

# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2003**

**HISTORY - EUROPE**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

**1. To what extent was an outdated monarchy the cause of the 1789 French Revolution?**

In 1789 the French monarchy was part of the “ancien regime”, and was regarded as in need of modernization, because it was expensive, autocratic – the States General had not met since 1614 – inefficient (administratively, politically and financially) and bankrupt. The present king and queen, Louis XVI, and Marie Antoinette, were unpopular. The monarchy had preserved numerous feudal privileges and was associated with the privileged positions of the aristocracy and the Church. The nobles had their own grievances against the monarchy; they wanted a share in the government. The bourgeoisie wanted to play their part in all aspects of French life, and the peasants wished to be freed from feudal dues and pay less tax.

Candidates might discuss all the above under an outdated monarchy, or separate the financial elements, perhaps noting expensive wars. In any case other points to include in “to what extent” could be the philosophers, the example of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and economic grievances.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate general causes of the French Revolution.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of causes with implicit emphasis on “outdated monarchy”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit focus and explanation of “outdated monarchy”.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a structured, focused analysis of “outdated monarchy”.

*[17+ marks]* for an apt consideration of “to what extent” or an in-depth analysis of the position of the monarchy in 1789.

**2. Evaluate the results for France, and for Europe, of Napoleon Bonaparte’s foreign policy.**

Some candidates will probably start with Napoleon’s campaigns in 1796, whilst others may begin in 1799, or 1802. As the question calls him Napoleon Bonaparte, any of the three dates could be used. However a narrative of his campaigns should not be the focus of the answer. What is required is an assessment of the results of his foreign policy. For France, this could include his aims; what did he hope to achieve through his wars? Candidates could point out the advantages of “La gloire”, in prestige, support for his regime at home and abroad, but the downside of losses of men and money. For Europe some of the following could be discussed; spread of revolutionary ideas, stirring of nationalism in Italy and Germany, death and destruction, change in the balance of power, coalitions, and finally the determination to prevent an over mighty France in the future.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for some inaccurate, irrelevant or inadequate comments about Napoleon’s wars.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers that are mainly narrative or descriptive, but have implicit evaluation of the impact of Napoleon’s foreign policies on France and Europe.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit evaluation of policies on France and Europe.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers focused on Napoleon’s foreign policies with analysis of results for both France and Europe.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive explanation, balance, and the realization that foreign policy is more than war.

**3. For what reasons, and with what results, did the Congress of Vienna and the various meetings of the Congress System, take place?**

For reasons candidates need explanations of both the Congress of Vienna – the necessity of restoring peace and order after the turmoil of the Napoleonic wars, and preventing France from ever being in a similar situation again – and for the Congress System – an explanation of the hopes and aims of the statesmen responsible for launching the system. Peace, power politics, balance of power, the status quo, all played their part.

For results of Vienna, candidates could discuss the exile of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons, the curtailment of France, European boundary changes, and the gains of the four great powers. For the Congress System the individual congresses and the breakdown of cooperation could be assessed, and no doubt peace, or no major war until the Crimea.

There is much material to use, so do not expect all of the above: if only reasons or results are tackled, the maximum mark might be **[12]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate detail and comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with implicit reasons and results, and a lack of balance between Vienna and the Congress System.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a more equal balance between Vienna and the Congress System and reasons and results.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that address all four parts of the question with some explicit analysis.

**[17+ marks]** for analytical balanced interpretations of the reasons behind, and results of, Vienna and the Congress System.

**4. Why did Louis Philippe become King of France in 1830, but lose his throne in 1848?**

Firstly candidates need to analyse the reasons that led to the downfall of Charles X and the choice or acceptance of Louis Philippe as king in 1830. A brief assessment of Charles' religious and autocratic policies would suffice, with an explanation of the "credentials" of Louis. The disappointment caused by his main political, foreign and economic policies should be explained, followed by the immediate causes of the 1848 Revolution which led to the end of the Bourbon monarchy in France.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for some but inadequate comments on one or more of the required areas, Charles X, Louis Philippe, the 1848 Revolution.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptions of the three parts, probably unbalanced.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for better treatment of Charles X, Louis Philippe and the revolution, with some assessment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for an analytical explanation of why Louis became King but lost his throne 18 years later.

