist view of the purpose of education/government and with Rousseau's emphasis on moral idealism rather than politics. From the *Social Contract* there is likely to be discussion of the General Will and some focus on the implications of "man is born free but is everywhere in chains". The emphasis on the necessity for government to act in the best interests of citizens and Rousseau's rejection of democracy can be linked to the theory of enlightened absolutism although his support for direct participation cannot. Rousseau's attack on his fellow Philosophes' optimistic support of progress might also be considered.

Level 1 answers may be vague and brief description of either Rousseau's work or the meaning of enlightened absolutism with no link to the question. Level 2 answers are likely to be descriptive of both with passing comment linking with the question. Alternatively there may be some attempt to analyse some aspects of both but this will lack weight and balance. Answers at Level 3 will analyse some aspects of both Rousseau's ideas and enlightened absolutism, pointing to the difficulties in defining the latter and perhaps considering the later significance of Rousseau's work but argument will lack weight and balance. Level 4 answers will be critical, offering some sophistication in the grasp of both aspects and partially meet the challenge of 'to what extent'. Level 5 answers will reach a conclusion which might be that aspects of Rousseau's work could, with qualifications, support the concept but was, potentially, the antithesis of absolutism if not of enlightenment.

- 9 “The Encyclopaedia was the manifesto of the Enlightenment.”  
To what extent did both Frederick II **and** Catherine II put the social and political principles of the Encyclopaedia into practice? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

Some knowledge of the content and intention of the editors and authors of the Encyclopaedia needs to be used in conjunction with knowledge of some of the two rulers’ relevant policies. As both are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each ruler is expected than in Options A and B.

All of the main French philosophes contributed to the Encyclopaedia and, if these were not wholly unified in their ideas, agreement on principles of reason, humanitarianism, equality before the law and opposition to superstition and intolerance as well as privilege can be seen as, largely, shared by all its contributors. In that sense it was a ‘manifesto’ but it was far more restricted as a statement on future policy. Much of the Encyclopaedia was veiled criticism of the French system of government and gave over-prominence to the supposed superiority of the English system rather than being a blueprint for reform or coherent proposals. However, its political principles can be considered as some, vague, degree of participation in government favoured by some contributors; others, such as Voltaire, argued for enlightened absolutism.

The policies implemented by the “enlightened rulers” perhaps coincided with some of the Encyclopaedistes’ principles but it is highly debatable how far the Encyclopaedia was their inspiration.

On social principles: both rulers can be argued to have qualified in terms of religious toleration; Frederick II at least did not extend serfdom as did Catherine and he treated Crown serfs with some degree of humanitarianism. The pursuit of reason might be supported by their policies on education and there was rationalisation of the legal codes in each state but neither pursued equality before the law nor made any attempt to challenge the privilege of the nobility. On political principles: both rulers most certainly supported and put absolutism into practice but not any participation in government, although Catherine’s Charters of the Nobility and Towns did provide for elections in local government and her Legislative Commission might be argued as representative.

Level 1 answers will be limited description of what the Encyclopaedia or the rulers’ policies were or assertion with no clear links to the question. Level 2 answers are likely to be fuller description of the Encyclopaedia and the rulers’ policies. Alternatively there may be some attempt to analyse its intent or impact. At Level 3 the answer will be mainly analytical and will give consideration to some range of the Encyclopaedia’s principles with some attempt to link these with the rulers’ policies but this will lack balance. Level 4 responses will be more balanced, soundly directed to the focus and aware of the differences amongst the writers

which qualified the concept of a united statement of principles and offer some comparison between the rulers. Level 5 answers will in addition refer to the degree of interpretation which could be placed on the implementation of the principles as deliberate or coincidental.

- 10** “Voltaire’s relationships with both Frederick II **and** Catherine II were determined by mutual self-interest rather than commitment to ideals.”  
How far do you agree with this statement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20**

### **Indicative content**

Less depth of knowledge on each ruler is expected than in Options A and B. The question is worded to aid candidates to focus on the motives on both sides and to evaluate the most significant. “Relationship” can be seen on a personal level and as linkage between theory and practice.

On Voltaire “self-interest” can be supported by Voltaire’s financial needs; the need to leave France; his cynical willingness to heap praise on both rulers. On either monarch’s “self-interest” candidates may point to the advantage of having praise from the most famous writer in France, particularly for Catherine, but should also focus on key ideas of Voltaire and the degree of monarchical agreement.

Voltaire’s “commitment to ideals” can be illustrated by his consistent opposition to religious intolerance and Church privilege, e.g. his pamphlet campaigns on the Calas Case and the Chevalier de la Barre; works on the Index and the Church refusing him Christian burial although he remained a Catholic. To what extent either monarch shared this commitment because of ideals or self-interest can be discussed, e.g. Frederick’s personal cynicism towards religion and continuation of toleration as Hohenzollern policy for social harmony in disparate territories and to benefit the Prussian economy rather than commitment to it in the abstract. Catherine’s toleration and the secularisation of Church lands – how far was it commitment or for financial benefit and to keep peace in her multi-cultural empire? Opposition to censorship – countered by Catherine’s treatment of Radishchev and Novikov. Voltaire’s support for absolute monarchy and opposition to democracy was certainly shared by both rulers although how far this extended to his denunciation of the abuse of power can be questioned. How far all three shared a commitment to equality and cultural freedom only for the elite might be considered. Voltaire’s loss of faith in progress and man’s perfectibility can also be linked to either monarch.

Level 1 answers may be thin description of some areas of self-interest or the ideas of the enlightenment. Alternatively there will be assertion on both without linkage to the focus of the question. Level 2 answers may also be description of the relationship or policies but they will be fuller and offer some links with the question. At Level 3, analysis in line with the question will predominate although lacking in weight or balance on either aspect. Level 4

responses will be critical and focus clearly on the interests and commitment of both, appreciating reasons for the degree of support and that it was variable. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-argued conclusion.