

MARKSCHEME

November 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 authorization of IBCA.*

1. **“A ruthless dictator”; “a true social and political democrat”. With reference to the French revolutionary leader, Robespierre, explain which statement you consider to be more appropriate.**

Candidates are expected to discuss these two differing opinions by making reference to Robespierre’s actions and policies during the French Revolution between 1789 and 1794. The majority of the response should focus on the dates 1792–1794. Candidates should make specific reference to the Committee of Public Safety, the Triumvirate, the Terror and the Thermidorian reaction. The essays should make a judgment as to whether Robespierre was a “dictator” or “democrat” depending on which actions and policies are emphasized. Better candidates should be aware of the historiographical debate concerning Robespierre’s role in the Revolution. If only one part of the question is answered award no more than **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical descriptive accounts of Robespierre’s actions/policies that do not relate back to the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of actions/policies but only passing connection between these and the focus of the question.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of actions/policies and where candidates have begun to make a simplistic analysis of Robespierre.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, linked to actions/policies and with a clear attempt at a line of argument, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those actions/policies which lead to a judgment of whether Robespierre was a dictator or a democrat and which provide a clear analysis of the rationale upon which this judgment is based.

2. **To what extent has Napoleon’s impact on France between 1800 and 1815 been exaggerated?**

Policies which could be included are the reform of the banking system, the reform of the administrative and educational systems, the reform of the judicial system, the coup d’état, the use of the secret police, religious toleration, the Concordat, the gradual movement towards dictatorship *etc.* Candidates are then expected to make a judgment about the condition of France between 1800 and 1815 as to whether much had changed. There is a vast amount of historiography which could be used as supporting material.

[0 to 7 marks] for uncritical accounts of Napoleon’s policies that do not relate to the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of Napoleon’s policies but only a passing connection between these and his impact on France.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of policies and which begin to analyse at a basic level whether or not anything changed as a result of them.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, and a clearly developed argument, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies which did/did not affect France and provide clear analysis relating to the question.

3. How successful were the members of the Congress of Vienna in achieving their aims by 1830?

Candidates should initially identify the members of the Congress of Vienna, either by name or by country: Britain, France, Austria, Prussia and Russia. They should then recognize that the Congress had two sets of aims. Firstly, the question of how to deal with France and post-Napoleonic Europe. Secondly, the individual aims of each person/country who attended the Congress. Candidates should then detail the terms of the Vienna Settlement insofar as they were successful/unsuccessful in meeting these respective aims.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of the terms of the Congress of Vienna.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of aims but only passing connection between these and the decisions made at Vienna.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of aims and a clear linkage between these aims and the actions of the Congress. Any analysis would be at a simplistic level.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, linked to aims with a developed line of argument and some analysis, although this analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that outline the respective aims, carefully select those actions of the Congress which are/are not successful in light of these aims, and provide a clear analysis of the relationship between both.

4. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Disraeli and Gladstone between 1868 and 1886.

If candidates only include one leader the highest that should be awarded is **[8 marks]**.

Disraeli's policies include support for Turkey, Egypt and the Suez Canal, action against the Dreikaiserbund, the Congress of Berlin, Afghanistan, South Africa, India and the desire for Britain to play a greater role in Europe.

Gladstone's policies include the Bulgarian Question, Sudan, Afghanistan, Egypt and the Suez Canal, lack of European intervention and Egypt.

Candidates should select policies from the list above and argue whether or not Disraeli / Gladstone were consistent in them. In many cases there was extreme disagreement – Europe, Egypt and Bulgaria. In other cases the disagreement was a matter of degree. Some policies were similar.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of Disraeli / Gladstone's foreign policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of similarity/difference at a very simplistic level but only a passing connection between this and respective policies.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for policies with a direct attempt at comparison/contrast, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies which are/are not consistent, and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between both.

