

General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative C Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

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.

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 importance of “lands annexed” in the context of Louis XIV’s *réunion* policy in the years 1679 to 1684. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. they extended French territory into the Empire and most were later lost by France. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. after Nymegen Louis felt powerful enough in Europe to claim, and take, territories which would strengthen France’s north-eastern and eastern frontiers; these were recognised for twenty years by other powers in the Truce of Ratisbon in 1684; naming some of the territories and effect on the Spanish, Dutch and the Emperor. **2-3**

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

Explain how the views expressed in **Source C** differ from the views put forward in **Source B** on Louis XIV’s desire to avoid war over the Spanish Succession. (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 he used diplomacy, Source C that he did make concessions but was willing to go to war over the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source B’s point that France could not afford another war, supported by own knowledge, e.g. the Nine Years War had exhausted France and its treasury; Louis needed to avoid further antagonising William of Orange as he was now ruler of England as well as the United Provinces; Louis agreed to partition, and to a second partition treaty after the death of Joseph Ferdinand which gave the bulk of

Spanish possessions to the Archduke Charles. Whilst Source C agrees that, even with a better claim than Leopold, Louis had passed on his own claim and accepted greater restriction than Leopold, it does not mention Partition and asserts that Louis was prepared to go to war to defend his dynastic rights. From own knowledge candidates might include Louis' moderation in the terms of the Partition Treaties; the terms of the Will, Louis' reasons for its acceptance and why this made war "inevitable".

3-5

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. to show how Source C both supports and challenges the view given in Source B by acknowledging Louis' moderation but also indicating that his actions led to war and supporting this with own knowledge.

6-7

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

Explain the ways in which the War of the Spanish Succession had seriously affected France, both at home and abroad, by 1715.

(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 on both international and domestic aspects: Source A shows the territorial losses; Sources B and C that diplomacy had failed to prevent war and that France could not afford it; Source C indicates the effect on France by 1709.

From own knowledge of the domestic effects candidates might consider: the cost – a deficit of 430 million livres by 1715; taxes – capitation continued, dixième introduced in 1710, a burden falling disproportionately on the 3rd Estate; melting down the gold and silver of Versailles; France invaded for the first time 1708 and loss of Lille; by 1709/10, famine in areas of France; smallpox deaths, including members of the royal family; the problems the depleted finances caused Louis' successors. However, loyalty had strengthened as the people rallied to the King over the Allies' terms in 1709 but France was too exhausted to sustain the war, hence Utrecht.

On consequences for France abroad candidates might include the terms of the will and why Louis accepted them; Spain's approval of Philip of Anjou as monarch; the formation of the Grand Alliance and its terms; military defeats, e.g. Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde and Malplaquet, not compensated for by victory at Denain in 1712; impact on the army/navy; by 1709 Louis was willing to make peace and accept considerable territorial losses but the Allies pressed too far in demanding that he join the war against Spain; a mistake, as at Utrecht France essentially retained its 1697 frontiers if making overseas concessions. Mitigating the seriousness of the effects – the prospect of Bourbon alliance as Philip remained king of Spain and the American territories; even if other European lands were lost, France was not returned to its 1678 frontiers.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited narrative or heavily reliant on sources. At Level 2 there will be greater range and selectivity, if narrative, and answers will try to link with the question although judgment will be bland. Level 3 answers will display greater accuracy, range and depth with an analytical focus although the response will be unbalanced, perhaps focusing mainly on foreign or domestic effects. Level 4 answers will look at both sides and provide a more balanced case, perhaps with some challenge on how far effects were all detrimental. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment and full explanation. Judgment, even at this level, may still be implicit and partial.

Brandenburg-Prussia 1640–1688

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “electoral prince” in the context of Frederick William's status. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means he played a part in elections in the Holy Roman Empire. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Frederick William was one of the seven Electors in 1640 which gave him precedence as an imperial prince and some possible influence with the Emperor and in the imperial Diet. Frederick William was one of only two Protestant Electors. **2-3**
-

- (b) Explain why Frederick William had little control over his territories in 1640.
(7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he was young and faced severe difficulties with little power over his territories. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the 30 years war was devastating Brandenburg despite supposed neutrality; the Hohenzollerns had had to take refuge in Königsberg; the scattered nature of his inheritance; no effective administration; small, ill-disciplined army; the power of the Estates. **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. internal weaknesses had helped create Brandenburg's precarious international position with, perhaps, geographic disunity being of most significance. **6-7**

- (c) "Only by his military reforms was Frederick William able to succeed in strengthening Brandenburg-Prussia."
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

