



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/22

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

May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 90

Published

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

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

This document consists of **34** printed pages.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:
- Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.
- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

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

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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

Band 3: 13–18 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Section 1: c.1400–c.1461

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>How substantial were the achievements of the conciliar movement?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns what might, or might not, be seen as achievements by the Councils that met in the fifteenth century (Pisa, Constance and Basel). Factors such as the Avignon Papacy, the ending of the Schism, Hus, the relationship between the Pope and the rest of the Church, the issue of ‘national’ churches and the unity of the Church as a whole could be considered.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on the nature and extent of the possible ‘achievements’ is expected as well as comment on both where it attained and where it failed. It could be argued that, given what was to happen later, the work was both limited and did not last long but rather an exercise in papering over the cracks rather than dealing with the fundamental issues which affected the Church. Ultimately, Conciliarism failed and was discredited. However, it could be argued that in the context of the situation of the early fifteenth century in Europe, it did all that was possible.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Was Venice the most successful Italian city state in the first half of the fifteenth century?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the attainments of Venice, and other Italian city states in this period. A variety of factors could be considered when assessing ‘success’, such as wealth, artistic attainment, commercial strength, broader cultural works, military and political attainment. The part played in international politics could also be considered. While the focus should be on Venice, there is scope for commenting on the attainments of other states such as Florence, Milan and Bologna.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on what might be the criteria for ‘success’ in this context is expected, and it could be on both the more fleeting political and military ‘successes’ of the period or the longer term artistic and cultural attainments. Venice was, of course, different with its great tradition of commerce in both Italy and abroad. If the premise is accepted, then there should be comment on why other city states were not.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>‘An event of only symbolic importance.’ Assess this view of the fall of Constantinople.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the implications of the fall of Constantinople on the Ottomans and on Europe and the Middle East as a whole. Factors which could be included are the results for areas like Hungary and Poland, as well as the immediate Balkan area, and the impact the fall had on the principal rulers of Western Europe, the Papacy and the whole Mediterranean region.</p> <p>AO2 – A balanced view is looked for here. On the one hand, the Byzantine Empire had really only survived through the consent of the Ottomans. The power and influence of the Empire had long gone and the Ottomans already had a fairly dominant influence in the city and its surrounding regions. Yet, on the other hand, the replacement of a dying Christian empire by a dynamic and highly aggressive Islamic autocracy was bound to be of great significance, and the fall could be seen as a key stage towards the taking of Belgrade and Rhodes, and the great march to the West.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>How serious a threat to established authority was the Hussite movement?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of the actual and potential threat that Hus and the movement which developed after his death posed to established authority. This ‘authority’ could be the Church (at all levels), academe and all types of secular authority. The focus could be on both the attack on the Church and its theology, or on the many other possible threats which later emerged such as social, economic or nationalistic factors.</p> <p>AO2 – The focus should be on commenting on the seriousness of the threat that Hus and the movement posed to all forms of the ‘establishment’ of the time. Candidates could argue that the social, economic and political ideas, such as common property and electing leaders, were more of a threat than Hus’ own criticisms of ecclesiastical behaviour. There were also the theological criticisms of Hus and the spread of his ideas into surrounding areas such as Brandenburg which might be raised, as well as the threats posed by an emerging Czech nationalism.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>'The greatest success of Charles VII was gaining financial independence for the French monarchy.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns which of many possible 'successes' of Charles VII should be seen as his most impressive, and why. Possible successes could include: his relationship with Burgundy and weaning it away from the English; his military revival and his reorganisation of the military; his management of the nobility; his conduct of the war against the English such as the regaining of Normandy and Guyenne; his management of the civil war; and, of course, his management of the nation's finances.</p> <p>AO2 – There is a lot to choose from, but expect the identification of at least two other factors in the discussion. Given the low base to start from after Troyes then even survival could be seen as an achievement, and what was attained by the end of his reign was considerable. Arguably, largely driving out the English was of huge significance, and much else (e.g. the whole Burgundian affair and the military reorganisation) was only a part of a much greater achievement.</p>	30

