

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/22**

Paper 2b (European History Outlines, c. 1378–1815),  
maximum raw mark 90

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

## **Introduction**

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

Examiners should 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 should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, 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 well 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 2 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 should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should 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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

### **Band 1: 25–30**

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. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

### **Band 2: 19–24**

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. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

### **Band 3: 13–18**

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. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

#### **Band 4: 7–12**

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 well 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. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

#### **Band 5: 0–6**

The answer 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; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. 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 whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

### Section 1: c. 1378–c. 1461

#### 1 Why was the Great Schism so prolonged?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates will need to demonstrate understanding of a variety of factors. They may outline the circumstances which led to the development of the Great Schism and then consider the reasons for its prolongation. These may include the role of the French, the relative even support each claimant enjoyed and the intransigence of some of those chosen as Pope. Candidates may discuss why efforts to end the Schism failed, such as the slowness of communications in 1394 and the insanity of the French king which made it difficult for France, in the best position to bring pressure on both camps, to do so. The way in which the Schism ended is less relevant but candidates may refer to it to show how a new set of circumstances was more conducive to a settlement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question does not ask candidates to decide which were the more important factors, but they are likely to see the part played by the French as crucial, not least because, in the end, it was the support of the French which allowed the Avignon faction to survive.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

## 2 How is the political instability in Northern Italy in this period best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates will need to demonstrate understanding of a variety of factors. They may refer to the growing power of the *condottieri* and their ambitions and readiness to fight for the highest bidder. Some individuals like Gian Galeazzo Visconti contributed to the instability by his seizure of Verona and Padua. The wealth of some states meant they could pursue their own ends determinedly and thus raise up opposition. The death of Gian Galeazzo caused a fresh round of upheaval as did the revival of Milan under Filippo Maria and then the end of the Viscontis and the rise of Francesco Sforza. Fictious and trading rivalries also affected Florence and the Albizzi/Medici contest, and along with the nature of the Florentine constitution, further contributed to instability. The example of the Bentivoglio in Bologna might also be used. It could be argued that there was a transition from city states to territorial states. There should be discussion of both general and particular explanations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question asks candidates to suggest which of the explanations is the most valid and the debate may well be between the role of particular individuals on the one hand and the part played by the constitutions of the states in Northern Italy which made it hard to establish a stable government. There could be discussion as to whether events in Milan, Venice or Florence had the greater impact, but the answer should not be confined to a single state.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**3 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Dukes of Burgundy during this period.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. This period covers the rule of three Dukes of Burgundy; Philippe le Hardi, Jean sans Peur and Philippe le Bon. A chronological approach is not likely to form a successful response. Strengths of the Burgundian Dukes might include their accumulation of lands in the Low Countries, their strong civil service, the wealth and the trading power of their territories, which included the mouths of the Rhine and the Scheldt and the cities of Bruges and Antwerp, the alliance with England up to 1435, the magnificence of their court and their patronage role with van Eyck as Philippe le Bon's court painter. The Order of the Golden Fleece had a European-wide membership. Weaknesses might be the lack of unity in their loose bundle of territories, where there was little administrative centralisation, the decline of the Flanders cloth industry as a result of competition with England, the beginning of the decline of Bruges at the end of the period, their failure to win the title of king from the Emperor and the unfortunate impact of events in France such as the rivalry of Jean sans Peur with the Dauphin, resulting in his death in 1419 and the disputes over the Somme towns. Philippe le Bon was on bad terms with Charles VII in the latter part of his rule which was not helped by the Dauphin taking refuge on Burgundian soil.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are asked to assess the strengths and weaknesses which implies considering which outweighed the other. They can decide either way, but might argue that up to 1467 the Dukes were stronger rather than weaker, given the standing of Philippe in Europe. They might point out that the rule of Charles was a disaster and ruined Burgundy, which could be credited, although beyond the scope of the question.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

#### **4 Why did the Hussites incur the hostility of both lay and ecclesiastical leaders?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Lay leaders were hostile to the Hussites because of their anarchic tendencies and especially their rejection of property rights, disavowal of the need for a lay ruler and beliefs that there should be no serfdom or taxation. In addition Sigismund, king of the Romans, was opposed to the moves towards the independence of Bohemia and the fact that the Czechs, led by Zizka, prevented his recognition as king of Bohemia would obviously increase his ill-feeling towards them. The ecclesiastical leadership was concerned particularly that Hus was so critical of the corruption of the clergy, more so than over his theology. The development of his views on the levelling of the status of the priest and the layman, symbolised by the receiving of communion in both kinds by the people as well as the priest, was seen as a threat to the position of the priesthood. He further believed that obedience to the church was only to be enforced when the church complied with biblical teaching. This led on to clerical marriage, rejection of images and the abandonment of the Latin liturgy. Hus was burned as a heretic in 1415.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates could comment that, given the radical nature of much of Hussite belief, the support which they received from the landed classes in Bohemia is surprising and shows that dislike of the German influence could outweigh class interests. Candidates might, therefore, take issue with the terms of the question. They could also suggest which factors had the greatest impact in causing opposition to Hussitism.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

## **5 Account for the recovery of France in the reign of Charles VII.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might point out that the Treaty of Troyes represented the nadir of French fortunes so that any improvement was to be applauded. The reasons for recovery are balanced between the revival of France and the problems in England. The French military successes, beginning with the relief of Orleans, were a key factor. Candidates might discuss how much these owed to Joan of Arc, whose role has been challenged, although made much of in many contemporary accounts. Another vital factor was the Burgundian abandonment of England for a French alliance at Arras in 1435. Although the terms were humiliating on paper for Charles VII, he evaded the worst of them. Military and financial reforms followed. On the other hand, the English suffered from the premature death of Henry V and the factionalism of the English court, notably after the death of the duke of Bedford in 1435. Their estrangement from Burgundy was crucial.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates could argue that it was the Burgundian alliance which made all the difference, to France for gaining it and to England for losing it. The determination of Charles VII compared with the less committed attitude of Henry VI and his ministers, also contributed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

