**Assess the view that opponents of the rulers of Russia were consistently ineffective in the period from 1855 to 1964.**

* Key Words
* Key Theme to focus on
* My argument and counter-argument
* My probable overall judgement

Some things to consider

1. What does it mean for an opposition to be effective?
	1. Changing things?
	2. Meeting their aims?
	3. Assassinations? Revolutions?
2. Consistently ineffective – is there a change to their level of effectiveness over time? Peaks of effectiveness?
3. I’ve got to cover the whole period – make sure I have Khrushchev!

My Introduction – Set up your parameters – how will you assess whether opposition was *consistently* ineffective?

What can I focus each paragraph on to enable me to then write synoptically, cross-referencing and comparing several rulers in each paragraph (if not sentence by sentence)?

Suggestions

* P1 How consistently effectively did opposition change **the way Russia was ruled**?
* P2 How consistently effectively did opposition resist or change **the policy of Russian rulers**?
* P3 How consistently effectively did the opposition meet its changing **aims** in the period?
* P1 How consistently effective was **political** opposition?
* P2 How consistently effective was opposition from **workers**?
* P3 How consistently effective was opposition from different **ethnic** groups?

My conclusion

My Introduction – Set up your parameters – how will you assess whether opposition was *consistently* ineffective?

What can I focus each paragraph on to enable me to then write synoptically, cross-referencing and comparing several rulers in each paragraph (if not sentence by sentence)?

* At first glance it seems that opposition to Tsarist rulers became more effective in **changing the way Russia was ruled** and achieved the Tsars overthrow in 1917, whereas under the communists was consistently ineffective in changing Russian government itself.
* This view of more increasingly effective opposition under the Tsars and consistently ineffective opposition under the Communists is re-enforced by the failure of opposition under the communists to resist unpopular **policies** like war communism and collectivisation, which contrast with the reforms that Tsarists brought in following peasant unrest.
* However, if we look at the nature of the changes that opposition seems to have won we can see that, with the exception of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and the opposition to Khrushchev in 1963 and 64 it was consistently a failure across the period because **it failed to meet any of its aims.**

My conclusion

My Introduction – Set up your parameters – how will you assess whether opposition was *consistently* ineffective?

What can I focus each paragraph on to enable me to then write synoptically, cross-referencing and comparing several rulers in each paragraph (if not sentence by sentence)?

* **political** opposition was consistently ineffective throughout the period, with two exceptions in 1917 and 1964 because it consistently failed to meet its aims.
* Opposition from **workers** was in-consistently effective across the period because agricultural workers were more likely to win changes to policy than industrial workers. However even when the workers successfully opposed Russian rulers, their success was often short lived.
* Overall opposition from **ethnic** groups was inconsistently effective. Several groups won concessions, autonomy and even independence, whereas others were more consistently repressed and failed in their opposition.

My conclusion
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