



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative C Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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 2008

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 ‘the Edict of Nantes’ (line 1) in the context of the Huguenots in France before 1685. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. it was an edict that gave the Huguenots certain rights of worship in France. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the Edict of Nantes, passed in 1598, guaranteed certain rights to the Huguenots in France. These included the right to build churches in certain agreed areas, to pursue certain careers and allowed the building of fortified towns. Top of level might be achieved by additional mention of the weaknesses of the Edict, e.g. the unpopularity of the Edict amongst French Catholics; the gradual weakening of the provisions; Louis XIV’s reluctance to confirm to it. 2-3

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source C** about the reasons why Louis XIV adopted a more aggressive policy towards the Huguenots. (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 suggests that the decision was not Louis XIV’s alone, Source C suggests that it was Louis who alone was responsible. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. Source B suggests that Louis was influenced by his Catholic clergy, and especially by Madame de Maintenon, but goes further to assert that the more aggressive policy employed was merely part of a longer campaign against the Huguenots. Source C does give some indication of a more moderate policy by the implicit consideration of the Caisse de Conversions. However, Source B makes clear that the previous policy, although working, was too slow and that this was a major

reason for the adoption of more aggressive tactics. Source C simply mentions that a more aggressive policy would be cheaper. Source C mentions the personal ambitions of Louis XIV, and gives little indication of a desire to unite Church or State. Indeed, Source C indicates the popularity of Revocation within France giving further justification for a more personal motive from Louis. Own knowledge might detail the influence of Maintenon or the role of Louis' Jesuit confessor. Mention might also be made of the 1683 siege of Vienna as motive for Louis' desire to lead Catholic Europe. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source C, e.g. Source B probably gives a much more favourable view of Louis' motives in adopting a more aggressive policy. He seems to be supported by his advisers, although not dominated by them. This interpretation is a controversial one and certainly the influence of Maintenon over Louis is often seen as a sinister one. Whilst it is true to suggest that mild policies might finish off Protestantism, there is little indication of why Louis should have suddenly felt that more action was needed. Source C, however, gives more immediate motive and is probably closer to the main influence of Louis – namely his desire to bolster his own image especially after the successes of Leopold and the problems with papal relations. It is difficult to conclude a motive for the persecution although a combination of factors probably played a role. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in relation to other factors, in explaining the impact of Louis XIV's Huguenot policies. **(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* 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

Evidence can be selected from the sources to indicate the impact of the Revocation. Source A gives considerable detail about the destruction of churches; use of troops; sending to the galleys; forced religious observance. In addition the content of the source implies the impact that the flight of the Huguenots had on the French economy and also provides some comment on the popularity of the measure. In addition the fact that this source was written by an English author with reference to the 'French Tyrant' might be used as further evidence of the impact on Louis' reputation abroad. Source C supports the idea of flight from France, and illustrates that some Huguenots continued to oppose the policy of Louis. Explicit reference is made to the forming of foreign alliances against Louis, and Source C supports the assertion in Source A that this exodus of refugees carried skills and money away from France. However, Source C contradicts Source A by suggesting that the Revocation was very popular within France. Yet Source C seems to support the assertion in Source A that Revocation was a failure and that despite Louis' ambition to be the Catholic leader of Europe, not only has he failed but his policy has ranged countries against him. Source B makes further reference to the aggressive tactics of Louis XIV and clearly indicates Louis' desire to finish off the Huguenots. Source B therefore supports the assumption of all sources that the Revocation resulted in brutal tactics, although Source C makes no value judgement itself, merely referring to foreign powers considering Louis to have been a persecutor.

