

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/22

Paper 2b (European History Outlines c. 1378 – c. 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 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 1: c. 1378–c. 1461

1 What best explains the intense rivalries between the Italian city states in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There is a wide range of factors which could be considered, such as: the very different culture and traditions of each city state; the rise of a strong and often very intense civic patriotism, just as strong as the aggressive nationalism of Europe in the 19th century; there was a long tradition of warfare and competition between them; there was a strong cultural rivalry, as well the usual territorial and wealth acquisition ones; the simple desire to acquire more wealth and territory at the expense of others; the decline/loss of status of some could be prevented by acquiring the wealth/terror of others; with the growing rule by autocrats, their ability as rulers was judged by their ability to acquire; there was considerable wealth there, so mercenaries could be easily hired from Switzerland to do the fighting on their behalf; the considerable strategic significance of some states, such as Bologna, naturally whetted the acquisitive and aggressive appetites of others.

AO2- is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

A range of factors need to be considered. The best will identify the key factor/s and argue a case for them, ideally prioritising, but also indicate why others were of lesser importance. Those who stress that factors changed over time should be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

2 'Valois Burgundy played only a limited role in the Hundred Years War.' Discuss

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A variety of factors could be mentioned, covering a wide period, such as: courted by both Henry IV and Henry V of England; standing aloof at such critical times as Agincourt; the degree to which Burgundy benefited from the disaster at Agincourt; the acceptance of Henry V's claim to the French throne; the Montereau assassination; Philip the Good's many dealings with the English; 'the hole through which England made its way into France'; Burgundy's vital role at Troyes; the limited assistance in the 'middle' period, bar of course its role with Joan of Arc; in the end it was always a factor/player.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a good case to be made each way. Whether non-intervention could be as significant as actual intervention needs to be considered and often a diplomatic role needs to be reflected on, in contrast to the actual use of soldiers. 'Limited' needs to be reflected on and also whether their role is looked at from a French rather than an English perspective.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

3 'Over-extended and under-resourced.' Discuss this view of the Byzantine Empire in the years c. 1378 to 1453

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the continuous civil wars – with the monarch (John) V being evicted from the throne by his own son; the Ottoman advance, into Greece and Slav areas; the lack of support from Rome; the Bulgar humiliation; the collapse of the Balkan Entente; the endless dependency for survival on others; the disaster at Kosovo; the nature and extent of the empire itself; the way in which the Turks were supported by Venice and Genoa; however, the success of Tamerlane was a great support; the failure of Manul to consolidate in the early fifteenth century – with again the lack of any Western help; the poor quality of the state infrastructure; the sheer diversity of the Empire; the role of John VIII and his brothers; the failure of the Union of Florence, the ballet of Varna in 1448.

AO2- is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Both terms need to be considered and both were major issues when it came to the final collapse. Given the extent and structure of the Empire and the very weak centre, the over extension could be agreed with. However, with satisfactory support, there is a case against. Given the threats to the Empire it was under resourced to deal with them, but there is a clear case for arguing that very poor use was made of the resources available. Sensible diplomacy and good administration were never the hallmarks of the later Byzantine Empire.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

4 To what extent was the reign of Charles VII a period of ‘real recovery’ for France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered when arguing each way: the dreadful low point of Troyes; the increasing success in the Hundred Years War; the morale boost provided by Joan of Arc; the crowning at Rheims; Arras in 1435 and the support from Burgundy; the cost to France of Arras; the flight of Louis to Burgundy; the regaining of Paris; the military reforms; the recovery of Normandy and Guyenne; the gradual erosion of the powers of the greater nobility; the importance of growing support from the lesser nobility; the rise of an ‘official’ class; the increasing scope of royal jurisdiction.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The issue of ‘extent’ needs to be dealt with firmly and here should be a concise and clear answer to that part of the question. Reflection on the ‘real’ aspect should also be there, with comment on whether it was more superficial than lasting. It could well be argued that he made a start on an upward curve and France in 1461 was a very different place from the dire situation after Troyes and Agincourt.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

5 What best explains the rise of Poland in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the geographical advantages with flexible borders; it became the largest European kingdom west of Muscovy; its decentralisation could be a real asset; unusual dynastic continuity, in both fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the excellent basis laid in fourteenth century by Casimir III; the marriage of Jadwiga to the Lithuanian Jagellion and the resulting unity; the development of the powerful and able Jagellion dynasty; the highly competent early Jagellion rule from 1386 to 1434 providing a firm basis; useful and highly co-operative relations with both Hungary and Bohemia; greater Europeanisation; religious unity; the good working relationship between landowning class and the monarch; sensible foreign policy.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is no one single reason, expect perhaps the continuity and ability of the Jagellion kings building on the work of the Piast dynasty. The extent to which it was good judgement, rather than good fortune, could be debated. What is looked for is a range of factors, carefully prioritised and a well evidenced judgement.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 2: c. 1461–c. 1516

6 To what extent does Louis XI deserve his title of ‘Louis the Prudent?’

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A lot is known here and there is a lot that could be covered: Louis XI was a hard worker, but a hard man; committed to his role; highly authoritarian, but that was perhaps what was needed and expected; a great information gatherer and keen on diplomacy, often with very mixed results; a phrase he used ‘never so great as when up to his neck in water’ could equally well be used for him; he was very good at getting out of very difficult situations, but there were cases where his failings had got him into them in the first case, e.g. Arras; certainly successful in his aims in Burgundy; the reduction of French baronial power; the exclusion of the English; Crown income increased; trade and the ‘fairs’ started to expand; there was a real sense of monarchical recovery. Most of these points could be used to support the case for ‘prudent’, but the methodology used in many cases might form the basis of a case ‘against’.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Reflection on the term ‘prudent’ in the context of France in the fifteenth century is looked for. Obviously, in consideration of what he attained for France in terms of Burgundy, there is a valid case for dealing with the English and ‘centralisation’. But, there are ample examples, with his ‘diplomacy’ in particular where he could not be seen to be prudent at all. Much depends on the definition utilised and the quality of reflection on it.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