## Section 2: c. 1461–c. 1516

### 6 'The achievements of Louis XI have been much overestimated'. Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The evidence for this statement comes largely from the two major errors Louis made during his reign. The first of these was the crisis at Peronne in 1468 when he became a virtual prisoner of the Burgundian duke and was forced to renounce his allies in Liege, although the concessions he had to make were later scaled back somewhat. More serious was his over enthusiasm to profit from the death of Charles in 1477, leading to the marriage of Mary of Burgundy to Maximilian of Austria which had grave long term results for the security of France. But the alternative view has a large body of evidence to support it, and Louis succeeded in his three main aims, to overthrow the virtually independent Burgundy, to reduce the power of the feudal nobility in France and to prevent any English intervention in France. His dismantling of the League of the Public Weal, his use of allies to overcome Charles, his diplomacy in reconciling Warwick and Margaret of Anjou and then, when they fell, in buying off Edward IV, all contributed. His financial security and encouragement of trade were other assets. It could be argued that Louis had some good fortune as well as clear policies. Several noble houses died out and Charles of Burgundy's rash character helped lead to the implosion of his duchy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Better candidates will consider the two sides of the argument rather than look at aspects of the reign to see if the achievement has been overestimated.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**7 Why did Italy experience so much foreign intervention in the late fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The reasons fall into two categories; the attractions of Italy for an invader and the rivalries of the main European powers, the rulers of France and Spain. Candidates can draw examples from the wars throughout the period but the question could be seen to end in 1529 and instances from a much later period are not relevant. Italy was a magnet for intervention since it was enviably rich, a trading centre for the Mediterranean Sea and the Eastern trade and the focus of an artistic revival. It was also the seat of the Papacy. It was not a united state and the feuding between the main states weakened it. Armies tended to be of mercenaries and so of unreliable loyalty. Ludovico Sforza went so far as to invite a French invasion in pursuit of his own ends. On the other hand, the French revival led Charles VIII in search of glory and his invasion was compounded by the existence of claims to Milan and Naples which he had inherited. Louis XII and Francis I continued the trend. Equally, the accession of Charles V to the throne of Spain and as HRE prolonged the fighting. The French resisted the control of Charles and he was determined to take the prize. The two sides with their allies were relatively evenly balanced and there were few really decisive battles. Pavia in 1525 is an exception.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well try to assess which of the factors had the greater impact or distinguish between the underlying and immediate causes, seeing Italy as a temptation to an invaders but also ascribing a major role to the circumstances of 1492. Candidates could feel that once the wars began, a permanent settlement was hard to achieve, as one power was usually left feeling aggrieved.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**8 How great were the achievements of the Ottoman Turks in the period 1451–1520?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to conclude that the achievements of the Ottomans in this period outweighed their failures. The prime success is likely to be seen as the capture of Constantinople in 1453 from the Byzantines by Mehmet II. The further territorial advances of the Turks meant that they had mastery over the Greek world as well as making serious advances into Asia. The Black Sea came under their control, giving them a key position in trade with the East. Under Bayezid II and Selim I sea power was built up which led to the conquest of Syria and Egypt. Although the reign of Suleiman is outside the set dates, candidates could refer to his magnificence as the outcome of the growth of Turkish dominance under previous rulers. On the negative side, Belgrade under Hunyadi, and Rhodes, held out against the Turks, although both were to fall to Suleiman and Venice spearheaded some resistance to maintain her trading rights. The incompetence of several of the European rulers who tried to resist the Turks could be seen as flattering them. The religious unity was broken by the sectarianism in Islam. The power of the Janissaries was made clear by the need for new Sultans to bribe them to get their backing.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether the achievements were that great, but may well struggle to find much to say on the negative side. But some suggestion that the view that the Ottomans were all-powerful and all-conquering can be qualified, should be attempted for the higher bands.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

**9 To what extent, if at all, did Ferdinand and Isabella of Castile unite Spain?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might suggest that religion was one area where there was a degree of unity. Ecclesiastical appointments came under the control of the monarchs and Cisneros carried out church reform. The Inquisition was the only institution common to Castile and Aragon and the expulsion of the Jews was widely welcomed. The conquest of Granada may have had a uniting effect. There was some unity in foreign policy and in diplomatic correspondence the title King of Spain was first used to describe Ferdinand. The acquisition of Roussillon, Cerdagne and Navarre were beneficial to Spain and the wars in Italy were largely national undertakings. Beyond this, the two components remained distinct. The *fueros* enjoyed by Aragon meant the king could make little impact there, failing to introduce the *Hermandad* successfully, so he concentrated more on Castile where he spent most of his time. Castile and Aragon had their own institutions, laws, coinage and economies – Aragon played no part in the expansion in America. Arguably the monarchs did not see unity as a priority but were more concerned with stability in the kingdoms and the defeat of France. The crisis on the death of Joanna exemplifies the lack of unity.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Spain was at all united. They are likely to indicate there was some movement in that direction. They may be aware of debate about the relative success of the Inquisition and other reforms and may argue that the monarchs concentrated their efforts on Castile, which was easier to control and more rewarding and this was their main aim. Events after 1516 show some reaction to the policies and could be used as further evidence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**10 To what extent did Ivan III strengthen the Muscovite state?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might suggest that Ivan was very successful in expanding the frontiers of Muscovy, absorbing his neighbours gradually. He was able to secure Novgorod and then to make his power there a reality. He benefited from rivalries among the Tatar states to make allies of some of them. He became influential in Kazan and once he had built up his position was able to attack Lithuania, his long term aim. His enlarged territories required a more extensive administrative system and power began to move from the boyars to professionals. Land acquired by his conquests was given to new tenants in exchange for the provision of troops, which gave him an army not dependent on the boyars. These reforms were only a start and succeeding rulers had much to do to bring them to completion and the boyars revived somewhat when there was a minority and so were able to threaten the security of the Muscovite state.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to how far Ivan strengthened the state looking at the situation when he began to reign and at the end of his reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

### Section 3: c. 1516–c. 1559

#### 11 (*Candidates offering Paper 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.*)

##### Why, by 1521, had the Papacy excommunicated Luther?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might suggest a variety of reasons. Luther's pamphlets of 1520 had expounded his new theology based on *sole fide* and *sole scriptura*, which was sufficiently radical to undermine the structure of the church and so needed decisive action from the Pope. At this point the Pope was not convinced that Luther had much support and so hoped to end his movement before it had really begun. Charles V had made it clear that he was firmly against Luther so the Pope needed to assert his authority as well. The threat to the unity of the church was probably the main reason for papal action and the Pope behaved just as previous pontiffs had done and their reactions had normally quietened protests. Leo tended to underestimate the degree of support Luther enjoyed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to what was the major motivation of the Papacy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

**12 (Candidates offering Paper 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.)**

**How successful was Charles I as King of Spain?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might indicate that Charles was successful in rebuilding support for the monarchy after the revolts of 1520-1 and from being seen as a foreigner he became accepted as a Spaniard. His marriage to Isabella of Portugal followed Spanish traditions. He ruled in partnership with both the Cortes and the nobility of Castile. The bureaucracy he initiated was reasonably efficient. Under his rule the Spanish Empire was established in Mexico and Peru, a great source of wealth and power. His foreign policy in the Mediterranean was in Spanish interests. Alternatively Charles was less successful in provoking the revolts through his ignorance of Spain, in his reliance on the revenues of Castile to finance his wars, not necessarily in the interests of Spain, which caused hardship and eventually bankruptcy under Philip II, and in his economic policies, where the need for ready cash prevented any long term plans from being made and led to terminal decline later. On balance candidates might feel that Charles was seen as immensely powerful by contemporaries and as ushering in the Golden Age of Spain, but that this view was quite flattering to him and the reality was somewhat different.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Charles deserves his reputation as a successful Spanish ruler.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



