

# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2006**

**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. In what ways and for what reasons did the French Revolution a) benefit France and b) harm France?**

Some suggestions for ways that the French Revolution benefited France are: the outdated feudal system was abolished, and this included removing the privileges of the monarchy, nobility and higher clergy; the States General were summoned, and no longer met as three separate assemblies; the judiciary was reformed; equality before the law was proclaimed; finance and taxation were reformed.

Reasons why the Revolution benefited France: the way was prepared for a national, uniform and representative system of administration for the whole of France; equality was greater; taxation was fairer; industry, trade and education improved.

Suggestions for the way the Revolution harmed France: it caused bloodshed; terror; civil discord; foreign wars; and the collapse of law and order in which many of its early gains were lost.

Reasons for the harm could include: disunity and different aims of revolutionaries; actions of the mob; the royal family; the reform societies and clubs; Robespierre; the Directory; and Napoleon.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unfocused narrative of events in the Revolution.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of events and measures with implicit benefit and harm.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on benefit and harm.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis of benefit and harm.

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

**2. “The overall effect of Napoleon I’s foreign policy was to bring glory to France.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?**

Two main results of Napoleon’s foreign policy were to bring glory to France by winning military battles and campaigns, and thus acquiring territorial conquests in Europe, and to expend money, resources, manpower and energy, which could perhaps have been used more profitably at home. Candidates need to assess both these points of view and reach a conclusion.

Candidates may begin with Napoleon’s conquests before he became ruler of France, or only deal with his campaigns as emperor. In 1796, Napoleon was appointed to command the army in Italy, and in 1796-7 conducted successful Italian campaigns. He achieved victories against Austria in 1796 and 1797. During 1798, campaigns were fought in Switzerland, Malta was occupied, and Egypt invaded. 1800-04 brought further campaigns in Europe, and plans to invade England. 1805 saw battles at Trafalgar, Ulm, Austerlitz, 1806, Jena, Auerstadt. Napoleon had abolished the Austrian Empire, conquered and renamed much of Europe and given himself, family and supporters various titles. But with the invasion of Spain, and then Russia, the tide turned, and Napoleon was finally defeated at Waterloo, 1815, and exiled. Napoleon’s diplomacy could also be discussed.

Candidates must decide if the bloodshed, loss of life, and financial drain on France, outweighed the prestige, booty, and power gained from conquests and submission of much of Europe.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for accounts of some battles or campaigns.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of important conquests and implicit assessment of “glory”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit assessment of foreign policy in relation to gains and losses.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused and structured analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for a balanced analysis, or an appreciation of different interpretations, of Napoleon I’s foreign policy.

**3. In what ways, and to what extent, did the aims and policies of the Great Powers in the Vienna settlement shape Europe until 1852?**

The “Great Powers” refers to Austria, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia, and candidates need to explain their aims and attitudes at the Congress of Vienna, and how far these were responsible for the main events in Europe between 1815 and 1852. The general aims of the four were to prevent the re-emergence of an over mighty France, restore a balance of power, restore rulers overthrown by Napoleon, and exclude liberalism and nationalism. Each power had its own agenda for its own gains.

Candidates could structure their answer by referring to actual terms of the settlement, and assessing how far they achieved the Great Powers’ objectives. They could also comment on the gains and changes of territory of the Powers’ themselves, for example the trade gains and concessions obtained by Britain secured commercial advantages that lasted to 1852 and beyond, and Austria remained the dominant force in Italy, and Prussia’s economic position strengthened. Also France was not a danger, but Belgium and Holland split, and evidence of liberalism and nationalism gaining ground could be given. Many other points could be raised, such as the 1848 Revolutions.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of the period with implicit focus and assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit attention to the aims of the Powers and their effects.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis of how the Vienna settlement set the scene for the period 1815 to 1852.

*[17+marks]* for perceptive analysis, balance, or different interpretations.

**4. Compare and contrast the reasons for the fall from power in France of Charles X in 1830 and Louis Philippe in 1848.**

Charles X (1824-30), at first promised to support the constitution, but provoked opposition through favouring the clerical party and former émigrés, and passing reactionary legislation, especially the Five Ordinances (1830), which limited political and civil rights. This led to revolution, so he abdicated.