**[17+ marks]** for depth of analysis and perhaps realization of different interpretations of complex situations.

**5. Compare and contrast Peel and Palmerston as statesmen and politicians of Victorian Britain.**

The wording of the question allows candidates to use material on both politicians when they held office other than that of prime minister, but do not penalize those who concentrate on their prime ministerial roles.

**For comparison:** both were prime ministers – Peel 1834–1835, and 1841–1846; Palmerston 1855–1858, and 1859–1865; both were Home Secretaries and introduced penal reforms; both entered parliament as Tories.

**For contrast:** Peel remained a Tory, modernized the party with the Tamworth Manifesto of 1834, but split it with the repeal of the Corn Laws, and Palmerston became a Whig in 1829. Peel’s main interest and expertise was finance, *e.g.* Bank Charter Act, abolition of many duties: Palmerston’s main interest was foreign affairs; he is best remembered for supporting what he believed were British interests *e.g.* in 1830 Belgian revolt, 1839 Opium War, 1850 Don Pacifico incident, 1864, Schleswig-Holstein Question.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate responses or if only Peel or Palmerston is tackled.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for end-on answers with implicit comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for detailed end-on answers with excellent linkage, or a comparative framework with some lack of balance.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers with a comparative framework and specific detail.

*[17+ marks]* for comparative structure, balance and analysis, and/or recognition of the difference between statesmen and politicians.

6. **“Cavour united Italy not because he intended or wanted to, but because circumstances forced him to.” To what extent do you agree with this judgment?**

Candidates need to analyse Cavour’s aims and actions in relation to Italian unification, and decide whether he was forced to go further than he intended because of external factors, such as Garibaldi’s expedition.

A survey of Italy, with the differences between north and south, and the strength and weakness of the movement for unification, would be relevant. This could be followed by Cavour’s aims and work to strengthen and modernize the kingdom of Piedmont/Sardinia. Candidates then need to analyse the purpose behind Cavour’s negotiations with Napoleon III. Was the intended defeat of Austria to enlarge Piedmont, or a step towards unification? Finally Cavour’s relations with Garibaldi should be assessed, and a conclusion reached on the quotation.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague and unsatisfactory comments on Italian unification.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of Cavour’s part in unification with implicit judgment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus and detail and more explicit judgment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured essays which assess Cavour’s aims, intentions and the circumstances.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that are able to give different interpretations or analyse different points of view, realizing that no certain judgment is possible.

7. **In what ways, and with what results, did economic developments and the 1848 revolutions affect the changing balance of power between Austria and Prussia between 1815 and 1862?**

The year 1815 refers to the Congress of Vienna with the territorial settlements that affected Austria (Italy was to some extent a millstone), and Prussia (helped by consolidation and acquisitions). 1862 is the year that Bismarck was appointed minister-president of Prussia. During these years Prussia developed her economy, with the Zollverein and industrial expansion, whilst Austria struggled with her diverse nationalities. The latter also weakened Austria in the 1848 revolutions, although her continued military strength secured the survival of her empire. The Frankfurt Parliament lost momentum, failed to unite Germany, and Frederick William refused the offer of the crown of the united Germany. But the signs were clear that Prussia was rising and Austria struggling, and Bismarck recognized the way forward.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate, irrelevant or inaccurate comments on Austria and Prussia.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of the two countries, probably lacking balance.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers that refer to economic developments and the 1848 revolutions, in relation to the changing position of Austria and Prussia.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that assess the importance of economic developments and the revolutions for the decline of Austria and the consolidation of Prussia.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that analyse the given factors in relation to the Prussianisation of Germany, or assess them in relation to Austria’s failure to dominate a greater Germany.

8. **“Alexander II tried to reform Russian institutions only because the Crimean War showed that Russia was no longer a great military power.” Use specific examples of Alexander’s reforms to show to what extent you agree with this assertion.**

This is another way of asking for the aims and motives of Alexander’s reforms. Is it true to say that Alexander was only trying to preserve the Russian monarchy and/or her status as one of the great European powers by reforming the army and thus increasing Russia’s military potential. Did his emancipation of the serfs have no humanitarian motive? Candidates should consider Alexander’s key reforms in the light of the quotation and make considered judgments about them. A satisfactory to good answer should consider, as well as the army reforms and Emancipation Act, at least two of his other important reforms, such as local government, law, education, the press. Top answers may consider his failure to introduce a national duma and its implications.