<b>Page 17</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**13 Was the Valois monarchy of France stronger or weaker in 1559 than it had been in 1515?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might indicate that the ability of the Valois monarchy to resist the Habsburgs over a long period shows their inherent strength. They were capable of raising large amounts of taxation at will and their control of the organs of government was considerable. They had consolidated the royal territory in France. Their role as the leading Renaissance monarchs of their day was another strength. They maintained command over the French church and limited the incursions of the Protestants. But this view could be considered over optimistic. The Italian Wars left France in debt and for very little gain beyond Metz, Toul and Verdun, although arguably these were of greater strategic value than Milan. The defeat and capture of Francis I was a great blow. Magnificent palaces were not much practical help. The overriding needs of the wars had allowed nobles and ministers to have a greater role in government and some families were in a position to challenge the crown. The outbreak of the civil wars after 1559 might be seen as showing that France was weakened, but the unexpected death of Henry II, a main contributing cause, was not an event for which the monarchy could prepare. Candidates could tackle the question by writing about the powers of the crown in 1515 and then in 1559, but such answers need to be analytical and not descriptive.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether the monarchy was stronger or weaker and avoid arguing that it was partly one and partly the other.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 18</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

#### **14 How is the expansion of Ottoman power under Suleiman I best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might argue that the reasons fall into two groups. On the one hand are the positive advantages of the Ottoman system and on the other are the weaknesses of Suleiman's opponents. Suleiman had the benefit of a superb army of Janissaries and cavalry. He inherited an equally efficient navy. He could raise considerable amounts of money. His power was absolute and he had no rivals. There was religious harmony in his empire. His predecessors had begun the expansion of the Empire, notably with the capture of Constantinople. Against him the forces of Christendom were far from being united. Francis I even collaborated with him on occasions. The only consistent opposition came from Charles V and he had the Italian Wars and the problems in Germany to deal with as well. Luther was against crusades as they merely benefited the Pope in his view. War was an integral part of the Ottoman Empire and as such was pursued single-mindedly by Suleiman.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Suleiman would have been so successful had Western Europe been stronger in its resistance to him. They might note that the Ottomans were not invulnerable as they were open to attack from Persia, did not have the naval resources of their enemies and their annual march from Constantinople could leave their supply lines dangerously extended.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 19</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**15 Assess the significance for Sweden of the reign of Gustavus Vasa.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might argue that the reign had considerable significance. From being a divided country in union with Denmark it became a nation state. The Roman Catholic church, after a protracted dispute between the monarchy and the Pope, became independent at the Diet of Vasteras and moved to Protestantism with its wealth being extensively despoiled by the king, in much the same way as Henry VIII did in England. A vernacular Bible was introduced. The army was remodelled with volunteers and became a professional body. The navy was established. Industry and foreign trade developed after Gustavus broke free from the control of Lubeck. The monarchy became hereditary instead of being elective. The length of the reign added to its impact. The significance thus lies largely in the laying of foundations for the future. Sweden was still in a backwater with relatively little impact in Europe.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to how much change was brought about by Gustavus and how far his autocratic and unpredictable nature weakened the significance of his reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 20</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

#### Section 4: c. 1559–1610

### 16 To what extent were the foreign policies of Philip II determined by ‘a grand strategy’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might indicate that there is some debate about this issue. One view is that Philip had expansionist aims to establish Spain as the dominant empire of his day and his policies were all geared to this end. The alternative interpretation is that he had a series of different priorities at different points in his reign and that often circumstances, rather than an over-arching plan drove his decisions. Candidates can use illustrations from various European arenas in their argument. The wars against the Turks and England, Philip’s acquisition of Portugal and his intervention in France in the 1590s might show his religious and dynastic aims. His truce with the Turks after Lepanto and his toleration of Protestant England until 1585 show his religious motives could be muted and hint at a more defensive attitude.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to how far there is a discernible single trend in Philip’s policy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 21</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**17 How effectively did the French Monarchy deal with the challenge of the Huguenots in the period 1559–1610?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might suggest that the monarchy was inept in its dealings with the Huguenots and that it was not always certain just what it was trying to achieve. Catherine de Medici failed to understand the depth of Huguenot beliefs and veered from negotiation and hints of toleration, to complete hostility in the Massacre of St Bartholemew. The military power of the Huguenots allowed them to extort a favourable settlement in 1576. The situation after 1584 caused Henry III to change direction again and persecution spurred on by the Guise took over. However, the response could be credited with some realism. Catherine tried hard to find an acceptable compromise, until 1572. Henry IV settled the challenge with the Edict of Nantes, although this could be seen as too generous and establishing a state within a state. The military aid the Huguenots received from England and the Netherlands and the intervention of Spain to help the Catholic League made it harder for the monarchy to respond effectively since it did not always control events. Descriptions of the Civil Wars of the period and any chronological approaches are likely to founder, given the amount of material.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to how far the policies were effective, depending to an extent on what their aims might have been.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 22</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

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

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The focus should be on the issue in the question before other possible reasons are explored. Candidates might suggest that religious grievances include the suggested introduction of new bishoprics and Philip's determination 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 would 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. Candidates are unlikely to be able to illustrate these arguments in much detail if their coverage is broadly based

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which factors had the greatest role in the outbreak and continuation of the revolt and avoid arguing they all had an equal contribution.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 23</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**19 Assess the view that the Catholic Church was disastrously slow in responding to the need for reform in the sixteenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue in favour of the statement that the Papacy was more concerned with protecting its position after the challenges of the conciliar movement and that the nature of early sixteenth century popes was not such as to promote reform. The main instigators of reform were hostile monarchs like the German princes or Henry VIII. Even when the Council of Trent was summoned, it was postponed because of the Italian Wars. Lutheranism was well established by this time so the delay was disastrous. The Index and the Inquisition came too late to be effective. Alternatively, candidates could refer to reforming groups like the Brethren of the Common Life or the Oratory of Divine Love which predated Luther. New orders sprang up in Italy and the Capuchins and Jesuits showed great commitment. In Spain Cardinal Ximenes carried out major reforms, although few other rulers were as enthusiastic in the cause. But it could be argued that these had their best results in countries where Protestantism had not penetrated so deeply. There was some valuable work in overseas missions. When the Council did meet and when the Inquisition was extended, both had some impact so that the slow reaction was not so disastrous after all.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether there was a delay in reform throughout the church and whether the outcome was disastrous.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 24</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**20 How far, and in what ways, was there a decline in Ottoman power in the period 1566–c. 1617?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that there was little decline. The Sultans after Suleiman may not have been his equals but were able to maintain the empire and even add to it with the conquest of Cyprus and the maintenance of power in North Africa. The Sultans developed ties with England which helped their trade and gave them support against Venice and France who wanted more privileges. Turkish historians mostly date the decline from later in the seventeenth century. But there were some signs that all was not well. In Russia an attack on Astrakhan failed. A long war on the Hungarian frontier showed that the balance of power there was moving towards the Habsburgs. The European use of firearms was superior to that of the Ottomans, who were often reluctant to take new methods on board. Lepanto was a setback, albeit quite a brief one. The Persians were a constant threat and took advantage of Ottoman problems and even tried to ally with European enemies of the Sultan.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether there was a decline.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 25	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

