



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative C Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June 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.

June 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 ‘pursuit of glory’ (lines 1 and 2) 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 was Louis’ desire to win personal acclaim/gloire for himself. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. gloire was a key factor in Louis’ early foreign policy and can especially be seen as a motivating factor behind the Dutch War and possibly the Wars of Reunion. This was often linked to Louis’ control of imagery at home and might be seen as an attempt to reinforce his absolute authority. Top of the level might be achieved by offering challenge to the source, e.g. it is much less certain that gloire was a key motivating factor in the outbreak of the War of Spanish Succession; or might alternatively be reached by a brief attempt to assess importance of gloire in relation to other factors such as dynastic concerns or security of borders **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source B** differs from the views put forward in **Source C** about the motives of Louis XIV in foreign policy in the years 1679 to 1684. (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 Louis had some legal claim to seize towns and lands; Source C suggests that Louis seized lands in order to increase his prestige. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. whilst Source B claims that Louis was simply strengthening his borders, no reference is made to this motive in Source C. Moreover, whilst Source B at least suggests there was some legal pretext for his claims, and even states that the French courts agreed with this, Source C makes the point that France had no claim whatsoever at least to Strasbourg. In addition, Source C hints at a religious motive for

Louis' actions and the reference to his triumphal entrance might reasonably be seen as a reference to personal glory. Whilst Source B emphasises legal considerations, Source C makes no reference to the valid use of the law, making reference instead to the use of troops. Both sources refer to the hostility this policy engendered. Own knowledge might refer to specific lands annexed in the Reunion policy or explain how the Chambers of Reunion functioned. **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. the suggestion in Source B that Louis was simply strengthening his border has some truth to it. The eastern border of France lacked the security of a natural frontier and as such was vulnerable to Hapsburg attack; no king might be expected to ignore such basic tenets of security. However, as Source C suggests there were other motives, not least of which was opportunism. Neither source mentions the fact that Louis was seen to be taking advantage of recent Turkish attacks on the Hapsburgs, it was this that helped to cause others to view him as a greedy conqueror as expressed in Source B, yet Louis might reasonably be expected to take opportunities when they arose and he had no obligation to the defence of the Hapsburg Empire, in fact it rather served his purpose to do nothing. Foreign propagandists certainly exploited the religious motives as suggested in Source C and this fuelled fears that Louis was attempting to create a universal monarchy, but it would have been unwise for a king who felt he had a genuine legal claim to ignore such dynastic concerns. It was a desire for secure borders combined with dynastic concerns, opportunism and gloire that fuelled foreign policy in this period. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Louis XIV's over-confidence, in relation to other factors, in explaining the failure of French foreign policy in the years 1679 to 1715. (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 illustrate possible over-confidence and the failure of policy: Source A suggests that Louis' pursuit of glory prompted foreign powers to unite and launch the war of Spanish Succession. Source B suggests that Louis' efforts to strengthen his borders 1679–1684 antagonised neighbouring powers despite attempts at legal justification. Source C suggests that it was expansionism and aggressive use of the military that prompted similar concerns. In addition Source C suggests a religious motive behind Louis' foreign policy and also makes reference to his personal glory. Source D states that Louis alienated other countries and that his own policies, even domestic ones, actively united powers against him.

Fully effective answers might reasonably be expected to give some criteria for assessing how foreign policy failed in this period, and might even suggest some challenge to the statement. The early foreign policy of Louis XIV is commonly considered to have succeeded in better securing borders, especially after the instability of the Fronde; also in advancing Louis' glory; in strengthening mercantile interests; and in addressing dynastic concerns. However, the last part of Louis' reign was dominated by wars fought against much better organised and united enemies. The Nine Years War (1688–1697) was certainly inconclusive and drawn-out. In an

attempt to secure the gains of the Reunions Louis seems to have simply antagonised foreign powers and confirmed their view of him as a dangerous aggressor. The Treaty of Ryswick forced Louis to relinquish all of his Reunion gains, except Strasbourg and is evidence of Louis' humiliating reversal of fortune. The War of Spanish Succession brought real financial and socio-economic problems for France, and might even be considered a reason for Louis' own declining popularity and his need to reassert his absolutist credentials in 1709. Both Utrecht 1713 and Rastadt 1714 forced Louis to accept that his grandson was unable to inherit the French in addition to Spanish throne, and also partitioned the Spanish Empire. However, it might be argued that Louis did manage to retain his grandson on the Spanish throne, although this seems meagre compensation for the years of fighting.