7 To what extent were the Italian Wars caused by a failure of diplomacy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of causative factors could be considered, such as: the way in which the great powers found it a convenient theatre of operations to conduct their rivalries; Italy's inability to resist invaders; simple geographical factors; the depth of internal rivalries; the importance of control of the Papacy; the elitism of Italian culture being a contributory factor – they were too involved in patronage and court life to 'mind the shop' both economically and political; neglect of the usual pattern of alliances between powers (the diplomacy factor); a reluctance to invest in the productive sectors of the economy; lack of political stability in Italy and the traditional rivalries; a lack of any 'national' feeling; simple greed on the part of other powers; internal chaos made it a tempting target; the ambitions of Charles VIII, Louis XII and Francis I; the Spanish/Imperial involvement of Charles V.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Certainly, there is a case to develop on the 'diplomatic' front and there are many possible culprits who could be seen to have failed, such as the Papacy and the Medici clan. However, French ambitions and the desire of the Habsburgs to prevent the growth of French power in Italy and the Mediterranean generally, were also key factors.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

8 ‘Dominated by Italians who had only Italian interests at heart.’ Discuss this view of the Papacy between 1458 and 1513.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There are many examples which could be used to back up the statement, such as: Pius II – a Piccolomini from Siena: well-meaning but lacking in any reforming zeal; Calixtus III, the Borgia who made his nephew a cardinal who later became Alexander VII; Paul II, a Venetian, and nephew of Eugenius IV who was remarkable for his inactivity; the totally secular Sixtus IV (Liguria) who promoted his criminal nephews and was involved in the Medici murders; the ineffective and beleaguered Innocent VIII from Genoa; the Borgia Alexander VI, who took worldliness to new heights with his promotion of his nephews and the public acknowledgement of his mistress; Julian II (nephew of Sixtus IV) always totally involved in the complexities of Italian politics; and finally Leo X, the son of Lorenzo who had been bought his cardinalship at the age of 13.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The Italian domination would be hard to argue against but the ‘Italian interests’ aspect is easier to challenge. The secular roles adopted by many could be seen as damaging to Italy and given that the Papacy could be seen as a potential unifying force against foreign intervention, it could well be seen as an ‘un-Italian’ feature. Interests could be very personal and the degree of nepotism, (perhaps the least of their crimes?) might suggest other factors were closer to their hearts.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

9 'More successful as Holy Roman Emperor than in any other role.' Discuss this view of Maximilian of Habsburg.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There is a very wide range of factors which can be considered, for example: his defeat by the Swiss in 1499 and being compelled to recognise the Confederation as virtually independent; Maximilian's attempts to revive chivalry; his gains in 1493 of Artois and Franche-Comté; his marriage to Mary of Burgundy, the daughter of Charles the Rash; the many ideas for constitutional reform which came to nothing; his regular inability to raise troops and/or money; the Reichstag of 1495; the 'Common Penny' failure; the *Reichsregiment*; alienation of the Electors; the degree of success in unifying the Austrian lands; the Bavarian succession; his role with the Turks; the degree of anarchy in Germany; his impotence in the Italian Wars.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a strong case to support the view in the quote, as Austria was to remain the basis of Habsburg power for a long time afterwards. His successful dynastic role could be largely down to his father's choice of bride for him. He certainly tried to achieve elsewhere – both in territorial acquisition and in developing the role of the Emperor, and creating a support system for the role he had assumed – but there is little in the way of success there.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

10 How convincing is the view that Ferdinand and Isabella achieved more in their foreign than in their domestic policies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There is an enormous range of factors which could be considered and expect probably more on domestic than foreign policy (allow Granada, Navarre, Perpignan etc. to count as ‘foreign’). Candidates might discuss: the degree of fusion and unity attained in Spain; the weakness of the crown largely ended; the scene set for the growth of a great Spanish empire; dealing with Portugal; feudal barons; money shortages; fragmented jurisdictions; the termination of Castilian anarchy; the conciliar work; currency reform; the Mesta; the development of the army; the Moors; the conquest of Granada; the move into Italy; the work with the Church and the New World exploration.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a very strong argument either way. If ‘foreign’ is interpreted quite broadly, then there is real achievement there both in terms of events within the Iberian Peninsula, as well as in the Pyrenees and the wider Mediterranean, and in the New World. However, there is an equally powerful case to be made for the ‘domestic’, as what they achieved when starting from such a low base it quite remarkable. Allow comment on what happened to their legacy as well. There might be a ‘short term versus long term’ contrast, but, equally well, there could be good answers which simply argue that both were exceptional and explain why.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 3: c. 1516–c.1559

**11 (Candidates offering 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.)
‘A very conservative reformer.’ Assess this view of Luther.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

Factors which could be considered are: that Luther was a highly educated and trained theologian whose instincts were naturally conservative; much of his early work was a reaction to visible corruption and the ‘innovation’ of indulgences and papal power; the content of the 95 Theses; the development of the major ideas of the Bible as the basis of all belief and the ‘faith alone versus the individual effort’ argument; the developing ideas contained in the writings such as ‘On Christian Liberty’, ‘On the Freedom of Christian Men’ and the ‘Babylonian Captivity’; his reaction to the Peasants’ Revolts and Anabaptists; the Bible in the vernacular; his anti-Jewish ideas; his hostility to papal power, which was not an untypical sentiment at the time in Germany.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

A case each way is looked for and the arguments are well known. Certainly, in the pre-Augsburg period, it could well be argued that the title is apt. However, those that put more emphasis on the ‘conservative’ part of the question might come up with a different sort of answer to those that have a focus on the ‘reformer’ part of the question. It could be argued, of course, that he was a reformer, but a very radical one. Some might see him as a revolutionary from the start of course, and come up with a very different approach. There is a lot of scope here and the best responses will reflect separately on the two key words in the question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

