



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2E

Absolutist States: The Reign of Peter the Great of Russia, 1682–1725

Mark Scheme

2009 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 © 2009 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.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2009

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2E: The Reign of Peter the Great of Russia, 1682–1725

Question 1

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

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the attitudes of Peter the Great's subjects towards his reforms. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

- L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**
- L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**
- L4** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

Indicative content

Source A focuses on the grievances that the Streltsy felt against the reforms and changes of Peter the Great. There is a clear indication that the Streltsy felt that both their religious faith and Russia were being undermined: both patriotic and religious outrage are highlighted – so much so that they cannot believe that Peter, who had initiated reforms, could really be their Tsar. There is a specific reference to their desire for the 'old traditional ways', and specific grievances are mentioned: the fact that instead of remaining in stately isolation, Peter caroused with lowly foreigners. They are so hostile to Peter's reforms that the Streltsy regard him as the Devil's child.

Source B gives a different picture. Referring to the upper class, the Source states that its members were gradually, though perhaps reluctantly, being won over to reform and to Peter's 'cosmopolitan' attitudes, because they felt that their status had actually been enhanced. They now had privileges (although these are not specified in the source), and there is no indication that they were concerned about the widening gap between themselves and the lower orders.

Therefore there are some clear distinctions between **Source A**, describing resentment at change from the old ways, and Source B, describing a more positive response to reform.

However, candidates can also point out some similarity between the sources. **Source A**, in showing the grievances of the Streltsy, shows attitudes at the beginning of Peter's reign, and **Source B** agrees that there was initial reluctance to accept Peter's reforms. **Source B** also recognises that attitudes to Peter's reforms opened up gulfs in Russian society, such as between the clergy and the ruling class and between popular and elite culture, particularly surrounding religion and Peter's flirting with cosmopolitanism; **Source A** highlights that these were the same concerns that the Streltsy had.

Own knowledge should flesh out the sources. The power of the Streltsy had increased during the turbulent period of factions (Miloslavski and Naryshkin) during Sophia's regency, and their success in previous revolts had got them used to challenging tsarist authority. They did not like it when Peter, whose traumatic upbringing had given him plenty of cause to fear and hate the Streltsy, asserted his authority after becoming sole ruler in 1696. Also his determination to reform was bound to provoke conflict since the Streltsy were representatives of traditionalism. They were also used by Sophia as part of her campaign to depose or kill Peter. The Streltsy could not adapt and were destroyed after their revolt, in 1698–1699. Some of the boyars were traditionalists; others, including many of the younger ones, were persuaded to adopt Peter's attitudes, even if they may not have been genuine 'Westerners' at heart. Some did well out of this, and were wealthy and privileged, and therefore almost bound to support Peter's reforms. The nobility was westernised either willingly or unwillingly, and some of his associates were fanatical in their loyalty.

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

How far did Peter the Great transform Russian society?

(24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Source A does not indicate how far Peter actually changed Russian society, but it does give a clear indication as to the fears one significant group of Russians had about the nature and scope of Peter's reforms. The Streltsy opposed the reforms as they saw the changes as heretical, not representative of Russia's true interests and traditions, and they believed that Peter did not behave as a true Tsar should. Therefore any of his reforms were seen as a plot to subvert the state and the true religion. It can be inferred that the Streltsy viewed Peter's reforms as far-reaching in transforming Russian society. In addition Source A hints at the personal grievance the Streltsy felt; their own position was being undermined, indicating change in society.

Source B indicates a number of ways in which Peter's reforms can be seen as transforming Russian society. It indicates that some of the ruling class were won over to Peter's reforms because they gained recognition, prestige and privileges as a result and it suggests that Peter had some success in carrying out his transformation – the references to changing the 'manners and outlook' of the ruling class; bringing in 'new culture'; and indeed actually creating a new ruling class. It also highlights the way that Peter's reforms intensified social discord and the gap between classes. This might indicate some degree of failure, since there was clearly some strong opposition to the reforms.

