

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative C Units 1 and 4 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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 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 C** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of “the Dragonnades” in the context of the policy of Louis XIV towards the Huguenots. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. it was a way to forcibly convert the Huguenots. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the Dragonnades meant the billeting of dragoons on Huguenots and forcible conversions were reported, leading to Protestant emigration and shock in Protestant Europe (the source of the drawing). The Intendant, Marillac, who began them was dismissed by Louis XIV who ordered their cessation. However, the Dragonnades were re-introduced, as royal policy, in 1685 and their success was a factor in his reasoning for the Edict of Fontainebleau. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source B** differs from the views put forward in **Source A** on Louis XIV’s measures to deal with the Huguenots. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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 and 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.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source A says that Louis merely wished to persuade them or did not use any pressure, Source B that pressure was used and it was popular with Catholic Frenchmen. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source A refers to Louis’ intention to respect the liberties granted to Protestants under the terms of the Edict of Nantes and his early policy of

gradual persuasion but also shows that he intended no further concessions. Source B differs as it shows the increasingly restrictive measures taken, as well as the use of bribery, and the Huguenots position becoming more difficult in the 1670s. Source B also implies that after 1679 “persuasion” became more persecution and mentions the Revocation. Own knowledge could be from examples such as specific restrictions, the Dragonnades and the terms of Fontainebleau. Candidates may point out that Source B agrees, to some extent, that Louis used persuasion rather than physical persecution in the earlier years, although success depended on extension to official bribery. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. Source B challenges the view given in Source A although Louis XIV’s words can be seen to imply the measures and the meaning and methods of “persuasion” changed across the period. **6-7**

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

Explain why Louis XIV’s policy towards the Huguenots became increasingly severe. **(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* 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, while 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 support increasing severity and reasons for this: Source A shows the early intention of Louis to rely on gradual persuasion but also his determination; Source B acknowledges that earlier methods did not involve violence but implies others did so as Huguenots were “uncomfortable” and popularity of Louis’s policies amongst Catholic Frenchmen as a possible reason; Source C shows the increasing severity of methods in a hostile cartoon and implies that earlier methods had not succeeded as a reason.

From own knowledge candidates might include further evidence to support increasing severity but the main focus should be on reasons for this, e.g. initial reasons for policy might include: his coronation oath; his genuine faith; tolerance was an exception in 17th Century Europe; the Edict of Nantes had not led to toleration as Huguenots were a resented minority; even if their numbers had, slowly, been diminishing since 1598; Louis finding, to his surprise, that material self-interest did not persuade many Huguenots; he was encouraged by both Bishops and Parlement as well as the Assembly of the Clergy which set up a commission to interpret Nantes “within narrowest bounds”; the end of the Dutch War (1679) made it easier to ignore Protestant states; the increasing influence of Louvois; Colbert’s death in 1683; the dispute with the Pope over the regale; Louis did not wish to be less a good Catholic than the Habsburgs, especially with his sights on the Spanish throne; encouragement from M. de Maintenon and Louis’ confessor; the Revocation was popular and needed enforcement; Louis’ suspicion that Huguenots were agents of William of Orange and rebels, confirmed in his view by the revolt of the Camisards in the Cevennes from 1702. Candidates might, partly, defend Louis as he relied on information from the Intendants who played down the severity of measures in reporting success and from Pellison; violent action against Huguenots was forbidden in 1698 – if re-introduced in 1702.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited offerings on some methods or empty assertion. There will be greater range and selectivity at Level 2 and descriptive answers will try to link with the question although judgment will be bland. At Level 3 it will be clear the question has been understood with focus on reasons and answers will display greater accuracy, range and depth, although there may be some imbalance. Level 4 answers will provide a wider range of reasons across the period 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.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “mercenaries” in the context of the army inherited by Frederick William in 1640. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Frederick William recognised they were an important part of the army, and the most effective, which he continued to rely on. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. mercenaries were paid professional soldiers, usually foreigners, and, in the army of 1640, the most

disciplined and reliable troops, most of the senior officers were foreigners. Much of the remaining army were more used to terrorising its citizens rather than defending Brandenburg from occupation by Swedish troops. Although mercenaries were expensive for Frederick William's limited resources in 1640 he had little choice but to maintain them. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the army was a major factor in the policies of Frederick William. *(7 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he wanted a useful standing army. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. considers both domestic and foreign aspects, explaining them relatively; the army was Frederick William's passion and he led his troops personally; he was determined to build up a disciplined force; a standing army was a symbol of power and prestige; it could raise useful foreign subsidies, especially after its 1675 victory at Fehrbellin; to aid him gain West Pomerania; the army was a major domestic asset as tax-gatherer and could be used against recalcitrant Estates, e.g. East Prussian revolts; its support was the major purpose of his administrative reforms. **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, e.g. that development of the army was the main foundation of all of Frederick William's policies and a major means to their implementation. **6-7**

