



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative C Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

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

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

The 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 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 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.

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) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

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

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

Level 1:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

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

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

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

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

C: 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.

June 2007

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

A2 Unit 4: Monarchy in the Age of Enlightenment

Question 1

(a) Use **Source B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** in explaining the extent to which Louis XV and Louis XVI were able to assert the absolute power of the monarchy? (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 might be restricted to simple statements and brief points in which the sources agree or disagree, e.g. that both sources illustrate the opposition Parlement offered to royal authority, or that Source B portrays the king as being in the right, whereas Source C suggests it is Parlement. Level 2 responses will examine the sources more thoroughly and will also show some limited knowledge, e.g. in Source B reference to Divine Right by Louis XV and very fact he made the speech at all illustrates his continued attempts to protect an increasingly outdated concept of royal authority. Source C, however, suggests that just ten years later Parlement attempts to constrain the monarch by concepts of natural justice and a power superior to the crown. By Level 3 candidates will support such points with much sounder knowledge of events, e.g. the context of the flagellation speech as an example of Louis XV attempting to limit the claims of Parlements to unity but that within two years Parlement was again presenting remonstrances on the Brittany affair and thus implicitly asserting the unity of all parlements to the detriment of sovereign authority. Source C is perhaps evidence of the self-interest of Parlement, but more than that their increasing power and identity. Louis XV had effectively exiled the Parlements in 1771, only for Louis XVI to allow them to return to office and to block effective reform. By Level 4 there will be a critical approach and probably an attempt to assess other areas in which the authority of the monarchy was/was not asserted, however, this will not be a narrative approach. Candidates will use the sources to assess the extent of royal authority and may consider omissions, e.g. opposition from other privileged groups but they will arrive at a judgement clearly related to the issue.

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

'It was the failure of the monarchs and of the Regent, the Duke of Orleans, to support reform that was the main cause of the crisis for the French monarchy.'

Assess the validity of this view of 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.

Attainment of higher grades will require candidates to consider a range of issues across the whole period, although most initial focus will consider the extent to which the monarchs had the inclination and the ability to support reform. Source A suggests that Louis XIV was willing to offer support to his ministers, and that he perhaps of all monarchs had the authority to implement reform if he so desired. However, the suggestion in Source A that Louis XV was indifferent to government and in fact succumbed to factionalism seems to prove the premise of the question. Source B, however, contradicts such a view and shows Louis XV willing to protect his authority. Source C might be used to illustrate the reforming nature of Louis XVI, especially if the context is considered, and also suggest that opposition from Parlement and the privileged was a far greater cause for crisis in this period. Source D however suggests that Louis XVI tried to reform too much and lacked application to a consistent principle. This might be used in

conjunction with Source A and to suggest that both Louis XV and Louis XVI failed to support reform and reversed policy at will. Source B and C then illustrates the consistency in this period was actually offered by the opposition of privileged groups and especially Parlement.

Own knowledge can quite clearly be used to develop the nature of reform. The fact that Turgot's six Edicts were a major financial reform might be used to prove the monarchy's commitment to change, but candidates will probably refer to Turgot's subsequent dismissal as evidence of the Crown's and especially Louis XVI's susceptibility to public clamour. Both Louis XV and Louis XVI failed to support reforming ministers such as Machault, Turgot, Calonne and Brienne. Ultimately Louis XVI was happy to settle for a finance minister, Necker, who openly admitted to having no programme of reform at all and regarded himself as a caretaker until the Estates Generals met. Possibly the failure of Law's Systeme under Orleans crippled any possibility of major financial change, and even quite apparently radical change such as the return of pre-registration remonstrance under the regent was simply an attempt to restore or maintain the status quo. The inactivity under Fleury certainly balanced the books but perhaps left the underlying problems unresolved. Louis XV seemed relatively uninterested in this early period in taking the reins of government. The development of enlightened thought might be evidence of an undermining in the notion of divine right and consequently the ability of the monarchs to justify any claim to speak for the new concept of 'nation'. However, more sophisticated answers might suggest that it was the privileged groups that used the language of the enlightenment and natural justice, but actually stood as the greatest obstacle to reform; hence privilege was a major cause of the crisis. Moreover, it was not the lack of reform but the very fact that increasingly ministers felt unwilling to upset the factionalised court, or that preferment actually came from closeness to favourites rather than effectiveness of ideas for reform that caused the stagnation at court. However, crisis was certainly not a term relevant to the political situation across the whole period and even monarchs that sought to pre-empt any crisis, such as Louis XIV in his Will, found it difficult to get the support from Parlement or even the regents/ministers. In addition, it may well be argued that financial problems hindered any substantial reform, and that in part this was due to excessive expenditure in war, but also might consider the opposition of privileged groups such as that against Law's Systeme.

