



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative C Unit 4

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:

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 2008

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

A2 Unit 4: Monarchy in the Age of Enlightenment

Question 1

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

How fully do these two extracts explain the effectiveness with which ministers served the monarchy in the 1770s and 1780s? (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 extracted directly from the source. Often this will indicate some awareness of where there is agreement or disagreement, e.g. Source B suggests that Maupeou had the ability to save the monarchy, whereas Source C suggests that all ministers failed to provide a solution to France's problems. Level 2 responses will examine the sources more thoroughly in conjunction with some limited knowledge, e.g. Source B suggests that Maupeou served the monarchy by attempting to deal with the Parlements that by this time were demanding a more central role in government, and also by attempting to address a financial crisis, the solution to which became the driving force behind the political crisis of the 1770s and 1780s. Source C refers to ministers' attempts to raise taxes, for example Calonne whose dismissal had little to do with the ineffectiveness of his proposals. The sources illustrate the ministers' efforts to serve the monarchy. By Level 3, candidates will support such points with a much more comprehensive knowledge of events, possibly the context of each source, using this to draw a supported conclusion, e.g. Source B refers to the Maupeou Revolution and the effective removal of Parlement. As Parlement was agitating for a greater role beyond a purely judicial one, their weakening by Maupeou can only have been considered to have served the interests of the monarchy. However, such actions may also have been counterproductive certainly after Louis XVI felt fit to recall the Paris Parlement on his accession. This made it easier for the charge of ministerial despotism to be levelled at the king, as suggested in Source C. In addition, Source B suggests that Maupeou was motivated by ambition for power, and this in itself supports the view that ministers wished to run the country as highlighted in Source C. Louis XV's decision to pass the reins of the government to the Triumvirate in this period probably only reinforced this impression. At Level 4 there will be a critical approach to both sources and an attempt to discuss areas of ministerial competence not covered in the sources, however this will not be a narrative approach.

Candidates may highlight the fact that the two sources refer only to a portion of the period covered by the question, and consequently had omissions. They may suggest that the failure of Necker and his *Compte Rendu* and also of Brienne further supports the idea of ministers motivated by ambition intimated in both Sources B and C. Alternatively the efforts of Turgot to reform the financial system may indicate at least the correctness of certain ministerial ideas, supported by Source B, if not the method of implementation. At this level candidates will arrive at a judgement clearly related to the issue of ministerial effectiveness in the 1770s and 1780s.

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

'It was the behavior of the parlements that was the main cause of the crisis in royal authority.'

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 the period 1688 to 1789, as detailed in the specification for this particular alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified in the indicative content given below. Attainment of higher levels will require candidates to consider a range of issues across the whole period, although most initial focus will consider the extent to which the parlements caused the crisis in royal authority. In addition, there should be some attempt to define the nature of the crisis. Source A suggests that it was the return of pre-registration remonstrance by Orléans in 1715 that prompted a period of opposition from

Parlement not fully resolved until Cardinal Fleury took full control. Such opposition undermined attempts to deal with the pressing problems of France, and especially those of finance. This seems to support the notion that parlements undermined royal authority. However, Source B suggests that it was the actions of often self-interested ministers that prompted obstructionism from the parlements, and this in turn is supported by Source C's intimation of the rise of ministerial despotism. Further, Source C seems to suggest that it was the monarch that had changed his position and was increasingly willing to attack the fundamental laws of the realm – in this sense Parlement was not undermining royal authority but merely protecting that which it considered individual monarchs were attempting to subvert. Source C mentions that Parlement emerged at the forefront of political opposition but does not indicate whom this opposition was directed against. Source D does however make this focus clear, being a direct attack on the prerogative of Louis XVI and Parlement attempting to justify its actions by using a somewhat vague reference to the French constitution.