Section 2: c.1461–c.1516

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Were the early Italian Wars of 1494-1516 anything more than a power struggle between France and Spain?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the motivation for the Italian wars as well as possible reasons for their longevity. Factors which might be considered, in addition to the suggested power struggle, might be the long tradition of French expansionism and claims in the region; the initial and separate attitude of the Empire (Maximilian in particular); the traditional rivalries which existed in Italy at the time; the behaviour of the Papacy in general and Popes like Julius II, with his anti-Venetian agenda in particular. The role of the Swiss, especially in the early stages, could well be mentioned.</p> <p>AO2 – There is a clear debate to be had. Certainly, both France and Spain wished to dominate the Italian peninsula for prestige reasons, but there were strategic and commercial considerations as well which influenced them. Other factors, such as in the early stages when the Empire was not closely associated with Spain, in the pre-Charles V days, need to be reflected on as does the roles of the various Popes and the traditional rivalries and particularism of individual city states.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p>‘Dominated by purely world considerations.’ How valid is this judgement on the Papacy in this period?</p> <p>AO1 – This question concerns the key factors which influenced the papacy in general and specific popes in particular. Identification of what might be, or might not be, ‘worldly considerations’ is expected. There were some attempts at change by men like Pius II, but there was a lack of will to push anything through. The aims and ambitions of Paul II, Sixtus IV and above all the Borgia Alexander VI were worldly to say the least and there is no evidence of any theological impetus. Most popes of the period saw themselves as secular rulers, and that is how critics like Luther viewed them.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on the ‘domination’ as well as identification of what might be covered by ‘worldly’ considerations should be there. There is, of course, a strong case in support of the judgement, but responses should include more than just a list of the factors which created the strong anti-clericalism of the period. The Papacy was seen, and was expected to behave, as a secular ruler, so perhaps it was inevitable that it responded accordingly.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p>'A purely destructive force.' Discuss this view of the Ottoman Empire in this period.</p> <p>AO1 – Responses should include some reflection on what might be covered by a 'destructive force'. On the one hand, factors which might be considered in a case against the statement are: the great administrative skills which the Ottomans brought to their territories; their cultural attainments; the quality of their rule; and, the degree of tolerance they showed to other faiths. On the other hand, in support of the statement, candidates might describe the dreadful depredations of Mahomet II and later Selim I, with their devastation of Western European trade and their attacks on Greece, Bosnia and Italy, and the consequent mass deportations.</p> <p>AO2 – There is a good case to be made each way. While on the one hand, the Ottomans could be benign rulers who could be seen as a great deal more civilised than the regimes they replaced, with their version of justice and value on intellectual pursuits; on the other hand, they could destroy and kill on a huge scale.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>Was Ivan III anything more than a successful military leader?</p> <p>AO1 – This question concerns the events of the reign of Ivan III and the extent to which the only noteworthy achievements were purely military or whether there were features which could show him in another, perhaps more creditworthy, light. Factors which might be included are his management of the Mongol Tartars. Responses might mention: his huge territorial expansion of Russia and the ways in which he achieved this; his marriages; the establishment of new legal codes; his political astuteness and diplomatic skills; the absence of any cultural achievement; and, the rise of a feared autocracy. The standard quote about him is 'Militarily glorious and economically sound.'</p> <p>AO2 – Certainly, the military skills during his rule were critical, both in the rise of his regime in Russia itself and also in its massive territorial expansion, but he had other strengths as well. The ending of the Tartar tribute was not achieved by fighting, as the armies stared at each other, and never fought. The boyars were cleverly managed and his westward vision was to last. There is a very strong case for arguing that he was more than just a good soldier.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p>How successfully did Ferdinand and Isabella deal with the internal challenges to their authority in this period?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the range of internal challenges which faced the monarchs and the degree of success attained in dealing with them. Possible internal (and Portugal could be seen as internal) challenges could include: the long tradition of separatism and particularism in all parts of what became Spain; the profound differences which existed in the different areas; the background of the Reconquest; the weakness of the Crown/s especially in Castile; the shortage of revenue; noble power; institutional power; religious diversity; and, outright anarchy in some parts of Spain.</p> <p>AO2 – Some reflection on what might or might not be seen as the criteria for ‘successes’ in this context could be included. A case each way is looked for. The strongest arguments will tend to agree that it was very successful, but there will need to be good justification for this conclusion and awareness of an alternative view. The extent to which religious diversity truly represented that much of a ‘challenge’ could be discussed. However, there were success stories, ranging from the growth of royal revenues to the ending of the rigid separatism which existed in many parts of Spain.</p>	30

Section 3: c.1516–c.1559

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>What best explains why Luther's protest in 1517 developed into the German Reformation?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns why the simple act of nailing Luther's theses to a church door led to the enormity of full reformation. Factors which could be included are: the depth of anti-clericalism and the prevailing hostility to the Roman Catholic Church; the growth of German nationalism; the growing dislike of papal taxation; the nature of Luther's challenge and the methods used to propagate his message; the role of the princes; the mismanagement of the affair by the Church and Charles V; the printing press; and, German politics generally.</p> <p>AO2 – Identification of the key factor/s is looked for with a developed explanation of why it/they were more important than other factors, and perhaps also why other factors should be seen as less important. What he said was not, by and large, new, but the depth of feeling in Germany was, while the particular state of politics in Germany at the time was a great assist. Whether the Church was capable of reform of the extent needed is also a factor which could be developed.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p>'Poor decision-making by Spain provides the best explanation for its failure to suppress the Dutch revolt by 1577.' Does it?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns identifying the principal reasons for the failure by Spain to suppress the revolt which had developed in its Dutch provinces. Factors which could be included are: the decision-making and overall management by Philip II himself and his Spanish governors such as Margaret, Alba and Requesens; the wealth of areas like Holland and Zeeland; the leadership of Orange and others; the dynamism provided by Calvinism; geographical factors; the Spanish bankruptcy and the impact of the Spanish Fury on the more neutral and Catholic provinces.</p> <p>AO2 – Bad decision making, as well as bad management were clearly key factors. Philip's lack of empathy for the Dutch and his narrow view of what should be the relationship between Spain and the Low Countries could also be developed in detail. Given the strength and wealth of the Provinces, as well as their distance from Spain, and the other huge distractions facing Philip and Spain, suppression may well have been virtually impossible after the initial revolt had started.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
13	<p>To what extent did Spain experience a period of rapid expansion and great prosperity in the period 1516 to 1556?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns whether Spain expanded rapidly and was particularly prosperous in this period. The expansion element of the question is straightforward and could include acquisitions in Italy such as Milan as well as those in Mexico and Peru. The ‘prosperity’ element could include initial issues such as the revolt of the Comuneros and the Castilian revolt; the huge debt left to Philip II; the price rises; the sale of offices and crown land; the income from silver and overseas trade; the growth of shipping and the ports; and, what happened to internal commerce and agriculture.</p> <p>AO2 – While the ‘rapid expansion’ is straightforward, it is a debate on the ‘great’ prosperity that it looked for and whether it really was anything more than a superficial and transient period of ‘prosperity’. The way in which the newly acquired wealth was utilised could be examined as could the extent to which so much of the income was committed to debt repayment. Candidates might consider whether the basis of the future bankruptcy was possibly laid here.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
14	<p>Who achieved more for France: Francis I or Henry II?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of the work of the two kings and its impact, beneficial or otherwise, on France. The focus of the response must be on what they achieved for France, and what might be seen as a personal achievement needs to be viewed in a different light here to be fully relevant. Factors which might be included are: the contribution to arts and letters; the development of absolutism; the attitude towards the Church, Protestantism and Humanism; the growth of an overseas empire; involvement in the Italian Wars and its outcome; administrative skills and development; the rise of noble factionalism; and, the Treaty of Cateau Cambresis.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on the extent to which France gained or lost from the work of the two kings is looked for, and a broader thematic approach might well work much better than a pedestrian survey of the legacy of the two men with a weak conclusion. As long as the focus is on ‘France’ then a variety of answers is possible. The legacy of both men was to cause huge problems for their successors, but also France was a much stronger and united country by 1559.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
15	<p data-bbox="316 248 1326 315">To what extent did Sweden become a well-organised and effective state during the reign of Gustavus Vasa?</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1326 618">AO1 – The question concerns how the Swedish state developed during this period with a focus on the ‘well-organised’ and ‘effective’ aspects of the question. Factors which could be included are: the creation of a ‘proper’ state in the early years of the reign; the methods by which Gustav rose to power; the creation of a dynasty; the reformation in Sweden; the role of the Diet; the Council of State; the degree of domestic stability; the various rebellions against him; the creation of a standing army; and, the continuity provided by forty years of rule.</p> <p data-bbox="316 651 1326 853">AO2 – He certainly laid the basis of a state, but both parts of the question are open to debate. His successors had to work hard to build on a tenuous organisation and a state which depended very much on the personality and personal ability of one man might not be always seen as an ‘effective’ state. There needs to be reflection on what the two terms involved in the context of the Baltic region in the first part of the sixteenth century.</p>	30