5. **“Only governments who do not have the will to resist are overthrown by revolutions.” To what extent do you agree with this assessment of the revolutions in France between 1789 and 1848?**

This is a question which is designed to test the candidates’ ability to make linkages between events. Candidates should examine the Revolutions of 1789, 1830 and 1848 in France and analyse why it was that the three monarchs (Louis XVI, Charles X, and Louis Philippe) were overthrown. In the case of 1830 and 1848 candidates may argue that the legacy of 1789 with the eventual execution of Louis XVI made later monarchs afraid to resist. Candidates may also argue that the monarchs had lost support anyway – which would support the quotation – or they may argue that they wanted to resist but were uncertain about their support, particularly by the military. All three revolutions should be included in any answer. The danger here is that candidates might be too general and not focus on the specifics of each revolution.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of the revolutions with no explicit linkage to the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for some linkage but with only simplistic and general detail.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of the revolutions with explicit reference to the question. Analysis might be at a very low level.

[14 to 16 marks] for greater details linked to the question with a developed line of argument, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that identify the reasons why the monarchs were overthrown, and provide a fully detailed analysis of the question.

6. “The resolution of the question of Rome was the key to Italian Unification.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates should focus on Rome and not on Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini. The question asks responses to start with the Roman Republic and France’s position vis-à-vis the Pope. Events which could be included are Piedmont’s relationship with the other Italian territories, the importance of the Pope and the Vatican, Garibaldi’s threatened occupation of Rome, the Franco-Prussian War and Rome. Candidates should ask themselves whether politically or spiritually a united Italy could exclude Rome and discuss the process which led to Rome’s incorporation into Italy as its capital.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of Italian unification.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of Rome but only passing connection between this and Italian unification.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of Rome’s importance with a simplistic analysis of whether or not it was the “key”.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, linked to Rome’s importance with more sustained analysis, although this analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that include relevant detail which is explicitly related to the question and which demonstrates consistent critical analysis.

7. Assess the importance of the role of Bismarck in the unification of Germany.

Candidates should place the 1871 unification in a wider context. The question is asking what factors, other than Bismarck’s role, contributed to unification. It will be necessary for candidates to go back before 1862 and identify key events such as the position of Prussia in 1815, the formation of the Zollverein, the effects of the 1848 Revolutions, the decline of Austria’s position, and the role of Napoleon III and France in German unification. Candidates who restrict themselves to Bismarck between 1862 and 1871 should receive a maximum of *[12 marks]*.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of German unification.

[8 to 10 marks] for some details/events of unification but only passing connection between these and Bismarck’s policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of policies and which begin to evaluate factors other than Bismarck.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, linked to Bismarck’s role, which construct a clear line of argument although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those events/policies which do / do not stem from Bismarck, and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between these policies, Bismarck and German unification.

8. How consistent were the domestic policies of Alexander II?

Alexander II really had one consistent aim – the preservation of autocracy and the continuation of the Romanov dynasty. Following defeat in the Crimean War Alexander II introduced reforms: Emancipation of the serfs, legal, military, educational and administrative reforms. But the reforms were not pursued to their logical ends which provoked criticism and assassination attempts. By 1879 he had turned repressive. Candidates should identify which of, and on what grounds, Alexander II's policies were consistent.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of policies of Alexander II but only passing connection between these and consistency.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of policies of Alexander II and which begin to construct a line of argument with simplistic analysis.

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

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies which are/are not consistent, and which provide a soundly argued position which includes solid analysis.

9. Why was there such an increase in membership of trade unions in Europe between 1875 and 1900?

The major reasons are economic expansion after 1871 which combined workers into larger units, the development of democratic ideas which encouraged legislation giving unions legal protection, the Europe-wide depression between 1882-1886 enlisted masses of workers, more national and unified labour organizations developed, and finally unionism become more international. Candidates should be able to identify these general reasons and apply them to individual case studies to develop a widely based analysis.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of the trade union movements in Europe.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of why membership increased, at a very simplistic level.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed explanation of membership increase in Europe.

[14 to 16 marks] for details and a clear line of argument, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that outline the reasons why membership increased and which provide a clear analysis of why this phenomenon was widespread throughout Europe. Analysis will be thorough and critical.

10. Analyse the factors that led to the increase of educational opportunity in many European countries between 1850 and 1900.