### Section 5: Themes c. 1378–c. 1610

#### 21 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the pre-Reformation Church.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that the strengths of the church lay in the general acceptance of its rituals by much of Europe as the basis of the daily round. Private religious practices were often flourishing as the *devotio moderna* illustrates. The onset of printing had helped here. The power of the church was considerable, as a political force in Italy and as a major provider of administrators in many countries. It was wealthy. Alternatively, there was criticism of the structure of the church and of some of its leaders – unworthy popes and proud prelates, more interested in riches than in religion. The religious orders came under much attack for the neglect of the poor and moving away from their prime purposes. Ignorant clergy were the butt of critics like Erasmus. Candidates could assess how justified such complaints were.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether the strengths outweighed the weaknesses. Given the fact of the Reformation, they could well argue they did.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

## 22 How important was Erasmus to the development of Humanism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may start by providing some definition of the term. They may outline what Erasmus contributed, such as his publication of the *Adages*, to introduce Europeans to the classical learning of the Renaissance. He saw Humanist textual criticism as a tool which could lead to a deeper understanding of the Christian gospel and hoped that familiarity with the Bible could become available to all. He wanted church reform, but from within and used satire, as *In Praise of Folly* illustrated, to make his points. One of his key contributions was his version of the New Testament in Greek, which corrected many errors in the Latin Vulgate. These publications helped the evolution of Christian Humanism. He saw man as capable of self-improvement in the Italian Humanist tradition. His influence lessened after the emergence of Luther and Humanism moved in a different direction. His moderation in the face of radicalism won him few friends and he was increasingly marginalised, while Catholics blamed him for encouraging the reformers, so that he is probably more valued today than he was by his later contemporaries.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to the extent of his role and may well conclude that even if his contribution was eventually seen as less relevant, he did more than others to develop Humanist ideals and practices.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 27</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**23 How significant were developments in the conduct of war in the period up to c. 1550?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that there were significant developments, with a move away from feudal armies to more disciplined and trained forces. Another significant change was the use of firearms, with the arquebus gradually replacing the power of the pike or bow. The possession of cannon became a matter of pride and standing for monarchs and the expense of such weaponry reduced the capability of princes to war against their lords. In the Atlantic especially, naval warfare was dominated by the broadside rather than ram and grapple tactics. Diplomacy also developed and the idea of the balance of power became prevalent. Ferdinand of Aragon was a master of this art. Alternatively, there were some areas where there was less change. Sieges and the methods of attrition were still important and the infantry remained a key factor. In the Mediterranean, traditional fighting methods continued. On balance, the changes could be seen as highly significant, as they presaged the age of the musket and professional armies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to the extent of the changes in waging war.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 28</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**24 To what extent did the aims of Portugal in overseas expansion in the fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries go beyond a quest for slaves and bullion?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that slaves and bullion were the key targets of the Portuguese. There had been a marked shortage of gold in Portugal which had led to a lack of gold for minting coins. From the earliest days of exploration, gold from Guinea was being transported to Portugal. The trade in slaves tended to develop later when Spain began to colonise America and needed extra labour. Portugal dominated the Atlantic slave trade until the challenge from England in the 1560s. But there were other motives. Early expeditions were often led by nobles who wanted to serve the crown, win personal glory and crusade against non-Christians. The patronage of overseas voyages by Henry the Navigator, although his role has been reassessed, resulted from his curiosity but also his willingness to exploit the opportunities he saw. The kings of Portugal also realised they could profit and this probably became their main motive as exploration progressed and access to the lucrative spice trade became a possibility. There was, too, their hope of finding a Christian ruler in Africa such as the legendary Prester John. Examples from the Atlantic Islands, Africa, Asia and Brazil could be used but not all need to be mentioned.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which motives predominated and may well argue that financial incentives were bound to have the greatest sway.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 29</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**25 Assess the social and economic consequences of rising population for sixteenth-century Europe.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could suggest that the extent of the rise in population is estimated differently by various experts, but that it is, nevertheless, a recognised trend. The main outcome in Europe was that pressures of people on the limited employment opportunities in the country, led to migration to towns and to a consequent increase in those living in poverty. Cities like Paris, Amsterdam and London grew considerably and the towns of Spain expanded particularly. These immigrants did not bring wealth with them. They came in pursuit, usually fruitless, of it and so worsened urban conditions for those already there, leading to famine and starvation, and to debate among religious reformers about the need for civic schemes of relief. Economically, the main outcome lay in rising prices, although there were other contributory factors here as well. The cost of bread rose and consumed a higher proportion of wages and so reduced the real value of wages and the ability to buy manufactured goods. Candidates can use examples from any European country.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which of the results had the biggest impact, although they may suggest that the effects varied from country to country and depended on individual circumstances.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

**26 Why were more women than men prosecuted for witchcraft in sixteenth and early-seventeenth Europe?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could point out that on average 80% of those accused of witchcraft were women, although the proportion varied from place to place. The reasons lie in the view of women as a weaker sex and thus more vulnerable to the wiles of the devil, as Eve's succumbing showed. The Bible had other examples of degenerate women from Delilah to Jezebel and classical authors had similar views. Women were seen as more likely than men to enjoy the rituals of the sabbat and to infect their daughters with witchcraft. It may also be that women were more prone to make malicious remarks about their neighbours. Many of those accused were poor and lone, elderly women were more likely to be in this grouping. It has been argued that prosecuted women symbolised the role of women as healers and midwives which was resented by men. Another theory is that the celibate priesthood, as exemplified by Kramer and Sprenger, resented the temptations posed by women. One problem with these theories is that uneasiness about the position of women was being translated into a desire to see them put to death. This may have arisen because the type of accusation made against witches often came from the domestic sphere where women predominated – milk curdling, pigs dying and babies becoming unwell. Midwives were often a target. Candidates do not need to cover all these possibilities.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which of the supposed explanations carries the most weight.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

