



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative C Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

January 2007

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

AS Unit 1: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1725

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of ‘a more defensible frontier’ (lines 2 and 3) in the context of Louis XIV’s foreign policy aims. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. it meant making France secure from invasion. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the pursuit of natural frontiers or the rationalisation of the border, allowing for Vauban’s chain of forts – this was especially true in the border with the Spanish Netherlands which lacked mountains and sizable rivers. Possibly the motivation for the War of Devolution/War of Reunions. It meant resolving those issues left unresolved on Louis XIV’s accession, such as the status of Strasbourg (a potential Rhine crossing for invading armies) and the fate of Lorraine. Essentially a defensive aim which Louis sought to achieve aggressively. 2-3

- (b) Use **Source B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source C** differs from the views put forward in **Source B** about the reasons for the Dutch War of 1672 to 1678. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/ assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. Source B claims there was a struggle in the Royal Council amongst ministers. Source C claims the Dutch were to be taught a lesson. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. both sources agree that Louis’ desire to avenge the Dutch was a factor, but Source C suggests that there were also more rational motives, such as desire to advance French trading interests. Own knowledge might include recognition that Dutch involvement in the Triple Alliance during the War of Devolution enraged Louis and was a key motive for the war. 3-5

L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source C challenges Source B, e.g. Source B suggests Louis was subject to faction at court and emotion, whereas Source C gives the impression that Louis had a more immediate and rational role. Some may identify mercantilism as hinted in Source C as a motive. Louis wanted a short war to teach the Dutch a lesson and to secure against future incursions into the Spanish Netherlands as Source C illustrates. However, de Lionne's pacifism, implied in Source B, neglects the fact that he bribed Sweden to withdraw from the Triple Alliance in preparation for war. It is probably unfair to suggest as Source B does that Louis could give 'no plausible justifications' for war. **6-7**

(c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of Louis XIV's pursuit of personal glory, in relation to other factors, in the aims of his foreign policy in the years 1661 to 1688. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based either on own knowledge or the sources. **1-4**

L2: **Either**

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources candidates should be able to establish that there was a range of aims and that these aims were interlinked. Source A suggests sheer survival, which was certainly a factor in the aftermath of the Frondes, and the pursuit of secure frontiers as factors in addition to glory. Source B seems to support the view of a king eager to maintain reputation, but Source C identifies mercantilism and the economy in addition to the need to secure the weak frontier with the Spanish Netherlands. Candidates' own knowledge might include dynasticism with reference to the War of Devolution and possibly the Reunions, although it might be considered that this was secondary compared to other factors. Candidates might also address a religious motivation, especially in reference to taking Strasbourg in 1681 and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes 1685, although the claim Louis sought a united catholic Europe will probably be dismissed. Strasbourg might be used as evidence of Louis' glory as he entered the city in a golden coach, but it was an important Rhine crossing as well. The Dutch War will perhaps be seen as that with least justification, but the War of the Reunions will show the desire for a stable and rational frontier.

Level 1 answers will be of limited narrative or simple identification of some points, e.g. definition of glory, frontiers, wars. Level 2 answers will show greater range across the aims but with little support and depth. Level 3 answers will focus clearly on personal glory initially although there may be some attempt to mention other factors. Level 4 answers will be accurate and argue a case perhaps in support of personal glory or other factors, they will provide balance across a fuller range of Louis' motives. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement and involve much more debate, they will clearly draw conclusions about the importance of personal glory compared to other factors.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'his own Edict of Potsdam' (line 3) in the context of the religious policies of Frederick William. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a response to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and attracted Huguenots to Brandenburg-Prussia. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. many Huguenots left France because they were unable to practise their religion freely. The Edict of Potsdam offered Huguenots 'safe and free asylum'. Staging posts were established from France to Brandenburg-Prussia to assist in Huguenot flight. It also offered asylum to other protestant communities in Europe, and especially to the Calvinists whose influence subsequently increased at court. By offering tax concessions and land, Frederick William hoped to create a strong protestant community ranged against the increasingly intolerant Louis XIV. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William was keen to encourage immigration to his lands. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he needed to attract people to sparsely populated areas; he needed people that could bring new ideas. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. develops the type and utility of new ideas/skills that were being brought – artisans skilled in textiles, silks, lace, paper, watch-making. Some Huguenots were agriculturalists who brought lettuce, beans and pea cultivation, perfected in France; others were officers able to command the new standing army. Re-population was needed after the Thirty Years War. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. a recognition that Frederick William was influenced by mercantilism encouraging the export of goods, and a healthier population. By increasing the prosperity and productivity of his lands he might reduce the individual financial burden. Candidates might also highlight differences between different immigrant groups, e.g. eighty Frisian families encouraged to settle in 1649 brought agricultural skills whilst the much larger Huguenot immigration had a larger artisan element. Candidates may recognise that skills needed to build the Frederick-William canal in the 1660s could only be found abroad. Some answers may combine economic and religious motivation and highlight Frederick William's protestant sympathies as a reason for encouraging the influx of Huguenots (Edict of Potsdam). **6-7**

