



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2004**

**HISTORY**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

*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.*

**Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war****1. Evaluate the social and economic consequences of *two* twentieth century wars.**

Emphasis should be on identifying and evaluating the types, nature, extent of changes produced as a result of war in social and economic areas – supported by specific examples to substantiate claims. The relative emphasis given to each area of change may alter depending on the conflicts selected, but responses should attempt to cover both areas as requested. “Consequences” may be interpreted as occurring during the period of conflict or after such conflicts have ended.

Social consequences could refer to issues of – demographic imbalance as a result of deaths, infringement or curtailment of civil liberties – freedoms of speech, press, assembly – changing roles/perceptions of females as a result of contributions made to a war effort, increased state control over the life of the individual – conscription, requisition, rationing *etc.*

Economic consequences could include – mobilization of work force behind war effort, industrial boom/slump, dislocation of pre-war trading and production patterns, agricultural disruption, inflation, increased taxation, government borrowing, indemnities/reparations as a consequence of defeat, physical destruction/damage and post-war recovery needs. In some cases profits could be made by individuals and the economic status of certain states improved immeasurably – for example the USA as a creditor nation after both World wars.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive responses of two wars which cover the changes implicitly – but little evidence of an attempt at evaluation or critical commentary. Likely to be an end-on account with insufficient focus.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will require a more explicit focus on the areas of change, providing specific examples – perhaps unbalanced in terms of the areas and/or the treatment of the two wars selected. Evaluation present but not fully developed.

**[14 to 16 + marks]** will be awarded for a structured (possibly thematic) approach as opposed to end-on account. Evaluation will be present and developed and evidence provided to support the arguments. Balanced in terms of the treatment of both areas and the two wars chosen. At the top end of the band a high level of analysis/critical commentary, a strong supporting base of relevant and accurate information concerning the types, extent, nature of changes will be present.

**2. How valid is the claim that in 1914 states went to war due to fear rather than for motives of gain?**

The question requires candidates to consider the motives of the various states in Europe (and their respective empires) for entry into the First World War. A popular question no doubt, which could produce an avalanche of pre-learned or pre-planned responses on the Origins of World War One: such responses are unlikely to score well.

The question indicates two areas/issues for particular consideration *i.e.* “fear” and “gain” and both areas should be addressed. The “How valid” invitation permits candidates not just to consider the relative merits of “fear” and “gain” but allows for identification of other motives which they may feel to be significant. Stronger responses will no doubt produce such an approach. Belgium, for example, had little time to worry about either issue in 1914 and found itself at war for quite simple reasons.

“Fear” could be linked to individual states – *e.g.* German fear of encirclement, Russian fear of diplomatic failure/humiliation, Vienna’s fear of Pan-Slavism/Serb Nationalism and anxiety over imperial disintegration, British fears of naval/economic challenges. “Gain” could be linked to desires (overt or covert) of various states by 1914 which, it was believed, might be achievable through military means/war. Such gains might be territorial, economic, diplomatic, irredentist, *etc.*

*N.B. The First World War provides much opportunity for investigation and examination of other motives and the problem will not be a lack of detail in responses, but a plethora of indiscriminately selected and deployed material.*

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which are largely descriptive but which do touch upon the issues of “fear/gain” albeit in little convincing depth before moving on to other areas. Responses may in some cases give the impression of a learned response approach.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will consider the issues of “fear “ and “gain” explicitly, though specific examples of each may be limited and/or unbalanced. The “How valid” element will be identified and tackled though the level of analysis and provision of alternative motives may not be well developed.

**[14 to 16 marks]** may be awarded for responses that deal effectively with both issues of “fear” and “gain”, provide convincing, accurate, substantiation of each and address the issue of “How valid” effectively. Investigation of other possible motives of the powers involved (individually or collectively) may be apparent and once more, specific examples provided as evidence.

**[17+ marks]** as above but candidates will provide accurate detailed knowledge and reveal evidence of wide reading and/or different interpretations concerning motives/motivation of the warring states.

**3. To what extent did guerilla warfare determine the outcome of the Vietnam War?**

The question requires candidates to make a judgment as to the significance of the role of guerrilla warfare undertaken in Vietnam pre-1975 in determining the outcome. Likely to be a popular question which will, for some candidates, result in a narration of the French and American involvement in Indo-China/Vietnam post-1945. In Vietnam the struggle against France, the tactics of Giap and examination of guerrilla warfare in its military and psychological impact could be identified and addressed. Other factors affecting the outcome could be identified and developed – external aid to the NLF, economic conditions, collapse of morale, international pressure/interference, mistakes (political or military) or inappropriate strategies of opponents. Much is available.

*[8 to 10 marks]* generalized narratives of the conflict lacking focus on the question of “To what extent”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for responses which examine the role and practice of guerrilla tactics explicitly. Awareness of other factors may be present but not adequately developed or supported. Assessment may be cursory.

*[14 to 16 marks]* will be awarded for answers which reveal a sound knowledge of the motives for, and practice of, guerrilla warfare. Awareness of other significant factors will be apparent and some attempt will be made to put the physical conflict in a wider context in trying to assess the relative contribution to eventual victory.

*[17+ marks]* will be awarded for answers which are structured, show knowledge of the theory and practice of guerrilla warfare and estimate its importance in relation to other clearly identified (and elaborated) factors (internal and external). The level of assessment in such a response will reveal a degree of critical analysis suggestive of wider reading and/or knowledge of historiography.

**4. Why did foreign intervention occur so frequently in civil wars of the twentieth century and what impact did this intervention have on *two* civil wars each chosen from a different region?**

If only one example is dealt with or both examples are chosen from the same region mark out of **[12]** maximum.

The form of the question may help candidates structure a response, requiring them to address the question of examining the motives (*e.g.* economic, ideological/proxy/surrogate, strategic gain, religious, military) of outside powers in such conflicts, and how such intervention affected for example the nature (type of weapons, the strategy, duration, levels of physical and human destruction) and outcome (*e.g.* did such intervention prove decisive in producing victory, and if so for whom and why?) of the war.

The most popular examples are likely to be the Russian Civil War, the Chinese Civil War, the Spanish Civil War. Vietnam and Korea may appear though the civil war element should be made clear from the outset. Greece, Pakistan, Biafra may also appear. Depending on the wars selected, the emphases as to motives will vary – as is the case with impact. What is important is the coverage of the different elements or components in a balanced manner.

