

---

**HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)**

**9769/02B**

Paper 2B European History Outlines, c. 1400–c. 1800

**For Examination from 2016**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**2 hours 15 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 90**

---

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **25** printed pages and **1** blank page.

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

## **Introduction**

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Band 5: 25–30 marks**

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

**Band 4: 19–24 marks**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

**Band 3: 13–18 marks**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected.

**Band 2: 7–12 marks**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

**Band 1: 1–6 marks**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated and investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Section 1: c. 1400–c. 1461****1 'Overall, the conciliar movement must be deemed a failure.' Discuss.**

AO1 – Candidates should demonstrate awareness of what the conciliar movement involved, and also knowledge of some of the principal sessions such as Pisa, Constance, Siena and Basle. The schism was finally healed, but the nationalistic 'divisions' remained, as did many of the failings of the papacy.

AO2 – Some analysis and development of the concept of 'failure' in this context is required. There is a case to be made each way. The institution did survive and faced up to the challenge of Hus – eventually – but it was not in a strong position to face the challenge from Luther.

**2 Why did Burgundy play such a central role in the politics and diplomacy of this period?**

AO1 – Candidates could consider the cohesion and wealth of the region, the relationship with England, the competence of rulers – they tended to be good politicians – the acquisitions and the problems facing the French such as Agincourt.

AO2 – Candidates could identify a central reason, provided there are good cases made and clear indication of why it is the most important. An 'internal versus external factors' argument is equally acceptable, but it should have a clear focus one way or the other. Some thinking about how 'central' a role Burgundy had is fine, but candidates should not try and adapt this question to argue that it did not play a central role.

**3 Discuss the view that weak and divided opponents provide the main explanation for the rapid expansion of the Ottoman Empire in this period.**

AO1 – As evidence for the proposition that opponents of the Ottoman Empire were 'weak and divided', candidates could cite the following: Greek disunity; the reluctance of any potential ally to support determined opponents of the Turks, such as the Serbs; and the divisions over Byzantium just before the fall of Constantinople. As evidence of Ottoman strengths, candidates could mention their military skills, methods of rule, tolerance and efficiency.

AO2 – There needs to be a balance, as a reasoned case can be made both ways. Candidates should prioritise their reasoning and make a strong case around one or two points. They should focus on the range of 'plus' points on the Ottoman side, rather than on the lack of a coherent opposition.

**4 How far were the problems facing the Valois monarchy in France during this period self-inflicted?**

AO1 – Candidates should identify the problems, which range from the military and relations with Burgundy and England to the financial. Charles V had a limited inheritance, but there was real competence there, and an early death was not his fault! Charles VI obviously had many failings, as seen in his dealings with Burgundy, with the English and in the disaster of 1420. A case could be made each way with Charles VII, with his treatment of Joan of Arc on one side and the gradual assertion of monarchical power in the latter part of his reign.

AO2 – Candidates should analyse of the problems facing the Valois monarchs in this period, ideally with an overview of the period as a whole, and examine the work of the three key individuals.

**5 What best explains the growth of Muscovy in this period?**

AO1/AO2 – The reasons are partly internal, arising from the work of individual rulers and successes like Kulikovo. Starting from their role as collectors of tribute for the Tartars, the rulers asserted dominance over the other minor states they were to absorb. Primogeniture played a part, as did weakness and distraction of opponents, good military skills and judicious marriages. The centring of the Orthodox Church in Moscow was another factor. There should be a clear weighing up of reasons and candidates should be able to identify which are the main reasons and why.

**Section 2: c. 1461–c. 1516****6 To what extent were the Italian city states similar in both structure and achievements?**

AO1 – Candidates should refer to the major cities, such as Florence, Milan, Venice and Verona. A broadly thematic approach is required, and candidates should follow the points suggested in the title. The idea of ‘achievements’ should be interpreted broadly; candidates can consider more than just ‘renaissance’ factors. It is not necessary to keep strictly within the narrow timescale of the suggested period.

AO2 – There should be a clear answer to the question of ‘extent’, and good reasons given for either agreeing or disagreeing with the suggested thesis. Candidates do not need to follow one particular essay structure in their answers, and may deal with ‘structure’ and ‘achievements’ either together or separately if they wish. They should discuss both factors, ideally giving equal coverage to both, but may still gain good marks if they give more emphasis to one than the other.

**7 ‘Just another ruler of an Italian state.’ Discuss this view of the post-conciliar Popes.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates could cover the role of the papacy within Italy as well as outside it, and also the broader spiritual role and involvement in ‘politics’ outside Italy, as well as factors such as the patrons of art and architecture. Issues such as ignoring the needs of wider reform and failing to learn the lessons of Hus and the Lollards could also be raised. Candidates should look broadly at the work and attainment of the papacy both within and outside of Italy and present a clear picture of what the papacy did, or failed to do, in the period. The ‘just another’ offers tremendous scope and candidates should consider the implications of the phrase.

