

# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2004**

**HISTORY – EUROPE**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorisation of IBCA.*

**These must be read in conjunction with current mark bands.**

- 1. To what extent did the actions and policies of Louis XVI cause the outbreak, and affect the course, of the French Revolution until 1793?**

There are two parts to this question:

First, candidates should consider how and to what extent the actions of Louis XVI as king of France from 1774, contributed to the outbreak of the revolution, with his rather weak and vacillating policies, failure to reform finance, appointment of a succession of finance ministers, failure to curb his wife's extravagance and entry into the American War of Independence. The summoning of the Assembly of Notables and then the Estates-General led to the revolution.

The second part is concerned with Louis's policies between the outbreak in 1789 and his execution in 1793, his dealings with the Estates, and with the revolutionary measures such as the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 1790, the flight to Varennes, 1791, acceptance of the new constitution, 1791, appeals for help *etc.* Candidates should also assess the extent to which the king's actions and policies caused the revolution and affected its course.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a narrative of some of Louis's actions with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for awareness of both parts and more explicit assessment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for attention to and analysis of both parts.

**[17 + marks]** for awareness and analysis of the extent that Louis did influence events.

**2. Analyse the effects of the policies upon France, of either Napoleon I between 1800 and 1815, or Charles X between 1824 and 1830.**

Candidates have to select either Napoleon I, (probably he will be more popular) or Charles X, and analyse their policies in order to determine their effects upon France. There is much material which should be known about Napoleon, for example, for his foreign policy, the positive effects of “the glory”, and the negative drain of men and money. In the domestic sphere, law and order after the Revolution, legal codes, local administration, education, economic reforms could be balanced with his illiberal measures. The selected evidence must be analysed and a final verdict reached.

The reign of Charles X was shorter although candidates could note his influence during the previous reign. In his own reign he was increasingly ultra-royalist, attached to the clerical party, and alienated all shades of political opinion. The publication of the repressive ordinances of St Cloud provoked the 1830 revolution which deposed him and ended the Bourbon Restoration with the accession of Louis Philippe.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of the chosen ruler with comments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for accurate material with some explicit analysis of effects.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for an analytical and structured approach.

*[17 + marks]* for balance and perhaps different interpretations.

**3. Assess the main weaknesses up to 1848 of the Vienna Settlement and the Congress System.**

Candidates are probably more used to pointing out the successes of the Congress of Vienna, and the fact that with the later congresses there was no major war until the Crimean War. No doubt they will immediately think of the ignoring of nationalism and liberalism. It would be better to use the actual terms of the settlement to illustrate the former, and point out that this was the result of the bargaining of Austria, Britain, Prussia and Russia, each determined to maintain power, rather than an ideological concept. This emphasis on power and position can also be illustrated in the actions of the later congresses, *e.g.* in relation to Spain and Naples. The restoration of deposed/illiberal rulers was also an attempt to preserve the balance of power and the power of the main participants. Disunity and greed as shown by the delegates working for their own interests could be criticized, as well as the number of incidents of unrest, culminating in the 1848 revolutions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of some terms that failed.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on criticism and failure.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structure, focus and critical analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for answers which analyse motives and policies in the context of the period.

4. **“Victorian Britain’s most successful prime minister.” To what extent do you agree with this assessment of Gladstone?**

Most candidates will probably assume this requires an analysis of Gladstone’s four periods in office, and will assess his most important policies. His treatment of the Irish question, army reforms, electoral, judicial, and educational policies as well as his conduct of foreign and imperial affairs would all be relevant and if done well could reach top bands. Some may compare him with other prime ministers in order to reach a verdict on the quotation. This again, if well done, could score well. If another candidate is put forward for being more successful, at least half of the answer must be directed to showing Gladstone’s weaknesses as well as the strengths of the alternative choice.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a focused assessment of Gladstone’s measures.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a critical assessment of success.

*[17+ marks]* for attention also to “to what extent.”

5. **Compare and contrast the contributions made by Cavour and Garibaldi to Italian unification.**

Cavour became a minister in the Piedmontese government in 1850, and was prime minister from 1852 until his death in 1861 (apart from a few months in 1859). Garibaldi was seriously involved in Italian unification from 1848 until Italy was unified. Both were important figures in Italian unification, opposed Austria, and agreed to unification under Piedmont. Candidates will probably find more to contrast, in that Cavour was a politician, Garibaldi a soldier. Cavour probably sought the extension of Piedmont rather than complete unification, whereas Garibaldi always wanted to unite Italy as a whole. Also, he was originally a republican rather than a monarchist. Cavour realized the necessity of foreign support, Garibaldi did not.