Own knowledge can quite clearly be used to identify the nature of the crisis. This will probably be identified as the inability of the monarch to assert his will, and most significantly the efforts of privileged groups to undermine the monarchy. Such groups might also include the ministers and the nobility, although the monarch's increasing appeal to public opinion and the public good might be used as an indicator of royal decline. The return of pre-registration remonstrance by Orléans was not in itself the cause of parliamentary pretensions; Louis XIV's will and especially his attempts to construct a regency council created the environment in which the Regent was forced to make concessions in order to establish his own authority. In this sense, the monarchy had willingly ceded authority rather than Parlement demanding it. However, the extent to which Parlement genuinely undermined the monarchy during the Regency has probably been exaggerated. It was not until after the death of Fleury in 1743 that Parlement can really be considered to have been effective in undermining the monarchy, for Fleury managed to deal firmly with all of the parlements especially over Jansenism. However, the willingness with which Louis XV relinquished direction of government policy in these years might be considered a more significant factor in the weakening of the Crown. Even during his personal rule, Louis XV's shift in policy and use of a range of ministers, often chosen for their membership of a faction, created an inconsistent and often contradictory rule. The most promising period for the assertion of royal authority came under the rule of the Triumvirate but was itself undermined by Louis XVI's 'desire to be loved' and also heavy reliance on Maurepas who had his own ministerial ambitions. The return of the Parlements certainly gave them added ambition and an inflated impression of their necessity. But it was the increasingly desperate efforts to find a solution to the financial crisis, compounded by the pursuit of expensive wars, and especially the American War of Independence, that allowed Parlement to assert a role closer in purpose to a legislative body than a judicial one. It was the reluctance of Parlement to grant reform that can be said to have prompted the calling of the Assembly of the Notables and the Estates General – both bodies that seriously undermined the concept of royal absolutism. However, the idea that parlementaires were deliberately seeking to weaken the monarchy is probably, in the most parts, false. There was a clear notion that Parlement looked to uphold the rights of the nation and privilege, not weaken the Crown. A reasonable argument can be asserted that it was the Crown that sought to undermine privilege in order to enact financial reforms. Other factors that undermined the monarchy can easily be identified. Most obviously the worsening financial crisis was the engine behind change, but the vacillation of both Louis XV and Louis XVI, the ambitions of ministers, the rise in public opinion and concept of nationhood, and the decline in Divine Right played important parts. Most candidates will probably conclude that it was the interplay of factors that accounts for the crisis, and indeed that one factor could not have existed without the other. Possibly the actions of Parlement were the consequence rather than the cause of the crisis in royal authority.

Level 1 answers will provide limited generalisations on a limited aspect of the question or will simply provide a summary of the sources. Level 2 answers will attempt to cover a wider period or number of occasions in which Parlement undermined royal authority, although by no means a comprehensive range. Narrative answers are likely to be limited to a reign by reign focus. There may be some implicit understanding of the analytical demands. By Level 3 there will be an analytical approach that covers the full 100 years although not necessarily with balance across the full period. There may be some attempt to consider other factors that caused the crisis although without weight or effective support. There will also be use of the sources, although not necessarily the full range. At Level 4 there will be consideration of other factors that caused crisis with good support from own knowledge and sources. There may also be some challenge to the premise of the question. At Level 5 there will be sustained judgement across the entire period and a range of factors. There will be clear engagement on the focus of the question however that ensures a consistently relevant analysis.

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 a genuine commitment to the Enlightenment yet failed to improve the welfare of his people.’

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 assess the impact of the Enlightenment on Frederick and on his policies.

Candidates' initial focus may be to determine Frederick's commitment to the principles of the Enlightenment. His patronage of the arts and personal interest in music, poetry, science clearly indicate his inclination, as does Sans Souci, his time at Rheinsberg, the Anti-Machiavel, and the political testaments of 1752 and of 1768. His personal correspondence especially with Voltaire is an added indication.

Some candidates may attempt to give some definition of 'people' and reasonably identify a range of groups including the nobles, religious minorities, merchants and also peasants. In support of the question, candidates may consider the following:

Frederick's education reforms were largely ineffective with very little financial support and an absence of trained teachers. The type of education was clearly directed towards the inculcation of loyalty to the state rather than the liberal curriculum advocated by some philosophes. In addition he showed little enthusiasm for higher education and did little to develop much beyond the primary level.

