



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative F 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 F: Russia and the USSR, 1855–1991

AS Unit 1: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855–1917

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the significance of 'peace' (line 2) in the context of Bolshevik propaganda in 1917. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. recognising that calls for peace made good propaganda since Russia was fighting an unpopular war. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the Bolsheviks used peace propaganda in 1917 for several reasons, but particularly since they opposed the war a capitalist war fought against the interests of the working class; because the war had brought all sorts of problems to Russia; and because continuation of the war made the Provisional Government unpopular. By calling for peace the Bolsheviks were both expressing an ideological belief and also trading on popular opinion at the time to win support. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source B** differs from the view put forward in **Source A** in relation to Lenin's attitude towards taking action against the Provisional Government. (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. in Source A Lenin appears not to be calling for revolution and an attack on the Provisional Government, whereas he is in Source B. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. recognises the importance of the context of both sources, especially the dates. In April 1917 the Provisional Government still had a reasonable amount of support, and the Bolsheviks were not as strong as later. Also, although shortly before Source A was written Lenin had urged the overthrow of the Provisional Government in the April Theses, this had not been enthusiastically received by all the Bolsheviks, and Lenin was still attempting to impose his unchallenged authority on the Party. Consequently Lenin might be being more cautious in Source A, and he is also

frankly recognising the situation that the proletariat as a whole is not 'revolutionary', and that the Bolsheviks did not dominate the soviets. Hence he is not advocating immediate revolution, since the Bolsheviks might well fail to win control. In contrast, by September the Bolsheviks did have a majority in the key soviets, and the Provisional Government had been discredited by its failure to carry out promises such as setting up a Constituent Assembly, and by continued shortages in Russia and its disastrous continuation of the war. It was evident that the Provisional Government was increasingly powerless and that there was a power vacuum at the centre. The Bolsheviks had also been strengthened by the recent Kornilov affair. Hence Lenin in Source B is now confident of a successful attack on the Government, and despite the reservations of some colleagues, his authority in the Party was secure – although his reference in the last line of Source B to the need to 'explain' things 'clearly' to the rank and file of the Party shows that Lenin still recognised that he had work to do to convince everybody. This was because not only were some colleagues on the Central Committee dubious, but also leaders of the Bolshevik Party Military Organisation were urging thorough preparation in September and October before attempting a coup. Other references in Source B, e.g. to proposing peace, show that by September Lenin was also aware that worsening problems in Russia gave increased opportunities for propaganda which could further enhance Bolshevik chances of gaining support and victory. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source A challenges Source B, e.g. develops well the context of the sources as explained in Level 2 above. Candidates may develop the tone of the sources, e.g. the tone of Source B is more strident and confident, showing Lenin's awareness that things are moving in the Bolshevik's favour, provided they act decisively. Answers may develop references such as those to the soviets and Kerensky, although it should be possible to reach this level without doing so, provided the answer uses the sources well, shows some contextual knowledge, and reaches some sort of judgement.

6-7

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

Explain the importance of Lenin's leadership, in relation to other factors, in explaining the success of the Bolshevik seizure of power in October/November 1917. (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

Lenin's leadership was clearly an important factor in the Bolshevik success, although other factors were also important. Source A does not give much direct evidence of Lenin's role, although it does show Lenin thinking clearly about tactics, and not being hidebound by Marxist 'theory' like some colleagues. Lenin is making a realistic appraisal of the situation and why it is not yet time to strike – suggesting a clear-headed approach which could be useful later. Source B shows a similar pragmatism, but combined with confidence and determination: again there is a clear-headed appraisal of the situation, and then a clear call to action, although combined with an awareness that it is still important to convince colleagues. There is also evidence of the Bolshevik use of propaganda. Source C gives further evidence of Lenin's skills: the emphasis on action; the use of simple yet direct propaganda slogans; the use of specific policies to win support from workers, peasants, non-Russians seeking freedom from Moscow, those fed up with the war. There is an emphasis in the source on Lenin's flexibility. The source emphasises that the Bolsheviks were waiting for decisive leadership, but the point is made that Lenin still had to provide it for a Bolshevik coup to be successfully carried out.