**8 How successfully can it be argued that Maximilian I’s greatest achievements lay in Germany?**

AO1 – Mere survival could be argued to be an achievement, but there are also a large range of other factors which could be considered, ranging from economic, religious, and social to political ones. Candidates could refer to the strength of the monarchy, the Turks, Italy, France and taxation.

AO2 – Candidates should give an overview of the nature and extent of Maximilian I’s achievements. What he attained inside Germany should be balanced against what he attained outside, and it could be considered both in the long and the short term. Candidates should demonstrate that they have thought carefully about what might constitute an ‘achievement’ in this context.

**9 'Profoundly conservative rulers.' Discuss this view of Ferdinand and Isabella.**

AO1 – The union itself, the idea of a federal monarchy, could be seen as contrary to this view, while Ferdinand and Isabella's joint rule had huge implications for the Spanish monarchy. Other factors which could be considered might include: the administration of the Indies; the retention of local autonomies; Granada; the treatment of Muslims; and the views of Ferdinand and Isabella on the role of religion and the administration of their country.

AO2 – Candidates should think carefully about their definition of 'conservative'. They should provide a baseline definition and a reasoned answer, preferably with good reasons why the contrary view might be wrong. This is quite a challenging question, and candidates should show evidence of careful thinking about 'conservative' in this context.

**10 Did Ivan III achieve more inside Muscovy than outside it?**

AO1 – Candidates should interpret 'inside' and 'outside' Muscovy fairly tolerantly, as several areas could conceivably apply to both. Factors to be mentioned might include: Ivan's claim to be the founder of the Russian state; the acquisition of Novgorod; the defeat of the Tartars; Kiev; what happened in Poland and Lithuania; as well as Ivan's achievement as far as the monarchy itself is concerned.

AO2 – Candidates should give a retrospective view of the reign, with clear weighing up of the evidence each way. They could argue that Ivan III achieved more in the short term in one respect, but more in the longer term in another. Candidates should think carefully about what 'achievement' means in this context.



**Section 3: c. 1516–c. 1559****11 Evaluate the respective contributions of Zwingli and Calvin to the evolution of the Protestant Reformation.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should demonstrate a good level of knowledge of the work of both men. The Luther/Zwingli debates could be relevant, as well as Zwingli's key role in the development of Protestantism in Switzerland, his leadership there, his administrative work, and his criticism of many Catholic practices such as image worship and the focus on hierarchy. His theology should also be considered. Calvin's work should be better known, and candidates should show detailed knowledge of his work as a writer, polemicist, theologian, and 'spreader' into France, the Low Countries and Scotland, as an administrator, and as a founder of a theocracy. Candidates should weigh up the respective contributions and keep the focus on 'evolution'. While it could easily be argued that Calvin was a more significant, and better known, figure, Zwingli's contribution to the evolution was vital in its own way.

**12 'A period of limited achievement.' Discuss this view of Charles V's reign as Holy Roman Emperor.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should focus on Charles V's achievements as Holy Roman Emperor, although inevitably, given the relationship between it and other aspects of his rule, there may be overlap. Religious disputes, both Reformation and Counter Reformation, are involved, as well as his relationship with the papacy. Other factors might be the administration of his inheritance, his economic policy (or possibly lack of?), and his dealings with the Turks. The failure of the imperial idea is central, but his policies towards France, Spain and the Netherlands are less crucial. Germany should be covered, including the conflicts, Schmalkaldic League, Muhlberg and Augsburg and Cateau Cambresis.

**13 'While little was achieved outside France, much was achieved inside France.' Discuss this view of the reigns of Francis I and Henry II.**

AO1 – In terms of external achievement, candidates should focus on the Italian wars and on the growth in size of France as a result of conflicts with England and with Charles V, as well as possibly the cost of the wars and the impact of that cost on the monarchy and on France generally. In terms of internal achievement, candidates should focus on the development of trade and industry, the increasing unity of France, and the growing strength of the monarchy.

AO2 – There is scope for debating and challenging both parts of the question, and candidates should evaluate the results of French foreign policy carefully and consider whether or not it could be seen as simply harmful. The focus of the essay should, however, be on internal achievements and on what a 'real' achievement might be.

