



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2010**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3 – Aspects of the history of  
Europe and the Middle East**

*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.*

*Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. **For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.***

<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
<b>1–2:</b>	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
<b>3–4:</b>	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
<b>5–6:</b>	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
<b>7–8:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, in-depth, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
<b>9–11:</b>	Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications are considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
<b>12–14:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
<b>15–17:</b>	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
<b>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.

**1. To what extent were financial problems the most significant cause of the French Revolution?**

Candidates will probably know the problems caused by the expenses of the French court, but they should also be aware of the inequalities of the taxation system and about the various Controller Generals whose suggestions for reform were not heeded. The better candidates will make a direct connection between taxation and the calling of the Estates General. There were other problems leading to the revolution such as bread shortages, lack of representation for the Third Estate and feudal laws. Candidates should weigh the various causes to arrive at some judgement about how significant the financial problems were.

**2. “Napoleon Bonaparte failed to maintain the ideals of the French Revolution in his domestic policies.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should know the basic ideals of the French Revolution: liberty, equality and fraternity, and should consider the extent and limits of the claim that Napoleon did not maintain these ideals with his domestic policies. Foreign policy is not a requirement for this question and will not gain any marks.

Napoleon was considered to be the son of the revolution. Points in favour of the argument could be: his encouraging promotion by merit rather than birth; maintaining the rights to property of those who had taken it during the revolution; plebiscites. The Code could be analysed from at least two points of view. Arguments against could be: crowning himself as Emperor; appointing his relatives to positions of power; the gradual growth of repression. Candidates could consider the institutions in his government and the extent to which he promoted liberal ideas.

**3. Compare and contrast the roles of Cavour and Garibaldi in the unification of Italy between 1850 and 1871.**

Cavour’s role in the process of unification was essentially political and diplomatic, strengthening the Piedmontese state and gaining allies to assist with the removal of the Austrians. It is a matter for debate as to whether he wanted a unified Italy or merely a strong unified northern kingdom. Answers may touch on this but the main focus should be the unification of the whole of Italy. Piedmont was strengthened economically – industrial development, shipping trade, *etc.* Cavour also reduced the influence of the Church (Siccardi laws) making the monarchy stronger and increasing support for the removal of the Austrians. Diplomacy – he gained support abroad by participating in the Crimean War, raising the “question of Italy” at the peace conference in Paris 1856. In 1858, with the aid of Victor Emmanuel II (regarding the Orsini Bomb Plot), he gained the support of Napoleon III (Pact of Plombières) in the war against Austria in 1859, which ultimately led to Austria’s departure from Lombardy. He also used his “political” skills to ensure that plebiscites in the Central Duchies favoured Piedmont.

Garibaldi’s role was much more flamboyant, his high profile (military activity in South America, establishment of the Roman republic 1848/1849) generated support for unification both within the Italian states and abroad. He was particularly popular in Great Britain. In 1860 the Sicilian expedition furthered the process of unification by driving the Bourbons out and almost forcing Cavour to take action in the papal states to prevent a republic being established in the south.

*If only Cavour or Garibaldi is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**4. Analyse the successes and failures of Bismarck's domestic policies after 1871.**

Answers should clearly identify Bismarck's aims before they can assess success – these could include: the effective unification of the new federal empire; dealing with internal threats (Catholics/Socialism); the maintenance of the dominance of the Prussian monarchy; the containing of democratic institutions such as the *Reichstag*.

Policies: finance; currency; communications; support for industry; *etc. Kulturkampf*; state socialism; suppression of national minorities.

His changing alliances in the *Reichstag* (Liberal/Conservative era) ensured there was no build-up of unified opposition.

Also worth considering is Prussia's position within the Bismarckian constitution and how that contributed to the power of the monarchy.

*If only successes or failures are discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**5. Assess the reasons why Greece had gained independence from the Ottoman Empire by 1831.**

The Greek revolt began in 1821 and by 1823 the Sultan had asked Muhammad Ali for military assistance, promising him Syria as a reward. Egyptians, led by Ibrahim Pasha, began the ruthless suppression of the Greek revolt – prompting the intervention of the Great Powers. Russia had sympathy for the Greek cause and was also interested in extending her influence in the region. Britain under Canning also had great sympathy for the Greeks, the French were quite keen to weaken the Alliance system and also sympathetic to Greek nationalism.