Level 1 answers will provide limited generalisation on a limited aspect of the question or will simply quote from the sources. Level 2 answers will attempt to cover a wider period or number of factors, although by no means a comprehensive range. Narrative answers are likely to be limited with a reign by reign focus, although there may be some implicit understanding of the analytical demands. By Level 3 responses will cover the full 100 year period, although not necessarily with balance. There may be some attempt to consider other factors. At Level 4 there will be consideration of some range of factors with sound support from both sources and knowledge, perhaps with some challenge to the question. At Level 5 there will be sustained judgement across the entire period and a range of factors, there will be a clear engagement to the focus of the question leading to a consistently relevant approach.

Section B

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

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

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

Or

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

L2: *Either*

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Question 2

'Frederick II had no desire to reform the systems of government and of justice that he had inherited in 1740.'

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

How great Frederick's domestic achievements were remains an area of considerable debate with an increasing tendency to credit his father's earlier reforms for many of the improvements that occurred under Frederick II. This question allows candidates to analyse the condition of Prussian government on Frederick's accession, the depth of his reforms and possibly motivation as well within a manageable topic area. Candidates aiming for the higher grades will assess whether reform of the stipulated areas did take place, and reasons why it did/did not.

Superficially it appears that Frederick II made few changes to the system of government established by his father. The fact the system worked well when Frederick was on campaign proved it needed little reform. However, although no changes were made in the formal structure, i.e. the General Directory, War and Domains Chamber, estates bodies etc, change did take place in the practice of government. Frederick II ensured the General Directory met only once a year, and that most of his work with it was carried out by formal correspondence. This ensured the Directory became much less cohesive and gave Frederick the ability to enact decisions quicker. In addition Frederick created new ministries, Army (1746), Silesian Affairs (1742), Commerce (1741) all of which stood outside the authority of the General Directory. At a local level, Frederick continued to use the Civil Service largely developed by his father. Frederick certainly gave close personal attention to it, often interviewing candidates himself. However, there is evidence he distrusted it – the use of Fiscals, for example, or of arbitrary arrest – but again this might be seen as efforts to perfect a system that had already been instigated. Possibly Frederick's individual involvement actually hindered the development of an independent and effective civil service. Frederick's legal reforms were again largely based on the work initiated before, and most obviously includes the codification of the law under von Cocceji, which was not in fact finally completed until 1794, after Frederick had died. This Prussian General Code did give the provinces a common legal structure for the first time; judges were to be salaried and had to pass exams with further promotion based on merit. The legal system was simplified and the system of appeals improved. This system was far from perfect and did not create equality before the law, but it did help to unify the Prussian state. Hence there is much evidence to suggest that here there were major reforms; however there must be some debate as to the credit Frederick can be given for continuing reforms already initiated – certainly Cocceji was one of the few officials trusted by Frederick and given considerable freedom of action. However, it might well be argued that military crises during the Seven Years War and his territorial conquests were the reason for genuine reform from Frederick although despite his apparently enlightened credentials, there was little genuine commitment to the abstract concept of reform.