- (c) 'By 1688, the most successful areas of Frederick William's economic policy were trade and communications.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

There should be a clear focus on the outcome of, rather than motivation behind, economic policies and an attempt to assess how successful they were. Answers should therefore show a sound knowledge of the policies as well as their effectiveness. The initial focus should be an evaluation of trade and communications. This might include an assessment of the reduction of tolls on the river network and its use to facilitate trade. Reference might be made to the Frederick William Canal – its significance in allowing German exports to avoid Swedish tolls, and the consequent development of Berlin as a minor port. The development of Prussian docks and especially Königsberg prompted greater trade. Improvements in road communication, especially after the 1669 edict will also be relevant. Matthias' postal service and its income may also be mentioned. The development in trade was closely linked to that in communication, and includes the development of luxury goods, the navy, attempts to establish colonies, Trading Companies and protective tariffs. It can be argued however that commercial overseas expansion was not wholly successful, e.g. failure of colonies, naval weakness, the influence of the Dutch, and the disadvantages of heavy mercantilist tariffs. Developments in other economic areas, and especially the domestic industry brought about by religious toleration and the involvement of the General War Commissariat might be adjudged to be more significant. The development of agriculture, the economic plight of the towns, attempts to combat the guilds and broader financial policies such as the excise and attempts to bear the increasing cost of the army are also indicative of success or failure in other spheres of economic activity.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited narrative of any area of economic policy, with assertion and undeveloped statements and little link to the question. Level 2 answers will be descriptive but with some limited attempt to address degree of success/failure of commerce/trade and with little support. Level 3 answers will show awareness of the degree of success and will be analytical. They will concentrate on the successful policies and thus offer little balance. By Level 4 answers will recognise that commerce and trade had successes and failures, and will recognise that they were not the only factor to consider in economic policy. The clear focus should be on the degree of success. At Level 5, answers will also contain judgement as demanded by the question, will prioritise on the factors given at Level 4 and will reach a conclusion focused on the demands of the question.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'a standing army' (line 1) in the context of Frederick William's army reforms. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a permanent army, a symbol of prestige. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the standing army came to replace the undependable foreign mercenaries, inherited in 1640, that had pillaged Brandenburg rather than defended it. He wanted a disciplined, unified force that could adopt ideas from abroad, e.g. Dutch drill regulations. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the development of a standing army helped to increase Frederick William's authority in his territories. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. it brought him military glory or it allowed him to exert financial pressure on the Estates. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Frederick William identified himself closely with the army and led it personally. After initial mistakes of demobilisation, he recognised that an independent foreign policy, and thus a robust personal international presence, required a standing army. His domestic reputation was furthered by victories such as Fehrbellin 1675, and his subsequent acquisition of the title 'Great'. Consideration will need to focus on the domestic impact. The need to finance the army and the excuse of a national emergency was used to bully the Estates into acquiescence. The development of the General Kriegskommissariat and the beginnings of centralised administration might be attributed to military demands and furthered Frederick William's authority. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. the army might be identified as the most important in extending Frederick William's authority within his domains. Domestically, whilst there was not a unified state, the army did become the excuse for and also the means of collecting substantial taxation. Estates were initially prepared to pay taxation as they felt that this might save them from a repeat of the horrors of the Thirty Year War. Ultimately however, Frederick William used the army as a means of unifying his territories and thereby increasing his authority. **6-7**

- (c) 'By 1660, Frederick William's aims in foreign policy had largely been achieved.' Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The initial focus might be an assessment of the achievements of foreign policy before 1660. Initially, and especially considering the weakness of his inheritance, survival was the priority. He certainly achieved more than this at Westphalia, acquiring substantial territories that saw Brandenburg the second largest area of the Empire, behind Austria. The secularized bishoprics were substantial concessions in their own right. Westphalia extended religious toleration to the Calvinists and made Frederick's own position more secure. The settlement also seriously reduced the Emperor's sovereign rights. The Peace of Oliva that concluded the Northern War 1655–60 realised a long-term goal – sovereignty over Prussia and raised him to the rank of sovereign European prince. However, the Elector had relatively little to show that brought immediate material benefit. Despite gaining East Pomerania at Westphalia, it was not until 1653 that the Swedes eventually vacated it. Oliva did not grant West Pomerania, despite the presence of his army, and Frederick felt forced into this treaty by French diplomacy. Thus he felt embittered at how little he had to show for such financial cost.

