

MARKSCHEME

November 2001

HISTORY - EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

1. Explain why the assembling of the Estates General in 1789 led to the overthrow of Louis XVI.

Candidates should be able to identify why the Estates General met, what it discussed, and what the immediate effects of its actions were on France. Weaker answers will agree with the statement assuming that there was a clear connection between the meeting and the overthrow of the Monarchy. Stronger answers will recognise that there were many alternative courses of action which could have occurred. They could refer to several key turning points: the method of voting chosen by the Estates General; the reaction to the Bastille; the events of August 1789; the Constitution of 1791; the flight to Varennes *etc.* In fact the overthrow of the Monarchy was far from inevitable in 1789.

[7 marks] maximum for simple accounts of the causes of the Revolution.

[8 to 10 marks] for informed answers with implicit explanations or comments.

[11 to 13 marks] for analytical answers which understand that the overthrow of the monarchy was not inevitable, but do not provide more than a superficial explanation of why this was the case.

[14 to 16 marks] for clearly argued analytical essays, which understand the complexities of the question.

[17+ marks] for answers that are comprehensive, consistently analytical, and which may show evidence of broad reading.

2. To what extent were Napoleon's domestic policies based upon the principles of the French Revolution?

Answers should first identify what they consider to be the principles of the Revolution. Many answers will focus on Liberté, Fraternité and Egalité, although better answers will realise that these were not achieved by 1795. Napoleon's policies can then be assessed in light of whichever definitions have been selected. Answers could include his governmental, educational, legal and financial reforms but should realise that by 1804 Napoleon was Emperor and that under Fouché the secret police were active.

Award no credit if foreign policies are the entire focus of the answer although if candidates briefly mention that domestic/foreign policies are connected, then reward appropriately.

[7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of Napoleon's domestic policies that do not relate back to the French Revolution.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of principles but only passing connection between these and Napoleon's policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of principles/policies.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, linked to principles, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that outline the principles, carefully select those policies which do/do not stem from the French Revolution, and provide a clear analysis of the relationship between both.

3. How far did the Congress System succeed in achieving the aims of its members between 1815 and 1822?

Answers should identify the aims of the Congress System. These could include restoration of monarchy, the creation of a balance of power, punishment of France (after the 100 Days), territorial readjustments, and how to deal with liberalism/nationalism. Better answers will note that the aims changed between 1815 and 1820 after the inclusion of France at Aix-la-Chapelle into the Quintuple Alliance, and after the Troppau Protocol. Answers should then assess how far these aims were achieved by the demise of the Congress System in 1822. The relationship between the Holy Alliance and the Quintuple Alliance will need to be discussed.

[7 marks] maximum for a simple account of the territorial settlements.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers that include some notion of what the Congress System was trying to do but there will be no real analysis of the aims/achievements.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which begin to analyse the aims/achievements at a superficial level.

[14 to 16 marks] for a clear cause-effect relationship with well-selected supporting material.

[17+ marks] for answers that provide a sophisticated analytical essay, which answers all parts of the question.

4. How far is it true to say that Peel's foreign policies were more effective than his domestic policies?

Peel held various offices and was involved in the Poor Law, the Reform Act and Catholic Emancipation. He established the modern Conservative Party and the Police Force and his ministry was responsible for revising the banking laws, establishing an income tax, allowing free trade and repealing the Corn Laws. Peel's foreign policies have to do with Afghanistan, France, China, Ireland and the US/Canada. The majority of answers are likely to consider his domestic policies more effective than his foreign exploits although either side could be supported.

[7 marks] maximum for a mere listing of policies without assessment.

[8 to 10 marks] for an informed account with implicit assessment or comment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment, not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for well-argued essays that balance both sides of the equation.

[17+ marks] answers will be well argued with supporting material.

5. Assess the relative importance of the roles played by Mazzini and Cavour in the unification of Italy.

This is a relatively straightforward question. Although most candidates know Cavour better than Mazzini, they should be able to identify the respective roles of the two men. For Mazzini answers should start with Young Italy, go through the Roman Republic and analyse the importance of his contribution. Cavour is easier but candidates should realise that he died in 1861! Cavour's influence in the strengthening of Piedmont, the effect of the Crimean War, Cavour and Napoleon III, and the plebiscites in the Duchies should be included. Better answers will argue that without Mazzini's interventions little would have been achieved.