The main reason was the gradual realization by most European governments that it was necessary to provide their citizens with a system of public education – both primary and higher. This would increase the professional classes and resolve the national need for doctors, engineers, technicians and administrators. Extension of the franchise led to educational advances in the majority of European countries. Another reason was the controversy between church and state which dominated the issue of education particularly in France, Germany, Italy, Belgium and Austria-Hungary. Realism, positivism, nationalism and scientific developments were also contributory factors. Candidates should be able to identify general trends and provide specific examples to support their line of argument.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for narrative accounts of educational change which may only use one country as an example.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of change but with a wider base for evidence.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of why change occurred although the analysis might be simplistic.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, linked to change, and the analysis will be more fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that provide a clear analysis of the relationship between educational change and the factors that led to it from a number of examples. The line of argument will be clear and supported by sound analysis.

11. How successfully did the governments of *either* France *or* Spain deal with domestic problems in the period 1848 to 1914?

Candidates should identify what they consider to be the major domestic problems and then analyze the extent to which either country successfully resolved them. The full chronology should be included. Some examples of problems that might be included are the following, but these are not intended to be prescriptive.

Spain: Revolutions, the Hohenzollern crisis, anticlericalism, lack of economic growth, the Constitution, Amadeo, political instability, church-state relations, the Carlist Movement, regionalism, Maura, assassination of Canalejas.

France: Revolutions, economic expansion, social legislation, the policies of Louis Napoleon/Napoleon III, the Paris Commune, militarism and pacifism, anti-Semitism, Constitutional change, clericalism, Boulangerism, and socialism,

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for a descriptive list of events/policies in either country.

[8 to 10 marks] for some elementary discussion of policies which are perceived as problems.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of policies and a discussion of how they were dealt with. Any analysis will be superficial.

[14 to 16 marks] for explicit detail, linked to problems, and the analysis will be more fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies which were problems and which show whether the manner with which they were handled was successful/unsuccessful. Analysis will be thorough and critical.

12. “Although Germany was blamed for the outbreak of the First World War other countries were equally responsible.” How far do you agree with this statement?

Candidates could take several different approaches to this question. Weaker responses could focus on the general causes: the Alliance System, militarism, colonialism and the assassination of Franz Ferdinand. These responses may not focus enough on the question. Other candidates might examine the immediate causes of the war from June to August 1914 with specific reference to the actions and policies of each country. Better candidates might be aware of the historiographical debate on this topic and be able to identify some of the key lines of argument *e.g.* Fay-Fischer-Ritter and apply them directly to the question.

Ensure that, if candidates are citing names, they are aware of the arguments and that they use them as evidence to support their own line of argument. Frequently names are “inserted” apparently to indicate wider reading but the candidate sometimes has little idea of what has actually been written.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which simply list the causes of the First World War.

[8 to 10 marks] for essays which begin to link these causes to German aggression but which lack analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which explore the notion of the role of other European countries in the outbreak of the war, although the level of analysis is relatively simplistic.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which demonstrate a balanced assessment of the relative responsibility for the outbreak for the war with a linkage between cause and effect.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

13. Compare and contrast the political and constitutional development of any *two* of the following countries in the twentieth century: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, or Finland.

Candidates are expected to identify, where possible, common factors which exist between any two of the listed countries and develop an analysis based on their own selections. The intention of the question is to compare/contrast the machinery and institutions which have been developed as each nation has evolved its own specific identity.

If only one country is included award no more than **[8 Marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts which describe events in two countries.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of events but only passing connection between these and comparison/contrast.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of events/policies and which show a clear attempt at comparison/contrast at a superficial level.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, explicitly compared and contrasted although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies which are similar/different and provide a clear analysis of them. Analysis will be soundly argued.

14. Compare and contrast the contributions of Lenin and Trotsky to the establishment and consolidation of a communist state in Russia between 1917 and 1924.

This question has several parts to it and it is important that candidates include all of them if they are to receive top marks. The first part deals with the Revolutions in Russia in 1917, the eventual overthrow of the Provisional Government and the development of Bolshevik Russia by 1918. The contributions of both Trotsky (Chairman of the MRC, his military contributions) and Lenin (ideological base, oratory, single-mindedness) need to be evaluated. The second part encompasses the Civil War, economic changes, and the direction Bolshevism should take. Here again the respective roles/policies/aims of the two men need to be compared and contrasted. There is disagreement among historians as to the importance of Lenin and Trotsky so it is important that candidates' responses are evaluated on the basis of the quality of their arguments and the degree to which these are supported by well-selected evidence. If only one leader is included award no more than **[8 marks]**. If only the establishment or the consolidation of the state are included award up to **[12 marks]** if Lenin/Trotsky have been compared/contrasted.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of events in Russia.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of events with only passing connection between these and Lenin/Trotsky.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of events and a better-developed line of reasoning with implicit comparison/contrast although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, explicitly linked to Lenin/Trotsky, with a more fully developed analysis.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies/events/actions which demonstrate comparison/contrast and which provide a clear analysis of the similarities/differences between Lenin/Trotsky.