Canning persuaded France and Russia to take joint action (Treaty of London 1827) – leading to the defeat of the Turkish and Egyptian navies at Navarino Bay. War between Turkey and Russia ensued – Turkey was too weak and was defeated, and the Treaty of Adrianople was signed in 1829 – mostly to the advantage of Russia, however, it also contained a clause which gave autonomy to Greece.

Britain particularly felt that an independent Greek kingdom would be more stable and less likely to be influenced by Russia. All the major powers supported full independence for Greece leading to the second Treaty of London. Thus key reasons for Greece gaining independence were the Great Powers pursuing their own interests, as well as supportive public opinion in Britain and France.

**6. Examine the impact of the major European powers on the Ottoman Empire between 1850 and 1880.**

French interests in Syria were a cause of the Crimean War. There were tensions in Lebanon between Muslims, Druzes and Maronites and France intervened in 1860. The French role in building the Suez Canal, which opened in 1869, increased Western influence in Egypt and in the region. There was British concern over the canal's strategic and economic importance: it greatly shortened the route to India and from the start most of the trade passing through it was British. Hence Disraeli bought the Suez Canal shares in 1875, reducing weak Ottoman influence in Egypt.

The Eastern Question (1875–1878) – Congress of Berlin, Russia and Austria Hungary keen to extend her influence; Great Britain to maintain the status quo; Austria Hungary gained protectorate over Bosnia-Herzegovina; Turkey had to promise internal reforms; Bulgaria (although reduced in size) gained independence.

Impact of major powers: at times their presence/interests led to conflict and the weakening or reduction in size of the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand it may also be argued that the major powers (particularly Britain) also helped the Empire to survive in order to maintain a relative balance of power in the region.

**7. “The Republic is the form of government which divides France the least.” To what extent do you agree with this statement with reference to the period 1870–1914?**

Candidates will need to be aware of the four regimes with followers in France: Republicans, Bonapartists, Legitimist monarchists and Orleanist monarchists.

The Second Empire had widespread support but republicanism remained strong, especially in the big cities, and the Empire's dependence on military success explains its sudden collapse in 1870 and the formation of the Third Republic.

The 1871 elections showed that monarchism was still strong in France, but as in the period between 1848 and 1851 monarchist divisions preserved the new republic, this time permanently. A conservative republicanism emerged which was acceptable to many monarchists, and after 1879 the Republic seemed there to stay. The death of the Prince Imperial and the Republican capture of the presidency and Senate in the same year seemed decisive.

A key aspect for the survival of the Republic was the rallying cry of “no enemies on the left” – Republican parties buried internal divisions to ensure the Republic survived threats such as Boulangism, the Dreyfus Affair and even the growth of the far left.

**8. Analyse the impact of the extension of the franchise on the development of British political parties between 1867 and 1914.**

Candidates may choose to challenge the assumption in the question that franchise extension (1867, 1884) had a major impact on British political parties. They might choose to argue that it was other legislation such as the Secret Ballot Act (1872), the Corrupt Practices Act (1883) and the Redistribution Act (1885) which had a greater impact on political parties. This legislation meant that parties had to become more organized and be clearer about their ideas in order to gain the support of a more independent and increasingly class-based electorate. The decline of patronage and the increased power of the Commons after the 1911 Parliament Act, as well as the payment of MPs all had an impact on political parties. In addition, the way that elections were conducted on a national level after Gladstone’s Midlothian Campaign had a significant impact on political parties.

*This is not a question on the extension of the franchise; answers should focus on the development of parties.*

**9. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Alexander II’s reforms.**

Alexander II’s reforms will be well-known: emancipation of the serfs in 1861; local government reform – judicial, education, military and economic. Better answers should be able to identify his aims (modernizing and strengthening Russia whilst maintaining autocracy).

Analysis should focus on how well this was achieved – limited impact e.g. the replacement of serfdom with “economic serfdom” as a consequence of redemption dues; limited progress in agriculture, as the land was held in common by the Mir. There was no elected national assembly.

Some improvements were made to the legal system (although the state still had arbitrary powers) and education, which contributed to the growth of opposition groups who were frustrated at the limited nature of reform.

The military was relatively successful – evidence of this could include Russia’s success in the 1876 conflict with Turkey.