This is also hinted at in **Source C**: new and higher taxes to pay for reforms and prestige projects and the drafting of peasants into both the army and forced labour. But the changes were costly and provoked unrest, suggesting that attempts to transform society proved difficult. The act of tying peasants to the land provoked flight and 'desperate' violence from the peasantry. Although the reforms were not stopped, there was some resistance and an increase in tension between groups in society.

Own knowledge can be used by candidates to develop these arguments. Despite some resistance to Peter's church reforms, they succeeded: not replacing the Patriarch allowed Peter to gain and keep control of Church wealth and prevented opposition from using the church as a powerful focus of an anti-reform movement. Peter also changed the dress and customs of the ruling classes, and made symbolic changes such as changing the Russian calendar and alphabet. All nobles were made dependent on service, either military or administrative, to the crown, through the Table of Ranks and the 'soul tax' tied the peasants more tightly to the nobles and the land. In addition the peasants faced drafting into the army and to work on Peter's projects such as the canal system and the building of St. Petersburg. Peter's changes widened the splits in society, especially between the peasants and the ruling classes.

However, there were limitations to their impact, not always due to open opposition but due to various forms of undermining. Corruption and bribery remained strong at all levels of society, which restricted the success of administrative and financial reforms; and also the fact that these reforms were complex, overlapping and frequently changed, limited their effectiveness. There was inbuilt conservatism and suspicion of the reforms, especially because of the foreign influences behind them. There were too few trained administrators, and the pressures of war, restricting the impact. The overt opposition of the Streltsy, Sophia and some nobles was clearly unsuccessful, since the revolts were brutally suppressed. Eventually the threat of rivals to Peter was eliminated, even if he did have to constantly fight corruption or simply incompetence. Peter's power over all aspects of government weakened the impact of resistance. Nevertheless, it is possible to argue that many Russians conformed to the cultural changes rather than embracing them.

Candidates' answers should draw on the sources and their own knowledge to give examples of Peter's reforms and their impact on society to come to a conclusion on how far Russian society was transformed by these reforms.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why the regency ended in 1689. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

There are a number of reasons why the regency came to an end in 1689:

- Sophia's regency had come into being in 1682 when Peter was only ten, and his elder half-brother, Ivan, was disabled. Peter was, by 1689, 17, married, and therefore assumed to be able to take on the responsibilities of the Tsar.
- Sophia's 'western' reforms were unpopular with many of the Streltsy and the boyars, so she lost their support.
- Armies led by Golitsyn, Sophia's minister and lover, to the Crimea in 1686/7 were forced to withdraw twice. Victories were proclaimed, but as the truth was realised, Golitsyn was undermined. Peter was openly critical and refused to meet Golitsyn on his return from the second campaign undermining the regency further. Sophia was perceived as overreaching her role as regent, acting as a joint ruler, rather than as regent. The failures in the Crimea gave Sophia's enemies an excuse to strike
- During Peter's youth in Preobrajenskoe he had been allowed to 'play war games' raising his own regiments who were loyal to him, this enabling him to challenge Sophia militarily.
- As Peter reached the age where he would be able to take on the full role of Tsar, Sophia would only be able to hold onto power if she disposed of Peter but Sophia found that she could no longer rely on the Streltsy for support: they perceived Peter as Tsar and Sophia as only regent and they were not prepared to follow a woman.
- As the tension between the followers of Peter and Sophia increased, more and more of the noble families defected to Peter. Sophia realised her weak position; she was deposed and confined to a convent before Peter returned to Moscow to end the regency. Nevertheless, Peter did not take full charge of the government leaving this to Narishkine survivors until 1694, when he assumed real power himself.