Section 4: c.1559–c.1610

Question	Answer	Marks
16	<p>'Philip II managed the internal affairs of Spain badly.' Did he?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the way in which Philip II managed internal affairs. Candidates should concentrate on 'internal' affairs, but some consideration could be given to the affairs of the Low Countries. Factors which could be included are: regional self-government; the workings of the Council of State; 'paper' dominated; factional rivalry, for example, the divide and rule issue; the sale of offices; the role accorded to the Church; the cautious decision-making; bankruptcy; Philip II's management of Aragon and the Moriscos; and, agriculture in Spain.</p> <p>AO2 – There is ample scope for debate. On the one hand, it was a period of great achievement for Spain. On the other hand, there was serious mismanagement of great resources which caused serious damage and led to decline. The focus should be on the way in which Philip II managed Spain, rather than the appropriateness of the many policies he undertook. The focus should very firmly be on 'internal' affairs and little credit should be gained by dealing with affairs outside Spain.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
17	<p>Why did the French civil war last so long?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns identifying the reasons for the longevity of the war. A variety of factors could be considered: political, religious, social and economic; the limited power of the Crown; the competence or otherwise of the monarchs and Marie; a poor administrative structure; the role of the nobles and family rivalries; the intervention of foreign powers, Spain in particular; the religious divisions and the dynamism of the Calvinist faith; and, the distrust the Huguenots felt towards the monarchy.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates should identify the principal reason/s discussing which are the most important and why, and explaining why others are less important. A list would not score well. There is, of course, no 'right' answer and comment on the historical debate on the issue would be very creditable. The best responses will focus on the 'so' aspect of 'so long' and, possibly, comment on the different reasons for longevity at different times.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
18	<p>'The Catholic Reformation was limited in both scope and impact.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns both the aims/objectives of the Catholic Reformation and the impact and effectiveness it demonstrated in the period. Factors which could be considered are: its broad aims; whether it was just a reaction to events; the Council of Trent and the decrees; the reliance on specific individuals; the Jesuits/Oratory/Theatines; the reforms between 1545 and 1563; and, the conflict between national interests and the Church's ambitions.</p> <p>AO2 – 'Scope' and 'impact' should be looked at separately. Arguably, the scope varied between orders such as the Jesuits and the Benedictines, and the Curia and Gallicans, and that affected the impact in many cases. There were radicals and those who favoured a gradualist and non-innovative approach, and those who focused more on practice rather than doctrine. The impact of the Catholic Reformation varied from region to region. While areas like Bohemia and Bavaria were retained for the Faith, Scandinavia was lost for ever. Consideration of the impact in South America, for example, would be valid.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
19	<p>How effectively did Henry IV restore royal authority by 1610?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the work done by Henry IV to restore the authority of the monarch during the course of his reign. Factors which could be included are: the Edict of Nantes and the ending of the civil wars; his energy and commitment to affairs of state; the production of a male heir; the work of Sully; dealings with the League, the Huguenots and agriculture; the budget surplus; Vervins; Paris; the debts and the Paulette; and, Canada.</p> <p>AO2 – The emphasis should be on the 'effectively' part of the question for the higher marks. The work Henry IV did is well known. On the one hand, it could be seen that Henry IV laid a basis which Richelieu could build on. On the other hand, it could be argued that with issues like the Paulette and the establishment of a 'state within a state' as a result of Nantes, that he was laying the basis for problems that would return to haunt his successors, and that his work was fundamentally for the short-term.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
20	<p>‘An empire in serious decline.’ Discuss this view of the Ottoman Empire in the period 1566 to 1606.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of any decline in the Empire in this period. Factors which could be considered are: the attainments to the period up to 1560 which is often seen as the ‘summit’ of Ottoman achievement; the influence of the harem; the quality of administrators; the increasing negligence of rulers; the growth of court factions; the failure to adapt to a then ‘static’ empire; Lepanto and Cyprus; Tunis in 1574; the struggles in Hungary and Persia; inflation; and, the flight of the peasantry from the land.</p> <p>AO2 – The consensus appears at the moment to see the period as one of ‘indubitable, though as yet, incipient, decline’. The focus ideally should be on the ‘serious’ aspect, as arguably the expansion was to continue and there were still great cultural and other attainments. It was possible, as some contemporaries did, to identify factors which were to lead to the decline in status. There were certainly fundamental issues arising as so much depended on expansionism.</p>	30