15. Analyse the key factors that led to the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire by 1919.

After the defeat in the Austro-Prussian War (1866) and the introduction of the Dual Monarchy (1867) Austria's position in Europe was weakened. However it is a mistake to overestimate the weakness of the state in 1914. Economically it was strong. There was an alliance between church, state, crown and the army. Areas of tension between the two members had generally been resolved. The one single event, which led to the disintegration of the Empire by October 1918, was Austria's participation on the side of Germany in the First World War. This led the incipient problem of the national minorities to reassert itself with declarations of independence by the Czechs, Southern Slavs and Hungarians. Austria-Hungary's aggressive foreign policy in the years before 1914 had ultimately led to the end of its Empire. The Peace Treaties that followed the First World War ratified this change.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of events with no real focus.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of key factors but only passing connection between these and the break-up of the Empire.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of key factors and which, at a simplistic level, begin to explain why the Empire crumbled.

[14 to 16 marks] for detailed material explicitly linked to factors, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that outline the key factors and which provide a detailed analysis of the relationship between these factors and the demise of the Empire. Analysis will be thorough and critical.

16. “Unwanted and unloved.” How far do agree with this assessment of the Weimar Republic in Germany between 1918 and 1933?

The questions asks candidates to discuss the formation of the Weimar Republic to see whether it was “unwanted” and then to discuss its policies up to 1933 to see if it was “unloved”. Naturally any answer to these questions will depend on the perspective of the person making the analysis and the time period which is under discussion. The Weimar Republic was a democratic state which was popular among some groups, but not socialist enough for others, and among monarchists/aristocrats it would have been unpopular. By 1924 the situation in Germany was improving. But, by 1929 after the Wall Street Crash, a constitutional crisis occurred leading to a drift to the right and Hitler’s accession to power. Candidates should not just focus on Versailles and Hitler.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of the Weimar Republic.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of events/policies but only passing connection between these and the demands of the question.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of events/policies with an explicit attempt at analysis which will be rather superficial.

[14 to 16 marks] for details linked to the question through a clear line of argument. The analysis will be more fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those events/policies which show that the Weimar Republic was/was not “unwanted” or “unloved” and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between them.

17. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Hitler and Mussolini up to 1940.

Mussolini had longer to develop his foreign policy and initially this was aimed at redressing perceived grievances over the Paris Peace Treaties – Fiume and Corfu. Both leaders wanted to develop an Empire although Hitler's was more European based than Mussolini's. Mussolini desired revenge for Adowa, which led to the Abyssinian campaign in 1934. Both were members of the Four-Power Pact, but only Mussolini belonged to the Stresa Front. Mussolini, following Locarno, was pledged to support the Rhineland, which led to his intervention against Hitler in Austria in 1934. It was only in 1936 that the two leaders started moving in the same direction although Hitler's plans for conquest were more ideologically based and more widespread than those of Mussolini. Candidates should include the Spanish Civil War, Anschluss, Munich, aggressive moves in 1939, and campaigns in the Second World War.

If only one leader is selected award no more than **[8 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive, unrelated, lists of events/policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for accurate details, but with minimal analysis of the policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of policies and some analysis of their similarities/differences although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for details, with explicit analysis which is more fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies which demonstrate comparison/contrast and which have a consistent and thorough analysis of these policies.

