



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2011**

**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, 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 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 are 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. “A new France emerged out of the revolution; Napoleon Bonaparte’s achievement was to organize it.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The demands of the question are that candidates consider the ways that the revolution changed France, and then point out and analyse the ways in which Napoleon organized and modernized the country.

In spite of the bloodshed and chaos of the revolution, there were benefits. Some that could be included are: the changes to the Estates-General; the ideas in the Declaration of the Rights of Man; the abolition of the feudal system; the Constituent Assembly; some religious and financial reforms.

Napoleon Bonaparte carried out many organizational reforms as First Consul, a position he obtained in 1799, before he became Emperor in 1804. He reformed the law with his codes, made a Concordat with the Pope, and reformed local administration by instituting prefectures. He also improved education and the economy, and as Emperor he established an imperial nobility. His organizational reforms and other successes with the army were carried out from 1795 until defeat in Spain, Russia and Waterloo, contributing to the development of a strong national identity.

Candidates should consider and analyse some of the above, and/or other points. It is quite a wide area, so do not expect all the above. Expect both parts of the statement to be addressed if only one part is addressed award a maximum of *[11 marks]*. Some candidates may validly and successfully challenge the quotation.

**2. Analyse the successes and failures of the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815).**

The Congress of Vienna, which aimed to reach a peace settlement after the Napoleonic wars, took place between October 1814 and June 1815. Candidates should know the details of the settlement, and will no doubt disagree about some measures being a success or failure, but their verdict should be explained.

Successes could include: the treatment of Napoleon and the settlement with France, which enabled France to rejoin the European Powers, but not become a threat again; the lack of a major war until 1853; the territorial settlements, which attempted to maintain the pre-war status quo and satisfy the winners; maintaining a balance of power.

Failures could include: the emphasis on legitimacy and restoration of pre-revolutionary rulers; the determination of the winners/great powers, Austria, Britain, Prussia and Russia, to satisfy their own requirements; the disregard of the views of other states; ignoring nationalism both in the territorial settlement, and as a concept; ignoring demands for more constitutional measures.

The section that contains the Congress of Vienna ends in 1815, but candidates might refer to the Congress System. Do not penalize those who do not, but give credit if they do and it is clearly linked to the question

**3. Assess the contribution to Italian unification of *either* Cavour or Garibaldi.**

This should be a well-known topic and popular question. It is hoped that “contribution to Italian unification” will be the focus of the answer, and that a narrative account of Italian unification will not be written.

**Cavour (1810–1861)**

Cavour may or may not have sought Italian unification, but he certainly worked to strengthen Piedmont when he became prime minister in 1852, a post he held, except for six months in 1859, until his death. He had taken no part in the revolutions of 1848, but learned from them that foreign help was needed to expel Austria from Northern Italy. His main contributions to Italian unification included: the internal strengthening of Piedmont; participation in the Crimean War; the Pact of Plombières with Napoleon III; the war against Austria – but Napoleon’s Peace of Villafranca led to his resignation; the plebiscites within the central Italian states and allowing Napoleon Nice and Savoy; his reaction to Garibaldi’s invasion of Sicily and invasion of the Papal States to prevent Garibaldi doing so; plebiscites in the Papal States and Sicily led Garibaldi to hand his conquests to Victor Emanuel II. Cavour became the first prime minister of Italy, but died four months later.

**Garibaldi (1807–1882)**

Garibaldi joined Mazzini’s Young Italy in 1834, and was forced to flee the country. The part he played in the unification could include the following: he was an ardent supporter of the *Risorgimento*; he took part in the 1848 revolutions in Rome, which forced him into exile again; in 1860 he invaded Sicily with his Thousand (in fact 1100) troops; he and his forces, plus Neapolitan troops, drove out the Bourbon dynasty; he crossed over to the mainland and captured Naples; Cavour forestalled him in the Papal States, so Garibaldi gave his conquests to Victor Emanuel II. Later he tried twice to seize Rome, but failed. Garibaldi’s contribution could be considered to be that of “national figurehead”.