Candidates might identify Louis' pursuit of glory as evidence of over-confidence, especially given the prompt in Source A. However, as balance, reference could easily be made to the partition treaties and to Louis' apparent efforts to avoid war over the succession. Moreover, the will of Carlos II can hardly be considered to have been something engineered by Louis' pursuit of personal glory; the upholding of the will had a great deal to do with Louis' desire to secure his frontiers and also dynastic concerns. Glory might be a factor in the Wars of Reunion and the Nine Years War but again seems marginal compared to the desire for stable frontiers and a desire to retain what earlier foreign policy had achieved. However, regardless of substance, foreign powers did view Louis' actions as a threat, and candidates might well argue that it was not his motives that were at fault but rather the impression that he gave to foreign powers. The singing of a Te Deum in Strasbourg Cathedral was insensitive and when combined with the Revocation in 1685 may well have been a factor in aligning protestant powers against him. Regardless of his genuine belief in dynastic principles, also illustrated by his recognition of James III as the Old Pretender in 1701, the cynical attempt to use the outdated legal precedent, especially when Vienna was a threat, might itself be viewed as a miscalculation and an indication of over-confidence especially considering that such territorial gains were relinquished in 1697. However, there were other factors for failure. Louis XIV might not be blamed for the foreign misinterpretation of what may have been a genuinely defensive French policy in this period, indeed Louis was to a degree a victim of his own earlier successes. The loss of Colbert, and also of Conde weakened France's ability to fight and to finance war, as did a whole series of poor harvests and trade recession. Huguenot exiles reinforced foreign armies with personnel and technology such as the bomb-ketch whilst France seemed to lack the inclination to reform the military. Louis cannot perhaps be blamed for the eventual accession of William of Orange to the English throne thus uniting two very powerful rivals, the fighting potential of whom was further enforced by the happy coincidence of having exceptional generals such as Marlborough. The defeat of the Turks gave further cause for European powers to turn their attention to Louis XIV, and perhaps as a longer term perspective it was only once the other great powers had recovered from the disaster of the Thirty Years War that the abilities of Louis were really tested – the successes of his early reign being a symptom of European exhaustion.

Answers at Level 1 will be simple assertion and limited points dependent almost entirely on basic information probably lifted directly from the sources, e.g. Louis was over confident as he antagonised foreign powers and this united them together. Level 2 answers will be descriptive, perhaps giving an account of one of the wars that Louis fought in the period, or a descriptive overview of one of his motives. There will be some attempt to link the question but probably predominantly in the introduction or the conclusion. At Level 3, candidates should have some analysis. By Level 4, answers will display greater range and depth with an analytical approach with very few areas of narrative. In addition, answers will be balanced by considering a range of other factors that might account for the failure of foreign policy. At Level 5, answers will also contain judgement and make a clear attempt to assess how important over-confidence was. There might also be some attempt to challenge the notion of complete failure of foreign policy in this period.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by 'a more unified administration' in the context of Frederick William's administrative aims. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Frederick William had inherited scattered territories, a unified administrative system might serve to unite these territories. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the varied inheritance meant that Junkers and the Estates had a varying degree of influence in Frederick William's territories. This was especially true in Prussia. Frederick William was very much aware of the need for unity despite geographical distance and sought to use central agencies such as the Privy Council and especially the Great War Commissariat to weaken local influence through the Estates. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William felt the need to reform the economy and finances of his territories. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he had inherited territories that were poor; he needed money to pay for his reforms and military exploits. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the establishment of a standing army strained existing finances. Existing methods of raising tax, including the Contribution were insufficient, especially considering the weakened economic state of Frederick William's territories. The use of foreign subsidies further weakened the diplomatic independence of the Elector. Frederick William took a personal interest in Cameralism and his upbringing certainly convinced him that economic models of state intervention abroad brought well-being as well as greater prosperity that could in turn be taxed. Frederick William remained personally keen to improve agriculture and trade. **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 economic and financial inheritance was certainly weak and there was good reason to seek increased revenues especially with the establishment of a standing army, it appears that his greatest motive in seeking greater taxation may well have been as a toll to humble the Estates through emergency measures. **6-7**

- (c) 'The establishment of a standing army was the most important of Frederick William's domestic policies in the years 1640 to 1688.'
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 question enables candidates to consider a range of Frederick William's domestic policies and to assess relative significance within the period 1640 to 1688. Candidates should have an initial focus on the development of a standing army with a clear focus on why such a reform might be considered to have been significant. In order to reach a judgement on relative significance candidates should also consider a good range of other policies.

