

GCE 2004  
*June Series*



## Mark Scheme

### History Alternative C Units 1, 4 and 6 *(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 from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA  
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

#### 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 A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “the law of devolution” in the context of Louis XIV’s aims in the War of Devolution. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the excuse for threatening Spain for the Spanish Netherlands. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. using the internal Brabant law to assert the rights of the daughter of a first marriage to property over a son of second marriage as the means to lay claim to the Spanish Netherlands; to dispute the Will of Philip IV; part of the claim that the Treaty of the Pyrenees had been rendered invalid because the Spanish had not paid the dowry and signal that Louis intended to pursue the Spanish Succession. **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 Louis XIV’s foreign policy up to 1679. (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 B claims failure, Source C total success. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. both sources agree that territories were gained and on the power of France, but Source B challenges the degree of success. Own knowledge may include objectives/gains/terms of treaties. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. draws conclusions to show how Source C

challenges the view given in Source B by showing military success and that France was able to dictate terms at Nymegen, even against “united” enemies. This opposes the assessment in Source B which gives grudging acknowledgement of partial success at Aix-la-Chappelle, but also claims that this was far outweighed by the consequent antagonism of the Dutch. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of military superiority, in relation to other factors, in the success of Louis XIV’s foreign policy up to 1679. **(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 both on military success and other factors: Source C focuses on military superiority which is acknowledged in Source B, whilst Source A stresses diplomatic finesse.

From own knowledge candidates might show appreciation of the French army – Louvois reforms, numbers, training, tactics; Conde and Turenne – and why these could not be matched by the Spanish, Dutch etc; naval strength. Other factors might include de Lionne’s skilful diplomacy; Habsburg financial exhaustion; Austria’s pre-occupation fighting Turks; Anglo-Dutch rivalry. Success should be defined/discussed, e.g. in relation to: La Gloire; staking claim to Spanish Succession; territory; punishing Dutch ‘betrayal’.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited narrative. At Level 2 there will be greater range and selectivity, if narrative, and 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 mainly on military superiority or other factors but it will be clear that the question has been understood and pursued, although the answer will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will look at both sides and provide a more balanced case, perhaps with some challenge on how far success was achieved. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement and full explanation. Judgement, even at this level, may still be implicit and partial.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by his “inability to get what he wanted” in the context of the foreign policy aims of Frederick William, the Great Elector, in the 1648 negotiations of Westphalia. (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 been strong enough to impose his terms in the negotiations. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Frederick William did not have the military strength or diplomatic weight to impose his will at Westphalia; he did not realise his aim of gaining West Pomerania and Stettin; he did not win recognition of his claim to Julich-Berg and had to wait until 1680 for possession of Magdeburg, a major Elbe crossing; Sweden did not withdraw its troops from the territories he did gain. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William’s involvement in the Northern War of 1655-1660 was important for the development of Brandenburg-Prussia. (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 enforcing the terms of Westphalia. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the gain of sovereignty in East Prussia meant he could overcome the power of their Estates and impose his administration; the gaining of international recognition for the quality of his army, thus potential subsidies; unique position in the Holy Roman Empire; he could now

gain more easily from the development of the Prussian economy; growth of his army.  
**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. appreciates the military's major significance in relation to other aspects above.  
**6-7**

(c) “The Great Elector achieved very little in his foreign policy.”  
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 might be on the aims of Frederick William's foreign policy and the problems which he faced in achieving them. Given the initial weaknesses of his position, e.g. his scattered territories, the impact of the Thirty Years' War, his limited authority over his dominions and insignificant army, simply surviving might be argued as achievement. The gains made at Westphalia came courtesy of France, and Frederick William's lifelong ambition to gain West Pomerania remained frustrated. Despite taking West Pomerania in the Northern War he was not powerful enough to retain it at Oliva, nor did his victory over the Swedes at Fehrbellin in 1675 enable him to retain it in the Peace of Nymegen. Thus, in his own eyes, he had “achieved very little”. However, his adroit diplomatic manoeuvrings had gained sovereignty of East Prussia at Oliva, as well as financial subsidies to enable him to

build up Brandenburg's military strength. Continuing to change sides between the Dutch and French increased his income still further, particularly after the victory over the Swedes at Fehrbellin increased the reputation of his army. His flexible loyalty earned him admiration, if grudgingly, as "the sly fox of Europe". Thus, although he was unable to pursue an independent foreign policy in the Europe of Louis XIV or to gain the territory he coveted was perhaps "very little", the preservation and strengthening of his territories, as well as gaining respect in Europe, might be argued as a considerable achievement.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on foreign policy, 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 across the period 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 be unbalanced across the period and/or the range of success/weakness involved. Alternatively they will offer sound support solely in agreement (most likely) or disagreement. Level 4 answers will be more balanced but equal weight is unlikely. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of achievement.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by "the economic contrast between Brandenburg and Prussia" in the context of the condition of Frederick William's inheritance in 1640. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means that Brandenburg was much weaker than Prussia. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Brandenburg had few resources, poor agriculture and no port whereas Prussia had good wheatlands and access to markets through Konigsburg; Brandenburg was devastated by the Thirty Years' War and famine, unlike Prussia. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William was able to attract many Huguenots to his lands. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because Frederick William offered incentives to help strengthen Brandenburg's economy. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. fellow Protestants; religious toleration for all; the significance of Louis XIV's religious policy from the 1660s and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the Edict of Potsdam; Frederick