**12 (Candidates offering 5d: Reformation Europe should not answer this question.)
How well governed was Spain in the years 1516 to 1556?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: the endless demands on it for cash – the ‘milch cow’; the unpopularity of ‘foreign’ regents such as Adrian of Utrecht; the factors which led to the revolution of 1520; the degree of concessions made – but without actually touching the basis of royal authority; the way in which authority was restored in Castile; the gradual exclusion of the grandees from power; the continuing noble exemption from taxation; tax falling on those least able to pay; the Mesta; the limited industrial developing and an almost anti commercial policy; whether the failure to utilise the bullion from the New World was at all sensible; the removal of regional autonomy; absentee rule.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Balance is looked for in the answer as there is a case to be made each way. Some reflection on the implications of ‘well-governed’ would be the hallmark of a strong response, together with identification of the clear signs of good government (and there are some such signs), with consideration also of factors which clearly were not good government in the context of the first part of the sixteenth century.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

13 ‘Suleiman the Magnificent’s abilities were exclusively military.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: Belgrade; Rhodes; Mohacs; Vienna; the final failure to expand into central Europe; the Persian conflicts; Lepanto; Malta; the development of a North African empire; his skill in choosing advisors; an administrator; his fortifications; a builder, especially in Constantinople; the ‘Lawgiver’; his role in encouraging the arts in all forms.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

While there were certainly real military skills, there were also failings – these could be stressed. Arguably the failures, such as the Indian expedition, demonstrated a lack of ability and judgment. It could be argued that his abilities lay elsewhere, especially as the organiser and administrator, and in creating an empire which was to last until the twentieth century.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

14 Evaluate the nature and extent of the achievements of Ivan IV of Russia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

When considering achievements, there are a variety of issues that can be looked for as points which could be made in favour of a substantial achievement on his part, such as: he created for the first time a centrally administered Russian state; a real start was made in developing a Russian empire; the substantial territorial expansion including non-Slavs for the first time; real organisation developed in administration at both central and local level; the creation of the Zemsky Sobor – although it could be argued that this was not followed through; the armed services were reformed and conditions of service improved; he managed to curb the power of the boyars.

On the other side, there are factors such as: the endless and often unsuccessful wars – particularly the 24-year Livonian war; the fruitless Sweden wars; the creation of a system of terror which was often counterproductive; the murder of the heir and his mishandling of the succession which led to the ‘Time of Troubles’. His work with the Church could be seen to be an improvement in one sense, but it could also be seen as getting a vital support to his ideas on Divine Right.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Both ‘nature’ and ‘extent’ need to be considered – and ideally separately. For the first, the type of achievement needs to be reflected on. Was he anything more than a bloodthirsty tyrant anxious to build an empire – a putative Stalin in other words? Did he really wish to create a ‘modern’ state and bring better rule to his subjects? Could the attack on the boyars be seen as a simple power struggle or an attempt to modernise? Candidates should reflect on his aims and the type of changes he brought about. To respond to the ‘extent’ part of the question, candidates should consider his actual work commenting on its longevity and how profoundly it affected the development of Russia. Was Russia a fundamentally different place at the end of his reign in 1584?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

15 Evaluate the nature and extent of the achievements of Ivan IV of Russia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the minority and his awful inheritance; the role of the 'old' Boyars and the degree of family infighting; the alienation of Crown lands and an empty treasury; his anti-boyar campaign; the work of the Chosen Council; the initial centralisation and efficiency of the administration; coping well with the previous 100 year expansion of Muscovy; local government reforms and the rise of the service gentry; the legal code of 1550; his army reforms; the use of terror and the Oprichnina; the conquest of the Lower Volga region; his failures in Livonia and the Baltic region generally; his failure in succession issues; laying the basis for Russian sovereignty in Asia; the development of commerce with England and Holland; sowing the seeds of a future civil war with the Oprichnina.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is ample scope here for serious argument and evaluation. Given the nature of his inheritance, there is a lot to praise and several factors such as dealing with the Boyars, expansionism and administrative change, could be seen as real achievements, but on the other hand, the Baltic disasters, the whole succession issue and the legacy of terror left for his successors to try and sort out, could all be seen to diminish the overall achievement.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 4: c. 1559–c. 1610

16 To what extent did Philip II of Spain subordinate Spanish interests to Catholic interests?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Candidates should offer a fairly comprehensive coverage of the main foreign and imperial policy areas where Philip involved Spain, in particular: Cateau Cambresis; the Dutch revolt; England; Scotland; France; the ‘Austrian’ part of the Empire; Italy and his relationship with the Pope as a temporal ruler; the whole Mediterranean area including North Africa and the Turk; Lepanto; the American Empire.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There needs to be an attempt to identify what might be seen as Spanish as opposed to Catholic interests. Arguably, endless involvement in war was costly and led to major problems in Castile. Philip might well have seen, for example, his role in the Netherlands as sustaining his inheritance and dealing with a difficult ‘colony’ rather than as part of a pro Catholic crusade. There were occasions when being supportive of the Counter Reformation was very much in the interests of Spain (or, arguably, the Habsburgs), but there are plenty of occasions when it did much to damage the economy and people of Spain.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

17 What best explains the survival of the Huguenots in France in the later sixteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the reaction to St Bartholomew's; the wider conflict with the involvement of the Dutch and the English, for example; economic and social resources; internal divisions amongst the Catholics; noble rivalries – the Guise and the League; a moderate government fighting a revolutionary movement outbid by an extremist faction on its own sides; Joinville Treaty; the role of Henri III and Marie against the Guise; the military and personal abilities of Navarre; the Blois assassination in 1588; the 1589 alliance with Navarre against the Guise; the Huguenot organisation; the dynamism of Calvinism and external support; the interconnecting with various social issues, especially peasant versus landlord.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

While the identification of one major factor is not expected, there is the expectation that a range of major ones are identified, and with supporting reasons why they are the major ones and why more important than others. The fact that certain factors rose and fell in importance over a time could also be emphasised.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