18. **“He brought his country and his people nothing but harm.” To what extent do you agree with this assessment of Stalin’s domestic policies in the USSR between 1929 and 1953?**

Stalin’s policies are generally well known. Collectivization and the kulaks, the Five Year Plans, the Constitution of 1936, the Show Trials, the Purges, the Kirov Affair, the disbanding of the Central Committee and the Politburo, the Doctor’s Plot, anti-Semitism, the Leningrad Affair, and postwar reconstruction. There is considerable debate as to whether or not these policies/actions were beneficial or not. Weaker candidates will accept the quotation unquestioningly; better candidates will make a more balanced assessment of positive/negative effects. Historians are also sharply divided on Stalin and it is likely that candidates will be aware of some of these opinions. It is possible to argue that the Russian people were harmed but that Russia, as a nation, benefited.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of event/policies in Russia under Stalin.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of “harm”, but only passing connection between this and events/policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of events/policies and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement at a rather simplistic level.

[14 to 16 marks] for events/policies, linked to “harm”, where the line of argument is more clear and is supported by solid evidence although any analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully select those policies/events that support/refute the statement and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between it and the question.

19. For what reasons, and with what results, did Britain and France pursue a policy of appeasement in the 1930s?

Candidates should first identify what they understand by the term “appeasement” and then go on to analyze this definition in light of the policies/actions of the British and French governments. The traditional approach is that Chamberlain was duped by Hitler when they met and, by not taking a more aggressive stance, allowed Hitler free rein in Eastern Europe. Daladier was then convinced by Chamberlain to support him. More recent historiography maintains that Chamberlain had little choice for strategic reasons, because of the political climate in Britain and France, and actually bought time for Britain and France who could have done nothing about Czechoslovakia anyway. Appeasement also forced Stalin to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in order to try to delay a German offensive against Russia. Candidates who merely accept the traditional approach will need to support their arguments with solid evidence.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of events in the 1930s.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of appeasement but only passing connection between this and events.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of events and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement at a rather simplistic level.

[14 to 16 marks] for events/policies, linked to appeasement, where the line of argument is more clear and is supported by solid evidence although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those policies/events which support/refute the statement and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between it and the question.

20. To what extent did the states of Central and Eastern Europe benefit economically from Soviet control between 1949 and 1989?

Fundamentally this is a question dealing with the role of Comecon after the Second World War. Comecon was founded in 1949 as a Communist response to the Marshall Plan. Initially Comecon concerned itself with bilateral trade treaties through standing commissions. After Stalin's death and the events in East Germany and Hungary Comecon became more directive in matters of economic planning. Candidates could use examples from Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland to show how individual countries tried to develop independently, without success. Any attempt at decentralization was equated with liberalization of controls. Members of Comecon had a common interest in raising economic performance and expanding trade practices outside the Communist bloc. Initially it was relatively successful, but later when oil prices rose and inflation occurred Comecon's economic performance declined. Comecon developed full employment and did help initial industrial expansion but its negative effects are generally seen to have outweighed its positive effects.

[0 to 7 marks] for descriptive accounts of events/policies in Central and Eastern Europe.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of effects but only passing connection between this and events/policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of events/policies linked to effects and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement at a rather simplistic level.

[14 to 16 marks] for events/policies, explicitly analysed, where the line of argument is clearer and is supported by solid evidence although any analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers, which carefully select those policies/events, that support/refute the statement and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between them and their effects.

21. Analyse the effects of technological development on the arts after the Second World War.

Candidates will be able to argue both ways here but the general consensus among historians is that technology did transform the world of the arts but that the popular arts (non-classical music, architecture, art, popular literature, and film) were affected earlier and more completely than the “high” arts (theatre, opera, ballet, poetry and literature). The reasons have to do with the development of consumerism, the advent of mass marketing, television, and new electronic technologies. Public and private resources devoted to the arts were far greater than ever before but there was, in fact, a decline in the genres of high art and literature. Performances increased but mostly of pre-twentieth century composers/writers. Western Europe was no longer the centre of the “high arts” by 1989. Technology transformed the arts by making them omnipresent and consumerist.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of technological developments

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of technology, but only passing connection between this and the arts.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of technology and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement at a rather simplistic level by referring to limited examples from the arts.

[14 to 16 marks] for appropriately selected examples from the arts, linked to technological development, where the line of argument is clearer although any analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully select examples and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between them and the question. Analysis will be consistent and thorough.