*Developed analysis is required for higher marks.*

**10. “Lenin abandoned ideology in order to gain and consolidate power.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should know about Lenin’s basic aims as he stated them before 1918 (as seen in the April Theses or in his various addresses to the Bolsheviks). For example he was against the bourgeoisie and for the proletariat forming the government. The government would be based on Soviet organizations. Better candidates will be aware that he changed Marx’s ideas on Communism because of the size of the peasant class in Russia and he therefore promised “Peace, Bread and Land”. Candidates should consider Lenin’s government, War Communism and the New Economic Policy in comparing his actions with his promises. The role of the Communist party and the establishment of a single-party state is an area that could also be considered, as well as Lenin’s response to the Kronstadt Mutiny in 1921.

Better candidates may discuss Marx’s ideas on revolution and the nature of the state but these must be linked to Lenin’s policies.

**11. In what ways, and with what results, did German foreign and colonial policies change after 1890?**

Candidates should have knowledge of both Bismarck's and Kaiser Wilhelm II's foreign and imperial policies, and the best answers will explain how the Kaiser differed from Bismarck.

Bismarck set up a series of alliances – *Dreikaiserbund*, Dual Alliance, Reinsurance Treaty – in order to avoid Germany's isolation, and he did not encourage colonialism because this would bring Germany into conflict with France and/or Britain. The Berlin Conference could be used as an illustration of his diplomatic abilities. The Kaiser sacked Bismarck and weakened the alliance with Russia and encouraged German intervention in Africa (e.g. the Kruger Telegram and the two Moroccan crises).

Some results that could be considered include: France's drawing closer to Britain, leading to an Entente mostly because of colonial matters; Russia's joining the Entente; the arms build-up and Russia's increasing concern about events in the Balkans as Germany encouraged its ally, Austria. Wilhelm's policies contributed to German isolation (except for Austria) whereas Bismarck's policies kept Germany on reasonable terms with the other powers except France.

*This is a two part question; if only "ways" or "results" are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**12. Compare and contrast the political and economic effects of the Paris Peace Settlements on Germany and Italy up to 1923.**

Both political and economic effects must be considered and candidates should know that Germany had to sign the Treaty of Versailles because it lost the war, whereas Italy fought on the side of the allies. The Treaty of St Germain with Austria upset Italy, who believed they had not been rewarded enough after suffering losses in the war, particularly in terms of territory – "the Mutilated Victory".

There are several comparisons because both countries were disappointed with the treaties and used them to blame their governments who had signed them, leading to right-wing hostility. There were economic difficulties in both Germany and Italy when soldiers returned from the war, and left- and right-wing opposition groups were strong in both countries. Differences include: the Fascists took power earlier in Italy but the monarchy was retained there, whereas Germany was a republic and the Weimar governments that were dominated by Stresemann had some economic success. In Germany economic difficulties were perceived to be a direct consequence of Versailles, thus impacting on political stability, especially in the recession which followed the Wall Street Crash – a key factor in the emergence of the Nazis. Thus one political effect in the long-term for Germany and shorter-term for Italy was the establishment of dictatorships.

*If only political or economic effects are mentioned, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*



**13. Analyse the major causes of instability in Palestine between 1917 and 1939.**

Candidates should understand the context. Arab nationalism had been encouraged by Britain during the First World War. The promise was taken to mean Arab predominance in Palestine but some say it was misleading. The Balfour Declaration had made Palestinian Arabs bitter. In 1920 in San Remo, Palestine became a mandate entrusted to Britain to be advised and administered until it could stand alone. The Palestinian Arabs were not represented in San Remo, and riots against Jews broke out in Palestine. Causes of instability could include: Arab anger at land purchase; Jewish economic dominance; Jewish immigration; Zionist influence with the British government; Jewish anger at attempts to limit immigration. The contradictory nature of British policies/white papers led to increasing anger from both communities, which led to violence.

*Better candidates will try to assess which was the major factor.*

**14. How successful was Reza Khan in modernizing Iran between 1924 and 1941?**

Reza Khan was proclaimed Shah of Iran in 1925 and ruled for 16 years. He reorganized the army, government administration and finance, the legal system and he improved the status of women. Iran became more industrialized, and modern education was introduced. Candidates must analyse his reforms, especially his political system and the extent to which the reforms impacted on Iranian society and politics, in order to reach a balanced conclusion which is based on solid evidence about his success.