**14 To what extent were the government and organisation of the Ottoman Empire the key factors behind its success in the period 1520–66?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider not only the two factors mentioned in the title, but also many other ‘internal’ factors, such as: the quality of the Ottoman rulers; the skills of their soldiers and sailors; Ottoman methods of ruling subject peoples; and their attitude to commerce. External factors should also be considered, such as: the Ottomans’ exploitation of the poor relationship between France and Spain/the Holy Roman Emperor; papal failings; the distractions of Lutheranism and the Low Countries.

The key word here is ‘extent’ and candidates should analyse carefully what they consider to be the most important factors behind the successes of the Ottoman Empire. The question is not just about the expansion of the Empire and a genuinely reflective approach is required.

**15 ‘A competent administrator, but little else.’ Discuss this view of Ivan IV of Russia.**

AO1 / AO2 –The view that Ivan IV was an able administrator could be supported by reference to the reforms he introduced to modernise and centralise administration, his legal reforms, the changes he introduced in local government, and developments in the armed forces. The organisation of large-scale building projects would also be relevant. In support of the view that this was the limit of his achievements, candidates could consider the erratic elements of the reign: Ivan’s withdrawal from Moscow and his return claiming absolute power - which was used oppressively, for example in the establishment of the Oprichniki and the subjugation of Novgorod. The losses in the western wars might cast doubt on his wider abilities, as might the depredations of the Crimean Tartars. References to his personal life, the death of his son and his inconsistency of behaviour could be relevant. The counter view might emphasise the trade developments, the raising of Ivan’s status to that of Tsar, the taking of Kazan and Astrakhan and the construction of St Basil’s Cathedral. Alongside his brutality can be cited Ivan’s love of learning.

**Section 4: c. 1559–c. 1610****16 How successfully did Philip II govern Spain?**

AO1 / AO2 – There could be consideration of the nature and style of Philip's rule, his religious policies, the preservation of his inheritance, fiscal policy and bankruptcies, the role of the aristocracy and factionalism. There should also be discussion of Philip's policies towards the different parts of his Spanish inheritance and of the suppression of the revolt of the Moriscos and its consequences. Candidates should discuss what constitutes 'successful governance', and the focus of the analysis should be on Spain and on internal factors.

**17 To what extent was the weakness of the monarchy the principal cause of the civil wars in France between 1559 and 1598?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider a range of socio-economic factors, including inflation, peasant poverty, revolts, religion and autocracy. Other factors to consider may include the problem of the 'over-mighty subject'; the various political crises; the minorities; factional fighting; the roles of individuals such as Marie, Conde, Coligny and the Guises; and the St Bartholemew's Day Massacre. The importance of foreign intervention should also be discussed. Candidates could argue that incompetence was as much a factor as weakness and that different factors rose and fell in importance as the wars progressed.

**18 Account for the rivalry between the states of the Baltic region in this period.**

AO1/AO2 – The states chiefly involved were Denmark/Norway, Sweden and Poland/Lithuania. Russia and Brandenburg-Prussia may be regarded as aspirants to influence in the Baltic, and the Emperor also had interests there. Baltic rivalries are complicated by the interests of extra-Baltic powers such as England and the Dutch.

Candidates may consider the following: the earlier union between Denmark and Sweden which was broken by Gustavus Vasa in the early sixteenth century; control of the Sound by Denmark and its importance in controlling entrance to the Baltic; communications between Denmark and Norway; shortage of natural resources on the part of Denmark/Norway; the importance of the resources of the Baltic, not only to the Baltic states but also to the European economy – grain, timber, naval stores, fish, minerals; control of river mouths flowing into the southern and eastern Baltic coasts; Sweden's expansionist policy under the Vasas, for example, the seizure of Estonia and Narva, and Ivan IV's designs on Livonia which were contested by Poland; Brandenburg's foothold in East Prussia; the breakdown of co-operation between Sweden and Poland; the election of Sigismund Vasa to the Polish throne and his later succession to the Swedish crown; a clash of interests in Livonia.

**19 'The real credit for the recovery of France after 1598 must go to Henry IV.' Discuss.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider a range of points including: Henry's personality, his flexibility, his military and administrative competence, and his awareness of France's problems and of possible solutions. Candidates should also consider: the work of ministers such as Sully; the willingness of the other 'side' to compromise; near terminal exhaustion; and the natural resilience of the country itself. Candidates may focus on Henry himself, but his contribution needs to be weighed up carefully against other factors.