Candidates may link together or prioritise these reasons. This period of Russian history there was much intrigue and violence and there were powerful alternative centres of strength in Russia such as the Church, the Streltsy, and warring factions within the nobility. The end of the regency, in part, reflected the struggle for power between the Miloslavski faction and the Narishkine faction. Once Peter came of age, the Narishkine faction could exploit the disaffection with Sophia, and Russian cultural tradition dictated that he was supported as the Tsar; despite the hopes of her supporters, Sophia's regency was only ever seen as a temporary measure by many members of powerful groups such as the Church and the Streltsy.

- (b) 'Peter the Great failed to strengthen government in Russia.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Peter clearly changed aspects of Russia's government, although it is possible to debate the degree to which it was actually strengthened. Answers could include several aspects. For example, it could be argued that economic and financial reforms were important in strengthening Peter's position – with local government trying to make tax collection more efficient, improvements in trade, measures such as protectionism and developing manufacturing to create a stronger economic base, and increasing taxation. However, clearly several other factors are important, and they will include aspects such as: Peter's domination of the nobility, his church reforms, his crushing of opposition etc. It might be argued that some of Peter's activities, such as forcing 'Western' customs on his courtiers, were only symbolic, although they were part of Peter's determination to build up Russia, which also meant strengthening his own government.

Clearly one way of strengthening his government was to suppress opposition. This was achieved, brutally, for example through his suppression of the Streltsy revolt in 1698.

Peter did strengthen state finances by doubling tax revenues, and this enabled Russia to play a bigger part in international affairs.

Peter did work hard to increase all aspects of government: efficiency, status and his own power. He had at least partial success regarding the church, which had frequently been an obstacle to tsarist power in the past. Peter did not appoint a successor to the Patriarch when he died in 1700, and in 1721 the Church was placed under the control of the government-appointed 'Spiritual Department'. This certainly strengthened his power, although it might be argued that these measures did not significantly alter the attitudes of ordinary Russians.

Answers may well focus specifically on reforms to government structures. Peter strengthened his government, because when he came to power, there was no centralised administrative structure of any real significance: the Senate was weak and advisory only, and local government was chaotic. Peter (1701–3) created several Directories with specific responsibilities (e.g. for naval affairs). The boyar *duma* was replaced with a Chancery. These changes were not that successful, but in 1711 the Administrative Senate was created to administer justice and finance, followed by ministerial departments based on the Swedish 'collegia' model, each with a President (usually Russian) and a Vice-President (usually foreign). The local government reform of 1708 divided Russia into 8 vast areas under governors, subdivided into provinces which were run by presidents assisted by noble-elected councils – but all administrators were directly responsible to the central government.

Peter's success in strengthening his position was marked in 1721 by his assumption of the title of 'Emperor of all the Russias', followed by his declaration that he alone could nominate his successor. Compared to the years before he became Tsar, the position had clearly been strengthened, with no serious rivals, and Russia relatively stable. This perspective should be borne in mind, although of course it is possible to argue that Peter's success in strengthening government was always restricted to some extent by the failure to make all the reforms work effectively – Peter was constantly trying to overcome corruption and incompetence in the administration, and his efforts to create an aristocracy with the duty of service to the state were only partially successful. There was no effective coordination between the various government offices, and so to a large extent the strength of government did depend on Peter himself rather than the position of Tsar *per se* – and for some time after Peter's death, the personal power and personality of the Tsar remained a key factor.

A good answer, as well as following a reasoned argument, will be balanced and contain a well-substantiated judgement.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Russia went to war with Sweden in 1700. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

There are a number of reasons why Russia went to war with Sweden in 1700:

- The reasons given by Moscow were to avenge the insult at Riga in 1697, when Peter was prevented from inspecting the fortifications, and to end Swedish occupation of what was perceived as 'Russian' territory – Ingria and Karelia.
- The war was also to gain possession of the Baltic Coast. Peter wanted to conquer Sweden's possessions on the eastern shore of the Baltic – Livonia, Estonia, Ingria. He needed these for his ambition of bringing Russia into the European orbit, taking advantage of Western European developments and 'opening a window on the west'.
- Success for Peter would enhance his status and position both within Russia and in Europe more widely. Peter had already faced the revolt of the Streltsy highlighting the potential precariousness of his position, and his failure to gain allies during the Great Embassy proved that Russia was not considered a major force in Europe.
- Access to the Baltic was a long-term aim of Russia. Previous Tsars, for example Alexis in the 1660s, had tried to gain access to the Baltic coast. Peter felt he had an opportunity to avenge these defeats and enhance his own status.
- Peter had reached a stalemate in his conflict with the Turks. The Treaty in Karlowitz agreed a 30 year truce with the Turks, meaning that Peter was able to concentrate his efforts and resources against Sweden. His inability to gain allies against the Turks meant that this conflict had reached a stalemate.
- Peter was also able to make alliances with Frederick IV of Denmark and Augustus II, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, against Sweden.
- Charles XII was a young and inexperienced king whilst Sweden was seen as vulnerable, both because of internal instability and because it could have over-extended itself.

Candidates may prioritise or link these reasons. It is possible to argue that access to the sea was the dominant theme of Peter's foreign policy, both in conflict with the Turks and in the Great Northern War. Alternatively, candidates may argue that the conflict with the Turks petered out just as Peter was able to make alliances with others against the Swedes and at a time of perceived Swedish weakness; thus the war may be seen as an example of Peter's opportunism.

- (b) 'Russia's success in the Great Northern War of 1700–1721 was due mainly to Peter the Great's reform of the army and navy.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

The military and naval reforms were very important. After Peter's first European tour, he purchased a lot of military and naval material. He reorganised his army, introducing uniforms and new tactics. He raised new guards regiments to form a modern, professional force, trained in the European fashion by foreign officers. Then he conscripted levies into regiments, creating an army of over 200 000 by his death. He could put 100 000 into the field (more than Sweden or Prussia, and similar to Austria). After Narva the Russian army was drastically reformed under Sheremetev and new tactics absorbed. Also with foreign assistance, Peter created a powerful fleet of nearly 50 ships of the line, 800 smaller ships and 20 000 sailors. Though the fleet only

enjoyed one major success, at the Battle of Cape Hango in 1714, Russia was beginning to dominate the Baltic, and at one point threatened Stockholm.

Other factors were also responsible for Russia's victory in the Great Northern War. The Swedish Empire was possibly past its prime and over-extended. Charles's devastating victory at Narva made him over-confident and too dismissive of Peter and Russian strength and became embroiled in Poland. Peter's first successes after Narva were consolidated by the building of St. Petersburg, which guarded Russia's route to the Baltic. Because Charles was heavily involved in Polish affairs, he could not attack Russia until 1708, by which time Russia was stronger.

Charles's strategy before Poltava might be considered faulty, and by then Russian forces were much stronger than before, whereas Swedish forces had been halved, and their hopes of allies dashed. Charles's injuries at Poltava made him personally less effective as a commander. Candidates might recognise that this was an important turning point in the war; however, answers should not merely explain success in this one battle, but refer to the whole war.

Peter was also fortunate in the actions and attitudes of other states. The Turks avoided conflict with Peter, ignoring pleas from the Tatars for assistance and not taking advantage of Peter's difficulties in the Ukraine. Even though Austria, Hanover and Saxony signed an alliance directed at driving Russian troops out of Poland in 1719, and in 1720 Britain signed an alliance with Sweden they all had their own concerns elsewhere, and the anti-Russian coalition collapsed in 1720, effectively forcing Sweden into the Treaty of Nystad.

Candidates may also make reference to other domestic reforms in explaining success in the Great Northern War. Reforms to finance and the administration of tax collection meant that the war could be paid for; Peter opened naval and military academies and engineering colleges to ensure that he developed home-grown skilled officers. Russia increased the production of the raw materials (e.g. iron, cloth, hemp) and weapons (e.g. flintlocks muskets).

A good answer, as well as following a reasoned argument, will be balanced and contain a well-substantiated judgement.