Louis Philippe (1830-48) was chosen to succeed Charles X because of his revolutionary background, but his popularity waned with his failure to grant political rights by extending the franchise; his reactionary policies such as press censorship and interference with the judiciary; failure to pass measures to improve the economic situation; and disappointment with his uninspiring foreign policy.

Thus for comparison, both monarchs lost their throne because of their unpopularity, their reactionary measures, failure to improve the franchise, and failure to improve the economy and lives of the people.

For contrast, Charles X upset France by his favour of the Church, royal prerogative and nobility, whilst Louis Philippe was dull, too much like an ordinary citizen, and failed in his foreign policy. The time factor could also be contrasted.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inaccurate answers or if only one king is addressed.

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for comparative, structured answers based on sufficient evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for very detailed knowledge which is carefully compared and contrasted.

**5. Assess the main features of foreign and imperial policy (excluding Ireland) in Victorian Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century.**

The main politicians who influenced British foreign policy during this period were Palmerston, Disraeli and Gladstone. Palmerston as prime minister 1855-8 and 1859-65 continued to be mainly interested in foreign affairs. He concluded the Crimean War, suppressed the Indian Mutiny, recognised the new kingdom of Italy, and was neutral in the American Civil War. Disraeli, prime minister 1868 and 1874-80, also concentrated on foreign and imperial policies. He bought half shares in the Suez Canal, made Victoria Empress of India, opposed Russian advancement, obtained rights in Cyprus at the Congress of Berlin, and was involved with wars in Afghanistan and Zululand. Unlike Palmerston and Disraeli, Gladstone, prime minister 1868-74, 1880-85, 1885-6, 1892-4, tried to avoid foreign and imperial commitments, but was forced to intervene, especially in Africa.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate/irrelevant comments or statements.

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for relevant knowledge which is used in a structured answer as evidence for focused assessment.

*[17+ marks]* for full coverage of the time period and perhaps different interpretations.

Candidates would probably be more successful in tackling the question thematically, based on aims and achievements, with sections on Africa, India, and Turkey/Ottoman Empire/Eastern Mediterranean.

**6. Analyse the weaknesses of Austria in the period 1815 to 1866.**

This question would be appropriate for either chronological or thematic treatment. For the top bands the whole period should be covered, and most candidates should realise that the dates refer to the Vienna Settlement and defeat by Prussia.

Main points could include:

- territorial settlement in Vienna Settlement, especially in Italy
- importance of German Confederation and Austria's presidency
- Carlsbad Decrees 1819
- Zollverein, foundation 1819 in Prussia, subsequently in 1833, Austria excluded
- failure of Metternich and Emperors Francis I and Ferdinand I to modernise
- discontent and revolts culminating in 1848, in various parts of Austrian Empire
- relations with Prussia, especially Bismarck with 1864 war against Denmark, and 1866 war against Prussia, ended by the Treaty of Prague.

Some of the above, at least, should be explained and analysed. Thematic points could include: problem of diverse nationalities and nationalism; failure to reform and modernise in Austria and other territories; economic decline; discontent and revolts; relations with Prussia within the German confederation.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for lack of content and coverage.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit analysis focused on weakness.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis of Austrian weakness and good coverage of the period.

*[17+ marks]* for insight, perhaps focusing on how weakness was largely not realised.

**7. Why was Italy united under Piedmont-Sardinia and not under Rome?**

A satisfactory structure would be to explain the strength/advantages of Piedmont-Sardinia, and the weakness/disadvantages of Rome, then draw them together in a conclusion.

Advantages of Piedmont could include: size; resources; ruler, Victor Emmanuel II; prime minister, Cavour, especially for his pragmatism, strengthening of Piedmont, his realisation that outside support was needed, hence entry into Crimean War, and Treaty with Napoleon III; feeling of support for a national state in Italy, and anti-Austria, *e.g.* by Britain.

Disadvantages of Rome: failure of 1848 Revolution and revolutionary government; complicated situation with the Papacy; French policy towards Papacy and Rome.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for uncoordinated statements or generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of Italian unification with implicit attention to question.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on why Piedmont rather than Rome united Italy.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for an analytical answer based on specific evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for a critical and perceptive evaluation of reasons for Italian unification under Piedmont.

**8. In 1862 Bismarck said: “The great questions of the day will not be settled by speeches and majority decisions.” What were “the great questions of the day” for Bismarck, and how did he settle them up to 1871?**

This is an opportunity for candidates to use their knowledge of Bismarck’s three wars, but they should also analyse Bismarck’s preparations, diplomacy and settlements.