- (c) "Any success that Frederick William had in his foreign policy depended entirely on France."
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

There should be some definition of what success Frederick William did have in his foreign policy, e.g. the gains at Westphalia, sovereignty of East Prussia in 1660, foreign subsidies. The significance of France may be supported by consideration of its increasing dominance in Europe, e.g. even from 1640 France was likely to be victorious in the Thirty Years War and as Mazarin wished to keep a balance of power in the Baltic he was willing to consider Brandenburg-Prussia's claims at Westphalia – but not to agree to all of them leaving Frederick William with East, not West, Pomerania; in the personal reign of Louis XIV French subsidies created an opportunity to rebuild and strengthen the army, enabling it to defeat Sweden at Fehrbellin in 1675. As a result of French dominance, the Dutch, from the late 1660s, were willing to offer subsidies to build their coalitions against France; France was a major influence on the ending of the Northern War and Frederick William was powerless to further any of his ambitions beyond sovereignty of East Prussia; his geographic and financial position left the Elector little chance of an independent foreign policy.

To challenge the quotation candidates might consider other factors which determined his policy and success, e.g.: Frederick William's skill in reading the international situation ensuring Brandenburg-Prussia was on the winning side in 1648; the astute changes of alliance in pursuit of greater subsidies; his exploitation of his position as an Elector to gain support from the Emperor; the determination to be on the side opposing Sweden to gain possession of West Pomerania; reverting his allegiance to Poland in the Northern War; his Protestant sympathies leading to the Dutch alliance by 1688; his determination to build the economy and Crown finances to create sufficient wealth to support his army independent of subsidies.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on Frederick William's foreign policy not linked with the quotation or 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, perhaps concentrated on a limited period or one or two aspects of policy affected by the importance of France, which will be explained, but the answer will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will examine a range of factors as well as some range on France's significance and answers will be more balanced with some assessment of "success" and/or of France and other factors. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “concessions to the Junkers” in the context of the administrative aims of the Great Elector. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. reforms depended on their agreement. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. at the 1653 Brandenburg Landtag Frederick William gained a grant of 530,000 thalers which enabled him to build up Crown administration in return for his formal recognition of the nobility’s jurisdiction over the serfs and their exemption from the Contribution and new excise tax; similar acknowledgement for the Junkers of East Prussia enabled him to extend his authority and administration over their recalcitrant Estates. The nobility were given preference in the army and administrative appointments as part of his aim to create a service nobility. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William undertook reform of the system of government in Brandenburg-Prussia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he wanted to build up his authority over the nobility. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to impose his authority over that of the Estates in the various territories; to increase the efficiency of tax collection; to impose the new excise tax; to deal with recruitment and finance for his army; to use the army in administration (*Generalkriegskommissariat*); to maximise income from the Crown lands (*Amtskammer*). **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, e.g. the inter-dependence of increasing his power and finances. **6-7**

- (c) “The Great Elector’s administrative reforms were the most successful of his domestic policies.”
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 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 question enables candidates to consider a range of policies and evaluate their relative success. In support of the administrative reforms they might compare the system of administration in 1640 with that established by 1688: the 1640 predominance of the Geheimer Staatsrat and the gradual decline in its significance in favour of the War Commissariat and Secret Council by 1679, which were fully under the control of Frederick William; the efficiency of the military in bureaucracy; the integration of the nobility into Crown service. All of this enabled the Elector to maximise revenue as well as the supervision and implementation of other policies, e.g. replacing the role of the Estates in administration; economic policies.