From own knowledge, candidates have considerable scope to develop. Louis' attempts to deal with the Huguenots might reasonably be said to stem from his coronation oath, a desire to achieve religious uniformity and a wish to bolster his absolutist credentials. It is clear that the year 1679 marks a divide both in terms of methods and also outcome. An increasingly strict adherence to the precise terms of the Edict of Nantes was having success, especially the *Caisse de Conversion* and offers of relief from the *Taille*. Forbidding of inter-denominational marriage in 1680 and restrictions on church services were also very effective. It might be asserted that policy up to this date was largely successful in reducing the number of Huguenots in France, yet the objectives of Louis' policy might be considered to have changed. Having signed the Peace of Nymegen in 1679, Louis was keen to prove his absolutist credentials at home and so a genuine desire to extirpate heresy became entwined with Louis' own desire to enhance his reputation – this might also be linked to his failure to support the Christian monarchs during the Siege of Vienna, and also his desire to re-assert his title of The Most Christian King. In almost every respect the Revocation brought failure. However, many candidates may comment that whilst the Revocation shocked Europe, the actual physical persecution of the Huguenots began in 1679. Indeed, the Revocation can be seen as the culmination of a campaign as indicated in Source B, and not the start. Moreover Louis himself may have revoked the Edict from a misguided belief that all Huguenots had already been converted within France. The *Dragonnades*, although perhaps not instigated by Louis, provoked outrage in Europe and disquiet from the Pope, whom Louis was attempting to impress. Far from proving Louis' absolutism, Revocation proved not only that Louis could not prevent Huguenots from fleeing, as shown in Source C, but also had serious implications abroad from monarchs already fearful of Louis' religious, military and dynastic plans in Europe. Louis failed to capture leadership of Catholic Europe from Leopold I and actually drove many Huguenots to fight with his enemies. Economically, the effect was still pronounced, and the loss of expertise should not be underestimated. However, some candidates may comment that the flight of Huguenots from France had begun some time before 1685. Whether these exiles became a focus of political opposition to Louis XIV remains contentious, but certainly Louis'

more extreme policies drove what had been a dying community toward the prestige of martyrdom and international renown. Even the underlying aim present from the start of the reign of extirpating heresy was not achieved, as evidenced by the Cevennes revolts and the Camisards war. By 1715 it was recognised by the church synod that the Huguenots were still present in France. Yet there were some successes. The policy certainly bolstered Louis' image at home, with widespread support amongst Catholics, and it is often asserted that the acquisition of the Spanish throne would have been impossible if Louis had not already proven his Catholic credentials in dealing with the Huguenots in 1685. However, there should be a clear balance between the effect of policies such as the *Caisse de Conversions*, the *dragonnades* and later policies of physical persecution.

Answers at Level 1 will be simple assertion and limited points dependent almost entirely on basic information probably lifted directly from the sources. Level 2 answers will be descriptive but will show a greater range, possibly making some passing reference to a number of effects of Revocation. At Level 3, answers will show much greater range and depth with a clear focus on impact, rather than a simple description of the policies themselves. There will be some attempt to consider a number of effects of the revocation, perhaps with passing reference to factors other than the Revocation. By Level 4 answers will be analytical and will consider a good balance of factors with some attempt to consider positive and negative effects of Revocation. Level 5 answers will in addition contain judgement, and will attempt a full explanation. There might in addition be some challenge to the concept that the Revocation was the most significant factor in explaining the impact of Louis' Huguenot policies.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Fehrbellin' in the context of Frederick William's foreign policy. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a battle fought in 1675 in which Frederick William led his army in person. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. in January 1675 the Swedish army had invaded Brandenburg. On 28 June 1675 Frederick William engaged this Swedish army which outnumbered his forces two to one. Over two days Frederick William ruined the Swedish army, many of whom deserted. This was the first battle he had won without foreign assistance and as such became a significant source of propaganda for the rest of his reign. The reputation of the Swedish army had been shattered, and they were forced back into Pomerania. It was clear that Frederick William was now much more of a desirable ally to other European powers. It won Frederick William the title 'Great Elector', but as a military victory it merely marked the beginning of an unsuccessful four year struggle to acquire Western Pomerania. The Peace of Saint Germain-en-Laye (1679) forced Frederick William to return to Sweden almost all of his territorial acquisitions. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William was keen to reform his military forces. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he wanted a bigger and more efficient army to defend his scattered territories/defeat his enemies. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the army Frederick William had inherited was a poorly disciplined and supplied mercenary force. Given the scattered nature of his territories, the lack of suzerainty, and the geographical location of Brandenburg, it was clear that any hope of power, prestige and international status would require an efficient standing army, as would any hope of realising the ambition of Western Pomerania. A strong army would also assist in acquiring valuable foreign subsidies and alliances. The army could also be used domestically against the Estates; in addition it became an excuse for financial reforms and extension of authority throughout his territories. **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. whilst Frederick William's initial impetus for military reforms was borne out of his weak inheritance, his motives for reform changed. Certainly Fehrbellin convinced him of the need to maintain a sizeable military force, but even this was not a traditional military victory and it might reasonably be argued that other factors, such as the French, had more of an influence in the outcome of foreign policy. The development of the General War Commissariat, the desire to govern all territories effectively and the suppression of the Estates may have consequently become a more significant motive for maintaining the impetus behind military reform. **6-7**