Candidates should give some consideration to what is meant by strengthening Brandenburg-Prussia so that the significance of the army can be placed in context. What his military reforms entailed should be well-known: disbanding his original army, recruitment, discipline etc. The army's effectiveness gave Brandenburg-Prussia greater status, especially with Fehrbellin in 1675, and gained important subsidies but Frederick William was not strong enough to keep West Pomerania. The gains at Westphalia, which strengthened the Electorate territorially, were not the result of military reform but of French interests. Gaining sovereignty over East Prussia at Oliva increased diplomatic strength. The Elector's economic reforms played a significant part in strengthening his territories, especially when the 1640 situation is compared with 1688. His increased powers over the Estates strengthened his state financially and his own administration.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on military reform, 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 with some attempt to consider other relevant factors but are likely to be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced with a good range of factors and clear criteria for "strengthened". Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of the army reforms' significance.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "the provincial Estates" in the context of the Great Elector's system of government. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means groups in the provinces with powers which the Elector wished to overcome. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the Estates of Brandenburg, East Prussia, Cleves and Mark, made up of the nobility and, in the western provinces, some bourgeoisie. These Estates held power over local administration and the Elector needed their consent on financial policy. These were powers which Frederick William had to deal with to create his own authority and administrative system. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William had more difficulty in dealing with the Estates of East Prussia than with those of Brandenburg. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because they opposed his financial reforms or setting up his own administration. **1-2**
-

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. greater powers than the Estates of Brandenburg; less loyalty as a newer Hohenzollern territory; the power of the nobility and financial strength of the burghers of Konigsburg; Polish sovereignty until 1660 so the Estates could appeal; Prussian determination to resist a new military grant in 1669; distance. **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. East Prussia's wealth and distance from Brandenburg made its nobility the most recalcitrant in contrast to the initial weakness of Brandenburg and Frederick William's compromise with its nobility. **6-7**

(c) "Only by overcoming the power of the Estates was Frederick William able to strengthen the finances of Brandenburg-Prussia."
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

Candidates should show awareness of Frederick William's actions in dealing with the different Estates and some range of his policies to deal with improving the finances of his state. The degree to which these depended on "overcoming" the power of the Estates, such as gaining sovereignty over East Prussia, or making concessions to them to gain finance, e.g.

recognising all the powers of the nobility and extending tax exemption to those of Cleves and Mark; the terms of the 1653 Recess. Consideration can be given to aspects of finance which lay outside the Estates' control, e.g. Crown lands, foreign subsidy. The range of areas of policy might include both direct and indirect means to improve finances: the setting up of an efficient administrative system; the Generalkreigskasse; effective tax collection, using the army where necessary; the Contribution; *modi generales*; improvements to Crown lands and shorter leases; gaining subsidies from the French and Dutch; agricultural and industrial policy; religious toleration as an economic policy.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on dealing with the Estates or financial policies, with assertion rather than proof and will not link with the quotation. Level 2 responses will offer a wider range of material, considering both the Estates and finance with some attempt at valid links, although these may be in the form of general statements. At Level 3 there will be an analytical focus and an attempt made to consider a range of policies contributing to improved finances but this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will offer a well-supported consideration of policies which did/did not depend on the Estates' consent and/or appreciation that Frederick William did not totally overcome the powers of the Estates. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment as demanded by the question although this may be partial.

Russia 1690–1725

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the German Quarter” in the context of the education and interests of Peter the Great. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means where he grew up and received an unconventional education. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it was where foreign traders, doctors, engineers and soldiers lived in Moscow and where Peter went to learn practical and military skills and foreign languages; gaining knowledge of naval skills from Timmerman. All of these became lifelong interests of Peter. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter introduced changes to the armed forces of Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he had enjoyed playing at soldiers when he was young, forming his own Guard. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. because he distrusted the Streltzi, he destroyed them and replaced them with his Preobrazhenski; to ensure full control over the army after the experiences of his childhood; Narva taught him the weaknesses of the existing Russian troops; to introduce western methods and

technology; he wanted a navy to aid in foreign policy aims; part of Peter's intention was to break with Muscovite tradition; to symbolise his determination that Russia was to be a modern, western power. **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. early experiences and interest gave the impetus, but ambition for power, both internal and external, became predominant reasons. **6-7**

(c) "Peter the Great's diplomacy was the most important reason for the success of 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 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

Candidates should show clear awareness of what constituted the success of Peter the Great's foreign policy: the defeat of Sweden and gaining of the Baltic provinces; the respect and fear of his German neighbours as a result of his victories over Sweden; Ottoman concern, although they had regained Azov. Knowledge of Russian diplomacy can be linked to this, e.g. Peter's initially junior role in the anti-Swedish coalition changing to dominant partner once the coalition was re-formed; in 1710 he became the ally of Hanover in support of its claims to Bremen and Verden; Russia's significance in the Mecklenburg crisis; the ability to dictate the terms of Nystadt and keep Russian troops in Courland. Diplomatic failure might

be used to challenge the assertion, e.g. the failure of the Great Embassy to create an anti-Ottoman coalition.

Other factors which contributed to success: the creation of the navy – victory at Cape Hango in 1714 signalled the end of Sweden’s Baltic dominance and even aroused Dutch and British concerns; the army reforms, especially after Narva, e.g. enforcing the service nobility concept which had declined; Cadet Institutions; Schools of Engineering and Artillery; conscription, 1705; promotion on merit; the use of foreign mercenaries as teachers; better weapons and tactics, all helped towards victory at Poltava etc. These can be compared with other factors which aided his foreign policy success: the problems of Sweden and Charles XII; the effectiveness of Peter’s administrative and financial reforms and increasing state monopolies to support the military; rapid exploitation of Russian resources and economic development to provide weapons; Peter’s own determination and energy.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on diplomacy or another factor with general assertions on success. At Level 2 narrative/description of policy 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 with a definition of success and some range of contributory factors but this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and demonstrate secure knowledge on a range of factors with some attempt at assessment. Level 5 answers will, in addition, make reasoned, if not extensive, judgements as demanded by the question.

Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the Table of Ranks” in the context of Peter the Great’s administrative policies. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a new graded list of civil servants to improve the efficiency of the administration. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it divided the senior posts in the armed forces and civil service into fourteen ranks; attaining the 5th rank conferred nobility, the 9th hereditary nobility. Drawing on Swedish precedent this was meant to give incentive and opportunity to the talented within the administration and to formalise a service nobility but raised the resentment of the old nobility. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great made frequent changes to his system of government. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because he needed an efficient system; 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. he needed to improve

Crown finances and wished to copy European examples of efficient government but this was difficult to impose on Russia's traditional system; to create more efficient central supervision of government; need for provincial reforms; the flaws in the initial hurried reforms; the Senate to deputise for Peter in his frequent absences; to eliminate the advisory influence of the nobility; to deal with corruption. **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. administrative policies were usually expedients, linked to Russia's military needs, although later changes were more considered attempts to create an efficient, subordinate system. **6-7**

(c) "The power of the nobility was the most important factor limiting the success of Peter the Great's 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 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 of answers should be on the power of the nobility and the effect this had on Peter's policies, e.g. the semi-independence of the nobility; their conservatism, especially amongst the boyar class; suspicion of westernisation; their traditional role and corruption in government; power over serfs. Peter needed to re-impose the concept of service nobility to provide both loyal officers and administrators, to convince the nobility that western policies, e.g. economic reforms, education, would benefit them. Despite Peter's successes he was

unable to overcome noble conservatism and corruption – witness the frequent changes to administration, use of Fiskals, the reversion to old systems after his death. Candidates may contrast this with other limiting factors, e.g. frequent changes in administrative structure; the size of Russia; the enormity of the task; the conservatism of the Church; the pressures of warfare.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited assertions on the power of the nobility or description of Peter's domestic successes. At Level 2 there will be some consideration of the effects of noble power or other limitations on Peter's success with some attempt at valid links, though these may be in the form of bland statements. Level 3 answers will be analytical with clear definition of noble power and its effects with comparison of some range of other factors but this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and discuss the degree to which factors limited success with some indication of linkage to the aristocracy's power. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgment as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the decisive factor/s.

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 difficulties in achieving financial stability? (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 agree that the Kings were faced with an inefficient taxation system. They disagree because Source B focuses on the Crown's responsibility for overspending whilst Source C stresses the issue of financial privilege and exemptions. 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. support for Source B: Crown reliance on financiers; the role of Parlements in opposing the continuation of the *vingtième* under Louis XV or Louis XVI's financial proposals; the Crown's expenses, particularly on warfare. Support for Source C: explanation of the flaws in the system of tax-farming or of *pays d'Etat* determination to maintain exemption; some of the proposals in Calonne's memorandum and the response of the Assembly of the Notables. To argue that the sources are not sufficient candidates might point out that neither source considers the exemption of the Church and its determined preservation, e.g. effective opposition to Machault's proposals; nor the effects of economic conditions on the ability of the Third Estate to pay the most important tax, the *taille*; nor the effects of specific wars on financial stability. 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' difficulties and the significance of omissions. 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 reasons focused on central government and direction, whilst Calonne stresses the scope of the difficulties and, by proposing a land tax, indicates only radical measures and overhaul of the system could possibly lead to stability – by 1786 perhaps over-optimistic.

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

Consider the extent to which the financial system rather than royal extravagance caused the financial problems of the French 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.

Candidates will need to consider the range of issues causing the Crown financial difficulties across the full period designated to reach a judgment. Material from the sources to support the financial system at fault might include: Source A: the complexity of the taxation system, the continuation of Church exemption; inconsistency in taxation policy in the period. Source B: the inefficiency of the system; dependence on loans from financiers. Source C: the range of exemptions; complexity and cost of the system. Source D implies the system was not at fault as there was a favourable financial situation in the late 1770s. Only Source B implies royal extravagance but the sources indicate the Crown allowed exemptions to continue, did not assert authority over Parlement, would not introduce a universal tax system. Sources A, B and C also indicate the responsibility of the vested self-interest of the privileged and Parlement; Source D implies that a flourishing economy was essential to support Crown finance.

Own knowledge can be used to illustrate these points and to consider further issues affecting the relative responsibility. Major aspects of royal extravagance are likely to be the cost of wars – dates from Source A should provide a basis for some specific examples, palaces and Court expenditure compared with the inequities and inefficiencies of the taxation system across the period, despite some royal efforts at reform. Other factors might be argued to have been of significance: the monarchy as its own worst financial enemy not from extravagance but in failing to exercise its power to keep its financial house in order and to order reform – as Louis XIV, at least partially, demonstrated with the *capitation* and *dixième*; the failure to undertake fundamental reform and deal with privilege; Louis XV and Louis XVI's failure to support reforming ministers such as Machault, Turgot and Calonne; the character of the monarchs; the resistance of Parlements and financiers to any radical attempt at reform e.g. Law's system under the Regency, Terray's policy under the Triumvirate; the self-interest of *rentiers*, financiers, tax-farmers etc. economic problems. Candidates should show appreciation that the scale of the problem did vary across the 100 years – there were periods of relative affluence under Fleury and in the early years of Louis XVI, even the Regency had managed to almost halve the debt inherited from Louis XIV.