William's incentives such as exemption from military service for skilled workers and subsidies to set up enterprises; opportunity for officers in his army. **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. links the Great Elector's tolerance to the increasing severity of Louis XIV's actions; draws conclusions on push/pull factors. **6-7**

(c) "The Great Elector's economic policies had achieved only limited success by 1688." 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**

Answers should show sound knowledge of the policies as well as the ability to assess the degree of their success. The range of areas of policy might include: agricultural and industrial policy; river transport and canals; development of ports and the navy; attempts to develop Trading Companies and colonies; religious toleration as an economic policy; subsidy and incentives such as tax and military exemption for a period for those taking over abandoned farms; tariffs. Success was limited in that the Elector had not achieved his mercantilist aims of self-sufficiency and full emulation of the United Provinces, e.g. the vested interests of towns and the state's need for revenue had meant maintaining tolls; the Dutch had undermined his attempted East India Company; Brandenburg-Prussia lacked capital and a tradition of free commercial enterprise. It can, however, be argued that there

was considerable success, particularly in Brandenburg given its condition at the start of the Elector's reign, and his policies had aided his territories to both recover and develop. By the end of his reign he had even established luxury industries such as velvet and lace; his canals meant that north German exports could bypass Swedish tolls on the Sound and Prussian grain could reach western markets more cheaply.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on economic 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, although these may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical but are likely to be unbalanced across the range of policies and degree of success. Alternatively they will offer sound support solely in agreement or disagreement. Level 4 answers will examine both sides of the statement and answers will be more balanced, but equal weight is unlikely. The clear focus should be on the degree of success. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of success.

#### Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by "his Baltic ambitions" in the context of Peter the Great's economic policies. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the meaning of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means he wished to develop a Baltic port. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. easier access to markets than Archangel for export of hemp and iron ore – although he needed to build a canal to link to the Gulf of Finland; to rival Riga and break Sweden's dominance of Baltic trade; to replace Archangel. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why St. Petersburg was deliberately built in western style. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because Peter wanted to have access to western markets. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. because of Peter's intention to break with Muscovite tradition; to symbolise his determination that Russia was to be a modern, western power supplanting Sweden; to imitate the most up-to-date naval bases of the Dutch and English; to emulate/exceed the merits of Louis XIV's buildings; to civilise the nobility. **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. draws conclusions about the relationship between the desire to break with tradition and the reasons for modernisation. **6-7**

- (c) “Westernisation was the key motive for 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 generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by 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 wider range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgment as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The initial focus of answers may be on the definition of “westernisation” in relation to the existing weaknesses in the Russian economy together with some detail on economic policy, but these need to be linked to Peter’s motives for reform. Examples of weaknesses may be the predominance of backward agriculture; reliance on the export of raw materials, very limited industry; few towns; lack of skills; reliance on German merchants; no navy; subject to Swedish tolls for Baltic trade; poor infrastructure. Economic policies which can be linked to westernisation included Peter’s adoption of a mercantilist approach; industrial development; encouraging immigration of skilled workers; the building of St. Petersburg as a port; the development of Baltic trade. Other factors may be considered as the major motivating force: the military needs of war, stimulating the economy to increase revenue; the desire to exercise central control; the Tsar had monopoly of foreign trade and could increase his own wealth through its development. It can be argued that Westernisation *per se* was not Peter’s main motive, but he had to use western methods if Russia was to develop and compete with the West.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on the reforms with general assertions. At Level 2 narrative/description of the policies or general motives 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 and should focus on the motivating factors for economic reforms but are likely to concentrate on westernisation. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and discuss the linkage between the motives. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of linkage.