*[0 to 7 marks]* answers will be general and the comments unsatisfactory.

*[8 to 10 marks]* answers will be mainly narrative with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* answers will contain adequate specific examples of reforms and explicit comments on motives.

*[14 to 16 marks]* answers will analyse the quotation, aims and motives and show how they are reflected in the reforms.

*[17+ marks]* will be scored by full analysis of aims, based on the quotation, with assessment of what Alexander failed to do as well as what he did.

9. **In what ways, and with what results between 1862 and 1871, was Germany unified under Prussia?**

To most candidates “in what ways” will suggest Bismarck’s three wars, but more than a narrative account of these is needed, and if a narrative is given there will be no time for explaining why Bismarck was successful and what the results were. Candidates need to examine Bismarck’s strengthening of the army and finance, then his diplomacy throughout the period, which enabled him to fight three successful wars. For results, candidates could consider some of the following points: the obvious one of the unification of Germany under Prussia; the position of Austria and the Ausgleich; the German constitution and form of government; Bismarck’s own position and subsequent policies; the humiliation of France and end of Napoleon III’s empire.

There is much material that candidates should know, so time management and selection will be important. Reserve at least *[6 marks]* for results.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for an incomplete or inaccurate account of the wars fought under Bismarck.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for some accurate details of the wars and implicit assessment of their results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for chronological accounts which do explain how Bismarck’s policies led to unification, and its results.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured focused answers that assess the ways that Germany was unified under Prussia, and its results.

*[17+ marks]* for depth of analysis and/or different interpretations.

- 10. In what ways, and with what results, did the daily life and status of women change during the nineteenth century? Specific evidence should be given from one or more European countries.**

Ways could include the increase of education, *e.g.* more and better education was within the reach of more girls; industrial and transport changes helped female literacy; women writers were popular and admired (after initial disapproval); women obtained more legal rights and protection; laws were introduced against the exploitation of women in workplaces; religious, social and moral “crusades” for women’s rights; the franchise was granted for local government and movements started for votes in national elections. Results could include an improvement in the status of women in some areas; the beginning of more careers open to women; greater independence and less drudgery. But it should be noted that progress was slow and patchy.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few uncoordinated remarks.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers with some specific evidence.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better detail and assessment of aspects of changes and results for women.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed and analytical case studies of nineteenth century women, focused on changes.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that are also aware of the difficulties and the slow progress of improvement in the lives of the majority of women.

- 11. Explain and evaluate the demands for, and the extension of, the franchise in one European country during the nineteenth century.**

Candidates need to explain why the nineteenth century saw increasing demands for the right to vote in local and parliamentary elections. The franchise had been extremely limited and generally based on property values. It also varied considerably in different countries and parts/seats, of the same country (*e.g.* Britain). Demands for the right to vote were driven by increased education and prosperity as well as a belief in more equality and the demand for no taxation without representation. This question should not be attempted unless a case study has been undertaken. The three important Reform Acts in Britain were those of 1832, 1867, and 1884. Voting was limited to males.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for limited knowledge and explanation.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of some demands and some details of reform.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for an explanation of the demands for an increased franchise and details of its extension.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused analysis of the demands and specific details of reform of the franchise and its limitations.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth analysis of demands, reforms and limitations of the franchise.

**12. Why and with what effects on both countries, was Norway ceded to Sweden in 1814, and the union between the two countries dissolved in 1905?**

Norway was ruled by Danish governors until 1814, when it was joined to Sweden (even though the pro French party in the Swedish estates had triumphed in 1809) who gave up Pomerania. Constitutional developments included reforms of 1809 and 1864.

Norwegian nationalism, helped by a literary revival demanded responsible government, which was granted in 1884. Universal male suffrage was granted in 1898. The union with Sweden was unilaterally dissolved in 1905. Both countries developed their economies during the nineteenth century.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for brief or irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for chronological narrative with implicit assessment of key developments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus on reasons and effects.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers structured on reasons and effects and which analyse them.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed, balanced, analytical responses.