#### 4. Why was Germany unified under Prussia in 1871?

The wording of this question gives scope to candidates who have studied section 2, which covers the time period 1815 to 1890, to use their judgment and knowledge, to express their views, on why in 1871 Germany was united under Prussia. There are many different ways to answer the question. Some may take a long view, and others concentrate on the years of Bismarck's control.

The following are some of the points that might be considered:

- the effects of the measures introduced in the Congress of Vienna, such as reducing the number of states to thirty nine, and the territorial gains of Austria and Prussia;
- the Zollverein and economic advances of Prussia throughout the period;
- the supremacy of Austria in the *Bund* for most of the period;
- problems faced by Austria in her empire, with diverse nationalities, conservative attitudes to governance, and opposition within Italy;
- the 1848 revolutions and the Frankfurt Parliament;
- Olmutz and the Erfurt Union;
- Bismarck's policies from 1862 – were they to strengthen Prussia or seek unification, planned or opportunistic?
- Bismarck's use of, or manipulation of, changing European situation;
- Bismarck's diplomacy and three wars;
- Prussia's success and the foundation of the German Empire.

**5. Assess the success of *either* Muhammad Ali in modernizing Egypt *or* Abdul Hamid in strengthening the Ottoman Empire.**

Muhammad Ali (1769–1849) led a force against Napoleon’s Egyptian expedition in 1801, and established himself as Pasha of Egypt, a position he held from 1805 until 1848. He also founded the dynasty that ruled Egypt until 1952.

He consolidated his rule of, and territory in, Egypt, gained independence from the Ottoman Sultan, and defeated the Mamluks. He used French and Italian instructors to strengthen his forces, army and navy. He modernized the economy and financial system, founded educational establishments for the elite army officers and civilian officials, but taxed the peasants to pay for his “reforms”. Muhammad Ali and his son Ibrahim took part in various campaigns for and against the Ottoman Empire, and became involved in European power struggles. The Egyptian fleet was destroyed in 1827 at Navarino, during the Greek War of Independence. The European powers did not want the strong Muhammad to take over the Ottoman Empire, so in compensation, Muhammad Ali and his descendants were made hereditary khedives of Egypt.

Thus the success of Muhammad Ali could include: taking control of Egypt; founding a dynasty; obtaining independence from the Ottoman Empire; using his forces to increase his territories; becoming a powerful player in Eastern Mediterranean politics; modernizing Egypt.

Abdul Hamid was born in 1842, was Sultan of the Ottoman Empire between 1876 and 1909, and died in 1914. He was appointed Sultan on condition that he granted a constitution, which he did, but soon dissolved it, and the assembly that it had introduced also ended the Tanzimat reforms, and he ruled as an autocrat for the rest of his reign. His main appeal to his Arab subjects was as leader, and Caliph of Islam. He built mosques and surrounded himself with Ulema. He showed little concern for his Christian subjects and was held responsible for the Armenian massacres of 1894–1896. He got into debt and foreign bankers controlled the economy. He was unable to prevent the independence of some of his dominions, such as Bulgaria/Romania. In 1908 the Young Turk revolution compelled him to restore the constitution. He attempted a counter-revolution, failed and was deposed.

Abdul Hamid’s success was limited: his rule consisted of reform; reaction; loss of territories and power, especially in the Mediterranean; poor relations with European states; problems with religion, finance and debt.

**6. Analyse the causes *and* consequences of the Crimean War (1854–56).**

The causes of the Crimean War ostensibly concerned the guardianship of the Christian Holy Places in Palestine, but were more of a power struggle between Russia and France. The care of the Holy Places had come under the guardianship of the Orthodox Church and Nicholas I tried to extend this to all the Sultan's Christian subjects. Napoleon III, supported by Britain, objected, and Turkey refused. Russia invaded the Turkish provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, and sank the Turkish fleet at Sinope. Britain and France allied with Turkey in order to reduce Russia's power. The war was ended by the Treaty of Paris. One of the key causes included the fear of other European nations that Russia was trying to profit from the weakness of Turkey and thus disturb the balance of power.