18 To what extent, and why, did the Baltic assume greater strategic importance during this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors might considered, such as: the spread of Lutheranism and Calvinism northwards which shifted the balance of ‘religious’ power; the economic development of the region, especially with iron ore and copper; the growth of trade and shipping in the Baltic; the increased interest of both the Dutch and the English in the Baltic/Russia trade; political developments and the rise of Russia, in particular, seeking an outlet to the West; the rise of both Sweden and Denmark as independent powers seeking to gain status; the expansion of North Baltic powers into the southern Baltic region.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Both ‘extent’ and ‘why’ should be treated separately. Some of the reasons why are to be found in factors outside the Baltic like the growth of Russian power, the reformation process and commercial enterprise. However, there are ‘Baltic specific’ factors like the development of the Swedish state and the decline of individual powers on the Southern Baltic coastline. Extent is more difficult to gauge, so candidates who keep a focus on the strategic aspect of the question will be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

19 'The successes of the Counter Reformation were achieved largely in spite of, and not because of, the Papacy.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered such as: the closure of Trent in 1563 – not to meet again; the roles of Paul III, Julius III and Paul IV and the latter's clashes with Philip II of Spain; the lack of support from the 'national' Catholic churches; the role of the Jesuits; the role of the Inquisition; the work of Henry IV of France; the extent to which success was caused by military and political factors; the role of individual bishops and the new seminaries; the role of the universities; the work of other new orders and reformers within the old ones.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a case to be made each way and the 'in spite of' side may be a harsh judgment. Certainly, the papacy could have done a great deal more and many of the successes of the process were down to individuals, be they monarchs or dynamic leaders like Loyola. There was obstructionism at times, as Philip II of Spain was well aware, but certainly Rome at the end of the sixteenth century was a very different place to the one that Luther witnessed ninety years earlier and, the papacy did play a major part in that change.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

20 How important was William of Orange to the Dutch revolt?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the traditional leadership role of the Golden Fleece; his hatred of religious persecution; being linked by marriage to Lutheran German princes; his leadership of the attack on Granvelle; the failure of his initial invasion from Germany in 1568; being totally committed to destroying Spanish power; his role in keeping the revolt alive; his military and diplomatic skills. Other factors which could be considered are: the role of the Sea Beggars; geographical factors; resources and the Spanish bankruptcies; religion; the local traditions of autonomy; the roles of the various Spanish Governors; the role of Philip II of Spain; a range of social and economic factors; the critical impact of Alva's policies in creating opposition.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There should be a great deal more than answering just 'very' and then writing a list. The best will look at the revolt as a whole and make a judgment as to the importance of Orange to the course and result. Certainly, he was a great deal more than a figurehead, but there needs to be real reflection on the importance of his work when compared to many other factors.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 5: Themes c. 1378–c. 1610

21 How effectively did the pre-Reformation Church deal with heresy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: the Crusades; the Turks; the Byzantines; the focus on the Schism; the impact of the Black Death on the Church and society; anti-Semitism; Luther; the challenge of Ockham and nominalism; Hus; the Czech martyrs and Utraquism; Wycliffe and the Lollards; the Humanists.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There needs to be reflection on what ‘effective’ management of heretic might imply. Simple suppression using the conventional brutal methods could often be counterproductive or just drive it underground. Evidence of any sensible preventative methods should be rewarded. Was it anything more than just trying to keep a lid on a pot about to boil over?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

22 'Without patronage there would have been no Italian Renaissance.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the strong links with classical civilisation already there, both visual and written; the usual fall of Constantinople-Greek revival argument; the strong universities and educational traditions already there; the strong local cultural traditions such as painting in Florence; the degree of local autonomy; the fact that there was nothing to discourage non-conformity and innovation; civic pride encouraged artistic and cultural endeavour; the existing libertarian tradition; Pius II referred to a 'change loving Italy'; the great wealth of the papacy, cities and individuals; yet the papacy, the great families, the guilds and the cities all supported it; artistic patronage strengthened political authority; the decline linked to Spanish, Catholic, foreign autocratic domination in the later sixteenth century.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

A debate is expected on the role of patronage when compared with many other factors in the whole development of the Renaissance in Italy. Certainly patronage was vital in its own way, but so was the absence of constraint, a fine and longstanding liberal/humanist tradition, and communities where the artist was given great respect.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

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

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

With this type of question, a very broad range of factors can be considered and there should not be too close a line drawn between what might be seen as ‘economic’ and ‘social’. Issues which might be covered are: family; marriage; the status of women; the role of religion and the Church; landownership; the status of the peasant, the serf and the artisan; the decline of serfdom and the rise of social mobility; rebellion and unrest; feudalism and seigneurial rights; noble status; population; urbanisation; kinship and neighbourhood solidarities; price rise implications; credit availability and the rise of a bourgeoisie; education.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is scope for a very ‘broad brush’ answer which looks at the whole period, as well as a more detailed look at specific issues or regions. Flexibility should be allowed in terms of the period covered. The best responses will give a firm answer to the ‘extent’ part of the question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

24 'The military changes were so great that they constituted a revolution.' Discuss with reference to either the fifteenth or the sixteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered for both centuries, such as: the role of the mercenary; fortifications; the renewed supremacy of defence over attack (e.g. Colonna's defence of Milan in 1521); strategy now being emphasised more than tactics; recruitment methods; supply issues; artillery; changed infantry tactics – such as the tercio; new cavalry tactics; new weapons – the gun in particular; changed views on military discipline; the rise of the citizen army and the militia; naval developments from the galley onwards; the use of guns on ships.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Reflection on what amounts to a 'revolution' is looked for with a sensible degree of balance. There is a case to be made for both, but a stronger one, particularly if naval aspects are looked at as well, for the sixteenth century.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

25 What best explains the dominance of Portugal and Spain in European expansion overseas in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: Portugal – simple geography; the tradition going back to Ceuta in 1415; major developments there in nautical science, shipbuilding, and methods of exploration and colonisation; the link between the Reconquest and expansion; the royal encouragement of Henry the Navigator and John II; the success of da Gama and Diaz, especially the former with the spice trade; the work of Cabral. For Spain, candidates could consider: the support of Ferdinand and Isabella given to Columbus; the lack of any opposition – the Dutch involved elsewhere; the involvement of the French and the English in their own internal affairs; and, the sheer ability of the Conquistadores.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There should be an argument that they just got lucky as there was no serious opposition, either in the new territories, or from other countries such as Holland, but that is too simplistic a view. There was a real drive from the top and, certainly, in the case of Portugal, a desire to expand and innovate and explore. There was a lot of talent there and it was well used.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