Section 5: Themes c.1378–c.1610

Question	Answer	Marks
21	<p>What best explains attitudes towards the ‘outcasts’ of society in this period?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the reasons for social attitudes in the period towards the various social and religious groups deemed to live beyond the usual ‘pale’. Reasons for this hostility could include; the absence of any tradition of tolerance; threats seen to the established social order; the fear of anarchy; looking for groups to blame for phenomenon beyond the control or grasp of many, such as inflation or the collapse of feudalism; paranoia on the part of the Church and any threatened challenge to its monopoly on the ‘truth’.</p> <p>AO2 – A range of possible factors needs to be considered and also identification of what might be seen as the most important and why. The key to higher marks lies with good reasoning for the attitudes themselves and why they were to lead to viewing such individuals or groups as a threat to society.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
22	<p>‘The Northern Renaissance had a distinctly different character from the Italian Renaissance.’ Did it?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the extent to which the Northern Renaissance differed from the distinctly Italian experience. A range of factors could be included with perhaps a general focus on art, sculpture, architecture and music, or a more specific reference to a range of artists such as Dürer, Breughel, Bosch, Holbein and Grunewald; and, innovators like Cranach. There was less of the classical ideal in the North and greater focus on detail and different techniques. The Italian basis of humanism differed from the Northern, more religious, stimulus.</p> <p>AO2 – The focus on the question should be on the ‘distinctly’ different character. There was obviously a considerable debt owed to Italy, and many of the great artists of the ‘North’ had visited Italy and were profoundly influenced by what they saw. It is the extent to which they moved on which is the key to the high marks and there should be a careful examination of both the debt and the difference.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
23	<p>Was there greater innovation in naval warfare, rather than land in this period?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the differing degrees of innovation between developments on land as opposed to those at sea. Naval factors could include ship design; sail as opposed to oars; navigation; actual methods of fighting and the use of sea power; guns and ‘combined’ operations; and, the overall naval strategy. As far as land warfare is concerned, factors considered could include: the shift from attack to defence; professional soldiers as opposed to citizen armies; standing armies and the use of mercenaries; changes in guns and artillery; recruitment and deployment; fortifications; tactics such as the Swiss ‘square’ and the Spanish tercio; and, changes in the way the cavalry was utilised.</p> <p>AO2 – There is a good debate to be had here as there were substantial changes in both strategy and tactics in both areas of warfare. Candidates might focus on the tactics, such as those seen at Pavia and Lepanto, but these can also illustrate a major shift in their own way. However, there does need to be consideration of a reasonable range of factors in both areas.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
24	<p>‘Greed was the principal motive for overseas expansion and exploration in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.’ Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the motivation for both exploring, and expanding into, territories outside Europe. There could be common factors, or factors which best explain just one of the two parts of the question. These could include: commercial considerations, such as trade in spices and luxuries; acquisition of gold and silver; the Turks blocking the ‘old’ route (overland or Red Sea route East); the growth of knowledge about the world, (including the ‘round’ world’); mapmaking and navigational development; the inspiration provided by Columbus and da Gama; religion (the Spanish were always great crusaders); scope for lower classes to move upwards in a hierarchical society; a greater willingness to invest in profitable businesses; the role of the Fuggers; and, the great stimulus of men like John II of Portugal and Henry the Navigator, and the motives of men like Cartier and Cabot.</p> <p>AO2 – It should not be an issue if the two factors are treated together, but candidates who identify different motivation for exploration as opposed to expansion (although they were often seen as identical in the eyes of contemporaries) should be fully credited. There is no expectation of identification of a single factor as being critical, but there should be clear identification of valid reasons with comment on why some were more important than others in specific circumstances.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
25	<p>What best explains the price rise in the sixteenth century?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the reasons for the increase in prices during the course of the sixteenth century in Europe. Factors could include: population increase, which put pressure on limited resources; the growth of capitalism and the availability of credit; the influx of gold and silver, especially the latter; the production of goods did not increase at the same rate as the availability of money; tampering with the coinage, such as the arrival of the Spanish copper currency; and, the simple greed by those who possessed scarce resources.</p> <p>AO2 – There has to be both careful explanation and evident understanding of how the factors put forward actually affected prices and also a clear prioritisation of factors with sound reasoning of why some factors were of greater importance than others. The ‘best explains’ element in the question offers ample scope for high marks. A straightforward list of reasons will not score well.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
26	<p>‘Economic distress was the main reason for the persecution of witches.’ Was it?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the principal reasons for the increased (or, possibly, better recorded) persecution of witches in this period. Factors considered could include: there was a long tradition of it; it followed a period of huge religious turmoil; the links with heresy and the devil; fear, ignorance and superstition; simple witchcraft being converted into systematic demonology; the Papal stimulus provided by Gregory XV; influential thinkers like Bodin supported it; the lack of influence on it by the Renaissance and Scientific Revolution; and, the links with social and economic distress and upheaval.</p> <p>AO2 – The reasons for the persecution of witches varied from time to time and region to region. Candidates therefore may give a survey of the many reasons put forward, with a careful explanation of why certain reasons may have been of greater importance than others. They may also attempt to prioritise reasons with comment on why some factors may have been more important than others. Given the extent of disagreement amongst the ‘experts’, no definitive answer is expected, but an awareness of the nature of the debate will gain credit.</p>	30