### Question 5

- (a) Explain, briefly what was meant by “the boyars’ Duma” in the context of the government of Russia in 1690. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a noble council. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term linked to the context, e.g. an advisory council of the upper nobility with some executive and judicial functions which had increased in influence during the Regency. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Senate was created in 1711. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because the earlier system was too complicated. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to create more efficient central supervision of government; to deputise for Peter in his frequent absences; to eliminate the advisory influence of the nobility; part of conscious imitation of Swedish system together with later Colleges; the war situation in 1711. 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. how far war more than efficiency determined the reform. 6-7

- (c) “Despite all his reform of central and local government Peter the Great’s administration was not a success.”  
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 generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by 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 wider range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgment as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The initial focus of answers may be on the reasons for administrative change, e.g. the assertion of absolutism and need for fiscal/military efficiency with some consideration of the weaknesses of the original system. From this candidates may argue that frequent changes in structure, decentralisation and recentralisation, together with other factors such as corruption, the size of Russia, lack of trained officials, over-prescription on roles stifling initiative and passive resistance, weakened the effectiveness of the system. Alternatively the changes may be argued as a strong response to perceived flaws and the new system of Senate (1711), Colleges (1718), Table of Ranks (1722) and provincial reforms – Gubernii (1708/1713), subdivisions (1719), inspired by German and Swedish precedents, proved more effective in fulfilling the Tsar’s purpose in reform. A service nobility incorporated into a bureaucratic hierarchy ensured the consolidation of autocracy and the Ratusha/fiskals (1699-1709) ensured increased revenue.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on the reforms 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 are likely to concentrate on either the strengths or weaknesses of the administration, with a lack of balance

between central and local government. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and discuss the degree of effectiveness in both aspects of government. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of effective administration.

**Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640-1789****A2 Unit 4: Monarchy in the Age of Enlightenment****Question 1**

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

Explain what was meant by “our Council” in the context of royal decision-making during the Ancien Regime in France. (5 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. the King’s ministers. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. the source indicates that the King considered the advice of his ministers and usually accepted it, with the exception of Louis XIV. Own knowledge may detail the titles/roles of the ministers making up the Council and their influence. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. its increasing importance in influencing eighteenth century rulers in comparison with Louis XIV’s ministers. **4-5**

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

Comment on the usefulness of these two sources in explaining Louis XV’s attitude to his role as absolute monarch. 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. both show that Louis was able to govern by himself; they disagree as Source B shows Louis XV's laziness, Source C that he insisted on governing alone, but at this level 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 own knowledge, e.g. that source B's focus on Louis's laziness and reliance on Fleury is not borne out by Source C, which supports a forceful and determined attitude to his role; own knowledge might indicate that at 16 it was perhaps not surprising that Louis relied on advisors, or slight indication of the reason for the 1766 speech.

At Level 3, candidates should be drawing conclusions about the utility of the sources in highlighting the character and attitude of Louis with sound support from own knowledge.

At Level 4 there should be supported understanding of the different interpretations indicated in each source, with comment on the bias against Fleury in Source B which might limit its objectivity, whilst Source C, focused 27 years later, might give a better indication of the mature attitude of Louis XV. However, from own knowledge of the context, Source C could be argued to give a false impression of sustained resolve.

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

Consider the extent to which over-reliance on ministers was the reason for the weakening of the authority of the Crown 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 by the indicative content for each particular question.

Evidence from candidates' own knowledge to support "reliance on ministers" can be drawn from across the period: even Louis XIV can be argued to have relied on ministers such as Louvois, the Pontchartrains and Chamillart; Orleans relied heavily on Dubois and Law. How far this was over-reliance can be disputed and this, alone, did not weaken the authority of the Crown in this earlier period. Louis XV allowed Fleury to govern France until 1743 – over-reliance which can be argued to have preserved rather than weakened royal authority. The constantly changing array of ministers during Louis XV's personal rule helped to create inconsistent, often contradictory, policies and even the resolve of the Triumvirate could not restore full acceptance of Crown authority. Louis XVI's initial reliance on the advice of Maurepas to restore the Parlements' right of Remonstrance was a further blow, whilst the sequence of Controller-Generals and their contradictory advice on finance furthered the decline of royal authority. Other factors, however, played a significant and, possibly, greater part: the self-interest of privilege, of Parlements in particular; the absolute monarchs' decisions to wage wars which, even when successful, were too expensive; the inherent weaknesses of the fiscal system; the problem of royal debt which no minister could solve; the character and commitment of the monarchs; Orleans' restoration of Remonstrance; the decline in belief in Divine Right. Over-reliance can be supported from Sources B and D and challenged from Sources A and C.

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 section or period, e.g. Controller Generals or ministers of one monarch. 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 monarchs/Regent (probably Louis XV/XVI) followed by some thinly supported analysis of other factors such as opposition from Parlements, finance, foreign policy. 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.

Level 3 answers will show some appreciation of the demands of the question and the focus will have been appreciated to some extent. The full period should have been covered if not

with equal weight. Ideally answers should place the initial focus on the monarchs' and the regent's reliance on ministers and the influence of their judgments. They should range over the period, using material to demonstrate some awareness of the differing degree of monarchical reliance, the qualities of various ministers and explain the effect on royal authority as well as indicate briefly that other factors were involved. All the sources can be used advantageously here.