[7 marks] maximum for simple accounts of the unification.

[8 to 10 marks] if there is implicit analysis or comment in an informed account.

[11 to 13 marks] for more specific essays that refer to Cavour and Mazzini with analysis which is not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical essays that relate back to Cavour and Mazzini with direct reference to their relative importance.

[17+ marks] for well-structured analysis showing depth of knowledge.

6. “While the Crimean War was essentially an unimportant conflict in an insignificant place its results were irreversible.” How far do you agree with this statement?

Candidates have a free rein in how to interpret the question. It is possible to argue that it was important or unimportant, the place was significant or insignificant and its results were reversible or irreversible. Any permutation of the above is acceptable. It is important for answers to cite evidence to support their claims. Another factor, which is important, is from which viewpoint each of these perspectives is taken – Britain, the Ottoman Empire, Russia *etc.* The most common tack will probably be that the conflict was relatively unimportant, the place was insignificant but the results – the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the weakening of Austria, leading to the unification of Italy and the rise of Prussia – were irreversible. Keep an open mind when awarding marks here.

[7 marks] maximum for simple accounts of the war.

[8 to 10 marks] for essays that only answer one part of the question.

[11 to 13 marks] if there is some attempt at analysis although this will be relatively unsophisticated.

[14 to 16 marks] for an answer that is more focused on all parts of the question, and which is analytical and well organised.

[17+ marks] for answers that demonstrate accurate, well-selected knowledge, which supports a sophisticated line of argument, and where all components of the question have been treated equally.

7. How successful was Bismarck as Chancellor in his foreign policies between 1862 and 1890?

An easy question, which will be popular, but the dates may cause concern as they include all of his years in office. Weaker answers will only mention the wars of unification up to 1870, but better answers will then discuss the importance of the Eastern Question (1877 onwards), the Berlin Conference, the formation of the Triple Alliance and the role of the Dreikaiserbund. Candidates must evaluate these policies rather than merely describe them if they are to receive high marks.

If only part of the chronology is covered award up to **[12 marks]** depending on how comprehensively the essay deals with the policies.

[7 marks] for simple description of the policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers that have no evaluation.

[11 to 13 marks] for analysis, not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers that assess the success of the policies and provide an explanation of the basis upon which this assessment was made.

[17+ marks] for answers that cover the entire chronology, evaluate the policies, and provide sound evidence to support their arguments.

8. “The key change in industrial development was the replacement of competitive industrial capitalism by monopoly capitalism.” Discuss the truth of this statement by referring to *two* specific examples from Europe in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

This will not be a popular question. Candidates are free to choose their examples although England, France and Germany will be the most likely choices. If only one example is included award no more than **[12 marks]**. Ensure that answers focus on the phrase “key change” rather than simply cataloguing industrial differences. Better answers should provide some explanation of the terms “industrial capitalism” and “monopoly capitalism”. The essay must focus on the dates 1875 to 1900 although brief mention may be made outside this time frame.

[7 marks] for a simple listing of industrial changes.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers which describe in rather more detail whatever changes are selected.

[11 to 13 marks] for analysis which is not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for good comparisons with balance of industrial/monopoly capitalism.

[17+ marks] answers will be well argued, analytical, with soundly chosen examples.

9. **By referring to *two* specific examples, discuss the effects of the increase in democratic representation in Europe (excluding Scandinavia) between 1850 and 1900.**

Here again candidates have a free rein. England, France and Germany will probably be the preferred countries. If only one country is covered award no more than **[12 marks]**. The question asks for the “effect” of the increase in the franchise, not merely for a description of the way in which voting patterns changed. Again candidates must keep to the time frame but do not penalise answers which relate back to key issues (e.g. Reform Act 1832 in England).