Own knowledge should develop these points. Lenin was able on his return to Russia in April to eventually galvanise his colleagues. His use of propaganda was clever. He was skillful and persistent in overcoming colleagues' objections to his policies, e.g. Kamenev and Zinoviev. He was willing to work with recent 'converts' like Trotsky. His policies for the Bolsheviks proved to be the right ones, e.g. his insistence that the Bolsheviks alone should have nothing to do with the increasingly discredited Provisional Government gave them more credibility in the long run, unlike other parties on the Left who joined the Government. Although a keen theoretician, Lenin never let theory stand in the way of decisive action when the opportunity arose, e.g. his bypassing of the Petrograd Soviet to carry out the coup. It is difficult to believe that a coup could have been successful without his decisive leadership.

Other factors though were equally important. Trotsky's role in organising the coup on the ground was vital. Bolshevik strength had been growing before October, but that alone was not decisive. Other factors were at work: groups like the Mensheviks dithered. There were divisions and indecisiveness within the Provisional Government and the Soviet and by Kerensky. The Kornilov coup further weakened the Government. Continuing problems caused by defeats in war and shortages on the home front weakened morale and increased the opportunities for successful propaganda. Bolshevik strength was not overwhelming – but there was an increasing power vacuum at the centre. Other outcomes were possible, e.g. a military coup. But in the event the Bolsheviks, certainly in large part due to Lenin, were the one group with an apparently clear objective and determination to use whatever means, including force, to realise it. Whilst clearly there can be no definitive answer to the exact contribution of Lenin's leadership, it should be possible to construct a reasoned argument.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be very generalised or contain a very limited description of events between the two 1917 revolutions. At Level 2 there will be more range and selectivity in use of evidence, and some attempt, however limited, to focus on Lenin's role, although answers may still be predominantly descriptive or narrative-based. Level 3 responses will have greater accuracy, range and depth, and will make some specific links between Lenin's role and the Bolshevik success in October, although not all aspects will be covered. At Level 4 the arguments will be more convincingly supported, and there will certainly be some reference to 'other' factors besides Lenin's leadership, although answers will not necessarily be well balanced. Level 5 answers will certainly evaluate a range of factors and show sustained and reasoned judgement. Such answers may also cross reference sources and own knowledge convincingly.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'backward, peasant Russia' in the context of Russia at the time of Alexander II's accession to the throne in 1855. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Russia was backward in relation to other European Great Powers. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Russia's economy and society were rurally and peasant based, on a system of serfdom which was socially restrictive. There were also other reasons for Russia's comparative backwardness, but in a wider context, the fact that Russia's economy, army and society were based on serfdom, led to Russia increasingly falling behind more advanced Western Powers

especially those that were industrialising. This was seen by many as a major problem for the new Tsar (a view he shared). **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Alexander II emancipated the serfs. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Alexander thought serfdom was wrong. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the liberal-educated tsar agreed that serfdom needed abolition. There had been growing pressure for emancipation. There were fears of a serf revolt. There were strong economic arguments for emancipation: agriculture was inefficient, and serfs had no incentive or few opportunities to improve farming methods or yields. Russia was falling behind other countries, and if Russia were to progress and industrialise, serfs needed to be freed to help provide a new labour force. The army would be improved if serfs no longer had to be conscripted. Serfdom was seen by many as morally wrong and anachronistic. **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. develops at least some of the points as in Level 2 and links them. For example, the candidate might examine the relative significance of practical and ideological ('liberal') motives or develop the link between emancipation and the wider issue of economic, social and military reform, all seen as part of Russia moving forward like other Great Powers in Europe. **6-7**

- (c) 'Alexander II's reforms between 1855 and 1881 weakened rather than strengthened the tsarist regime.'
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