At Level 4, in addition to the initial focus, answers will examine other factors responsible for weakening the Crown's authority and may offer some argument on reliance or over-reliance.

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 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**

- 2** To what extent was determination to gain and retain Silesia the dominant motive and most successful aspect of Frederick II's foreign policy? *(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 Frederick's foreign policy will clearly be essential: the value of Silesia to Prussia; the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War and how far these were merely first, second and third Silesian Wars for Frederick; foreign policy after 1763 and his motives for involvement in the Partition of Poland. Here, candidates might discuss to what extent consolidation of territories was the primary motive for gaining West Prussia or if it was to ensure that Maria Theresa would not be strengthened, and thus tempted to attempt regaining Silesia. The issue of Bavarian Succession and 1778 Potato War; the League of Princes can also be linked to these motives. Assessment of success on each area of policy should include consideration of Frederick's flexible diplomacy, consideration of the cost to Prussia, especially of the Seven Years War, and its effect on later policy, as well as the value, territorially, of Silesia and in terms of Imperial and European prestige.

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 success. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on Silesia, but it will attempt to assess success on this aspect.

At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. Although the period 1740-1763 may still predominate, there will be some consideration of later foreign policy if concentrating more on either "dominant motive" or "successful" (probably the latter).

Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will also be critical, showing some recognition of the need for definition and evaluation on "dominant motive" and "most successful", with some appreciation of the contrast or linkage between early and later foreign policy.

Level 5 answers will sustain an argument both on motive and degree of success to reach a valid judgment.

- 3** To what extent did Frederick II's policies towards the nobility serve the interests of the state rather than those of the nobility? (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 should offer definition of the interests of both the state and the nobility and are likely, at higher levels, to consider how far these were synonymous. Other possible motives for Frederick's policies towards "the fairest jewels of my crown" can also be considered. A wide range of policies can be assessed in light of these definitions, e.g. making the officer class the preserve of the nobility served the interests of both, and although this was suspended in the Seven Years War because of shortage, it was rapidly restored and extended; nobles were given preference and rapid promotion in administration and came to monopolise higher posts, although entry was restricted to nobles who had attended university and were successful in civil service examinations; with one exception (Michaelis) all Ministers were noble; Frederick frequently forbade the sale of noble land to non-nobles without his express consent, which was rarely given on larger holdings; no sale was to be accompanied by the feudal rights; after 1762 resale of such land could only be to nobles and, after 1775, it could not be left to middle-class descendants; encouragement was given for primogeniture on noble lands, (if not successful); long-term mortgages at low interest were made available after the Seven Years War to preserve noble holdings; no further royal inroads were made on the powers of provincial diets; Frederick abandoned his father's policies to extend royal control over the rural commissioners, to enlarge Crown domains and to regain land absorbed by the nobility; nothing was done to limit noble jurisdiction or ease the burden on serfs on manorial estates. The degree to which Frederick's policies differed between territories and the reasons for this may also be considered.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited number of policies towards the nobility with assertion on success. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller range of policies with some slight attempt at the assessment of whose interests were best served but these will not be well defined. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on either the interests of the state or of the nobility with limited attempt at their definition.

At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. Although the interests of either state or nobility may still predominate, there should be clear attempt to define both aspects and some consideration of manorial as well as administrative/military aspects. Some differentiation between territories may be offered at this and higher levels. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will recognise some degree of integration between the interests of both state and nobility. Level 5 answers will sustain an argument on both aspects to reach a valid judgement.

- 4 “Frederick II insisted in his advice to his successor that the welfare of the people must be the ruler’s first concern.”  
How far do you agree that, in practice, Frederick II had ignored his own enlightened advice in his domestic policy? (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 quotation identifies one of Frederick II’s possible motives which can be evaluated against others as his “first concern”, and the question offers candidates the opportunity to consider the extent to which he had or had not addressed the welfare of his people. Categories of “people” can be considered and both parts of the question can be challenged.

“First concern” can be interpreted either/both as his initial focus and/or as the most important. In either case foreign policy objectives and military interests can be argued to have predominated, with the consolidation of royal authority always taking precedence over welfare. Candidates can consider a wide range of policies in evaluating the degree to which Frederick ignored or pursued his own advice, e.g. what were Frederick’s own definitions of both welfare and “the people”? The welfare of the nobility was catered for in many ways: administratively, militarily, legally and as landowners; there was no attempt to ameliorate the lot of manorial serfs although labour service was limited on Crown lands. Covering a wider range of “people” some policies were, perhaps, enlightened: mercantilist economic policies such as subsidies and tax/conscription exemption to encourage industries; direct state ownership; transport improvement; stabilising the price of corn and state granaries; primary education made compulsory in 1763 (if little achieved, except in West Prussia); continuing religious toleration and encouragement of immigration. How far, however, were these policies pursued primarily to benefit the people? Frederick II can be argued, in practice, to have kept enlightened concern subordinate to the interests of the state: the non-noble were the most efficiently taxed in Europe as well as subjected to new taxes; all rights of the nobility were preserved, even extended; the effects of the devastation caused by the Seven Years War on his people and policies.