- (c) 'It was Frederick William's cunning use of foreign alliances that explains his success in foreign policy in the years 1640 to 1688.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (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

Some candidates may comment on the allusion to the French approbation of Frederick William as ‘the most cunning fox in Europe’ in relation to his alliances. There should be some definition of what constituted real success in foreign policy, e.g. the gains of Westphalia, sovereignty over Prussia 1660, influence at Oliva, foreign subsidies, international prestige, the sheer survival of Brandenburg Prussia. To support the statement some assessment may be made of the continued weakness of Frederick William’s inheritance. He remained the ruler of a minor power that was not united, was geographically vulnerable and was subject to the whims of the major European powers. It was skilful use of alliances that would ensure survival in this context. His objective at Westphalia of forcing Sweden from Pomerania could only realistically be achieved with the help of other nations, as could acquiring West Pomerania. The desire to acquire sovereignty in Prussia would also require a somewhat Machiavellian approach to alliance making. The disastrous Berg wars proved how Frederick William lacked even the means to conduct his own dynastic policies. The War of the North 1655–1660 provides clear evidence of the methods employed by Frederick William; an alliance with the Dutch for the protection of Prussia, continued negotiations with the Swedish aggressors at Szczecin and eventually a treaty in 1656 at Königsberg, thereby betraying the Dutch, who had continued to provide subsidies. Frederick William’s army did prove significant at the retaking of Warsaw but his army was now little more than an incorporation of the Swedish. As the Swedish hold on Poland subsequently became weaker so Frederick William sought influence by threatening to swap sides, which he did in 1657 in the Treaty of Wehlau. It can be argued Frederick William gained little from this war except a reputation for duplicity, yet he did acquire the sovereignty he had craved and had established the reputation of his military force. Further evidence of skilful alliance-making worthy of the title ‘cunning fox’ comes from the later part of his reign, especially in relation to Frederick William’s secret alliance with Louis XIV in 1679, his subsequent fear of French influence and a further defensive pact with Charles XI in 1686 and a secret alliance with Leopold. It was these often secret machinations that perhaps ensured his greatest foreign policy success, namely survival. To challenge the statement it might be argued that any success at Westphalia came from Frederick William’s intransigence and that whilst alliance was a vital reason for the successes of Oliva in 1660, it was precisely the military reforms and Frederick William’s international presence that had made him an ally worthy of courtship. As a military leader he was able; the reason for failure might be attributed not so much to defeat on the battlefield but rather a failure to break away from the influence of the Great Powers and especially of France in his later years. Even at Oliva, he was prevented from reaping the benefit of a lengthy campaign by the self-interest of Sweden and France. It might reasonably be argued that diplomatic failure actually accounts for foreign policy disappointment such as the Peace of St Germain, 1679. Likewise the commitment to often unrealistic aims contributed to failure. He himself stated ‘Alliances are good, but forces of one’s own are far better’.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative/assertion on foreign policy, not linked to the question. At Level 2 narrative will still prevail but there will be some attempt to link to the question and to so with a wider use of knowledge although in the form of bland statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical, perhaps concentrated on a limited chronological range of factors illustrating diplomatic success, which will also be explained but there will be no balance across other factors. By Level 4 there will be a greater range with some attempt to address the significance of alliances compared to other factors and/or an