Frederick's policy towards serfdom did not develop much beyond principled opposition. Even on Crown lands where opposition from nobles was less of an issue, Frederick seems not to have ameliorated the position of the serf. The condition of the peasant remained bleak with taxation levels of around 40% and conscription terms of 25 years. Frederick did little to improve the lot of the Jews within Prussia. Jews remained banned from most jobs and had restrictions placed on free movement. They were barred from certain professions and were not allowed in as immigrants.

Increased taxation, especially after the selling of collection rights to French tax-farmers, did cause increased hardship although it might reasonably be claimed that general levels in comparison to other European powers remained low.

To challenge the question there is a range of policies that can be said to have improved the welfare of his people, these include:

The nobility saw little deterioration in their condition and certainly as landowners the failure to tackle serfdom was in part an effort to protect the legal status and privileges of the nobility. The rights of the nobility were probably extended during this period.

Economically the peasants remained amongst the most lightly taxed in Europe, and the merchants enjoyed considerable exemptions. The establishment of state granaries and the encouragement of immigration improved the welfare of all.

Religious toleration is probably the area in which Frederick's enlightened principles had greatest impact, although candidates may well suggest that the establishment of toleration for Muslims and other minority groups had little effect and was anyway motivated by economic concerns rather than those of principle.

Education did see the establishment of compulsory state education, which although inconsistently applied across his territories was amongst the most comprehensive systems in Europe and drew considerable praise from the philosophes. In addition the ending of torture and the lightening of censorship did much to improve general welfare. Some candidates may well be able to separate effective domestic reform from enlightened motivation and suggest that much of this reform had little to do with an enlightened programme of change.

Answers at Level 1 will be limited to simple assertion or a general overview of domestic policy with little link to the question. At Level 2, answers will offer a more detailed description of policies and link this to the question in a general manner perhaps with bland statements about the effect on welfare. By Level 3 there will be a much more analytical approach with a focus on the effect of policies more than a summary of what the policies were. The response should consider factors to challenge the question but in an unbalanced manner. At Level 4 there will be a confident analysis both in favour and against the notion that Frederick II's commitment to the Enlightenment failed to benefit the welfare of his people; this will be clearly different from a response that establishes simply whether welfare had improved. By Level 5 judgement will be made appropriate to the demands of the question although this may be partial and implicit in parts.

Question 3

'Frederick II's domestic policies served the interests of the nobility far more than the interests of the state.'

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 range of domestic policies and the effect of their implementation.

There should be an attempt to define the interests of both the nobility and state, and also some criteria established for serving their interests.

The nobility were increasingly relied on by Frederick II as a loyal and reliable group within Prussia. The nobles played an important role in an increasingly centralised bureaucracy and as such had a more influential function in Prussian society. All ministers were drawn from the ranks of the nobility. That this influence did not become dominant was probably due to the personal control exerted by Frederick rather than any feature of the new administrative system. Nobles were given much preference under Frederick II and were allowed to monopolise the higher ranks of the army in all periods except for a brief period of shortage during the Seven Years War. In fact, the bulk of non-noble officers were sacked and men of noble birth rather than of talent replaced them. The rights of the nobility were further confirmed in legal reforms, especially in relation to land usage and serfdom. After 1762, resale of noble land to any non-noble was prohibited and as such merely confirmed Frederick's custom of forbidding the passing of large holdings to those below noble rank. From 1775, middle class descendents were also barred from inheriting the lands of the nobility. Frederick's reluctance to implement reform of serfdom might itself be considered to have stemmed from a desire not to harm the interests of the nobility, and even laws prohibiting noble mistreatment of their serfs were rarely enforced. Frederick's own distaste for the bulk of his subjects can explain at least some of his preference for the nobility as a class.

