



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative D Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS 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 AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS 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 AS.

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 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: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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 2008

Alternative D: Revolution, Conservatism and Nationalism in Europe, 1789–1914

AS Unit 1: Revolution and Conservatism in France and Europe, 1789–1825

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of the ‘privileges’ (line 9) in the context of the French Revolution in 1789. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the nobles enjoyed special rights under the *ancien regime* which the revolutionaries wanted to overturn. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. privileged position in law, exemption from the *corvee royale* (forced labour on the roads, exemption from the *taille* and *gabelle* etc.. Privileges were an important point of conflict and they were overturned by the August Decrees and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen in 1789. 2-3

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

Explain how **Source B** challenges the views expressed in **Source A** about the impact of the Revolution on French society. (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: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. both sources agree that the bourgeoisie benefitted from the Revolution. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. Source A claims that only the bourgeoisie benefitted, whilst Source B states that the nobility were in a better position to benefit from the reforms of the Constituent Assembly due to their wealth and education. Source A argues that the bourgeoisie benefitted at the expense of the nobility, whereas Source B claims that the nobility lost their privileges yet gained ‘wealth and political power’. Own knowledge could include reference to the numbers of nobility who emigrated from France which left a small number who positively benefitted from the Revolution up until the period of the Terror. 3-5
-

L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source C, e.g. Source A and Source B agree that the major winners socially from the Revolution were the bourgeoisie at the expense of the lower ranks in society, the workers and peasantry. Conclusions can be drawn about the changes in society over time. Both of the sources refer to the more moderate early phase of the revolution and ignore the impact of the period of the Terror where anybody, irregardless of rank could become a victim. During the Terror the *sans-culottes* briefly increased their social and political status, most notably through the introduction of the General Maximum. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the reforms of the Constituent Assembly, in relation to other factors, in explaining the political changes in France in the years 1789 to 1794.

(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: **Either**

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

Or

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

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, 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

Responses need to consider how and why France changed politically during the years 1789 to 1794. The importance of the Constituent Assembly's reforms in bringing about political changes during the more moderate stages of the Revolution 1789–1792 needs to be balanced against the more radical stage of the period of the Terror 1793–1794.

Evidence from the sources:

Source A – Reforms mentioned include careers open to talent and the revised voting system. All of the Revolution's leader's posts 1791 were from the bourgeoisie. 'Workers and peasants benefitted little', 'bourgeoisie were its main beneficiaries'.

Source B – Refers to the creation of a meritocracy, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen and the loss of noble privileges. Argues that both the bourgeoisie and the nobility benefited from the reforms of the Constituent Assembly due to their education and wealth.

Source C – States that the period of the Terror allowed for great male social mobility 'transfer of political influence from the upper to the lower ranks'.

Arguments for the importance of the Constituent Assembly's reforms

It can be argued that the most important political changes to France took place before 1793 and were implemented by the Constituent Assembly as argued in Source A. The Constituent Assembly restructured local government, brought uniformity to the legal system, and drew up the Constitution of 1791, which transformed France from an absolute to a constitutional monarchy. The period of the Terror reintroduced political elements of the *ancien regime* and reversed the gains of 1789, e.g. centralised political power, authoritarian rather than democratic.

Arguments against the importance of the Constituent Assembly's reforms

The Terror represented the most radical stage of the Revolution. It allowed for a great deal of social and political change, men rose 'from obscurity to positions of power and authority' (Source C). Politically, the period of the Terror introduced the Law of 4 December, which centralised political power in the hands of the CGS and CPS, giving France her first strong government since 1787. The *sans-culottes* also made significant political gains during the period of the Terror, the right of insurrection was guaranteed in the Constitution of 1793 and all adult males were granted the vote.