**[8 to 10 marks]** will be scored for a narration of two civil wars with only implicit reference to the tasks.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will be awarded for responses which address all parts of the question, though not always in a balanced manner, and which still tend towards narrative/descriptive.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** available for structured essays which address all parts of the question: motives, impact such as nature, outcome in a balanced manner and provide accurate supporting knowledge to substantiate arguments. The level of analysis/investigation of the component parts will suggest, at the top end, evidence of wide reading and/or awareness of historical interpretations.

**5. Assess the role of air power in *two* twentieth century wars.**

*N.B. Only candidates with a sound grasp of technological developments in the military use of air power and the tactical/strategic use of air power in both wars are advised to tackle such a question. Knowledge of technology alone is not sufficient to provide an adequate response base.*

*[8 to 10 marks]* will be awarded for general, largely descriptive accounts of airpower in the two wars.

*[11 to 13 marks]* responses will provide a sound knowledge base concerning the type and usage of air power in both cases. Specific knowledge of campaigns, functions of air power and its effectiveness/ineffectiveness will not be fully developed.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for responses which show a solid grasp of the technology associated with air power development, the role and relative effectiveness of such air power. Detailed reference to specific campaigns/theatres of operations should be present.

*[17+ marks]* will address the issues of technology, development, usage and effectiveness of the aircraft/weaponry identified and may make informed comment on the ways in which such air power changed in its role in both wars. Evidence of wide reading may be apparent. Responses will go beyond technical descriptions and consider the impact/contribution of aerial warfare in each case.

**Topic 2 Nationalist and independence movements, decolonization and challenges facing new states**

**6. Evaluate the claim that decolonization after 1945 was due less to the strength of nationalist movements than to the weaknesses of the colonial powers.**

*N.B. No number of examples is stated but responses providing reference to only one example are unlikely to score highly.*

The decolonization process is dated from 1945: no end date is given and the candidate is able to choose a finishing point depending on case studies or examples selected. Arguments can be found for both views *i.e.* the growing strength of nationalist movements frustrated by colonial rule in the past and willing to take up arms in some cases (Indo-China, Dutch East Indies, Algeria for example) or simply mobilize civil resistance against the colonizing power (India for example). Yet the weakness of colonizing powers as a result of the Second World War, which had economic, military and psychological effects on both colonizer and colonized, also played an important role in the process: – hastening the decision of the metropolitan power to quit before an explosion occurred (South Asia) or, where colonialism hung on, making it difficult to use sufficient military power to repress as had been the case in the past (Indo-China, Indonesia).

Depending on the examples studied the assumption of nationalist strength/colonial weakness could be challenged (Belgium and Congo – and the motives behind that decolonizing experience?). Some candidates may even call into question whether decolonization was simply a ploy to re-impose control by a less formal means – neo-colonialism (Francophone Africa?) The decolonization process as it affected France, Britain, Portugal, Belgium, the Netherlands and their respective territories should provide much detail to support arguments.

**[7 marks]** and below for generalized and unfocused comments on nationalism/nationalist movements. No real evidence that the demands of question are understood or tackled.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for generalized, often narrative/descriptive responses of the decolonization process with implicit treatment of the evaluation task. A coherent argument may be present but limited convincing supporting material.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood and an attempt has been made to address the “strength/weaknesses” reference as well as some recognition of the need to evaluate. Not always balanced in its treatment of the different components and requiring more development in terms of the evaluation task.

**[14 to 16 marks]** deals effectively and relevantly with the demands of the question, providing sound information and specific case studies/examples of the decolonization process in its attempts to weigh up *i.e.* evaluate, the issue of strengths and weaknesses of nationalists and decolonizers. Consistent level of analytical ability is present although not all aspects may be covered.

**[17+ marks]** as above – but in addition response may exhibit a grasp of the topic/task gained from wide reading or show awareness of historiographical issues or mount a challenge to the assertion possibly identifying or emphasizing other factors responsible for the process – Cold War, US pressure in some cases, UNO and decolonization *etc.*



7. **With reference to *either* Ghana (1957-1966) *or* Indonesia (1949-1965) identify the problems facing the newly independent state and assess the extent to which such problems were successfully resolved.**

For Ghana reference could be made to: – economic dependency on exports of a few commodities (colonial economic inheritance), tribal differences inhibiting national unity, regionalism and separatist movements, ambitious undertaking of industrialization and prestige projects by Nkrumah, application of “emergency measures” effectively establishing a one-party state. Nkrumah was overthrown in a military takeover in 1966.

Foreign policy and its effects on Ghana – antagonism of USA due to links with PRC, Nkrumah’s pursuit of Pan-Africanism – how helpful to the new state?

How did Ghana in this period deal with the economic and political problems? With what success? Details required to substantiate!

For Indonesia reference could be made to: – economic devastation caused during colonial war with Dutch, demobilization of guerrilla units after revolution, unemployment, fluctuating prices for raw materials (rubber, oil, tin *etc.*) on the world market, population growth, (especially in Java), lack of trained administrators, no tradition of democratic institutions/parliamentary system, proliferation of political parties with none having absolute majority, arguments over Islamic or secular nature of the new state, centrifugal tendencies due to size and diversity of the archipelago and resentment at Javanese “domination” – secessionism *e.g.* Sumatra, South Moluccas throughout 1950s, growing influence of (Communist) PKI, introduction of “Guided Democracy”. Military coup due to growth of Communist influence in government.

Foreign problems – “Konfrontasi” with Malaysia, West Irian dispute with the Netherlands, US hostility due to links with China.

Again, there is a need to comment upon the extent to which problems were addressed and resolved - or not - by the given dates. Specific detail needed for effective responses.

**[7 marks]** and below for generalized comments about problems of new nations which are not supported adequately by reference to the named states.

**[8 to 10 marks]** general narratives or descriptive accounts identifying types of problems but not dealing effectively with the “resolution” part of the question.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for responses which do identify problems and make comment on the extent to which they were/were not resolved. Answers likely to be unbalanced in treatment of the two sections and/or somewhat limited in the identification of the different types of problems.

**[14 to 16 marks]** balanced coverage of problems and the issue of resolution. Sound historical information base regarding the types and extent of problems is present. Demonstrates a consistent level of analytical ability though not all aspects of the question may have been addressed.

