



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative F Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 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 © 2007 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 2007

Alternative F: Tsarist and Revolutionary Russia, 1855–1917

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

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the significance of ‘the demand for a Constituent Assembly’ (lines 3 and 4) in the context of developments in the months between the two revolutions of 1917.

(3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. recognises that the Constituent Assembly was a form of parliament. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. recognises that although the Tsar had been forced out, power had been assumed by a non-elected Provisional Government. Although the Government introduced reforms, it recognised that it did not have the mandate, and therefore a key part of its programme was to arrange elections for a proper parliament to represent the ‘new Russia’. All political groups welcomed this, except for the Bolsheviks, who at Lenin’s insistence regarded such an assembly as a meaningless ‘bourgeois’ institution which could not represent the interests of the workers. Answers may comment on the fact that the promised elections were postponed for several months, largely because of the war situation, although this is not necessary for full marks. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source B** challenges the views expressed in **Source A** about supporting the Provisional Government and its policies. (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 A expresses support for the Provisional Government, whereas Source B is opposed to it. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. explains that the Kadets like most political groups supported the Provisional Government, and indeed were part of it. The Kadets hoped for a continued and successful prosecution of the war, but also internal reform based on ‘law, equality

and freedom', which they obviously hoped the Provisional Government could deliver. Whilst recognising that there were class and other differences within Russia, the Kadets are appealing for Russians to forget these in a spirit of reconciliation for the benefit of the country. In contrast, Lenin in Source B expresses clear opposition to the Government, to which the Bolsheviks do not belong, and Lenin refers to its 'false promises'. Whilst not necessarily opposing the war, Lenin is only prepared to support it if the Government becomes a radical workers' and peasants' government. In other words, far from calling for an end to class differences like the Kadets, Lenin openly bases his policy on class warfare. He seeks a radical regime based on the popularly-elected soviets, and a far-reaching political and economic policy involving attacks on land ownership and 'abolition' of organs like the police, army, bureaucracy, used to maintain the fabric of society. **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. based upon the content and timing of the sources. Source A was written by a party, which whilst previously opposed to many aspects of the tsarist regime, was moderate compared to the Bolsheviks, and the Kadets believed in reform rather than a radical overhaul of society. Source A was also written just after the February/March Revolution when the mood was euphoric and there was hope that the new Government would be able to establish order, unity, and successfully continue the war. In contrast, Lenin's piece was written two months later on his return to Russia. Lenin was more radical even than his own party, which had expressed conditional support for the Government immediately after the Revolution. Lenin here is partly fighting his own internal battle to impose his leadership and views on the Party, but his message is clear: unlike the Kadets, he is unequivocally opposed to the Government, and by implication will seize any opportunity to overturn it and bring about a 'second', genuinely Socialist, revolution.

6-7

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

Explain the importance of the continuation of the First World War, in relation to other factors, in explaining the second revolution in Russia 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

The sources give some indication that the continuation of the First World War was a significant factor in the upheavals which took place in Russia in 1917. Source A does not give any direct pointers towards the second Revolution, but the references to the need for organisation and unity to defeat the external enemy suggest that the war was a significant threat to stability. This is also implied by Source B: after all, if a country is at war the call of a political party to attack the government and abolish the army and police was not likely to aid the war effort – although candidates might point out that Lenin’s view at this time was not representative of the majority. Source C suggests that the war was a significant factor: the Bolshevik slogan of peace (which would also pave the way for reform) was seen as a major factor in their winning support. Other factors mentioned, such as economic difficulties, are clearly also associated with the war situation. It is also implied that the Army might be a significant factor, the more so if the country was at war. Therefore the sources at least imply that the war was a factor in political uncertainty and/or revolution, without always making the links explicit.