Many candidates will argue that the army became the key motive/excuse for domestic reforms, especially in administration and relations with the Estates and also the development of new taxes. The need to develop an effective officer class and the desire to have effective administration of the army led to the development of the Generalkriegskommissariat which was itself a key component of an increasingly authoritarian domestic regime. Increased expenditure on a standing army seriously weakened relations with the Prussian Estates in the Northern War. Moreover, military officials increasingly took over the role of wider administration developing a general responsibility for the collection of taxation. It was relatively easy for Frederick William to provide excuses in terms of meeting the emergency of war, although this did not convince the recalcitrant Estates. The Junkers might also be weakened by drawing them into army service. In both circumstances, the development of a standing army became the excuse by which Frederick William sought to extend his personal authority across his scattered territories.

However, it can be argued that whilst the army became a prime motive for change, there were other significant events. Economic developments were important and especially the encouragement of over 20,000 Huguenot refugees to settle in his territories. Indeed by 1686 1/6th of Brandenburg's population were immigrants; toleration was itself a general principle. The

attempts to break the monopoly of the guilds and to develop internal communications including a postal service, whilst not often mentioned did have considerable significance for a monarch attempting to rule disparate territories. It might be suggested that the traditional view of Frederick William having successfully established an efficient militaristic bureaucracy is slightly outdated with increasing recognition that there was much more retrenchment than innovation, even in financial affairs. In this sense the most significant event in domestic affairs appears to be the weakening of the Diets and subjection of the Estates to royal authority. Moreover, it was not the establishment of the standing army that provided the initial excuse for increased taxation but rather the frequency of war. Possibly the establishment of the Contribution used to maintain an army in peace time was of great significance, but this should not be confused with the general demands of war.

Level 1 answers may consist of general assertions or limited consideration of one aspect of Frederick William's domestic policy with no clear link to the question. At Level 2 there should be a greater range with some description of the establishment of the standing army or on another aspect of domestic reform with some basic attempt to address the concept of significance; however, such attempts may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers should cover a range of policies with some analytical focus on the issue of significance, although not fully sustained and lacking balance. By Level 4, answers will be more balanced with a clear analytical focus on the significance of the standing army. There should be criteria for the assessment of significance applied to a good range of domestic aspects. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion, if not sustained on the most significant event of Frederick William's domestic policies.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the terms of Westphalia' 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 treaty which Frederick William was very disappointed by, especially as the terms were broken by others. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it refers to the Treaty of Westphalia which ended the Thirty Years' War in 1648. Frederick William's aim of getting legal recognition for the Calvinists was achieved as they were given the same legal status as Lutherans and Catholics in the Empire. However, although his territorial possessions had increased, he had failed to realise his claim to Julich-Berg, and more significantly he had failed to gain Pomerania in its entirety despite a just claim stretching back to the death of the last duke in 1637. He did gain the port of Colberg, but failed to win the valued port of Stettin. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Frederick William considered the gaining of foreign alliances important to his foreign policy. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he needed alliances to bolster a weak military presence; he could not achieve his objectives without support. **1-2**

-
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Brandenburg-Prussia's weakness, especially in terms of the use of mercenary troops and geographical disunity made the pursuit of an independent foreign policy impossible. A policy of armed neutrality might yield better results. This was illustrated by Frederick William's reluctance to enter a Swedish alliance in the prelude to the Northern War, preferring instead to sign a defensive treaty with the Dutch in 1655. In 1656, after a series of Swedish victories, Frederick William's decision to switch support to Sweden was in part a forced arrangement again illustrating the point that he was forced into alliances by circumstance and did not have the luxury of independence. The support of France as the great power of the continent would be vital to Frederick William's plans, as demonstrated as early as 1648 when his ambitions for territorial aggrandisement were thwarted by Mazarin. Even the acquisition of sovereignty over Prussia might be considered to have been the result of skillful diplomacy fostered not so much by Frederick William's initiative as demanded by the weak nature of his inheritance. **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. Frederick William's determination to follow a policy of armed neutrality in foreign affairs proved possible only after he had developed a strong military presence with army reform, but he remained subject to the whims of France, although his greatest use of alliance was probably a mature response to the shifting balance of power in Europe. **6-7**

- (c) 'The increase in his personal prestige was the main achievement of Frederick William's foreign policy.'
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 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

This question allows candidates to consider a range of achievements relating to Frederick William's foreign policy, and to consider the issue of priority. Hence, while some focus should be given to the issue of Frederick William's prestige and authority, effective answers should also assess a good number of other factors.