Level 1 answers will be limited accounts of a small number of policies with assertion on depth of reform. Level 2 answers will offer a greater range of policies and some slight attempt at assessment but this will not be well defined. Where an analytical response is attempted it will have a limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on one aspect of the question. Level 3 answers will show definite analysis. There will be a clear attempt to define reasons for change or lack of it and the degree of Frederick's commitment to those changes, although there will still be some excessive focus on one of the topic areas. Level 4 answers will offer more balance across both of the topics and will offer some assessment of whether Frederick was content with his inheritance and whether he introduced major change. By Level 5 there will be sustained judgement based on a wide selection of material and leading to a valid and supported judgement.

Question 3

'Frederick II's success in foreign policy between 1740 and 1763 was more the result of the weakness of his enemies rather than of his own military power.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This question gives candidates the opportunity to establish reasons for foreign policy success within a period and topic restraint narrow enough to allow for sufficient depth of supporting material. Candidates should assess Frederick's abilities across the period combined with some consideration of degree of success. Considering Frederick's apparently enlightened attitude and the lack of obvious or historical claim, the Silesian wars might be considered to have been an act of extreme opportunism exploiting as they did a predictable, but nonetheless damaging succession crisis in Austria; here candidates might identify other factors likely to have contributed to success. Moreover, there is much to be said of his apparent inability to support his allies, e.g. Treaty of Klein-Schnellendorf 1741 effectively left his allies in the lurch, as did the Peace of Breslau in July 1742. The second Silesian War 1744–1745 might again be seen as opportunistic, although some candidates may suggest that Hohenfriedberg illustrates some other reasons for success – military prowess and fortune. The battle at Soor, 30 September 1745 was one won against the odds largely because of the re-organised Prussian cavalry, and might be seen as clear evidence of military power.

The Seven Years War certainly provides evidence of improvisation, and to some extent was a war for Prussian survival. Better candidates will be able to assess the degree to which this improvisation accounts for Frederick's survival and the maintenance of Prussia's greater power status. By this stage Frederick's foreign policy aims had shifted to include the retention of Silesia and this may be established as a consistent theme to the period 1756–1763, yet despite the range of powers against him, Frederick saw the opportunity to enact plans to seize Saxony. The full range of factors that explain Frederick's survival might include the disunity of the allies, the failure to follow up on military victory, e.g. Russia's failure to capitalise on Kunersdorf 1759 and march on Berlin, and the role of luck including the change in government in Britain and the accession of Peter III in Russia, all of which can be used as evidence of the weakness of his enemies. The superior administrative structure and military machine of Prussia ensured other

powers would feel a greater degree of exhaustion. Conclusion might be that despite being an opportunist, this was the very mark of greatness of Frederick – he fought short sharp campaigns and battles that were highly successful, e.g. Rossbach, he took advantage of the weaknesses of his enemies or potential enemies but in so doing ensured success. Many candidates might conclude that both factors were of considerable importance and that, in fact, it was opportunism combined with a panoply of other factors that ensured success; success being counted in the retention of Silesia and survival as a great power.

Level 1 answers are likely to be simple assertions of success and limited account of events, possibly the Silesian Wars of Seven Years War. Level 2 responses will be narrative but with greater depth although still with little balance either across the period or in considering both factors. Where analytical, answers will have a limited range with only a slight attempt to assess the degree of success. At Level 3 there will be much more definite analysis across both factors, although there may still be imbalance either between Silesian and Seven Years War or between considerations of weakness of enemies or military power. By Level 4 there will be greater balance with a clear evaluation of other factors affecting foreign policy success and across the full period set by the question. At Level 5 argument will be used to reach a reasoned conclusion based on a wide range of material.

Question 4

‘Frederick II showed that he was committed to the ideas of the Enlightenment both as an individual and as a ruler.’