26 Did the influx of bullion bring substantial benefits to Europe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

On the whole, the influx of bullion was not well used, especially by the Spanish; monarchs tended to remain insolvent; in the early stages c. 50% was absorbed in collection, shipping and administration – later this would rise to 80%; it led to piracy and corruption on a large scale; it just improved Habsburg credit and made them more ambitious; created rivalries and inflation; it led to highly negative mercantilist effects; it led to profit inflation – especially in the European markets; it did encourage capitalism and social change; there is a clear link between it and the industrial development of the sixteenth centuries.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The ‘benefit’ aspect could be challenged on its own as well as the ‘substantial’ element of the question. Reflection on what might be seen as a benefit is looked for and not just a survey of impact.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 6: c. 1610–c. 1660

27 'Richelieu's attack on the Huguenots was the only serious mistake he made in his domestic policies.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, ranging from: his management of the nobles and factions generally; duelling edicts; his consolidation of royal power; his centralisation; the implications and results of his Huguenot policy; the plots, Montmorency and Cinq Mars; his authoritarianism, spies and censorship; the 'power hungry cynic'; neglect of trade and the economy; his overall subordination of the domestic to the military/international; his taxation system and the feudal privileges; his institutionalisation of the ancien regime.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There are other possibilities for 'serious mistake', such as the development of an autocracy and his palpable neglect of the domestic economy. What is looked for here is a reflection on the implications of La Rochelle and the ending of much of Nantes, and then comparison with other, arguably equally damaging aspects of his domestic policies, such as the retention of the feudal tax privileges of the nobility.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

28 ‘Able ministers serving foolish monarchs.’ How appropriate is this view of Spanish government under Philip III and Philip IV?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as under Philip III: the respective ability of Philip and Lerma; the foreign policy of the period; the rise of the favourite; Philip’s overdependence on advice from wife and favourite; the expulsion of the Moriscos and its economic impact; the greater degree of government efficiency than had been the case under Philip II; the rise of the proconsuls; the quality of men like Spinola and Fuentes, and Villafranca in Italy; little was done to improve the economy; the decision to get involved in the Thirty Years War; perhaps the decline started here? Under Philip IV, the Cardinal Infanta and Nordlingen; the work and role of Olivares, with his firmness and confidence providing the counterbalance to Philip IV; the work of the much less able de Haro; the Peace of the Pyrenees; the Catalan issue; the currency changes; the roles of the Juntas; the patronage of the arts and the acceleration of decline.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Arguably, it is much more complex than the quote suggests. Certainly, Olivares was able, but he made errors and there are occasions when Philip IV’s approach was better suited to Spanish interests. De Haro certainly lacked judgment and, while Philip might be criticised for appointing him, he did bring some judgment to proceedings. Lerma, while perhaps astute when it came to court politics, had limited judgment and could be argued that Philip III brought more sense to public life in Spain than Lerma ever did. But, at the same time, Philip could justifiably be criticised for allowing the rise of the alien ‘favourite’ into Spanish politics.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

29 Assess the view that Gustavus Adolphus was a great general but no statesman.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered for both his general ship and statesmanship, such as: the rise to great power status; the territorial gains; the good choice of ministers such as Oxenstierna; the invasion of the Southern Baltic region; his management of the economy and industrial development; his grasp of the strategic importance of Sweden in the Baltic and in Europe; whether he became an agent of France’s expansionist ambitions; the extent to which he overstretched Swedish resources; his innovations in military tactics; his victory at Brietenfeld; ‘the father of modern warfare’; the destruction of the tercios; the quality support service for his armies; the disaster at Lutzen – getting himself exposed and killed; his overall legacy.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The great general ship is usually accepted, certainly from the tactical point of view; however, his strategic sense could be challenged and great generals don’t let themselves get killed at critical moments. As far as Sweden internally is concerned, the ‘statesman’ aspect could be justified, but in terms of the role he envisaged Sweden playing in the future in the wider world, then the case is perhaps not so strong.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

30 'A remarkable achievement in the circumstances.' Discuss this verdict on the Treaty of Westphalia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, ranging from: the 'peace of exhaustion'; the return to the status quo of 1618 for France and Spain; the nature and extent of the antagonism which existed pre-1618; the French gains of Metz, Toul, Verdun and Alsace; Sweden's gains in Western Pomerania; Brandenburg's gain in Pomerania; Spain's recognition of the United Provinces; the Empire's benefits in Upper Austria; the religious agreement; over 194 separate states represented there; France and Spain's representatives never actually met; the Swiss issue solved; the autonomy of the German princes dealt with; the actual circumstances as the end of the war and the nature of the causes, and the very different aims and aspirations of the many protagonists; its longevity.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

An analysis of the circumstances at the end of the war is looked for as well as the huge number of participants with their very diverse aims and aspirations (and memories). Given the bitterness of the conflict and the vast range of fundamental issues that were actually dealt with, it certainly could be argued to have been a fine attainment. Holes can be picked in it, and a fair amount was left until 1659, as well as the way in which it was utilised as a springboard for countries like Sweden and Prussia. It could of course be argued that sheer exhaustion had set in and that all were too broke and broken to wish to fight any more.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

31 What best explains the rise of Brandenburg–Prussia between 1640 and 1688?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: the gains of Westphalia; the impact of the Thirty Years War on potential rivals, such as the Habsburg Empire; the sheer quality of the ruler; the excellent management of the ‘composite’ state; the royal income; the development of an effective standing army; the degree of absolutism and the centralised bureaucracy; luck-long lived and sensible rulers; the continuity possible; the way in which local autonomy, such as the self-government of the towns, was dealt with; a supportive and well manage nobility; Fehrbellin and good military leadership; pragmatic opportunism.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The identification of a range of the more important factors is looked for with reasons why some were of greater importance than others. Prioritisation is looked for and not a list. There is a real debate possible between the ‘in the right place at the right time’ line of argument, as opposed to the highly talented and long lived Frederick William who used his ability and his country’s potential to the full.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 7: c. 1660–c. 1715