High quality responses may well establish the relationship between the desire to increase personal prestige and other factors such as regaining Pomerania. Achievement at Westphalia will probably be assessed, with some commentary about Frederick William's disappointment. However, the fact that few of the concessions were lost by 1688 might indicate achievement in itself. However, the acquisition and loss of Western Pomerania can not really be considered to have been a success and ultimately Frederick William failed to acquire the independent foreign policy that he desired. It may be argued therefore that his greatest achievement was the survival of his scattered territories especially in the context of a weak inheritance. However, Frederick William's skill in utilising foreign alliances, whilst leaving him vulnerable to the influences of major powers and especially France, did increase substantially the prestige and diplomatic presence of Brandenburg-Prussia. In addition he had become a sovereign ruler and clearly an important individual in Europe.

Level 1 answers might consist of general assertions or limited consideration of one aspect of Frederick William's foreign policy with no clear link to the question. At Level 2 there should be greater range and selectivity of points with some supportive description on foreign policy with some attempt at valid links to achievements, although these may be in the form of general

statements with little support. Level 3 answers should cover a range of policies with some clear analytical focus on the issue of prestige and authority and perhaps criteria for its attainment, although not fully sustained and lacking balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced with a clear analytical focus on Frederick William's achievements rather than aims and some attempt to address the question of priority. Level 5 answers will, in addition contain judgement as demanded by the question and will reach a conclusion, if not sustained on the main achievement of Frederick William's foreign policy.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Table of Ranks' in the context of Peter the Great's domestic reforms. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. as a component of Peter's domestic reforms, it placed the nobility into a system of ranks or grades. It served the state and not the nobility. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it was introduced in 1722. Peter's intention was that position at court would depend on rank earned, Swedish influence, not inherited title. Service in the Navy, Army and state bureaucracy was divided into 14 levels or ranks with individuals earning the right to progress based on individual merit. The influence of foreign models, and especially the Swedish, might also be mentioned. Top of the level might be earned by brief commentary on why Peter felt this was a necessary reform and/or why it was implemented at such a relatively late stage of his reign. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great wanted to reform the economy and finances of Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he needed money to pursue his foreign policy; Russia was a backward country that Peter wished to westernise. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Peter's reforms were driven by a desire to finance his foreign policy, to modernise Russia, forge contacts with the west and to finance other areas of domestic reform such as education. Military reforms necessitated more efficient and wider ranging taxation, such as the tax on salt and tobacco and most obviously the 'soul' tax. However, this five-fold increase in taxation by the end of the reign was also used to finance expensive programmes of westernisation and especially the construction of St Petersburg. The development of commerce and industry may likewise be attributed to military objectives such as the development of the iron industry early in Peter's reign, although other areas of development such as the silk and china industries might be used as evidence of the broader ambition of widening Russia's consumer base and of westernising. Commercial links with Europe and his mercantile tendencies helped to create a commercial class of entrepreneurs which Peter considered vital for a modern state. **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. that as Peter himself commented to the senate in 1711 'money is the artery of war' and it was the military demands that were the main motive behind economic reform. Initially such demands were met by temporary expediency such as debasement of coinage used to fund the Northern War, but Peter came to realise that more fundamental economic and financial reform whilst funding foreign adventure, could also fulfil secondary objectives, and indeed many of the reforms could fulfil a range of objectives in one, for example the soul tax not only provided more money but provided a means by which Peter could extend his personal authority. Industrial reforms provided for the military but also helped to create a class of entrepreneurs. **6-7**

(c) 'In his domestic policies, Peter's greatest achievement was reform of the Church.'
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

This question allows candidates to consider a range of Peter's domestic policies and the more effective answers will probably establish priority and establish some criteria for achievement.

Initial focus may well be on Peter's reforms to the Church. Such reforms, motivated in part by a desire to westernise, seize lands and moneys, and also a personal distrust of the institution, were significant. It was Peter's ability to utilise the Church almost as an office of the state and as a tool for the extension of his own authority that perhaps justifies consideration of it representing his greatest achievement. By the end of his reign, Peter had effectively abolished the independence of the Church and had done so in the context of a very devout populace. In addition, Peter had taken effective steps to limit the numbers entering monasteries and had

seized much of the wealth of monastic institutions. There was in fact relatively little resistance to Peter's church reforms.

However, candidates may identify a number of other reforms and argue that they were of greater significance. Certainly, Peter's reforms to the military must be counted as very significant. The development of a standing army bolstered by foreign leaders and conscripted men became the driving force behind most of the reforms of his reign. Indeed, candidates may well argue that this reform alone accounts for a range of other developments such as the attempt to improve education, the development of the iron and textiles industry and the attempt to westernise. To this degree military reforms may be considered a much greater achievement. There may be some recognition however, that many of these reforms were interlinked and that, for example, attempts to establish service nobility were simply another facet of Peter's already successful policy of extending his authority within Russia.