22. Assess the significance of Adenauer's achievements in West Germany between 1945 and 1963.

In 1945 Adenauer wanted to form a new political party which later became the Christian Democratic Union. He was asked to help create a provisional constitution in 1948, and became West Germany's first Chancellor in 1949. His aim was to create a sovereign West German state and he prepared the way for West German participation in the OEEC, in the Council of Europe and the International Ruhr Authority. Eventually, after his memorandum of 1950, West Germany was included in plans for a European Defence Community and, when it failed, NATO. Adenauer ended the Allied occupation in 1954 and negotiated a compensation agreement with Israel. He was forced to retire in 1963 after the creation of a CDU-CSU-FDP coalition. Scandal and the Spiegel Affair troubled the last years of his rule.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts of Adenauer's actions/policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of policies but with very limited assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of actions/policies and implicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for actions/policies, explicitly assessed, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those actions/policies that demonstrate the success or failure of Adenauer's achievements, and which provide a clear analysis of the relationship between both.

23. How successfully did Spain make the transition to a constitutional monarchy after the death of Franco?

Candidates first have to identify what they consider to be the main issues faced by Spain in 1975. These could include Basque nationalism, economic recession, the state of exception in 1969 leading to repression, lack of social reforms, the Political Associations Act of 1974, and labor strikes.

By 1978 a constitutional monarchy had been formed but the lengthy process led to demonstrations and political unrest which was suppressed. An amnesty was declared, reforms were passed with help of a National Referendum and elections were held in 1977. Problems still existed: a growing economic crisis, Basque terrorism, the threat of military subversion and regionalism. A new constitution was drafted and new elections were held in 1979. Improvements were made but some of the problems that had been inherited from Franco remained.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of Franco's legacies.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of issues but only passing connection between these and post-Franco policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of issues with implicit analysis of how they were resolved.

[14 to 16 marks] for details of issues and identified solutions, and where the analysis should be more developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that outline the issues, carefully select those policies which resolved/did not resolve them, and which provide a clear, consistent and thorough analysis of the relationship between issues and solutions.

24. **“Gorbachev has been hailed as a great statesman and politician but in reality his domestic and foreign achievements were far less significant than has been claimed.” Discuss.**

Gorbachev’s greatest problem in the Soviet Union was to change the stagnant Soviet economy. To do this a change in the political and social structure was necessary. Gorbachev’s policies of glasnost and perestroika democratized Soviet society and improved relationships with capitalist countries. Gorbachev reshuffled the Politburo, became Chairman and eventually President of the USSR. Gorbachev’s abandoning of the Brezhnev Doctrine with the resulting turn to democracy by Eastern European countries was hailed by the West as it led to a series of non-violent revolutions which ended the Cold War and for which Gorbachev received the Nobel Peace Prize. While Gorbachev is generally well regarded in the West in Russia his reputation is very low. It is perceived that he brought about the collapse of the country as the economy crashed and he was forced to resign in 1991. Candidates will be expected to contrast his success outside the USSR with his perceived failure within, despite the establishment of a democratic government.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of actions/policies followed by Gorbachev.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of Gorbachev’s position as a statesman, but only a passing connection between this and his actions/policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of Gorbachev’s actions/policies and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement at a rather simplistic level.

[14 to 16 marks] for actions/policies, where the line of argument is clearer and where it is supported by solid evidence of Gorbachev’s success/failure although any analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully select those actions/policies that support/refute the statement and which provide a clear, consistent and thorough analysis of the relationship between them and the question.

25. Compare and contrast the social and economic consequences of the Second World War on two European countries.

Candidates should select two countries – if only one is chosen award no more than **[8 marks]**. If only social or economic consequences are analyzed award up to **[12 marks]**. A clear linkage must be made between the events in the chosen countries and the fact that these were caused by the Second World War. In many cases candidates know the events/policies of particular countries but cannot deal with them on a cause/effect basis.

[0 to 7 marks] maximum for uncritical accounts which describe events in two countries.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of consequences but only a passing connection between these and comparison/contrast.

[11 to 13 marks] for more specific answers that include a detailed account of consequences and which show a clear attempt at comparison/contrast although at a relatively superficial level.

[14 to 16 marks] for consequences, explicitly compared and contrasted, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers that carefully select those social and economic consequences which are similar/different and provide a clear analysis of them. This analysis will be consistent and thorough.