However, the question can be easily challenged by consideration of a range of other policies, and higher-level answers may well acknowledge the link between the interests of the nobility and those of the state. The extension of bureaucracy was in itself an effort to serve the interests of the state, and the greater dominance of the nobility was merely a tool to achieve this objective. Many of the nobles were barred from service in the new bureaucracy due to the lack of a university education or success in the civil service exams and so this should not be seen as serving the interests of the nobility as a whole. There were restrictions placed on noble exploitation of serfdom, largely in an effort to improve efficiency, for example banning the practice of noble enclosure of peasants' holdings, and limiting serf labour obligations to four days a week. The failure to abolish serfdom outright may not indicate a fear of the nobility but rather a practical realisation that to do so would be to weaken the government and economy of Prussia. The promotion of religious toleration, education reforms and immigration had little to do with the interests of the nobility and might be clearly linked to the interests of the state and especially the economy. The reforms to bureaucracy whilst favouring the nobility, were seriously limited by the personal intervention of Frederick and by his desire to retain a tight

control over all aspects of administration. Indeed Frederick had a deep distrust of his ministers and civil servants preferring to remove their scope for independent action.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited accounts of an area of domestic reform with assertion on interests of nobility or state. Level 2 answers will include a more detailed description of domestic policy with some attempt to link to the focus of the question on nobility and/or state. There will be little attempt to define the interests of the nobility or state. By Level 3 there will be a largely analytical response with some attempt to define the interests of nobility and state. There will be some attempt to link the domestic policies with the interests of the state and nobility but there will not be balance. At Level 4 there will be a greater range of policies considered with some balance between both state and nobility. At the higher end of the level there might be some recognition of the interconnection between the two factors. Level 5 answers will sustain an argument on both aspects and reach a valid conclusion.

Question 4

‘The conquest of Silesia in 1740–1741, rather than the partition of Poland, was a more significant achievement of Frederick II’s foreign policy.’

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 to consider the achievement of Frederick II in foreign policy and to assess relative significance.

The significance of Silesia will probably be the initial focus of responses. Silesia’s significance as a military objective might be identified in economic terms, especially its population size and coal and iron deposits. The value of the Oder as a link between the Baltic and central Europe and the likely ease with which Protestants in Silesia would accept Frederick’s rule all made Silesia a significant target. The conquest of Silesia also did much to distance Frederick from the reputation of Frederick William and to bolster his own reputation in Europe. Most candidates will identify significance in terms of the impact this action had on the long-term foreign policy of Frederick and especially comment that its real impact was not the immediate benefits that it brought to the state or indeed to Frederick, but rather that holding on to Silesia became the dominant objective of Frederick’s entire foreign policy. The defeat of the Austrian army at Mollwitz in 1741 ensured that Austrian foreign policy centred on the desire to regain Silesia and indeed encouraged the great powers to ally against Prussia. Significance might be judged not in terms of achievement but rather on the impact that this had on the other great powers. Prussian involvement in the Austrian War of Succession was in part motivated by Frederick’s concern that Austria would be strong enough to attempt to recapture Silesia, and the success of Frederick might be judged in that by 1745 Prussia had gained Silesia at little expense, certainly in comparison to Austria or France. The damage that Frederick’s unprovoked attack on Silesia did to Prussia’s reputation is a valid point, although possibly too much has been made of the consequences of a contemporary reputation for immorality.

There should be consideration of Poland, although a perfect balance of factors is unlikely. The partition of Poland is often underestimated, not only did it contribute towards a weakening of Russian influence along the long Prusso-Polish border, but also it gave Frederick II significant territorial gains. Whilst only 660 square miles was gained for Prussia, the significance lay in the fact that Prussia gained a land bridge to East Prussia and control over the River Vistula, in addition to the integration of West Prussia. Frederick's most significant achievement might well be judged to have been Prussia's emergence as a great power; the attack on Silesia in 1740 was merely the beginning of this process.

Answers at Level 1 will consist of simple narrative accounts of Frederick's foreign policy with no real link to the question. Level 2 responses will give a more detailed narrative account but with little balance across the period. By Level 3 there will be a predominantly analytical response although still with sections of narrative. There will be some attempt to assess significance of Silesia rather than a simple analysis of events, although this will still be unbalanced across the period or range of factors. At Level 4 there will be a consistently analytical approach with a clear balance between Silesia and Poland. There will be a focus on the issue of significant achievement perhaps with clear criteria for this achievement. By Level 5 candidates will, in addition, show sustained judgement and reach a clear conclusion based on detailed and well-supported information.

Option B: Russia under Catherine II, 1762–1796

Question 5

'The partition of Poland was a more significant achievement of Catherine's foreign policy than gaining territory from Turkey.'

