



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 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. To what extent did the outbreak of war in April 1792 change the nature and the course of the French Revolution?**

Candidates should be aware that, despite the apparent revolutionary nature of events between 1789 and 1791, Louis was still alive in 1792 and the changes which had occurred – Declaration of the Rights of Man, abolition of feudalism, *etc.* were leading towards the establishment of a constitutional monarchy. To many historians the declaration of war in 1792 however changed the nature of the French Revolution and “radicalized” or “revolutionized” its development leading to the execution of Louis and the Terror. It is possible to develop several different lines of argument here so ensure that the candidates are given credit for these.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the French Revolution.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts of the war, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework which has explicit focus on the effect of the war on the French Revolution. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**2. “The success of Napoleon’s domestic policies in France between 1802 and 1815 has been greatly exaggerated.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should be able to identify the various policies introduced by Napoleon from the Concordat, through the respective reforms of the legal, administrative, educational and financial systems. These reforms should then be analysed to see to what extent they succeeded or failed and whether the success of any policy has been exaggerated.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments concerning Napoleon’s domestic policies.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments which relate to Napoleon’s policies.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the success or failure of Napoleon’s domestic policies. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that include detailed specific examples: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**3. Why were revolutionary activities so widespread in Europe between 1848 and 1849?**

The general reasons could include economic distress, demands for constitutional progress and, in some countries, the increase of nationalistic feeling. Better candidates will recognize that individual countries had particular issues. France – disappointment with Louis Philippe; Austrian Empire – independence movements; Prussia – potato crop failed, dissatisfaction with the monarchy *etc.*

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the 1848 Revolutions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments which relate to the revolutions.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a narrative framework which has explicit focus on the widespread nature of the revolutions. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific details: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**4. Assess the influence of Robert Peel on British politics during the nineteenth century.**

Candidates should consider Peel's work as Home Secretary, his support for the Whig reforms and his work as Prime Minister. This should give rise to an analysis of his penal reforms, the founding of the Police Force, the Catholic Emancipation Act, the Tamworth Manifesto, financial reforms and the repealing of the Corn Laws. Candidates must evaluate these policies events rather than merely list them.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments concerning Peel's career.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a narrative framework which has an explicit focus on the importance of Peel's policies/actions. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of Peel's influence.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**5. Compare and contrast the contributions of Mazzini and Garibaldi to Italian unification.**

**Comparison:** Mazzini founded the Young Italy movement and Garibaldi supported it. Both men supported republicanism and the Kingdom of Sardinia. Both were involved in Rome and Sicily. Both were exiled.

**Contrast:** Mazzini was the more intellectual and tried to influence the King. Garibaldi was always the soldier. He started being more republican but then, at Teano, changed his allegiance. Garibaldi was later criticized by Mazzini for this shift.

If the candidate writes about only Mazzini or Garibaldi *[8 marks]* would be the maximum that could be awarded.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the two men.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments concerning Mazzini/Garibaldi.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a narrative framework which has explicit focus on specific details relating to Mazzini/Garibaldi. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers in a structured comparative framework.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**6. “The unification of Germany by 1871 was the result of Bismarck’s foresight and careful planning.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should realize that there is some debate about Bismarck’s role in German unification and how he built on events which had occurred between 1815 and 1862. Reference should be made to the Zollverein, the 1848 revolutions in Prussia, and Austria’s weakness by 1862. Candidates should then discuss whether or not they consider that Bismarck had a long term aim to unify Germany, whether he was more concerned with Prussian expansion or whether he simply reacted to events in Europe as they occurred.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about Bismarck.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a narrative framework with explicit focus on both Bismarck’s domestic and foreign policies. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that include specific examples and which evaluate Bismarck’s intentions/actions in relation to unification.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of Bismarck’s intentions and policies.

**7. Assess the importance of the Eastern Question for Europe between 1850 and 1880.**

Candidates should be able to define what they understand by the “Eastern Question”. Key events which could be included are the Crimean War, the Treaty of Paris, the London Conference, the Bulgarian revolts and massacres, the Russo-Turkish war, the Treaty of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin. These events should be assessed in relation to the Powers who were most involved.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments concerning the Eastern Question.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a narrative framework which has an explicit focus on the importance of the Eastern Question with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**8. To what extent did Alexander II's reforms cause more problems than they solved?**

The reforms include the emancipation of the serfs, the reform of local government, changes in the legal system, changes in educational policy and reforms in the military. Candidates will probably argue that all of these had initial limited success but most of them created more problems later on. The Emancipation was only a beginning, the local government bodies led to calls for a national assembly, which was refused. The assassination of Alexander in 1881 reflected the failure of dealing with the problems of political agitation and revolutionary activity.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about Alexander II reforms.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on Alexander's reforms. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that contain specific examples relating to the question: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**9. To what extent did developments in transport affect the economic development of one European country in the nineteenth century?**