Section 6: c.1610–c.1660

Question	Answer	Marks
27	<p>'Religion was always a minor consideration in Richelieu's foreign policy.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the principal motives behind Richelieu's foreign policy, remembering that he was a Cardinal, living in a Catholic country, who waged a war against his own, Protestant, countrymen. Factors which could be included are: his involvement in Italy in 1629; his interest in developing both the West Indies and Canada; his relationship with the Habsburg Empire; his support for Gallicanism; his dealings with Gustavus Adolphus and Bernard of Saxe-Weimar; and, his deal with the Dutch and the Swedes in 1635.</p> <p>AO2 – In one sense religion was important to him, as he was prepared to utilise Protestant nations against his Catholic opponents. His principal aim seems to have always been to 'stop the progress of Spain and gain entries into neighbouring states' and he pursued that relentlessly and appeared to disregard the implications of his policies on the future of the Roman Catholic Church in Europe. There is a limited case 'against', but at least there should be awareness of it and a good explanation of why other factors clearly dominated.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
28	<p>'The rise of Sweden in the first half of the seventeenth century was made possible by external rather than by internal factors.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the factors which help explain the rise of Sweden in the first part of the seventeenth century. Factors could include: the military ability of Gustavus, both as a strategist and as a tactician as shown by Breitenfeld; Germany was in chaos; Denmark was in serious decline; and, Muscovy was interested elsewhere; Poland was more concerned with expanding eastwards; there were no threats such as Prussia and Russia after 1650; Richelieu's role; internal political stability; resources like iron and copper; and, the ability of ministers such as Oxenstierna.</p> <p>AO2 – There is a good case to be made each way. Sweden had a tiny population, limited cash and was mainly a rural and agricultural country but despite these, it played a major part on the political stage of the big powers and external factors were key in its 'rise'. However, as later events were to show, it was capable under inspired leadership of sustaining its empire and acquired territories for a long period of time but, ultimately, it could not compete against the more powerful nations.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
29	<p>Was Hapsburg unwillingness to compromise the principal reason for the long duration of the Thirty Years War?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the many reasons for the longevity of the war. Factors could include: its sheer complexity with so many different issues being involved; the role of religious divisions; there were in fact five different wars as well as wider issues, such as the Bohemian, the Danish, the Swedish and the Franco-Habsburg conflicts; there were too many evenly matched groupings with no clear ‘winners’; the reliance on mercenaries who liked and made money out of war; the lack of any really decisive ‘Waterloo’ type result; the reluctance of the diplomats to settle the issues; and, much of the fighting took place away from the territories of the major powers, therefore not affecting their own people and there was indifference as to the effect on German peasants.</p> <p>AO2 – The Hapsburgs, both Spanish and Austrian, played a strong part in keeping the conflict going and the contribution of the Cardinal Infanta is an example of this, but there were a wide range of other factors which could be considered as the reason, or a, vital reason for keeping it going. Candidates should examine a range of factors and identify one or more as being particularly important with valid reasons for their prioritisation.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
30	<p>‘France gained most from the Treaty of Westphalia.’ Did it?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the implication of the Treaty of Westphalia for the many participants and groups who participated in the various wars which made up the overall conflict. Factors which could be included are: Germany, which achieved peace; religious tolerance; Europe as a whole, which got a reasonably stable and rational settlement; Calvinism; the Hapsburgs who did not have to impose tolerance in their territories; the German princes who saw a diminution of imperial power; the question of whether or not Spain lost; Sweden with its territorial gains; France with gains like Metz and cutting the Spanish/Austrian links; and, Prussia who was able to build on its territorial gains in Eastern Pomerania.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on the implication of ‘gains’ will be important. It is not necessary just to look at adding or losing bits of territory, but the best should look at the wider picture when considering the impact of the Treaty. It could well be argued that Europe as a whole gained much from the settlement, and those that look at issues like Calvinism and nationalism should get credit as well.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
31	<p>'A golden age.' Is this an appropriate description of the Dutch Republic in the period to 1660?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the history of the Dutch republic in the stated period and whether it could be seen as a 'golden age'. Factors considered could conclude: the excellent use of resources; the role of free enterprise; whether they were able to gain from the background international situation; the East and West Indian companies, and overseas explanation and commerce; 'the factors and brokers of Europe'; shipbuilders, carriers and credit providers; the banking and finance centre of Europe; a tolerant and voluntary federal union; the cultural experience, such as the world of Vermeer, Descartes and Spinoza; the regents versus the stadtholder; the lack of a central executive; and, its foreign policy.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on what might or might not be implied by a 'golden age' is called for, but comment on events outside the period is not expected. There should be some clear criteria to base the answer on and then a case argued each way as to whether it was, or was not, 'golden'. In many respects, there were remarkable achievements in a variety of areas, but also there were fundamental flaws which were not addressed and which the nation was to suffer from.</p>	30