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

To prove or disprove this statement there should be some criteria established for foreign policy success which may be related to Catherine's original objectives. There should also be consideration of a good range of other foreign policy achievements in order to arrive at a justifiable conclusion with some focus on the issue of greatness.

Initial focus might well be on Catherine II's achievements in Poland, indeed this should be a major feature of candidates' responses. Catherine clearly intended to gain control over Poland from the earliest years of her reign. Initially this meant maintaining and extending the influence that already existed over the monarchy and the nobility. Such influence would not only ensure that Poland remained calm whilst Catherine focused on the Ottoman Empire, but also secured Russia's western borders by the effective creation of a buffer state. Initially, Catherine's policy towards Poland lacked obvious success. The attempt to establish a puppet ruler in the form of Stanislas Poniatowski and to hide behind the excuse of religious toleration provoked unrest and provided the excuse for Turkey to attack Russia. The first partition of Poland is perhaps further evidence of the failure of Catherine II's policy in this area for she was persuaded to seek territorial expansion at the expense of Poland's integrity – an integrity that served the defence of

Russia's borders. However, the very acquiescence of European powers to this attack on a sovereign state was a significant indicator of Russia's developing diplomatic power, and in addition Catherine did acquire the whole course of the River Dvina and Belorussia. Russian influence in Poland was clear when in 1791 the Poles attempted to dismantle Russian control and to declare a new constitution. The very fact that a number of Polish nobles opposed to this new constitution were encouraged to invite the intervention of Russian soldiers again indicates the control Russia still exerted. The Treaty of October 1793 between Russia and Poland that effectively reduced Poland to a protectorate led to the slaughter at Warsaw in autumn 1794 but again indicates Catherine's determination to maintain control. The final partition of Poland in 1795 ceded Russia even more territory including Lithuania and marks the effective end of the Polish state, and would have allowed Catherine the freedom of action to attack French republicanism if she had lived. The ease with which these new territories were assimilated into Russia is a further indication of the success of this policy. Perhaps the greatest significance of this policy was to allow Catherine freedom of action against the Turks, or the evidence it provides of Russia's ability to exploit German rivalries.

Catherine's efforts to provide Russia direct access to the eastern Mediterranean and her Turkish policy provide evidence of success in other areas. The gains at Kutchuk-Kainardjii 1774; freedom of navigation on the Black Sea; annexation of the Crimea in 1783, great military victories at Chesme, Ochakov; the Treaty of Jassy are all obvious. However, it might equally be argued that Catherine lacked realistic objectives in the Ottoman Empire – certainly in relation to the 'Greek Project' – and that gains were due to weaknesses in the increasingly frail Turkish Empire. However, the cost of her Turkish Policy and its failure to achieve its objectives of the final expulsion of Turkey from Europe should not divert attention from the significance of what she actually achieved.

Answers at Level 1 will be limited accounts of probably one area of foreign policy with little depth and relying on assertion and generalisation to prove any success. Level 2 answers will be a more balanced argument attempting to consider some range of policies towards Poland or Turkey. There will be some understanding of the analytical demands possibly with some attempt to provide support for the concept of success but again lacking weight and not considering a range of policies in other theatres. By Level 3 answers will display an analytical style, although still with some narrative passages. There will be some attempt to address the issue of greatest success with reference to other areas of foreign policy, although without balance. At Level 4 there will be a consistently analytical response with a clear balance between Poland and Turkey as the two significant areas of foreign policy. There will also be a definition of success perhaps with some attempt to challenge the extent to which Catherine held power in Poland. By Level 5 there will be clear judgement that can be supported by a wide range of precisely selected material with an effective conclusion to greatest success.

Question 6

‘Catherine II sacrificed her enlightened principles in order to preserve the existing society and institutions of Russia.’

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 provides the opportunity to consider Catherine II's commitment to the Enlightenment. This is a central theme of the Specification and should provide candidates with a range of material that can reasonably be applied in support of an argument. Good responses will need to establish some definition of enlightened principles as well as identification of some of the key features of the society and institutions of Russia. These features might reasonably include serfdom, the authority of the Tsar, the nobility and also the Church although this is by no means an exclusive list.