**[17+ marks]** addresses the demands of the question in an effective manner and in a well structured and well-supported essay. Level of analysis/critical commentary will be high and/or response may show evidence of wide reading and good conceptual ability.

**8. To what extent did the colonial legacy hinder social and economic progress in newly independent states in *either* Africa *or* Asia?**

The question does not state any set number of examples but dealing with only one state is unlikely to provide the basis for answers which will score highly.

There needs to be identification of the term “colonial legacy” and what elements it consists of – especially in relation to social and economic developments (or under-development as some historians would have it) in the colonial territories being discussed pre-independence and the extent to which subsequent progress was hampered (or not) due to this legacy. Depending on the states chosen, details concerning colonial economic development and its impact on the indigenous population(s) will differ greatly as will the coverage of subsequent post-independent progress (or the lack thereof).

Some may argue that formal colonialism and economic exploitation were replaced with neo-colonialism, that economic linkage into the colonial state’s economy skewed the course of economic development and created dependency on few and limited primary products in post-independence times, thus making economies vulnerable to international price fluctuations on the world commodity markets. Social progress in terms of benefits in health, education, an end to discrimination, *etc.* may also be seen in the light of the inheritance of colonialism. What exactly was left by the colonizers? What progress was made in improving upon the inheritance?

Hard evidence is expected to support the claims made whichever states are selected. The “To what extent” invitation allows candidates to bring in other factors (political for example) which hindered social and economic progress.

**[7 marks]** and below for generalized and possibly polemical responses condemning the “evils of colonialism” without a sufficiently convincing historical knowledge base.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for general comments on the colonial legacy suggesting the demands of the question are generally understood but the level of supporting information is limited, resulting in a response which is coherent but not always convincingly substantiated.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood and addressed though not all aspects are considered. Examples of colonial legacy are provided for specific states under consideration and the answer is structured. The issue of social and economic progress (or lack) is dealt with – though may require a stronger evidence base.

**[14 to 16 marks]** the demands of the question are effectively addressed in a structured framework dealing with specific case studies or states. Accurate historical information has been provided to support references to the issues of “colonial legacy” and “progress”. “To what extent” has been addressed – but all aspects of the question may not have been dealt with.

**[17+ marks]** the response is focused and addresses all parts of the question. Historical details are relevant, accurate and well deployed. In addition to the mark band descriptor above, answers in this level will also demonstrate either an awareness of historiography, a good conceptual ability or – in this particular case – even mount a challenge to the assumptions implied in the question and allocate responsibility at other doors, pre- and post-independence.

**9. Assess the contribution of the leader of an independence movement in either *one* African or *one* South Asian state.**

*N.B.* South Asia for the purpose of this question refers to India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka. Indo-China/Vietnam is **not** acceptable.

While it does not state that the period relates to pre-independence necessarily, most responses to this question will probably interpret it as such. There may be a case however for some responses to consider post-independence events if the leader and the independence movement continued as the ruling polity after the attainment of freedom. Examiners should give the benefit of doubt where possible.

“Contributions” – could cover ideology, methods of resistance: peaceful/violent means of promotion of unity between divergent indigenous religious, ethnic groups in an anti-colonial movement, creation and mobilization of mass movements as opposed to elitist groupings. Not all independence movements and their leaders created a secure base for national unity it might be noted, and neglect of tribal or religious communities often hindered rather than promoted progress during the independence struggle and in the post-independence period.

*[7 marks]* and below for unfocused narratives.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers which are generalized, largely narrative or descriptive and which deal with “assess” implicitly.

*[11 to 13 marks]* answers identify areas of contribution by the chosen leader. Adequate relevant knowledge is present and the demands of the question are understood, though not all implications are considered.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* responses indicate that the demands of the question are clearly understood and effectively addressed in a focused essay. Analytical ability is obvious as is evidence of either good conceptual ability, historiographical knowledge, evidence of wide reading.

**10. Analyse the importance of the two World Wars in the process of decolonization.**

Both wars should be commented on. Responses which deal with only one, mark out of **[12]** maximum.

Answers will probably be end – on in most cases, examining the impact of each war on the process of decolonization (specific examples to be provided) from the point of view of the frustrations amongst the colonial populations and the decline in power (economic, military) of the colonizing power.

Points arising are likely to be:- First World War – colonial disenchantment with selective application of self-determination at Peace Conferences, failure of colonizing powers to acknowledge contributions (human, economic) of colonies, breaking of the myth of moral superiority of western civilization, disillusionment with measures adopted by colonizing powers to placate rising demands for independence. Also important is the resentment of Dominion status for white colonies; colonial nationalism on the rise (*e.g.* India, Indo-China, West Africa, Central Africa) but still essentially contained.

Second World War – decline of Great Powers and inability to hold on to imperial possessions despite, in some cases, the use of violence (*e.g.* Dutch East Indies, Indo-China, Algeria) Impact militarily and psychologically of victory of non-western powers (*e.g.* Japan) in successfully challenging traditional colonial powers, in promoting indigenous nationalist groups and the Atlantic Charter raising hopes of populations. Candidates may also refer to the rise of the super-powers post-Second World War and anti-colonial stance of both – for their own reasons (political and economic in Cold War circumstances); United Nations Organization and early stance on decolonization.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for generalized narratives – lacking sufficient specific examples to convincingly substantiate points made.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which deal with both wars but there may be an imbalance and/or need for better supporting information.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** addresses both wars and their impact in a balanced fashion, provides convincing examples, shows awareness of relative importance of each war in the process of decolonization as well as the outside pressures. At the top end a strong supporting evidence base will be present and wide reading may be evident.

**Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states**

11. **“Fascism’s rise to power in Italy and Germany in the inter-war years largely resulted from the consequences of the First World War.” To what extent do you agree with this verdict?**

The ascendance of Fascism is a popular field of study. Many attribute the birth of the movements in Italy and Germany to the impact of the First World War on the societies of both states. Defeat, humiliation and a perceived punitive treaty in Germany and frustration at a “Mutilated Peace” in Italy provided a basis for extreme nationalism in the period 1919 onwards. Responses should deal with the consequences of the First World War and the revisionism/revanchism which helped fuel Fascism in both States. Economic and social dislocation post-First World War could be identified and the failure of existing regimes to solve problems – thus leaving the way open for extremist ideologies – could be investigated. Issues of collaboration by establishment elites, the fear of the Left, aggrieved or unfulfilled nationalism, revanchism, the mistakes of those in power who failed to recognize the threat, the strategies and raw appeal of the Fascist leaders and their programmes in times of troubled economic circumstances are all areas which could be referred to.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive responses dwelling on the story of the “rise to power” of Fascism/Nazism.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for essays dealing with both examples, which move beyond narrative/descriptive accounts, identify the post-war conditions and comment explicitly on some of the problems. There may be references to other factors but knowledge base may be limited. “To what extent” will not be adequately addressed.

**[14 to 16 marks]** candidates will provide sound knowledge of post-war economic, political and social problems, comment on their performance/lack of performance of political systems and explain why. Comment could be made on the extent to which conditions produced disillusionment/support for extreme alternatives. Other factors would be identified and their respective weight/responsibility considered.

**[17+ marks]** for answers which deal convincingly with the consequences of war providing a sound evidence base to explain the nature and extent of instability. Responses will address other factors which may be relevant and will make a considered judgment in keeping with the invitation to evaluate *i.e.* “To what extent?”

**12. Assess the role of economic and social policies as factors explaining the consolidation and maintenance of power of *two* of the following: Castro, Mussolini, Perón, Nasser.**

Emphasis is on single-party states in power and the extent to which such states have established their position as a result of the economic and social policies pursued/implemented – or whether additional factors must also be examined to explain consolidation/maintenance. Two examples required. If only one example is used mark out of a maximum of **[12]**.

Whichever examples are chosen there should be identification of specific social/economic policies and their relative contribution. Agrarian reform, industrialization, social security, housing programmes, (full) employment, medical/educational opportunities, gender/racial equality – all may be addressed and considered. Other factors may also be examined in attempts to deal with the question of consolidation depending on the examples chosen – *e.g.* nationalism/anti-imperialism, police state repression, propaganda, purge, foreign policy, outside support *etc.*

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/end-on general accounts of two examples. Assessment element – implicit at best.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for responses which clearly identify the social and economic policies of the two examples and comment upon their role in aiding consolidation and maintenance. There may be an imbalance in treatment of examples and/or areas of economic and social policies.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well balanced and structured answers, which identify policies, comment on impact/role. May see other factors as also being crucial in the question of consolidation/maintenance of power: *i.e.* tackles the issue of “Assess”.

**[17+ marks]** for responses which provide a strong and accurate knowledge base concerning economic/social policies and reveal a structured analytical approach, placing economic and social policies in a wider context in explaining consolidation and maintenance of rule. Good conceptual ability, awareness of historical interpretations may be evident.

**13. For what reasons, and with what success, have single party states attempted to control *either* education *or* the arts?**

Whether “education” or “the arts” is selected, answers require a sound knowledge base. Why the single-party state targets such areas or why artistic life (in its widest sense – for example literature, poetry, painting, sculpture, theatre, film) becomes a focus for state control and direction requires examination and explanation. How effective or successful state activity has been in achieving its aims will also require evaluation.

Popular choices for both “the arts” and “education” are likely to be Mussolini’s Italy, Hitler’s Germany, the USSR under Lenin/Stalin, Castro’s Cuba, Mao’s China. Answers may refer to two or more states to develop the argument, though it is possible that one single-party state examined in detail could provide the basis for a convincing response. Specific knowledge should be provided to support the arguments made.

This question would not be advisable for candidates who have not made a specialized or in-depth study of such areas in their course.

Education need not be restricted to schools/youth movements- technical, medical, engineering programmes in pursuit of economic and social goals may be considered apart from simply the issue of political indoctrination.

**[8 to 10 marks]** will be awarded for generalized/descriptive answers with implicit treatment of motives and/or assessment of success or effectiveness.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for responses which deal with the rationale for single-party interest/involvement, which adequately support claims made by reference to historical knowledge. May be an imbalance in tackling rationale and assessment components. Analysis present but not fully developed.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for balanced examination of motives for state involvement in either sphere of activity as well as containing detailed accurate knowledge of the implementation of state schemes or programmes of control and the extent to which desired goals were achieved. Evidence of wide reading, high level of analysis and/or original, perceptive critical comments will characterize responses at the upper end of the band.

**14. To what extent was the rise to power of *one* Left wing and *one* Right wing single party ruler, the result of previous political problems?**

The question mentions both left and right wing rulers and responses need to provide examples of both. Thematic, rather than end-on narratives are likely to produce more effective responses. The popular examples are likely to be taken from Germany, Italy, USSR, China, Cuba. Whichever is selected there needs to be identification and examination of specific political distress or situation(s) and a judgment as to how these may have aided the coming to power of the chosen rulers/regimes. Other factors may also be considered in addition to those indicated in the question – in keeping with the invitation to evaluate. In this case such factors and relative contribution will depend on the example selected. Anti-imperialism/nationalism, revanchism, ideological appeal, economic problems, charismatic leadership, fear/insecurity are all possible areas for development and investigation.

*[7 marks]* and below for unfocused, narrative/descriptive responses.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for end-on narratives of two examples. Implicit evaluation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for identification of suitable left and right wing examples. Response covers issue of political distress/conditions and provides supporting details. May be unbalanced in treatment of examples. Evaluation element present but limited.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for reasons which identify two examples, provide evidence of political circumstances surrounding the rise of each extreme. May recognize other factors as well but fails to develop and evaluate effectively.

*[17+ marks]* as above but shows an accurate and detailed base of support concerning political factors. Candidate is able to recognize and comment on the importance of other factors and makes an attempt to evaluate or make judgment on the relative importance or contribution of the various factors.



**15. Assess the role of terror and force in maintaining the ruler in power in *two* totalitarian states each chosen from a different region.**

If only one example is tackled or both examples are taken from the same region mark out of **[12]** maximum.

Maintenance is the focus, not rise to power. The issue of “terror” and “force” – depending on the examples chosen – can be dealt with through examination of the mechanism of a (secret) police state, the use of violence/intimidation, detention/labour camps, forcible “re-education”, purges and arbitrary punishment of individuals/groups. Popular areas of focus will probably be Lenin, Stalin and purges, Mao and campaigns (*e.g.* 100 Flowers, Cultural Revolution), Hitler, Franco.