Level 1 responses may provide limited generalisations about the monarchy's financial situation, heavily reliant on the sources or considering only one monarch. 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 limited discussion of some of the relevant issues but coverage will be uneven. At Level 3 the full period should have been covered, if not with equal weight, and answers will show appreciation of the focus on responsibility for financial difficulties with some assessment of both the system and royal extravagance and other factors although this will be unbalanced. At Level 4 in addition to the initial focus answers will examine other factors offering sound support and drawing conclusions although these will be limited in scope. 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: 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

Question 2

To what extent was his lust for glory more significant than the geographical characteristics of Brandenburg-Prussia in determining Frederick II's foreign policy between 1740 and 1763?
(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Candidates can be expected to begin from some outline of relevant geographical characteristics which could be seen as both weaknesses, such as Prussia's vulnerable frontiers and relative lack of resources, and as potential strengths, for example strategic position and the significance of Silesia in strengthening Prussia by 1756. Frederick's desire for glory might be defined as on the battlefield, e.g. Frederick's military tactics such as the oblique battle order and victories such as Rossbach and Leuthen; as firmly establishing Prussia as a major European power, e.g. by exploiting the vulnerability of Maria Theresa in 1740, in the pre-emptive strike of 1756; to overcome his father's image.

The significance of these factors can then be evaluated against others which affected Frederick II's foreign policy objectives and success: the international situation and his diplomatic abilities; Austrian willingness to make peace with Frederick in 1745; Austria's aims in the Diplomatic Revolution and outbreak of the Seven Years' War; British subsidies and errors by his opponents enabling Prussia to survive; the sheer luck of Peter III's accession in Russia which rescued Frederick from the military exhaustion of 1762. Candidates might question the degree of his success based perhaps on the military failures which matched successes and on the degree to which his foreign policy exhausted Brandenburg-Prussia by 1763 compared with the significance of gaining and retaining Silesia against massive odds.

A conclusion might be that geographical factors together with his own ambition for military reputation determined Frederick II's foreign policy objectives, but other factors were more significant in determining his success.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of either geographical characteristics or Frederick's actions with assertion on responsibility with no clear focus. Level 2 answers are likely to be fuller narratives with some awareness of the significance of geographical characteristics or lust for glory. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, with some slight attempt to assess factors. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis and consideration of some range of factors but the answer will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer clear evaluation of factors determining foreign policy with some appreciation of the linkage of factors and/or possible challenge. Level 5 answers will sustain an argument and reach a balanced conclusion.

Question 3

“Frederick II’s domestic policies were affected more by the ideas of the Enlightenment than by traditional Hohenzollern concerns.”

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

A range of Frederick II’s policies should be considered, not simply reforms: social, economic, political, religious, educational, cultural, legal and military policies are all relevant. Clear definition should be made on what constituted ideas of the Enlightenment where these are pertinent to the assessment. The concept of a social contract: Frederick’s claim to be “the first servant of the State”; enlightened ideas on greater personal freedoms: religious toleration was extended. On law reform: Frederick’s system was made less complex, rational, efficient and cheap, theoretically the executive was separated from the judiciary; his administration also met the enlightenment’s criteria of efficiency and promotion on merit. Humanitarianism: Crown serf labour was reduced; Crown grants to restock farms after 1763; state granaries to stabilise prices and avoid famine; compulsory education decreed. Physiocratic ideas on free trade were adopted: Frederick’s reciprocal free trade agreement with America; easing of excise duties, e.g. on flour. Patronage of the arts, re-establishing the Berlin Academy, building the Berlin Opera House.

Traditional Hohenzollern concerns might be defined as absolutism; administrative efficiency; the predominance of military policy and hence maintaining the privileges of the Junker class; economic development. To support an argument that these were more significant examples might be: nothing was allowed to affect absolutism; the army and its financing remained the paramount concern; mercantilism remained the major economic policy; nothing was done to limit serfdom on Junker estates; religious toleration was continued for economic purpose; education was to instil loyalty to the state. Candidates might also argue that Frederick went further than his predecessors as he strengthened the nobility at the expense of meritocracy: nobles gained the monopoly of higher ranks in the army and in the administration and judiciary; legal reforms furthered the rights of the nobility.

Level 1 answers are likely to be accounts of a limited number of policies with assertion on enlightenment or Hohenzollern concerns. 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 ideas and Hohenzollern concerns linked to policies although treatment will be unbalanced and judgment somewhat bland. 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

To what extent was Brandenburg-Prussia stronger in 1786, both internationally and internally, than it had been in 1740? (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

On balance, candidates are likely to conclude that Prussia was stronger in 1786. However there are sufficient aspects open to challenge which can lead to a balanced assessment.

Frederick II later acknowledged his debt to his father for the strength of his state in 1740 and candidates might consider: Frederick William's caution internationally and careful financial policy which meant Prussia was almost alone in Europe in having a surplus in the Treasury; its army was large and well-drilled and absorbed 80% of state revenue, if not tested in the field; both army and administration were open to merit to a degree; absolutism was assured through the tandem of interest nurtured with the nobility; administrative efficiency; however, it was a brutal regime and economically Prussia remained poor in resources and low in population. Internationally, if of some significance in the Holy Roman Empire, in 1740 Prussia was of little importance, Frederick William had been easily bribed and his foreign policy had been clumsy and unsuccessful.