The consequences of the war included: the disclosure of weaknesses and inefficiency in all the forces taking part, especially logistics and inadequate clothing and equipment; the disclosure of the horrific conditions for the sick and wounded, and the efforts of Florence Nightingale and others to improve them; various military reforms, including those of Alexander II of Russia; the effects of the Treaty of Paris, in favour of the allies, including the neutralizing of the Black Sea (soon broken); the promise of the Sultan that he would treat Christians the same as Muslims (also soon broken); the independence of Moldavia and Wallachia, forming the Kingdom of Rumania; the continued decline of Turkey.

The significance of at least some of the above should be discussed in more depth, and in its international context for higher level marks.

*If only causes or consequences are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [11 marks].*

**7. Compare and contrast *two* of the crises faced by the Third French Republic between 1875 and 1914.**

The three obvious crises in the Third French Republic were firstly the Boulanger Affair, 1886 to 1889, which arose when General Boulanger, minister of war, became very popular and appeared to be a danger to the Republic, aiming at a coup d'état. He failed to challenge the government, fled to Brussels and later committed suicide. Boulangists wanted to strengthen the Republic.

The second challenge was the Panama Scandal, 1892, which involved faulty technical planning, extravagance, bribery, fraud and blackmail, and caused many French electors to vote socialist at the next election.

The third and most serious crisis was the Dreyfus Case (1894–1906). The Jewish army officer was condemned by a closed court martial for selling secret information to the Germans. The French public were divided: some claimed that Dreyfus had been treated unjustly, others asserted that to say this attacked the honour of the army. Emile Zola joined in the controversy, supporting Dreyfus, who was eventually cleared in a civil court. Here the opposition wanted to overthrow the Republic. Candidates should compare and contrast the government reaction and policies, public reaction, and the outcome.

*If only one crisis is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [8 marks].*



**8. In 1867 Disraeli said: “Change is inevitable in a progressive country.” What changes did Disraeli introduce in Britain up until 1880?**

Disraeli entered parliament as a Tory in 1837. He expressed his early political views through his leadership of the Young England group and his political novels, *Coningsby* and *Sybil*. Regarded as an outsider by many Tories, he was not given office by Peel in 1846. He attacked the Repeal of the Corn Laws and became leader of the protectionist conservatives helping to rebuild the party's fortunes. He became chancellor of the exchequer in Derby's three short-lived minority governments. He was responsible for the 1867 Reform Act which nearly doubled the electorate. He succeeded Derby as party leader, and was prime minister briefly in 1868. His main work was in his second ministry from 1874 until 1880. In the first two years, eleven acts were passed concerning licensing laws, factory hours, trade unions, workers' dwellings, education, public health, food adulteration, river pollution and merchant shipping. How far these were the work of Cross, and how effective they were is debatable, but they did introduce changes.

Under Disraeli, the Tory party became the Conservative party, and changes, especially social changes took place. It is hoped that candidates will focus their answers on the quotation rather than writing a chronological narrative.

**9. In what ways, and with what success, did Alexander II attempt to modernize Russia and preserve imperial power?**

This will no doubt be a popular question with most candidates agreeing that Alexander did want, and did try to modernize Russia, because it was badly needed, and at the same time preserved his imperial power, for himself and his dynasty.

Many will note the widely accepted view that Alexander thought that Russia should be modernized from above rather than below, and use the same reforms to illustrate their and Alexander's views. A thematic approach could be to analyse each reform for motives, ways, successes and failures. Some examples follow.

The emancipation of the serfs (1861) did modernize Russia by granting serfs their freedom – a success, but the Mirs and redemption payments that had to be made by the peasants helped to preserve imperial power, and dissatisfied the peasants – and failed to modernize agricultural production.

The judicial reforms were successful in improving justice, but the composition of the courts helped to preserve imperial power. A similar verdict could be reached about the military reforms; the army was modernized, peasants would have been helped by shorter service, and tsardom was not weakened. The introduction of local Dumas satisfied few. Although some local services were improved, Alexander failed to introduce a national Duma, which was either wanted or needed by all classes and the Tsar by 1881. Education was widened and reformed, but later when it was seen to encourage opposition to the Tsar, and help his enemies, some reforms were withdrawn.