Other policies might be considered as more successful, in particular the army reforms as they were an integral part and purpose of the administration, and given the remarkable transformation from the army's 1640 condition by the end of his reign; the army's significance in dealing with the power of the Estates and revolts in East Prussia. Economic reforms, again comparing 1640 with 1688, and the development of trade, communications and industry aided by the policy of religious toleration.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on one aspect of Frederick William's policies, with assertion rather than proof and will not link with the quotation. At Level 2 narrative is also likely to prevail but it will be wider-ranging on administrative reform or on other policies 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 covering a good range of policies but will lack balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced with a clear focus on success and the criteria for its evaluation across the range of domestic policy perhaps with some comment on the inter-relationship between administration and army. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the relative success of policies.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the humiliation of Narva” in the context of Peter the Great’s foreign policy. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means he had not expected to be defeated. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Peter’s aims were to take Ingria and the other Baltic provinces from Sweden and to impress Europe, he had expected an easy victory over the young Charles XII with a Russian army which outnumbered the Swedish force 5:1. The defeat at Narva was spectacular and Peter was one of those who fled the battlefield but the humiliation spurred him into more determined opposition to Sweden and later success. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great was successful at Poltava in 1709. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because he had improved his army after the shock of Narva. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. because Peter had reformed his army using Sweden as a model to develop discipline and tactics, better weapons and increased recruitment; Peter’s forces vastly outnumbered the Swedish (42,000 against 19,000); Charles turning to defeat Poland had given Peter the time to make these improvements and to develop the industrial base and revenue to support his army; Peter had taken the Baltic provinces by 1709 depriving Charles of their resources; Sweden could not support the costs of the Polish campaigns and was exhausted; Peter’s scorched earth policy and the severity of the Russian winter; Charles’ supply lines were dangerously overstretched; the Cossack revolt and reinforcements had failed. **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, e.g. Peter’s determination and Sweden being over-stretched and isolated combined to create the victory. **6-7**

- (c) “As it took Peter the Great twenty-one years to defeat Sweden, his achievements in foreign policy are not impressive.”
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 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

Support for the assertion can be drawn from examples such as: Poltava being seen as a fluke by most of Europe; even though Denmark and Poland re-entered coalition with Russia it took until 1716 to take the last Swedish fortress in Germany, and then only with the aid of Prussia and Hanover; France did not consider it worth entering the alliance Peter hoped for in 1717; Charles's death in 1718 and Sweden's exhaustion rather than Russian strength led to Nystadt; he failed to gain European support for his first campaigns against the Turks and was deserted by Austria in 1699; support from Balkan Christians did not materialise as Peter had expected; heavy defeat by superior Turkish forces on the Pruth in 1711 showed the weaknesses of Peter's much larger army and was as humiliating as Narva; he had failed to gain access to the Black Sea or the mouth of the Danube; he lost all the gains of Azov and had to destroy his fleet under the terms of Adrianople in 1713.

Candidates might argue that achievements were impressive: under the terms of Nystadt Russia gained all the Baltic provinces from Sweden, not just Ingria and Karelia as agreed with Denmark and Poland in 1700; by 1703 Russia effectively controlled those provinces and was able to build St. Petersburg and a Baltic fleet; the fall of Riga in 1710 consolidated Peter's hold; Poltava was decisive in turning the war against Sweden; in the renewed alliance with Denmark and Poland Russia was dominant, not the junior partner he had been in 1700;

western Europe did come to recognise Russia's potential, e.g. the maritime powers after Cape Hango, and some feared it, e.g. Hanover in the Mecklenburg crisis of 1716/17; Russia was the major northern power and continued to keep an army in Polish territory.

Level 1 answers may consist of thin narrative on some aspects of foreign policy or battles such as Poltava with assertion rather than proof and will not link with the quotation. 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 unbalanced and are likely to concentrate mainly on war against Sweden. Level 4 answers will examine both parts of the statement and answers will be more balanced in assessing achievements. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of achievement.

Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the system of Colleges” in the context of Peter the Great's system of government. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. part of the administration which took over some of the Senate's tasks. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. this was not a policy-making body but copied an established and effective European system of administration. Each College was in charge of overseeing and implementing a specific aspect of government, e.g. war, the navy and foreign policy, which took precedence over those for finance and the economy. In order to rationalise the increasingly complex Russian system, Peter, taking advice from a former Swedish civil servant, set up the colleges in 1718 to replace the 44 prikazy. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Peter's Western-style reforms caused criticism. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because he copied ideas from Russia's enemy, Sweden. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Russian conservatism; xenophobia; the resentment of officials displaced in the palace revolution of 1689 and by administrative reforms; the streltsy resented the new regiments; Church influence and Old Believers; no sea-going tradition; Moscow being replaced by St. Petersburg as capital; Peter's personal behaviour; the pace of change. 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, e.g. the pace of change coupled with Russian conservatism created suspicion of the West which self-interested groups encouraged and Peter did little to allay fears. 6-7

- (c) “Peter the Great extended his power over the Russian government but failed to do so over the Russian people.”
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

Both parts of the quotation can be supported and challenged, but both need to focus on the power of the Czar and to deploy knowledge of the changes to the system of government and their purpose. In support of extending his power over the government candidates might consider: suspending the Duma; the Ratusha as an effective treasury from 1699; creation of the Senate; the Holy Synod meant Peter controlled the Church as a department of state; the Ober-fiskal; replacing the prikazii with the more efficient Colleges as instruments of government; the Table of Ranks. All of this aided the implementation of reforms, conscription, increased revenue and control.