By 1786 most aspects of internal policy had been continued and consolidated but, between 1740 and 1763, the burden of war had weakened the economy and revenue. Frederick II did improve economic resources thanks to gaining Silesia and West Prussia, and also by policies to rebuild the economy after 1763; the brutality of the regime had been lessened to a degree and candidates might include aspects of social and legal policy here; Frederick can, however, be criticised for making the judiciary, higher office in the administration and all army office the exclusive preserve of the nobility which had begun to weaken their efficiency even by 1786. Internationally Prussia had become a major power; acquired territory; strengthened Prussia's frontiers; now rivalled Austria in the Empire; had Russia as an ally after 1764; had gained respect and admiration for military prowess and diplomatic skill. Frederick's responsibility for improvement might be evaluated against both his responsibility for isolating Prussia in the 1750s and the near disaster of the Seven Years' War and against the opportunities presented to him by Maria Theresa's weaknesses in 1740 and 1756; the quality of the Austrian army; Joseph II's role in the Potato War; Britain's subsidies; Catherine II's reasons for the 1764 alliance and partition of Poland and the role these played in sustaining and/or strengthening Prussia.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited description of the situation in 1740 and 1786 or of policies with assertions on strength. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller comparison and consideration of a 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 either domestic or international condition. At Level

3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be clear attempt to compare across a range of aspects, both internal and international and to qualify the degree of change across the period although treatment will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and well-supported across a range of aspects with developed assessment. Level 5 responses will sustain an argument and reach a balanced, valid judgement.

Option B: Russia under Catherine II, 1762–1796

Question 5

“In her policy towards Turkey Catherine II progressed from caution to extreme daring and did not achieve her objectives.”

How valid is this judgement? (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

Restricting the focus to Turkey should ensure a manageable question and both aspects of the quotation are open to challenge. Catherine’s objectives might be defined as: to fulfil Russia’s traditional aims; to prove herself a worthy leader; to ensure Russia great power status; to gain territory; access to the Black Sea; to protect fellow Orthodox Christians; to break up the Turkish Empire and establish client states. The priority Catherine accorded these objectives can be discussed as can the degree to which she failed to attain them and why. How far there was a consistent progression from caution to daring might also be considered.

Caution towards Turkey can be supported: initially Catherine had no responsible minister to guide her and so had to frame policy herself; Poland and the Northern Accord were the first priority; she did not wish to face Austrian opposition or lose her Prussian ally; finances and the army were not ready for war in 1768; it was Turkey that declared war first; limited engagement; she had to withdraw troops to deal with Poland; waiving Russian claims to Moldavia and Wallachia; rapid peace-making in 1774 because of Pugachev revolt; careful preparation for a second Turkish war, e.g. terms of the Austrian alliance; Turkey began the Second War; readiness to make peace at Jassy and limited gains.

Daring: the Baltic fleet sent to Greece in 1770; destruction of the Turkish Mediterranean fleet at Tchesme; military leaders, e.g. Suvarov and Rumyantsev and aggressive tactics leading to victories, e.g. capture of Bucharest; Kutchuk-Kainardjii terms – territorial, war indemnity, freedom of Black Sea navigation and Straits; protection of Christians in the Ottoman Empire and of the independent Crimea; the annexation of the Crimea in 1783; Catherine’s determination to avoid bargaining under pressure again; capture of Ochakov; despite protests no other power came to Turkey’s aid.

Although most of these points support considerable success rather than failure, Catherine’s policy did fall short of her territorial objectives. The over-ambitious and woolly ‘Greek Project’ was certainly both daring and a failure, as was the ambition to drive the Turks out of

Europe and re-create the Byzantine Empire. Catherine’s “daring” might be qualified given the weaknesses of the Turkish.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of policy towards Turkey with assertions on success. At Level 2 there will be either a fuller account of policy across the period with limited comment on caution and daring or an analytical focus with inadequate substance. At Level 3 there will be a clearly analytical focus with support across a range of aspects with some attempt to consider both parts of the quotation but this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and offer well-supported evaluation of all aspects of the quotation with clear challenge. Level 5 answers will, in addition, sustain argument and draw effective conclusions on the statement’s validity.

Question 6

“Catherine II’s enlightenment was no more than a superficial image; it brought no practical benefits to the Russian people.”

How valid is 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 be expected to deploy a wide range of knowledge on Catherine’s domestic policies but criteria for enlightenment should be defined and practical benefit assessed across some range of the Russian people.

Catherine’s personal degree of enlightenment can be seen as more than superficial, e.g. her commitment to the works of the Philosophes; support for Voltaire and Diderot; patronage of the arts; religious toleration; Free Economic Society. Superficial image might be supported by her need to impress Europe and Russia after the palace coup; the publicity sought for the Nakas and its borrowed terms; the purpose of the Legislative Assembly; the supposed and real purpose of policies such as the secularisation of Church property, education, law reform etc; her reaction to the French Revolution; Catherine’s self-interest: her dependence on noble support; recognising the privileges of the nobility left her absolutism unchallenged; serfdom was the historical basis of stable society in Russia.