The above are some of the comments that could be made, but accept other valid arguments, and analysis, and reward genuine attempts to focus on the demands of the question in a structured answer.

**10. Analyse the impact of the First World War on Russia between 1914 and 1924.**

This will probably also be a popular question. Some of the areas that could be analysed include:

- entry into the war initially produced a patriotic response and renewed support for the Tsar;
- the war revealed weaknesses in the army, especially poor logistics and equipment;
- as the army mostly consisted of peasants, agriculture suffered and widespread famine occurred;
- Nicholas’s decision to personally command the army in 1915 led to many problems at home and on the war front with defeats;
- the war helped to cause the first 1917 Russian Revolution and the abdication of the Tsar;
- the Provisional Government was weakened by the war, and by the decision to continue it;
- Germany’s decision to send Lenin to Russia helped to bring about the Bolshevik Revolution;
- the war also caused problems and assisted Lenin. The war was ended by the treaty of Brest–Litovsk, and was a factor in the civil war (Allied intervention);
- the Russian Civil War, which could be said to be partly caused by the First World War, had both positive and negative consequences but certainly Bolshevik victory was achieved partially because of Allied intervention in an attempt to bring Russia back into the war.

*Do not expect or demand all of the above and credit other relevant material.*

**11. Discuss the importance of *two* of the following in European diplomacy between 1870 and 1914: the Alliance System; global colonial rivalry; changing balance of power; nationalism.**

Candidates need to select two of the factors, define them, and show their importance in diplomacy that involved the key European states, between the unification of Germany and the outbreak of the First World War.

The Alliance System would include Bismarck’s Alliance System (candidates could challenge that it was a system) and the formation of the Triple Alliance and the Entente, why they were important and their role in the outbreak of the First World War.

Global colonial rivalry was the attempt of various European powers to obtain colonies outside Europe. This led to rivalries, especially between Britain and France, and later Britain, France and Germany, and will no doubt be regarded as a cause of war in that it increased tensions. Answers should be supported by reference to specific crises: Fashoda, Morocco, *etc.*

The changing balance of power refers to the rise and decline of various European powers, especially Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and the Austro–Hungarian and Ottoman Empires. Much of the diplomacy in this era revolved around this change, and candidates could bring the Balkans, and the outbreak of war, into this section.

Nationalism and the desire of states, especially those whose ethnic majorities had been ruled by foreign powers, for freedom and autonomy, could be analysed. This is a complicated area and included various wars, revolts, annexation and probable genocide (Bulgaria and Armenia) as well as the outbreak of the First World War, as a consequence of Balkan nationalism.

This should not however be turned into a “causes of the First World War” answer. The period it covers is 44 years, so for “good” marks, demand reasonable coverage of the time period.

*If only one factor is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [11 marks].*

**12. Assess the factors that led to the defeat of the Central Powers in the First World War.**

This is a very mainstream question that will probably be popular, but often in the past answers have been short of specific details as well as analysis. Some points that could be included are:

- failure of the Schlieffen Plan to knock out France before Russia could mobilize;
- two-front war faced by Germany;
- weakness of German allies, Austria Hungary, Turkey, Bulgaria (1915);
- Germany and the Central Powers outnumbered by the Allies, especially with the entrance of Italy (1915), US (1917) and British Imperial and Commonwealth forces;
- Germany's use of unrestricted submarine warfare adopted in 1917, was at first successful, but brought in the US and made Britain adopt the convoy system;
- Allies fought successful campaigns in the Middle East, and Germany lost colonies in Africa and the Far East;
- Germany's final drive, the Ludendorff Offensive: failed to obtain victory before American troops arrived in strength;
- the German fleet mutinied (October 1918) and food shortages caused unrest in Germany, also her allies were failing (Turkey in the Middle East, Austria Hungary collapsing). Points raised should be assessed to show their significance in the loss of the war.