How far do you agree with this statement?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This allows candidates the opportunity to assess Frederick II's commitment to the Enlightenment both as an individual and as a ruler. That Frederick possessed enlightened credentials is probably quite easy to prove; he certainly had a good reputation in Europe fostered in part by his correspondence with Voltaire, love and patronage of music, art, his library at Rheinsberg etc. His writings and obviously the anti-Machiavel and political testaments of 1752 and 1768, and Sans Souci might be used as more tangible supporting evidence for him at least believing at some stage in enlightened principles, although candidates might question how sincerely these were held once Frederick was in a position to implement them. Frederick's attitude to the church might appear much in keeping with enlightened principles but he failed to issue patents of Toleration, and probably simply continued the general policy of indifference of his predecessors, indeed in 1777 'Essay on Forms of Govt.', Frederick clearly associates toleration as a policy advantageous to the state, rather than an abstract philosophical principal. In legal matters he did abolish torture in most cases, and it might be argued his attempts to codify the laws were based on the principles of Montesquieu. Economically Frederick seems unaffected by physiocratic ideals and actually advocated mercantilism rather than free trade. However, there were developments in internal trade and moves towards a better distribution of taxation. His political testaments in this light can be seen as a statement of the principles of absolute monarchy rather than a blueprint for enlightened rule. Frederick supported and

extended noble influence and inequality and did little to help the serfs, although some candidates may argue on crown lands the burden of serf labour was reduced from six to three days, however, compulsory primary education was introduced, hence he acted out of enlightened principles when circumstances permitted. Enlightenment in Prussia was an excuse for the strengthening of the state and modernization and not the fulfillment of ideals Frederick may have advocated in youth.

Answers at Level 1 will probably offer simple assertions about whether Frederick was enlightened or a vague description of a limited policy area. Level 2 answers will offer a wider range of evidence and link this to the question in a basic manner, there may be some attempt to consider arguments for and against the statement but there will be very little balance. Answers that are descriptive will examine a greater range with some valid links to the question. By Level 3 there will be a much more analytical approach and considering reasons to support and oppose the statement but this may still be one sided, yet it will be supported with evidence. At Level 4 there will be a confident analysis of both sides, and a consideration of arguments in favour and against Frederick's enlightened principles, a greater range of the argument, i.e. did he hold enlightened principles, did he implement them in several areas. Some candidates may suggest that Frederick certainly wanted to be praised but that this does not necessarily imply an element of dishonesty, and that moreover Frederick II's attitude to the enlightenment changed through the course of his reign. At Level 5 judgment will be made appropriate to the demands of the question, with a confident analysis of a range of relevant factors.

Question 5

'In her foreign policy, in relation to Poland and Turkey, Catherine II was an opportunist.'
How far do you agree with this statement? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This question allows candidates to consider a common criticism of Catherine's foreign policy and one that is covered in a number of monographs. To prove or disprove the statement there should clearly be some discussion as to the nature of foreign policy objectives during her reign, whose objectives they were and the degree to which those objectives were realised. It is entirely possible to also claim that she had consistent objectives but was opportunistic in their realisation.

Catherine's policy towards Turkey might well be considered much more consistent, being a continuation of some long-standing Russian objectives and especially the acquisition of a presence on the Black Sea and a stabilisation of the Crimea. However, it was aggression from the Turks that brought the first conflict and encouragement from other great powers such as France and Austria. Catherine's military leaders managed some great military victories which she was keen to gain credit for, such as Chesme 1770; however like her land victories it was not followed up. Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainardzhi does represent the realisation of Russian ambitions consistently held, but was followed up by Catherine's own and much vaguer schemes such as the 'Greek Project' – although this should be put into the context of maintaining the objectives of 1774: the peace of Jassy (1792) confirmed most of the gains acquired in Turkey