Candidates should be aware of developments in road, rail and water and how these affected the transport of raw materials, finished products and the labour force – all of which helped to increase output. Marks will depend upon specific detail and the response must be focused on one country rather than be a general description of European affairs.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**10. What effects did the demand for, and the development of, the franchise have in one European country in the nineteenth century?**

The franchise had been very limited and usually was based on property values. It also varied from country to country and within countries. Increased education and wealth led to increased demands for the right to vote as well as a belief in more equality. Representation was also linked to taxation. Candidates must focus on one country although a general background which could include some of the above material would be appropriate.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**11. How important was the Paris Commune (1871) for France and for Europe?**

The Commune was mercilessly suppressed, buildings were destroyed, revolutionaries were exiled or imprisoned and the Third Republic was established. Philosophically and as a catalyst for socialist and communist movements the Commune was seen as an important landmark in history. It was only in 1879 that republican parties in France began to allow socialist parties to re-emerge. Throughout Europe the Commune contributed to the growth of socialism elsewhere – in Germany the Gotha Programme emerged and social democracy became the general pattern of the new socialism.

If only France or Europe are included award no more than *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments relating to the Paris Commune.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the importance of the Paris Commune. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that relate both to France and Europe: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.



**12. Assess the effects of the Napoleonic Wars and the Congress of Vienna on Scandinavia and Finland.**

This is a very specific question and candidates will be expected to know the Napoleonic campaigns in some detail and the specific terms of the Congress of Vienna as they related to Scandinavia. The position of Russia is important in relation to Finland and the reasons behind the merging of Sweden and Norway at Vienna should also be included. Candidates should also be aware of both the short-term and long-term effects of the Napoleonic Wars and the Vienna settlement.

If only Finland or Scandinavia are discussed award no more than **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**13. Compare and contrast the causes and consequences of the 1905 and February/March 1917 Russian Revolutions.**

The 1905 Revolution was linked to defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, the breakdown in transportation, an increase in bread prices and the corruption and inefficiency of the government. The 1917 Revolution was linked to military defeat (although the war was still continuing); governmental incompetence; economic inflation; and dislike of the Romanovs (including Alexandra).

The consequences of the 1905 Revolution include the survival of the Tsar, the Duma, the formation of the Peasant Union and the soviets, Stolypin's reforms, repression, and the desire for autonomy of the non-Russian peoples. The consequences of 1917 include the fall of the Tsar, the formation of the Dual Authority, the granting of some political freedom, the compromise with the soviets, the continuation of the war, the calling of the Constituent Assembly and the return of Lenin.

Candidates should identify the similarities and differences between the two revolutions where appropriate. If only one revolution is discussed the highest that can be awarded is **[8 marks]**.

If only causes or consequences are discussed award no more than **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the two revolutions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a narrative framework with an explicit focus on comparison and contrast between the revolutions. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with detailed reference to the two revolutions: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**14. Analyse the factors which led to the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary during the First World War.**

Candidates should be aware that there were many factors that contributed to the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary in 1918. These could include the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, the armies of the Entente Powers, the role of the USA, the weakness of Germany's allies, the leadership of the Allies, the failure of the 1918 offensive, domestic problems in Germany, the German U-boat campaign and poor military strategy.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the First World War.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the role of the various factors. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, balanced answers which develop a soundly constructed argument: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**15. How important was Trotsky's role in the establishment and development of the Soviet state between 1917 and 1929?**

Trotsky was chairman of the Petrograd Soviet during the October Revolution, helped organize it, took charge of foreign affairs, including Brest-Litovsk. Later as Commissar for War he built up the Red Army and was heavily involved in the Civil War. Trotsky's belief in "permanent revolution" contradicted Stalin's policy which ultimately led to Trotsky being dismissed, expelled from the Party and deported in 1929. Candidates will probably know the details well but it is important that Trotsky's role be evaluated rather than merely be documented.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments on Trotsky.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the importance of Trotsky's role. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers which evaluate Trotsky's importance: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**16. Assess the effects of *two* of the Paris Peace Settlements.**

Candidates can choose any two countries from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey (including the renegotiation of the Sèvres treaty at Lausanne in 1923). They should focus on any territorial changes that were made, the establishment of new governments, disarmament and any financial reparations that were included. Most candidates will select Germany and one other country but answers should be approximately equal to receive higher marks.