### Section 6: c. 1610–c. 1660

#### 27 To what extent did Richelieu achieve his aims in domestic policies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates will benefit from making some suggestions as to what Richelieu's aims were. They could include reducing the power of those threatening the French monarchy, building up the position of the crown and improving its administration. To argue that Richelieu was successful, candidates could refer to the reduction in the privileges of the Huguenots, the defeat of noble attempts to dislodge the minister and the limitations put on the pretensions of the Parlement. He had grand plans to develop the French navy, colonies, trade and manufacturing. He raised the revenue to support an ambitious and successful foreign policy. He introduced the *intendants*. On the other hand, events after his death, such as the Fronde, show the nobility were not permanently cowed, although the Huguenots and the Parlement gave no more trouble. His economic aims were not achieved because his foreign policy had priority and the need to raise taxes was paramount. The impact of his taxes led to revolts by the despairing people. The balance is likely to be that his achievement was remarkable, given his often precarious grasp of power and his need to placate Louis XVIII.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether he was more successful than not.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 32</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**28 How deep-seated were the problems facing Spain in the first half of the seventeenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may suggest that the perception of Spain in this period as a great empire, was not necessarily accurate. They could cite the precarious financial position of Spain, the continuing efforts to subdue the Netherlands, the rivalry with France, the depopulation and poverty of mainland Spain, the quality of the monarchs and their advisors and the failure of all proposals for reform. Events like the expulsion of the Moriscos made the situation worse. The unity of the empire was loosely maintained and the revolts of Catalonia and Portugal were serious threats to it. On the other hand, the Spanish Empire was dominant. There was the chance that the problems could be overcome. Olivares put forward various proposals such as the Union of Arms. There was religious homogeneity. The Spanish administration was well equipped to run a war. But, in the end, the disasters of the 1640s and the problems with the succession were issues which could not be surmounted.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Spain could have revived or was in terminal decline.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



<b>Page 33</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**29 How well did the foreign ambitions of Gustavus Adolphus serve the interests of Sweden?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may discuss what the interests of Sweden were and may suggest that independence from Poland and Russia were important. How far Sweden benefited from its appearance on the European stage can be questioned. The Swedish Diet in 1628 believed that intervention in Germany was in their interests to prevent Habsburg dominance in the Baltic and to preserve Protestantism. Gustavus might have argued that he gave Sweden a stable administration so that his long absences did not lead to a decay of governance and even after his death the system of regents worked well. He developed the copper and iron industries and his capture of Riga gave Sweden a valuable port. Swedish landowners benefited from the conquest of Livonia. In the final settlement Sweden obtained parts of Pomerania and an indemnity. On the debit side, the war was expensive and led to the death of the king at Lutzen. Despite the efforts of Oxenstierna, Sweden favoured withdrawal at this point. Conscription was increasingly unpopular and had led to depopulation. The rivalry with Poland was not settled.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Sweden benefited or not, but might feel that this depends on exactly when the judgement is being made.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgement concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 34</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

### **30 What issues were at stake in the Thirty Years War?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the issues changed as the war proceeded. Initial concerns might include the Habsburg determination to recover Bohemia and defend the integrity of their lands, religious issues over the toleration of Calvinism and the militancy of the Emperor and unfinished business between Spain and the Netherlands. The eruption of Sweden into the war brought the control of the Baltic into play and the rivalry between Sweden and Poland. Gustavus Adolphus was also religiously motivated. As Habsburg power grew, the princes of the Empire became concerned, notably at the efficiency of Wallenstein. The ambitions of Bavaria were another issue. The real change in the focus of the war came with the alliance of France and Sweden. Their joint aim was the defeat of the Habsburgs, who were seen by Richelieu as encircling France. Their individual aims for Germany may have been different.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which of the issues predominated, but may well conclude that they became entangled with each other.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 35</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**31 In what ways, and with how much justification, can the first half of the seventeenth century be regarded as a 'golden age' for the Dutch Republic?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the so-called Golden Age arose from the wealth generated by Dutch domination of trade in the Baltic and the Indies, from the herring fleet and from the industrial development. The power of the Dutch was demonstrated by their ability to sustain a drawn out war with the Spanish, from which they gained most of their objectives. Their tolerant outlook meant that they were home to philosophers like Descartes, Grotius and Spinoza. The telescope and microscope were used to good effect and Dutch painting with Vermeer and Rembrandt and others was internationally renowned. The tulip might be mentioned. As for being justified, candidates could indicate that this is one of the most prosperous periods in Dutch history, when they could claim to be a leading European power. They went on to defeat both Britain and France later in the century. Given the immersion of most of Europe in war, it could be argued that the Dutch had few rivals.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to how far this really was a 'golden age' for the Republic.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 36</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**Section 7: c. 1660–c.1715**

**32 How much did the rise of Brandenburg-Prussia in the period 1640–1713 depend on the abilities of its rulers?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the Great Elector had a dominating effect on the rise of his electorate, but that his successor was less important. The achievements of Frederick William II include the establishment of a national army which could beat the Swedes, limiting the influence of the Estates and increasing taxation to fund the military. This could be seen as the foundation of Prussia. A princely lifestyle was established in Berlin and other palaces and the peripatetic court helped to integrate the scattered provinces. Other factors might include the influence of the Dutch brought to Prussia by the marriage of Frederick William to Louise of Orange and to the influx of Huguenots into Prussia after 1700. Although Frederick William III was far less successful as a soldier, he did gain the title of king, benefiting from the Habsburg need for assistance in war. His main contribution was in the development of royal ceremonial and palaces, some of the most magnificent built at the time. But these were expensive and followed very much the French model.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which factors were most important in explaining the rise of Prussia.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 37</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**33 Explain the motives underlying Louis XIV's religious policies.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that Louis XIV did not follow a consistent policy with regard to religion and that his motives varied in accordance with other issues. His relationship with the Papacy could be a case in point. Initially under the influence of his ministers, Louis was anti-papal and determined to control his own church, challenging the Pope over the regale, but later he found the Pope useful and became less attached to Gallicanism, notably in his struggle with Jansenism. With the Huguenots, Louis was always hostile to a group which depended on toleration, a policy for which he had no sympathy. He disliked any religious body of opinion which was critical of his reign and so became opposed to Quietists and Jansenists and to Fenelon. His hostility towards heretics sharpened over his reign. Madame de Maintenon certainly had some influence on religious policies and so did Louis' confessor in his later years.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which motives predominated and may conclude that Louis was intent on staying in control of the church at all times.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 38</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**34 How valid is the judgement that the society, government and economy of Russia were transformed by Peter the Great?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that Peter's reforms made a real impact. He tried to westernise society and transform the boyars into a European style nobility through the Table of Ranks, with a court at St Petersburg. He introduced council to make government more efficient and took control of the church. He built up a navy and far more effective army. Industry was developed with iron and copper production flourishing. Taxation was raised, mostly from the peasantry. Assessing the impact of these efforts is more problematic. Opposition was marked, from the nobles, the church and the peasants and reforms were often undermined and not pursued. It was not easy to make radical changes in Russian society. One view is that Peter's attempts at reforms were not matched by his successes. But Russia was never quite the same.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Peter's reforms can qualify as transformation. This was his aim, certainly, but how far he achieved it is open to question.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 39</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**35 The reign of Charles XII served only to delay the eventual decline of Sweden.' How just is this verdict?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the statement is correct. Charles inherited a situation where Swedish supremacy in the Baltic was being challenged and his heroic organisation of the army and navy led to success at Azov. Even after the disaster of Poltava he reformed the army, introducing conscription and better artillery and was unlucky to be killed by a sniper in 1717. Alternatively, candidates could suggest that Charles' father had put the administration of Sweden on a sound footing and cut the power of the nobles, giving Charles a useful inheritance. Charles' erratic personality and his five year sojourn in Bessarabia, however involuntary, worsened the situation in Sweden and the final outcome of the Great Northern War was the loss of Estonia, Livonia and Ingria and the entrance of Russia as a Baltic power. In this respect Charles could be said to have hastened rather than delayed the decline of Sweden. In his defence, it could be argued that Sweden lacked the resources to be a permanent great European power, as time has shown.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Charles arrested or speeded up the decline of Sweden.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 40</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