*[0 to 7 marks]* if only Cavour or Garibaldi is addressed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for end on accounts of both.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a comparative structure or excellent linkage.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for a balanced analytical comparative structure.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis of both leaders.

**6. Why was Germany unified under Prussia and not under Austria?**

It is hoped that candidates will explain this with more than Bismarck's three wars. No dates are given, but it could be noted that the period 1815 to 1848 saw the gradual strengthening of Prussia with the Zollverein and economic reforms, whereas Austria suffered from divisions with the diverse nationalities and was over stretched, especially with the Italian commitments. Although Prussia failed to take advantage of the situation 1848 to 1850, the country continued to grow in strength, with army and financial reforms, and Bismarck's diplomacy, culminating in the three wars, against Denmark, Austria and France.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative mainly consisting of Bismarck and the wars.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for an explanation taking into account the changing position of both countries.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for analytical, structured answers which deal with both Austria and Prussia.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis of both countries.

**7. Why did Napoleon III become Emperor of France in 1852 and lose his empire in 1870?**

The focus of this question should be the events in France, 1848 to 1852 that led to Napoleon becoming Emperor and his relations/negotiations with Bismarck circa 1866 to the Franco-Prussian War, in which he was defeated.

Napoleon III was the nephew and "heir" of Napoleon Bonaparte. After a life in exile he made two abortive attempts to lead a Bonapartist rising against the July monarchy. His name and the appeal of the "Napoleonic legend" led to his election in December 1848 as President of the Second Republic, after the fall of Louis Philippe, and the failure of the National workshops of Louis Blanc. The constitution of the Republic limited the president to one four year term, so Napoleon, after narrowly failing to amend the constitution to allow a second term, carried out a coup d'état, December 1851. At the end of 1852 Napoleon obtained a plebiscite agreeing that he should become hereditary Emperor.

The Second Empire ended when Napoleon was defeated by Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War, at Sedan, 1870, having been outwitted by Bismarck in relation to the Austro-Prussian War and the succession to the Spanish throne. He was imprisoned in Germany, then exiled to England.

Candidates could briefly explain the downfall of Louis Philippe or/and some of the unpopular (or less popular) policies of Napoleon III, but focus should be on the events above, which for good marks must be analysed in order to explain Napoleon's success and failure.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of some of the above with implicit explanation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit explanation and assessment of the events.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical answers structured and focused on the acquisition and loss of empire.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth analysis of Napoleon's appeal, success in becoming Emperor and in his loss of his empire and failure.

**8. “The emancipation of the serfs in Russia was the only genuine reform introduced by Alexander II.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?**

The quotation should be used to structure an answer on the reforms of Alexander II.

Candidates could do this in various ways: they could agree with the quotation and analyse the emancipation of 1862, showing it to be a genuine reform; they could do this and also note other reforms such as, army, judiciary, education, local government, *etc.* which they also consider to be genuine reforms; they could point out the weaknesses in the emancipation and show that other reforms were more “genuine”; they could criticize the quotation and argue that no reforms were “genuine”, but passed in order to preserve the Tsar’s authority. It is hoped that whichever argument they adopt, they will not just describe reforms with no analysis or reference to the set question.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for an account of some reforms.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for addressing the emancipation in a focused manner.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a focused, structured and analytical answer.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth analysis and perhaps different interpretations of the emancipation act and its consequences.

**9. Analyse the successes and failures of Bismarck’s domestic policies between 1871 and 1890.**

The German Empire was proclaimed in January 1871 and Bismarck became Imperial Chancellor. This question relates to his home policies. This is not usually very popular with IB students, and Bismarck himself was more interested in diplomacy and foreign affairs.

The main areas to consider are: political/constitutional developments; relations with the kaisers; liberals and tariffs; Catholics and the Kulturkampf; socialists and early anti-socialist legislation, and later social reforms, insurance *etc.* The above need to be analysed for successes and failure, and an overall verdict reached.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a descriptive answer with implicit judgment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on successes and failure.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus on, and analysis of, successes and failure.

*[17+ marks]* for balance and an in-depth analysis of Bismarck’s domestic policies.

**10. Assess the impact on nineteenth century Europe of *two* of the following: imperialism; industrialization; urbanization.**

Candidates need to select two of the above and show how they affected, impacted upon, changed, developed *etc.* Europe in the nineteenth century. Specific details/evidence is essential for a satisfactory response. No number of countries to be used is stated. Candidates can use one or more, but they must not use sweeping assertions. Many countries *e.g.* Britain, France, Germany and Italy were concerned with imperialism, and industrialization varied considerably throughout Europe, as did urbanization. Impact, of course, covers positive and negative aspects.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general answers with insufficient specific evidence.