Bismarck was appointed chief minister of Prussia in 1862; he dissolved parliament and reformed the army. For him the “great questions of the day” were the positions of Austria and Prussia in Germany, and candidates could discuss his aims. Was he seeking expansion of Prussia, or full unification under Prussia? Was his policy planned long term, or did he react to events? Whatever his original aims, candidates should explain his diplomacy and the three wars: 1864, war with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein; 1866, Seven Weeks War with Austria, after which the North German Federation was proclaimed; 1870-71, Franco-Prussian War, which achieved the unification of Germany under Prussia, with Bismarck as the Imperial Chancellor. Narratives of the wars are not required, and it is not necessary to go beyond 1871.

**N.B.** The great questions of the day could also be domestic, especially economic.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inaccurate or irrelevant material.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of the three wars with the implicit idea that Bismarck was settling the questions.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on settling the “great questions of the day” with how he did it.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analysis of his aims and policies, in settling the questions.

*[17+ marks]* for insight and analysis; perhaps a discussion of preplanned or pragmatic.

**9. Compare and contrast the policies of Alexander II (1855-81) and Alexander III (1881-94) of Russia.**

Probably candidates will find it easier to contrast the policies of these two Russian rulers, but some comparisons should be found. Both were autocratic rulers, who believed in preserving their rights and refused to institute a national duma. Alexander II resorted to repression after assassination attempts and growth of revolutionary societies, and Alexander III applied repressive measures throughout his reign.

In contrast, Alexander II attempted to reform Russian institutions, such as the army, justice, education, local government, and above all in emancipating serfs. Alexander III failed to reform, followed a policy of Russification, which especially affected the Jewish population.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate material or if only one ruler is addressed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for acceptable evidence in a comparative framework.

*[17 + marks]* for sound knowledge of similarities and differences, with balance and analysis.

**10. For what reasons, and with what results, was social legislation an important feature of *one* nineteenth century European government?**

The nineteenth century was a time of industrial growth which led to urban development, exodus from the country to towns, an increased demand for raw materials, transport developments, and changes in employment levels and areas. All this led to problems, such as poverty, poor housing, overcrowding, disease, unemployment, child labour, riots and social discontent. Thus social legislation to cope with the situation caused by this industrial revolution was necessary, for economic, social, and political reasons as well as to maintain law and order. The actual legislation, its suitability, results *etc.* will depend on the country chosen.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsupported generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive essays with implicit reasons and results.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers based on specific evidence which explain and analyse reasons and results.

*[17+ marks]* for a thorough and critical evaluation of reasons and results.

**11. Evaluate the nature and importance of cultural developments in *one* European country during the nineteenth century.**

Candidates must select one European country, and assess the development of culture, that is the arts, for example how did culture affect the lives of the people, was its influence confined to that country, or important in a wider field, was it supported by patronage of the ruler, government, rich, did it affect a few only or much of the population? All forms of cultural activity: music, dance, literature, the theatre, art in its widest sense can be included.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague general assertions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers with explicit evaluation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit evaluation of the nature and importance of culture.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, balanced and evaluative essays.

*[17+ marks]* for an added skill such as different interpretations.

**12. Analyse the effects of Napoleon III's domestic policies.**

As leader of the Napoleonic faction Louis Napoleon (1808-73) was elected President of the Second French Republic, in 1848. He offered France security against social unrest, and the nostalgic appeal of the Napoleonic legend led to support for him. In 1851 he extended his presidential authority by a coup d'état, and the following year he accepted the imperial title. Candidates can refer to any domestic policy after his election as president.

Policies could include:

- repression: restoring order after the 1848 revolution; press censorship; arrest and exile without trial; political associations banned; from 1864 position reversed to some extent, trade unions and strikes allowed, rules on censorship and political meetings relaxed
- education: Loi Falloux 1850, which gained catholic support
- various constitutional measures throughout his rule: restricting the franchise; plebiscites; annulment of constitution; new constitution; rights given to parliament increased after 1860; so called "Liberal Empire" 1869-70
- economic and social: slum clearance; modernisation with gas; water; sewers; work of Haussmann in Paris; transport developed especially railways and telegraph; banking; trade and commerce including the (unpopular) Cobden Treaty; coal; iron *etc.*; Paris Exhibition; magnificent court.