Proof of Catherine's commitment to enlightened principles might be established by means of her extensive reading before coming to the throne; her correspondence with philosophes; her patronage of the arts; her purchase of Diderot's library; religious toleration; the Free Economic Society. Catherine's early commitment might also be established through reference to the Legislative Assembly and Nakaz and her apparently ideological objection to serfdom.

As a usurper, there was a clear need for Catherine to establish her authority and to placate the nobility; she could do this by emphasising continuity rather than change. The failure of the Legislative Assembly might be seen as initial evidence of Catherine's willingness to sacrifice principle to the need to preserve. Most obviously, Catherine did little to enact any significant improvements for the serfs, despite initial promise. The preservation of serfdom is a clear example of an instance in which the reality of administration, the need for noble support and also the demands of the economy provided little opportunity for change. Indeed, as an institution, serfdom was extended with the acquisition of new territory and the granting of Crown serfs to Catherine's favourites, especially after the secularisation of church land. In addition the burden on the serfs probably increased with time as Catherine made no attempt to limit labour service or to provide serfs with legal protection. Serfdom remained the basis of stable society throughout her reign.

The Charter of Nobility 1785, granting legal recognition of land rights and also privileges such as freedom from arbitrary arrest, might be used as an indicator of Catherine's need to appease the nobility and to preserve their privileges. The Pugachev rebellion may also be seen as the beginning of a more reactionary style of government, and this was certainly true in the aftermath of the French revolution with the reversal of many of the changes to Russian society that Catherine had previously introduced. However, there are areas in which change may be said to have been maintained. Education reforms did attempt to broaden provision. The Smolny Institute provided for the daughters of the nobility. Elementary schools and provincial state schools indicate a willingness to enact change along enlightened lines. However, the determination of Catherine to see such policies succeed may be questioned, especially as she was reluctant to provide central financial support. Candidates might also argue that the attempt to end the religious persecution of the Old Believers; legal recognition of the Roman Catholic

Church; the Muslim Spiritual Assembly; and the Jewish Pale are clear indicators of reform to Russian society.

Level 1 answers will be limited narratives of some of Catherine's policies with very little link to the question of sacrifice of principle or of maintenance of existing institutions. There may also be some assertion on the nature of Catherine's enlightenment. Level 2 answers will seek to examine both areas of the question but with limited support or will be more detailed narrative accounts of Catherine's domestic reforms with a limited attempt to link to the question. By Level 3 there will be an analytical focus with support across a range of policies with some attempt to consider the degree to which Catherine abandoned her enlightened principles; there should also be some attempt to address the issue of preservation of institutions, but by no means in a balanced way. At Level 4 there will be much more balance, with consideration of areas in which she actually succeeded in introducing enlightened change or indeed abandoned principles for reasons other than preservation. At Level 5 answers will in addition sustain argument and draw effective conclusions on the validity of the statement.

Question 7

'Catherine II's domestic policies served the interests of the privileged far more than the interests of the state.'

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 range of domestic policies and to examine their impact on two groups within Russian society. Some definition of the privileged may well be offered especially in the more effective answers, as may some consideration of what the interest of the state might have been. There may also be some analysis of the degree to which the interests of the privileged and those of the state overlapped.

Initially answers may focus on Catherine's concern to consolidate her rule by offering concessions to the nobility. Later concessions such as the Charter of the Nobility and the confirmation of the nobility's control of serfs may also be seen as policies that helped the privileged far more than the state – certainly in economic terms. However, improvements to education, and the effort to improve trade and communications might well be considered to have been far more effective than what seem largely illusory concessions to the nobility. Strong central government served the state as did reforms to provincial government.

Answers at Level 1 will be limited narrative accounts probably of just one domestic policy or a brief general summary of both, with very little appreciation of achievement, or limited to assertion. Level 2 answers will be a more detailed but still predominantly narrative account of the domestic policies. However, there may be some attempt to focus on the issue of achievement. Level 3 answers will be mainly analytical although may still have sections of narrative in support. There will be a clear focus on the issue of achievement, with some consideration of a range of other domestic policies, although without balance. At Level 4 there will be a good balance of domestic policies, although the focus should remain how these

policies served the interests of both the privileged and the state. Answers that do not give adequate analysis of both factors should rightly be placed at the top of the previous level. There should be a consistently analytical approach with a clear focus not simply on achievement but greatest achievement. Level 5 answers will have clear criteria for reaching a reasoned conclusion on greatest achievement and supported by a range of precisely selected material.