After 1660 whilst his dynastic objective of Pomerania remained, his methods altered. Recognition of his inability to follow an independent foreign policy led to a flexible attitude to alliance, which also increased the subsidies that foreign powers, and especially France paid. There were military victories such as Fehrbellin (1675), but this did not bring diplomatic success at the Peace of Nymegen in which he again had to abandon Pomerania. Possibly Frederick William stuck to the French alliance too long, believing that Louis would abandon his Swedish ally. His constant shifting of alliance certainly angered allies. Many of his achievements after 1660 were also the result of decisions made before – accession to Magdeburg (1680). He was also bitterly disappointed by the Peace of St Germain (1679). Yet after 1660 he did considerably enhance his prestige and had through being 'the sly fox of Europe' ensured that Brandenburg Prussia was a state worth negotiating with.

Level 1 answers will consist of limited narrative of any area of foreign policy with assertion and undeveloped statements and little link to the question. Level 2 answers will be descriptive but will be wider ranging with some attempt to address achievement but with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical and offer some sound support in favour or against the statement but will be unbalanced across the whole period. Level 4 answers will be more balanced across the period and will offer more weight. At Level 5, answers will contain judgement as demanded by the question, will analyse achievements or lack of them in both periods, although probably without balance, will prioritise and reach a conclusion focused on the demands of the question.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the new capital' in the context of Russia in the early eighteenth century. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means the new capital of St Petersburg. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. in 1703 Peter ordered the construction of a new capital on the Neva River. This would become a symbol of his Baltic ambitions, especially as it was built on Swedish territory. Peter hoped this would be his 'window on the west' growing into a successful port and reflecting its European credentials in its architecture. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why many Russians did not welcome Peter the Great's new capital. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Peter's reforms were unpopular and hence so was his new capital. People did not like the location. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. its location was unsuitable being broad marshland, it was bitterly cold and was frozen in for about six months with only four hours of daylight in winter. Peasants needed to be conscripted for the building work, malaria contributed to the high death rate. People had to be forced to live there, including Peter's family. The Hinterland could not support it and hence food and commodity prices were high. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. a recognition that there were many factors that angered Russians including Peter's desire to forge a maritime people, conditions etc but most will perhaps identify the increasing dichotomy between the 'old Russia' typified by Moscow and Peter's westernised and increasingly alien version at St Petersburg as the key factor. **6-7**

- (c) 'Peter the Great failed to strengthen the Russian economy in his reign.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

There are a range of factors that should be considered: the introduction of foreign skilled labour and ideas that initially did little for native Russians, especially considering that many of these foreigners simply took the money and imparted little knowledge, an example might also be the predominance of foreign and especially Dutch and English merchants at St Petersburg. The need to produce for the demands of the expanding army led to improvements in metallurgy, leatherwork and armaments industries. The number of manufacturers had increased from 21 in 1682 to 200 in 1725, yet these had suffered at the end of the Northern War. There was a lack of an educated middle class willing to run risks and a lack of capital – Peter largely failed to establish this class of entrepreneurs and many trainees that had been sent abroad simply refused to be educated there. Peter did however succeed in improving communications, and although his canal system did not realise the lofty dreams of linking the Black and Baltic seas, he did connect the Neva and Volga rivers. Peter's mercantilism meant a focus on precious metals, high protective tariffs and the encouragement of exports, in fact foreign trade increased four fold by the end of his reign and may be due in small part to his 1711 edict permitting all to embark on commercial ventures – Peter also established small colonial outposts in Asia much in line with mercantilist thought. Financially, Peter's military exploits were a huge burden and led to the 5 fold increase in taxation, yet Peter restrained from borrowing money and throughout his reign balanced the budget.

Level 1 answers will consist of limited narrative of economic measures, probably related to westernisation, with assertion and undeveloped statements and little link to the question. Level 2 answers will be descriptive but wider ranging and will have some attempt to address how strong the economy was. Level 3 answers will be analytical and offer some sound support in favour or against the statement but will lack balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced examining positive and negative economic achievement. Level 5 answers will contain judgement as demanded, will analyse success or lack of it perhaps both in the long and short term, will prioritise the most important factor according to the conclusion which will in turn be based on the demand of the question.

Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘the recruiting system’ in the context of Peter the Great’s military reforms. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it means the method that Peter used to recruit soldiers to his army. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Army reform was a priority for Peter. In 1699 he started the creation of a western style army. He used a combination of volunteers and a conscription system requiring landowners to raise one infantry soldier per 50 peasant households and a cavalryman for every 100 such households. The loss of 12000 at Narva, led to Peter’s decree of 1705 in which a man aged 15 to 20 years was to be raised for every 20 peasant households. These ‘immortals’, so named because for every man lost another had to be provided by the district, effectively meant that Russia became a country of mass conscription and moved away from the haphazard recruitment pre eighteenth century. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great wanted ‘a window on the west’. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Peter liked the ideas he had seen whilst in the west/on the Great Embassy and believed they could help Russia. He wanted a city that would symbolise the new direction of Russia. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. he wanted to introduce new technology such as ring bayonets for the army; he wanted to attract those with skills such as shipwrights and engineers; he felt that Russia was backward and wanted the secular, scientific knowledge of the west. He wanted to place a self-sufficient Russia firmly in Europe and wanted to earn the respect of Europeans. St Petersburg as a city might also encourage the influx of foreign merchants who would in turn bring new ideas and technology; it might also confirm Russia’s Baltic presence and new influence in European diplomacy. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. a focus on the Great Embassy will probably prioritise the need for military technology and ideas as the key motive for westernisation. Defeat at Narva also put great emphasis on the drive to create a westernised military force. However, other reasons must be discussed aside from military at this level. Some candidates may focus on the construction of St Petersburg as the literal manifestation of the ‘window on the west’ and this should also be given due credit, especially when linked to a range of reasons for construction, such as symbolism and practical advantage to the Russian economy. **6-7**

- (c) 'In the north, Peter the Great's foreign policy achieved its aims; however, his policy towards Turkey failed.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Initial focus might well be an assessment of achievements in the north. Here the desire for a 'window on the west' via access on the Baltic was clearly the consistent theme, as was the desire to win back territory from Sweden that had been lost in the seventeenth century, and also the recapture of Ingria and Karelia. However, up to 1701 Peter's policy might be typified by a lack of planning and an inability to recognise Russia's weaknesses. Russia had isolated herself and was short of money. Certainly such impetuosity was a contributory factor in defeat at Narva. However, the rebuilding of the army, the construction of St Petersburg in 1703, military victory at Poltava 1709, the building of a Baltic fleet and capture of Riga in 1710 signified the resilience of Peter in the north. Although some of this was the consequence of opportunism, the mistakes of Charles XII, to the extent that many European powers considered Poltava a fluke, the victories of 1709–10 meant Russia was treated with a new seriousness in European courts and the anti-Swedish alliance was renewed. The Mecklenburg crisis 1716–1717 illustrates how influential Russia had become, and how the balance of power in the Baltic was changing. There were still diplomatic failures, especially in cancelling the coalition's invasion of Sweden in September 1716 and the inability to win a French alliance in 1717. But by 1721 at Nystadt, Peter gained Livonia, Estonia, part of Karelia and also Ingria in return for a nominal payment to Sweden. Russia had become the dominant Baltic power, with an effective military, and now had diplomatic recognition across Europe. Peter's policy towards Turkey was equally impetuous, marking virtually his first act on assuming power. This was an attempt to fulfil Russia's traditional policy aims to breakthrough to the Black Sea and also to avenge the disgrace of Russian defeat in the Crimea in the 1680s. At Azov 1695, a system of divided command, lack of siege technology, the absence of a fleet, and the poor Russian army led to humiliating defeat, yet the building of a small fleet and the use of Austrian engineers ensured

the second action was more successful capturing both Azov and Tagenrog – this was his one great achievement. Yet Peter's decision to turn his attention to the north in 1699 meant Russia still lacked the Straits of Kerch and thus access to the sea. The renewal of war in 1710, Peter's failure to raise the Balkan Christians, and the humiliation of Pruth 1711 marked Peter's gross miscalculation of political realities in the region and his own inability to supply his army. That Peter was not humbled was more the result of Turkish moderation than Peter's skill but he still gave up Azov and destroyed his fleet. Even if Peter had managed to capture the Straits of Kerch, access to the Mediterranean could have only been achieved by capturing the Dardenelles. In Turkey Peter was blind to reality and he might be said to have failed.

Level 1 answers will consist of limited narrative of foreign policy/events with assertion and undeveloped statements and little link to the question. Level 2 answers will be descriptive but wider ranging with some attempt to address achievement but with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical and offer some sound support in favour or against the statement, but will lack balance between geographical areas. Level 4 answers will be more balanced across geographical areas, although the focus will probably be in the north. Level 5 answers will contain judgement as demanded by the question, will analyse aims and achievements in the north and achievement in the south, will prioritise and reach a conclusion based on the demands of the question.