**13. Analyse the main political developments in *either* France *or* Spain between 1848 and 1914.**

The main political developments in whichever country is chosen should include an exact statement of the changes in the form of government, and the way the country was governed, its strengths and weaknesses, *etc.* and an analysis/explanation of the developments. This question is designed for candidates who like to assess a broad sweep of history. France passed through many changes; Louis Philippe abdicated in 1848; the Second Republic with Louis Bonaparte as president lasted from 1848 to 1852, when Louis Bonaparte as Napoleon III proclaimed the Second Empire. He was replaced in 1870 by the Third Republic. Spain saw changes of the monarchy; Isabella II, fled in 1868, there was an interregnum until 1874, when Alfonso XII became king. He was succeeded in 1886 by Alfonso XIII.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unconnected and/or inadequate statements.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit analysis of development.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of the major changes.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analytical answers which are able to explain the political developments.

*[17+ marks]* for balanced, analytical essays which give meaning to the broad sweep covered.



14. **In what ways, and for what reasons, did the First World War lead to economic and social changes? Specific examples should be given from one or more European countries for the period 1914 to 1930.**

Some of the social and economic changes that resulted from the First World War were: votes for women; increased educational and employment prospects for women; changing patterns of employment; boom then slump, changing trade and industrial patterns; need to rebuild finance, industry and infrastructure; effect on society of the death of, and injury to, so many men – “the lost generation”. Actual details will depend on the country or countries chosen.

Reasons would include: change to wartime economy; cost of armaments weakened financial resources of state; change in balance of power, USA and Japan profited in trade and industry; conscription; shortage of men, *e.g.* in factories meant women had to take their place; realization that women could play a greater part in industry, and other spheres.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers with implicit reasons.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for specific changes clearly resulting from the war.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused analytical answers which demonstrate the connection between the war and the changes.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed analysis and an additional dimension, *e.g.* which developments would have occurred in time but were accelerated by the war.

15. **Compare and contrast the nature and results of the two 1917 Russian Revolutions.**

**For comparison:** both were opposed to Tsardom; both wished to overthrow the existing government; both were affected by the war; both took place in a period of economic distress; both used economic grievances for their own advantage.

**For contrast:** the first caused the abdication of the Tsar, the second his and his family’s death; the first arose out of strikes and bread riots, the second was organized by Bolshevik activists; the first resulted in the formation of a Provisional Government the second in rule by the Bolsheviks and a totalitarian state under Lenin; the first continued to fight in the First World War with the allies, the second made peace with Germany (and received German funding).

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate material, or an answer that only deals with one revolution.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for end-on descriptions/narratives.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for detailed end-on accounts with excellent linkage or a weaker comparative structure.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers in a comparative framework with full detail and analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for those with an extra quality such as perception and balance.

**16. Analyse the political developments and external relations of *either* Weimar Germany between 1919 and 1933 *or* Great Britain between 1918 and 1935.**

Political developments suggest the form and working of the government and the nature of politics in the chosen country, and external relations indicate treaties, alliances, loans, relations with the League of Nations *etc.*

For Germany, William II abdicated and a republic was proclaimed on 9 November 1918. The German National Constituent Assembly met in Weimar in February 1919, hence the name Weimar Republic, which lasted until 1933, when Hitler suspended the constitution, which had come into force in July 1919. The government moved to Berlin in 1920. Communists and Nazi caused political instability, but the advent of Stresemann, chancellor in 1923 and foreign minister 1923 to 1929, restored some stability. External relations were largely directed by him and some of the following could be discussed; Dawes Plan, 1924; Locarno, 1925; joined League, 1926; Young Plan, 1929.

For Great Britain, the changes in government from Lloyd George in 1918 to Ramsay MacDonald prime minister until 1935, the state of politics with the decline of the Liberals, and the Labour split. The General Strike, votes for women over 21, in 1928, formation of a National government 1930, could be considered. External relations could include: Dawes Plan; League; Zinoviev letter; Statute of Westminster and relations with dominions and colonies. If only political developments or external relations are addressed mark out of **[12]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for too general/inadequate answers.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with some attention to both political development and external relations.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for specific details and assessment of both areas.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focus, structure, and analysis of politics and external relations.