**15. Analyse the reasons for the weaknesses and collapse of democracy between 1918 and 1939 in *either Italy or Spain.***

The main similarity is lack of confidence in the ability of democracy to maintain national self-respect and social order. In both countries extreme rightists gained widespread support because of fear of the “Red Menace” in its various forms. Mussolini and Franco both appealed to the public desire for a strong leader. Another key reason could be the failure of democratic parties to cooperate with each other and establish stable governments.

There are also factors peculiar to each country. In Italy frustration at failure in the First World War led more quickly to democratic collapse because the Liberal leaders were ready to collaborate with Fascism. In Spain, as in Italy, the monarchy sided with authoritarian rule in the 1920s during the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera. In Spain the monarchy’s fall in 1931 created a vacuum, and the new republic had many enemies and few loyal supporters. In Spain Fascism did not become a mass movement as in Italy but part of a reactionary Nationalist coalition. Unlike in Italy political violence erupted into a full-scale civil war and bitter divisions on the left helped the extreme right to destroy the Republic and set up a Fascist dictatorship.

In both countries political divisions were exacerbated by economic problems.

**16. For what reasons, and with what results, were appeasement policies followed in the 1930s?**

British and French opinion was deeply affected by the carnage of the Western Front and the belief that the First World War must be “the war to end wars”. British and French governments, as democracies, could not be seen by the voters to be preparing for war. There was strong support for the League of Nations and organizations like the Peace Pledge Union.

British and French governments were also influenced by considerations other than pacifism. The Great Depression, which resulted in economic weakness, made them reluctant to finance any military build-up to match Hitler’s. In France this prevented completion of the Maginot Line or maintenance of French air superiority. In Britain it led to the Anglo–German Naval Pact in 1935 to prevent a naval race, as was the case before 1914. Chamberlain was warned by the service chiefs before Munich in 1938 that Britain was not prepared for war. There was real fear that German bombing of London, Paris and other cities would create huge civilian casualties and social breakdown.

There were those on the right who saw Hitler as a bulwark against Soviet Communism. “Better Hitler than Blum” was a slogan in France, where the left-wing Popular Front government in 1936–1938 feared that political tensions could lead to civil war as in Spain, so it failed to take a strong line in spite of its anti-Fascist ideology. In Britain there was a firm belief that Germany had been unfairly treated at Versailles in 1919 and that Hitler’s demands that all German speaking lands should join the *Reich* were not unreasonable.

Results could include Hitler’s successful foreign policy up until March 1939, the disillusion of Stalin, and the signing of the Nazi–Soviet pact (August 1939), which in itself could be considered as a policy of appeasement by Stalin.

*If only reasons or results are discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**17. In what ways, and with what results, had Stalin developed the Soviet Union into a major industrial power by 1941?**

Candidates should be aware of the gains in production of coal, oil, steel and tractors for example, but better candidates will consider the expense of these gains and what the sources were for the statistics about the Five Year Plans. By 1940, compared to 1928, the USSR had made impressive strides with the growth of cities, building of dams and canals, and universal education. Candidates should analyse Stalin’s motives and the cost of such development by considering purges and labour camps. Ways could include: collectivization, freeing up of peasant labour, as well as the authoritarian nature of the state and a central command economy, which facilitated rapid economic growth.

Results may also include the Soviet Union’s ability to ultimately defeat the German invasion, but also arguably the establishment of a totalitarian state.

*If only ways or results are discussed mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**18. Analyse the extent of Soviet political *and* economic dominance in *one* Eastern European state between 1945 and 1968.**

This question requires a case study of one Soviet satellite state such as Poland, East Germany or Czechoslovakia, and candidates should explain how the USSR took control after the Second World War, how the government was installed and what the trade relations were. There were changes when Stalin died and these should be taken into account. Issues to consider could include: the extent to which national parties were controlled by Moscow; Soviet response to any sign of independence. Economic issues should consider the impact of COMECON and the way that industry in the satellite states was linked to the economic needs of the Soviet Union.

Specific detail is required and not just an overview of conditions in the Soviet bloc.

*If only political or economic dominance is mentioned, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**19. Assess the impact of Cold War tensions on Western Europe between 1945 and 1955.**

Relations between the USSR and Western Europe deteriorated rapidly after 1945. Imposition of Communist rule in Eastern Europe, Churchill's Iron Curtain speech and Communist activity in France and Italy all aroused fears of Soviet aims. The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid were welcomed in Western Europe but not by Stalin, so it led to both Western European economic recovery and the increasing division of Europe.

