



MARKSCHEME

MAY 2008

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 IB Cardiff.*

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war

1. Compare and contrast the causes of the Korean War and the Vietnam War.

The Korean War lasted from 1950 to 1953 and the Vietnam War from 1964 to 1975.

For comparison candidates could include:

- both were ex-colonies that became independent after the Second World War and were divided by the action of external powers;
- both were civil wars;
- both leaders, on both sides, in both wars claimed to be nationalists;
- both were Cold War conflicts with external involvement;
- in both wars communist forces fought anti-communist forces.

For contrast:

- The Korean War resulted from a series of border clashes, the invasion of the south by the communist north, and a UN resolution, in response to which a US led force landed and drove back the invaders.
- The Vietnam War started later, as part of the US policy of containment. More US “advisers” were sent to the south, and the north sought Soviet and Chinese permission and aid to invade the south. The North attacked US ships, and President Lyndon Johnson ordered retaliatory bombing.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate material, or if only one war is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for a sequential account with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent comparison and balanced interpretation.

2. Examine the role of warfare *either* at sea *or* in the air in *two* wars each chosen from a different region.

In order to “examine the role” candidates need to explain, with specific details, the part played by their chosen force, either air force or navy, in their two chosen wars. Both would include transportation, attack and defence. Candidates should then assess the impact on the campaigns and whole war, such as did the chosen force help to win the war, or by its failure lose the war.

The wording indicates that candidates address either warfare at sea or in the air, but accept if one war is about sea warfare and the other about war in the air, but the chosen wars must be from different regions. However if the war is fought in more than one region, *e.g.* the Second World War, accept that for two regions.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers.

[11 to 13 marks] for relevant focused specific information.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, focused and well structured answers.

[17+ marks] for perceptive and balanced analysis.

N.B. If only one war or one region is chosen mark out of [12 marks] (with exception of the example mentioned above)

3. Why, and with what results, was the First World War not confined to Europe?

This is a new question set to make candidates think and produce interesting reasoning. Some points that could be raised for “why” are: the alliances, the involvement of the British, French and Turkish Empires, European tensions and rivalries, mistaken calculations, world reactions, policies and actions of the USA, attacks on rival colonies. Results could bring in victory and defeat, American influence (especially that of Wilson), the League of Nations, effects on colonialism *etc.* For high marks candidates must not treat the question solely as causes and results of the First World War; the focus must be on why the war was not confined to Europe.

[0 to 7 marks] for general answers mentioning the war.

[8 to 10 marks] for causes and results but at least implicit attention to beyond Europe.

[11 to 13 marks] for an attempt to focus on why the war was not confined to Europe.

[14 to 16 marks] for a well thought out and structured argument.

[17+ marks] for a perceptive interpretation of the question.

4. Analyse the results of *one* twentieth century treaty or peace settlement.

Candidates can choose any treaty or peace settlement from a twentieth century war. Results could include winners and losers, actual terms of the settlement, with analysis of their appropriateness, and political, economic and social results from the treaty or settlement. This may include some areas where it is necessary to note results from the war itself, but candidates must be careful not to confuse results from the war with results from the treaty. No doubt the Treaty of Versailles will be popular, but it is hoped that candidates will be more critical not about the treaty but about how it is usually perceived.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis.

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

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

5. For what reasons, and in what ways, did *one* twentieth century war affect the social and economic conditions of *two* countries fighting in it?

Candidates need to select one war and examine how and why two of the countries fighting in it were affected socially and economically. The period to be examined should consist of the war itself and its aftermath, probably for about five years. The exact period would depend on the circumstances of the chosen war. Areas to be considered could include the roles of men and women, conscription and direction of labour, shift in production to munitions, food shortages and rationing, shortage of luxury and essential clothes, goods *etc.*, evacuation, loss of education, blackout, bombing, invasion. The after-effects could cover the terms of a treaty, financial problems, reconstruction, demobilisation, psychological problems with the return to peace *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptions of some of the problems.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for an analytical approach and appropriate specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for perception of how a war affects society.

N.B. If only one country is addressed, mark out of [12marks].

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

6. Analyse the results of *one* independence movement *either* in Africa *or* in Asia.

Candidates need to select an independence movement in either Africa or Asia and briefly explain its foundation then focus on its leadership, composition, aims and policies. Where relevant the external as well as the internal impact of the movement could be discussed. As a postscript it could be noted if the movement continued after independence or if it ceased to exist. Details will depend on the movement chosen.