**20 To what extent were religious grievances responsible for the outbreak and continuation of the revolt of the Netherlands?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates might suggest that religious grievances include the suggested introduction of new bishoprics and Philip's determination, as for example can be seen in the Segovia letters, to maintain the persecution of Calvinists. The continuation of the revolt was fuelled by a determination on the part of some to gain toleration for Protestants and by others to maintain Catholicism, especially on the part of the wealthier classes who saw radical religious revolutionaries as a threat. Other factors could be seen as more vital. These include taxation, the assault on traditional liberties and disregard of the advice of the governing classes and the response to Alva. The continuation of the revolt might be attributed to the obstinacy of William of Orange, the part played by other European powers and the other priorities which prevented Philip from being able to defeat the rebels decisively.

**Section 5: Themes c. 1378–c. 1610****21 'The pre-Reformation Church was in need of fundamental reform.' Discuss.**

AO1 – Candidates should consider the increasing secularisation of the Church and papacy. The Church had become a highly politicised and wealthy organisation. The papacy had become too much of a factor in Italian politics, and there were issues surrounding nepotism and corruption. The curia/college of cardinals might also be considered, as well as the issues arising out of the Schism and the conciliar movement.

AO2 – There are two areas requiring debate: 'extent' and the degree of need for reform, and the idea of 'fundamental'. Candidates could argue that the 'fundamentals' were sound, and that it was only in certain minor or peripheral areas that change was needed.

**22 Is 'renaissance' the most appropriate term for the artistic and cultural developments in Italy in this period?**

AO1 – Candidates could focus on breadth or depth, and there is merit in both approaches. Candidates should separate 'artistic' from 'cultural' developments and should demonstrate sound knowledge of both.

AO2 – Candidates should review the cultural, intellectual and artistic history of Italy. There is a strong case to be made for the idea of 'cultural rebirth' and 'renewal', and the views of many contemporaries can be considered. As well as the case for emphasising much that was very novel, however, there is also an argument that could be made for 'continuity'. Candidates may also consider whether there was a strong Greek influence and how great an impact the 'Roman' tradition had.

**23 To what extent were the later Middle Ages a period of substantial social change?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider factors such as class, family, the role of women, marriage age (demographic factors may be relevant), and social mobility in some countries. Candidates might argue that there was social change in some areas, but not in others. The focus should be on 'social' factors, but other factors, such as economic factors, might also be considered.

**24 How convincing is the case for a 'military revolution' in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should show knowledge of the following areas: the military on 'land' and 'sea', strategy, tactics, command, weaponry, application of science and ship structure. There should be a balanced discussion but candidates should focus on the strength of the case, on what is 'convincing', and should consider what might, or might not, amount to a 'revolution' in this context.

**25 How far had the early Portuguese and Spanish explorers fulfilled their aims by the middle of the sixteenth century?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider a variety of aims, including: curiosity; adventure; territorial acquisition; the evangelical or crusading ideal; gaining a Christian ally (Portugal) in Africa; the idea of a federal monarchy; acquisition of geographical knowledge; the spice trade; loot; the sea route to India and its markets; settlement; slavery; and simply preventing acquisition of territories by other powers. Spain's aims were different from those of Portugal at times; Cortés was very different from da Gama. There should be coverage of both and awareness that they had different aspirations, as well as some common ground. Candidates might argue that some aims were fulfilled while others were achieved only in part. The aims of Spanish and Portuguese explorers should be treated separately, and a clear picture of 'extent' given in each case.

**26 'Inflation was the most important economic change in the sixteenth century.' Discuss.**

AO1/AO2 – There is a good case for arguing that inflation was the most important economic change but candidates should also consider other economic changes such as: the decline of feudalism, the rise of capitalism, changes in banking and finance, commerce and trade, overseas empires, population changes and urbanisation. Answers should focus on economic change although there will be some overlap with social change.

**Section 6: c. 1610–c. 1660****27 How far did France benefit from the administrations of Richelieu and Mazarin?**

AO1/AO2 – There are many factors in Richelieu's career which candidates could consider, ranging from ecclesiastical and administrative reform, Intendants and Parlements, Huguenots and the nobility, to his foreign policy and his work for the monarchy. With regard to Mazarin, candidates should consider Westphalia and the Frondes and his contribution to the establishment of a great reign. Candidates should consider what might be meant by 'benefit' and also assess the long-term implications for France. Ideally Richelieu and Mazarin should be treated separately.

**28 To what extent was Sweden 'an overstretched and artificial empire' in 1660?**

AO1 / AO2 – Candidates need to consider why the Swedish empire after the peace of Olvia in 1660 and the Treaty of Copenhagen was both 'artificial' and 'overstretched'. Knowledge of the nature of the empire is required. The arguments could be that: its possessions were dispersed; the population and resources of Sweden were not great enough to sustain the control of diverse possessions; success relied on French support and the divisions and weaknesses of other powers. The counter view is that Sweden had shown considerable military strength and that in the context it was not impossible that the empire could have been sustained, but that the key elements were the weaknesses that followed the death of Charles X Gustav.