Own knowledge should indicate that continuation of the war was an important factor in the second revolution, although not the only factor. Many of Russia's problems since 1914 had been caused directly by the war or had been exacerbated by it. After a brief 'honeymoon' for the Provisional Government, this continued to be the case. Economic problems were significant: the war was very expensive and had seriously contributed to massive problems such as inflation, which continued after February 1917. Morale had been hit by a string of defeats against the Central Powers, which led to massive casualties and loss of territory, and this continued after February, for example in the failure of Kerensky's summer offensive. Many Russians wanted peace, and the failure of the government to deliver victory or peace seriously diminished its authority. Whether the Provisional Government could have survived if it had not faced a major war is debatable, although of course it might well not have come to power in the first place without the debilitating effects of three years of war since 1914. Other factors were also important in the Provisional Government's failure. The Government faced inherent threats to its authority, particularly since it was not elected. It faced internal opposition from the Soviet, and initial failures led to a draining of support and to political crises such as the July days and the Kornilov Revolt. The Provisional Government failed to deal with major problems such as land reform and did not hold the promised elections for a Constituent Assembly. These factors were of course linked to the war, since it was largely the war situation which led to a postponement of elections and several reforms. Those reforms that the Provisional Government did carry out, such as the release of political prisoners, actually worked against it by allowing revolutionaries such as Lenin the opportunity to cause trouble. The role of individuals like Lenin and groups like the Bolsheviks was also important: Lenin was very skilful at taking advantage of the difficulties faced by the Government, for example during the Kornilov Revolt, and the relative unity and organisation of the Bolsheviks enabled them to exploit a volatile political situation. It is of course difficult to totally separate the war from "other factors", because often they were intertwined, and this created a revolutionary situation without making a successful revolution 'inevitable'.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a narrative of events leading to the second Revolution, without explicitly addressing the question. At Level 2 there will be a greater range and selectivity of evidence and description will be supported with accurate knowledge and/or use of sources. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth and make some links between the impact of war and other factors e.g. linking the decline in morale caused by the Provisional Government's failure in war with growing support for the Bolsheviks; and there will be use of the sources *and* own knowledge. At Level 4 the quality of argument will be stronger and there will be a good understanding of the relationship between different factors leading to the second revolution, including military, economic and political factors. Level 5 responses will be particularly effective in recognising the complexity of the various factors, will probably cross reference sources and own knowledge, and will make well argued conclusions about the second revolution.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'autocratic powers of government' in the context of tsarist power in Alexander II's reign. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. recognition that autocracy means dictatorial or one-man rule, or that Alexander II had a lot of power. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. understanding that Alexander II, like other Tsars, had great power as a 'divine right' monarch, without having his power restricted by a parliament or other institution. Answers at the top of the level might well recognise that although Alexander II carried out several reforms, none of them significantly reduced his own power or that of his government. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Alexander II's reforms failed to satisfy all those who were seeking change in Russia in the years 1855 to 1881. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that Alexander II carried out some reforms or else that people in Russia were unhappy. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining why Alexander II's reforms did not satisfy most of those seeking change in Russia. Those, including peasants, who had initially welcomed the emancipation of the serfs, were disappointed with the terms, especially the redemption payments; land hunger and the pressure of the rise in population made the rural situation worse. Although there was some liberalisation of the universities, education for most Russians remained limited. The zemstvos did not satisfy those seeking a significant voice in government at a national level. Legal reforms represented progress, but did not cover political offences. There was nothing in the reforms to satisfy radicals and intellectuals who wanted real change: the political structure, and especially the power of the Tsar, was untouched. Those who put their faith in a form of popular socialism were equally dissatisfied. Disappointment was increased when the pace of what reform there was slackened after the Polish Revolt and attempts on the Tsar's life. **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 the distinction between different groups wanting "change" (liberal 'westernisers', Slavophiles, Populists, nihilists, anarchists etc) and the degree to which particular reforms could satisfy these groups, and indeed considers the impact of those reforms. There will certainly be an awareness that although individual reforms were important, they did not radically alter the nature of the regime or Russian society – in other words, there is an explicit link between reform, change and expectations. **6-7**

- (c) 'Tsarist Russia changed little in the years 1861 to 1894 because opposition to the regime lacked strength and unity.'
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

"Opposition" in terms of this question can be taken to mean both 'intellectual opposition' and actual 'resistance'. Tsarist Russia did not change much in these years. Alexander II carried out some significant reforms: notably the emancipation of the serfs, military reforms, university reform, a reduction in censorship, legal reforms leading to more openness in civil trials, the zemstvo initiative leading to some reform in local government. However, the overall impact of these reforms was limited, and the fundamental nature of society did not alter. The majority of peasants remained tied to the land, poor, and subject to the dictates of the *mir*. Central government controlled the chief levers of power such as the police. Education was still limited. Crucially, tsarism remained an unrepresentative autocracy, with policies largely dependent on the whims of the tsar. Under Alexander III, influenced by reactionaries such as Pobedonostev, the very notion of change was anathema, and was held responsible for the assassination of Alexander II. Although not all reforms were abolished, there were new limitations such as the appointment of Land Captains, restoring to the nobility some of their traditional powers in the countryside. Reactionary policies such as russification were pursued, censorship reinforced, and the secret police was active in preventing political change.

These factors alone signified a society either afraid of change or confident in its existing policies. However, it is also true that opposition was lacking in strength and unity, and therefore the prospect of real change was even more remote. Intellectual opposition was largely split between 'westerners' who favoured liberalisation or constitutional developments on Western European lines, and Slavophiles who rejected the West in favour of what they saw as Russian values, and in some cases put their faith in the peasants. Populist groups favoured a sort of peasant socialism, but had no backing from the peasants themselves. Radical groups,

sometimes terrorist in character, could hit the headlines with acts such as the assassination of Alexander II, but lacked the support to threaten the system itself. Intellectual movements like Marxism were only just beginning to develop and were very limited in size and impact. There were nihilist groups which had no real philosophy beyond attacking the system. None of these groups had real strength, they certainly could not agree amongst themselves, and even had they shown signs of wanting to unite, would have found it difficult in a society in which an autocratic regime controlled the media, and in which there was no outlet for open political discussion or 'loyal' opposition, a police state was in operation, and the regime in any case could still count upon great reserves of traditional loyalty. Those 'groups' such as an emerging middle class were not seeking to overturn the regime or society and would certainly not support minority activist groups. The real pressures for change which were gradually emerging in late nineteenth century Russia were not caused by the activities of individuals or groups but by economic and social forces such as pressure on land ownership and the beginnings of industrialisation. These led amongst other things to the development of some cities and industrial centres, which created new social pressures and potential political ones. Had particular opposition groups developed more strength and unity, which would have been difficult in any case, it is by no means certain that this would have led to any real change in this particular period, given the conservative nature of tsarist politics and society.