To challenge extending his power over government: the frequent changes in the system can be seen as acknowledgement of its ineffectiveness; corruption remained endemic despite the threat of savage punishment; control over local government remained weak because of the size of Russia; the prikazi overlapped in function; the 1708 reform of gubernii/uezdy did not improve provincial government and was frequently amended; administration was not systematised until very late in the reign (1718–1721).

Failure with the Russian people: unable to overcome their innate conservatism; Cossack and peasant revolts; his power affected only the elite not the masses; even the boyars resisted his western-style education for all; the Old Believers; rejoicing on Peter's death.

Success with the Russian people: drawing the nobility into state service and to his western style court at St.Petersburg; control over the army and navy; dealing with the Streltsy and other revolts; the Spiritual Regulation to use the church as guardian of loyalty.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on changes in government or other policies with assertion rather than proof and will not link with the quotation. 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 focusing mainly on one part of the quotation. At Level 4 answers will examine both sides of the statement and answers will be more balanced, perhaps recognising some inter-linkage. The clear focus should be on the extension of power and how far this was successful. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree to which Peter succeeded over both government and people.

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 **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How fully do these sources explain Louis XV and Louis XVI's reasons for firm action against the Parlements? (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 in which the sources agree or disagree, e.g. both agree that the Kings saw the Parlements as a danger to absolutism and both were intent on creating a more subordinate system. The sources disagree because Source B focuses on royal despotism as motive over a 20 year period whilst Source C implies a sudden resolve. 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. both agree the monarchs were intent on preserving, even extending, royal authority: Source B presenting Louis XV as consistently high-handed and over-riding traditional safeguards to the point of despotism, and C implies Louis XVI's timidity up to 1788 had strengthened Parlement's confidence to the extent that action was essential. Own knowledge could be used to develop reasons for Louis XV's actions on the issues specified in Source B and for Louis XVI's "firmness" in 1787/8 or drawn from a wider range. To argue that the sources do not offer a full explanation candidates might point out that Source B focuses on royal action rather than direct motives and C offers no specific example of constitutional conflict or detail of the "seditious resolutions". By Level 3 candidates should be supporting points with sound knowledge and should begin to draw conclusions on the sufficiency of the sources in highlighting reasons for the monarchs' actions. Both sources' images of determined and consistent monarchs can be challenged and the omission of other factors highlighted. At Level 4 answers will adopt a critical approach. There should be supported understanding of the reasons indicated in each

source, and their omissions, and answers may arrive at a judgment by consideration of the nature of the sources – Source B indicating a range of motives if over-dramatised, whilst Marie Antoinette shows the Crown appreciated the urgency of the issue, although by 1788 it was perhaps over-optimistic to judge that action against the Parlements would be sufficient to preserve absolutism.

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

Consider the extent to which the French monarchs and Regent successfully maintained the power of the monarchy in the years 1688 to 1789. (20 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. **1-6**

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.

7-11

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. **12-15**

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.

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

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 by the indicative content for each particular question.

Ideally answers should initially indicate what constituted the power of the monarchy and how far it could be defined as having been maintained during the period, perhaps with 1789 as a starting point to challenge the assumption. Power can be defined as, for example, the acceptance of Divine Right absolutism; control over policy-making, both domestic and foreign; control of the administration, including the Parlements; financial stability. Support for the focus on the success of the monarchs/Regent could be: the power to appoint ministers of their own choosing and to decide and authorise policy was maintained throughout the period; the character and determination of the rulers, in particular Louis XIV (Source A) who could be argued to have extended, not merely maintained, the power of the monarchy; Orleans restored the Right of Remonstrance but conceded little of substance during the Regency; Louis XV's response to opposition and, particularly, the reforms of 1771 (Source B) demonstrated that royal power could be asserted; Louis XVI's power was still respected by the majority in 1789 and he could take firm action against the Parlements (Source C) as well as decide the composition and voting pattern of the Estates General. The financial health of the monarchy improved for much of the eighteenth century and the Intendants continued to ensure local control for the monarchy for most of the period.

Success can be challenged by the Crown's expenditure on war; the failure to undertake fundamental financial reform and to deal with privilege; the relative weakness of Louis XV and Louis XVI and failure to support ministers, dispute with Parlements (Sources B and C), the Jansenist issue (Source B). Ministers, such as Fleury and the Triumvirate, might be argued to have had more success than the monarchs and the challenge of the Enlightenment to absolutism might also be considered.