### 36 Who gained most, and who lost most, by the War of the Spanish Succession?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may suggest that the carnage of the War of the Spanish Succession meant no single power gained much at all. If the aim of the war was to decide who should rule Spain, then the Bourbons had gained their point, albeit by default in the end. Spain emerged strengthened by its resolve to defend its integrity. But the war was also about the domination of Europe by France and here likely nominees as beneficiaries would include Great Britain who had sustained a long war to keep France and the Catholic line of the Stuarts at bay and also the United Provinces, who had a string of fortresses to protect them from the French. Britain gained in the Mediterranean and the asiento was to be one of the foundations of trading wealth in the next fifty years. Another gainer was the Austrian Empire in that it acquired the Netherlands. Candidates might add that an individual gainer was Marlborough, who, even if he was disgraced in 1712, did get Blenheim Palace and also George I of Hanover, who became King of England in 1714. The main loser looks to be France, facing famine, and at one point, total humiliation. The defeats inflicted by the allies should have ensured the downfall of France. But negotiations foundered as the allies insisted on no peace without Spain and Louis recovered to benefit from the divisions among his enemies and the coming to power of the Tories in Britain. The death of the Emperor was a fortunate event for Louis. Most of his gains were confirmed at Utrecht and France recovered relatively rapidly in the next reign. His hopes of controlling Spain through his grandson were somewhat dashed when Philip married Elizabeth Farnese.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether anyone really gained much from the war.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



<b>Page 41</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

### Section 8: c. 1715–c. 1774

#### 37 How well did Maria Theresa deal with the problems facing her as ruler of the Habsburg lands?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may give an overview of the problems. These could include the hostility of Prussia and the issue of Silesia, the need to modernise the government of Austria and her own feelings on religious questions, which were at variance with the Enlightenment. In general she is seen as a successful ruler who held out, using whatever methods she could, against her arch-enemy, Frederick the Great. She won over the Hungarians to come to her aid and she reconquered Bohemia. With the help of von Haugwitz, she carried out military and bureaucratic reforms in Austria which made the country stronger and more resilient. On religion she was less successful. She encouraged and then removed the Jesuits and she persecuted Protestants and Jews and then became more tolerant. She did much to improve education in Austria and tried to do more for the peasants.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that, given her inheritance, Maria Theresa managed very well in overcoming the problems and revitalising the Austrian Empire.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 42</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**38 To what extent does Frederick II of Prussia's reputation as 'the Great' depend upon his military achievements?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may give an account of Frederick's military achievements such as his major victories at Hohenfriedberg, Rossbach and Leuthen and his training of his army and his choice of competent generals. He also, like Napoleon, was ready to disregard the accepted rules of warfare if it seemed likely to bring him victory. But he had his failures as well and his invasion of Saxony in the Seven Years War was ill-judged. His other achievements lay in his emphasis on improving education, agriculture and manufacturing, the ending of serfdom and his efforts to remedy the outcome of years of war in Silesia. He also tried to bring improvements to the lives of those living in the areas he obtained from Poland. His cultural achievements were, perhaps, less than might have been expected but Sans Souci remains.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that it is hard to judge Frederick other than in military terms, because so much of his reign was spent in war and his wars had a long-lasting impact on Europe. But he gave Prussia enlightened government and the resources to fight long wars, so he was not just a clever soldier.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 43</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**39 Explain the contrast, in the period 1725–62, between Russia's problems at home and its importance abroad.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may give some account of both the problems at home and the achievements abroad, but the focus of the question is on the reasons for the contrast. The problems at home arose partly from difficulties over the succession and from powerful background figures, especially in the reigns of women. The policies of Peter the Great were developed and continued to cause opposition and dissent. There was heavy taxation. But the growth of the Russian army and navy, easily the most expensive part of the administration, made Russia a threat to Eastern Europe, of which Frederick the Great for one, was fully aware. Russia had victories in all the wars of the period and made some substantial territorial gains. Her iron and copper production went on increasing and helped to supply her forces. The withdrawal of Peter III from the advance on Berlin made a crucial difference in the Seven Years War.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that the legacy of Peter the Great is almost enough to explain the difference. His westernisation policy had made Russia count in Europe and his successors built on this. Equally, his domestic policies were incomplete and often resented. The uncertainties about the succession were a major drawback in the promoting of internal stability.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 44</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**40 How successful was the Spanish monarchy in restoring the domestic stability and international standing of Spain during this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the Spanish rulers were more successful at home than they were in restoring the reputation of Spain beyond their frontiers. In Spain the power remained in the hands of the grandees, the Church and the Inquisition, but there was some success in improving the administration along French lines and certainly in encouraging cultural life. There could still be disorder in Spain, as the 1766 riots which led to the fall of Squillace, showed. The grandees remained intent on protecting their privileges. Charles III reduced the position of the church, by expelling the Jesuits and reforming the Inquisition. He also tried to lessen the grievances of the peasants and did break the power of the Mesta. Spain's role in the wars of the period was rarely a distinguished one – failures in the Seven Years War were one cause of the riots and Spain was clearly subordinate to France and often unwise to accept a Bourbon line.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that there was success and domestic stability was improved after the devastation of the wars, but Spain was no longer a great power in Europe. The Empire was restricted to Parma and Piacenza and rather loose control of Spanish America and was of doubtful value economically.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 45</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**41 'Absolutism in decline.' How accurate is this judgement on the reign of Louis XV?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the aim of the rulers of France at this time was to maintain the absolutism of Louis XIV. The risky projects of John Law served to underline the need for conservative policies and the regent Orleans, Louis himself and Cardinal Fleury all concurred. But parts of the despotism of Louis XIV were dismantled. Provincial governors and Parlements regained some of their former rights and there was some revival of Jansenism. Religious discord mounted, culminating in the expulsion of the Jesuits. The real decline came with the failure to solve the financial problems and to force the exempt classes to pay direct taxes. In foreign policy hopes of reversing the losses of Louis XIV's later years were dashed. France chose the wrong allies and was defeated by the wealth and the navy of the British and so lost her incipient empire.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that the judgement in the question is accurate, but they could argue that the legacy from Louis XIV was not a strong one and that the decline had begun even before his death. But the chasm between court and country grew greater, even if Madame de Pompadour, one of the more intelligent persons at the French court, recognised the dangers. Looking forward, the outbreak of the Revolution could be seen as simply underlining the extent of the decline.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