**13. Analyse the role of religion in Saudi Arabia between 1932 and 1949.**

For the role of religion in Saudi Arabia, some of the following could be selected and analysed:

- the branch of the Muslim religion, Sunni, Shia, Wahabis;
- relations between rulers or government and religion;
- law and religion, the Sharia;
- the strictness imposed by Muslim clerics on the population;
- Islamic learning and schools.

Some specific points about Saudi Arabia could include:

- Ibn Saud proclaimed himself imam of the Wahabis;
- he founded the Ikhwan (Brothers) and sent them to try to persuade the Bedouin to live according to the Sharia;
- in 1932 Ibn Saud became king and found the Ikhwan an embarrassment as they opposed modernization;
- he fought against and destroyed the movement in the battle of Sabila (1929);
- modernization was carried out within the rules of the Sharia;
- protection of the holy places gained him support.

**14. For what reasons, *and* with what success, were attempts made to modernize *either* Turkey or Iran in the first half of the twentieth century?**

Some of the reasons for the modernization of either Turkey or Iran could include: the perceived need for modernization of the chosen country and its rulers; European politics and policies; the First World War and its aftermath; economic situations including oil; attempts to modernize by reformers.

For Turkey expect some mention of the Young Turks but the majority of answers are likely to focus on Atatürk and his policies, which could include: abolition of the caliphate; introduction of a Civil Law Code; imposition of western style dress; female suffrage; extension of education and modernizing the economy. Success could include: the development of industry; the establishment of a secular republic; improvements in education. Critical analysis might comment that modernization had a limited impact in rural areas and that Islam also continued to be influential.

For Iran, Reza Khan became Shah in 1925, as Reza Shah Pahlavi he built roads, railways, schools, *etc.*, but alienated the people by his wealth and greed. He abdicated in favour of his son in 1941. Anti-American and anti-British sentiments led to the rise of Mussadeq in 1951, and the question does not go beyond this date.

*For answers which only address either “reasons” or “success”, mark out of a maximum of [11 marks].*

**15. Why did attempts at cooperation in Europe between 1919 and 1939 end in failure?**

Although the League of Nations is relevant for this question, candidates should not attempt to answer the question **solely** on the failure of the League of Nations. Points on this issue could include: the inherent weaknesses of the League, such as its constitution and workings, and especially the lack of important countries, including the US; its lack of an army, and its failure to impose its will on larger states, such as Italy and Japan. Other reasons for attempts at cooperation ending in failure could include some of the following: the effects of the First World War and the treaties that followed; the failure of disarmament; distrust between nations, especially between France and Germany; US policies, which tended to be regarded as inconsistent; the Great Depression, which led states to pursue their own interests even more selfishly; the Spanish Civil War, and the failure of the Non-Intervention Pact; the rise, attitudes and policies of dictators. The Second World War broke out as the ultimate result of the failure of attempts at cooperation. Candidates may mention the failure of collective security as being partially a consequence of fear and distrust of the Soviet Union.

*If only one key factor is addressed for example the League of Nations or Hitler’s Foreign Policy then award a maximum of [11 marks].*

**16. “The Spanish Civil War was essentially a domestic matter that rapidly became an international issue.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The causes of the Spanish Civil War were mainly domestic issues. They included: separatism; the wealth and privileges of the nobility and the Church, which contrasted with peasant and urban poverty. This poverty in the countryside, and in the towns with the growth of new industries and its labour problems, led to strikes and unrest; many wished to overturn the existing order. Government extremes within the Republic, formed in 1931 after the departure of Alfonso XIII; polarization of politics; army revolt led by various generals with Franco emerging as the Nationalist leader by September 1936.

The actual conflict (1936–1939) did become a European and an international issue. The former developed with the attempt to limit the conflict to Spain, with the failure of the policy of Non-Intervention pursued by Britain and France. Germany and Italy supported the Nationalists, and the USSR and the International Brigades supported the Republicans. European issues were fought out in Spain. Germany and to a lesser extent Italy, used it as a “dress rehearsal” for a larger conflict; it was also perceived to be a conflict between Communism and Fascism.

