



MARKSCHEME

May 2008

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 IB Cardiff.*

1. To what extent was the French monarchy both the main cause and the main victim of the 1789 French Revolution?

This question is about the French monarchy as an institution, not only Louis XVI, thus the first part of the question needs an analysis of the nature of the monarchy, as head of an outdated feudal system and as a cause of the revolution, as well as of the actions of Louis. It could be relevant to give a brief background, possibly mentioning Louis XIV, then show the absolutist nature of the monarchy (no States General was called for 175 years until 1789). Government finances relied upon a mixture of increasingly burdensome direct and indirect taxation. Louis XVI was considered weak and incompetent, debt increased, and a series of ministers failed to solve it. But there were other causes, such as the economic situation, influence of the philosophers, and the American War of Independence.

The monarchy was a victim, in that Louis was executed, and the revolution was at least partly responsible for the dauphin's death. The monarchy's former absolutist power was removed by legislation, and it was abolished in 1792 (but restored in 1814). However there were other victims, and some judgment should be given on "main". The question is intended to provoke thought on the nature of both the monarchy and the revolution. There are many ways of addressing the question, so reward what is written and relevant.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of causes and results with some implicit judgement.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on Louis XVI and the monarchy as cause and victim.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analysis of the monarchy as cause and victim.

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

2. Assess the domestic policies of Napoleon I between 1799 and 1814.

This question covers the domestic policies of Napoleon from First Consul to his defeat and exile in 1814, as many of his reforms were instituted before he became emperor. The main areas to assess are his legal codes, the Concordat with the Church, administrative and economic reforms, public works and educational measures. He also restored law and order after the turmoil of the French Revolution, as well as keeping some of its gains. However as virtual dictator of France from 1799 to 1814, he was also responsible for censorship, even a police state, and the deterioration of the economy because of his later wars (especially the campaigns in Spain and Russia) which caused many casualties and a serious financial drain.

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

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical and balanced treatment of domestic policies.

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

3. **“The Congress System was a genuine attempt by the Great Powers to produce a unified policy, but their interests were too diverse for it to succeed.” To what extent do you agree with this judgment?**

The demands of this question are such that candidates should consider two areas: was the Congress System a genuine attempt to work together to restore peace and stability after the turbulent years of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars and did it fail because countries pursued their own national interests?

In November 1815 delegates of the four so called Great Powers; Austria, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia, agreed to hold regular meetings to discuss their common interests. Meetings were held between 1815 and 1825 at Aix-la-Chapelle, Vienna, Troppau, Verona and St Petersburg. The main aims were to settle disputes by diplomacy and to maintain peace. The main problems they addressed were France, revolutionary movements, unrest in Italy and Spain, the Spanish colonies and Greek revolts. Divergence occurred over whether to intervene militarily to put down revolutionary movements and/or revolts against governments they considered legitimate, and whether this constituted interfering in the internal affairs of other countries.

The treatment of France did not cause disagreements, but divisions between the powers and opposition, especially by Britain, to the use of force to support reactionary rule led to the breakdown of the Congress System.

Candidates could decide whether the Congress System was therefore a genuine attempt at unified policy, and whether its failure to be expected because of the diverse interests and nature of the Great Powers. Some may comment that it was perhaps a forerunner of the later European Union, and although there were revolutions there was no major war.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of the Congress System with implicit focus.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis, structure and focus.

[17+ marks] for clear analysis of both parts of the quotation.

4. Analyse the main reasons why Louis Philippe became King of France in 1830, but lost his throne in 1848.

Louis Philippe (1773–1850) supported the French Revolution but later went into exile. He returned to France in 1817 but avoided political involvement. Restoration of the Bourbons instituted a limited monarchy but Charles X tried to restore former monarchical power. His ordinances of 1830 limited political and civil rights and led to revolution. Charles abdicated and Louis Philippe, partly because of his revolutionary background and bourgeois lifestyle, replaced him.

Louis' initial popularity waned through a timid foreign policy, failure to initiate social reforms or increase the electorate, and unpopular ministers such as Guizot. The increasingly wealthy middle class sought a greater share in government and set up reform banquets, while the poor suffered economic distress and supported republicanism. Revolts broke out in Paris, and Louis fled to England.

[0 to 7 marks] for lack of relevant knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of Louis Philippe.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on why Louis became king, then lost the throne.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis in a focused and structured essay.