Conclusion – effect was contradictory; reform and modernisation were hindered by money spent on foreign ventures. Squalor remained, but the Empire was brought down by Bismarck, not by domestic policies and opposition to them.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for lack of knowledge of domestic policies.

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit analysis of Napoleon III's key domestic policies.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused analysis of specific examples of the effect of Napoleon III's domestic policies on France.

**[17+ marks]** for perceptive interpretation of contradictions in Napoleon's policies.

**13. Why and with what results did Spain fail to modernise in the second half of the nineteenth century?**

Candidates need to explain why this was on the whole an unsatisfactory period, with, in spite of some progress especially during the premiership of O'Donnell and the early years of the Bourbon restoration, lack of modernisation politically and economically. 1850-56 saw revolutionary activity and numerous changes of government, 1856-66 improved with O'Donnell's ministry, 1866-74 was again chaotic, with the departure from Spain of Queen Isabella II in 1868, revolution 1868-70, Amadeo of Savoy, king, 1870-73, a republic 1873-4, and the Bourbon restoration with Alfonso XII in 1874. He died in 1885 and Maria Cristina became regent for her son, Alfonso III.

The main reasons for lack of progress and modernisation were: problems with the monarch; lack of political stability with numerous parties, *e.g.* Alfonists, Carlists, Democrats, Federalists, Progressives, Radicals, Republicans, Unionists, and there was also disunity in the aims and personnel of the parties; actions of the military, with many generals active in politics; fear of social rebellion; the Church; lack of financial resources for investment, especially from the Spanish – much railway and industrial development was financed by France; continuation of outdated agricultural methods; weakness of navy and loss of Cuba, Puerto Rica and the Philippines; short term industrial crises and bad harvests after 1896.

Candidates could also point out progress made under O'Donnell, and during the early constitutional restored monarchy with a more or less two party system with Canovas and Sagasta. Apart from actual results noted above, nineteenth century weaknesses and failures led to more problems and civil war in the twentieth century. Do not expect all the details noted above.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of some of the above with implicit reasons and results.

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

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

*[17+ marks]* for depth of analysis and detailed knowledge.

**14. Examine the main economic and political developments in *one* Scandinavian country, or in Finland, in *either* the nineteenth or the twentieth century.**

This is a very wide and open question which allows candidates to use their knowledge of the history of one of the following countries, Denmark, Finland, Norway or Sweden, in either the nineteenth century or the twentieth century. The material used must be assessed, not just narrated in order to obtain good marks.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured answers with focused analysis based on specific evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for a critical, thorough evaluation.

**15. Analyse the long term and short term causes of the 1917 February/March Russian Revolution.**

The focus of this question is the causes of the 1917 February/March Revolution in Russia. Candidates are also asked to differentiate between long and short term causes, but allow latitude in deciding where the boundary lies between the two.

Long-term causes could include the nature of Tsarist rule but candidates do not need to go farther back than the reign of Alexander II. Probably many will start by noting that he tried to introduce reforms but many failed to satisfy, or gave rise to more opposition. His successor, Alexander III was regarded as a reactionary, thus the backward nature of the economy, lives of the peasants, lack of a national legislative assembly, growth of opposition parties (specific examples should be known), with terror by and against them.

The policies of Nicholas II before 1914, the 1905 Revolution, October Manifesto, Dumas, work of Witte and Stolypin, will probably be regarded as short term causes by some and long term by others, but most should agree that Rasputin, the First World War, Nicholas taking over command of the war, military defeats, shortages, strikes, discontent at home, were all short term causes. Revolution erupted with demonstrations, bread riots, firing by police on the rioters, and failure of the army to support the tsar.

Candidates should stop at the outbreak of the 1917 February/March Revolution, but need to analyse all causes identified by the candidate in order to score well.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit analysis of most of the material used.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured and focused analysis of short and long term causes.

*[17 + marks]* for perceptive interpretation and balance.

**16. Assess the effects between 1914 and 1921, of the First World War on the civilian population of *one* European country.**

This question covers the period from the outbreak of the First World War until three years after the war ended, thus it requires material during the actual war, and effects from the war and the Paris Peace Settlement. Effects can cover social, economic and political results for the civilian population. It could include former soldiers after they had been demobilised, but candidates will probably not differentiate between citizens when assessing the years after the war ended. Actual detail will of course depend on the country chosen. No doubt Germany will be a popular choice. If Russia is chosen, candidates should not turn it into an effects of the Russian Revolutions answer. The First World War must be the focus.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few general comments, or answers limited to women.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/description with implicit assessment.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus, analysis and balance between war years and post war effects.