Level 1 answers are likely to be either bland assertion on whether Frederick was enlightened more in theory than practice or limited description of a few of Frederick’s policies. At Level 2, answers may offer a wider range of Frederick’s concerns or (more likely) description of a range of relevant policies with slight links to the focus of the question. Level 3 answers will adopt a more analytical approach with some definition of “people” and some range of motives, although this will be unbalanced and there may be some narrative. Some challenge may be offered but not sustained. Level 4 answers might attempt to differentiate between “people” and consider how far policies were inspired by their welfare or other motives. At Level 5, answers will draw conclusions on both aspects of the question.

**Option B: Russia under Catherine II, 1762-1796**

- 5 “Catherine II’s policy towards Turkey was both coherent and successful, unlike her policy towards Poland.”  
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**

The question invites candidates to compare the two major areas of foreign policy and to reach a judgement on the merits of their pursuit and achievement. Coherence might be defined in one or several valid ways: in line with traditional Russian foreign policy objectives; serving Russia’s best interests; consistent. How far Catherine succeeded and how far the two areas were wholly separate in her foreign policy are major areas for discussion. Challenge to both aspects can be supported.

The coherence of policy towards Turkey: pursuit of traditional Russian expansionism; response to Turkish aggression; Potemkin’s influence. Lack of coherence: the over-ambitious and woolly ‘Greek Project’; in the distraction caused by other powers, e.g. the need to avoid Austrian opposition; Sweden 1788-1790; Great Britain and Prussia in 1791.

Success: in spectacular military victories; Kutchuk-Kainardjii gains – territorial, war indemnity, freedom of navigation on the Black Sea and through the Straits, protection of Christianity in the Ottoman Empire; protection of the Crimea led to its Khan being no more than a Russian puppet by 1779, and its formal annexation in 1783 gave Russia major naval potential; no other power was able to resist; the timing and terms of the alliance with Austria; military victories in the 1787-1792 war, especially Ochakov; the gains at Jassy. It can be argued that success was limited and depended more on Turkish weaknesses and isolation rather than on Russian strength; the terms at Jassy fell far short of Catherine’s aims; the cost.

The coherence of policy towards Poland: the preservation of Russian influence and hold over the Polish monarchy and major nobility; continuing the 17<sup>th</sup> century absorption of Polish territory. Lack of coherence – abandoning informal hold over the entire state in favour of Partition.

Success: Stanislas Poniatowski the puppet-king; territorial gains from the partitions; annexing mainly Russian provinces in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> partitions; stifling Polish discontent and opposition to enable concentration on Turkish wars. Lack of success: the degree to which Catherine was the dupe of Frederick II; comparison with the value of Prussian and Austrian gains; Polish resistance especially under Kosciuszco.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of foreign policy, possibly on either Turkey or Poland, with assertions on success. Level 2 answers will be either a fuller account of policies towards both states or some attempt to link both to the question but with inadequate substance.

At Level 3, there will be clear awareness of the focus of the question with some attempt to consider coherence and consideration of the degree of success achieved in each area but there will be a lack of balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced looking at reasons both for agreement and disagreement with the statement with some acknowledgement of the connections between the two areas of policy.

Level 5 answers will draw conclusions related both to coherence and success based on the comparative evidence presented.

- 6 “For Catherine II the advantages of serfdom always outweighed her commitment to the Enlightenment, as her policies demonstrated.”  
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 should enable candidates to consider the degree to which Catherine II ever held any serious intention to alleviate the condition of serfdom, and how far and why its preservation and extension benefited Catherine. Although it may be difficult to argue against policies in practice being of no, or little, benefit to serfs the primary focus of the question is on assessment of Catherine’s interests where debate is clearly possible. Other areas of policy may also be considered to support her enlightened credentials.

The advantages of serfdom for the nobility – financial, economic and social – can be linked to Catherine’s self-interest: her dependence on noble support for her accession and the granting of Crown serfs in repayment; recognising the privileges of the nobility left her absolutism unchallenged; serfdom was the historical basis of stable society in Russia; serfs carried the greatest burden of taxation, provided the conscripts to expand Catherine’s army as well as the work-force; serfs had no effective means of opposition to the Crown; Catherine made no attempt to limit labour service or the sale of serfs separate from land nor to provide any legal status or protection.