Whichever is selected there should be detailed knowledge of the nature and operation of “terror” and “force” in the totalitarian system. In a few cases there may be a challenge to the assertion.

“Assess” also permits candidates to identify and comment critically on other features/factors which may be relevant to maintenance of power: economic policies, successful foreign policies, lack of effective alternatives, propaganda/media control, education *etc.*

**[8 to 10 marks]** for end-on narratives or descriptive accounts. Knowledge base requires development. Assessment is implicit.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers clearly identifying the nature of “terror” and “force” within the regimes chosen, how it operated, effectiveness – and identification of other areas – though not well developed. May be an imbalance in treatment of the two states chosen. Assessment explicit but not fully developed.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for accurate detailed knowledge of the mechanisms and nature of “terror” and “force” as applied by the regimes selected. Comments on the effectiveness of such methods/mechanisms and identifies other factors linked to the issue of maintenance of power. Responses make judgment as to the relative contributions of the factors.

**Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states****16. Why were the attempts of the League of Nations to ensure collective security more successful before rather than after 1929?**

No doubt many will produce standard pre-learned responses on “The failure of the League” but the question does require students to identify and critically examine the collective security attempts both pre and post 1929.

Reference may be made to conditions pre-1929 when arguably the “climate” for successful attempts at “collective security” was more propitious *e.g.* Locarno, rapprochement between France and Germany, post-war economic prosperity generally in the 1920s. There were indeed challenges to “collective security” (Wilna, Corfu) but also successes (Aaland, Iraq). Political extremism though present (Italy) not yet seen as a major threat to international peace.

Post-1929 – Great Depression – radicalization of politics and the search for solutions to economic and political problems by aggressive/predatory states – Japan, Italy, Germany. Domestic concerns due to economic crisis led to an unwillingness to commit resources by democratic states (Britain, France). Nations guided in the period post-1929 by increased emphasis on national self-interest – whether it be expansionism for material and prestige gains or a retreat to insularity to preserve resources and concentrate upon solving internal problems. Examples – Manchuria, Abyssinia, Appeasement policies of the 1930s – all of which reveal the ignoring and subsequent abandonment of the principle of “collective security”.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for generalized narratives on the failure of the League which may implicitly address the question’s demands.

**[11 to 13 marks]** understands and addresses the demands of the question though not all aspects are covered.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** a well-balanced treatment of the demands of the question in a structured and focused manner. Reveals a good grasp of the climate pre-and post-1929 in which the League operated and makes critical comment, with substantiation, of the ways in which the application of the principle of “collective security” was made more difficult in the changed circumstances caused by economic depression, right-wing totalitarianism/militarism and appeasement/apathy/isolationism practised by certain powers.

**17. Evaluate the United Nations Organization’s peacekeeping role in the period 1945-64.**

Areas for consideration – improvement in terms of Charter and limited veto power in comparison to League, presence of super-powers from outset – but a mixed blessing in some cases *etc.* Examples of successful peacekeeping operations – Korea 1950-1953, Suez 1956, (Belgian) Congo 1960-1964, West Irian 1962 – though UN success was also dependant on other factors – especially in case of the first two examples. Not a case of continued success – only possible when circumstances permitted. Cold war prevented successful involvement in other crises – Middle East, Hungary for example.

*[7 marks]* and below – for generalized unfocused narratives.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive accounts of some successes/failures and reasons-but little evaluation noted explicitly.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers which identify key peacekeeping actions and attempt to explicitly comment on the relative success/obstacles to peacekeeping of the UN.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* demands of the question are understood and an attempt has been made to deal with all aspects of the question. Well structured and focused response and knowledge base in relation to UNs peacekeeping role and reasons for success/failure is good. Specific cases are used to substantiate and effectively evaluate.

**18. For what reasons, and with what success, did South Africa make the transition from an apartheid state to a multiparty democracy, 1985-1995?**

“Why/for what reasons?”: internal opposition and problems (often linked to) external opposition to the system, producing concessions as early as 1980 under PW Botha and increasing pace and need for reform under FW de Klerk after 1989.

Internal: opposition and problems could include – economic recession, emigration of whites, growth rate of non-white population. ANC and moderate stance adopted after release of Mandela, condemnation of apartheid by Dutch Reformed Church, failure of Homelands Policy. Realization of danger of revolution if reform/transition to majority rule was not implemented. “Moderate” leader de Klerk attempts change despite right-wing opposition.

External: international criticism/condemnation (Commonwealth, OAU, UNO) sanctions on goods and cultural, scientific, sporting contacts leading to the isolation of South Africa. Especially important:- 1986 United States Congress decision to halt loans, cut air links, ban importation of iron, steel, uranium, textiles thus causing economic problems. No more buffer states to cushion South Africa.

1993 elections 2/3 majority to ANC. Mandela as President and a coalition government established, based on agreements prior to election.

“With what success” should identify the most pressing problems facing the new multiparty South Africa: education (illiteracy, low school attendance, overcrowding); economic (decline in key industries, shortage of skilled workers); employment, housing/sanitation; health care; land distribution; crime; rising expectations of the previously oppressed majority non-white population and reconciliation and difficulties associated with the process. Generally, dealing with the social, economic and political legacy of apartheid. Comments/judgments as to how these have been addressed *e.g.* through the Reconstruction and Development programme 1994 would be relevant.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for generalized overviews/narratives of the period with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for attempts to deal with the “for what reasons” and the “with what success” components but unbalanced treatment, requiring more specific detail to support judgments made.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers which deal with the components in a balanced fashion and convincingly support claims by reference to accurate and detailed information.

**[17+ marks]** in addition to the above the response reveals evidence of wide reading. May be an awareness of both overt and covert reasons behind the process of ending apartheid on the part of Nationalist Party leadership and outside political influences in the post-Cold War era. Answers reveal insight, perception of the apartheid legacy.