It can also be argued that it was the actions of the Parisian crowd in 1789, especially at the Bastille and during the October days, which secured the gains of the Revolution. The actions of the king can also be considered, e.g. his flight to Varennes in 1791, which brought about the most significant political change, that of monarchy to republic. The declaration of war against Austria can also be considered as the key turning point for political changes as it was the war which promoted the use of Terror to save the revolution from internal and external enemies

At Level 1, candidates will make assertions about the importance of the Constituent Assembly in bringing about political changes. Level 2 answers will either describe some of the political changes that happened in France without linking to events that caused those changes or they will attempt an argument about the key reasons for political changes with little secure supporting evidence. At Level 3, political changes will be linked to the reforms of the Constituent Assembly and at least one other factor causing change, but not necessarily in any depth. At Level 4 the reforms of the Constituent Assembly should be ranged against at least one other factor and linked securely to political changes in France. At Level 5, answers should demonstrate judgement about the importance of the reforms of the Constituent Assembly against a range of other factors which caused political changes in France during the Revolution.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Consul' (line 1) in the context of Napoleon's rule. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the position of Consul allowed Napoleon to establish authoritarian personal rule. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the term Consul refers to a position of political authority which was created after the coup of 1799. The Law of Brumaire established a new government where three Consuls (Napoleon, Sieyes and Ducos) would share political authority. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Napoleon was made Emperor in 1804. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Napoleon's personal ambition, he increased his position of power through the role of the First Consul (without specifically explaining how). **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. as First Consul Napoleon manipulated political power and established the path to authoritarian personal rule under the guise of Emperor. He argued that the two other Consuls should only have an advisory role, and packed the Council of State and Senate with personal supporters. Plebiscites were used to demonstrate public support for Napoleon's personal power and the political changes he implemented, e.g. 1802 following the plebiscite Napoleon was made Consul for life with the right to nominate his own successor. Napoleon's personal ambition meant that he enjoyed the trappings of 'royal' 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. answers which demonstrate an understanding of the political situation in 1804 and the immediate reasons why Napoleon was made Emperor are clearly Level 3, however this is not a prerequisite for awarding Level 3. In 1804 Napoleon faced opposition from émigrés and royalists and there was an assassination scare as the Duc d'Enghien was accused of trying to murder Napoleon. Napoleon's loyal supporters in the Senate argued that he should be declared Emperor with a hereditary title. This was approved by plebiscite. **6-7**

- (c) 'Napoleon's domestic reforms restored many aspects of the *ancien régime* to France.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

The central theme of responses should be the debate about the extent to which Napoleon was a reformer, revolutionary or reactionary. Effective responses will examine Napoleon's domestic reforms and their impact on France and come to the conclusion that Napoleon was neither a reactionary or a reformer, but an opportunist who used aspects of the Revolution and the *ancien régime* to maintain support and further his authoritarian rule.

Evidence to support the statement

Napoleon's domestic policy was in many areas a reversion to some of the practices of the *ancien régime*. The people of France were referred to as 'subjects' not 'citizens' and did not have any democratic rights or political freedom of choice because Napoleon created a dictatorship. The Council of State was a revival of the old Royal Council (but under a more acceptable name). The reintroduction of the hereditary title basically made the Consulate into a monarchy, whilst the 1804 coronation had all the pomp and ceremony of the *ancien régime*. The Concordat ensured that the Catholic Church was a pillar of the Napoleonic regime. The provincial administration was once again centralised as it had been under the Bourbons and the Prefects were often likened to the *intendants*. Napoleon abandoned the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the Napoleonic Code was authoritarian in practice and the rights of women were ignored. Educational reforms and the Legion of Honour reinstated social inequality and patronage, whilst the burden of taxation was shifted onto the poor due to the rises in indirect taxation.

Evidence against the statement

It can be argued that Napoleon's rule had little in common with the *ancien régime*. Napoleon's ideas and reform laid the administrative foundations of a modern France, with its enormous power over the lives of the individual and the ability to decide the fate of the local community, was a far cry from the chaotic government of the Bourbons. The Napoleonic Code completed the codification of the law begun by the Convention and the Directory. The Code simplified and unified the laws of France. The basic principles of 1789, the destruction of feudalism, freedom of conscience and employment and equality in the division of estates between all children were maintained. Educational reforms, the creation of the Legion of Honour and 'career open to talents' within the army went some way to create a meritocracy, a far cry from the society based on birth and privilege of the *ancien régime*. Although the Concordat re-established the position of the Catholic Church, equal rights for Protestants and Jews were also introduced.