[17+ marks] for a balanced and perceptive treatment of both parts.

5. Compare and contrast the roles of Cavour and Garibaldi in Italian unification between 1852 and 1861.

The dates of the question refer to the period between Cavour's appointment as prime minister of Piedmont-Sardinia, and his death. Garibaldi was concerned with Italian unification before and after these dates. Comments on his earlier and later actions are not required, although they may be referred to in introductory or concluding material.

For comparison:

- both were partly responsible for achieving Italian unification,
- both wished to drive Austria and Austrian influence out of Italy,
- both finally supported Victor Emmanuel II as king of Italy.

For contrast:

- Cavour was a statesman, Garibaldi a soldier,
- Cavour arguably sought Piedmontese expansion, not total Italian unification,
- Garibaldi always sought Italian unification,
- Cavour was responsible for north and central Italy joining Piedmont,
- Garibaldi won Sicily and the south for unification,
- Cavour advocated foreign help, Garibaldi opposed it.

The above points should be known. Accept and reward other relevant details.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narrative accounts of both with limited linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for an attempted comparative structure or excellent linkage.

[14 to 16 marks] for accurate knowledge in a comparative framework.

[17+ marks] for a perceptive, analytical and balanced comparison.

6. What were the main areas of industrial growth in Victorian Britain, and how did they affect the social and economic conditions of the people?

Britain led the nineteenth century industrial revolution, and was known as “the workshop of the world”. The main areas of industrial growth in Victorian Britain were coal, iron, textiles – especially cotton and woollen goods, transport – especially railways and shipbuilding. Although imports exceeded exports, financially the deficit was more than made up by banking, insurance *etc.* Urbanization was also a feature of industrial growth, and towns developed rapidly in the industrial areas.

Social and economic effects for the population were both positive and negative. Industrial growth increased prosperity, improved lifestyle, helped literacy, education, culture and travel for the aristocracy (old and new) and the middle class, but workers suffered employment- and slum-related illnesses and, until legislation prohibited it, the exploitation of women and children. Disease was rife in the insanitary crowded housing.

The above are some of the points that could be made. Accept other relevant details and also accept answers that take areas to mean geographical areas and base their answers mainly on industrial northern and midland Britain and industrial regions of Scotland and Wales.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague general answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of industrial development.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that try to address all parts of the question.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused, structured arguments based on specific evidence.

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

7. For what reasons, and with what results up to 1871, did Prussia replace Austria as the leading Germanic power in the German Confederation?

Candidates prefer questions focused on Prussian strength, although knowledge of Austrian weakness is necessary for top bands. Reasons could include: Prussian gains at the Vienna Settlement; Prussian economic growth, including the Zollverein; Austrian weakness as a politically backward multi-national empire which did not share in economic advancement; the political, diplomatic, financial and military work of Bismarck – including wars against Denmark, Austria and France.

Results could include: formation of the dual monarchy of Austria–Hungary; unification of Germany; emergence of Germany as a major European power; humiliation of France; end of the Second French Empire and formation of Third French Republic.

Do not expect or demand all of the above, and note the end date.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of Bismarck’s policies or his three wars.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of reasons and results based on specific evidence.

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

8. Analyse the strengths and weaknesses of Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century.

This question covers the end of the reign of Nicholas I (1825–1855), Alexander II (1855–1881), Alexander III (1881–1894), and the first few years of Nicholas II (1894–1917). It is hoped that in order to avoid an answer based only on Alexander II and his reforms, candidates will structure their answer thematically, focusing on strengths and weaknesses. They will probably emphasize weaknesses, and may well start with them.

For strengths: the size of Russia and her population; traditional status as a Great Power; the reforms of Alexander II, which were aimed at modernization and catching up with other European powers in areas such as the emancipation of serfs, education, the economy, the army, justice, and to a lesser extent politics; the industrial policies of Witte in the 1890s.

For weaknesses: the size of Russia and the difficulties of governing such a large and inaccessible country; autocracy; repressive policies of Nicholas I; backwardness (especially serfdom); defeat in the Crimean War; unpopularity and failure of some of Alexander II's reforms; very small middle class; uneducated and untrained population so foreign expertise needed; repressive policies of Alexander III; opposition and terrorism; nature and policies of Nicholas II.