If only one settlement is dealt with award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the Peace Settlements.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on two settlements. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers which demonstrate assessment of the effects of two settlements: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**17. Analyse the effect of the Wall Street Crash on *two* European countries (excluding Germany) between 1929 and 1935.**

Answers will depend on which European country is chosen but it is important that the candidates make a clear cause-effect relationship between the Wall Street Crash and the political, social and economic effects on the country. Some background material pre-1929 is appropriate, but candidates must ensure that the bulk of their response is focused on post 1929 events.

If only one country is covered, no more than *[12 marks]* should be awarded.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the crash.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers which analyze two countries.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**18. Analyse the reasons for the collapse of the Weimar Republic and the establishment of a Nazi dictatorship in the period 1929 to 1934.**

Candidates could include the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution; dislike of Versailles; propaganda; economic weakness; Wall Street Crash; violence/role of SA; negotiations with the army; the roles of von Papen, Schleicher and Hindenburg; the Enabling Act after the Reichstag fire the Night of the Long Knives and any other relevant factors. Ensure that the above details are used in a focused, analytical explanation rather than merely being listed.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about Germany after 1918.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the reasons behind the replacement of the Weimar Republic by Hitler. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that indicate a cause-effect relationship between the Weimar Republic and Nazi Germany: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

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

Comparison could include totalitarian policies, treatment of opposition, emphasis on heavy industry and armament, indoctrination, censorship and propaganda. Contrast could include agriculture, industry (Hitler's dealing with industrialists and Stalin's five year plans). Anti-Semitism and racial policies are also relevant. Education, religion and the arts could also be variously assessed.

If the candidate writes about only Hitler or Stalin *[8 marks]* would be the maximum that could be awarded.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the two leaders.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the domestic policies of Hitler/Stalin. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers within a comparative framework that includes specific policies: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**20. Why did internal tensions in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s lead to a civil war in 1936?**

In the 1920s and 1930s Spain had a number of governments which struggled to deal with a range of problems – regionalists versus centralists, anti-clericalists versus Catholics, landless labourers versus great landowners, and workers versus industrialists. Reforms did not satisfy all parties and economic distress and financial collapse exacerbated the situation. Gradually politics were polarized into a right versus left struggle which led to war in 1936.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments relating to Spain.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the tensions in Spain which led to war. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that cover the whole chronology: some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**21. Analyse the importance of *one* of the following to the eventual outcome of the Second World War in Europe: war in the air; war at sea; war on land.**

Answers will depend on which of the three areas is chosen but candidates must refer to specific military tactics, battles and technological developments in whichever area they choose. Peripheral reference can be made to territories outside Europe *e.g.* North Africa or Asia, but the main focus of the essay must be on Europe.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments concerning the Second World War.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific reference to events/developments in the Second World War: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**22. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev.**

In foreign policies Khrushchev was involved in the Warsaw Pact the Suez Crisis, the Sino-Soviet split, Berlin, Cuba. Brezhnev, played a key role in Sino-Soviet relations, the West German non-aggression agreement, detente and reductions in nuclear armaments, the Middle East crises, Afghanistan and the Gulf War.

If the candidate writes about only Khrushchev or Brezhnev **[8 marks]** would be the maximum that could be awarded.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the two men.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments with little comparison/contrast.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the policies of the two leaders. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific details in a comparative framework: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**23. “The history of European cooperation between 1957 and 1975 was harmonious and successful.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The EEC came into being in 1957 and EFTA in 1959. Various countries tried to join the EEC from 1960 – some with success, others failed and the importance of EFTA declined. The Common Agricultural Policy came into operation in 1964 and in 1979 the ECU was introduced, as were the first direct elections to the European Parliament. Peace and disarmament have also been key areas since the Helsinki Conference of 1975. The question is intended to stimulate a discussion on the nature of the relationship between the various countries.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about European cooperation.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments which relate to European cooperation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a narrative framework which has an explicit focus on the harmonious nature and success of European cooperation.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers making specific reference to events/policies in Europe and which assess the nature of the individual countries involved.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question and which have supported their arguments with relevant examples.



**24. Analyse the reasons for the decline and fall of *one* communist regime in eastern Europe (excluding the USSR).**

Specific details will depend upon which country the candidate chooses. The nature of the regime, the policy of the USSR towards that country and the policies of the new government following the decline of the communist regime will need to be included. Candidates should be able to establish a clear cause-effect relationship between communist and post communist policies and their respective successes or failures.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments which relate to one country.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that specifically demonstrate the effect of the change in government on the country: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**25. Analyse the importance in developments in *either* education *or* the arts in *two* European states between 1960 and 1995.**

Candidates should be able to produce specific evidence from two countries to obtain marks in the upper bands. Exact material will depend on the countries that are chosen. Marks will be awarded according to knowledge, relevance and focus on importance.

If only one country is chosen award marks up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.