Answers at the two lowest levels are likely to conform to the mark scheme. At Level 1 narrative answers could be thin consideration on a brief period or simply extracts from sources. 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 relevant issues. 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 the full period should have been covered, if not with equal weight, and answers will show some appreciation of the focus on maintaining of power. Answers should range over the period using material from sources and own knowledge to support points. At Level 4 in addition to the initial focus answers will examine a range of aspects of monarchical power and how far these were maintained, offering sound support and, perhaps, some challenge. 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 judgment and relevance to the question.

Section B

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 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 almost to 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, 1740–1786**Question 2**

“Financial exhaustion was more important than fear of diplomatic isolation in influencing Frederick II’s foreign policy in the years 1763 to 1786.”

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

Frederick’s major objectives in foreign policy between 1763 and 1786 can be seen as the determination to hold Silesia, to further consolidate Prussian territory and to advance Prussian interests in the Empire against those of Austria – in all of which he succeeded.

To support the significance of financial exhaustion, candidates might consider: Frederick estimated the Seven Years’ War had cost Prussia the equivalent of 20 years income from taxes; the need for recovery made a period of peace essential; Frederick needed to rebuild and develop Prussia’s economy as well as State finances; lack of finance meant military weakness and the need for an ally. In the twenty three years covered by the question Prussia did recover both financially and economically and the army had more than doubled in size yet Frederick avoided large-scale war.

Fear of diplomatic isolation: its isolation had nearly meant the defeat of Prussia in the Seven Years’ War; although Russia ended its war with Prussia in 1762 Britain had ended its alliance and, more importantly, its subsidy whilst, in theory at least, the Franco-Austrian alliance remained. Catherine refused to continue her husband’s commitment to Prussia and Frederick feared that she might renew alliance with Austria. Hubertusburg did mean retention of Silesia but Frederick feared the Russian army “more than God” and knew that all of Europe remained suspicious of Prussia. The 1764 alliance with Russia ended complete isolation but Prussia was decidedly the junior partner and was given no support by Russia over the Bavarian succession.

Other factors which might be argued as more significant influences on foreign policy: the ongoing strengths of Prussia – the absolutism and determination of Frederick II; preserving the reputation of his army and his military leadership; retaining Silesia meant both its resources and stronger frontiers; Maria Theresa’s desire to avoid war after 1763; Joseph II’s qualities as diplomat and military leader; Frederick’s skill in persuading Catherine II to partition Poland to his advantage; the significance of gaining West Prussia compared to Russian and Austrian gains; contesting the Bavarian Succession, although successful the war displayed the decline of the Prussian army.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited and assertive responses perhaps only considering the problems of Prussia in 1763 or general points on the full period. Level 2 answers are likely to be fuller narratives but with awareness of the significance of 1763 conditions for foreign

policy. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, with some slight attempt to assess the factors. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis and consideration of some range of well-supported factors, both Prussian and international, but the answer will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer clear evaluation of factors influencing foreign policy with some appreciation of the linkage of factors. Level 5 responses will sustain an argument on both aspects of the question to reach a well-balanced conclusion.

Question 3

“Frederick II’s domestic policies demonstrate that his commitment to enlightened ideals was only half-hearted and did not extend to affecting his absolutism.”

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

Some definition should be given of what constituted enlightened policy as a basis for assessment. Both parts of the statement can be challenged if less so on absolutism. Frederick’s degree of commitment to the enlightenment can be considered from a range of policies. In support of “half-hearted”: mercantilism predominated in economic policy; a rigid social hierarchy was continued and even furthered in legal reforms; no attempt was made to extend freedom to serfs; education’s primary focus was to instil loyalty to the state; religious toleration was continuation not innovation; support for the arts was personal indulgence, not to benefit society.

To challenge “half-hearted”: economic enlightenment in offering military exemption to immigrants; reciprocal free trade with America; some easing of excise duties, e.g. on flour; religious toleration perhaps aided social freedom and Frederick did assert its importance; legal codification was rational; humanitarianism was evident – e.g. state granaries to stabilise prices and avoid famine; easing the burden of Crown serf labour; compulsory primary education and school building; patronage of the arts, re-establishing the Berlin Academy, building the Berlin Opera House.

That enlightenment did affect his absolutism can be argued from his acceptance of the concept of a social contract; “first servant of the state”. That it did not: no possibility of introducing representative institutions; total autocratic power over the administrative and legal systems as well as military and foreign policy; total commitment to preserving the noble foundations of his absolutism; the arbitrary nature of his punishments for “insubordination” from civil servants.