Do not expect or demand all the above (especially comments on Nicholas I and Nicholas II) but the question demands more than Alexander II's reforms.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives mainly of Alexander II's reign.

[11 to 13 marks] for genuine attempts to focus on strengths and weaknesses.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analysis of strengths and weaknesses.

[17+ marks] for perceptive analysis and specific evidence of strengths and weaknesses.

9. “Bismarck pursued a successful foreign policy between 1871 and 1890, but was often defeated on domestic issues.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This is a straightforward question on whether and why his foreign policy was successful, but his domestic policy was successfully challenged and perhaps flawed. Policies in both parts should be named and assessed, but not described at length. Candidates should know and be able to assess the following elements of foreign policy: keeping France isolated; preventing war between Austria and Russia over the Balkans; the various Alliances/Treaties; the Congress of Berlin.

Domestic issues include: maintaining his own and the Hohenzollern monarchy’s authority by limiting the power of the Reichstag and that of political parties; the Kulturkampf; disagreements with liberals and socialists.

Most candidates will probably agree with the statement, but they must explain why. Some may legitimately challenge it, but specific evidence must be presented for a successful argument.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, inadequate or inaccurate answers.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment of acceptable factual knowledge.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused, analytical and balanced essays.

[17+ marks] for perceptive insight into the effects of Bismarck’s policies on Germany and Europe.

10. Assess the impact of developments in *either* transport *or* agriculture on *one* European country in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Candidates should select one country, possibly their own, or one for which they have researched as a case study, and, using specific evidence, show how either transport or agricultural developments impacted both beneficially and harmfully on the lives of the people and the overall state of the chosen country. The question covers 1850–1900, but earlier material could be relevant for background. Transport will probably emphasize railways, but should also include water and road transport. Use for industry, daily needs and leisure could be considered. Agriculture covers land owners, land usage, workers, methods, implements, animals and crops and those who consumed the products.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalizations.

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for assessment based on clear specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for excellent depth and detail.

11. Analyse the impact of *either* nationalism *or* socialism on nineteenth century Europe.

This is a very open-ended question, apart from the choice to be made of analysing nationalism or socialism. Candidates can choose Europe as a whole, or select specific countries to analyse. Candidates could select themes for nationalism such as: its impact on unification – *e.g.* in Germany and Italy; its impact on the break up of empires, *e.g.* the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires. Themes for socialism could include: its political and socio-economic effects; Marxism; trade unionism and strikes; its importance in securing social legislation.

Approach this question with an open mind, and credit thoughtful answers.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of nationalism or socialism.

[11 to 13 marks] for genuine attempts to analyse nationalism or socialism.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and thoughtful analysis based on evidence.

[17+ marks] for a perceptive essay with perhaps different view points.

12. Why, in spite of crises, was the Third French Republic still in power in 1905?

The Third French Republic was established in 1871 after the defeat of Napoleon III in the Franco-Prussian War. Although originally intended as a stop gap arrangement, with a majority of royalists in the Assembly, it lasted until 1940 (but this question only covers the republic until 1905). The crises were the Boulanger Affair of 1886, the Panama Scandal of 1892, and the Dreyfus Case 1894 continuing into the twentieth century. Reasons why the republic survived could include: absence of a suitable candidate for the monarchy; republican support; 1875 constitution; work of Thiers; recovery after the war, and swift payment of the indemnity; reforms of 1881–1884; support for the reduction of influence of the Church; Waldeck-Rousseau reforms.

Do not expect all the above, but it should be realised that as a moderate, secular, reformist form of government, the Third Republic proved popular.

[0 to 7 marks] for lack of knowledge and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of France 1871–1905, or of the crises.

[11 to 13 marks] for judgment on the crises, and why the republic survived.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical treatment of the republic's survival.

[17+ marks] for balance, depth of analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

13. Compare and contrast political developments in *either* the nineteenth *or* twentieth century, in *two* of the following: Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden.

Details to compare and contrast will depend on which century and which two countries are chosen.

Denmark supported Napoleon, lost Norway to Sweden in 1814, was an independent monarchy, was involved in the Schleswig-Holstein war, generally progressed economically and politically, remained neutral in the First World War but was invaded by Germany in the Second, was a founder member of NATO, and joined the Common Market in 1972.