Candidates might argue that given the limitations imposed by Russian society Catherine’s reforms went as far as was possible towards being enlightened. The practical benefits Catherine brought to some of the Russian people through policies such as religious toleration, the abolition of censorship, education and economic improvements, might be assessed as enlightened in both purpose and practice. The limited social groups who benefited: religious minorities, the bourgeoisie, the nobility, can be used to support “superficial” especially when compared with the vast bulk of the Russia people who did not, i.e. the serfs. Catherine was aware of the disadvantages of serfdom and made vague hints of reform but in her reign serfs continued to carry the greatest burden of taxation and lost all the limited opportunity they had

had to appeal against the nobility; Catherine made no attempt to limit labour service or the sale of serfs separate from land nor to provide any legal status or protection; the Pugachev Revolt was savagely put down; c800,000 Crown serfs were granted to the nobility and industrialists, Catherine extended serfdom to the Ukraine; the Charter of the Nobility gave exclusive rights to serf-ownership; Radischev was exiled to Siberia. Practical benefit to the nobility and industrialists therefore – but not the result of enlightened policy.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited narratives of some of Catherine’s policies with no real link to the set question, or assertions on the degree of her enlightenment. Level 2 answers will seek to examine both aspects of the question but with limited support or will be fuller accounts in narrative form of policies with limited attempt to link to the question. At Level 3 there will be a clear analytical focus with some attempt to establish criteria for enlightenment and assessment of Catherine’s commitment with some assessment of practical benefit but this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers more balanced, well-supported and seek to assess Catherine’s practical effect against her motives and degree of enlightenment. At Level 5 candidates will, in addition, sustain argument and reach a clear conclusion.

Question 7

“The most serious charge against Catherine II was that she did not attempt to develop the economy of Russia and left the country with an intolerable burden of debt.”

How valid is 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

The question has been formulated to enable candidates to assess both Catherine’s specific economic and financial reforms/policies and her broader impact on these areas, as well as to appreciate links between them.

On the economy: definition of the resources of Russia might include its mineral wealth; trading potential; agriculture; its labour force; state monopolies – gold, silver, copper and salt. Failure to develop the resources might be supported by: export remained the export of raw materials rather than manufactured goods, naval stores the largest factor; iron exports declined in Catherine’s reign; nothing was done to remedy the weaknesses of agriculture; although Catherine was well aware of its flaws, serfdom was maintained and extended into new territories; her primary expenditure was on foreign policy; none of the economic initiatives were sufficiently funded; successful developments such as cotton manufacture owed more to free enterprise than to Catherine; the state monopolies were milked for revenue not developed.

However, some attempts were made and some success achieved, e.g. some road and canal building; development of a Russian merchant fleet; the opening up of ports such as Odessa; the encouragement of immigrant skilled workers, especially from Germany; Catherine’s Physiocratic free trade policy – by the end of her reign all exports and many imports were

duty free, the duty on luxury imports reduced from 200 to 20 per cent; reciprocal free trade agreements; the abolition of state sales monopolies; foundation of the Mining Academy to aid education and stimulate innovation; gaining Black Russia from Poland did mean some good land. Catherine might be defended by highlighting the weaknesses of the Russian economy limiting her attempts: the size of Russia; its disproportionately unproductive land and climate; communication weaknesses; the preponderance and backwardness of agriculture; reliance on foreign merchant ships for exports; lack of capital and internal demand; the noble market for luxury goods was served by imports; population increase from conquests was not an asset – Russia did not suffer from a shortage of cheap labour, but only 4% of the population was urban.

Finance: Crown revenues did increase from 17 to 78 million roubles in Catherine's reign but expenditure continued to outstrip income: Court expenditure was lavish; the cost of foreign policy was never one of Catherine's considerations yet military expenditure was enormous; by the 1760s Catherine was borrowing money from abroad; the issue of paper money from 1769, cautious at first but increasing, led to inflation; the issue had reached 100 million roubles by 1787 and Catherine made a formal declaration that no more would be issued then a further 50m was issued by the early 1790s; taxation was increased – Poll Tax, obrok four times in her reign; State monopoly of liquor enabled her to increase its price; all of this meant greater poverty/ even less internal demand; reducing the Salt Tax was negligible in comparison; taking over Church property benefited Catherine personally, not the State; no attempt was made to tax the nobility.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited description of Catherine's economic or financial policies with assertions on impact or claiming enlightenment. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller consideration 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 economic policies. At Level 3 there will be a direct approach with appreciation of the scope of the issues, although treatment will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and well-supported across a range of aspects with developed assessment. Level 5 responses will sustain an argument and reach a balanced, valid judgement.

Option C: Enlightenment in Theory and Practice

Question 8

How far do you agree that the differences between the key ideas of Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau on government were far greater than the similarities? (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 major works will be needed to assess the degree of difference between them and a conclusion supported for either proposition.

Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* classified existing systems of government, based on the nature and history of states. He claimed the basic spirit of republics was virtue and of monarchies honour, comparing this to fear in a despotic regime. His major advocacy of the separation of powers presented a challenge to absolute monarchy. Voltaire, on the other hand, viewed absolutism far more positively and argued that only an absolute ruler had the power to overcome privilege and prejudice to govern in the best interests of all, hence distancing itself from despotism. 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 even greater challenge to absolutism. Some discussion of *The General Will* as supporting absolutism, if not absolute monarchy, could also be considered. Thus the argument might be that there was similarity between the three in their opposition to monarchical despotism and to religious justification for absolute monarchy and in their support for a rational system of government. However, there was major contrast in their preferred replacement: Voltaire's support for absolute monarchy and his abomination of the idea of government by the masses distancing him from both Montesquieu and Rousseau. The point could also be made that none gave any detailed consideration to the practicalities of a system of government and all three were influenced by what they saw as the flaws in the French system and their somewhat idealised interpretation of other states' systems.

Level 1 answers are likely to be vague and limited description of one or two of the writers and their views or assertion on similarities/differences. Level 2 answers are likely to be wider-ranging description of the key ideas of all three writers with slight comment on difference or similarity. Alternatively there may be some attempt to analyse similarity and difference but with weak substance on each writer. At Level 3 the answer will be analytical with sound grasp of the key ideas of all three writers with some assessment of similarity and difference although unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced with clear appreciation of the distinctions to be drawn between the writers' ideas and evaluation of the degree of difference. At Level 5 well-supported and sustained judgement will be evident.

Question 9

“Despotism tinged with enlightenment rather than Enlightened Absolutism is the more accurate description of their reigns.”

How far is this a valid assessment of **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 are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each ruler is expected than in Options A and B. The successful response will clearly need definition and grasp of these terms central to this option and an exhaustive coverage of policies is not expected.

Enlightened absolutism might be defined as rule by a monarch who voluntarily acts for the good of the governed rather than for its own self-interests, one who does not justify rule by Divine Right, advances the personal freedoms of subjects and respects the law. Despotism as arbitrary and tyrannical government.

A case can be made for both descriptions of the rulers from consideration of their policies and styles of government. As enlightened absolutists: candidates might consider the evident wide reading and advancement of culture by both rulers; financial support for the philosophes, especially Voltaire; areas of reform, e.g. education, the law and administration, religious toleration, economic freedoms; Frederick II as ‘first servant of the state’.

As despots: Frederick could be seen as having a tyrant’s hold on the reins of government and, despite his codification of the law, often took cases from his judges and imposed high-handed and arbitrary personal decisions; Catherine’s advancement of serfdom to the point of slavery, acceptance of savage serf-punishment and the brutal suppression of the Pugachev Revolt. Both rulers held firmly to the view that all rights of the state were vested in the monarch, their powers were unrestricted by any representative institutions and, as neither ruler attempted to end the privileges of the nobility or abolish serfdom, their other enlightened policies were no more than “a tinge”.

Level 1 answers are likely to be brief descriptions of a few key enlightened ideas or aspects of the rulers’ policy with assertion on the influence of enlightenment showing only implicit awareness of the focus of the question. Level 2 answers will either show some appreciation of the focus of the question but offer only a limited definition of the terms linked to a few areas of policy or offer a general description of a wide range of policies not clearly linked to the focus. At Level 3 answers will be analytical with clear attempt to define the terms and analyse a range of both monarchs’ policies to reach some assessment although this will be unbalanced. Level 4 responses should offer a more critical and balanced approach, drawing distinctions between the two monarchs as well as similarities. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-substantiated conclusion having argued the case for and against the statement.

Question 10

To what extent did the economic and social policies of **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II deserve the approval of the Philosophes? (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 are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each ruler is expected than in Options A and B.

Candidates should ideally offer some consideration of the expectations of the Philosophes in each of these areas, and some may even draw distinctions between them. The most likely economic aspects to be highlighted will be the Physiocrats' views on the free economy, the abolition of serfdom and a single land tax. On social aspects: equality before the law, religious toleration, the encouragement of education, the ending of church and noble privilege, humanitarianism.

Both rulers certainly gained the praise of Philosophes such as Diderot and Voltaire but how genuine this was and how far it was deserved is a matter for discussion. On their economic policies: both rulers did take hesitant, limited steps towards free trade but, particularly in Prussia, mercantilism still predominated; neither abolished serfdom, Catherine extended its burden and the number of serfs but Frederick did limit Crown serf labour; there was no attempt at a single land tax.

On social policies: both supported religious toleration, a more radical step in Russia; extended education – perhaps more schools were built in Russia than under Frederick's supposedly compulsory state education; developed universities and encouraged the Arts; Catherine secularised Church property; Frederick did put great effort into improving the economic well-being of his citizens after 1763 which could be seen as humanitarian. Both, however, failed to merit approval for their policies on noble privilege and both maintained inequality before the law – although it was at least codified, cheap and efficient in Prussia.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of policy with assertion on enlightenment. Level 2 answers will consider a range of policies with some slight attempt at assessment of each aspect in line with the question. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on one aspect of policy or one ruler. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. Although the focus may be more heavily on either social or economic there will be some clear criteria for judging the degree of praise the policies of both rulers merited. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will also be critical, with sound definition of criteria and a well-supported range of policies on both aspects with a clear assessment. Level 5 answers will sustain argument, draw conclusions both on similarities and differences between the rulers to reach a valid judgement on how far they were deserving of praise.