A conclusion might be that autocracy was continuation and consolidation of Hohenzollern policy and enlightenment merely coincided with other areas of traditional policy.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited number of policies with assertion on enlightenment or absolutism. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller range of policies with some slight attempt at assessment but this will not be well defined. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on one aspect of the quotation. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be clear attempt to define what constituted enlightened policy and the degree of Frederick's commitment evidenced in the policies although treatment will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer assessment of both propositions. Level 5 responses will sustain an argument and reach a balanced, valid judgement.

Question 4

How far did the domestic policies of Frederick II demonstrate that his commitment was to strengthening the Prussian army rather than to benefiting the Prussian people? (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

Candidates will need to consider a range of motives and some might also argue that his primary and enduring commitment was to conservatism rather than reform. The degree to which Frederick's priorities changed after 1763 could also be used to assess the validity of the proposition.

The army was certainly strengthened in numbers – an immediate increase to 90,000 in 1740 and by 1786 to 200,000, although its efficiency was less enduring. Policies and reforms which support the assertion: the efficiency of government and financial policy; the noble officer tradition and efficient conscription; gearing of the economy to provide military resources; even educational reforms to instil discipline and loyalty. It might be argued that Frederick William's reforms had been more significant in strengthening the Prussian army so that Frederick's policy was merely continuation and that the army's efficiency and centrality in policy declined after 1763.

Benefit to his people: Frederick's commitment to the Enlightenment might be argued from his image as the Philosopher King, the Anti-Machievel and his continuing cultural interests and policies; how far this was for the benefit of his people might be supported by reforms such as the early abolition of torture; lightening of censorship; extending religious toleration; establishing state granaries; banning nobles' enclosure of peasant holdings; education policy (if ineffective in practice); economic policies; aspects of legal reform.

Policies and reforms which might be used to argue that Frederick's primary commitment was to his own absolutism can also include the foregoing and be supplemented by legal reforms;

the increase in government inspection; the bypassing of the General Directory; preservation of noble privilege but subordination to the monarch.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited number of policies with assertion on motive. At Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller range of policies with some slight attempt at assessment but this will not be well defined. Where an analytical approach is adopted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on one aspect. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be clear attempt to define motives for a range of policies and some consideration of the degree of Frederick's commitment although treatment will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer assessment of a range of aspects. Level 5 responses will sustain an argument and reach a balanced, valid judgement.

Option B: Russia under Catherine II, 1762-96

Question 5

Catherine II's policies towards Poland benefited both Russia and her reputation for Enlightenment."

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 is worded to signal that Catherine's supervision of Poland's government as well as international policies should be considered by candidates and both aspects of the assertion can be challenged.

In support of benefit: Poniatowski was to be Catherine's puppet-king; territorial gains from the partitions; annexing mainly Russian provinces in 1st & 2nd partitions; stifling Polish discontent and opposition by effective use of bribery and force; ensuring the maintenance of the liberum veto and thus the "Anarchy of Poland"; subjugating Poland enabled Catherine to concentrate on her Turkish ambitions; regaining the initiative over Prussia and Austria; the Second Partition applauded in Europe as the quashing of revolution and the 1795 *fait accompli*; Russia had absorbed over 60% of Polish territory; poised to dictate in Germany. Insisting on religious toleration in Poland aided Catherine's Enlightened image, as did maintaining the fiction of the liberum veto in some views.

Against benefit to Russia: informal hold over Poland had existed since the early eighteenth century which Catherine sacrificed; ending the Saxon Kings of Poland aided Prussia more than Russia; the degree to which Catherine was the dupe of Frederick II in 1772; Russia now became a "partner in crime" with Prussia and Austria; costs of dealing with Polish opposition, e.g. Confederation of Bar, Kosciuszko; the effects on Catherine's Turkish ambitions and wars; comparison with the strategic value of Prussian gains and those of

Austria in the Partitions; loss of a buffer state. Against enlightened: religious toleration led to worse pogroms, there was no attempt to limit the powers of the nobility and no economic benefit to the Polish people; Russian control was tighter than the Polish system.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of policy towards Poland, possibly only focused on Partition, with assertions. Level 2 responses will be either a fuller account of policy or attempted analysis with inadequate substance, perhaps focused on one aspect of the question. At Level 3 there will be clear awareness of the focus of the question with some developed consideration of both benefit to Russia and Catherine's Enlightened image although this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be analytical and more balanced considering both aspects of the proposition with a secure range of material. Level 5 responses will draw conclusions based on sound evaluation across the period and range of aspects.

Question 6

“It was only in her policies on religion and education that Catherine II had any claim to enlightenment in principle and practice.”