Overall, Alexander's reforms were significant, although they did not turn Russia into a modern state. Alexander III believed that the liberal reforms had undermined the autocracy, encouraged unrest and had led to his father's assassination. The truth is probably more complex. The aim of emancipation was to end serfdom without causing a major social, economic or political disruption. To a limited extent emancipation prepared the way for further modernisation, although it did not appease those like the serfs and their owners who did not benefit materially. Arguably therefore, whilst causing as much dissatisfaction as support, the measure weakened the regime – on the other hand, the possibility of serf revolts was eliminated. The legal reforms had a limited impact in some ways, although they formed the basis of the Russian legal system until 1917. The legal reforms might be seen as weakening the regime in the sense that some political trials went against the Government, and lenient sentences were handed out, but was the regime seriously under threat? Reform of local government introduced the elective principle, but the two-tier system favoured by landowners and to some extent appeased them for their loss of power over the serfs. Zemstva were essentially bodies for local administration and the Tsar rejected requests by the Moscow nobility in 1865 for a national zemstva. Therefore whatever their impact on society and administration, the zemstva did not seriously weaken the regime. Reform of the army made it more humane and with a shorter period of service, and arguably more efficient. In that sense it strengthened the regime, but not significantly, since deficiencies were still evident, e.g. in the later Russo-Japanese War. It might be argued that educational reforms weakened the regime in the long term, since the universities educated more intellectuals who were critical of the regime and sometimes engaged in anti-government activity. Religious reforms did not substantially improve the status of the church, a support of tsarism, but neither did they weaken the regime significantly. Economic reforms, e.g.

limited industrialisation, strengthened the economy to some extent; possibly they created a longer term weakness by leading concentrations of industry in which workers could more easily be organised and influenced by radical groups.

Reforms became much fewer after 1866. There was growing opposition from radical groups; but efforts such as those of the Populists were hardly successful. The only real success of radical opposition was the assassination of the Tsar. Alexander had no intention of weakening the autocracy and did not do so. It might be argued that by making any reforms at all, Alexander was opening a can of worms: once starting reform, he created further unrest and disappointment. However, some changes had to be made after 1855, and possibly Alexander succeeded by limited reform in creating the basis for a civil society and beginning modernisation without fundamentally threatening his autocracy, even if he did appear to veer between reform and reaction. Later mistakes such as those of Nicholas II cannot be blamed on Alexander II, and the problems he faced from terrorism and radicalism were not unique to Russia in late nineteenth century Europe. Therefore several lines of argument are possible: one might be simply that Alexander neither significantly strengthened nor weakened the regime – certainly it survived his assassination!

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be very generalised. At Level 2, answers will probably be descriptive, for example describing the reforms, but not significantly addressing the issue as to their impact in terms of the question. Level 3 answers will have more accuracy, range and depth, and make some specific links between the reforms and the issue of whether they strengthened or weakened the regime, although the answer may not be balanced. At Level 4 there will be good coverage and some convincing reasoning about the impact of the reforms on the regime. Additionally for Level 5, there will be sustained judgement as well as a clear analysis of the relationship of the reforms to the strength of the regime, possibly also with good perspective on the overall reign.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'The October Manifesto' in the context of the 1905 Revolution in Russia. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the October Manifesto was a list of reforms published in 1905. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the October Manifesto, by promising reforms such as a parliament, appeased some of the opponents of the regime such as liberals, and in so doing calmed the situation and helped end the 1905 Revolution. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the 1905 Revolution broke out in Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. revolution broke out because there was a lot of dissatisfaction with the way the Tsar ran the country. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Russia's failure in the Russo-