including Russian sovereignty over the Crimea, and dominance in the Black Sea, although such gains relied to a great extent on the increasing frailty of the Turkish Empire rather than Catherine's consistency of purpose. It is much easier to claim evidence of unplanned expediency in her Polish policy. There were long standing objectives – possibly the acquisition of a buffer state, and certainly continued Russian involvement in Polish domestic affairs – but she did eventually surrender control over the entire state for sovereignty over some parts. Partitions might be seen in light of Turkish adventure and need to secure at least one border – but partitions themselves were not part of a consistent objective and some were at the instigation of Frederick II. Some candidates may make effective comments on differences between the partitions. Moreover, the partitions did damage to her enlightened reputation despite an attempt to justify action on grounds of religious toleration; possibility of considering Austria and especially Prussia benefiting more from a certain naivety on the part of Catherine. If success is assessed by degree of territorial expansion then she did achieve – Russia's territorial expansion had been the greatest since Ivan IV, but this can hardly be considered the sole objective of her reign, although it was consistently held.

Answers at Level 1 will be limited accounts of foreign policy, lacking range and probably focused on just one theatre, with assertion on success or objectives. Level 2 answers will be a more detailed account of policy towards both states, but not with balance. However, there will be some attempt to engage the assumption of the statement. Level 3 answers will clearly focus on the demands of the question with a wider range and some consideration of consistency of purpose. Level 4 responses will be much more balanced across both Turkey and Poland and will be consistently analytical with some awareness of links between the two areas. By Level 5, conclusions will be drawn related both to objectives and achievements and supported by a wide range of precisely selected material.

Question 6

To what extent did Catherine II's domestic policies increase the influence of the nobility whilst reducing the authority of the Crown? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This question allows candidates to examine the extent to which Catherine was susceptible to pressure from the nobility and the degree to which this led to observable consequences within a defined topic area. That Catherine relied upon support from the nobility during the first years of her reign is evident; she seized power. However, the degree to which she was able to wrest herself free from such obligation and the extent to which the noble power increased throughout the reign is open to question. The Manifesto of 1762 had freed nobles from a requirement to serve the state, hence it is reasonable to argue Catherine's reign began with an increasingly confident nobility, and that as commonly suggested this augured well for a 'golden age' for the nobility. The fact that the issue of serfdom was removed from the Instruction to the Legislative Commission might possibly be suggested as evidence of an increasing awareness of the need for noble support in the effective governance of Russia. In 1765 nobles were granted the right to sentence serfs without reference to a court, and noble hold over serfs seems to have increased. Catherine did grant a number of concessions that seemed to mark not only the

nobles' ability to influence Catherine but also extend their influence throughout Russia. This is most evident in the 1785 Charter to the Nobility which agreed protection of titles, noble tax exemption, immunity from arbitrary arrest, trial by peers, freedom to trade abroad, and a confirmation that their state service was voluntary. The nobles were now also allowed to petition provincial governors over grievances and to control local affairs through assemblies. This increased the noble ability to influence Crown affairs and especially those in the provinces. However, it might be argued such apparently large concessions were nothing of the sort. The only way for noble advancement was still through service to the state and in the provinces control remained firmly in the hands of the governor who was a crown appointee. Even the freedom from arbitrary arrest was illusory, and many of these apparent concessions were in fact little more than a confirmation of rights already acknowledged by Peter III in 1762. Catherine might be credited with playing an astute game, creating the impression of concession whilst using the nobility's consequent compliance as a means of actually extending her authority and stabilising her position on the throne.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of a very restricted view of domestic policy with little link to the question and the issue of authority. There may be simple assertion on whether Catherine or the nobles benefited most. Level 2 responses will attempt to link to the question and will offer some attempt at an analytical response but with little support or will offer a greater narrative range but no analysis. Level 3 answers will use a wider range of material and will attempt to consider the influence of the nobility and the authority of the crown, but there will be little effective balance and excessive concentration on one of these factors. Level 4 answers will offer much better balance and will look for reasons to agree and disagree with the question based on clear criteria. There will be a good use of supporting material across a wider range of domestic policy. Level 5 answers will be as at Level 4 but offer sustained judgement which draws to a conclusion about the degree of noble influence and crown authority within the reign.