[0 to 7 marks] for general or inaccurate material and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative answers with implicit results.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit results.

[14 to 16 marks] for relevant and focused analysis.

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

7. For what reasons did *either* Algeria *or* Kenya obtain independence?

For Algeria, candidates could discuss: disenchantment with French rule; effects of the Second World War; growth of nationalism; the FLN (Front de Libération Nationale); Algerian War of Independence (1954–1962); policies of Ben Bella, French forces, De Gaulle. Algeria was declared independent on 3 July, 1962.

For Kenya candidates could discuss: effects of the Second World War; Kenyan African Union nationalist movement led by Jomo Kenyatta; Mau Mau 1952–1960; imprisonment of Kenyatta. Independence was granted in 1963.

Which ever country is chosen, candidates will be expected to analyse the reasons in order to obtain high marks.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts.

[11 to 13 marks] for assessment of reasons.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for perception, depth and full details.

8. Assess the results of independence on the lives of women in *two* new non-European states, each chosen from a different region.

The demands of the question require candidates to examine the position of women in the selected countries before and after independence in order to determine if their position had improved or deteriorated. Some areas to consider are education (or lack of it); work, both in the home and in employment; political rights; role and status in the home and in the community. A judgement should be reached and stated on the result of independence.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit results.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for balance and perceptive understanding of the position of women before and after independence.

N.B. If only one country or one region is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

9. Examine the successes and failures, in the ten years after independence, of the government of either India or Pakistan.

Under the Indian Independence Act of July 1947, the formerly British ruled Indian subcontinent was partitioned. India was predominantly Hindu, and Pakistan predominately Muslim. This question demands an examination of the successes and failures in the ten years following, thus approximately to 1957. Both countries suffered communal violence (a million deaths has been suggested although the official total is much lower), and migration, resulting in a refugee problem. The princely states and Kashmir also proved difficult.

Candidates are more likely to find successes in India than Pakistan but they should address the success and failure of political, social and economic and foreign policies for their chosen country. Nehru was India's first prime minister and was also minister of external affairs. He followed a policy of non-alignment in the Cold War. He also tried to industrialize, but poverty remained. Jinnah became governor general of Pakistan on independence, but died the following year. An Islamic republic was proclaimed in 1956, and Pakistan's parliamentary constitution was abrogated in 1968 by General Ayub Khan who ruled principally through martial law.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit success and failure.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit attention to success and failure.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical answers focused on success and failure.

[17+ marks] for extensive specific knowledge which is analysed in depth.

10. "Representative institutions of the European type were often unsuitable for the people of new non-European states." To what extent do you agree with this assertion in relation to the second half of the twentieth century?

This question seeks thoughtful and original ideas about the possibility or wisdom of trying to impose Western/European democracy on newly independent states. Some explanation of "representative institutions" should be given and successes and failures of their introduction into new states could be examined. Reward thoughtful, genuine attempts to address this new question.

[0 to 7 marks] for a few general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of representative government introduced into one state.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which focus on the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of the quotation.

[17+ marks] for thoughtful interpretations of the quotation.

Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states

11. Analyse the rise to power of *either* Hitler *or* Lenin.

This should be a popular question and candidates should have no trouble in explaining the post-war situation in Germany, support for the Nazi party, the aims and actions of Hitler, and the mistakes of the politicians that led to his acquisition of office. Similarly Lenin's views, publications, and actions, before and after the two 1917 Russian Revolutions, which led to his leadership of the Bolshevik party then of Russia/USSR should also be well known. Allow candidates to analyse events up to 1934 for Hitler. For Lenin answers would not be expected to go beyond the outbreak of the civil war. Well analysed and accurate historical details are needed for high marks.

[0 to 7 marks] for short general answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of Hitler's or Lenin's rise.

[11 to 13 marks] for some explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for specific details well analysed.

[17+ marks] for pertinent analysis of detailed factual material.

12. Compare and contrast the regime of *one* right wing and *one* left wing single-party state.

Candidates should select their states; probably the regimes of Hitler, Mussolini, Peron and perhaps Franco, will be popular choices, for right wing regimes; and Castro, Lenin, Mao and Stalin, for left wing single-party states, but accept others.