Assess the validity of 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

Clear definition of enlightened principles will be essential to effective consideration of this question and this should enable candidates to assess both aspects of the assertion in relation to these two areas and by comparison with other relevant domestic policies to reach a balanced conclusion.

Enlightened principles of religious toleration and secularisation can be well-supported from Catherine's policies: the secularisation of Church property; removal of the legal disabilities of the Old Believers; legal recognition of the Catholic Church; Muslim Spiritual Assembly set up in 1786; the Pale of Settlement for Jews. There is less support for genuinely enlightened practice: the seizure of Church lands meant enormous revenue and a million serfs for the State; tolerance for Protestants and Catholics was already well-established; toleration was expedient in the increasingly multi-cultural Empire created by her expansionist foreign policy; there were no effective means to ensure implementation.

In education the enlightened principles of extending knowledge and encouraging rational thought can be seen in setting up the Academies; Russia's first medical college; the Smolny Institute; Education Commission; 1786 free state co-education. Practice was not as radical: serfs were excluded; school was not compulsory; only 2% of government expenditure was committed to education; only 300 schools had been built by 1796; education for obedience to

the state not free thought. However, by previous Russian standards considerable progress had been made, even if it was the nobility and bourgeoisie which benefited.

Other aspects which had some claim to enlightenment in principle might include the Legislative Commission, the Nakas, abolition of censorship, free trade, legal reform, the Charters of the Nobility and the Towns. In practice all were restricted – some to the point of nullity, e.g. the Legislative Commission and the radical proposals of the Nakas.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited range of religious or educational policies with assertions on enlightenment. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller range on the two central aspects with some slight attempt at the assessment of enlightenment but this will not be well defined. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will address a limited range of policies, probably focusing on a narrow definition of enlightenment. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be a clear attempt to define criteria for enlightenment, consideration of both religious and educational policies and consideration of some other relevant policies 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.

Question 7

“From her accession to the end of her reign Catherine II was the puppet rather than the master of the nobility.”

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

This is a synoptic question on a central aspect of the specification and one on which candidates may reach a valid judgement supporting either proposition whilst appreciating the symbiosis.

Catherine’s accession certainly depended on the collusion of Court nobles and the Legislative Commission was used as a successful means to gain provincial nobles’ acquiescence. It can be argued that Catherine’s dependence resulted in a consistent policy of concession: the recognition of all existing noble privileges; increasing their power to exploit the serfs; exemption from punishment; recognition of inalienable property rights and status; mineral rights; role in provincial government and Assemblies; in particular, the terms of the 1785 Charter of the Nobility; Catherine’s abandonment of enlightened ambitions and awareness that she lacked the administrative and military power to overcome noble opposition.

However the balance of power can be argued to have shifted in Catherine's favour thanks both to external factors and her own skills: the Nakaz as a ploy to defeat Panin's projected Imperial Council; the Pugachev Revolt; the 1775 Decree and local administration may have given nobles local assemblies but the governor was appointed by Catherine and answerable to her; the range of governors' responsibilities; 1785 Charter was a drawing together of existing privileges rather than concession of power; cultural policies as "golden chains"; Catherine's exploitation of the French Revolution. Catherine's own power had increased, using the nobility as unpaid civil servants and any concessions were to noble privilege, not at the expense of her absolutism.

Level 1 responses will be limited accounts of some aspects of policy towards the nobles with assertions on puppet or master. At Level 2 answers may offer a wider range of policies with slight links to the terms of the question. Where analytical answers are attempted they will be one-sided. Level 3 answers will adopt a more analytical approach, using some range of material on both aspects of the question although unbalanced.

Level 4 answers will examine the range of factors involved in both aspects of the assertion with sound support and appreciation of the linkage, leading to a valid conclusion. At Level 5 answers will offer substantiated argument and offer securely based judgement.

Option C: Enlightenment in Theory and Practice

Question 8

"Voltaire was the best publicist for the Enlightenment yet he was not fully committed to its ideals."

How far do you agree with this view?

(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

Candidates can support Voltaire as publicist from a range of aspects: he was a well-established playwright and royal historiographer; became the most famous writer in France; praise for the works of Newton; his publications such as the *Lettres philosophique*, *Candide*, the *Dictionnaire philosophique*; contribution to the Encyclopaedia; his pamphlet campaign on the Calas Case and the Chevalier de Barre. His effectiveness might be supported from: correspondence with Catherine II and Frederick II, visits and influence on their policies; his imprisonment under *lettres de cachet* and need to leave France; continuation of his campaigns from Geneva; his veneration by revolutionaries. It might be argued that he was not as effective a publicist as other writers such as Locke or Montesquieu as its first "bestsellers"; or Diderot with the Encyclopaedia; Rousseau's longer-term significance; or as effective as the practical policies of enlightened rulers, but most candidates are likely to support this part of the statement.