**[17+ marks]** for balanced and perceptive essays.

**17. Why had Stalin become ruler of the USSR by 1929?**

Some suggested sections to develop are: Stalin's early career as a revolutionary and his contact with Lenin (brief); Stalin's position in the party during Lenin's regime, especially as Commissar for Nationalities, and General Secretary of the party (1922), where he was able to build up support; his work and identification with Lenin; rivalry with Trotsky; tactical maneuvers after Lenin's death, such as his use of Lenin and his manipulation of people and events. Candidates could also examine Stalin's ruthlessness, use of terror *etc.*

**[0 to 7 marks]** for uncoordinated or inadequate material.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of Stalin's rise to power, with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit analysis and explanation of his rise.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for structured focused answers which analyse the reasons for his success.

**[17+ marks]** for balanced analytical essays with perhaps suggestions of different interpretations.

**18. For what reasons, and with what results, did Mussolini abandon his Stresa Front allies, France and Great Britain, and ally with Hitler in 1936?**

After Germany announced conscription, and revealed an air force, representatives from Britain, France and Italy met at Stresa, reaffirmed Locarno and declared their support for Austrian independence. Stresa was weakened by Britain signing a naval agreement with Germany without consulting Italy (or France), and collapsed with Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, as Britain and France felt bound to support the sanctions imposed by the League of Nations. This prompted Mussolini to sign the Rome Berlin Axis.

As well as stating the facts candidates must analyse the reasons for the change: Mussolini felt stronger, and hurt by his former allies' rejection, he was intent on emulating the former Roman Empire; power had corrupted him; Hitler had persuaded him, *etc.*

Results should indicate the part played by Mussolini and the Axis in encouraging Hitler's aggressive foreign policy against Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland, and rendering the League of Nations powerless.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate reasoning.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of Mussolini's foreign policy with implicit reasons.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit explanation of reasons and results.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical answers focused and structured on reasons and results.

**[17+ marks]** for balanced analysis, perhaps with alternative interpretations, especially of reasons.

**19. Evaluate Hitler's social, economic and religious policies between 1933 and 1939.**

There are three areas to examine here, social, economic and religious, and an assessment of their impact, strengths and weaknesses could be given. Better candidates should realize that what appeared to be successful to-and for-Hitler, was not so for the German people. Social policies could include education, health, the Hitler Youth, League of German Maidens, and perhaps propaganda and the control of cultural activities. All social policies were directed towards obtaining and keeping support for Hitler, and producing a fit Aryan nation, ready to fight. It was successful in its object as far as Hitler was concerned, for most of the people and most of the time. Similarly Hitler's economic policies were designed with the same object, support and war. Trade Unions were abolished, "big business" directed where possible (not as much as Hitler would have liked), public works undertaken, autarky and protective tariffs introduced, and unemployment decreased. On the surface Hitler was successful. He also tried to manipulate religion, he made a concordat with the Pope, and sought to make the Lutheran Church subservient to the State. This caused a split into the Reich Church and the Confessional Church. As realization of Hitler's true aims emerged, opposition within the Churches increased, but many Christians supported Hitler's regime, because he said he supported family values and opposed Communism. Hitler's persecution of Jews could be made relevant in any of the above categories.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for short general answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptions of some social economic and religious measures with implicit evaluation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more specific detail and evaluation.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for balanced answers that evaluate the three areas.

**20. To what extent was the failure and collapse of the League of Nations the cause of the Second World War?**

This question requires a brief assessment of the weaknesses of the League of Nations in order to explain its failure and collapse followed by another concise section on the failure *e.g.* against Japan in Manchuria and against Mussolini in Ethiopia. Candidates should then analyse the impact of this collapse and failure in order to judge the extent of its responsibility for the Second World War. Other causes should then be considered: no doubt Hitler and appeasement will feature. Candidates can of course ascribe little “blame” to the League, but if they do this they must analyse the League to show why they are arguing in this way. An answer that dismisses the League in a short paragraph, and then goes on to argue others causes cannot score highly.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for an answer that does not give due attention to the League.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of the League with implicit judgment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for specific detail and argument.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus on, and analysis of the extent to which the collapse of the League led to war.

*[17+ marks]* for analytical essays which thoroughly debate the issue from various angles.