10. **Why did the French Republic, which appeared so unstable, survive between 1875 and 1914?**

It is something of a paradox that, although French governments changed with amazing regularity, French politics remained remarkably stable. The reason is that the people stayed in office while parties and governments changed. The professional classes provided the majority of the deputies and this group was also stable. Candidates can include the crises – among them the Panama Scandal, the Dreyfus Affair, the Boulanger crisis. They can also discuss economic growth, the relationship between the Church and the State, the numerous strikes, and the rise of socialism but essentially the Third Republic did last and was not unstable.

[7 marks] maximum for essays which only provide a partial description of the events.

[8 to 10 marks] if there is some attempt at evaluation.

[11 to 13 marks] for greater depth of knowledge and more analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers that critically assess the Third Republic’s stability and support this with some basis for the judgement.

[17+ marks] if the knowledge, understanding and analysis are superior.

11. **Assess the effect of the development of constitutional government on the inhabitants of any *one* Scandinavian country in the nineteenth *or* twentieth centuries.**

The question asks for candidates to select a country. In the IB History Guide Finland is listed as a possible choice as well as the more geographically correct Scandinavian countries. Candidates must not merely discuss how constitutional government came about, but must show what effects this change had on the people. Better answers might include minority groups, or the changing role of women, while weaker answers would include all the inhabitants under one grouping. Candidates should not be unduly penalised if both centuries are covered although essays that do this will penalise themselves as they will not have sufficient content when compared to essays that have followed the correct rubric.

[7 marks] maximum for a simple account of developments.

[8 to 10 marks] for an account of changes with implicit assessment or comment.

[11 to 13 marks] for some evaluation supported by satisfactory knowledge.

[14 to 16 marks] for clear cause-effect relationships and more critical analysis.

[17+ marks] if the knowledge, understanding and analysis are superior.

12. How far did the achievements of Alexander II, between 1855 and 1881, justify his claim to be the “Tsar Liberator”?

This will be popular and candidates generally know Alexander well. Weaker answers will just list the military, administrative, judicial, and educational reforms or overemphasise the Emancipation of the Serfs. Better answers will define and explain the term “Tsar Liberator” and the strongest answers must attempt to show how justified this phrase really is.

[7 marks] maximum for essays which are vague and unfocused.

[8 to 10 marks] for essays that only describe the reforms.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers with some analytical commentary although this may not be very sophisticated.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of the rationale behind the reforms and sound knowledge of the reforms themselves.

[17+ mark] answers are likely to include some historiography or have a well-developed critical slant as well as sound analysis and knowledge.

13. “Economically advanced, but politically backward.” How far do you agree with this assessment of Germany under Wilhelm II between 1890 and 1914?

Candidates shy away from questions on Wilhelminian Germany so this is unlikely to be a popular choice. There are plenty of statistics that would support the first part of the question: population growth, industrial productivity, agricultural output could all usefully be included. The negative aspects of this expansion include the expansion of cities although this had direct political effects. Politically candidates should include the legacy of Bismarck’s system, the role of Caprivi, Hohenlohe, and Bulow, the changing nature of the Reichstag, and the effect of Wilhelm’s foreign policies. Most candidates will probably broadly agree with the statement but make sure that better answers include enough accurate and detailed evidence that supports their arguments.

[7 marks] maximum for essays which are vague and unfocused.

[8 to 10 marks] for a listing of factors which demonstrate Germany’s strength without reference to politics.

[11 to 13 marks] for a balanced account of economic developments and political changes with some analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers showing critical assessment.

[17+ marks] for answers with linkage, analysis and well-supported arguments.

14. Why did World War One start in 1914 and not earlier?

This will be a popular question but beware of essays that are not specifically focused on the question. The general causes: the Alliance System, militarism, and imperial rivalries will provide the basis for many answers but a simple argument, that as a result of these the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in 1914 made war inevitable, is not sufficient. Candidates are expected to be able to analyse the July Crisis, the effect of the “blank cheque” and the state of military preparedness of the Great Powers to gain high marks. There is also a considerable amount of historiography, which could be brought in, for example, Fischer, Taylor, Ritter, Joll, Erdmann, and Geiss *etc.* Make sure that, if historians’ views are included, these are supporting arguments rather than merely being used to supposedly indicate wider reading

[7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of the causes of the war.