**29 What best explains why the Thirty Years War lasted for 30 years?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should show awareness of the staggering complexity and interrelationship of so many conflicting issues: dynastic, religious, political and territorial. The reluctance to compromise is central. Foreign involvement was also a major factor, with Sweden, France and the Netherlands, for example, bringing their own agendas and ambitions to the conflict. There was also the absence of decisive factors that might have ended the war sooner. The role played by Richelieu, Wallenstein and Gustavus Adolphus can also be assessed. Candidates could argue a number of different 'cases'; they should identify two or three primary factors and develop them, while at the same time considering why other possibilities are less important. They should avoid over-emphasising a single factor.

**30 'A remarkable achievement in the circumstances.' Discuss this view of the Treaty of Westphalia.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider the terms and the circumstances and the implications for all the major players. There should be an examination of issues like tolerance and national sovereignty and consideration of the different 'circumstances' for the participants. Candidates could argue that, given the longevity of the conflict, any settlement might be accepted or they might argue that the Treaty merely confirmed long-term trends.

**31 How is the economic and commercial success of the Dutch republic in this period best explained?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates could argue that the fact that the competition was at war may have helped. The Dutch seized opportunities, especially with Portugal and Spain. Other possible factors to consider could be: use of resources, fish, shipbuilders and great carriers, adventurers, traders, wise investors, factors and middlemen, sensible government which was conscious of the interests of trade, low interest rates, and open society.

Prioritisation of reasons is important. Candidates may choose to separate 'economic' and 'commercial' factors and identify different reasons for the success of the republic, but it would also be reasonable to link these two aspects.



**Section 7: c. 1660–c. 1715****32 'Frederick William, the Great Elector, achieved more at home than abroad.' Discuss.**

AO1/AO2 – On the domestic front, candidates should show awareness of the following areas: Frederick William's poor inheritance; the impact of war; diet management; nobles and serfs; taxes; the Huguenots; and the civil service. In relation to foreign affairs, candidates should have knowledge of Frederick William's dealings with Sweden, with the Habsburgs, with Westphalia and with Poland. They could also discuss the war of the North and Cleves. There needs to be a weighing up of achievements; a possible debate could be over the short-term and long-term nature of the achievements.

**33 'Without his ministers, Louis XIV would have achieved little.' Discuss.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should provide a survey of the unique contribution that Louis made to the achievements of his reign. They should also present a picture of what his ministers and generals contributed to the totality, in particular Mazarin and Colbert. Candidates would be expected to consider the reign as a whole and assess how important the ministers were to its success. The focus is often so much on the King, but how much could he have achieved without Colbert, for example?

**34 How valid is the claim that the greatest achievements of Peter the Great lay in his expansionist foreign policy?**

AO1 / AO2 – After the disastrous start against Sweden, there were foreign policy gains in the Black Sea, the Caspian and the Baltic. On the domestic front, candidates could consider: reforms of the army and navy post-Azov; Peter the Great's overall vision for Russia; the development of St Petersburg as the capital city; westernisation; the introduction of the table of ranks; and general improvements in government, administration, taxation and the church. It could be argued that what Peter achieved internally was all superficial, that little of it really lasted, and rather that his real legacy was the direction in which he pointed Russia for the future. Candidates should focus on his achievements and on the nature and extent of those achievements.

**35 'For much of the time it was a grim struggle for survival.' Discuss this view of the Dutch republic in this period.**

AO1/AO2 – As evidence for the 'grim struggle', candidates should consider: the Anglo-Dutch wars; the fall of De Witt; the depression of the 1660s; the hostile attitude of Colbert and the English; and the advances of Louis XIV. On the other hand, the Dutch did lead successful coalitions against Louis, and there was still great progress on the domestic front in terms of economics and commerce. Candidates should contrast the resilience and progress of the Dutch republic with the external and internal pressures. How much of a 'struggle' it was should be considered, as well as 'for much of the time'. Candidates should keep the 'overview' in mind while arguing a clear case.

**36 'The primary cause of the War of the Spanish Succession was the ambition of Louis XIV.' Do you agree?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider a variety of issues: the role of Louis himself; the attitudes of the English and the Dutch; trade and the colonies; economic factors; and the will of Charles II of Spain. Broader factors should also be assessed, such as tradition, militarism and the universal desire for prestige. Candidates could discuss the use of the words 'primary' and 'ambition'. They might also differentiate between the short-term and the longer-term causes of the War.