32 How seriously was Spain in decline in the later seventeenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the state of the royal finances; the ability of its rulers; the territorial losses in Europe and the Americas; the naval reputation gone at the Dunes; the defeat at Rocroi; the cultural revival; population factors; the debate on whether the ‘Golden Age’ actually existed; the extent to which it applied to Castile alone and not to Catalonia; its failure to match the economic growth of the rest of Europe in the period; its lack of able ministers; the impact of the plague in 1683–85; the degree of poverty; the domination of the Church over society; the rigid social system and its implications; the lack of any serious reform, or desire for it.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

A variety of viewpoints could be put forward. There is a view that the image of the ‘Golden Age’ from which Spain declined is an inaccurate one and that Spain possibly ‘plateaued’ for much of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. An analysis of the ‘serious’ aspect of the question is critical, and there is also the view that there was a superficiality in it and that recovery to great power status was a possibility with good management from the top.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

33 Did Louis XIV extend absolutism in France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors should be considered, such as: the extent to which he was his own ‘first minister’; the changes following the deaths of Colbert and Louvois; the degree of control he attained over issues like war, foreign policy and the Church; the organisation of power at the centre; Versailles; limiting the role of the councils; the education of noble influence; the lack of threats to his power; the way in which Colbert extended the power of the state to so many levels; the Civil Ordinances of 1667; the role of the Intendants; Parlement; Lit de Justice; the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the degree of local unrest; the Catholic Church; Jansenism; the noble elite; local particularism.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The nature and extent of absolutism in France needs to be reflected on. The state of absolutism in France when he inherited the throne needs to be compared with its state at the end of the reign. Arguably, it could be seen to ‘rise and fall’ and there may well be a link between the success of his foreign policy, his income and the extent of his power.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

34 'Unwise experiments.' Discuss this verdict on Peter the Great's attempts to modernise Russia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: given the problems that faced him on inheriting the throne and resulting from the early wars, he had to act; the results of the Great Embassy; hiring skilled foreigners; experiments were largely unplanned and done 'ad hoc', only coming to fruition in his last years; the various army and navy reforms; the engineering schools; the new fleet; his sensible taxation policy; the involvement of the state in economic life, especially in encouraging industry; the success of the iron industry; merchant fleet failings and also agriculture; good administration; treatment of the Church; the attempts at social change; the success at Poltava; becoming a major European and Asian power.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The wisdom, or otherwise, of his experiments needs to be reflected on. The need to experiment could be discussed, but the consensus is that reversion to the times of his predecessors was not a sensible option. Some of the 'experiments' clearly did work, others failed, arguably because there was a finite amount of change that a deeply conservative nation could adopt in a short period of time. He was trying to do in short space of time what had taken decades elsewhere, without the means at his disposal to use Stalin-like methods.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

35 ‘Charles XII of Sweden’s greatest weakness was his poor diplomacy.’ Was it?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the great alliance against him, in 1700 it combined Denmark, Norway, Saxony, Poland, Lithuania, Russia; yet in the Great Northern War he managed to beat them all bar Russia; the attack on Moscow and the exile; his loss of empire; he did irreparable harm to the Swedish monarchy; a good politician and administrator; developed a good war machine and started the development of parliamentary government in Sweden; reforms of taxation and legal code; marriage and heir failings.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Diplomatic failings certainly are a strong candidate for his principal weakness, but there are others. Perhaps more than his predecessors, he overestimated Swedish power and virtually destroyed the Swedish empire. Taking on Russia with its capacity to absorb punishment was a massive error and never looked likely to benefit Sweden much. Perhaps a reluctance to envisage a sensible way forward for Sweden was the greatest weakness?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

36 What best explains the outbreak of the War of Spanish Succession?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the will of Charles of Spain; the absence of a purely Spanish claimant to the throne; concern over balance of power issues; the actual size of the Spanish empire; the ambitions of Louis XIV; the vies of Leopold I, Holy Roman Emperor; the view of the British, the Dutch ,the Portuguese and of Savoy – the members of the Grand Alliance; the legacy of mistrust built up by Louis; commercial factors; the failure of Partition; Louis' provocation over the border fortresses in 1701.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

It could be easy to put the outbreak of the War down to just Louis XIV and his ambitions, but it is much more complex than that. Like 1914, quite a lot of powers must share responsibility and there were wider issues such as commerce, balance of power and simple mercantilism to consider as well. The best responses will identify a range of major factors and prioritise them with well supported reasons.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 8: c. 1715–c. 1774

37 'France was better governed during Louis XV's minority than during his majority.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of factors could be considered' such as: the retention of the traditional departmental rivalries; the absence of a 'premier minister'; the centralised bureaucracy remained; the Council and its rituals remained; total responsibility remained with the Crown, but not total power; the clergy, the nobility and Parlement could still be obstructive. In the minority, with Orleans : he had complete control; prevented chaos; his use of Parlement and the implications of this; his failings in conciliar use; made a real attempt to sort out finance; his peaceful foreign policy; the Law disaster; some stimulus to trade and industry. Under Fleury, the period of repose came to an end; both Chancellor d'Aguesseau and Orry the Controller General were very competent. During the majority however: foreign policy could easily be criticised; his indecisiveness and laziness; factionalism at court; serious ministerial instability; the management (or otherwise) of Jansenism, Parlement, money and foreign policy; the usual excesses of the Ancien Regime; the lack of economic progress.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The evidence does point to agreeing with the quote, although it could be argued that the main focus of the minority was propping up a regime and keeping it going until the successor of Louis XIV could continue in much the same way as his predecessor. Reflection on what might or might not constitute 'good government' is looked for and those who really think about what would be 'good government' for France in the eighteenth century should do well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