Areas for both comparison and contrast could include: form of government and administration (law, order, terror, censorship); economic policies including direction of labour; education; propaganda; the arts. There should be much material for both comparison and contrast whichever regimes are chosen. Foreign policy should be included where relevant.

[0 to 7 marks] for description rather than comparison or if only one regime is addressed.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison and contrast.

[14 to 16 marks] for specific evidence in a comparative structure.

[17 + marks] for balance, detail, and analytical comparison.

13. With reference to at least *two* rulers, assess the importance of social and economic policies for rulers of single-party states.

Social and economic policies were important for rulers of single-party states to win and maintain peoples' support, and thus remain in power. Candidates must select at least two states, but more examples can be used, especially if candidates choose a thematic approach, which could be very successful. Areas that could be assessed for their importance are: economic development as well as standard of living and elimination of poverty (employment, workers' rights, trade, industry and wages); education and training; youth groups; incentives such as holidays, cinema, theatre, the arts and free health care. A verdict should be reached on the overall importance of social and economic measures and policies.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for specific policies carefully assessed in a structured answer.

[17+ marks] for excellent detail and depth of assessment.

N.B. If only one ruler is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

14. In what ways, and with what results, did *either* Castro *or* Mussolini use foreign policy to support his regime?

Although foreign policy is not usually popular in this topic both Castro and Mussolini are and candidates should have reasonable knowledge of the foreign policy of both. Castro's change from US trade and support to that of the USSR and the missile crisis is always well known, but answers should also include Castro's support for communist regimes or rebels, especially in Latin America and Africa. The main points for Mussolini could be early support for the League of Nations and opposition to Hitler and Nazi policy in Austria; imperial ambitions; invasion of Abyssinia/Ethiopia which led to sanctions; joint intervention in Spanish Civil War with Germany; agreements with Hitler; and his failure and death in the Second World War. **Both choices require explanations of results in relation to supporting the regime.**

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit ways and results.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for thorough knowledge and focus on "support his regime".

[17+ marks] for in depth analysis of "support his regime".

15. To what extent was the ruler of *one* single-party state successful in achieving his aims?

This is a straight-forward question that demands that candidates should select one ruler of a single-party state, express his aims and assess how they were implemented and thus show to what extent the ruler succeeded in achieving them. “To what extent” also requires that failure to achieve some or all aims should also be examined. Able candidates could also query “successful” by asking for whom, the ruler or the country. Specific material will depend on ruler chosen. All aspects of his rule, including the aim “to stay in power”, could be made relevant; but rise is not asked for.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of rule with implicit aims and success.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit explanation of aims, success and failure.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers focused clearly on aims, success and failure.

[17+ marks] for perceptive analysis of aims, related policies, success and failure.

Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states

16. How successful were international organizations in achieving peace in the second half of the twentieth century?

Candidates will no doubt understand this question to mean the United Nations, and this is acceptable, although the question states “organizations” in the plural, and to reach the top band another organization should be referred to; NATO, SEATO or a more regional one such as OAS would qualify. Candidates could explain their peace keeping efforts, and there are many relevant ones for the UN, such as mediation in Palestine, Kashmir, Cyprus, Congo, *etc.* The UN Secretary Generals frequently attempted to arbitrate in disputes, and United Nations peace keeping forces were employed in trouble spots world wide. NATO forces were also used on several occasions, *e.g.* Bosnia. A verdict on success in achieving peace should be given, and it could go either way.

Probably a maximum of **[14 marks]** would apply if only the United Nations is discussed, but examiners should use their judgement.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit success or failure.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on “how successful”.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical answers based on specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for an extra dimension, such as another organization.

17. Compare and contrast the social and economic policies of the League of Nations and the United Nations.

For comparison:

- both sought to eliminate poverty and improve living conditions;
- both tackled the problems of refugees after the World Wars;
- the League founded the World Health Organization, and the UN continued it.

For contrast:

- the UN was more concerned with social and economic work than the League;
- the UN instituted more health initiatives such as vaccination programmes;
- the UN introduced numerous specialized agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Bank, International Atomic Energy Agency, *etc.*;
- many more people worked in the UN social and economic agencies.

It would be expected that candidates also comment on why the social and economic activities of the UN expanded, and how successful they were in comparison and contrast with the League.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge, or if only one organization is addressed.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 + marks] for a structured comparison based on specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for excellent knowledge and analytical comparison.