### Section 9: c. 1774–1815

#### 42 How successful were the foreign policies of Catherine the Great?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. There is a distinction between territorial gains brought about by two successful Turkish wars and the way that Catherine allied with Austria and Prussia to expand her lands by the partition of Poland and the less successful grand plans she entertained to inherit the role of the Byzantine Empire by reviving the Greek protectorate over Balkan Christians, something that would not have been acceptable to other countries. Through alliance with Prussia and taking advantage of the defeat of Austria she gained a virtual protectorate over Polish Courland after a disputed succession. Russian pressure secured the election of Stanislas Poniatowski to the elected throne of Poland in 1764, though the hostility of France was a feature in the first of the Turkish wars 1768–74. Russia gained sovereignty over the Zaporozhe Cossacks, the port cities of Azov and Kerch and the coastal stretch between the Bug and the Dnieper. The Crimean Khanate was proclaimed independent from the Ottoman Empire. The territorial gains were obvious successes, but it could be argued that Catherine misjudged the Russian claim to be the protector of the Christian orthodox peoples living in the Ottoman Empire, a claim which repeatedly led to conflicts during the coming century. Following a policy of developing Russia's economic interests, Catherine signed a treaty with China in 1768 (treaty of Kyachta) to increase trade. Catherine's policy was opportunistic and she made the most of Austrian support by another war against the Turks. In 1781 a secret Austro-Russian Alliance was signed, directed against the Ottoman Empire. In 1783 Russia annexed the Crimea from its Khan. In 1787–91, Russia fought another war against the Ottomans, forcing them, in 1792, to cede the Jedisan and recognise the Russian annexation of the Crimea. The orientation of Russia towards the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean was a major development, successful in terms of Russian power and the potential for influence; but also a danger to Britain and Austria. The expansionist tendencies were seen in the partitions of Poland and there were attempts to use Swedish internal instability to extend territory on the Baltic. Until 1772 Sweden had been in a situation similar to that of Poland, with a strong parliament and a weak executive. Here also the Russian ambassador, by the means of bribing parliamentarians, used to influence politics – until King Gustavus III staged a coup d'état in 1772. King Gustavus III, seeing an opportunity to regain territory lost by Charles XII, declared war in 1788. The Second Swedish war lasted until 1790. However, despite a revolt by the Finnish nobility who offered the throne to Catherine in 1788, Russian forces were not strong enough to avoid a Swedish victory at the second battle of Svensksund; Finland, for the time being, remained Swedish. Faced with limited naval and military might, Catherine used foreign alliances and dissident elements to her advantage – more successfully in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Partitions of Poland, where reactionary nobles preferred Russian rule which would confirm their privileges to a new and reformed Polish state.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. There may be a distinction between some short-term successes and long-term failures; where success depended on engaging with a powerful European state, results were less successful than in wars against much weaker states with internal divisions. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. A sense of context and of change will help in evaluation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 47</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

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

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may 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 feel 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, again showing a 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.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well 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, not always very wise.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 48</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**44 Why did the Great Powers involve themselves so closely in the affairs of Poland in this period?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that one reason was the weakness of its government, which was entirely controlled by the nobles, thus making Poland an easy target. The main reason lay in the complex relationships between Russia, Prussia and Austria. Frederick II was motivated by the need for a better understanding and peace. Austria refused to give up the area of Zips and hence Frederick put forward the idea of partition as a way of restricting the growth of his rivals. They agreed, with some reluctance from Maria Theresa but much more enthusiasm from Joseph and Kaunitz. The weakening of Poland was a worthwhile cause for Austria. Catherine was less concerned but was happy to take whatever she could. The motivation for the second partition came more from Catherine, who feared the revival of Poland and was backed by Prussia at a time when Austria was fully occupied elsewhere. Catherine was able to exploit the situation for her own advantage.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that Poland was vulnerable. The king, Stanislaw tried to break the noble power but his failure let in the Russians, who claimed to be restoring order. This looked like a threat to the weakened Prussia and Austria, who agreed to accept it, on the condition that they received territorial compensation. Self-interest is thus the basic explanation.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



<b>Page 49</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

#### **45 Why did Revolution break out in France in 1789?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the Revolution had been building for a long time and distinction between long and short term causes will help to differentiate between responses. The background situation with the inequality in society, the increasingly desperate plight of the peasantry, the challenge from the philosophes, the remote and unsympathetic monarchy and the losses in war can all be explained. The more immediate causes lay in the refusal of the nobles to contemplate financial or political reform to deal with the crisis in public finance, the poor harvests and resultant problems and the calling of the Estates General.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that revolution was almost inevitable or they may argue that the background causes needed to be ignited by some kind of trigger before a revolution could occur.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 50</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

#### **46 How is the fall of Napoleon best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may suggest that Napoleon overreached himself or that his enemies took heart and so defeated him. In the former case the invasions of the Iberian Peninsula and of Russia involved Napoleon in campaigns he found hard to win because of the resistance of the native populations. His Continental System was disliked for its economic repercussions and widely evaded as time went on. He became an increasingly arrogant despot and the benefits of French rule in Europe seemed to be few. In the latter case it was very much the continuing campaigns against France by Great Britain, which held the coalition together so that it could eventually defeat Napoleon. Britain had too much to lose, in her Empire and in her industrial expansion and her trade, to give in. She also had the resources to fight and some exceptional commanders to undertake the task. The alienation of Spain and Russia helped the British to begin to turn the tide. The position of Britain as an island that could be defended successfully against Napoleon helped as well.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well conclude that the longer the Napoleonic Wars lasted, the harder it was for Napoleon to win. But the Hundred Days and the close fought nature of Waterloo show that it was not a foregone conclusion.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 51</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