Section 7: c.1660–c.1715

Question	Answer	Marks
32	<p>'He created order out of chaos.' How valid is this judgement on the rule of Frederick William, the Great Elector?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of the attainments of the Great Elector. Relevant factors could include: his acquisition of territory and laying the basis of the Prussian state; his ending of the semi-autonomy of the provinces; his dealing with the issues arising out of the traditional roles of the Estates; the recovery from the Thirty Years War; his creation of a cohesive state based on autocracy, bureaucracy and militarism; the standing army; his creation of the General War Commissariat; his mercantilism, canal building and encouragement of immigrants; and, his 'efficient exploitation of the peasantry'.</p> <p>AO2 – There was chaos at the beginning of Frederick William's reign and the question requires an analysis of the nature and extent of the work done by him and comment on the degree of 'order' that he established. He is recognised as being the founder of modern Prussia but whether this should be seen as creating 'order' should be debated.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
33	<p>'By 1700, Louis XIV's foreign policy had clearly failed.' Had it?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns whether Louis' foreign policy could be seen to have failed, or not. Candidates could consider factors such as: the huge cost to France in terms of resources; the implications for the <i>ancien regime</i>; the continuing decline of Spain; Aix-la-Chapelle; gaining more parts of Flanders; the growing hostility of Holland and Britain; the failure to ruin the Dutch and the arrival of William of Orange on the British throne; much of Europe being aligned against France; the War of the League of Augsburg actually seeing Spain and the Dutch on the same side; his failure to get the 'grandeur and glory' hoped for; Dover and the Catholics; the gains of Nijmegen; and, the implications of the Grand Alliance.</p> <p>AO2 – There needs to be careful reflection on what might or might not be seemed as failure in this context. On the one hand, there were territorial gains and a growing reputation and the accumulated 'glory', while on the other hand, there was the growing hostility of most of Europe which was to defeat him in the end and had serious domestic implications for the regime he had struggled to build up. There are an interesting range of factors to weigh up and the best marks should be awarded to those who think about the criteria for success or failure and build a case on them.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
34	<p>How successful was Peter the Great’s attempt to modernise Russia?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the work of Peter the Great in attempting to change Russia and put it in a position to compete with other powers in Western Europe. Factors could include: whether he was a revolutionary or a reactionary; whether there was just evolution; a reign dominated by war; critical military changes such as conscription; the rise of the navy and success like Hango; the administrative reforms and their duration; the Senate which was perhaps a valid idea but which did not work; local government changes; the development of industry such as iron, but whether state control limited private enterprise; the lack of a carrying trade; agriculture; limited social change; and, the linking of the Church to the Tsarist autocracy.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates could argue that Peter the Great tried to ‘modernise’. However, they could also argue (and such arguments are favoured by some historians) that this was not his real ambition and he was just trying to develop his empire and his autocracy. The focus should be on the implications of what he was trying to do, whatever his ambitions, and the extent to which he was successful.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
35	<p>Why did the Great Northern War, 1700– 1721, last so long?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the reasons for the longevity of the Great Northern War and factors considered could include: it took time for Peter the Great to harness the vast resources of Russia and build up an army and navy; Charles not only loved war but was good at it; the support from the English and the Dutch; the role of Poland; Charles’ ability to knock out Denmark and Saxony; the Cossack revolt against the Tsar was a major distraction; Poltava and the Turkish support; Sweden seemed to manage very well without Charles; the sheer resilience of both Sweden and Russia, as when Charles returned from his ‘exile’ he was able to start again; and, Charles was only killed in 1718.</p> <p>AO2 – Charles’ ability and the incredible resilience of Sweden clearly are major factors, but there are many others which could easily be covered. There could be just one over-riding reason given, and there is ample evidence to back it up, but there needs to be consideration of other factors which were important. Peter started from a much lower base and it took a long time for the Russian ‘bear’ to swing effectively into action. There were other major players in the field such as the Turks and the Poles. The key is reflection on the ‘so long’ aspect of the question and more than just a list of reasons is looked for.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
36	<p data-bbox="316 248 1294 282">‘Spain was the only real beneficiary of the Treaty of Utrecht.’ Discuss.</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 1326 618">AO1 – The question concerns who gained most, or who lost least, from the Utrecht Treaty. Factors which could be included are: the fact that Spain and France were not united; France kept its Flanders gains, Alsace and its security to the North and East; the Emperor got the Spanish Netherlands and Sardinia; the Dutch got weakish barriers; the English got Gibraltar and Minorca and access to the South American trade; Austria-Hungary was kept in check; the Treaty stopped further modification of Westphalia; and, Philip was seen as the legitimate ruler of Spain but it took until the Treaty of Madrid (1715) and the Treaty of the Hague (1720) to sort it all out.</p> <p data-bbox="316 651 1326 853">AO2 – The key is to reflect on what a ‘real beneficiary’ might be and not just see the Treaty (as perhaps many contemporaries did) in terms of gaining more territory. Peace, security and stability should also be seen as important. Candidates can be rewarded for mentioning the aims of preventing future conflict and developing trade and commerce. These are not an issue if Britain is seen as a major beneficiary.</p>	30

Section 8: c.1715–c.1774

Question	Answer	Marks
37	<p>Why was it so difficult to reform French government in the period 1715–1743?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the reasons why there was little interest in reform and also why the attempts themselves lacked success. Responses could include factors such as: the minority made it difficult to get the critical royal backing; the huge range of vested interests naturally opposing any change; experimentation being stopped by aristocratic reaction; the economic disaster of 1720 stopped much more desire for financial changes; a real reluctance to tackle fundamentals; the focus was invariably on getting the existing system to work; the inevitable reliance on a nobility with a profound interest in the status quo; the lack of social mobility and social change, a caste system; the negative role of <i>Parlement</i>; Fleury's interest in the status quo; and, Orry, the traditionalist who confirmed privileges and his poor use of economic resources.</p> <p>AO2 – The key is to identify the reason/s why it was 'so' difficult to bring about major reform in this period. There was, occasionally, a determination to bring about change, but it was limited in scope. Arguably, it was the lack of any real will, or perceived need, to embark on a process which would challenge so many vested interests. In a society which was static and where many felt that any change would naturally be for the worse, reformers could make little headway.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
38	<p>'Her reign lacked real achievements.' Assess this judgement on Maria Theresa.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the extent to which there were, or were not, 'real achievements' during Maria Theresa's reign. Responses could include factors such as: her aims and objectives; the quality of her ministers; the constitutional and judicial changes; the planned economic and social changes; religious changes; centralisation; changes to both local and central government; the shelving of judicial reforms; mercantilism; government initiatives in industry in Bohemia; changes to serfdom; and, dealings with the Church and the Jesuits.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on what might be seen as 'real' achievements in the context of the eighteenth century is expected. A female ruler surviving as well as Maria Theresa could well be seen as a 'real achievement'. Arguably, the reign could be seen as little more than a link between the old era and that of Joseph, and a lot of good intentions which did not work out; and, an era of fine aims and limited attainment. However, within her reign, there was the correct identification of many major issues and at least a start made to fundamental change.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
39	<p>'European wars between 1740 and 1763 are best explained by the ambition and aggression of Prussia.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the causes of conflict in this period and whether the principal cause should be seen as Prussia. Responses could include factors such as: the role of Frederick, with his army and his money and his determination to reclaim Silesia; France with the ambitions of Louis and Fleury against the Habsburgs; the role of Carteret and George II after the departure of Walpole; Italian issues; commercial rivalry; Maria Theresa's role; Britain and France in Canada; and, possibly, the role of Russia and Poland.</p> <p>AO2 – The role of both Prussian aggression and ambition, which are not necessarily the same thing, needs to be contrasted with a range of other factors. Certainly Frederick cannot claim innocence in this respect, but there are plenty of other possible names for the 'principal troublemaker' role in this period, and there has to be an impressive case made out if Prussia is to take the bulk of the blame.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
40	<p>Assess the role played by Spain in Europe and the wider world in this period.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the role Spain played in both Europe and elsewhere in the course of the eighteenth century. Responses could include factors such as: its significant role in the Mediterranean and in Italy; the role of Elizabeth Farnese in diplomacy; the growth of its army and navy (and doubling of the population); the regaining of most of its Utrecht losses; the attack on Sicily in 1718; the Spanish conquest of Oran in 1732; the events in the Pacific and South America; the increase in treasure; the role of Carvajal; and the dependence on the British navy.</p> <p>AO2 – 'Assess' is looking for reflection on the role overall and comment on whether it changed significantly in the period. This period is seen as one of decline, but Spain still remained a major player in European politics and diplomacy and also as a 'world power' when its role in the Mediterranean, Italy, South America and the Far East were concerned. The attitudes of other nations, such as France, the UK and Austria towards Spain could also be considered.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
41	<p data-bbox="316 248 1316 282">To what extent did Louis XV strengthen the authority of the monarchy?</p> <p data-bbox="316 320 1337 618">AO1 – The question concerns the extent to which, if at all, Louis XV strengthened the authority of the monarchy. Responses could include factors such as: the absence of any clear plans for any reform or change in French government; limited economic reform; privilege and exception were still the rule; ministerial rivalry remained rife; no scope was given for any changes; Divine right was not replaced; ‘Ministerial instability elevated into a principle of government’; Jansenism was causing problems for the government; the weaknesses revealed in the relationship with <i>Parlement</i>; and, the way Louis XV gave in to the Devots over the <i>vingtième</i>.</p> <p data-bbox="316 656 1310 853">AO2 – If the authority of the monarchy was strengthened, it was not by design. At least with the end of the minority there was scope for rebuilding, but apart from the longevity of Louis XV little could be seen to have been done to restore the status that had existed in the previous century. The absence of any serious challenge or signs of an alternative system naturally assisted the Crown.</p>	30