attempt to address the concept of success. At Level 5 there will be judgement with a conclusion as demanded by the question.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by ‘the excise system’ in the context of Frederick William’s financial reforms. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a way of extracting revenues but was not ideal. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. this was a tax designed to replace the Contribution taxes on urban and peasant lands. First proposed by Frederick William in 1651, based on a Dutch model, to tax the sale and movement of goods. Ran into considerable opposition largely as it would also be payable by the Junkers and so was abandoned. Estates rights to be consulted on the excise confirmed by the recess of 1653, but townsmen in Brandenburg especially were keen to reduce some of their tax burden and were in favour. Adopted initially on a voluntary basis by some towns, eventually imposed by Frederick William on all in 1682, and extended to his new territories. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why there was opposition to Frederick William’s efforts to strengthen royal finances. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Frederick William inherited impoverished territories, he needed more money to rule effectively but this meant higher taxes. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. demands for a standing army, especially in the aftermath of the Thirty Years War, meant taxing more effectively. Revenues acquired from royal domain lands and regalia excited local opposition but were largely effectively raised. It was the need to widen the tax base, both across social class and all territories, that excited major opposition. Opposition was faced from urban elites and guilds, Junkers, and the Estates. Attempts to raise tax other than emergency war tax, especially in Prussia evoked opposition not only because of the level, but because of concerns at the role this played in state-building. Junkers became increasingly opposed to the methods used to exact the excise, especially as this was imposed directly without consultation and hence undermined their notion of privilege. **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. opposition varied according to territory, and certainly East Prussia’s geographical distance and wealth, combined initially with issues of sovereignty, made its nobility the most reluctant to contemplate change. The rising of tax became an integral part of state building especially as the *Generalkriegskommissariat* developed. It was not simply the issue of amount of tax that caused opposition, but combined with the military

became a way of attempting to humble the Estates. The pursuit of foreign subsidies might also reasonably be said to have evoked opposition. **6-7**

- (c) 'Frederick William's most significant achievement in domestic affairs was the strengthening of royal finances.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(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 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 focus on financial measures but this question does require candidates to assess relative achievement across a range of relevant achievements. In support of strengthening royal finances candidates might consider the successful use of the provincial chambers, *Amtskammer*, to collect regalia and domain dues, the effective appointment of von Canstein as *Hofkammerprasident* and von Knyphausen in 1684, both of whom increased returns. Indeed, von Knyphausen drew up for first time a state budget in 1684, allowing Frederick William his first effective assessment of all income across his territories. This ensured that this type of revenue became a significant and regular factor in royal finances, as did the granting of shorter leases and improvements to crown lands. Frederick William also effectively increased the tax burden throughout his territories. By the 1660s the Contribution had evolved from an emergency war tax to a means of paying for a standing army, and taxes in the 1680s remained fairly consistently set at wartime levels. The excise tax broadened liability, and was a significant factor itself in urban renewal, at least initially. The effective growth of a central bureaucracy and the General War Commissariat, combined with the use of tax commissioners gradually circumvented local opposition and again brought in more revenue. Frederick William's economic reforms, especially regarding infrastructure, agriculture and industry, plus his policy of religious toleration, also brought in greater revenues to the state. The importance of foreign subsidies should not be underestimated, although this was an

unpredictable source. By the end of his reign there had probably been a trebling of revenues, a much larger proportion of which now reached central government.

Other policies might be considered as more significant, and especially Frederick William's reforms of government, relations with the Estates and his reforms of the military. The integration of the nobility into government was a significant step, as was the central achievement of humbling Estates as a precursor to state building and extension of central government into the provinces. However, many candidates may assert that finance remained significant as it, stemming from the needs of the military, was the main motivation for many of these other reforms.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on financial reform with general assertion on achievements. Level 2 responses will offer a wider range of material still focused on finance, or on another area of domestic reform, but these will be in the form of general statements with little support. At Level 3, responses should have some analytical focus with some attempt to explain why certain reforms were significant, although still lacking balance. Level 4 responses should be more balanced with a clear analytical focus on the question of significance across a range of policies. By Level 5 there should in addition be judgement as demanded by the question, and a conclusion on the relative significance of a range of domestic policies.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Azov' in the context of Peter the Great's military campaigns of the 1690s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was the second campaign against Azov, the first having been a failure, Peter had learned from his previous mistakes. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Azov was a fortress on the River Don, controlling entrance to the Sea of Azov. Peter launched his campaign in 1695, determined to win an outlet to the sea, and stop Tartar raids. The first campaign failed due to poorly-disciplined troops, inadequate supplies and the lack of naval support. Peter's second campaign was far more successful, appointing a single commander, reinforcing supply routes and building a navy to ensure that success. This was Peter's first foreign policy victory, yet it did not give him access to the Black Sea, as the Turks retained control of Kerch. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter decided to go to war with Sweden in 1700. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. after success at Azov he turned attention to his Baltic objectives. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. although he had captured Azov, this was only a partial victory as he had still no outlet as the Turks still controlled Kerch. The Great Embassy 1697–1698 failed to obtain the allies that Peter needed to continue the conflict in the Ottoman Empire, with the Holy Roman Empire, Poland and

