

Solutions

Each answer shows the steps, then the **result**.

2.1

- they applied the principles of the Scientific Revolution - observation, evidence and doubt about inherited authority - to **society and human institutions** rather than to nature; Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws*; Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments*

2.2

- any three of: empiricism, skepticism, human reason, rationalism, classical sources of knowledge; plus one explained, e.g. empiricism holds that knowledge comes from evidence and observation rather than from authority or revelation

2.3

- both hold that legitimate government rests on a **social contract** rather than divine appointment. Difference, any one: Locke sees society as individuals driven by self-interest, with natural rights preceding the state, while Rousseau sees a people capable of a general will to which individual will is surrendered

2.4

- if individuals are driven by self-interest, the state cannot be natural or divinely given; it must originate in their agreement - the **consent of the governed** - entered into because it serves those interests

2.5

(a)

- wealth is a fixed stock, chiefly bullion, so one nation gains only at another's expense and the state must regulate trade, protect colonies and restrict imports

(b)

- wealth is produced by labour and grows through exchange, so free trade and a free market let both parties to a trade gain

(c)

- the **physiocrats**; Quesnay or Turgot

2.6

- any four of: salons, coffeehouses, academies, lending libraries, masonic lodges, periodicals

2.7

- any two of: argument circulated outside the control of church and court; the audience for new ideas broadened beyond those who could buy books; standing within it depended on what was said rather than on birth. Limit: participation remained largely confined to the educated and propertied. Maximum 3

2.8

- deism, skepticism, atheism. Deism holds that a creator made the universe but does not intervene in it, and is known through reason and the order of nature rather than through revelation or church authority

2.9

- belief became something held and practised by the individual rather than something the state or community enforced and organised publicly; so religion's **place** changed - it was removed from public authority - which is not the same as belief declining

2.10

(a)

- Mary Wollstonecraft; the Marquis de Condorcet

(b)

- the movement's own leading figures defended exclusions from the equality they proclaimed - Rousseau on women, and many thinkers restricted political rights to propertied men; so describing it as simply egalitarian reports the claim while omitting what its authors actually argued, which misdescribes the movement

3.1 B

3.2 B

- Beccaria analyses punishment by its effects rather than by tradition - the scientific method turned on a human institution

3.3 B

3.4 B

- A is orthodox theism through revelation; C is atheism; D is the interventionist view deism rejects

3.5

(a)

- any one, e.g. Montesquieu analysed government as a system whose form should suit a society's conditions; Beccaria analysed punishment by its effects rather than by tradition

(b)

- any one, identified and explained: Adam Smith argued for free trade and a free market against mercantilist regulation, holding that wealth is produced by labour rather than held as a fixed stock of bullion, so trade need not be zero-sum; or the physiocrats located wealth in land and production and argued for removing restrictions on it

(c)

- any one, with a specific example: Rousseau argued explicitly for excluding women from political life despite the equality the movement espoused; or many thinkers restricted the political rights they argued for to propertied men. Credit the naming of Wollstonecraft or Condorcet as contemporaries who contested this

3.6

- Mark on the rubric rather than by counting facts. **Thesis.** A defensible claim with a line of reasoning - e.g. that Enlightenment thought decisively changed the *grounds* on which authority had to be defended, requiring church, crown and custom to justify themselves before reason, while leaving much of the actual distribution of power intact until the revolutionary period. **Context.** A relevant broader setting - the Scientific Revolution's method; the wars of religion and the case they made for authority that did not rest on confession; the growth of print and literacy. **Evidence.** Specific and relevant: Locke on consent and natural rights; Rousseau on the general will; Montesquieu on the division of power; Beccaria on punishment; Smith and the physiocrats against mercantilism; Voltaire, Diderot, Hume and d'Holbach on deism, skepticism and atheism; the salons, coffeehouses, academies, lending libraries and masonic lodges; the *Encyclopédie*. **Analysis.** Evidence used to support the argument rather than listed - e.g. showing that the same demand for justification appears in politics, economics and religion, which is what makes it a change in the standing of authority as such. **Complexity.** Any one: change set against continuity, since monarchy, established churches and noble privilege survived the century; the movement's own exclusions, with Rousseau on women against Wollstonecraft and Condorcet; the narrowness of the public sphere, confined largely to the educated and propertied; or the enlightened absolutists who adopted the vocabulary while strengthening their own authority