Section 9: c.1774–1815

Question	Answer	Marks
42	<p>'Neither enlightened nor despotic.' Discuss this view of Catherine the Great.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the aims and attainments of Catherine the Great and the extent to which she could, or could not, be seen as enlightened and/or despotic. Candidates could consider: her intended reforms and the reaction to them; ultimately, there was the retention of the status quo; the failure to overcome Russian conservatism; the Instruction of 1767; radicalism turning to reaction; the outcome of her ideas on the serfs; her reaction against Pugachev; the concession of the nobility (The Charter of 1785); and, the cultural attainments of the reign.</p> <p>AO2 – Both the terms, 'enlightened' and 'despotic' need reflection and an answer, as both can be argued out. The intentions can be considered as well as the outcomes, and there needs to be a balanced view of both for the best marks. Catherine the Great may well have wished to be seen as enlightened and not as despotic but, arguably, in the context of Russia in the second part of the eighteenth century both aspects can be sensibly challenged.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
43	<p>How much did Joseph II achieve both at home and abroad?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of Joseph's achievements both within his empire and as far as his foreign policy was concerned. Responses could include factors such as: the enlightenment basis for his ideas; his autocracy; his tendency to move too quickly without preparation; his centralisation; his work in Hungary, Belgrade and Milan; his treatment of the Magyars; the idea of equality before the law; his tariff policy; his tolerance and his active, if unsuccessful, foreign policy, dealing with Russia, Prussia and Turkey.</p> <p>AO2 – The consensus tends to be that Joseph II achieved 'not much' at home or abroad. His ability to arouse considerable opposition which resulted in limited achievement was fairly consistent throughout his reign. His ideas on tolerance backfired badly and much the same can be said for his tariff policy, which managed to cause huge opposition. There were great and enlightened intentions, but very little actual achievement.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
44	<p>'The failure to reform the system of taxation was the principal cause of the French Revolution.' Was it?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the factors, both long and short term, which led to the revolution in 1789. A large range of factors could be considered, including: the background of economic depression; the growth of the divide between the first two and the Third Estate; the drought of 1785 and the harvests of 1788 and 1789; the huge social divide which existed in France; the growth of an educated middle class which had no power; the peasants versus the rural nobility; the breakdown of the alliance between the nobility and the Third Estate over the powers of the monarchy; the noble hostility to serious reform; the calling of the Estates General; the incompetence of the King; the population growth and unemployment; and, all the many failings of the Ancien Regime.</p> <p>AO2 – There are a large number of ways in which this question can be tackled. Responses should show awareness of a range of issues and some of the historiography of the topic. They should identify the key causes, with careful explanation of why one or some are more important than others. Responses should offer a sustained judgement on this well-known topic.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
45	<p>How well did the Directory rule France?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the way in which France was ruled during the era, or the Directory. Responses could include: the Constitution; the defeat of the royalists; dealing with the Church and state issue; peace in 1795; a modest franchise; educational changes; trying to get the balance right between central and local government; managing the war in Italy; getting a degree of both economic and political stability; and, the continuation of coups such as <i>Fructidor</i>.</p> <p>AO2 – Reflection on what might constitute 'good' rule in France after the endless crises of 1788–1795, and the death of the monarch and the <i>ancien regime</i> would be a good start to a response. Candidates might contrast the <i>ancien regime</i> with the Terror, and describe what was to follow. The Directory provided a degree of stability after chaos. There were viable attempts to ensure both the survival of the revolutionary system and to establish a system of government which could not only provide some stability, but also a way forward which would be of benefit to the majority of the French people. Getting some form of consensus was a remarkable attainment and starting on the route which led to the Napoleonic Empire was a considerable feat too.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
46	<p>How important was the Spanish Peninsular War to the defeat of Napoleon?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the role of the Spanish Peninsular War in the overall defeat of Napoleon in 1814–1815. Responses could consider factors such as: its role in inspiring opposition and destroying the image of invincibility; Baylen and Wellington’s numerous victories from Torres Vedras through Vitoria to the invasion of France and Toulon/Toulouse; the Russian campaign and its vast losses; the diplomatic work of Castlereagh and Metternich; Leipzig and the Fourth Coalition; the role of Murat and others; the naval campaigns and blockade; and, ultimately, the exhaustion of France.</p> <p>AO2 – The importance of the Spanish Peninsular War to the defeat of Napoleon is a much debated topic and the whole idea of the ‘ulcer’ constantly draining resources while at the same time demonstrating that the Napoleonic armies (at least without him personally leading them) could be defeated was important. However, responses should contrast Spain with the many other factors which led to his downfall and defeat and, while Spain may have provided inspiration, it was the campaign from Borodino to Leipzig which caused great damage to French military power, as well as the diplomacy of Castlereagh and others (including British money) which played a major part.</p>	30