Finland, captured by Russia in the Napoleonic Wars, was generally allowed autonomy, but national feeling increased. Nicholas II initiated a policy to Russify Finland in 1899. Finland declared independence in 1917, established a republic in 1919, fought the Winter War 1939–1940, then supported Germany but was defeated by the Soviet forces in 1944. Postwar Finland has greatly increased in prosperity.

Sweden lost Finland to Russia in the Napoleonic Wars, but gained Norway from Denmark in 1814. The French Marshal Bernadotte became King of Sweden in 1818, reigned as Charles XIV until 1844 and initiated a period of peace and liberalisation. The union with Norway was dissolved in 1905 and Sweden maintained neutrality in the two world wars. Social democracy and social welfare were promoted.

Norway, as noted above, was subject to Denmark then Sweden. It was noted for literature and music after 1850. 1905–1957, King Hakon reigned as a constitutional monarch. Norway was neutral in the First World War but was occupied by Germany in the Second World War. Economic prosperity, largely dependent on oil, has increased since 1945.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narrative accounts with brief linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for strong linkage or a comparative framework.

[14 to 16 marks] for relevant knowledge in a clear comparative framework.

[17+ marks] for good depth and detail or an extra dimension.

14. Why were the Central Powers defeated in the First World War?

Candidates should note that the question asks for the Central Powers, not just Germany. Before 1914 “Central Powers” referred to members of the Triple Alliance of 1882: Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. On the outbreak of war in 1914 Italy remained neutral; the term was subsequently applied to Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and later Bulgaria. Reasons for the defeat of these powers could include: the weakness of Germany’s Central Power allies; failure of the Schlieffen Plan which led to a war on two fronts; the nature of the war which was expected to be short, but on the western front turned into a trench war of attrition; Italy’s entrance on the Allied side which engaged a large Austrian army in the Alps; Commonwealth troops; reorganization of the Allied war effort including unified command; tanks; unrestricted U-boat campaign by Germany; Allied convoy system; Allied naval blockade of Germany; entry of USA, 1917 (by that date Central Powers were opposed by twenty-seven states with much greater manpower); collapse of morale and exhaustion of Central Powers.

N.B. Do not expect or demand all the above.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts with implicit reasons why.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reasons why the Central Powers lost, and as a maximum if only Germany is addressed.

[14 to 16 marks] for structure, analysis and consideration of all the Central Powers.

[17+ marks] for perceptive balanced argument based on specific evidence.

15. Analyse the reasons for the success of the Bolsheviks in the second (October/November) 1917 Russian Revolution.

The Provisional Government consisted of members of the fourth Duma and assumed power in a system of dyarchy after the fall of Tsarism in the February/March 1917 Russian Revolution. Reasons for its overthrow, and success of the Bolsheviks in the second (October/November) 1917 Revolution could include: its lack of authority or endorsement; weakness, failure to address problems such as land reform and war; Kornilov affair; the power and rising support for the Soviets; the opposition of Lenin and his determination to oust it; continued participation in the First World War; disintegration of the army; food shortages, riots and general disorder; German support for Lenin, sending him back in a sealed train and giving him financial support; organization of Trotsky and Lenin resulting in the ousting of the Provisional Government in a Bolshevik coup, which enabled the Bolsheviks to obtain power albeit in a limited geographical area in October/November 1917

N.B. Do not expect all the above points.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of events in 1917.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit explanation of reasons for Bolshevik success.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical essay with a clear argument.

[17+ marks] for well developed arguments and perhaps different interpretations.

16. Compare and contrast political and economic problems, between 1919 and 1939, in two of the following: France, Germany, Great Britain.

All three countries, Germany as a loser, and Britain and France as victors, suffered economic and financial problems, shortages, *etc.* as a result of the First World War, which has been described as “total war”. Postwar economic problems included inflation and unemployment. All three states were hit by the collapse of the US stock market and the depression. Political problems also arose because of the war. Germany saw most political changes and problems with the Weimar constitution and Hitler’s rise to power. There were twenty-nine changes of prime minister in France, and the British government faced a General Strike, party disputes and a National government. Specific material will depend on which two countries are chosen for comparison.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalizations, or if only one country is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narratives and weak linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for appropriate linkage or a comparative structure.

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

[17+ marks] for detailed knowledge and an analytical comparison.