Question 8

'The overwhelming similarity in their key ideas proves that the *Philosophes* can be treated as a single group.'

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 identify the key ideas of the philosophes and especially Montesquieu, Rousseau and Voltaire, combined with discussion of degree similarity should ensure access to the higher awards.

The work of historians such as Gay has long depicted the Enlightenment as a unity. The philosophes have been treated as a group that largely knew each other and were at least familiar with each other's works. Commonly held beliefs might constitute: the shared advocacy of rationality; a general commitment to 'exposing' the *ancien regime*; religious toleration; belief in progress; equality before the law; education, removal of censorship. However, such apparent similarity is in part a consequence of the vagueness of their shared aims. Once specific knowledge of the key philosophes is applied, it is clear that there were crucial differences and that the Philosophes themselves were keen to highlight this divergence. Rousseau's rejection of natural progress and his belief that man in a state of nature was good was reflected in the uncompromisingly bleak view of the achievements of civilisation in *Emile*. In this sense Rousseau presented the most lethal challenge to enlightened ideas. Indeed, Rousseau argued that much of what other philosophes were advocating would render man less happy and less free. Voltaire's thoughts on the progress of man constitute a long-standing attack on Rousseau, and in his essay, *Man*, Voltaire makes clear a belief in the merits of society given the degrading natural state of man. Blake in fact condemned Voltaire for making the industrial system possible. Likewise in theory of government there were clear differences between the three great Philosophes. Voltaire flattered the leading absolutists of Europe such as Catherine the Great although was still an advocate of civil liberty. Indeed, Voltaire did not develop a coherent system of political thought and rarely had consistency in argument. This can be contrasted with the work of Montesquieu whose greatest contribution, the *Spirit of the Laws*, became a lasting model of the separation of the powers in government. Montesquieu held that absolutism must distance itself from despotism and find a more rational justification for its existence. Rousseau however had little time for the constructs of state and suggested that the General Will should govern all. This was countered by Voltaire who saw little but ignorance amongst the masses and failed to support general education. The major contrast in governmental theory was Rousseau's apparent support of absolutism. Such a loss in faith in progress was a significant factor in Voltaire's decision to become a deist.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be vague and limited descriptions of one or two of the writers perhaps with assertion on similarity or difference. Level 2 answers will be more detailed, but still narrative accounts of the key ideas of two or three of the philosophes with some attempt to link the concept of similarity. By Level 3 answers will be analytical with a clear attempt not to describe thought but to identify obvious areas of similarity or of difference. There will be a range of ideas analysed however this will be unbalanced. At Level 4 there will be a much more critical and balanced approach considering areas of similarity and difference for two or three philosophes. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-sustained conclusion having argued the case for and against the statement.

Question 9

'The survival of serfdom proves that the Enlightenment had no practical impact on their policies.'

How far is this a valid assessment of **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

This question enables candidates to consider the degree to which the two monarchs put the principles of the Enlightenment into practice. Whilst some discussion of the personal commitment of the monarchs may be appropriate the clear focus of this question is the practical implementation.

Initial focus is likely to be the issue of serfdom. Catherine's enthusiasm for reform of serfdom was clear in her essay competition and indeed in the *Nakaz*. However, this was soon tempered by a growing realism of the impracticality of changing a system vital both for the administration of a country as vast as Russia, and also vital for economic stability.

The Pugachev Revolt was probably an added influence in tempering any efforts to reduce the burden of serfdom. Indeed, it is reasonable to suggest that the burden on the serfs increased during Catherine's reign especially in the context of the acquisition of new territory and also the secularisation of church land. Candidates may challenge the premise of the question and argue that Frederick II did manage to solve the problem at least in part with the abolition of serfdom in Silesia and west and east Prussia and on royal domains. Yet in his 1777 essay on the *Forms and Duties of the Rulers* he famously accepted the economic necessity of serfdom. Frederick was constrained in much the same way as Catherine in accepting the need to placate the nobility if his rule was to be effective. The best that can be said is that he reduced the labour services of the peasants living in certain areas, but this was not a solution to the problem of serfdom.