[8 to 10 marks] if there are signs of an argument being included.

[11 to 13 marks] for better answers that focus on the date, may refer back to the long-term causes, and could provide some simple cause-effect relationships.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured essays which show an awareness of most of the key issues with a more sophisticated level of argument.

[17+ marks] if there is extended critical analysis or properly used historiography.

15. Why did the Reds win the Russian Civil War (1918 to 1921)?

The reasons are relatively straightforward. The Reds controlled the industrial centres; Trotsky reorganised the Army; the nationalities were divided in their intentions, as were the Allies; “war communism” was introduced; the ordinary people detested the Whites more than the Reds; and Lenin remained the leader of Russia. The answer requires very little, if any, details of the actual fighting of the war itself.

[7 marks] maximum for simple outlines of the Civil War.

[8 to 10 marks] for accounts with implicit explanation or comments on the reasons behind the Reds’ success.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit but simplistic explanations with supporting evidence.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers showing consistent analysis and clear cause-effect relationships.

[17+ marks] for sophisticated essays which demonstrate knowledge, understanding and analysis of the question.

16. Why did the League of Nations fail to achieve its aim of disarmament between 1920 and 1939?

The specific focus of the answer must be disarmament. Beware of candidates who see this question as a “successes and failures” of the League of Nations answer. One of the main aims of the League of Nations was disarmament, which was clearly identified in the Covenant. Some candidates will mistakenly include the League of Nations as being part of Treaty of Versailles, and although some passing reference is justifiable, the Treaty of Versailles should not be the focus of the essay. Locarno and Kellogg-Briand should be mentioned, as should the Washington, London and Geneva Disarmament Conferences (although Washington and London have more to do with Pacific region). Ultimately candidates must deal with the aggression of Hitler and Mussolini, the attitudes of Britain and France, and the weaknesses in enforcement of decisions in the Covenant.

[7 marks] maximum for answers that demonstrate sound knowledge that is unfocused on the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers with some critical commentary but at a relatively simplistic level.

[11 to 13 marks] disarmament must be the focus but do not expect the analysis to be well developed.

[14 to 16 marks] answers should include the specific disarmament aims of the League of Nations with some analysis of at least two of the points mentioned above.

[17+ marks] for answers that are comprehensive and consistently analytical.

17. “The key factor was their control of the media.” How far does this statement explain the success of Mussolini and Hitler in retaining power in Italy and Germany respectively?

Candidates are usually not well prepared for questions to do with media and this could include a variety of forms - radio, newspapers, posters and cinema. Control in Germany will probably be better known than in Italy. Be careful not to expect exactly equal coverage. Better candidates will argue that, while control of the media was important, there were other reasons that need to be included such as the totalitarian nature of the regimes and the use of force. The question is about the retention of power, so essays should start in 1922 for Mussolini and 1933 for Hitler. Material on the respective rise to power of the two dictators should not receive any credit.

[7 marks] maximum for answers which provide a mere description of media without relating them to power.

[8 to 10 marks] for informed answers with relevant commentary.

[11 to 13 marks] for analysis which is not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for balanced, running comparisons that have detailed knowledge of media use by the two dictators.

[17+ marks] for answers that are balanced, have depth and detail, and are convincingly argued.

If only one country is included mark up to *[12]* if there is focus on the question. Better answers which argue that media alone was important should be judged on the quality of any supporting evidence.

18. What consequences did Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War have for Spain up to his death in 1975?

Following his success in 1939 Franco established a fascist single-party state. In the Second World War Spain was a "nonbelligerent", but was favourable to Hitler and Mussolini. Surprisingly, for some people, Franco remained in power after 1945 and Spain was "quarantined" by the United Nations which had the effect of increasing Franco's power. Conservative forces such as the army, the church, landowners gained influence and a two-party system of government was established although the power still belonged to Franco. Later the church opposed his policies and this led to the formation of Opus Dei. Poverty increased although popular discontent remained under control until 1955 when widespread strikes took place. Eventually Carrero Blanco took over much of the administration until 1969 when Juan Carlos was named as Franco's successor. The 1970s were years of turmoil in Spain with Catalan/Basque movements becoming stronger. The events in Portugal threatened Spain although Juan Carlos steered Spain to democracy by 1979.