Catherine was aware of the disadvantages of serfdom and there was some enlightened thinking on the issue in Russia: in 1763 Panin urged Catherine to limit the boundless power of the landowner over his peasantry; the report of the Free Economic Society in 1765 on the economic wastefulness of serfdom; Radischev’s “Journey” in 1790; Catherine’s writings to Philosophes and vague hints on reform in the Nakas. The extent and threat, both real and potential, of serfs joining Pugachev’s revolt.

Policies included the extension of serfdom throughout the Ukraine; the granting of c800,000 Crown serfs to Catherine’s favourites and industrialists; the secularisation of Church property increased Crown holding of serfs by c1 million; in 1765 nobles were allowed to sentence serfs without reference to a court; administrative reforms 1774-1785 tightened noble and central control of localities to keep revolt at bay; after 1774 a third of the army was kept in

Russia and dealt severely with c250 localised serf revolts; the Charter of the Nobility gave exclusive rights to serf-ownership; Radischev was exiled to Siberia. None could be argued to have been enlightened – but they served Catherine’s best interest. Other areas of policy might be argued to have had some enlightened influence, e.g. education, religious toleration – but the serfs did not benefit from them.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited narratives of some of Catherine’s policies with no real link to the set question. Level 2 answers will seek to examine some aspects of advantage and/or disadvantage or will be fuller accounts in narrative form of policies with limited attempt to link to the question.

At Level 3, answers will be more critical and will analyse some range of advantage and disadvantage as well as a range of policies implemented but with concentration on one aspect. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and seek to assess Catherine’s policies in practice against her motives and degree of enlightenment. At Level 5, candidates will, in addition, reach a clear conclusion on the degree to which pragmatism was principle to Catherine.

- 7 To what extent was Catherine II’s approach to domestic policy and reform shaped by the circumstances by which she became Empress? (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**

Consideration should be given to some range of the reasons for Peter III arousing military and church disquiet, e.g. making peace and then alliance with Prussia; proposing to disband the Guards; his ridicule of the Church and proposals for its reform and secularisation of church lands; noble disquiet despite the Manifesto on the Freedom of the Nobility. These can be evaluated against Catherine’s character and the role of the Orlovs and Panin as reasons for her becoming Empress instead of Regent for Paul.

How far the need for noble and military support remained the determining factor in Catherine’s approach to domestic issues can be assessed against others, e.g. her own character and the determination to remain and strengthen her position as autocrat; the decline in central control over administration in the localities since Peter the Great; Enlightenment and proposals in the Nakas; legal reform and the need to strengthen policing; the Pugachev Revolt; the complexity and flaws in the existing system of government; the need for efficient tax-collection and conscription; the need to assimilate new provinces; Catherine’s control of central administration; the role of ministers, e.g. Panin and Potemkin, calling of the Zemstvo and its limitations. Specific aspects of policy and reforms should be integrated into this discussion in support of judgement.

Level 1 answers might be simple accounts of the palace coup or limited aspects of reforms with no real links to the question. Level 2 answers may consist of a mixture of narrative on the two aspects with undeveloped links, or lack sufficient substance to support analytical points.

At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach to the question with definite analysis. Answers may still contain some description and may be unbalanced with concentration on one determining factor, or aspect of the question, but both aspects will be addressed. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will also offer some depth in considering the significance of other factors influencing policy and reforms. At Level 5, candidates will reach a reasoned conclusion having argued effectively on the linkage of factors.

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

- 8** “Montesquieu’s views on the distribution of political power were a far greater challenge to absolute monarchy than those of both Voltaire and Rousseau.”  
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**

The key ideas of all three are a major aspect of this option and knowledge of their works will be needed to assess the degree of difference between them as well as the degree to which they presented challenge.

Montesquieu’s *Spirit of the Laws* at first sight was neutral in his classification of existing systems of government, based on the nature and history of states. However, claiming the basic spirit of republics was virtue and of monarchies’ honour, compared to despotism as fear, and his advocacy of the separation of powers all presented a challenge to absolute monarchy. Absolutism needed to distance itself from despotism and to justify itself on a convincing basis. Montesquieu’s influence on the American and French Constitutions can be made relevant as challenge. Rousseau’s criticism of the despotism of monarchies can be presented as agreement here with the major difference in *The Social Contract*’s assertion of the indivisible sovereignty of the people as an even greater challenge to absolutism. Some discussion of *The General Will* as supporting absolutism if not absolute monarchy could also be considered. The major contrast can be made with Voltaire’s support for absolute monarchy and his abomination of the idea of government by the masses. However, it can be argued that his expectation of just and wise rule still distanced his view of absolutism from tyrannical government – despite his relationships with Catherine and Frederick – and from any religious justification for absolute monarchy.