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

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

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for detail, assessment and focus on impact.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth analysis of two aspects.

*N.B.* If only one topic is attempted mark out of *[12]*.

**11. Examine the main political and economic developments in Spain in the second half of the nineteenth century.**

This is a new question as Spain 1848 to 1914 has been added to the syllabus, and it is hoped that some Spanish candidates will take this opportunity to discuss their country. This was a troubled time, and the question covers the end of the troubled reign of Isabella II who fled in 1868, the interregnum, the reign of Alfonso XII, 1874 to 1885, and the beginning of the reign of Alfonso XIII, 1886 (abdicated 1931). Spain was economically backward, and as a result of the Spanish–American War, 1898, lost most of her remaining colonies. Although Alfonso XII restored some political order, and the dominant position of the Catholic church as well as seeking to increase monarchical power, problems remained.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative account with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a more focused examination of political and economic developments.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for an analytical structured essay.

*[17+ marks]* for an explanation of the causes of the troubled era.



**12. Why was the dual monarchy of Austria–Hungary formed in 1867, and dissolved after the First World War?**

The dual monarchy or *Ausgleich* was the result of an agreement between the Austrian Government and moderate Hungarian politicians. It was a response to the weakening position of Austria, continuing nationalities problem including the Hungarian demands for greater autonomy, and defeat in the Austro–Prussian War of 1866. By its terms, the two states maintained separate ministries and parliaments but shared military and foreign policy responsibilities. The system remained in operation until 1918 despite tensions resulting from commercial union and the resentment of other nationalities at the privileged position of Hungary.

The union was dissolved after the First World War with the defeat of the central powers, and the attempt to give all nationalities a separate state. The dissolution was included in the various relevant treaties.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of the formation and dissolution, with implicit “why”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for an explicit explanation of both parts.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a well structured and focused explanation of formation and dissolution.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis of both.

**13. To what extent, and with what results, did educational reforms take place in *one* European country in *either* the nineteenth *or* the twentieth century?**

This question allows candidates to discuss and analyse education in their own country in either the nineteenth or the twentieth century. The type of education, primary, secondary and higher, whether free, state, religious, subjects taught, percentage of children receiving education would all be relevant. Candidates also need to consider the results of increased literacy and education on the life and development of the country.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts of some of the above.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more detail and focus on extent and results.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for answers which connect the nature and extent of reforms with results.

**14. Why did Germany and her allies lose the First World War?**

This question will probably not be as easy for candidates as they expect. Some may recount the whole war, and others run out of steam, especially as they realize that for much of the time the central powers appeared to be winning.

In spite of their initial advantages, Germany and her allies faced a tremendous task. In the end the four central powers were at war with 27 states, which included those in the British Empire and the USA. Thus manpower and resources were balanced heavily in favour of the allies. Despite the absence of large sea battles, the command of the seas held by the allies was vital, especially at the end when Germany was starved of food and raw materials, whereas the allied fleets ensured Britain's food supplies and transported troops to wherever they were wanted. Germany also made some vital tactical errors, especially the invasion of Belgium and unrestricted submarine warfare. Some candidates may assert that Germany sought an armistice rather than losing the war.

If only Germany is mentioned and the allies are ignored the maximum mark should be **[14]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for a brief general account of the war.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for an account with some explanation of why the central powers lost.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for focus on, and assessment of, why the central powers lost.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a focused analytical answer to the question.

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

**15. Assess the part played by Lenin in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution and in the new Soviet State until his death in 1924.**

There are two parts to this question, and ideally both should be addressed at the same length. In 1917 Lenin, the accepted leader of the Bolshevik party, was in Switzerland when the first revolution erupted. He opposed co-operation with the Provisional Government, returned to Russia, published his April thesis, “peace, bread and land”, but was forced into exile in Finland from where he attempted to direct Bolshevik opinion and policy by letter. He returned secretly in October, convinced a sufficient number of his party that the time was ripe for a second revolution, but the organization of it was mainly left to Trotsky. After it was carried through, Lenin drafted resolutions and addressed gatherings.

For the “new Soviet State”, candidates need to discuss Lenin’s determination to secure total control for himself and the Bolsheviks, the dismissal of the constituent assembly, withdrawal from the First World War, the civil war, war communism and his new economic policy. By the time Lenin suffered his first stroke in 1922, a ruthless dictatorship was in place and he played some, but not much part in government between his first stroke and his death.