*[17+ marks]* for wide knowledge and depth of analysis.

**17. For what reasons, and in what ways, was a Marxist/Communist state set up in Russia between 1918 and 1928?**

The time frame of this question is from the dismissal of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918 under Lenin, to Stalin in power.

Reasons could include: the Marxist ideology of the Bolsheviks; the Bolshevik victory in the October/November Revolution; as a means for the Bolshevik Party, Lenin and later Stalin, of gaining and maintaining power; to change Russia from outdated Tsarist rule and modernise it as the USSR; as a means of winning the Civil War, and opposing its foreign enemies.

Methods could include: securing Bolshevik supremacy; emphasising party unity and discipline; War Communism; peace with Germany; building up the Red Army; winning the Civil War; nationalisation; collectivisation; industrialisation; terror with labour/concentration camps; propaganda; education and state control.

The above are suggestions. Do not expect all to be raised, and accept other points, but candidates should be able to give specific examples of actions by Lenin and Stalin.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit focus on reasons and ways.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit attention to reasons and ways.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, focused answers with analysis of reasons and ways.

*[17+ marks]* for balance of both parts, in-depth analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

**18. Account for the foundation of the League of Nations, and assess its success between 1920 and 1935.**

Candidates should have no difficulty in accounting for the foundation of the League, the brain child of Wilson, (the last of his 14 points), supported by Smuts and Cecil, to preserve international peace by the settlement of dispute through arbitration. The horror of the First World War prompted this aim.

Successes in the given period included Mandates, Upper Silesia, Danzig, disputes in Latin America, and the Balkans. It was also able to finance reconstruction of the economic infrastructure of the Danubian states and obtain some success for improved working conditions through the ILO.

Candidates will no doubt vary in how they assess success: some may go on to write about failures – but note end date of 1935, some may point out that the successes were in minor disputes, not with strong countries, and able candidates will explain that because of weaknesses in its foundation such as the lack of an army to impose sanctions, the failure of the USA to join, and the absence through late joining, or leaving of other states, success was limited.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a limited approach.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for adequate detail of both parts and some explicit assessment.

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

*[17+ marks]* for a thorough, critical assessment of success, rather than emphasising only later negative aspects.

**19. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Hitler and Mussolini up to the outbreak of the Second World War.**

For comparison:

- both rulers pursued aggressive, expansionist, foreign policies, Mussolini with Corfu, Abyssinia and Albania; Hitler with Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland
- both left the League of Nations
- both allied to form the Axis (1936) and signed the Pact of Steel (1939)
- both supported the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War.

For contrast:

- Mussolini began by co-operating with main European powers in the League, against the Anschluss, and with the Locarno treaties
- Hitler withdrew from the Disarmament Conference and sent troops into the demilitarised Rhineland
- time frame – Mussolini was in power earlier.

Other points could be mentioned such as Hitler's pacts with Poland and USSR and naval treaty with Britain.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for sparse general comments, or if only Hitler or Mussolini is addressed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for adequate evidence and explicit comparison.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well supported comparative structures.

*[17+ marks]* for full and balanced comparisons.

**20. Analyse the reasons for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.**

Reasons for the victory of the Nationalists could include:

- support of Germany and Italy, including transport of Army of Africa from Morocco, air power, troops and finance
- Non-Intervention Agreement signed by 27 nations including Britain and France
- Disagreement and in-fighting by the various strands of left wing supporters, especially CNT/POUM, and other Republican groups with political factionalism.
- Russian support for Republicans came with strings attached
- Nationalists were more cohesive under Franco
- tactical mistakes in conduct of the war by Republicans.

The above, and other points made, need to be analysed to show how and why they brought victory, in spite of various advantages that the Republicans had in relation to territory and resources at the beginning of the war, which lasted from 1936 to 1939.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for some explicit analysis of reasons for nationalist victory.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis of reasons based on specific evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for a thorough and analytical treatment of reasons.