Commitment to specific ideals, which should be defined, can be supported: his belief in the power of reason; consistent opposition to religious intolerance and Church privilege which led to the Church refusing him Christian burial although he remained, formally, a Catholic; his opposition to censorship; Voltaire's consistent opposition to arbitrary law and support for humanitarianism; support for empirical science.

Voltaire did not support the more radical ideals of some other enlightenment writers: the atheism of d'Holbach; Rousseau's General Will. Although he denounced the abuse of power and admired the civil liberties of England, Voltaire supported absolutism and did not advocate either democracy or equality; his support for cultural freedom did not extend to education for the masses; his loss of faith in progress and man's perfectibility led him to become a deist.

Level 1 answers may be thin description of some of Voltaire's works or generalities on the ideals of the enlightenment. Alternatively they will be assertion on both without linkage to the focus of the question. Level 2 answers may also be description of Voltaire as publicist or his commitment but they will be fuller and offer some links with the question. At Level 3 analysis in line with the question, with clear definition of enlightened ideals, will predominate although it will be unbalanced. Level 4 responses will be critical and focus clearly on the degree of Voltaire's excellence as publicist, comparing him to others, and supporting argument on his commitment, appreciating reasons for the degree of support. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-argued conclusion.

Question 9

“Absolutism was the driving force, enlightenment no more than a passenger.”

How far is this a valid assessment of the extent to which **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II put the ideas of the Enlightenment into practice in their domestic 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

Knowledge of a range of enlightened ideas can be used here to assess the comparative significance and argue the proposition. As both rulers are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each state is expected than in Options A and B.

On absolutism as the sole driving force: neither ruler was willing to concede any of their absolute power and both can be seen to have strengthened it, particularly Catherine given her initial weakness. Candidates can argue that enlightened absolutism gave the two equal status, as advocated by philosophes such as Voltaire, and consider Frederick II's claim to be the first servant of the state.

Both rulers can be argued to have put enlightened ideas into practice: religious toleration was continuation and thus no more than passenger in Prussia but as a new policy in Russia perhaps more significant; conversely Frederick II did not extent serfdom as did Catherine and he treated Crown serfs with some degree of humanitarianism, thus in Russia enlightenment on this aspect might be argued as not even on board; both rulers gave some attention to developing education; both gave some support to free trade; there was rationalisation of the legal codes in each state but neither pursued equality before the law or participation in government nor made any attempt to challenge the privilege of the nobility.

A conclusion might be that some enlightened ideas were more than simple passengers – but only where they did not challenge absolutism.

Level 1 answers may be limited description of some areas of policy or thin awareness of the ideas of the enlightenment, perhaps focused on only one ruler. Alternatively they will be assertion on absolutism and enlightenment without support. At Level 2 answers may also be description of policies but they will be fuller, considering both rulers, and offer some links with the question. At Level 3 analysis in line with the question will predominate although lacking in weight or balance. Level 4 responses will be more balanced, critical and offer well-supported comparisons between the rulers. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-argued conclusion.

Question 10

To what extent were the social and cultural characteristics of their states responsible for the limited implementation of enlightened reforms by **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II?

(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

As both rulers are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each state is expected than in Options A and B.

Ideally candidates should begin from some definition of these characteristics which might include the predominance of noble privilege and serfdom in both states. The degree of difference between the two states might also be considered both on these issues and others, e.g. the relative development of an urban bourgeoisie; the established tradition of religious toleration in Prussia. The influence of these factors can then be compared with others which limited enlightened reform, e.g. the degree of both rulers' commitment to enlightened policies; the strength of their authority; the predominance of military and foreign policies; the limitations imposed by the efficiency of the administrations; the size of Russia. Again differences between the states can be highlighted with Frederick, overall, in a stronger position to implement reform.

Candidates might also challenge “limited” using examples of policies which were implemented, e.g. religious toleration and educational reforms in Russia; Frederick’s treatment of Crown serfs and codification of the law; limiting of censorship; reform of the penal system; support for free trade.

Level 1 answers may be limited description of some social and cultural characteristics or policies which were implemented, perhaps focused on only one ruler. At Level 2 answers may also be descriptive but they will be fuller, considering both states, and offer some links with the question. At Level 3 analysis in line with the question will predominate although lacking in weight or balance. Level 4 responses will be more balanced, offering well-supported comparisons between the states and the degree to which reform was limited. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-argued conclusion.