Level 1 answers are likely to be vague and limited description of one or two of the writers and their views or assertion on their influence. Level 2 answers are likely to be wider-ranging description of the key ideas of two or three of the writers with slight comment on

challenge. Alternatively there may be some attempt to analyse challenge but with weak substance on each writer.

At Level 3 the answer will be mainly analytical with some definition of absolutism and concentration on challenge although assessment may be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced with clear appreciation of the distinctions drawn between despotism and absolute monarchy and appreciation of the degree of difference between the writers. At Level 5, well-supported and sustained judgement will be evident.

- 9** “The nobility rather than absolute monarchs had most to gain from the Enlightenment.”  
To what extent does this statement explain the appeal and effect of enlightened ideas in **both** Russia under Catherine II **and** Prussia under Frederick 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**

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

The appeal of the enlightenment was to the leisured and educated, which largely meant the nobility, but some candidates might mention its appeal to the bourgeoisie – of limited significance in these states. There might also be valid comparison with the effect of the Enlightenment in France. The main focus, however, should be on the two specified states. The wide range of political, social, economic and religious aspects of the enlightenment can be used to both support and challenge the assertion. The works of Enlightened thinkers were widely read by the nobility who, in theory, had much to gain from the ideas on participation in government and the separation of powers. In practice, however, their respective rulers had ensured their compliance in absolute government by reinforcing their privileges. The nobility became more ‘civilised’ and cultured perhaps as a result of enlightened reading but its ideas had no major political impact. Their absolute rulers had been more astute in recognising, and containing, the potential of any enlightened ideas on government. How far the rulers incorporated enlightened ideals into areas of policy and the gains these brought to the monarchs can be used to evaluate their gains against those of the nobility. Some candidates might point to the more radical enlightened ideas, e.g. of Rousseau, to add that both nobility and monarchs had more to lose rather than gain.

Level 1 answers are likely to be brief descriptions of a few key enlightened ideas or assertion on its influence. Level 2 answers are likely to be wider-ranging description of enlightened ideas with passing comments on its appeal or effect on either nobility or monarchs. At Level 3, answers will be analytical with clear attempt to analyse a number of enlightened ideas in terms of their appeal/effect on both nobility and monarchs in both states, if unbalanced.



Level 4 responses should offer a more critical and balanced approach. At Level 5, candidates will reach a well-substantiated conclusion having argued the case for and against the statement.

**10** To what extent did vanity rather than commitment explain the support for the Enlightenment of **both** Catherine II **and** Frederick 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**

The question allows for assessment of both aspects, consideration of other factors and the aspects of the enlightenment which had no support from these absolute monarchs. As both are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each state is expected than in Options A and B.

On “vanity” candidates might explore the flattery and approval from the Philosophes enhancing their image; the accolade of “Great” advocated for both; excuses for their excess, e.g. Catherine’s murder of her husband; the aggressive foreign policy of both; the praise heaped on specific actions/policies, e.g. the Nakas, religious toleration, legal reforms.

On “commitment” candidates might consider the evident wide reading and advancement of culture of both rulers; financial support for the philosophes, especially Voltaire; areas or reform e.g. education, the law and administration, religious toleration; Frederick II as ‘first servant of the state’. Other pragmatic reasons for policies as well as the degree to which theory was matched in practice and how far support was given to the range of enlightened ideas should be assessed to reach a judgment on the degree of commitment evidenced by the rulers.

Level 1 answers may be limited description of some areas of policy or the ideas of the enlightenment. Alternatively they will be assertion on vanity and commitment without support. Level 2 answers may also be description of 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, and mention of other factors may be present but limited. Level 4 responses will be more balanced, critical and perhaps draw comparisons between the rulers. At Level 5, candidates will reach a well-argued conclusion.

**Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640-1790****A2 Unit 6: Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1765-1790****Question 1**

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

Assess the validity of the views offered in **Source A** about the attitudes of Maria Theresa and Joseph II towards agrarian reform between 1765 and 1780. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. **6-8**
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

**Indicative content**

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the source. They will be simple summary reiterating the point on the major significance of agrarian reform and that Maria Theresa, if not consistent, was more willing to undertake far-reaching reform than Joseph.

Level 2 answers will show fuller understanding of the source and its views. Thus they may explain that Maria Theresa was prepared to undertake major reform despite the caution advocated by Joseph II. From own knowledge they may illustrate the point with reference to the series of Urbariums issued between 1767 and 1775 and/or the 1777 freeing from robot labour on Crown lands. The latter led Joseph to protest that it would lead to noble opposition and peasant unrest in other territories and to his urging of a more piecemeal approach.