**19. Compare and contrast the methods used by *two* multiparty states in dealing with major social and economic crises.**

The nature and extent of the crises should be noted for each of the states chosen. The emphasis is on “social” and “economic” – and probably many answers will be based on the Great Depression era and its impact on states – Weimar Germany and the USA under Hoover and Roosevelt could prove popular choices for this question. However any multi-party state is acceptable as long as the crisis situation is put into context and the efforts of the state to address the critical situation are focused upon. Answers may refer to specific programmes of action to tackle specific problems – unemployment/underemployment, inflation, hunger, poverty.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive coverage of two examples. Coherent, but implicit treatment of the “Compare and Contrast” task.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood but not all implications are dealt with. Imbalance in the treatment of the two states. Limited development of assessment task.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for effective treatment of the demands of the question. Accurate balanced treatment of the two states chosen concerning the nature/extent of problems and methods used to deal with them. Consistent level of critical commentary shown.

**[17+ marks]** the answer shows evidence of wide reading and a clearly structured and focused response showing good conceptual ability or a grasp of historiographical issues.

**20. How far has the “selfish pursuit of national interests” been the greatest barrier to the successful working of *two* international organizations?**

‘International organizations’ may be taken to include not only the League and the UNO but any other world or regional organizations - whether it be OAU, OAS, World Bank *etc.*

The “how far” in the question invites candidates to make an assessment of the extent to which organizations may have been obstructed in achieving their goals (partly/totally) by the behaviour of states – either individually or collectively – which has prevented the effective functioning of the organization. Other factors apart from this “selfishness” may also be identified and commented upon.

Whichever examples are chosen candidates should identify what the goals of the organization were at the outset and how far such goals have been realized.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for generalized end-on descriptions of the work of two organizations with implicit treatment of demands concerning evaluation of “selfish pursuit of national interests” as a barrier.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood and two examples selected. There may be an imbalance in the treatment of the two and a need for development of the assessment task.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers which effectively address the demands of the question in a balanced, structured and focused framework. A consistent level of analytical ability is obvious as is an accurate factual base which is used to substantiate the claims made.

**[17+ marks]** as above-but in addition may reveal evidence of either good conceptual ability or a successful challenge to the assumption in the question or wide reading – the fruits of which can be seen in the application of a closely argued, well substantiated and focused response.

## Topic 5 The Cold War

### 21. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the relationship between the wartime Allies deteriorate between 1945 and 1949?

Examination of the nature and purpose of the wartime Grand Alliance is an obvious starting point here – raising questions as to inherent stability/possibility of longevity at the outset. Consideration of the nature of a “marriage of convenience” may be present. “For what reasons” could include mutual fear, desire for security, pursuit of ideological goals, the loss of the Axis “glue” holding the different components together after May and August 1945, desire for economic gain *etc.*

In what ways – could bring in the Yalta/Potsdam deliberations and issues/cooling of relations, the physical division of the continent into spheres of influence, Truman/Marshall and Soviet equivalents. Specific areas of competition/“conflict” – Greece, Turkey, Berlin, atomic weapons, NATO *etc.* End date is 1949, some candidates may include reference to Asian developments.

A “How” and “Why” question approach which will probably attract many responses. No doubt a standard historiographical approach will be adopted by many *i.e.* the “There are three schools of thought... orthodox/revisionist/post-revisionist ...” Such responses are usually less focused on the specific question/task. Learned responses tend to be light on actual historical knowledge of the events of the period under investigation. Emphasis should be on the provision and deployment of relevant historical knowledge by the candidate in an attempt to reach the candidate’s own conclusion rather than parroting historiography devoid of historical context.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive overviews of the period which deal with how and why implicitly.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which deal explicitly with both parts of the question though possibly an imbalance in treatment. Level of knowledge is sound. Analysis is present, but requires development.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers which deal explicitly with both parts of the question, provide a good and accurate knowledge base to support arguments in both sections producing a balanced response.

**[17+ marks]** as above and in addition may show evidence of wide reading, knowledge of historiography to supplement and not replace candidate’s argumentation/case. Detailed and accurate knowledge base from which points are drawn for effective substantiation.

**22. Assess the impact of the Cold War on the economic development of *two* states each chosen from a different region.**

Note: Regarding the economy, some candidates may read this (wrongly) as invitation to write generally on development in widest sense *e.g.* military/political *etc.* The emphasis should however be on economic developments.

If only one state is chosen or two states from same region, mark out of **[12]**.

For some states the impact of Cold War politics may have proved beneficial for their economic development as super-powers attempted to incorporate them into their respective spheres of influence or power blocs and strengthen them by injecting money, investment, providing credits – for example Germany, or Japan, or any of the recipients of Marshall Aid in the post – World War II era. (Israel for example.) For other states the impact economically could be seen to be much less beneficial – Cuba for example paid a high price for its linkage with the USSR. The economies of both the USA and the USSR could also legitimately be investigated- arguably the strains of the competition between East and West proved one of the factors leading to the fall of Communism in the East Bloc and the Soviet Union itself whereas the maintenance and growth of a “military-industrial complex” co-existed alongside a consumer -based economy in the USA.

Whichever examples are chosen candidates need to examine the case studies selected in the context of the nature and extent of economic impact due to Cold War politics. Which areas of the economy benefited and why? What areas of the economy suffered? Were there shortages in key areas due to specialization in armaments production/security needs? How were the living standards of the populations concerned affected.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for largely narrative/descriptive answers with implicit explanation.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood but could be an unbalanced coverage of the two examples selected and/or a need for more convincing explicit explanation concerning impact.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** the demands of the question are effectively addressed in a structured framework. Answers are balanced in the treatment of the two examples selected and reveal a consistent level of analytical ability. At the top end the response shows evidence of insight or wide reading or awareness of historical interpretations.



**23. Why, and with what success, did the USA adopt a policy of containment in the period 1947-1962?**

Likely to prove a popular question with many candidates. The question has two parts and does invite an assessment of the success (or not) of the policy by 1962. Narratives of the origins of the Cold War with a heavy emphasis on “orthodox, revisionist, counter-revisionist” schools being identified and explained at length are a common approach by some candidates but the emphasis should be on the candidate using historical information to justify their answer, not to produce a summary of historiography – as often occurs.

The period under discussion should be well known. Candidates should identify/define Containment and its constituent parts (Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan) and explain the motives which lay behind the adoption of such a policy. Fear of Soviet expansionism, desire for economic dominance over Europe, mutual misunderstanding of East and West, change of personalities at post war conferences, could be generally investigated. Specific examples to illustrate could include arguments over Poland, Germany, fears over Iran, Greece and Turkey *etc.* Much is available to tackle the “why” section.