**Section 8: c. 1715–c. 1774****37 ‘An age of reform.’ How valid is this view of France under Orléans and Fleury?**

AO1 / AO2 – France was ruled by Philippe of Orléans from 1715 to 1723 as Regent, and he remained as minister until Fleury took over in 1726. Fleury would act as Louis XV’s chief adviser until 1743. Given the problems that Fleury inherited from the Regency, it is likely that candidates will associate reform more with his rule than with that of Orléans. The stabilisation of the currency and the balancing of the budget could be seen as essential reforms; there was expansion of roads and canals; trade increased. The authority of the crown was extended over religious matters. The counter view may focus on: the failures of the Regency to deal with rising prices; the Law affair; and religious persecution. However, some may challenge the scope of change suggested by ‘age of reform’ and point to continuing weaknesses and limitations to the development of both economy and society which continued through the *ancien régime*.

**38 Can Frederick II of Prussia reasonably be called ‘an enlightened despot’?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates could argue in favour of the proposition that Frederick was an enlightened ruler: he was a writer, thinker and architect, who focused on duty before rights, on education, legal codification and a freer press. On the other hand it could be argued that he was a brutal militarist. Candidates should reach a definition of the term ‘enlightened despot’ and decide what ‘reasonably’ might mean in this context. They should have an awareness of the values of the period and avoid condemning Frederick inappropriately from a twenty-first century standpoint.

**39 ‘Essentially a conflict over colonies.’ Discuss this view of the Seven Years War.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates might argue that this was just another part of the ongoing struggle between France and Britain over empire and trade. However, they should also consider other factors, such as: Prussia and its struggle for growth/survival; Austria, which was anxious to reduce the power of its growing neighbour and hostile to Silesia; Russia’s and Sweden’s plans to widen the conflict; and French ambitions on the Rhine and in the Austrian Netherlands. Colonies and commerce played a part, but they were by no means the only causes. Hanover was a concern for the British and the whole balance of power/diplomatic revolution issue might also be considered. The role of colonies and commerce should be assessed and balanced against the wide variety of other factors.

**40 'It was a period of continuous decline, in spite of heroic efforts to prevent it.' How justified is this view of Spain in this period?**

AO1 / AO2 – The period from 1715 to 1788 did see attempts at reform, most notably in the reign of Charles III under the Marquis of Esquilache and Moñino. These attempts built on the reforms of Philip V and could be seen as 'heroic' in the context of the extended decline, economic problems and the effects of war from the late seventeenth century to 1715. The underlying tendency was towards greater central control and to follow the lead of France, both in terms of the powerful central monarchy and also in foreign policy. The adherence to monarchical power, the power of the Church – particularly over education – and the existing social structures could be argued to have inhibited the type of change that would have made Spain a major European power again. There was limited economic development and mercantile growth and the middle class remained small. Military defeats in the Seven Years War and the loss of Florida revealed Spain's inadequacies. There was some valuable reform and it could be argued that Spain's position had improved since 1715, but the 'Golden Age' did not return and in that sense decline continued. Much depends how the 'decline' is measured and whether the failures to engage with fundamental changes can really justify the use of the term 'heroic'.

**41 'The reign of Louis XV demonstrated all of the bad features, and none of the good ones, of the *ancien régime*.' Discuss.**

AO1/AO2 – As examples of the 'bad features' candidates could consider the following points: women and hunting dominated the King's life; factionalism dominated the court; the *ancien régime* continued; there was an absence of any real religious, social or economic policy; foreign policy remained depressingly the same. Other aspects of the reign to consider might be taxation and social rigidity. As examples of the 'good' features, candidates might mention the artistic, cultural and architectural – through to the grandiose and expansionist – achievements of the reign. Candidates should think carefully about what might constitute 'good' or 'bad' features of the *ancien régime*, and about the use of the word 'all' in the title. They should view the reign as a whole and consider it in the light of the question.

**Section 9: c. 1774–c. 1815****42 How ‘great’ was Catherine the Great?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should consider a range of factors including the following: how Catherine’s initial insecurity was overcome; her work in education; the legislative commission; institutional reform; her work in government generally; and Catherine’s foreign policy. Negative factors to consider might include Pugachev’s rebellion and the costs of the wars. Candidates should consider the idea of ‘greatness’ and how it might be defined. They might consider other ‘greats’ for comparison, both within and outside Russia, and could take a short-term or longer-term view, or both.