38 'More despotic than enlightened.' Assess this view of Maria Theresa.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be covered in the answer, ranging from: her overall domestic policies; the degree of centralisation brought into her domains; the groundwork laid for the later work of Joseph II; her dealings with nobles and noble tax exemption; serfdom and her attempts to mitigate some of its failings; her humanitarianism – the 'doctrinaire humanitarianism'; her range of economic policies; her religious views, her relationship with the Jesuits and Church/State relations in the period; her attitude towards the 'new philosophy'; the pragmatist who eased the way into a reforming age; her work on education and the universities in particular; her recruitment of able men of intellect, especially Haugwitz; the concept of a 'God fearing equality'; her intolerance.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Arguably for her time, she could be seen as enlightened and there is an argument that while her instincts may have been enlightened, realism and pragmatism pushed her in a different direction. Both terms need definition and reflection. She could be seen very much as a bridge between the worst of the ancient regime and the new.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

39 How important were economic factors to the development of Prussia in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered as relevant to explaining the rise of Prussia in this period, such as: the quality and continuity of the ruler; the impact of the ‘composite’ state; taxation; quality administration; the bureaucracy; the army; foreign policy; primarily an agrarian state; poor communications; degree of government centralisation; the role of immigration; the weakness of both internal and external opponents; legal reform; the absence of religious strife; education; the internal colonisation, the new villages and adoption of English agricultural methods; support for industry; canals; reduction of trade barriers; good economics linked to military success; military ability.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Economics certainly played a part in the ‘development’ as opposed to just ‘territorial growth’. The two do need to be considered apart. Without a reasonable income and good management of that income, little could have been attained. However, the rulers themselves were vital and what is looked for is an identification of the key factors and valid reasons given for the order of priority suggested.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

40 Why was there so much international tension and conflict in Europe in the years 1721 to 1763?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors which led to the growth of tension and conflict in the period, such as: commercial factors; colonialism; mercantilist sides; the example of 1739; naval factors – the role of acquiring sea power; specific conflict areas such as the Mediterranean, Africa, India and the Americas; the way in which foreign trade was so reliant on naval strength; the legacy of the peace settlements of 1713–4; traditional rivalries; the diplomatic ‘storm centres’ of the Mediterranean and the Baltic; the Alliance system – the Quadruple Alliance; individuals like Farnese; succession issues such as Poland; the rise of new powers such as Russia and Poland.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

An explanation of the ‘so much’ is looked for and not just a list of causes. What was/were the key factor/s? To what extent was it just a continuation of traditional Europe-centred struggles and to what extent did non-European factors begin to dominate? How much can it be just put down to individual aspirations like those of Louis XV and Farnese, or perhaps pressure groups like those who pushed Walpole towards war in 1739?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

41 ‘The reign of Elizabeth of Russia was one of limited achievements.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: partial recovery from a background of chaos; her remarkable seizure of power; the age of intrigue and palace revolutions; the emancipation of the nobility from service; the developments in education; the extension of serfdom; the decline of national finances; the continuation of anti-Western xenophobia; much more interested in clothes and fun and in political matters; a period of compromise and conciliation- she did not execute anyone; her foreign policy.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is some truth in the judgment, but it could be debated. Given the inheritance it could easily have been another ‘time of troubles’, but it was not. Simply by having a period of comparative peace credit could be gained. However, the issue of the nobility and the serfs could lead to a valid argument that she did serious social harm.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 9: c. 1774–c. 1815

42 To what extent did Russia benefit from the rule of Catherine the Great?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the introduction of more western ideas; her work on education; the failure of her political reforms; her failure to make legal changes; her inability to grasp Russian reality; her feeling that only autocracy would work in Russia; serfdom; the increase in noble powers; arguably, her policies stultified Russia's progress; unfulfilled expectations; the southern expansion making Russia into a feared superpower; her welcoming of foreign investment; whether her introduction of enlightenment ideas was a good idea; Pugachev; raising hopes only to destroy?

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The implications of 'benefit' need to be thought through as it could be argued that expansion led to further conflict and the failure to think through what might really benefit Russia was highly damaging. What suited the 'West' was not necessarily good even then for the vast landmass that was Russia. What benefited a ruler and their autocracy might or might not been in the interests of Russia and its diverse people.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

**43 (Candidates offering 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)
How important were bourgeois grievances in bringing about a revolution in France in 1789?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of possible ‘bourgeois grievances’ needs to be identified, such as: the social divisions which existed in France; the tax inequality; the administrative and legal barriers which dominated the regions of France; the hostility to social, economic and political innovation of the Ancient Regime. There are a large number of other factors which could be considered, such as: poverty and hunger; the incompetence of the King and the Court’s refusal to compromise; the divisions within noble ranks and the reluctance of the First and Second Estates to accept change; the influence of new ideas (although they probably had greatest impact on the bourgeoisie); national bankruptcy.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

What might be deemed to be ‘bourgeois’ grievances need to be identified and then they need to be balanced against the large number of other factors which led to the crisis of 1789. The focus should be on the date given, but if events which followed in, say, 1790, are utilised to give greater emphasis to points made, then that is acceptable. There is ample scope here for a serious historiographical debate, if that is the approach adopted.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

44 ‘Poland had greedy neighbours.’ Is this the best explanation for the country’s partitions?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

All three partitions need to be referred to: 1773, 1793 and 1795. Candidate may refer to: geographical factors playing a part; the absence of natural barriers; internal weaknesses and the way in which they were used to justify 1773 in particular; the Polish tendency to provoke, such as the work of Potocki in the 1780s against Russia and Prussia; the way in which Polish nobles played politics with Catherine of Russia and its implications for 1793; the motives of the Russians and the Prussians in 1793; the tendency of neighbours – such as the Austrians – to promote instability in Poland; the role of the ruling personalities in Russia, Austrian and Prussia. What is looked for is an identification of the principal causes of the three Partitions, and there may be different factors involved in all three, and then clear prioritising with reasons given why the chosen reason/s are more important than others. Just giving a list will not do here. There has to be real evidence of reflection, an identification of which were they key factors and why, for each of the Partitions.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