Section 10: Themes c.1610–c.1800

Question	Answer	Marks
47	<p>‘The greatest advances were made in mathematics and physics.’ Discuss this view of the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the basis for, and extent of, scientific advances in the course of the seventeenth century. Responses could include factors such as: the work of Galileo; Kepler; Harvey; Descartes; Pascal; Bacon; the medical developments; the work of the botanists and the huge range of topics covered by the Royal Society; Newton’s ‘Principia’ of 1687; and, the technologists and the instrument makers.</p> <p>AO2 – There is a debate to be had here, but the current consensus is that much was dependent on the mathematicians and the physicists as their ideas provided the basis for so much and where it was not directly linked, then it was their methodology that was a key factor. Arguably it was the ‘thinkers’ who could have laid the basis for many of the advances, but then a study of their education leads back to the maths and physics men. Reflection on what might be seen as an advance would be important and a comparison between the extents of each ‘advance’ is expected.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
48	<p>‘Strategies changed, but tactics did not.’ Discuss this view of warfare in <u>either</u> the seventeenth or the eighteenth century.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the extent to which both military strategy and tactics changed in either of the two centuries. Responses could include factors such as: the type and use of artillery; fortification, for example Vauban; the development of joint operations; infantry formations; the ‘1-2-3 firing system; the naval ‘rules’ and line of battle ideas; the changing use of cavalry; the development of the blockade as a weapon; adapting to ‘New World ‘ conditions; logistics; and, the ideas of Gustavus Adolphus and those of Napoleon.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates could argue both aspects successfully in both periods, and with some overlap, but there is no need to stick too rigidly to the dates. The Spanish Succession War can be used for both centuries. Response should show good awareness of the differences between the two terms and offer a great deal more than just a list of changes.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
49	<p>'Women had more impact on the cultural than on the political life of eighteenth-century Europe.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of the impact that women had on political and cultural life in the course of the eighteenth century. The word 'cultural' can be very broadly interpreted in this context. Factors which could be included are: the role of rulers such as Catherine the Great, Maria Theresa and Elizabeth Farnese; women in the French Revolution; examples where women played a key role in influencing the decision makers; and, as writers, critics, commentators and managers of 'salons'.</p> <p>AO2 – There needs to be identification of the various ways in which women directly or indirectly influenced both cultural and political life during the course of the century. One approach could be in adopting a very 'broad brush' approach and looking at a range of fairly generalised examples covering both aspects of the question or, alternatively, looking at a more limited range but going into a fair amount of detail examining the impact that women had.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
50	<p>Assess the impact of enlightenment thinking on European political and economic life.</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the nature and extent of the impact that the Enlightenment thinkers and writers had on rulers, politicians and politics and also on the economic life of nations. Candidates could mention: the broader impact of the work of men like Descartes, Newton and Locke; the more 'political' impact of men like Turgot and Montesquieu; the separation of powers; the idea of Rousseau; the influence of the physiocrats on free trade and laissez-faire; Adam Smith; whether they inspired only ideas and not actions; and, the influence on rulers like Catherine the Great and Joseph II.</p> <p>AO2 – There is much to debate and 'assess'. Some argue that there was a very narrow basis of appeal, Voltaire and the 'hundred thousandth part' idea. While others suggest that it led to a major shift in thinking in both spheres with the growth of free trade and the French Revolution. There is, of course, the idea that the ideas were monopolised by the elites and adapted very much for their own purposes.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
51	<p>Was mercantilism still a major influence in the eighteenth century?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the extent to which, if at all, mercantilist ideas were a major factor in influencing decision taking in the course of the eighteenth century. Responses should offer a good definition of the term, <i>mercantilism</i>. Monopoly, or at least substantial control, was seen as the basis of mercantilism. ‘A conscious pursuit of commerce’ is another definition. Candidates could include factors such as: a desire to expand exports and decrease imports; the massive growth in overseas trade with effects on wealth and the growth of cities; the link between the balance of trade and the nation’s health; it was a common factor behind so many wars, the Seven Years War for example; the desire for more colonies; and, the role of the Board of Trade in the UK and its counterparts in France and Holland.</p> <p>AO2 – In its broadest sense, mercantilism was almost certainly a major influence in the eighteenth century, and the focus on commerce and colonies in peace treaties like those of 1763 and 1783 illustrates this well. The policies of men like Vergennes in France in the 1770s, although partially influenced by a desire for revenge, were dominated by essentially ‘mercantilist’ ideas. The addition of the Dutch and the Spanish to the war against the British in America was also primarily influenced by commercial and essentially monopolistic ideas.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
52	<p>To what extent did government policies in western Europe discourage rather than encourage the development of industry?</p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the extent to which government policies in western Europe encouraged or discouraged industrial development. Responses could include factors such as: the development of ‘official’ overseas companies; the degree of regulation of trade and development; any incentives and/or privileges accorded to individuals or companies; internal tariffs and their impact; the support for restrictive practices such as guilds; the ‘caste’ attitude to trade; the degree of access that commercial interests had to decision makers; and, the sheer lack of knowledge and interest by government.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates could adopt a variety of approaches to their responses such as a Europe-wide generalised approach, or an approach which has a more specific focus on individual countries like Russia under Peter the Great or France of the <i>Ancien Régime</i>. Often policies designed to encourage could damage, yet there are plenty of examples like the incentives given by Prussia to the Huguenots, where there were real benefits. Holland is an excellent example of where commercial influences dominated, and yet there is evidence that it was not always beneficial to the nation’s wealth as a whole.</p>	30