**21. Assess the political consequences of the Second World War in *two* European countries between 1939 and 1950.**

Political consequences covers areas such as: changes in political structure; fortunes of politicians or parties; fall of governments; invasion and occupation by enemy forces; legislation to enable the war to be fought, such as conscription and rationing; financial deficits; increased taxation and measures taken to recover; reliance on loans; political alliances in response to the war and its final ending; increase or decrease in democracy and democratic institutions, *etc.* Colonial problems and decolonisation could be made relevant.

Actual details for assessment will depend on the countries chosen, which can be on the same side or on opposite sides in the Second World War. Note that this is not a question on the Cold War, although the USSR take over at the end of the war might be relevant, and candidates could choose USSR as one of their two countries, and it would be a very suitable choice.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate knowledge and/or irrelevant material.

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balance and exact focus on “political” consequences.

*[17+ marks]* for specific detail and depth of assessment of the two chosen countries.

**N.B.** If only one country is selected mark out of *[12 marks]*.

**22. In what ways, and with what success, did Brezhnev direct domestic and foreign policies in the Soviet Union between 1964 and 1982?**

Brezhnev replaced Khrushchev as First Secretary, and thus leader/ruler in 1964. He headed the Communist Secretariat, and ruled through obtaining the support of provincial party secretaries. He aimed to make the system work better, stabilise, but not innovate. He clamped down on cultural freedom, and persecuted dissenters. KGB and informers increased, and Gulags continued. He was vain, corrupt, greedy and practised nepotism. He was not interested in agriculture, but was helped by good harvests. Some industrial reforms took place. He was also President of the Supreme Soviet (1977-82).

Abroad the Prague Spring led to the Brezhnev Doctrine and repression, but relations with China, India, Germany, and Chile improved, and some progress was made on arms limitation with the Non Proliferation Treaty and the beginning of SALT, in 1969.

As to success, his static policies led to political, social and economic discontent in USSR and other east European countries and thus contributed to the break up of USSR and the communist bloc.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis of ways and success.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive knowledge and understanding of Brezhnev's fulfilment of this role.

**23. "The Cold War both helped and hindered the recovery of post Second World War western Europe." To what extent do you agree with this judgment?**

The split between east and west after the Second World War meant that the USA helped western Europe in order to prevent the spread of Communism there. Thus its recovery was helped by US loans and aid, especially the Marshall Plan. West Germany benefited also by not having a stringent treaty imposed, as the western allies wanted German recovery as a bulwark against the east. The Cold War also prompted European co-operation, with the EU (EEC/EC). NATO was also a form of co-operation.

Western Europe was hindered by the necessity of spending money on arms, defence *etc.* Germany was truncated, and a climate of fear of a third world war emerged.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit assessment of helped and hindered.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit attention to helped and hindered.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, balanced analytical answers.

*[17+ marks]* for an extra dimension such as original thought and perception.

**24. Examine the successes and failures of Tito in Yugoslavia.**

As the question gives no dates, candidates can include Tito's successes during the Second World War, when after the German invasion of Yugoslavia in 1941, he organised partisan guerrilla forces into a National Liberation Front. A communist who had spent time in USSR, in the inter-war years, he emerged as leader of the new federal government, as prime minister 1945-53, and president 1953-80. He rejected Stalin's attempts to control Yugoslavia with the other communist east European states, and was expelled from COMINFORM. He became a leader of the non-aligned movement. Relations with USSR were resumed in 1955, but Tito retained his country's independence. His domestic policies included experimenting with various types of communist economic organisation, including worker participation in running factories. He kept a firm grip on the different states and Yugoslavia remained one country. His main failure was the disintegration of the country after his death in 1980, although candidates would probably find it difficult to quantify his share of blame for this.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit successes and failures.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced analysis focused on successes and failure.

*[17+ marks]* for a full critical examination of Tito's policies and their impact.

**25. In what ways, and with what results, have twentieth century transport developments changed European work and leisure patterns?**

An open question but candidates would be unwise to select it unless they have undertaken a case study of European transport. All forms of transport are relevant, and the question must be focused on European society, not on one country. Society suggests way of life, leisure, especially travel, work patterns, possibly more mobile with workers even commuting across borders, political implications with the EU members, ministers and civil servants also commuting from and to their Assemblies and homes. Sport has changed, at least at the top European level. Candidates could also analyse the benefits and drawbacks of this mobile situation.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsupported generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers with implicit ways and results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit ways and results.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for interesting, analytical and perceptive essays.

*[17+ marks]* for a thorough knowledge and assessment of the impact of twentieth century transport developments.

---