Level 1 answers will make vague assertions about the impact of Napoleon's reforms. At Level 2, answers will be more descriptive about some of the reforms introduced by Napoleon with brief undeveloped focus on reactionary/reformer. At Level 3 there will be some reference to the reactionary/reformer debate but this will not be very well balanced. Level 4 answers will be balanced with a range of secure evidence about the impact of Napoleon's reforms and at Level 5 judgement about the extent to which Napoleon was either a reactionary or a reformer will be made.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the three eastern powers' (line 3) in the context of international relations in the years 1815 to 1822. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. recognises that the three eastern powers were Austria, Russia and Prussia, 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the three eastern powers were conservative, autocratic and fervently anti-revolutionary. They were bound by the Holy Alliance and the Troppau Protocol. This created tension internationally as Britain and France were more liberal. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Britain objected to the eastern powers' intervention in revolutions in minor states. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Britain was liberal and did not agree with intervening in other countries – without explanation. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to explain why Britain was opposed to the eastern powers of Austria, Russia and Prussia intervening to crush liberal and nationalist revolts in Europe, e.g. Britain was a liberal power that sympathised with liberal, nationalist revolutions which rose against despotic rulers. Britain feared that

by using force to crush revolutions the eastern powers would gain greater influence among the smaller nations and upset the balance of 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. under Castlereagh, Britain objected to eastern power interference through the State Paper of 1820, where he argued that the Alliance was not created to govern and police the whole of Europe and the world, but to liberate Europe from France. Answers that demonstrate an understanding that although Britain was a liberal democracy the Tory government of the time far from supported the 'minor revolutions' in Europe. The refusal of the Spanish and Neapolitan revolutionaries to modify their constitutions alienated British sympathies for them. **6-7**

(c) 'The Congress System was doomed to fail because it lacked a clear structure.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

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

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

Indicative content

The central theme to this question is the breakdown of the Congress System and the extent to which the lack of clearly defined structure and working agreement led to the breakdown of international relations. More sophisticated arguments will query the phrase doomed to fail by using their understanding of how despite the lack of clear structure and organisation the Great Powers were able to respond, sometimes very effectively, to individual events and circumstances. In addition candidates may question the extent to which the breakdown of the Congress System was inevitable, if at all.

Evidence to support the statement

It can be also argued that the Congress System was doomed to fail because the principles upon which it was based were never clearly defined. Russia, in particular was guilty of confusing article IV of the treaty of November 1815 with the Holy Alliance scheme of September. There was no set time and structure to the meetings of the Congress, nor was there any secretariat.

Evidence against the statement

It can be argued that the Congress system did work for a period of time. The Great Powers worked best when they had a common goal/aim and the fear of resurgence of French power was central to the establishment of the Congress System. When France was reintegrated back into the Great Powers at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 this common aim was lost but the Great Powers had managed to compromise their own interests for the sake of stability.

Other Factors

It can be argued that a major failing of the Congress System was that all of the Great Powers to some extent pursued their own national self-interests. Austria pursued self-interests in Italy, while all of the powers had conflicts of interests in the near east. Since 1820 the Great Powers had become increasingly divided over the issue of intervention in other states experiencing revolutions. Britain and France refused to sign the Troppau Protocol which bound the three eastern powers to act if unrest threatened the stability of Europe. Canning did not support the idea of collective diplomacy and preferred to pursue British self-interests of trade. Independent French action in Spain in 1823 signalled the end of the Congress System. Therefore it can be argued that a fundamental flaw in the Congress System was its lack of flexibility. The five Great Powers had differing views as to what constituted a major threat to stability and security of Europe. The revolts in Spain, Naples and Greece divided the Great Powers in differing ways.

At Level 1, answers are likely to make undeveloped statements about the failure of the Congress System. At Level 2 agreement or disagreement with the statement will be inferred through a description of the Congresses. Level 3 answers will demonstrate some understanding of reasons why the Congress System broke down. At Level 4, answers will be balanced and have at least the equivalent of a paragraph on reasons why it can be argued that the lack of a clear structure led to the failure of the Congress System, ranged against other reasons. At Level 5, judgement will be demonstrated.