- 17. Mussolini wrote “war alone drives men to make their greatest efforts”. In what ways, and with what success, did Mussolini seek to put this belief into practice?**

Mussolini frequently used slogans, exhortations and propaganda. He also liked to think of himself as restoring the old Roman Empire, and began to expand his armed forces in 1930, which meant that after he felt sufficiently confident he began an aggressive foreign policy for conquests and fame. He engaged in the Ethiopian/Abyssinian War 1935–1936, the Spanish Civil War 1936–1939, Albania 1939 and the Second World War, with Hitler (from 1940), which led to his death in 1945. He also termed some of his domestic policies “battles” or “wars”, for example for births, grain and lira.

Although some partial success was achieved, ultimately Mussolini died as a result of war.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Mussolini’s career.

[11 to 13 marks] for specific knowledge linked to the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical answers focused on the quotation.

[17+ marks] for perceptive insight into Mussolini’s aims and methods.

18. Analyse the ideologies of *two* twentieth century European totalitarian states.

This is an open-ended and thought-provoking question. Candidates could begin by giving a definition of totalitarianism and querying how far their chosen states were totalitarian. They could do the same with ideology, and assess to what extent the rulers of the chosen states adhered to their stated ideology, which will probably be communism and/or fascism. Both states chosen can have the same ideology. However most candidates will probably select two well known but different authoritarian states and discuss the main features of their ideology. States that are likely to be chosen are the USSR, under Lenin or Stalin, or even under one of the later communist leaders, Germany under Hitler, Italy under Mussolini or Spain under Franco. Other lesser known communist leaders might also be chosen. If a candidate selects two leaders from the same state and analyses them both, allow as two examples, or, accept the USSR as one example if the candidate intends it to be so. Candidates are not asked to compare and contrast them, but do not penalize or reward any who do. The two examples may be addressed separately, or together, and one may be fuller than the other. Note that the focus must be on ideology and any policies mentioned must be analysed for their ideology.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague general statements.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive answers with implicit analysis of ideology.

[11 to 13 marks] for genuine attempts to analyse ideologies.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for perceptive analysis and understanding of the ideologies.

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

19. Compare and contrast the impact of the Spanish Civil War on Spain and on *one* other European state between 1936 and 1939.

The impact on Spain was far greater than on other countries, as the bitter fighting occurred on Spanish soil. It was a terrible civil war which devastated the country, caused some 750 000 deaths, and led to an authoritarian ruler. This could be compared but mainly contrasted with another country, involved in the fighting, such as Germany, Italy, or the USSR, or even one which advocated non-intervention, such as Britain and France, where there was bitterness and argument about the war. Many nationals of these latter states fought as volunteers.

Specific details for comparison and contrast will depend on the other country chosen.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for two sequential accounts with some linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for a comparative structure or excellent linkage.

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

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

20. Why did the Second World War break out in 1939?

The question asks why did the Second World War break out, and why did it break out in 1939. Candidates will no doubt be confident in giving the causes of the Second World war: the rise and aggression of Hitler, culminating in his invasion of Poland; appeasement; negotiations with Hitler by Britain and France, which, it has been claimed, allowed him to think that they would not object to his invasion of Poland, and the failure of the League of Nations to stop aggressive actions by Japan, Italy and then Germany. However candidates must also address 1939, probably by analysing the meaning and importance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, and why Britain and France made a stand against the invasion of Poland, but not before.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalisations and key omissions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative answers of the causes.

[11 to 13 marks] for assessment of the causes.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical essays which also address 1939 specifically.

[17+ marks] for perceptive understanding and perhaps different views.

21. “I am not an adventurer, but we must aid national liberation movements.” To what extent does Khrushchev’s assertion explain his foreign policy between 1953 and 1964?

After Khrushchev’s denunciation of Stalin in 1956 and talks of peaceful co-existence in his travels abroad meeting world leaders, the USSR and its satellite states and the West hoped that relations between them and the USSR would improve. Yet the Hungarian Rising of 1956 was repressed and his firm stance on Germany culminated with the increasing flow of East Germans to the West being combated by the building of the Berlin Wall. These events are not explained by Khrushchev’s assertion, but the Cuban missile crisis is. It could be said that the Soviet leader was claiming that missiles were not placed in Cuba for the benefit of the USSR, but to aid Castro whom he considered was the leader of a national liberation movement. He also took an interest in other areas in the Third World, perhaps to try to outdo Mao and China there. The outcome and aftermath of the missile crisis, with the hot line and suggestions of détente, could support his claim as not being an adventurer. The complicated and often bitter relations between Khrushchev and Mao could be said to support and contradict both parts of the claim.