Beware of weaker candidates who only know the Civil War and little else. These are unlikely to get more than **[5 marks]**.

[7 marks] maximum for simple accounts of Franco's policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers which show knowledge and implicit analysis or commentary on consequences.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that successfully link Franco's policies with events in Spain but are not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for well focused answers which include consistent analysis and detail.

[17+ marks] for answers that show detailed knowledge, sound understanding and superior analysis.

19. How significant was the year 1941 for the course of the Second World War?

Make sure that the essays are European-based. Passing mention to Pearl Harbor is appropriate but this should not be the focus of the essay and weaker candidates may make this mistake. There is considerable evidence to indicate that 1941 was the turning point of the Second World War. Better answers could include The Atlantic Charter, the capture of Tobruk, Hitler's invasion of Russia, and the subsequent loss of military support for his policies. Hitler became more introspective after this date, and recent historiography suggests that his dictatorship became increasingly unpopular after 1941.

Candidates can take several positions on this question. Some will agree with the date, others will choose other dates, probably 1944, arguing that these were more significant. Providing that claims are supported by accurate knowledge reward these essays accordingly.

[7 marks] maximum for generalisations that have no evidence behind them.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers with implicit analysis of significance or informed, relevant comments.

[11 to 13 marks] for analysis which is not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with consistent analysis, which make a convincing case, and show why a particular year is significant.

[17+ marks] for essays which show detailed knowledge superior analysis and sophisticated arguments.

20. How successful was Soviet foreign policy under Khrushchev?

Candidates should know the entire range of policies. This is a European paper so the focus must be on Europe. Passing mention may be made of Cuba, the Suez Crisis and the Sino-Soviet split. Policies/events in Europe which better answers could include are the establishment of the Warsaw Pact, the "peace offensive", Poznan, Hungary, Berlin, Turkey, Vienna, the Eastern European satellite states, Albania and Yugoslavia. Opinions will vary on whether these policies were successful or not but, in order to achieve high marks, there must be some assessment of the success or otherwise of Khrushchev's policies.

[7 marks] maximum for confused and vague answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers that only mention two or three policies and which are largely non-Europe based.

[11 to 13 marks] for discussion of selected European policies linked to analysis even though they may only present one side of the argument.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers that evaluate these policies in greater depth presenting the idea that some were successful and others not.

[17+ marks] for essays which show detailed knowledge, superior analysis and sophisticated arguments.

21. Why, after dominating the political life of France after 1958, did Charles de Gaulle resign in 1969?

Answers should focus both on de Gaulle's "special election" of 1962 which sought to reinforce his authority and his second term from 1965 to 1969 which culminated in his defeat in a national referendum forcing his retirement. The 1962 election was a repudiation of the traditional parliamentary leadership and showed that the voters wanted change. De Gaulle's nuclear policy was the catalyst for much opposition. By 1965 Mitterand was becoming a clear threat, and was rallying support against de Gaulle. Policies such as advocating a return to the gold standard; support for the autonomy of French Canada; the withdrawal from NATO; and the events of May 1968 which reduced France to virtual anarchy led to increased discontent in France. Despite a year's reprieve the high costs of wage increases, de Gaulle's refusal to devalue the franc, and the proposed administrative change for France, cost de Gaulle the referendum.

This is not a difficult question but candidates must not digress into Algerian affairs.

[7 marks] maximum for simple outlines of policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for general description with implicit analysis or comments.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis but limited development.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers that demonstrate the ability to provide accurate knowledge that supports a persuasive and critical argument.

[17+ marks] for essays which show detailed knowledge, superior analysis and sophisticated arguments.

22. How important for Europe and for Yugoslavia was Tito's refusal to allow Yugoslavia to be part of the Soviet bloc after 1945?