Other areas in which the Enlightenment may be seen to have had an impact include religion in which Catherine's attempts to introduce religious tolerance; to end the persecution of the Old Believers; give legal recognition to the Roman Catholic Church; establish the Muslim Spiritual Assembly and the Pale of Settlement for Jews has clear enlightened principles. Frederick II's principles of religious toleration stemmed perhaps more from indifference but he did express his commitment to the ideal of toleration in 1777. Yet he did fail to introduce a Patent of Toleration.

Consideration can also be given of the two monarchs' attempts to abolish torture; introduce enlightened educational reforms and especially Frederick's compulsory state education.

Answers at Level 1 will probably amount to a limited description of an area of policy or a very general overview of a range limited effectively to a summary. There will be no real link to the question. Level 2 answers will consist of more detailed descriptions of the ruler's policies, with some attempt to focus on the demands of the question, such as suggesting that the Enlightenment did have an impact, but with very little support or development. Level 3 answers will have a clear analytical focus examining a broader range of policies although this will be unbalanced. Both monarchs will be considered. By Level 4, answers will be consistently analytical and balanced with a consideration of a range of policies applying to both monarchs. There will be a clear attempt to indicate areas in which the Enlightenment did have an impact on policies. At Level 5 candidates will in addition sustain judgement and reach a clear conclusion.

Question 10

'It was their genuine commitment to the ideas of the Enlightenment that explains their desire to reform.'

How far is this a valid assessment of **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II? (20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

As both rulers are to be considered, less depth of knowledge on each state is expected than in Options A and B, but there should still be a good range of information considered. This question enables candidates to consider the depth of commitment of the two monarchs to the concepts of the Enlightenment and the impact that this had on their policies.

Commitment to ideas might readily be established by the correspondence and reading of both monarchs; cultural pursuits; financial support for the philosophes and especially Voltaire and Diderot; the *Nakaz* and the *Anti-Machiavel*; the concept of 'first servant of the state'; time spent at Rheinsberg; the early life of both monarchs might be used as clear evidence of an initial desire to reform.

The focus of this question is motivation, although candidates may well use specific examples of reforms as evidence of an apparent commitment to enlightened principles. Most obviously these include: the drive of both monarchs to improve education and to broaden its provision; the attempt to reform the administration of justice and also legal codification; free trade; restriction in censorship; religious toleration and the establishment of the Muslim Spiritual Assembly and the Pale of Settlement; patronage of the arts.

Other factors that explain their desire to reform might include: the obvious need to cement authority, especially in the case of Catherine; a wish to placate the nobility; the vanity and international image of the monarchs accounting for their correspondence with the philosophes; economic motivation being a sizable component in the move towards religious toleration; a desire to preserve the status quo and especially the social structure of their states; the need to provide an educated bureaucratic class.

Candidates may well conclude that the Enlightenment was much less of a guiding principle, and more of a convenient cloak for the implementation of policies that illustrate a certain continuity of monarchical ambition. To see the philosophes as drivers of reform or of either Frederick or Catherine slavishly following a programme of enlightened reform is to misunderstand the nature of the Enlightenment and also kingship.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited narratives of some of the rulers' policies or vague assertion on the nature of the monarchs' commitment to the Enlightenment without support. At Level 2 answers may also be a description of policies or of the monarchs' commitment to principle, but this will be considered in more depth. Answers will be predominantly narrative but will have some valid links. Level 3 answers will have a clear analytical focus with some attempt to consider criteria for establishing both monarchs' commitment to the Enlightenment. Mention of other possible factors for reform may be present but will be very limited. At Level 4 there will be a clear attempt to consider a range of examples of commitment to enlightened principles, and also other factors that may have motivated both monarchs. There may well be comparison between the rulers for the top of the level. Level 5 answers will, in addition, sustain judgement and reach a clear conclusion.