Venice signing the Peace of Karlowitz in 1699. Peter, reluctant to fight a war on two fronts, considered more realistic objectives now existed in the north, especially after the defensive alliance signed with Denmark in March 1699. This was the opportunity to regain Russia's lost Baltic lands, and for Peter to rapidly acquire a military reputation against the formidable Swedes. **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. with anti-Swedish feeling so rife in the north, combined with unrest within Sweden, and the fact that the relatively new Swedish king, Charles XII, was very young, made an attack look very promising. It was a combination of failure and disappointment in the south with apparently easier pickings in the north that explains the declaration of war in 1700. Hope in the north rather than failure in the south was probably the main reason. **6-7**

(c) 'Up to 1709 Peter the Great's foreign policy was a failure; after 1709 it was a success.' Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(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

Some definition of success should be given and supported, and most candidates should recognise the suggested turning point of the Battle of Poltava, July 1709. Objectives in foreign policy might be suggested as: personal glory for Peter; the desire to win back territories lost to Sweden; to obtain a warm sea port and access to the West; to acquire diplomatic influence for Russia; to prevent the incursions from the Ottoman Empire in the south and to break through to the Black Sea. In support of the statement, candidates may identify the somewhat impetuous nature of Peter's earlier military adventures. The first Azov campaign failed due to poor

organisation, lack of a fleet, the use of outdated Streltsy that resented their European officers, and poor command and control. The second campaign succeeded after military reforms. However, this had only given access to the Sea of Azov, and not to the Black Sea. It had proven the obsolete practices of Russia's military, and any apparent victory had only been achieved at an immense cost. The Great Embassy was a further failure, reinforcing the diplomatic isolation that Russia continued to suffer – it was a consequence of this that led Peter to conclude the Turkish campaign without achieving access to the Black Sea. It was clear that the European powers were much more concerned by the looming War of Spanish Succession, and Russia's claims actually counted for little. The outbreak of war with Sweden was also disastrous. Russia's ally, Denmark, capitulated the very day he declared war with Sweden. The siege of Narva, 1700, further reinforced Russian military problems, illustrated the continued impetuosity of Peter, and did nothing to build his personal reputation, especially after he fled the battlefield. The fact that Narva was not followed up with even more resounding defeats was probably as much due to luck as any other factor. It is difficult to see a clear policy in these early years and little of success. The battle of Poltava was a turning point. It proved the success of Peter's military reforms and was a humiliating defeat for Sweden. It achieved the diplomatic recognition that Peter craved and bolstered his own reputation. Peter was able to construct an anti-Swedish alliance, and led Russia towards a stronger presence on the Baltic, possibly confirmed by the Battle of Hango in 1714. The Treaty of Nystadt 1721 gave Russia all of Livonia, Estonia, and Ingria, recognising the balance of power in the Baltic had shifted in Russia's favour.