Level 1 answers will probably be generalised, possibly containing the smatterings of examples of change or opposition. Level 2 answers will contain some focus on 'change' and opposition, but will be mainly descriptive and there will be little attempt to focus on the link between change and opposition or to analyse the nature of the opposition. Level 3 answers should attempt to address the links, although the range of material and the quality of argument will be limited or unbalanced. At Level 4 the analysis of Russia during this period, and the discussion of the strength and unity of the opposition, will be reasonably balanced and broad. Level 5 answers will address the links clearly, and discuss the nature of the regime and opposition, reaching conclusions which are well argued and supported with evidence.

Question 3

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

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a bald statement that the October Manifesto was a tsarist document issued during the 1905 Revolution. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a recognition of the fact that the Manifesto promised limited constitutional reform and individual citizen's rights, designed to defuse the revolutionary discontent. There may be an explanation of the impact of the Manifesto, e.g. it helped to divide the liberals from the radicals, and thereby helped the regime to survive, but this approach is not essential to gain the marks. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the dumas did not significantly change the tsarist regime in the years 1906 to 1914. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. a basic description of the Dumas without examining their impact. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. there will probably be an explanation of the Government's attitude towards the Dumas with an explanation of their make-up and activities during this period. Although the 1906 constitution was outwardly quite radical, giving Russia an elected national assembly, the Tsar's attitude was shown by the Fundamental Laws, which emphasised his personal power. Ministers were still responsible to the Tsar for their power, there was an Upper House, and the Dumas had no real control over finances or ministers. The Tsar could rule by decree when the Duma was not in session. The First Duma was boycotted by left-wing groups. The Duma made some liberal demands such as land reform and so it was dismissed by a hostile Tsar. The Second Duma (1907) contained a range of parties from left to right, and constant arguments prevented progress before its dismissal after three and a half months. The electoral system, which was already by indirect 'college' voting, was then changed to favour conservative parties. Hence the Third and Fourth Dumas between 1907 and 1914 were much longer lasting, because the conservative majorities were manipulated by ministers, especially Stolypin. There was some criticism of the Government, and some legislation was passed, e.g. to improve health insurance and primary education, but there was no radical change and no real opportunity to hold Tsarist Governments to account. – although by 1914, at least political parties had become firmly established, so there had been limited political advance, albeit with the Tsarist autocracy seemingly securely still in place. **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. making the connection between Government/Tsarist attitudes and the changing nature of the Dumas themselves. **6-7**

- (c) 'By 1914 Nicholas II and his governments had recovered from the shock of the 1905 Revolution.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

In 1914 Nicholas II and his regime appeared to be securely in power, and had made a good comeback from the fright received in the 1905 Revolution. Although there was an increase in discontent evident in events such as the 1912 Lena Goldfields massacre and a number of politically motivated strikes after 1912, the Government seemed secure, and entered the war in 1914 to an outpouring of patriotic support. The regime survived 1905 for several reasons. The 1905 Revolution had not been an organised national uprising, but a reaction to the Russo-Japanese War and a series of other events such as Bloody Sunday, the Potemkin Mutiny, strikes and protests. Although they fed off each other to some extent, the events were not coordinated, nor could they be, since discontent ranged from the activities of political groups wanting moderate constitutional reform to revolutionaries wanting an overthrow of the system. Once the regime realised this and kept its nerve, it was able to reassert control. It retained the support of the bulk of the army. Witte advised concession, and the October Manifesto and the promise of the Dumas split the moderates, who were prepared to give the regime a chance and did not want revolution themselves, from revolutionaries like the Bolsheviks who found themselves isolated. After 1905, particularly under Stolypin, a combination of reform and repression helped to keep the regime secure, especially since it could still count to a large extent on traditional reserves of loyalty towards the tsar. Revolutionary activists were ruthlessly executed, imprisoned or exiled. There was moderate reform in areas like education. Stolypin's land reforms may not have had an enormous impact, but did show recognition of the fact that peasants wanted a stake in the land and freedom from debt, not revolution. Manipulation of the Dumas kept the regime largely free from parliamentary interference or control. Although there

are different interpretations of how stable the regime was in 1914, the essential fact is that the regime was still in control, which had not seemed likely to be the case ten years before.

Level 1 answers will make generalised, brief, undeveloped statements about events between 1905 and 1914, probably not directed at the question. Level 2 answers will be mostly descriptive of events and therefore relevant, but will not seriously address the issue of how and why the regime recovered from 1905. Level 3 answers will address the question, and have some explanation of the recovery, but will be limited in range and may lack balance. At Level 4 there will be a reasonably broad analysis of issues such as the Duma period and Stolypin's policies, linked to the issue of success and stability. At Level 5 the judgement will be more extensive and sustained, with a clear link between the various factors and probably a good perspective on how the situation in 1914 compared with 1905.