“Success” (or not) – up to 1962 – could consider the impact of Western European economic recovery as planned by Marshall for humanitarian/political motives, “victory” in the Greek Civil War, Berlin Blockade, NATO, Korean war, SEATO all as possible “successes” – but Czechoslovakia 1948, “loss” of China 1949, Indo-Chinese problems 1945/6 onwards, Cuban revolution and developments 1959-62 *etc.* might cast doubt on the level of “success” attained.

Do not expect all of the above – but circumstances of adoption, “containment” and the assessment task all need to be addressed for an effective response.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of the origins and development of the Cold War until 1962 with implicit coverage of the issue of “success”.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood but response requires more detail and more explicit commentary on the question of “success”.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a structured response which deals with the demands of the question, providing convincing substantiation of the claims made in relation to circumstances and degree of success achieved by 1962.

**[17+ marks]** for clear and focused structure, the provision of accurate and relevant substantiation and insight regarding both circumstances of adoption and level or extent of “success”. May show evidence of wide reading and/or awareness of different interpretations.

**24. In what ways, and to what extent, did relations between East and West change in the period 1960-1970?**

By 1960 the period of “thaw” was beginning to come to an end with renewed arguments over Germany and the U2 affair which led to the collapse of the Paris Summit. A “hotting up” of East-West tensions could be witnessed in events such as the Cuban revolution and challenges to America’s western hemispheric position, the construction of the Berlin Wall, Bay of Pigs, Missile crisis, a renewed nuclear arms race from 1962 onwards, increased US involvement in Vietnam under Kennedy and then Johnson. Inside the supposedly “monolithic” Eastern or Communist bloc tensions between the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China led to the Sino-Soviet split which transformed the East-West situation as the previously bipolar world became tripolar. By the late 1960s detente - a relaxation of tensions between the USSR and USA began. SALT began 1969 as both Soviets and Americans became aware of the potentially crippling economic burdens imposed by their rivalry and the knowledge neither side could win a nuclear confrontation. China’s position also encouraged both the USA and USSR (for different reasons) to consider a rapprochement of sorts.

There is much information which could be used – do not expect all, but effective responses will identify key events in the decade noted and attempt to examine the extent to which relations changed:- superficially – or fundamentally – in this period and why.

**[7 marks]** and below for generalized descriptions of a few events with no awareness of the demands of the question concerning “to what extent”.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers showing some awareness of the demands of the question but the knowledge base is limited and consideration of the question as to the nature and extent of change is largely implicit.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood but not all aspects are considered in a balanced and well-supported fashion. The response requires better substantiation in terms of details of “in what ways” and development of the nature and “extent” of change.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for effective focused response covering developments in the decade under consideration and a convincing attempt to assess the nature and extent of the change in East-West relations in the period. At the top end evidence of wide reading or insight or historical interpretations and/or a high level of analysis will be present.

**25. Why was Soviet control over East European satellite states successful in the period 1945-1968 and why did it collapse between 1988 and 1991?**

Post-war political, military and economic weakness of East European states due to Nazi occupation/exploitation allowed Red Army “liberation” to occur with relative ease – indeed in some cases Soviet forces were welcomed as liberators by some (Czechoslovakia for example). Even if not welcomed, there was no way to eject superior military forces of Soviet Union. Installation of “friendly” governments and political systems with the aid/presence of Red Army. Military strength of Soviet occupying forces and (reluctant) acceptance of Soviet “sphere of influence” by Western powers as Cold War tensions emerged meant no effective resistance was possible in East European satellites which were effectively Sovietised by 1948. Purges of non-communists and even of those communists within Eastern European satellites with “deviationist” tendencies (Hungary’s Rajk, Bulgaria’s Koslov, Czechoslovakia’s Slansky for example) ensured Stalinist conformity.

Examples of attempts to challenge Soviet influence (post-Stalin) within the satellites themselves – Germany 1953, Hungary 1956, Czechoslovakia 1968. All were crushed by military force. In no case was any effective aid offered by West. Brezhnev’s Doctrine (1968) seemed to lay down the limits of Eastern European satellites ability to experiment with different roads to Socialism/Communism.

By the late 1980s, early 1990s Soviet control over satellites weakened due to economic failure/frustrations of the populations of the satellite states, the decision in the USSR itself (Gorbachev) to “rescue” communism by introducing perestroika and glasnost policies which accelerated the reform process not only in the USSR but also encouraged changes within the satellites when it became obvious Soviet military force would not be deployed as in the past.

Examples of the process of dissolution of Communist domination in satellites – Poland and Solidarity, Hungary and free elections 1990, East Germany and the collapse of Honecker’s regime 1989, Czechoslovakia and the Velvet Revolution *etc.*

Much is available – do not expect all, but balanced coverage of the two periods and the reasons for the change in response of the USSR need to be addressed for an effective answer.

**[7 marks]** and below for a brief narration of a few events pre- and post-1968. Demands of the question are not understood.

**[8 to 10 marks]** the demands of the question are generally understood but there is a limited knowledge base of the period and implicit explanation of the rapidity of collapse by 1990-1.

**[11 to 13 marks]** the demands of the question are understood but there is a need for greater detail concerning events pre-and post – 1968 and more explicit explanation of reasons for change in attitude in both the satellite states and the USSR by the end date.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for effective, structured and balanced treatment of developments in the two periods and convincing examination of the factors which altered over the period in relation to circumstances within Eastern European satellites and the changing attitude of the Soviet leadership and how these produced the collapse of Sovietised Eastern Europe.

**[17+ marks]** answers show signs of insight, or awareness of historical interpretations or a high level of analysis supported by accurate and well deployed historical information.