**43 How wisely did Joseph II rule over his various dominions?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates might argue that Joseph ruled wisely in his own view but that more generally he is seen to have made mistakes. Among his more successful, and thus presumably wiser, policies were his participation in the partition of Poland, his visits to his various territories to see things for himself, his encouragement of religious toleration, his new legal code, his social reforms and his encouragement of primary education. But his war with Prussia over the Bavarian succession was unwise. He provoked opposition in both Hungary and the Austrian Netherlands by trying to enforce a more centralised government. Candidates might argue that this had much to commend it as an aim, but that Joseph went about it with a lack of wisdom. His efforts to abolish serfdom antagonised the nobles, which again showed his lack of grasp of practical politics. His worst error was his war against Turkey, which had the result that his final years were mired by a near collapse in his empire and an almost complete surrender to the power of the nobles. Candidates might conclude that Joseph was unfortunate in that his aims were good and morally justified for the most part, but, in terms of what was possible in his dominions, they were not always very wise.

**44 Discuss the view that the Enlightenment played an insignificant part in causing the French Revolution.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should discuss the possible links between the ideas of the Enlightenment and events and individuals. They should also be able to show some knowledge of the ideas themselves. Other causes of the Revolution, long-, medium- and short-term, can also be considered. Candidates should be able to provide a broad picture and a careful analysis of what role, if any, the Enlightenment played in the causes (and not the course) of the Revolution. A case should then be made justifying the answer and contrasting the role of the Enlightenment with other factors.

**45 What best explains the political instability of France between 1793 and 1799?**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates might consider a range of factors, including the background of war, ambitious personalities, the Terror and the lack of consensus. They should also be aware of the impact of massive social, economic, administrative and political changes being imposed on a system which had undergone such a radical change as the execution of the King and the termination of a long-established dynastic system. Candidates should be able to identify one or more central factors and then build a reasoned and well-argued case for them. There should be a definition of 'political instability'.

**46 'Napoleon was not a great general, just a lucky one.' Discuss.**

AO1/AO2 – Candidates might consider the issue of whether 'war became of itself an affair of the people'. There were great changes in the size of Napoleon's armies, the scale of his operations and the nature of his objectives, while, on the other hand, tactics and techniques did not change a great deal. In making the case for greatness, candidates might consider the following factors: Napoleon's introduction of mass conscription; his opening up of careers to talent; the introduction of training based on national characteristics; the focus on morale; his ability to move large armies at speed; his foresight in separating his enemies and placing his troops; his decision making at critical moments; and his military tactics at Ulm, Jena and Austerlitz. Examples of luck could be: the unexpected recovery at Marengo; the lack of coordination between Austria and Russia prior to the victory at Ulm; the miscalculations of Alexander II at Austerlitz. The discussion might centre on the relative importance of the mistakes of Napoleon's enemies and his ability to use them to his advantage. Napoleon might also be thought to be fortunate to inherit armed forces reformed and increased by Carnot and the revolutionary governments as well as technical and strategic improvements made in the eighteenth century.

Although Napoleon could be fortunate in his opponents at times, and benefited from their archaic methods, what he achieved over a long period of time, and so often, was indicative of perhaps much more than luck.

**Section 10: Themes c. 1610–c. 1800****47 Did the scientific achievements of the seventeenth century amount to a revolution?**

AO1/AO2 – Answers should be based on the work of scientists such as Newton, Descartes, Huygens, Kepler and Boyle and on the work of the Royal Society. Responses need not demonstrate great depth, provided there is real breadth of knowledge. Candidates should define and consider carefully what is or what is not a scientific revolution. The focus could be on what the work of great seventeenth-century scientists led to, as well on what they actually achieved. One approach might be to examine the work of individuals and to see whether they amount in total to a revolution; another, equally valid, approach might be to argue a broader case each way, citing a wide range of examples in the process and coming to a concise conclusion.

**48 Assess the impact of both slavery and the slave trade on the economies of Europe.**

AO1/AO2 – When answering this question, candidates might consider the UK, Africa and the West Indies. They should know about the growth of companies, the growth of cities such as Bristol and Liverpool, and the impact on the Lancashire cotton trade. They might also refer to the Dutch, the Portuguese and Spain and to the impact that the institution of slavery and the slave trade had on their economies. There could be some consideration of the fact that slavery led to wars and commercial and colonial rivalry. Candidates should be able to differentiate between the institution of slavery and the trade itself. There should be some consideration of how slavery and the slave trade affected different countries in different ways, as well as of the impact on the economy of Europe as a whole. There is great scope here for analysis.

