
A-LEVEL

History

Component 1E Russia in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment,
1682–1796

Mark scheme

7042
June 2017

Version: 1.0 Final

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

June 2017

A-level

Component 1E Russia in the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment, 1682–1796

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Catherine the Great's policy towards Poland. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

Extract A: In their identification of Alexander’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Catherine’s policy towards Poland was opportunistic and made her more willing to consider partition
- Catherine recognised the weaknesses of Poland
- Catherine disliked Catholicism in Poland
- she knew she had allies in Austria and Prussia that might assist in the subordination of Poland.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the imminent death of Augustus III and the election of a successor provided an opportunity for Russian influence
- the weakness of the Polish economy after the Seven Years War and the unstable nature of Poland’s political system
- the ambitions of Austria and Prussia
- antecedents of Russia’s relationship with Poland: Polish incursions into Russia; the nature of Russia’s influence in the previous century
- religious and geo-political considerations: attitudes to Catholicism; Catherine’s imperial ambitions.

Extract B: In their identification of Massie’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Poland was an unstable and a historically dangerous neighbour which still ruled what could be considered Russian territory and people
- historical Polish incursions into Russia
- the subordination of Poland that meant it could not further threaten Russia
- the reoccupation of lands containing Russian people and those of the Russian Orthodox faith.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the imminent death of Augustus III and the election of a successor provided an opportunity for further Russian influence
- the inherent unstable nature of Poland’s political system
- religious differences between Russia and Poland
- geo-political considerations including a potential threat to absolutism.

Extract C: In their identification of Anisimov’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Catherine’s personal dislike of Poles and her dislike of Polish institutions
- Polish ideas of democracy and freedom that might threaten Russian absolutism
- antipathy between Polish Catholicism and Russian Orthodoxy (and Lutheran traditions)
- Russia’s role in the three partitions of Poland.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Catherine’s frustration with Polish attempts to limit Russian influence
- Geo-political considerations: Poland’s instability and historical threat; Catherine’s imperial ambitions
- Catherine’s Lutheran background as well as her need, as a convert, to defend the Russian Orthodox Church influencing her attitude to Catholic Poland
- the roles of Austria and Prussia in the partitions of Poland.

Section B

- 02** ‘Rebellions and opposition during Peter the Great’s reign originated from the rejection of westernisation.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that rebellions and opposition during Peter the Great's reign originated from the rejection of westernisation might include:

- Streltsy dislike of Peter's western influences culminating in rebellion in 1698 and support for the rebellion in Bashkir: his favourites; western military techniques; the Great Embassy; attitude to the Russian Orthodox Church
- rumours, that spread ahead of the Bulavin rebellion, that Peter's beliefs, policy and behaviour were proof that he was a western imposter
- support for the conservative Alexis who it was hoped would reverse Peter's reforms
- widespread opposition to many western reforms across all classes that: nobility, Church, serfs.

Arguments challenging the view that rebellions and opposition during Peter the Great's reign originated from the rejection of westernisation might include:

- political and personal rivalries: the Miloslavsky vs. Naryshkins; Menshikov vs. Kikon
- Peter's challenge to previous privileged positions that sparked grievances: the Streltsy, the Cossacks, nobles, the Church
- discontent over the burdens placed on the population by Peter's reforms: runaway serfs; high levels of taxation; military service; loss of autonomy
- the acceptance of many of Peter's reforms, even by perceived conservatives such as Alexis.

Students might argue either in support or challenging the statement; there is evidence to corroborate either view. In concluding, higher level answers might recognise that, even where western reforms were the most visible and compelling grievances in conservative and reactionary Russia, they were often underpinned by more prosaic concerns about social and economic position and status.

- 03** ‘Swedish failings were more important than Russian strengths in securing Russia’s victory in the Great Northern War 1700–1721.’

Assess the validity of this view

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Swedish failings were more important than Russian strengths in securing Russia's victory in the Great Northern War 1700–1721 might include:

- Swedish failure to recognise the limits to its ambitions: population size; economics
- Sweden not securing victory against Russia after Narva when Russian defences were perilous
- mistakes, in the lead up to, and at Poltava
- despite decisive military victories, Russia was not strong enough to force an end to the war – the role of Britain was important.
- the death of Charles XII and the political situation internally that followed.

Arguments challenging the view that Swedish failings were more important than Russian strengths in securing Russia's victory in the Great Northern War 1700–1721 might include:

- Russia's natural resources and Peter's harnessing of these
- Peter the Great's understanding of Russia's weaknesses and his willingness to learn from early failure
- Peter the Great's diplomacy that afforded him important allies, particularly Augustus II in the period before Poltava, and the growth of the anti-Swedish alliance in the 1710s
- Peter the Great's capacity to implement necessary change: military; financial and economic; governmental
- Peter's understanding of the importance of the Baltic in ensuring dominance.

Students might argue either in support or challenging the statement; there is evidence to corroborate either view. In concluding, higher level answers might recognise the links between Swedish failings and Russian strengths; whilst Sweden did make mistakes, it was Russian strengths that ensured that Russia was in a position to take advantage of these; conversely without Swedish mistakes, Russia might not have been in a position to develop these strengths.

- 04** To what extent did the French Revolution change Catherine the Great's domestic policy? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the French Revolution changed Catherine the Great's domestic policy might include:

- early vocal support for Enlightenment ideas dissipating in the aftermath of the French Revolution: censorship of the philosophes from 1791; changing attitude to Voltaire
- a crackdown on criticism of her government: the Radishchev affair; Novikov and the freemasons: a formal system of censorship instituted in 1796
- Catherine's obvious horror at events in France and her response: surveillance of French nationals; requirement of oath of loyalty; economic sanctions; illness on hearing of Louis XVI's execution
- Catherine's concern about her grandson, Alexander, being her preferred heir because of his liberal views after 1790.

Arguments challenging the view that the French Revolution changed Catherine the Great's domestic policy might include:

- the depth of her support of enlightened ideas before 1789, especially after Pugachev: refusal to meet Voltaire; her beliefs about the difference in theory and practice in relation to ruling Russia
- the limits to Catherine the Great's enlightened policies before 1789: attitude to serfdom; support for the nobility; failure of much of the Legislative Commission
- earlier illiberalism: the use of the secret police; limits to religious tolerance
- responses to early challenges to Catherine's absolutism: the Pugachev revolt
- ongoing liberalism after 1789; limited use of death penalty; no change to social/welfare/education reforms.

Students are likely to recognise that the French Revolution did impact on Catherine the Great's thinking. The events in France made her fear the spread of revolutionary ideas and confirmed her suspicion about the mob. Whether or not students argue that there was a substantive change in her domestic policy will likely be determined by their assessment of the extent of her liberalism before 1789. Higher level answers are likely to recognise that Catherine's early idealism had already been dented by the practical problems she had already faced in ruling Russia before the French Revolution.