18. “Democratic government can only be achieved in a multiparty state.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?

This question is meant to make candidates think about the value of democratic government, which, it is asserted, can only be obtained when citizens have a choice, that is more than one party to vote for, and thus a genuine election. Some examples of democracy under multiparty states should be given and assessed. Candidates may argue that not all multiparty states do offer or produce democracy, and that a two party system is not always democratic. Some could argue that real democracy ended when it was impossible for all citizens to attend assemblies and vote on all matters. The question is about multiparty states and answers that just agree with the quotation then write about single party states should not score well. Arguments should be supported with relevant evidence.

[0 to 7 marks] for a few uncoordinated comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of one multiparty state with implicit focus.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for a well structured analytical answer based on the quotation.

[17+ marks] for perceptive ideas and in depth analysis.

19. Discuss the domestic and foreign policies of the governments of *either* the USA (1933 to 1945), *or* Spain (1975 to 1990).

Candidates must choose either the USA under F D Roosevelt 1933–1945, or Spain under the democratic government and constitutional monarchy of Juan Carlos, and discuss the domestic and foreign policy of the government during the given years. Roosevelt’s government had to deal with the Depression and the Second World War. The government in Spain had the problem of the transition from Franco’s regime to democratic government, and the part to be played by a democratic Spain in Europe. In fact, Spain became an enthusiastic and important member of the European Union. The part played by the president in the USA was of course much greater than that of the king in Spain, nevertheless Juan Carlos was an important figure especially at the beginning. Political parties developed, and the main ones dominated elections.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for detailed analysis of specific evidence.

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

20. Assess the successes and failures of the foreign policies of *two* multiparty states each chosen from a different region.

Foreign policy is not usually a popular choice, but this is a straightforward question. As two examples are asked for great depth and detail will not be expected. Assessment should include motives, aims, actual policies, and results both for the home country and the recipient country or countries. One consideration is whether the government was using foreign policy to mask domestic problems. The demand for different regions should not be difficult as the regions are well covered in material for detailed study. It is expected, but not demanded, that candidates will choose their examples from the list of material for detailed study and will only cover the dates given in the history guide.

[0 to 7 marks] for brief general answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of two countries with implicit assessment.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused assessment.

[17+ marks] for balance and perceptive interpretation.

N.B. If only one country or one region is addressed, mark out of [12 marks].

Topic 5 The Cold War

21. For what reasons, and with what results, did the Second World War allies become post-war enemies?

The beginning/origin of the Cold War is always popular and candidates should have no difficulty in pointing out that the Second World War allies were unlikely associates, only united by their enmity of Hitler and the Nazis. Some will go back to 1917 to explain the difference between USSR and the Western allies, but it is legitimate to state the different ideologies and the circumstances of the alliance that could include conflicting aims and rivalry over spheres of influence. Events to be discussed could include conferences, Germany and Berlin, Eastern Europe, the atomic bomb, *etc.* that caused the alliance to disintegrate. The results were the Cold War, and further conflict. Candidates would not be expected to go beyond 1950, and could conclude earlier.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit explanation.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of reasons and results.

[17 + marks] for a further dimension such as different interpretations.

22. In what ways did developments in Germany affect the Cold War between 1945 and 1961?

This should be another popular question, as it allows candidates to use their knowledge of Germany from Potsdam and Yalta, through Berlin including the blockade and airlift, to the division of Germany into east and west and the Berlin Wall. However candidates must comment throughout on the second part of the question as to how these developments affected the Cold War. They could bring in Marshall Plan, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and note the increase or decrease of tension and rivalry.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of Cold War events in Germany.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit attention to how developments affected Cold War.

[14 to 16+ marks] for planned structured analysis, tying Germany to the Cold War.

[17+ marks] for another dimension or excellent evidence and analysis.

23. Compare and contrast the roles of China and Cuba in the Cold War.

For comparison candidates could include:

- both countries were allies of the USSR, but had their differences;
- both had strong, ambitious leaders, Mao and Castro;
- both used aid to developing countries to further communism and their own role;
- both influenced the development of détente.

For contrast:

- Mao had more differences with USSR than Castro did;
- Mao had ambitions to be accepted as leader of the Communist bloc;
- China was active in Korea and Vietnam;
- for Cuba the height of the Cold War was the Missile crisis;
- the Americas was Cuba's main sphere of interest, Asia was China's;
- the relations of the USA with China improved in 1972, US relations with Cuba remained hostile.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments or if only one country is addressed.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for relevant specific material in a comparative structure.