*Do not expect or demand all of the above and credit other relevant material. Candidates should focus on both domestic and international parts, but there is no set division of marks for each section.*

**17. To what extent did the cult of personality contribute to Stalin’s maintenance of power?**

Stalin (1879–1953) rose to power in the USSR by 1928. His cult of personality started with his identification of himself with Lenin’s policies after Lenin’s death, his role as “Lenin’s Apostle” and then his use of this identification. Stalin’s cult of personality was developed to increase and maintain his power, and it was developed through propaganda, the media, decrees and policies, and fear.

The impact of this cult was apparent in many ways. It was used to prevent the successful challenge of potential rivals ,Trotsky, Kirov and others. It was used to drive through successful economic change which consolidated his position. During the Great Patriotic War Stalin was seen as the saviour of the Soviet Union which increased support for him. However other factors contributed to his maintenance of power for example the One Party State , the secret police , the establishment of the Gulags also prevented the emergence of open opposition

There are many ways that this question could be addressed, but the effects/impact of Stalin’s cult of personality must be analysed for “good” marks.

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

Khrushchev was First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1953–1964) and Premier (1954–1964). Brezhnev became First Secretary of the Communist Party after Khrushchev's fall from power. He was also president of the Supreme Soviet from 1977 to 1982.

The main features of Khrushchev's foreign policy were: coexistence, which started at the Geneva Summit in 1955, but in 1956 the rising in Hungary was put down. Travels to India, China, Yugoslavia, Britain, US; Camp David meeting with Eisenhower (1959); disagreement in Paris (1960) over the US spy plane; quarrels over Berlin with Kennedy (1961); Berlin Wall (1961); relations with China difficult throughout the period; Cuban Missile Crisis (1962); signed Test-Ban Treaty (1963); mutual distrust between Mao and Khrushchev, lowest point (1963).

The main features of Brezhnev's foreign policy included: visiting Western and non-aligned countries; Soviet–Indian relationships were warm, and attempts were made to help India and Pakistan settle their differences (1966); the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia after the “Prague Spring”, led to his pronouncement of the Brezhnev Doctrine, although Brezhnev sought some measure of détente and arms limitation, signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1969 and beginning Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in 1970; a treaty was signed with Federal Germany, giving formal recognition to the German Democratic Republic in 1970; relations with China remained cool; Soviet equipment was given to North Vietnam to fight South Vietnam; Nixon visited Moscow in 1972 and Brezhnev visited New York in 1973.

Thus both leaders sought more contact with the West and supported arms limitation. Both travelled outside USSR, visited China, but had cool relations with Mao. Both tried to improve their support in non-aligned and developing countries. Both put down attempts for more freedom in the satellite states. In contrast Khrushchev had the Berlin Wall built, whereas Brezhnev sought better relations with Germany. Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba which led to the missile crisis, which was his most serious and criticized foreign policy initiative, whereas Brezhnev's most serious foreign problem was Czechoslovakia.

*If only one Soviet leader is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [8 marks].*

**19. Compare and contrast post-Second World War problems and recovery in *two* Western European states.**

Candidates will probably expect the term “Western European states” to cover Belgium, Britain, France, Holland, Italy and West Germany. Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Switzerland would also be valid, but unlikely choices. The demands of the question are that two states should be chosen, and the post-war problems, that is problems caused by the Second World War, and the success/failure of the chosen states to overcome these problems, should be compared and contrasted. Answers with accurate running comparisons will score well.

Problems caused by the war, and apparent in the five years after the end of the war, could include: damage caused by air raids or invasion; loss of life and injuries to armed forces and civilians; financial loss, including the repayment of loans; invasion and treatment by enemy forces; poverty, famine, and displacement; attitude to collaborators; reparations and other measures demanded by the victors. Problems caused by the war to states that did not take part in the war would be significantly less, but there were some, especially in the economic sphere.

Recovery could include: return to general normality; economic and financial recovery; stability of government; Marshall Aid; treatment of refugees; ability of demobilized troops to find employment; end of food rationing.

*Specific details will depend on states chosen. If only one state is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [8 marks].*

**20. Why was Germany divided in 1945 but reunited in 1990?**

This is the Paper 3 that deals with Europe and the Middle East, therefore candidates must ensure that the focus of this answer is European, but the nature of the question partly concerns the US in the Cold War so this can be included where relevant. For example US participation in wartime and post-war conferences was significant in the division of Germany.