After being expelled from Cominform in 1948 Yugoslavia was forced to trade with the West and compromise its Marxist ideology. By 1951 the West had increased its financial support to Yugoslavia and had indicated that they would not allow it to be drawn into the Eastern bloc. Yugoslavia thus became a symbol of embarrassment to the USSR and a beacon of hope for other Eastern European states, such as Hungary in 1956. After 1955 relations became "normalised" between the USSR and Yugoslavia, but the latter was always a thorn in the side of the Soviet Union. Albania and, later, Romania were influenced by Tito's example in the 1960s. Yugoslavia condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and Afghanistan in 1980. Essentially then the decision not to join the Soviet bloc was extremely important both for Europe and Yugoslavia.

[7 marks] for answers which are vague and unfocused.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers that only describe the events with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for accounts with commentary or some explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers showing sound knowledge of the events themselves and which justify the basis upon which their importance both to Europe and Yugoslavia is assessed.

[17+ marks] answers are likely to include a well-developed critical slant as well as sound analysis and knowledge.

If only Europe or Yugoslavia is included mark up to *[12]*.

- 23. To what extent do you agree with the view that “terrorism is a justifiable weapon in the arsenal of European politics if it is the only means through which success may be achieved”?**

It will be interesting to see how candidates approach this question. Obvious examples could include the RAF in Germany; the Baader-Meinhof group; Action Directe in France; Northern Ireland; ETA in Spain; Turkish terrorism; or the Red Brigade in Italy. There is no definitive answer for this question and the awarding of marks will depend on how well candidates argue that terrorism is, or is not, justifiable. One example would be sufficient but ensure that there is adequate knowledge to support the arguments and that essays are not simplistic generalisations based on superficial material.

[7 marks] maximum for a mere listing of terrorist actions.

[8 to 10 marks] for accounts with implicit analysis or comments.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that define terrorism and make a superficial analysis of their justifiability.

[14 to 16 marks] for well argued essays that identify and justify/relate the quotation based on well chosen examples.

[17+ marks] for answers that are knowledgeable, comprehensive, analytical and balanced.

- 24. What were the most important effects of Salazar’s domestic policies in Portugal between 1932 and 1968?**

Salazar became Prime Minister in 1932 and established Portugal as a corporative “new state” with a one-party government. He was a strong supporter of the Catholic Church, kept Portugal neutral during the Second World War and was largely supported by landowners, bankers and industrialists. Opposition was ruthlessly suppressed including trade unions and the press. Social and political change was resisted. The direction answers take will depend on which political position vis-à-vis Salazar the candidate takes.

[7 marks] maximum for a mere listing of policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for accounts with implicit analysis or comments.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that select policies and make a superficial attempt at showing their effects.

[14 to 16 marks] for well-argued essays that identify key domestic policies and clearly demonstrate their effects.

[17+ marks] for answers that are knowledgeable, comprehensive and balanced.

25. What factors led to the reunification of Germany in 1990?

This question requires detailed knowledge of the short-term and immediate background to the events of 1989 and 1990 both in Germany and in Europe. Candidates should start with Gorbachev's policies of "glasnost" and "perestroika" and proceed with an account of what happened to demonstrate which factors were important. "People power" in Poland and Czechoslovakia led to the rejection of traditional pro-Soviet governments which, by October 1989, had led to mass movements of people out of East Germany through Hungary and Czechoslovakia. East Germany relaxed travel restrictions, the Wall came down in 1989, and free elections were held in December 1990. Events in Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary contributed to the movement for democratic government. The actions of key leaders like Gorbachev, Kohl Honecker, and Krenz were crucial factors determining the bloodless outcome. Some candidates might draw parallels with China in 1989. Allow credit for deeper causes which could go back to Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik and the decline of the Soviet Empire under Brezhnev.

[7 marks] maximum for vague and unfocused answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for accounts of the events with implicit analysis or comments.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis, not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers that show clear linkage between policies and actions and identify some key factors.

[17+ marks] for detailed knowledge, accurate identification of key factors, and the inclusion of a critical cause-effect analysis.