**21. Assess the rule of *either* Franco in Spain *or* Caetano in Portugal.**

“Assess the rule” – suggests a thorough examination and assessment of all features of the rule of the chosen leader, for example form of government and administration, domestic policies, effects on the life, development, growth, prosperity, and freedom or repression, in the state. It would not be necessary to consider foreign policy, but do not penalize those who do. The question does not require material prior to their rule. Franco ruled Spain from 1939 to 1975. Caetano was in power 1968 to 1974.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague, general, or inaccurate answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for satisfactory scope, detail and explicit assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers which provide an assessment of the key domestic elements of the regime.

*[17+ marks]* for analysis, balance, and possibly different interpretations.

**22. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the Soviet Union’s Cold War policies affect Germany between 1945 and 1961?**

After the Second World War Germany was divided into four sections each ruled by one of the four winning allies. Soon there were disagreements about the treatment and rule of Germany and about reparations. Berlin was also split into zones, and in 1948 disagreements grew into the Berlin blockade and airlift. The allies forced the USSR to back down. The Marshall plan and Truman Doctrine *etc.* caused conflicts and Germany was split into East and West. Reasons could include fear on both sides, spheres of interest, misunderstandings, and the geographical fact that it was in Germany that the two sides faced each other. If only “what ways” or “what reasons” are tackled, a probable maximum would be **[12]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for some uncoordinated remarks.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative details of the early stages of the Cold War.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for accurate details and focus on Soviet policies towards Germany.

**[14 to 6 marks]** for structured analytical answers explaining the effects on Germany of the Soviet Union’s early Cold War policies.

**[17+ marks]** for different interpretations of the effects of Soviet policies relating to Germany during the whole period.

**23. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of France under de Gaulle.**

Charles de Gaulle (1890–1970) was the first president of the Fifth French Republic (1959–1969). He served briefly as president of the provisional government, November 1945 to January 1946, and was called to lead France out of the Algerian crisis, in May 1958. After the passage of a new constitution, November 1958, he was elected president of the new Fifth Republic. He supported Algerian independence, but rebellions by the French delayed it until 1962. A great French patriot he sought to restore France’s position in Europe. He ended French participation in NATO, 1966, and developed a French nuclear programme. He sought a strong role for France in the Common Market, blocked Britain’s entry and also pursued independent foreign policies, seeking closer ties with China and USSR. He survived labour and student unrest, but resigned after his referendum on political reform was defeated. Candidates should decide which of his actions and policies made France strong or could be considered a cause of weakness.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate general comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with implicit strengths and weaknesses.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for specific detail and assessment of the above which could be considered strengths or weaknesses.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for essays which carefully weigh de Gaulle’s policies and judge them.

**[17+ marks]** for balance and analysis and judgment of strengths and weaknesses.

**24. Account for and assess the rise and fall of a Communist regime in *either* one Eastern *or* one Central European state excluding the USSR.**

Specific details will depend on the country chosen. Poland or Hungary would probably be popular choices. Wartime experiences, the Russian drive towards and occupation of the area in the closing stages of the war, the division of east and west with the onset of the Cold War, and Stalin's policies would all be relevant for the first part. In order to assess the fall of the Communist regime candidates need to consider the nature of the regime, policy of the USSR, and the growth and final success of the opposition, inside and outside the chosen state. Mark out of **[12]** if candidates only deal with either the rise or the fall of the communist regime in their chosen state.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for brief or inadequate answers.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of events with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** with specific details of the rise and fall, and some explicit assessment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused analytical answers that treat both rise and fall satisfactorily.

**[17+ marks]** for depth of analysis and understanding of the various opposing factors.

**25. For what reasons, and with what effects, did leisure activities and the media become more widespread and important in one or more European countries during the twentieth century?**

Candidates must be able to produce specific evidence in order to obtain a satisfactory mark. Reference to one country in depth is preferable to generalizations about many. Exact material will depend on the country chosen. Better candidates should see a connection between the two parts of the question, and all should be able to place both in the political, social and economic developments of their chosen state.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive essays with implicit assessment of either reasons or effects or both.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for specific examples used for reasons and effects.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical answers with balance between reasons and effects.

**[17+ marks]** for perception and perhaps an original approach.

---