**45 (Candidates offering 5f: The French Revolution should not answer this question.)
What best explains the fall of Robespierre?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors could be considered, such as: flaws in his own personality; the background of war; the degree of social and economic unrest; an inevitable outcome of the end of autocracy; violence had become a part of the governing process; another part of the crisis resulting from the execution of the King; loss of support from the Parisians and the execution of sans culottes; the changes in religion; innovation and terror; inflation; the result of too much liberty on a nation unused to it.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The simplest debate is one which balances the view that the reasons lie with his own failings with the one that he was very much a victim of the course of events over which no one had any control. The identification of a range of factors with valid reasons for their order of priority is looked for.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 47	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

46 How important was the Russian campaign of 1812 in bringing about the defeat of Napoleon?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the casualties involved; the incentive to other nations to attack; resources; military ability; the Iberian campaign; the excellent idea behind the Waterloo campaign but the errors in its execution; insecure support base in France; expectations of bourgeoisie from the government; proved too good at making enemies; overstretched; the ability of Wellington and the unwillingness of the British to give up; waking the Russian 'giant'.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The role of the Russian campaign, not just the losses, but also the impact on France's status and potential enemies, needs to be considered. Whether this was as important as the errors on the Waterloo campaign or the loss of patience by the French people needs to be debated. There may be different reasons given for the defeat as opposed to the overthrow and that should be welcomed.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 48	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

Section 10: Themes c. 1610–c. 1815

47 'Gradual evolution; rapid revolution.' Which is the more appropriate description of scientific development in the seventeenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of factors and individuals could be covered, such as: inventions like the barometer, the microscope, the telescope, the steam pump, algebra and logarithms. The work of individuals such as Newton, Boyle, Galileo and Kepler, Descartes, Pascal and Leibniz. The focus could be on specific areas such as mathematics, astronomy, technology and chemistry.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Much will depend on a definition of revolution. If the state of science at the beginning of the century is compared with that at the end, then it could easily be argued that a fundamental change had taken place, particularly if areas such as astronomy and chemistry are looked at. However, it did take time, and the way in which the work of one man was gradually built on by another, the Pascal/Leibniz example is a good one here, then the 'gradual' answer is more likely.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 49	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

48 How great an impact did the application of technology have on warfare? Answer with reference to either the seventeenth or the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A degree of overlap between the two periods is acceptable' the principal areas to examine are: fortifications; armour; logistics; handheld weapons, especially guns; artillery and ballistics; logistics; navigation; ship design; naval gunnery.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

'Technology' can be widely interpreted to include not only changes in metallurgy which affected the design and manufacturing (and accuracy) of guns, but also to changes in engineering which affected fortifications and the breaching of fortifications. Much depended on the willingness of military leaders to utilise new ideas and methods, such as Gustavus and Louvois.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 50	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

49 How significant an influence did women have on cultural and intellectual life in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

The principal areas to examine could include: politics and power (mistresses as well as monarchs), literature (letters, poetry and novels), performance arts (actresses and composers), painting (decorative and fine art), fashion and science.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Although women were still severely restricted in the eighteenth century (domination and subordination were the order of the day), we do see the emergence of many women who played an important role in cultural and intellectual activity. Indeed some of the most formidable rulers of this century were women – Maria Theresa and Catherine the Great in particular. In addition, Mary Wollstonecraft in England and both Olympe de Gouges and Madame Roland in France challenged the existing social order. However, despite these developments, candidates might well conclude that women of the eighteenth century merely paved the way for the achievements of those who followed- and there was still a long way to go.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 51	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

50 To what extent did the eighteenth century witness the decline of absolutism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered and the subject dealt with either in a broad ‘Europe wide’ way or by dealing with individual monarchs and countries; factors specific to Russia, France, Austria, Spain, Prussia and the Baltic and the Low Countries; the general acceptance of absolutism and the limited degree of challenge to the theories of Divine right; the greater degree of centralisation and central control seen as the century progressed; contemporary political thought; the growth of elements of the idea of consent – in Sweden, for example, after the death of Charles XII; Maria Theresa; the role and power of the nobility; office holding; examples like Poland.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The range of possible approaches is considerable and whether events in France after 1789 are factored in – even though they were to produce another autocrat. In many cases it thrived, but there is also ample evidence that in the growth of a bourgeois reluctant to accept an outdated social and economic order and interested in the ideas of men like Montesquieu, that change was in the air.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

51 Assess the importance of colonial trade to the European economy in the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the huge growth in the Europe-colonial trade in the period, especially 1710–60; vital for the Dutch, really put Holland on the map and kept it there; prime objective of the French and the English was to dominate this trade; French exports to colonies tripled in period; huge impact on towns; ports – such as Nantes, La Rochelle and Bordeaux; new merchant classes; new commodities; the economic balance between countries shifted; now Government departments to monitor it – such as in France in 1726; degree of legislation to control it; rise of the great Companies.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

It was always important, as the attempts by so many of the able rulers to expand it showed. Given the degree of stagnation in much of agriculture and industry it represented a growth area which could be taxed as well as utilised to expand national wealth, security and status.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 53	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	22

52 Was the second half of the eighteenth century a period of stagnation for European agriculture and industry?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A range of factors affecting a range of countries should be considered, such as: banking and its link to both; how Southern Europe remained agriculturally primitive; the degree of war damage to so many economies; the feudal reaction in Austria for example; a degree of agricultural development in the Baltic region, but it did not extent to trade and industry; limited in Germany as so atomised in structure with no free trade; Belgium the only real exception – with developments in agriculture along English lines as well as development of coal, iron and textile industries and improved communications; ‘in France men went into the barracks and in England into the factories’; the economic provincialism in France seen in both agricultural and industry, and in much of central and southern Europe.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Although there are exceptions such as in Belgium and in certain aspects in the Baltic region, by and large the answer is ‘yes’. Aristocratic and autocratic domination prevented much happening and unless there was a particularly interested ruler, like those in Prussia with agriculture, little happened.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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