Do not expect all of the above, but what is included should be analysed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of some of the above with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balance, focus and analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis of the part played by Lenin in both, and perhaps an overall assessment of his importance and impact.

**16. Compare and contrast the economic problems faced by *two* European countries between 1919 and 1939.**

Basically European economies were affected by two problems between 1919 and 1939: the aftermath of the 1914–1918 war, and the Wall Street crash and Great Depression. Economic problems took the form of “boom and bust”, financial problems stemming from paying for the war, labour changes, strikes, unemployment, wage cuts, collapse of stock exchanges and banks, agricultural downturn, *etc.* Actual detail will of course depend on the countries selected, and probably Weimar Germany, Britain and France will be popular choices.

Note the question says economic problems. The political problems that ensued are not relevant.

*[0 to 7 marks]* if only one country is addressed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for end on descriptions with linkage.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for very good linkage or a rather unbalanced comparative structure.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for a comparative structure with satisfactory specific detail.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis of the countries.

**17. Analyse the impact of Hitler *either* on Finland *or* on one Scandinavian country between 1933 and 1945.**

Material to be used will depend on the country chosen. The time period could be from about 1930 to the immediate post-war period. There is much material for Finland, attempted coups from the fascist movement, the Winter War against USSR, alliance with Germany, the Continuation War, peace with USSR, 1944, in return for concessions.

Sweden was neutral in the war but traded, and developed socially and economically. Norway was invaded, then had a government of Nazi supporters under Quisling and another in exile in London. Denmark was occupied by the Germans in 1940, and a strong resistance movement developed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for some explicit analysis.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for more explicit analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth critical analysis.

**18. To what extent were the aims of Mussolini's domestic and foreign policies achieved between 1923 and 1939?**

This is a relatively straightforward question on a popular topic framed in such a way as to offer candidates a structure to follow. Mussolini was appointed prime minister in October 1922. As *Duce* (leader), he had some form of parliamentary government until 1924, and established a full fascist government between 1924 and 1928.

Candidates will probably define his aims in various ways, but they could include, establishing a complete totalitarian government (or getting sole power for himself), restoring the position of Italy mirroring the ancient Roman Empire, pursuing an aggressive foreign policy to build an empire, playing a role as a European statesman, having good relations with (and the support of) the papacy and the Catholic church, improving the economy.

By 1939 when Italy was allied with Germany, (but did not enter the war until 1940), the position of Italy was mixed. Most of the economic reforms had failed but Italy was a one party state. Mussolini's power was not complete. The pope and church were powerful and forays into foreign policy had not all been successful. Hitler, who in the beginning had learnt from Mussolini, was now the dominant partner.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit aims and achievements.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on aims and achievements.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for clear aims and assessment of how far they had been achieved.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth perceptive analysis or discussion of different interpretations.

**19. In what ways, and to what extent, did foreign aid to both the Nationalists and the Republicans between 1936 and 1939 contribute to the outcome of the Spanish Civil War?**

This question requires that candidates explain the composition, nature, and effect of foreign aid to both sides in the Spanish Civil War, and give a verdict as to how far foreign aid was responsible for the nationalist victory.

The nationalists were assisted by Germany and Italy primarily. German air power, the Condor Legion, and about 50 000 Italian troops were especially important. The republicans were supported by the USSR and other foreign Communists and Socialists, including the International Brigade. German and Italian aid was more sustained and useful. The USSR demanded payment *etc.*, and there was much disunity and faction fighting among the various left wing groups.

To reach a conclusion on the outcome, candidates could discuss the performance of foreign contingents in the actual fighting. Most will probably conclude that foreign aid was to quite a large extent responsible for Franco's victory, but this is disputed by many who assert that other mainly internal factors were more important.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a very general account of the war with no mention of foreign aid.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of foreign aid within the war and implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on foreign aid and its importance.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for an analytical structured answer that deals with all the requirements.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that realise that there are different views and interpretations, or in-depth analysis.

**20. How important were appeasement and the collapse of the League of Nations as causes of the Second World War?**

This question requires that candidates explain and assess the importance of the parts played by both appeasement and the collapse of the League of Nations, in causing the Second World War. In doing so, they will also have to address the part played by the aggressive policies of dictators and single-party states, and may conclude that the peace seekers, those concerned with appeasement, and with the League, had no chance to be successful with their policies.