[17 + marks] for an analytical and balanced comparison.

24. “Gender issues played no part in the Cold War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates will probably agree with this assertion, and can show how ideology and power politics rather than social and economic ones started and fuelled the Cold War. But treatment of women could be shown to differ between East and West during the Cold War. Propaganda was used in both China and the USSR to obtain and maintain the support and active involvement of women, including fighting in the “hot wars”.

Communist countries also claimed to have emancipated women, and they were more likely to be involved in heavy labour in the communist bloc.

[0 to 7 marks] for sweeping generalisations without specific evidence.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive answers, with implicit focus.

[11 to 13 marks] for genuine attempts to focus on the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for thoughtful and perceptive essays that explore the quotation.

[17+ marks] for an extra dimension such as different interpretations.

25. Assess the economic and social effects of the Cold War on *one* superpower.

This will probably not be a popular question. By superpowers candidates should understand USA and USSR, but allow China. Candidates must focus on the economy, and how both the country as a whole, and individual citizens were affected; for example in relation to trade, employment, finance and commerce. Social effects could include fear, morale, travel, propaganda, education, *etc.* Political effects are not relevant, but the cost of the arms race is.

[0 to 7 marks] for a few general comments or political effects.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive/narrative answers with no real assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on economic and social effects and some explicit assessment.

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

[17+ marks] for balanced interpretative answers.

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

26. Assess the effects on social and economic issues of relations between religion and the state in *two* countries each chosen from a different region.

Social issues could include areas such as education, religious practices and observances, integration or the lack of it, gender issues, family relationships, especially between parents and children brought up in a new country. Economic issues could include either wealth or poverty by the minority in relation to the state majority, type of employment available to the minority, discrimination at work, different life styles *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers.

[11 to 13 marks] for some assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for good specific evidence and focused analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for thought and interpretation.

N.B. if only one country or one region is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

27. Compare and contrast the treatment of ethnic or racial minorities in *two* countries.

Candidates have to choose two countries and compare and contrast the treatment of ethnic/racial minorities in them. They should consider both negative treatment, for example discrimination, persecution and even death; and positive treatment, for example help to integrate, equality, and even positive discrimination in areas such as religion, education, employment, the right to vote, participation in social services *etc.* It would probably be easier if the two countries chosen were very different in their policies and treatment of minorities.

[0 to 7 marks] for scant knowledge and understanding, or if only one country is used.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for extensive knowledge in a clear comparative structure.

[17+ marks] for an extra dimension such as different interpretations.

28. Why and with what results were religious minorities oppressed in *two* countries during the twentieth century?

Reasons could include: fear of terror within, attack from co-religionists in other states, or even of conversion of own citizens, jealousy of wealth and success, lack of understanding, envious desire to take over the minority's goods, failure of minority to integrate, *etc.* Results could include discrimination, imprisonment, torture, murder, genocide. No doubt Jews in Nazi Germany will be one example chosen.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/ descriptive answers.

[11 to 13 marks] for attention to reasons and results.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers.

[17 + marks] for balance and genuine understanding.

N.B. if only one country is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

29. “In spite of intolerance, discrimination, persecution and terror, more understanding has been shown to minorities in the second half of the twentieth century.” To what extent do you agree with this verdict?

Candidates could answer this question either way; in many countries there are examples of improvement, of more understanding, toleration and fair treatment, but there are also examples of genocide within countries, as well as continued discrimination and exploitation, using minorities as underpaid workers, almost slaves. Whatever argument is put forward, specific evidence must be used to prove it.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with no focus on the quotation.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus.

[14 to 16 marks] for a well presented and argued answer.

[17+ marks] for a convincing answer based on well chosen specific evidence.

30. Analyse the part played by fear in the relationship between minorities and majorities in two countries.

Fear can be a minority's fear by a majority *e.g.* discrimination, exploitation, repatriation, inequality; or a majority's fear that a minority may be criminals, terrorists, social security scroungers, bad influence, cause of political unpopularity, *etc.* Two countries must be chosen to analyse, with specific details presented.

[0 to 7 marks] for a few general details.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive answers and implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for balanced analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for depth of understanding and analysis.

N.B. if only one country is addressed mark out of [12 marks].