Japanese War showed major incompetence by the regime. There were longer term economic/social factors such as the impact of the population rise, backward farming, recent famines, boom and bust, dislocation caused by Witte's industrialisation. There was a larger and potentially volatile urban workforce. There were specific events such as the Bloody Sunday massacre. There were revolutionary groups plotting or agitating for overthrow of the regime. There were discontented intellectuals and Liberals who wanted constitutional reform. Nicholas II publicly set himself up against reform. Even some in the upper classes felt increasingly sidelined by the regime. **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. distinguishes between long-term, short-term and immediate causes. Longer term causes could go back to the expectations raised and dashed by reforms of two generations before; medium term might include dissatisfaction by the growing middle class which wanted a political voice, and the pressures of industrialisation and an emerging working class; short term would include specific events such as the war with Japan. Answers might link these factors and explore their relative importance, showing perspective. Answers might explore the idea that the events of 1905 were not actually a 'revolution', but this approach is not essential. **6-7**

- (c) 'The 1905 Revolution resulted in no significant change in Russia in the years up to 1914.'
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

The regime survived the 1905 Revolution for several reasons; include the disparate nature of the Revolution, lack of unity among the revolutionaries, military support for the Tsar, and the concessions offered by the regime, especially the rights and promise of a constitution outlined in the October Manifesto. However, Nicholas II had no intention of relinquishing his authority or making significant changes. After the Revolution was quelled, Nicholas II sacked Witte, whom he blamed for forcing him into concessions. The Tsar's attitude towards the new Duma was made clear in his Fundamental Laws, which emphasised his supreme power. In this sense the tsarist regime was 'shored up' and proved resistant to change. The Duma did not lead to responsible government. When the First and Second Dumas showed signs of independence and called for reform, they were dissolved. There was electoral manipulation to ensure that the Third and Fourth Dumas were more compliant, although this was never completely the case. The regime also acted firmly to punish those involved in revolution, particularly through the summary trials and executions authorised by Stolypin, who also 'managed' the Dumas until his assassination. Nicholas mostly appointed nonentities as ministers, certainly those who would not oppose him. In a sense, therefore, Nicholas had learned nothing and was just shoring up the regime.

There were some changes to meet perceived needs, but their significance can be overstated. As well as repression, Stolypin carried out some reform. The agricultural reforms were certainly designed to shore up the regime by creating a class of conservative, well off peasants, but by allowing them to break away from the mir; they were also given the chance to become more progressive farmers. Redemption dues were abolished. There were limited reforms such as

education. There was evidence of a gradually emerging 'civil society' with political parties and unions allowed. And fewer restrictions on the press.

On the other hand, many needs were not met. The agricultural reforms were only partially successful: many peasants did not break away from the mir, and farming overall remained inefficient, and the peasants a barely satisfied class. Industrial workers lived and worked in poor conditions, with few effective rights. Liberals and others wanting constitutional government could not be satisfied by the Duma experiment. The majority of Russians still felt excluded from the political process. There was considerable economic progress, especially after 1908, but it was uneven, and the benefits shared by few. There was still bitterness towards the regime's repressiveness, e.g. over the Lena massacre. The increasing number of strikes, 'economic' and 'political', after 1912, was evidence of considerable dissatisfaction.

All this suggests that not all perceived needs were met and that significant changes were few. This is not the same as saying that Revolution was inevitable – the impact of the First World War was to be a major new factor in that. But it is certainly possible to argue a case that the regime was simply being shored up before 1914, even if there is no evidence of a widespread mood to bring down the regime. Candidates might argue either that the regime was just being 'shored up' and was still very backward compared to other powers, or alternatively that it had coped well with the challenge of 1905 and was meeting the needs of many Russians to a limited extent, or at least was counting on the traditional loyalty towards the tsarist regime to sustain itself without making changes.

Answers at Level 1 will be very generalised with very limited reference to relevant events after 1905. At Level 2 there will be some range and selectivity in use of evidence, but the answer is likely to be very narrative based or descriptive in mentioning some of the events in Russia between 1905 and 1914. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth, and will make specific links between events after 1905 and the degree to which any changes were significant. However, answers may still be relatively limited in scope, although relevant, and they may not be well-balanced. At Level 4 the links between the regime's actions and other events and the degree to which change was significant will be argued more convincingly, and coverage will be good. Level 5 answers will additionally make sustained judgements and conclusions on the issue of how significant changes were.