Although candidates often choose questions on the Cold War, they tend to know only mainstream subjects like Cuba, Germany, Korea and Vietnam, and to approach them from a US perspective, so it will be interesting to see how this question is addressed as it is on the European Paper, and legitimately focused on Soviet foreign policy.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit focus on the quotation.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for an analytical approach and adequate specific knowledge.

[17+ marks] for perceptive understanding and analysis.

22. What were the main problems faced by post-war western Europe in 1945 and to what extent were they overcome by 1970?

Some candidates have difficulty in knowing which countries can be classed as western Europe. The History Guide specifically names France and Germany; but it would be expected that Great Britain would be added to these, plus Italy, Spain and Portugal, (although for Spain the war that caused problems was mainly their civil war). A suitable method to tackle the question is thematically, giving examples from countries as appropriate. Main problems could include political ones with changes in government, especially in the former totalitarian states of Germany and Italy, and the onset of the Cold War. Economic problems will probably be emphasized, with countries devastated by fighting and bombing, hence the need to rebuild, food shortages, financial deficit, unemployment and employment problems with the change from war industries, and social changes and disturbances. For how far they were settled: the recovery of Germany politically and economically; France under de Gaulle; decolonization helping several of the western European countries financially; European co-operation leading to the European Economic Community; Marshall Plan; the Cold War, *etc.* could all be mentioned where appropriate.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported general comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for acceptable focus on problems and their solutions.

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

[17+ marks] for perceptive knowledge and analysis.

23. Examine the impact of economic problems between 1939 and 1995 on *two* communist eastern or central European states (excluding the USSR).

The long time period of this question allows for economic problems from the outset of the Second World War to the end of the Cold War and break up of the Soviet Union, to be discussed. Again, candidates are often uncertain which countries should be included in eastern and central Europe but they should know which ones belonged to the communist bloc (including Yugoslavia and East/German Democratic Republic). The question needs an explanation of the economic problems during the Second World War, and the Cold War, and how these problems affected the chosen countries' economies, politics, and the lives of the people.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative account with implicit attention to “examine”.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit attention to “examine” and “impact”.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical answers which have reasonable coverage of 1939–1995.

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

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

24. Assess the role of the media in *one* twentieth century European state.

This is an open-ended question but specific evidence is necessary for a satisfactory mark. Media includes press, radio and television, and how their role could be helpful to both government and people in publicizing information *e.g.* about health and safety or other uncontroversial matters. Most candidates will probably select a single party state and concentrate on the role of the media in assisting the government to obtain and control support, largely with propaganda. Much of the media was in these cases owned or controlled by the state, and censorship was imposed on all media forms. Answers must focus on the role of the media, not just propaganda. Its role could also be said to entertain, and to make money. Yet entertainment can also have a political dimension. Expect Germany and USSR to be popular choices, and note that the question asks for one twentieth century state, but coverage of the whole century is not demanded.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused and balanced analysis of the role of the media.

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

25. Analyse the successes and failures of *one* of the following European heads of state: Franco, Gorbachev, Salazar.

Candidates must select one of the three leaders, identify their main policies and actions, and analyse them, to decide whether and why they were successes or failure. Domestic and foreign policies should be assessed together with how their role affected the lives of the people. Specific material will depend on which head of state is selected.

Francisco Franco (1892–1975), with the title of “Caudillo”, or leader, established a corporatist, authoritarian state in Spain after Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War in 1939 and ruled until his death in 1975 having secured the succession of King Juan Carlos I as a constitutional monarch.

Mikhail Gorbachev (1931–), joined the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1952, and held various senior positions before he became head of state in 1985 and instituted radical reforms, especially perestroika and glasnost which helped accelerate the fall of communism and the break up of the Soviet Union.

Antonio de Oliveira Salazar (1889–1970), a right wing academic and economist, became minister of finance, then prime minister from 1932 to 1968. He was responsible for the authoritarian constitution of 1933, and implemented a government in Portugal which has been characterized as “fascistic”.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate, irrelevant or inaccurate knowledge.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit successes and failures.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for balanced detailed knowledge, perceptibly applied to successes and failures.