### Section 10: Themes c. 1610 – c.1815

- 47 'New technology was a more important feature of the seventeenth-century Scientific Revolution than were new scientific ideas.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the practical application of chemical, mathematical and medical knowledge was all-important. New techniques and apparatus were used, notably the telescope and other new instruments. There followed improvements in navigation, surveying and dyeing. Alternatively, candidates may argue that despite these signs of technological progress, the real momentum came in the nineteenth century. The empirical method, Cartesian mathematics, the acceptance of the mechanical explanation for the universe and the decline in belief in astrology and witchcraft all had a real impact on how the role of man in the world was perceived and led to a feeling of optimism that problems could be solved and solutions found by the intellect of man, rather than by the intervention of God. The belief that advances in scientific ideas led to practical and beneficial applications could be used to argue that the two views are not mutually exclusive.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question asks candidates to come to a judgement but it may be a synthesis of the apparently opposite interpretations.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 52	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2b

**48 Assess the importance of developments in warfare on land and sea in the seventeenth century.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that the developments were of considerable import. The tactical changes and emphasis on drill in the Swedish army had an impact in lessening the need for and importance of the cavalry. Officers in most armies attended some kind of training to study maps and become competent with the latest fire-arms. Armies undoubtedly became larger and this resulted in logistical problems, problems over pay and a need for increased administrative expertise. It also led to the rise of entrepreneurs like Wallenstein. Most armies were still mercenaries but the Swedes began to move to a conscripted national militia. Financing and running a long war became a challenge for governments as even Louis XIV eventually realised. The early eighteenth century showed that one outcome was the considerable casualty figures. The use of muskets and bayonets in place of pikes by 1800 made it possible for large armies to win battles as opposed to earlier stalemates and drawn outcomes, but siege warfare remained a key part of the fighting methods of the time and engineers like Vauban made a vital contribution. Supplies of ammunition had to be maintained. At sea similar changes could be noted – shipbuilding programmes, developing port facilities and improving administrative support all played a role and the English, Dutch and French navies particularly progressed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates could conclude that war on land was more changed in the century than war at sea and that the supremacy of Spain on land was surpassed by that of France in the course of the period.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 53</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**49 How significant a role did women play in the literary, intellectual and political life of Europe in the period c.1715 to c.1815?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may use a variety of illustrations and no specific knowledge can be demanded. The three categories need not be dealt with individually as there may well be overlap. Although plenty of examples of women in these fields can be found, candidates may argue that, compared with the male contribution, the women did not attract much attention or plaudits. In the literary life women travel writers became popular and also novelists such as Fanny Burney, who had an influence on Jane Austen. Burney's diaries are almost better known than her novels. Madame de Stael also wrote voluminously. Britain and France offered more opportunities to women while Spain and Germany lagged behind. There were many intellectual women and the term bluestocking was used to describe them. The French Academy allowed women to participate in contests they organised. The main outlet for such women was the salon, an institution which began in France and spread across Europe and can be seen as the forerunner of the influential hostesses of later centuries. But it could be suggested that the salon evolved because women had few other outlets. By the end of the period political rights for women were under discussion with Olympe de Gouges in France a leading campaigner. The salons also took up the cause and some salons, such as that of Madame Roland had a precise political outlook. Women of power and influence could include Catherine the Great and Maria Theresa and some powerful women behind the scenes such as Madame de Pompadour and Queen Caroline. In some cases these women did make a real difference. Madame de Stael stood up to Napoleon.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are likely to conclude that the experience of women varied according to country and period, but that their role expanded before 1815 and this laid the foundations for more progress after that date.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 54</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**50 Explain the influences shaping the Rococo style in art and literature.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to be able to write in more detail about art than literature. Influences could include a reaction against the excesses of baroque and instead there was an emphasis on shell like curves. Lighter designs were popular as in the work of Watteau, Boucher and Fragonard. One influence was undoubtedly the power of France, where rococo began and from whence it spread primarily to other Catholic countries. Palaces and churches were built in the more graceful style and the Catherine Palace by Rastrelli is a prime example. In Britain it was less popular, being seen as a French fashion. It also reflects a move away from a grandiose style of living to more intimate interiors where furniture could be moved about easily to make way for social events. Garden design also moved away from large set pieces to more curves and less regimentation. The colour palette tended to pastel rather than primary colours, again reacting against baroque. Rococo also reflected new fashions such as chinoiserie resulting from the opening up of China and asymmetrical patterns. Literature was similarly light and featured love poetry, novels, often epistolary and some erotic themes. It moved on to become florid and dominated by linguistic extravagance.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are likely to conclude that the main influences were a movement away from baroque, the dominance of France culturally and the impact of the enlightenment.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 55</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**51 Explain the similarities and differences between absolute monarchy and enlightened despotism.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may argue that both absolute and enlightened monarchs believed that they exercised personal authority, even if belief in divine right was receding; whether for the benefit of themselves or their subjects could be debated. They could add that both might feel the need for administrative reform, perhaps to increase revenue. Both were patrons of the arts, although again, possibly for different reasons. Differences are likely to be more considerable. Enlightened despots tended to favour religious toleration whereas absolute rulers were mainly firmly Catholic. The enlightened codified laws, ended torture and extreme punishments, encouraged trade, agriculture and industry, acknowledged that rulers had a duty of care for their subjects, reduced oppressive tariffs and supported increased educational opportunities. Absolute rulers were less likely to follow such policies and were often militaristic. But candidates could suggest that this is too simple. Maria Theresa made reforms to resist Frederick the Great, not to be enlightened. Frederick William I of Prussia had a similar motive, to strengthen his state. Candidates could discuss how far monarchs ruled to benefit themselves or to keep their country strong or whether these motives can be disentangled.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may conclude that the differences are more cosmetic than real as an increase in the power of the state was the aim in both types of government and indicate that the real distinction was between states with viable representative institutions and those without such benefits.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 56</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>2b</b>

**52 How extensive was the development of industry and urbanisation in continental Europe in the eighteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates should note that the question does not include Great Britain. They may indicate that the rate of industrial development was very variable. In Russia new methods met with little support and the steam engine was not taken up. The availability of plenty of cheap labour contributed to this. Even though factories and towns grew, Russia lagged further behind the rest of Europe. Similarly Austria tried to keep out textile machinery to protect the domestic system and in Bohemia, the most developed industrial province, the workforce in factories was small. Spain did take up new textile inventions and produced more than any other continental European country. But both Spain and Portugal suffered from the perception that industry was not for the noble classes to take up. Prussia experienced the most advance and became an industrialised state. France had the Jacquard loom. In western and northern Europe towns grew, especially in areas rich in coal or with good communications. The south and east were less advanced.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may find that the extent of the development depended on geographical location and on how much labour was available for factory work. They may point out that the domination of Great Britain, although not part of the question, was such that nowhere else could really compare.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.