Question 7

'Catherine II showed that she was committed to the ideas of Enlightenment both as an individual and as a ruler.'

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

Candidates should be able to consider the extent to which Catherine had a commitment to the principles of the Enlightenment and also what practical effect this had during her reign as a means of proving her commitment as a ruler. Good responses will need to establish an effective definition of enlightened principles and a determination of degree of commitment and consequent success. A range of policies may be examined, and most obviously Catherine's policy to the serfs, education, the economy and religion. The Legislative Assembly and Nakaz might show Catherine's early ideological opposition to serfdom, although the Nakaz had no legal validity and might rather be considered an attempt to placate potential opponents, or an exercise in self-publicity for a domestic or foreign audience. However, suggestions of limiting serfdom would have done little to appease the nobility who presumably represented a considerable threat to a woman who had seized power and so many candidates might suggest

this was one of the few occasions in which Catherine displayed her true enlightened principles as an individual and also her naivety. Despite early hope, Catherine seems to have done little to ameliorate the condition of the serfs; despite instigating the famous essay competition of 1765, the condition of the serfs in practical terms may actually have worsened. Serfs continued to pay the most tax, suffer the burden of conscription more than any other group, and had no means of legal opposition to the crown. Catherine made no attempt to limit their labour services or their sale; 800 000 crown serfs were granted to Catherine's favourites and the annexation of new land extended the reach of serfdom. 1765 nobles were allowed to sentence serfs without reference to a court. Pugachev's revolt possibly illustrates the depth of discontent possibly fuelled by false hopes encouraged by Catherine's apparent commitment as an individual.

Education superficially seems to have had more success; free state education established by 1786, education for females – Smolny institute; first college of medicine 1763, teacher training college, 1783. But education was not compulsory; only 2% of state expenditure went on education, serfs could not leave the land to attend school, and only 300 schools were established by the end of her reign, almost entirely middle class and potential bureaucrats. Free enlightened thought was not perhaps the motive, possibly her intentions were thwarted by circumstance especially as parents reluctant to allow children to leave the land. Relaxation in censorship and consequent explosion in seditious literature, in some cases encouraged by Catherine, is difficult to justify although by end of reign this trend was firmly reversed.

Economically there seems an adherence to physiocratic principles and there was an increase of 80 million roubles in foreign trade, although this was mainly in raw materials. She did reduce the salt tax and the duties on luxury imports declined from 200% to 20%; she established the free trade society and abolished state sales monopolies. Possibly then this is proof of enlightened ideas and wider benefits for her population once Empress, although she did increase the poll tax and failed to attack noble privilege.

Level 1 responses will be limited accounts of some aspect of Catherine's policy with assertion on motivation. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a wider range of policies with some slight attempt to focus on the question. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will lack support and will deploy a very limited definition of enlightenment. Level 3 answers will be much more analytical and will examine a range of policies, although they may well be unbalanced. There will probably be an attempt to define some criteria for assessing commitment to Enlightened principles once ruler. At Level 4 there will be more balance, and will consider depth of commitment, with possible other factors behind her apparently Enlightened reforms. There will also be sound support and some challenge to the question leading to judgement which may be limited in scope. There will be consideration of Catherine as ruler and as individual. By Level 5 answers will offer a sustained, substantiated judgement based on a wide range of evidence.

Question 8

'It was Rousseau rather than Montesquieu or Voltaire who showed the greatest opposition to the concept of absolute monarchy.'