The Cold War created the division of Germany. Between 1947 and 1949 the western zones were united in the democratic West German state (FRG) while the eastern zones became the Communist East German state (GDR). Divisions were intensified by the Berlin crisis (1948–1949). In 1949 the NATO Alliance joined Western European powers with the US, and by 1955 the Eastern bloc had established the Warsaw pact.

From 1949 Europe was firmly set in two stable blocs, but overshadowed by the threat of nuclear war between the US and USSR. Britain and later France decided to create their own nuclear deterrent. Tensions continued through 1950s, especially over Berlin. West Germany was rearmed much earlier than intended.

**20. To what extent did the European Community (Union) affect the rights of its individual member states between 1950 and 2000?**

The experience of the Second World War reduced the appeal of nationalism in Europe. This was reinforced by the apparent threat of Soviet Communism and the division of Europe, which forced Western European states to cooperate.

The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), set up in 1951, was the pioneer of European integration. Its six members, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Benelux, pooled their coal and steel resources. This was extended to the entire economic sphere by the Treaty of Rome (1957) which set up the European Economic Community (EEC). Members had to accept a common agricultural policy and VAT, as well as a common tariff. But the Council of Ministers would decide policy, thus preserving national sovereignty as their decisions had to be unanimous.

In France de Gaulle, who was president between 1959 and 1969, followed an independent line and asserted French sovereignty, though he accepted the EEC's economic role. In the 1970s and 1980s the EEC grew from 6 to 12 members, but the growth of its power at the expense of national sovereignty began only in the mid-1980s with the Single European market, which increased the powers of the European Commission.

In the late 1980s the move to a single currency began, adopted by the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 which created the European Union (EU) and a common European citizenship. A European Central bank was to be set up. In the 1990s the EU's role began to expand into social, security and defence cooperation, as well as economic. The need for unanimity was replaced by majority voting in some areas.

Better answers should consider the extent to which European states are able to resist aspects of European law/policies they dislike, *e.g.* Great Britain not participating in the Schengen Agreement.

**21. “Arab disunity was the main cause of Arab failure in conflicts with Israel from 1948 to 1973.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The various conflicts will be well-known and the main focus of answers should be on why the Arab forces were unsuccessful in each case.

Arab disunity was clearly an issue in the 1948/1949 conflict, intervention by other powers during the Suez crisis – candidates may argue that Nasser actually achieved a certain amount of success in 1956, but without much assistance from other Arab states.

Israel's military strength, strategy and determination to survive could be seen as the key factors in 1967, and could be used as an argument to challenge the question.

By the time of the 1973 conflict, Egypt was weakened by conflict in Yemen and in addition the conflict was brought to an end by the intervention of the superpowers. Again it could be argued that Sadat actually gained what he wanted from this conflict – the opportunity for dialogue with Israel.

**22. Assess the political and social developments in Egypt under *either* Nasser *or* Mubarak.**

**Nasser**

Political developments could include: Nasser became the dominant leader; he established an essentially authoritarian state – potential opposition suppressed (Muslim brotherhood).

Social developments could include: Nasser’s policies appeared to be establishing a more equitable society, with land reform, educational opportunities and less religious influence.

**Mubarak**

Political developments could include: that it was still a fairly authoritarian state with Mubarak as dominant leader, however some political relaxation with the Muslim Brotherhood allowed to function openly and voice criticism of the regime.

Social developments could include: as Mubarak’s economic policies are more capitalist and there has been some privatization of industry, there has been an increase in social divisions with less state protection for the poorer sections of society. Increased support for the Islamic religion has also led to tensions within Egyptian society.

*If only political or social developments are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**23. Analyse the social and economic impact of industrialization on *one* country of the region in the fifty year period you have studied.**

This is a case study and a fifty year period should be analysed, but this period will differ according to the time that the country chosen was industrialized. Candidates should consider both positive and negative effects of the growth of factories and urbanization and the effects on class structure as well as living and working conditions.

*If only social or economic impact are addressed mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**24. With reference to *one* country of the region, analyse the developments in *two* of the following in the fifty year period you have studied: health; education; gender issues.**

Candidates must choose one country and analyse the social developments in any 50 year period. A verdict should be reached on the developments in health, education and gender issues and whether they were positive or negative to that country.

*If only one factor is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

---