At Level 3, having understood the interpretation given in the source, and perhaps comparing it to other historians' views, e.g. Oppenheim, candidates will begin to examine its validity though judgment will be only partial, e.g. those who argue in favour of this view may point out that in the series of measures Maria Theresa, in supporting a free peasantry, demonstrated both humanitarian concern for the plight of the peasantry and pragmatism in the fiscal interest of the state, and she was willing to challenge noble privilege in both Hungary and the hereditary lands. Even so, she did not seriously contemplate the elimination of labour services altogether, recognising the noble protest this would provoke, although she did propose it in 1774 to the consternation of Joseph and Kaunitz. Some candidates may be more critical of the source pointing out that Joseph undertook major surveys of noble encroachments and abuse of power over peasants in the Co-Regency. These provided Maria Theresa with the evidence and incentive to undertake reform, and Joseph was proved correct

in advising caution in light of the 1775 revolts. Some may compare attitudes to other aspects of domestic reform in Co-Regency.

Level 4 responses will examine both sides of the debate and reach a conclusion.

(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the motives of Joseph II in issuing the Tax and Agrarian Regulation? (10 marks)

*Target: A01.1, A02*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. 3-5
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. 6-8
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. 9-10

### Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to the content in what amounts to little more than assertion, e.g. the source shows Joseph issued fiscal reform in the interest of equality. Alternatively, a few relevant points might be lifted from the source but with no effective links to the question and assertion on the value of primary evidence.

At Level 2 there may be a full summary of the content of the source and some attempt to look at the utility of the source, e.g. it tells the historian that Joseph II was willing to challenge the fiscal privilege of the nobility and landlords' dues, whilst the forceful language of the source shows his determination, but points on utility will not be developed.

Answers at Level 3 should offer some explanation of the value and limitations of the source, as well as showing understanding of the purpose of the Regulation and Joseph's motives, e.g. the language and style indicate Joseph's autocracy as much as his support for Physiocratic principles; its limitation in its failure to place the Regulation in the context of Joseph's earlier agrarian reforms – the abolition of serfdom, commuted robot and the careful preparation of the Kadaster, as well as fiscal necessity.

At Level 4, explanation will be developed on both content and style, offering some balance on value and limitations. The conclusion reached might be that the source is of value to historians because, even as a formal decree, it provides valuable direct and indirect indicators on Joseph II's motives.

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

“Joseph II’s policies towards the peasantry demonstrated that he lacked both the sympathy and practicality of his mother”.

How far does this explain the contrast between Maria Theresa and Joseph II’s policies towards the peasantry between 1765 and 1790? (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 wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### **Indicative content**

The quotation requires discussion of both parts, i.e. sympathy and practicality. All of the sources give candidates leads into answering the question but they should be integrated with own knowledge to attain higher levels of award, where the quotation can be challenged as well as supported. The question allows candidates to concentrate responses solely on agrarian policies or to broaden it to cover a wider range of policies relevant to the peasantry to support/challenge the quotation. Arguments to support the statement in relation to the peasantry might include Maria Theresa’s relatively mild response to the uprising of 1775

compared with Joseph's savagery towards Horia's revolt in 1784. Support for practicality might refer to Maria Theresa's willingness to scrutinise seigneurial authority as never before, yet not to eliminate labour services altogether or to pursue equality of taxation, in contrast to Joseph's policies as sole Emperor. Arguments to challenge the statement on both aspects might include Joseph's concern for the plight of the peasantry, evidenced by: his fact-finding missions during the Co-Regency providing Maria Theresa with much of the evidence on noble absorption of rustical land and abuse of the robot which led to her Urbariums; the degree of continuity/logical development of the Raab system to the Emancipation Patents of 1781/1782 for Bohemia, Inner Austria and Galicia, the Land Purchase Patent and 1783 Directive; Joseph's practical and placatory responses to noble protest on commutation fees and, eventually, to Horia's revolt which led to the 1785 abolition of serfdom throughout the Hungarian Crown lands; in principle the Tax and Agrarian Regulation; both rulers shared the view that contented peasants would be more productive and better taxpayers. Candidates may broaden the issue to include examples of other domestic policies which support the sympathy and/or practicality of Maria Theresa and Joseph, e.g. religious toleration, education, economic and legal reforms, which can be linked to the peasantry.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be patchy narratives on a few policies. This level also includes responses which amount to little more than assertion or quoting from the sources without explanation, e.g. Joseph's "alarm" (Source A), and "thwarting" of Maria Theresa (Source C), or on his desire for equality (Sources B and D).

Level 2 answers will be more detailed but likely to be narrative on a range of both rulers' policies, with only passing links to the question OR making use only of the sources.

At Level 3 there should be clear evidence that the candidate is discussing the various aspects of the question, especially the two main parts of the quotation, i.e. some explanation of the degree of both sympathy and practicality in both rulers' policies. At Level 4 in addition the statement can be challenged although the balance of the response may be uneven. At Level 5 there will be a more balanced case presented both between the two parts of the quotation and the arguments for and against its validity, and a conclusion will be reached.