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

An ability to both assess the writing of the three as individuals and to compare degree of similarity and difference will enable access to the higher grades. Initial analysis might suggest the statement to be true. Weaker candidates might focus on vague assertions such as 'Man is born free but is everywhere in chains' and stronger responses might consider the Social Contract and the General Will as further evidence of Rousseau's opposition to absolute monarchy. Indeed, he seems to have advocated direct participation of all citizens in government. However, that this was an impractical suggestion outside of Geneva led to his rejection of democracy as merely a means for individuals to give up their rights to another. That Rousseau's concept of the General Will caused problems might be used as further evidence of his belief in strong government. The idea that the General Will could force men to comply and do what a ruler sees best for them seems similar to absolute monarchy, as do Rousseau's ideas about state involvement in education, although notions of child-centred education might be seen to have mere accord with abstracted enlightened ideals. However, he had given a justification for democracy which may be seen as more than Voltaire or Montesquieu. Montesquieu *Spirit of the Laws* did challenge absolutism as it 'all too often led to despotism and rule by fear'. Indeed Montesquieu advocated mixed monarchy as the better form of government based on what he thought happened in Britain. His further advocacy of separation of the powers was an obvious blow to the concept of the enlightened monarch. It is perfectly feasible to argue that Montesquieu presented the more optimistic and workable alternative to absolute monarchy. However, it is certainly easier to argue Voltaire's support for absolute monarchy. His rejection of naïve faith in the goodness of man, writings in support of monarchs such as Louis XIV, and statements about his fear of the masses might all be used as evidence. He advocated an education system but one run by the state and certainly not involving the poor. However, Voltaire was no supporter of despotism and only supported the ruler he considered capable and suited to absolute rule.

Level 1 answers are likely to be vague description of a very limited range with assertion on degree of opposition. At Level 2 there is likely to be a wider range of writings and/or individuals considered, with slight links to the focus of the question. Analytical answers will lack depth in evidence and balance across the individuals. By Level 3, answers will be analytical with a clear attempt to assess a number of ideas in terms of how they might be used to support or oppose the concept of absolute monarchy, although there may still be lack of balance. Level 4 answers will, in addition, examine all writers in terms of how their writings opposed absolutist monarchy leading to a valid conclusion based on the demands of the question. At Level 5 sustained judgement will lead to a substantiated conclusion based on a range of evidence across all three individuals.

Question 9

'They clearly wanted to introduce the ideas of the Enlightenment.'
How far is this a valid statement 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

This question enables candidates to question the commitment of the two monarchs to the concepts of the Enlightenment and as such is central to the specification. High levels will be accessed by considering both their desire to introduce reform and reasons why such reforms were not introduced. Initial focus might well be on the extent to which the monarchs had a genuine inclination to enlightened reform. Both the early life of Frederick and that of Catherine might be used to illustrate an apparent desire to reform; the time at Rheinsberg, the extensive reading of both monarchs, the private correspondence, financial support of the philosophes, building of theatre and opera houses. Further evidence of genuine commitment might be found in the Anti-Machiavel and the Nakaz, and the fact that the philosophes continued to welcome the actions of these supposed enlightened rulers, e.g. the partition of Poland. Some analysis may be given of areas in which enlightened reforms did apparently occur, e.g. in education, although this might be considered constrained by a fear of political unrest as education was always limited and in some degree directed to training a better bureaucracy. Concern over the sway of the nobility and certainly the circumstances by which Catherine came to power influenced policy. The failure to abolish serfdom is a recognition of political reality which may be mentioned. Certainly the nobility's importance in ruling the provinces combined with the size of the country was a very important consideration for Catherine, although Frederick II may have had less concern and seems to have actively sought to divert power away from the nobles and systems of government prevalent under his father. Such a programme of centralisation, dictated by military needs and a strong foreign policy illustrates Frederick's desire to extend authority which may have triumphed over any Enlightened principles, although he made fewer concessions to the nobility. Ultimately the philosophes might be seen as idealists, and it was inevitable that monarchs would pick and choose those ideas that were possible, not simply accept all without discretion. It might be argued that the rulers themselves would have argued that reform was only possible in the absence of fear of unrest – the Pugachev Revolt illustrated the need even some way into Catherine's reign, to control firmly and that measures such as the abolition of serfdom would simply lead to further unrest. Consequently both monarchs wanted to introduce the ideas but were constrained by circumstance, or alternatively were exceptionally good at giving the impression of reform as a political tool when it suited them.