## Topic 6 The state and its relationship with religion and with minorities

26. **Assess the importance of economic and political factors in explaining the persecution of religious or ethnic minorities in *two* states each chosen from a different region.**

*N.B. If only one state is chosen or two states from the same region, mark out of [12].*

Certainly much scope here in geographic and chronological terms. Popular choices are likely to be Hitler's Germany and anti-Semitism but descriptions of the "Holocaust" is not a focus. Economic and political factors behind persecution is the focus in whichever examples are selected. Other possible examples could be case studies of persecution of ethnic Chinese in Malaysia or Indonesia, Karens in Burma/Myanmar, Tutsis in Ruanda, Ugandan Asians, Sri Lankan Tamils *etc.*

Political and economic factors could include:- need of majority regimes for scapegoats as a means of distraction, jealousy over perceived higher economic status of minorities shown in occupational/employment/educational spheres, fear that the minority may have separatist tendencies which threaten the integrity of the state *etc.*

*[7 marks]* and under for vague generalizations.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focused responses which are more explicit in the treatment of political and economic factors though still requiring better substantiation.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for responses which show a balanced approach to the demands of the question and reveal a consistent level of analysis to complement the accurate and well deployed information base.

27. **By what means, and with what success, did ethnic or racial minorities attempt to achieve national self determination in the second half of the twentieth century?**

Answers should identify the methods by which minorities (ethnic or racial) have sought to attain national self-determination in the face of opposition from majority regimes or governments. Methods may include the use of force/violence in the struggle for their goal or lobbying via the UNO *etc.* Not all groups have reached their target of self-determination – regardless of the justice of their cause.

Examples of such groups could be for example the successor states of the former Yugoslavian Federation, Eritreans, Basques, East Timorese, Ibos of Nigeria, Bengalis in the former East Pakistan, Kurds in Europe and the Middle East. While some commentators may dispute the accuracy of the description of some of these groups as distinct "ethnic" or "racial" minorities they should be accepted as such for the purpose of the question. Be generous in acceptance of the definition of such minorities chosen by the candidates.

*[7 marks]* and below for unfocused narratives and generalizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for responses which are largely descriptive with implicit explanation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers requiring more detail/examples and explicit treatment of the issue of "success" – identifying where such groups have/have not been successful – and why.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for structured, focused and balanced responses revealing a sound, relevant and accurate knowledge base and a consistent level of analytical ability.

**28. Compare and contrast the attempts of *two* states to deal with problems of discrimination against racial/ethnic minorities.**

“Problems of discrimination” could be of a racial, religious, ethnic nature which are revealed in unjust practices as reflected in the social and economic spheres of education, employment opportunities, segregation – officially government enforced (or at least not discouraged), separate facilities for separate groups, housing, health care, linguistic and cultural repression. Political inequality – in terms of lack of, or denial of civil rights may also be accepted as an example of discriminatory practice since it does adversely affect the social and economic status of such groups since it marginalizes political input and hence makes attention to their plight less pressing than might otherwise be the case.

In some cases states have made attempts to recognize and redress the discriminatory legislation and practices which have existed by introducing legislation - often of an “affirmative action” type to eliminate the sources of discrimination.

Popular examples here are likely to be the USA and government attempts to deal with issues connected with Native American, African–American and Hispanic communities, for example, Voting Rights Act 1965, Medicare provision 1965, Civil Rights Act 1964 *etc.* Aboriginal rights in Australia and the question of enfranchisement and compensation for land seizures and previously discriminatory treatment, the treatment of Aborigines as second-class citizens in social, educational, economic facilities in the past may also be covered.

**[7 marks]** and below for brief narratives of discrimination. No focus on the task is evident.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for responses which are descriptive/narrative with implicit treatment of the “compare/contrast” task.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers showing understanding of the demands of the question but requiring more detail concerning problems, government policies and explicit coverage of the attempts (methods of implementation, degree of success *etc.*) of two chosen states.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for responses which reveal a clear understanding of the demands of the question. Answers are structured, focused and offer a sound, accurate and relevant knowledge base to allow the candidate to develop a full, balanced analytical essay.

- 29. With reference to *two* examples from *two* different regions consider how successful ethnic or racial minorities have been in overcoming economic and political discrimination.**

*N.B. If only one example or one region is addressed mark out of [12] maximum.*

The United States and the position of African-Americans, Hispanic communities, Native Americans is likely to be the focus of some responses. Other possible choices are likely to be Australia and Aboriginal rights, Asians in East Africa, Chinese in Malaysia, Kurds in the Middle East *etc.* Since questions in this category are open-ended, examples selected could very well reflect the centre's location and this is perfectly acceptable. Two regions however must be considered to fulfill the requirements of the question.

Answers should identify the nature and extent of the economic and political discrimination which occurred and examine the ways in which minorities either by their own efforts or with outside help have attempted to overcome discriminatory practices. Specific details are required in terms of the types of discrimination and actions to tackle the problem(s). Assessment as to the level of success of such actions needs to be made for an effective response.

*[7 marks]* and below for generalized answers lacking focus.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for responses which are largely descriptive with implicit explanation/assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for responses with a balanced coverage of the examples but explicit explanation/assessment of success or lack thereof – (and why) – needs development.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for structured, focused and informed coverage and well substantiated assessment of the level of success achieved in the cases identified.

**30. To what extent was religion a cause of conflict in *either* the Middle East or South Asia after 1945?**

“Conflict” *i.e.* the state of hostility and/or physical war between states or communities within states. Popular choices in this question are likely to be (in the case of inter-state conflict) the Arab-Israeli dispute, the Iran-Iraq war (for the Middle East), and possibly the Indian-Pakistani conflict since 1947 for South Asia. For domestic communal conflict possibly Lebanon or India will appear.

Be aware of ill-informed narratives of September 11th and the issue of Jihad which may attempt to masquerade as history in this question.

Whichever example(s) is (are) selected for examination, the issue of religion must be addressed – even if it is only for the purpose of questioning its validity as a causal factor in explaining the existence of conflict/tension between states or communities. The opportunity to write narrative accounts of the origins of hostility between states/communities with only fleeting references to the religious factor should be avoided.

**[7 marks]** and below for answers which ignore the religious dimension and concentrate on generalized narratives of conflict between states/groups.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with limited knowledge of the religious component in a particular inter-state or communal conflict situation.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for responses which identify the nature of the religious component in the particular example(s) and make comment as to its role in promoting or causing the conflict situation. Awareness of other factors may be shown, but limited development.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** for responses identifying and making critical comment upon the nature and extent of religion as a promoter and/or originator of conflict. Answers could identify other areas *e.g.* nationalism, desire for acquisition of raw materials/natural resources, territorial aggrandisement *etc.* and address the “To what extent” effectively. At the top end the responses may show evidence of wide reading, historical interpretation or insight into the question.

---