**49 How ‘absolute’ were absolutist monarchs in seventeenth-century Europe?**

AO1 – Candidates could consider the following: the theories of absolutism and the seventeenth-century backgrounds; the outward show of monarchy – the grand palaces, the mystique and ceremonial kingship; the weakness or lack of representative institutions; the military power (for example in Prussia); the alliance with the nobles (the service nobilities of Eastern Europe, for example) and with organised religion. In some cases the lack of a middle class restricted dissent. On the other hand there were restrictions on the practical powers of the monarchs: Pugachev’s rebellion shook Russia; tax riots and urban affrays were a constant feature; financial weaknesses brought about by the extensive wars of the period had a debilitating effect (e.g. France); regional variations undermined effectiveness (e.g. Spain); administrations, even in the enlightened despotisms, did not reach the levels attained by post-1789 regimes; communications remained a problem. Monarchs were sometimes seen as alien dynasties and much depended on the personalities of the rulers as to the extent and effectiveness of real power.

AO2 – Candidates should grapple with the concept of ‘absolutist’ in eighteenth-century terms and draw some distinction between states with limited urban development and a history of strong monarchy based on military power, and states facing greater social diversity and the impact of social and intellectual development which challenged traditional authority. There may also be a distinction between monarchies which attempted internal reforms to strengthen their power, and monarchies which were more static.

**50 'Essentially static'. Discuss this view of European cultural life in the eighteenth century.**

AO1 – Candidates could exemplify their analyses from the visual arts: rococo; the classic portraits of the century; the cultivated landscapes and cityscapes. They could consider: Palladian classical architecture and its imitators; the development of the classical style of music in the Viennese school or the classically-based operas of France, Italy and Germany; the classically-inspired poetry; the *Sturm und Drang* period of the 1770s; and the beginnings of Romanticism.

AO2 – The discussion could be between formalism and a love for classical balance and subject matter, which is often seen to have restricted individualism and expression, and the dynamic elements within the style that actually developed it and pushed it more towards the emotionalism and individuality of later centuries. There could be some distinction between the last elements of the Baroque in the earlier part of the century and the beginnings of a more Romantic sensibility at the end.

**51 To what extent did the reasons for overseas colonisation change in the eighteenth century?**

AO1 – From the mid-seventeenth century to 1800 the major change was the transformation of Europe into the major supplier of goods for the world rather than simply a consumer of colonial products. By the mid-eighteenth century the only substantial numbers of Europeans in colonies were the 650,000 Spanish; the other empires were largely trading outposts. There followed a substantial increase in colonial populations, sometimes as a result of plans devised by the home governments to exploit resources, such as the attempt to develop Louisiana. The discovery of gold in Brazil was a stimulus to emigration. The greater numbers meant changes in administration: Spain introduced local governors on the French model; Spain and Portugal tried to tighten control of colonial trade. In some overseas possessions, the development of key cash crops led to an increase in slave populations. There was limited interest in establishing direct control unless necessary, but the nature of the relations between trading companies and indigenous rule changed, for example in India, where France and Britain recruited local rulers in the wars. The activities of Dupleix in India mark a change in the nature of colonial activity. The British East India Company official Robert Clive virtually established British rule over Bengal as an independent initiative. Generally, there was a shift away from the old colonisers to the more vigorous maritime nations, which had a broader economic base and range of products.

AO2 – For all the developments, trade and profit remained at the centre of Europe's interests and there was less interest in political control, mission, or developing colonies. Governments tended to see colonies and colonists as existing for the benefit of the mother country much as they had in the earlier phases – hence the shock of the American rebellion.



**52 Explain the rise in population in the eighteenth century and assess its consequences in this period.**

AO1 – This is a two-part question and there should be a sound balance between the two elements, although not necessarily an exactly equal coverage. Explanations and evaluation of ‘consequences’ should be confined to ‘this period’, that is, the period up to 1800. Candidates may demonstrate the scale of the population rise, and some statistics would be helpful. Taking Europe as a whole, the population rose from 118 million in 1700 to 140 million in 1750, and to 185 million in 1800. In the period 1700–70, the population of Italy grew from 11 million to 16 million; between 1715 and the Revolution, the population of France grew from 18 million to 26 million; over the whole century, Spain’s population rose from 5–6 million to 11 million. Explanations of the increase in population might include the following: a relative decline of epidemics and famine; improvements in nutrition connected with changes in agricultural techniques; and better knowledge of medicine and sanitation. When considering the ‘consequences’, candidates might explore the following: a quickening of the pace of urbanisation; a search for wider overseas markets; population growth as a spur to further agricultural reform; and improvements such as drainage, irrigation, new crops, crop rotation and land reclamation; the expansion in farming for a market; possibly an encouragement for improved communications in the form of roads and canals; and provision of labour for expanding industrialisation.

AO2 – Candidates could explore historiographical debates on the causes of demographic change. They should also analyse the interconnections between cause and effect. For example, industrialisation may have encouraged earlier marriages, which in turn produced more children and thus expanded the labour force to be employed in further industrial expansion.

**BLANK PAGE**