Answers at Level 1 will give limited descriptions of some area of policy with very basic links and assertions on Enlightened ideas. Level 2 answers will be narrative and focus predominately on one of the two rulers, there will be some attempt to link to the question but with limited support. Level 3 answers will have much more of an analytical focus and will attempt to address the rulers' commitment to enlightened reform and the degree to which this was constrained by political and/or other circumstance. At Level 4 answers will use a wide range of material balanced across the monarchs and issues, although judgement may still be implicit and partial. At Level 5 there will be a sustained argument leading to a reasoned conclusion.

Question 10

To what extent did **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II use the ideas of the Enlightenment to benefit the people of their states? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This question allows candidates to question the commitment of the monarchs and the benefit that the ideas of the enlightenment brought to 'the people'. Evidence of increasing enlightened principles might come from the correspondence and close personal relationship with the philosophes and the mutual desire to court each others company. Both monarchs fostered an image abroad of enlightened absolutism, and both acquired the support of the philosophes for various domestic and especially foreign policy ventures. Frederick's partition of Poland and Catherine's wars against Turkey are obvious examples of exploits that attracted the praise of some philosophes, although it is questionable what benefits such actions brought to their people. Indeed, Catherine used Voltaire to improve the image of the Russian monarchy abroad, even justifying the murder of her husband, Peter III. However, it might be argued that such measures had more to do with long-term objectives or national security and would have been carried out equally as enthusiastically without philosophe support. Praise for religious toleration, education policies and economic reform all enhanced prestige and can reasonably be argued to have had a beneficial impact on at least some of their subjects. However, a desire for the resulting acclamation was in part a measure of their feeling of security on the throne. Certain measures such as the Nakaz might be considered more an effort to increase respect abroad and legitimise rule rather than a programme of domestic reform of positive benefit. Certainly Catherine II might be argued to have actually extended serfdom during her reign rather than worked towards its abolition. Equally, some measures of reform were quite superficial in outcome. Education policy in both states was an improvement but can hardly be said to have benefited the whole population, and anyway mainly affected the middle-class town dwellers. Such programmes of education attracted positive commentary, but was not really about allowing independence or free thought. Relaxation of censorship again brought plaudits but was quickly reversed and was in many cases still carefully managed. Administrative reforms as efforts of rational centralisation served to increase the ruler's prestige as much as benefit the subjects' well-being. Yet there should be some recognition that even reforms that were superficial were reforms none the less, and it is hard to deny that religious toleration for example, despite Frederick II never issuing an Edict of Toleration, did improve the lives of many subjects in both states. More impressive responses might recognise that reforms that benefited the people did not necessarily benefit all equally, and also reforms that were not motivated out of an enlightened ethos might well still prove of benefit to the monarch's subjects.

Answers at Level 1 will consist of bland assertion on an area of the question; there will be limited description of some areas of policy. At Level 2, answers will consist of more detailed descriptions of the ruler's policies. Alternatively there may be some effort to analyse motivation or benefit but this will be limited with little supporting material. Level 3 answers will examine a broader range of policies across both of the rulers and will attempt to suggest a range of motivating factors behind reforms, however the answer may still lack balance. Level 4 responses will analyse with much more focus on the question and will be broadly balanced offering some comparison between the rulers and an analysis of degree or benefit. By Level 5

there will be consistent analysis leading to a reasoned conclusion on the degree to which the enlightenment was used to benefit the people rather than, for example, enhance their own prestige.