Answers at Level 1 may consist of narrative accounts of a single or very limited range of reforms with little focus on the specific issue of domestic reforms or the concept of achievement. Level 2 answers will cover a wide range of reforms but will remain heavily descriptive; there will be some attempt to link to the focus of the question, namely Church reform. Level 3 answers will clearly focus on the domestic reform with some attempt to assess the degree to which Church reforms were successful, rather than a simple description of domestic reforms. There will be some attempt to adopt an analytical style. Level 4 answers will be much more balanced with some attempt to consider other domestic reforms. There will be good analytical approach with a focus on greatest achievement. Level 5 answers, will in addition, contain judgement regarding greatest success with the use of clear criteria, and will reach a conclusion.

Question 5

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the Pruth disaster' in the context of Peter the Great'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 military campaign fought against the Turks. It was disastrous for Peter. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the Pruth disaster refers to the campaign that occurred as a result of Turkey's declaration of war in November 1710. Peter led over 50,000 troops deep into Turkish territory but found himself surrounded and forced to come to terms with the Turkish grand vizier. Top of the level might be achieved by some mention that Peter actually escaped relatively lightly, being allowed to go back to Russia in return for returning Azov and Taganrog. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great reformed his armed forces. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the army was ineffective, poorly led and ill equipped. There was no navy. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Peter began from the very start of his reign to reform the military, and in part is a reflection of his own personal

interests as a child. This might be supported by reference to the boyhood regiments and also Peter's fascination with the possession of a navy. The failure of largely foreign officered troops at Narva provided impetus for immediate reform of the army, as did the initial failure at Azov due to poor naval provision. The practicalities of the loss of over 12,000 men at Narva were an added consideration. Some reference might be made to motives directed at furthering Peter's domestic 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. Peter was most aware of the reforms needed after the initial defeat at Azov, reinforced by the disaster at Narva. Whilst reform of the army and navy came from a multitude of factors, it was defeat abroad that was the primary motivating factor. **6-7**

- (c) 'Victory at the battle of Poltava in 1709 was the most significant event of Peter the Great's foreign policy.'
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

Candidates might have some initial focus on Poltava with some explanation of why it might be considered a significant event. Higher level awards should consider a range of other foreign policy events with some attempt to provide criteria for assessing significance.

Poltava was certainly a successful battle with over 7000 Swedes killed and 3000 taken prisoner coming at a cost of just over 1000 Russian dead. In addition, the remainder of the Swedish army surrendered at Perevoluchna and Charles was forced to flee Turkey. The significance of the battle lay in part in that it represented the first significant victory of Peter's reformed military

forces and certainly that it removed the immediate threat of Swedish invasion. Possibly more importantly, it represents a genuine turning point in Russia's relations with other European powers. Peter was able to make a number of successful dynastic matches and was able to continue expansion into the Baltic. However, balance might be achieved by consideration of the fact that Russia had needed 42,000 troops to defeat 19,000 Swedish and that the battle did not remove the Swedish threat and actually encouraged Charles XII to continue fighting. The victory at Poltava might also be said to have led to disaster at Pruth for Peter who was desperate to remove Charles from Turkish territory.

Other foreign policy events that might be considered to have been of greater significance include the acquisition of an outlet to the Baltic, the construction of St Petersburg, naval victory at Hango, the defeat of Poland and perhaps most clearly the Treaty of Nystad of 1721. Indeed, many candidates might identify the fact that victory in one battle, although a significant turning point, brought little of immediate value if taken out of context of the Northern War. It was the culmination of this war – 12 years after Poltava – that brought diplomatic gain of lasting value including the acquisition of Ingria, Estonia and Livonia. Failures in foreign policy might be considered to have been of greater significance, and most obviously defeat at Narva which provided the impetus for much of Peter's military reforms. Reasonable argument might also be offered to suggest that Peter's diplomatic efforts in his later years to extend Russian influence beyond Europe had greater significance than any military victory Peter experienced.

Level 1 answers may consist of limited narrative on Poltava with no clear links to the concept or significance, or general assertions on the significance of Poltava. At Level 2 there should be some understanding of the question and some selectivity of material on the events at Poltava or other aspect of foreign policy with some attempt at a valid link to the issue of significance although these may be in the form of general statements with little support. Level 3 answers should cover a range of policies with some analytical focus on the issue of significance although not fully sustained and lacking balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and cover more than simply Poltava. There should be clear analytical focus and evidence of some criteria for evaluating significance across a range of events. Level 5 answers will, in addition, contain judgement as demanded by the question and reach a conclusion, if not sustained, on the relative significance of events in Peter's foreign policy.