To challenge the statement, candidates might identify that although Azov did not achieve access to the Black Sea, it was Russia's first military victory since Alexei's reign, it was the motive behind important military reforms, and the resulting existence of a fleet at Tagenrog remained a source of concern to the Turks, certainly this might be used as the base for further military expansion to the Black Sea. The Great Embassy was not such a disaster as it gave Peter the knowledge and skills necessary to re-build the Russian military. After Narva, Peter did win military victories and by 1703 controlled most of the Baltic coastline. He had also begun the construction of St Petersburg. Poltava in 1709 was a turning point but it did not end the war, which continued for twelve years. Peter launched a disastrous campaign against the Turks at Pruth, resulting in the light but nevertheless embarrassing Peace of Pruth in 1711. The Treaty of Nystadt was a victory of sorts but not one completely worthy of a 21-year war that had seriously strained Russia. The Persian Campaign might be seen as further evidence of great expenditure leading to marginal gains, in this case a small strip of land along the Caspian Sea.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on an aspect of foreign policy with assertion and no support. At Level 2, assertion will still prevail but there will be a wider range of information although still largely descriptive and with some valid links. Level 3 answers will be analytical although there will be no balance across the period of the statement, concentrated on a very limited period with little attempt to challenge the assertion. Level 4 answers will use a wide range of appropriate material with a clear focus on the notion of success. There will be balance with an attempt to challenge the statement. At Level 5, responses will in addition contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on the degree of success/failure in each given period.

Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the poll tax' in the context of Peter's efforts to increase state income. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. this was a new tax introduced by Peter, it had a considerable impact, popularly named the soul tax. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it was decreed in 1718 and was motivated by the needs of the army at the end of the Northern War; also an attempt to establish a tax more equally distributed across classes and regions. It was a tax on the individual rather than the old tax based on the household or the plough. It needed an accurate census and as such was a vehicle of administrative centralisation; however, this proved difficult to establish and consequently the tax was not levied until 1724. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter wanted to improve Russia's economy. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. because he needed more money, because he was determined to prove his abilities, because the Russian economy was under-developed. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Peter's foreign policy aims, and especially his desire to develop the army and the navy, necessitated economic growth and a consequent increase in state revenues. Peter was also keen to emulate the West, especially after the Great Embassy. The vast natural resources of Russia lay untapped and Peter recognised that the largely agricultural and sparse population would need encouraging to achieve his objectives. Peter especially wanted to improve industry, and especially the iron industry, as this could provide arms and ammunition. There was some connection between overseas trade and Peter's own objectives to westernise and build a merchant navy. **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. Russia's economy was essentially agrarian, with a population thinly spread. Communications were poor and contact with the West virtually non-existent with most overseas trade being conducted by foreigners resident in Russia. There was a clear need to develop, yet it was the pressing concerns of war that was the most significant motive: during Peter's reign 86 factories were established under state control simply to provide for the war machine. **6-7**

- (c) 'The most important factor limiting the success of Peter's economic reforms was the conservatism of the Russian people.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (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 conservatism of the Russian people may be seen as broad opposition to Peter's policy of westernisation, opposition to state control, resistance from the nobility and especially landowners fearful of the collapse of serfdom, opposition from the peasants themselves conscripted into factory work and forced labour, an immensely traditional peasantry fearful of innovation. However, there were a number of significant other factors that might be considered. Most obviously the size of Russia and the consequent problems in communication; the lack of precious metals which contributed toward prohibition of the export of bullion and mercantilism; the heavy taxation of the population; high duties on imported goods which may have done more to damage the economy than assist it; the shortage of capital; the lack of experienced and educated workers; the low status of merchant class; the lack of a significant domestic market; the use of foreigners that tended to exploit Russia's economy rather than promote it. There are grounds to challenge the statement. Certainly, Peter did not achieve all that he had intended economically and never managed to come close to matching the English or the Dutch, but he did manage to provide for his foreign policy objectives. In addition, there was substantial industrial development. He gave the economy a new impetus, contact with the West and the beginnings of an entrepreneurial class.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative of economic policy or of the nature of conservatism, typically excessively generalised and not linked to economic issues. At Level 2 narrative will prevail but it will be wider ranging with some attempt at valid links, although these may be in the form of bland statements with little support. Level 3 answers will be analytical with clear links to the focus but are likely to concentrate on conservatism or on another factor. Level 4 answers will examine conservatism and other factors limiting economic development

with perhaps some challenge to the assumption. By Level 5, answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion on a range of relevant factors.