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 Joseph II's lack of influence on Maria Theresa during the co-Regency. (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 points on Maria Theresa's skill in subordinating Joseph and his frustration. Level 2 answers will show fuller understanding of the source and this interpretation. Thus, they may explain that although Joseph had a programme for reform, Maria Theresa was unwilling to implement any change causing frequent dispute between them, with Kaunitz of more significance than the supposed Co-Regent. From own knowledge they may support points with Joseph being allowed only supervision of army policy whilst Kaunitz was instrumental in the newly created council of state; Maria Theresa's conservatism might be supported by her refusal to extend reform to Hungary and continued religious intolerance despite Joseph's pleas. At Level 3, having understood the interpretation given in the source, candidates will begin to examine its validity with more explicit signs of evaluation and may compare other historians' views though judgment will be only partial. They may point out that Joseph had advocated reform throughout the Co-Regency, with examples, as he was convinced that the Habsburgs must reform or be overtaken by Prussia and firmly believed in the enlightened principle of a social contract. Maria Theresa shared the view on Prussia but he was frustrated by his mother's caution just as she was worried by his intolerance of opposition. Candidates more critical of the source might point out that Joseph's desire to extend reform to Hungary was supported by Kaunitz, and here both were over-ridden by Maria Theresa; she was the radical in wishing to deal with serfdom through Urbariums and was restrained by the combined conservatism of Joseph and Kaunitz. There is also the implication in the source that Joseph was not astute enough to appreciate Maria Theresa's skill in keeping him in a subordinate role. Level 4 responses will provide a developed, balanced and well-supported assessment to reach a conclusion.

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

How useful is **Source B** as an explanation of the purpose and effectiveness of Joseph II's religious policies? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- 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 summarise the source or make simple statements related to the content but with no effective links to the question and offering assertion on the shortcomings of secondary evidence. At Level 2 there may be a full summary of the content of the source related to own knowledge and there will be some attempt to look at the utility of the source at a general level, e.g. it indicates the radical outcome of Joseph II's policies towards the Catholic Church but the focus of the source is entirely on outcome and it does not detail any specific policy, which will be briefly illustrated from own knowledge. There may be some comment on the choice of language and tone which implies a favourable view of Joseph's policies. Answers at Level 3 will give a more careful consideration to both utility and its limitations, appreciating that the source refers only to the Catholic Church and not the full range of Joseph's religious policies such as toleration, it implies that all reform was Joseph's whereas Maria Theresa had made major inroads on the Church's privileges. There should be some assessment of 'effectiveness' in light of reaction to his policies. However, the source does indicate that religious reform was part of Joseph's overall purpose and had proved effective in securing power over the Catholic Church. 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 it neatly summarises the radical outcome of major aspects of Joseph's policy but offers no specific support on the means or scope of religious policies.

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

“There was more continuity than change in the domestic policies of Maria Theresa and Joseph II”.

How valid is this view? (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 central aspects in the specification and a range of policies may be deployed in the assessment. All of the sources give candidates leads into answering the question: Source A supports change in the contrast of Maria Theresa’s conservatism and Joseph’s radicalism, but perhaps continuity in “the desire to control everything” and the highlighting of her political skills indicates reasons for her success and his failures; Source B supports Joseph’s radicalism and implies a major shift from his mother’s policies, but also Joseph’s success in this area; Source C, however, supports continuity in dealing with Church privilege and indicates that Maria Theresa was also willing to undertake radical reform; Source D focus is on the failure occasioned by Joseph’s idealism

implies change from Maria Theresa's successful pragmatism. The sources should be integrated with own knowledge to attain the higher levels of award.

Arguments to support continuity might include: their shared commitment to strengthening their authority, to the efficiency of the administration and the need to improve Crown finance; the shared awareness of the need to counter Prussia as a motive for military and economic reform; Maria Theresa's willingness to scrutinise seigneurial authority can be seen as forerunner to Joseph's more radical policies and both saw a contented peasantry would be more productive and better taxpayers; their shared willingness to tax the Church; legal reform; education. Arguments to challenge continuity might include: Joseph's commitment to more radical enlightened ideas such as religious toleration, the abolition of censorship, meritocracy and utilitarianism; his determination to deal with the non-hereditary lands, especially Hungary.

Clearly Joseph II was less successful than his mother in avoiding confrontation with the nobility and the non-hereditary lands, and in his administrative changes, but he can be argued to have changed policies, and been more successful, in several areas, e.g. education, religious policy, abolishing serfdom. A conclusion might be that Joseph did continue major aspects of his mother's successful policies but tried to introduce major change with some social and provincial policies/areas. These aspects might also be argued as continuity of his mother's aims in policies but proved less effective with his departures from her *festina lente* approach. Some candidates might address change and/ or continuity within each ruler's policies.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited consideration of few policies or deploy quotes from the sources in assertive responses. Level 2 answers will show awareness of the focus of the question and consider some range of both rulers' policies based on the sources OR from own knowledge. Alternatively they will indicate a wider range on both aspects of the question, making use of the sources, but will lack depth and balance. At Level 3 from both sources and own knowledge, there must be clear evidence that the candidate is discussing both change and continuity in a good range of policies. At Level 4 in addition the statement will 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 reached.