Appeasement is the term applied to foreign policy based on the conciliation of rival states, usually involving concessions, in an attempt to avoid conflict. Its most notable illustration is the attempt of Britain and France to satisfy Hitler's demands in relation to the Treaty of Versailles and land. Germany was allowed to rearm, to occupy the Rhineland, the Sudetenland areas of Czechoslovakia and to achieve *anschluss* with Austria – but this did not satisfy Hitler, therefore war.

The League failed to check aggression in relation to Japanese aggression in China, Italian aggression in Ethiopia and the USSR in Finland. Germany had left the League in 1933, and Hitler ignored it, as did all the states involved in the pre-war crisis 1938–39.

If only appeasement or the League of Nations is included in any answer the maximum mark should be **[12]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a narrative of appeasement and the League's failure as causes.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for focus on the importance of appeasement and the League's failure as causes.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focus on and analysis of parts played by appeasement and League's failure in causing the Second World War.

**[17 + marks]** for balance, in-depth analysis, or different interpretations.

**21. Assess the impact of the foreign policy of *either* Stalin between 1941 and 1953, *or* Khrushchev between 1956 and 1964, on the USSR and Europe.**

This question demands an explanation and assessment of the effects of foreign policy on the internal situation within the USSR, and the effect on Europe as a whole. Note that this is a Europe paper, so although wider world issues should be mentioned for their impact at Rome or on Europe they should not be described in full.

The main areas for Stalin will probably be: German invasion of USSR, 1941; Soviet invasion of eastern Europe; the onset of the Cold War; Cold War development, especially in Germany.

Khrushchev was involved with risings and unrest in eastern Europe, especially Poland and Hungary, (this can be counted as foreign), the Cuban missile crisis and in deteriorating relations with Mao in China. These events impacted on USSR, and the latter was largely responsible for Khrushchev's fall from power.

The markscheme includes Cuba and China to the extent that events in these countries impacted upon European foreign policy. Do not automatically discount mention of these countries as being inappropriate on a European paper.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a largely narrative account which does deal with USSR and Europe.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for satisfactory attention to both.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focus on and analysis of the set question.

**[17+ marks]** for insight or different interpretations.

**22. In what ways, and with what results, did *one* western European country recover from post-war problems between 1945 and 1970?**

This question requires candidates to explain how, by what methods, and with what results – at home, and in a wider context, one western European country recovered from the Second World War. Western could cover any country west of the iron curtain. All aspects, political, economic, social, and foreign policy (US aid and Cold War alliances), could be relevant. Details will depend on choice. Probably Britain, France and West Germany will be popular. Also note that the policies and actions of Adenauer or de Gaulle, named in the syllabus would be relevant. The time scale is up to 1970, but do not penalize if there is little on the sixties.

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for better focus and assessment.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for focus, structure and analysis

**[17+ marks]** for an in-depth critical analysis.

**23. What were the main political and economic problems faced by *one* central *or* eastern European country (excluding USSR) between 1945 and 1990?**

This question allows candidates to address countries on the other side of the iron curtain from Question 22. The time scale is wider than for Question 22, to allow for discussion of events leading to the collapse of communism/iron curtain. As in the previous question all aspects of government could be made relevant. The career of Tito, named in the syllabus could be used as a basis for an answer. The USSR is excluded to avoid overlap, and although this paper may appear at a first reading to favour questions on Russia, because several leaders are named, all the leaders named in the syllabus for the twentieth century could be used in a question.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts implicitly suggesting problems.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus on problems.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for analysis of problems, their treatment and impact.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis.

**24. “Considering the difficulties he faced, the success achieved by Gorbachev was remarkable.” To what extent do you agree with this judgment?**

This question requires an assessment of the situation in USSR pre 1985 and of the successes and failures of Gorbachev until his resignation in 1991. Difficulties faced need to be selective and analytical rather than long and descriptive. Policies could include, *glasnost* (openness) and *perestroika* (restructuring). His attempts to reform economic and social aspects of Soviet life, led to gradual liberalization. He fought against alcohol abuse, inefficiency and corruption, supported arms control, released political prisoners and made constitutional reforms.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative with implicit assessment of what Gorbachev did.

*[11 to 13 marks]* with clear focus on, and judgment of, the quotation.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for analysis and judgment.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis.



**25. Why did twentieth century Europe experience an increase in the availability and popularity of sport and other leisure activities?**

This is an open question in which candidates need to explain all the factors (political, social and economic) that were responsible for the increase of sport *etc.* Technology, the media, education, higher wages, increased competition including national rivalry, have all played their part. It is hoped that better answers will include specific examples as evidence, perhaps Hitler's Olympics.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for brief very general responses.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus and assessment.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for analysis and specific evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for an in-depth analysis.

---