Germany and her allies lost the Second World War, and the main victors were Britain, France, US and USSR, who all demanded some input into the treatment of Germany. Conferences, including Yalta and Potsdam discussed the German problem and Germany was divided into four zones of occupation. The three western states joined their zones, and the Federal Republic of Germany was declared in 1949. The Russian sector or zone, became the German Democratic Republic. This division of Germany into four, then two parts, needs to be accompanied by analysis of the discussions, aims and demands of the four powers. Analysis will probably focus on Cold war tensions causing the semi-permanent division.

The reunification of Germany was possible because of the problems and economic weakness of the USSR and her satellite states in Eastern Europe, including East Germany. The Berlin Wall and other crossings, were opened in November 1989, free elections took place in May 1990, and full political unification took place in October 1990. Analysis here should focus on the decline of Cold War tensions and the impact of Gorbachev’s policies on the Soviet bloc and the desire of all Germans to unite once Cold War barriers had broken down-

*If only division or reunification are discussed, mark out of a maximum of [11 marks].*

**21. Analyse the changing relations between Israel and the Arab world between 1967 and 2000.**

The time period for this question is from the Six Day War until the end of this syllabus. It is hoped that a brief but not too long background/introduction will be given stating the reason for antagonism between the two.

Events between 1967 and 2000 that could be explained and analysed could include:

- the Six Day War in 1967, and the gains obtained by Israel, the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula as far as the Suez Canal, the west bank of the River Jordan, and the impact of these on relations;
- 1973 war known as Yom Kippur War by Israelis, Ramadan War by Arabs and October War by others, caused by the attack on Israel by Egypt and Syria;
- the Camp David conference (1978) between Israel and Egypt, and its outcome;
- Israeli withdrawal from Sinai (1979);
- Israeli invasion of Lebanon and forcing the withdrawal of the PLO from Beirut (1982–1985);
- renewed tension with the Intifada, which began in 1988;
- peace agreement between Israel and the PLO (1993) Oslo Accords, introduced limited self-rule for Palestinians in Occupied Territories.

At least some of the above should be explained and examined, especially focusing on relations between Israel and Arab states.

**22. Assess the successes and failures of Nasser in Egypt between 1954 and 1970.**

The wording of this question demands that focus must be on Nasser's policies, and his successes and failures within Egypt, although some policies outside Egypt could be mentioned for their impact upon Egypt, especially if financial or other harm resulted from them.

Nasser ruled Egypt as prime minister from 1954–1956, and president from 1956–1970. He aimed to improve the Egyptian economy, and bring a large number of the poor out of poverty. He broke up the large estates of the rich in his attempt to bring about a social revolution. He also wished to modernize where possible and improve education. His stance was always nationalistic, for example he nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956, and built the Aswan Dam, which he hoped would help both agriculture and industry. He tried to play the different sides of the Cold War against each other, in order to obtain maximum foreign aid. Politically he established an authoritarian state.

Candidates should use some of the above and other domestic material to assess his successes and failures. Answers will not all agree, and marks will depend on evidence and argument.



**23. In what ways, and to what extent, did gender issues change in the fifty year period you have studied?**

For the last section in the syllabus candidates can study the various social and economic developments for a fifty year period in the nineteenth or twentieth century.

Gender issues can cover the position of both men and women, and how the position changed or fluctuated between them.

Gender issues could cover:

- education, and its development for girls and boys, from primary to university, and if and how the balance between the sexes has changed;
- healthcare, and any gender issues associated with it, perhaps maternity care;
- voting rights, changes in the period;
- employment, and how women achieved entry and success throughout the time period, and the effect this had on men;
- role of women in the family, changes and also how this affected the role of men.

Reward analysis and specific evidence produced to support assertions; unsupported general statements will not score well.

**24. Analyse the impact of technology on *one* society in the fifty year period you have studied.**

The answers to this question will depend very much on the time period studied, but technology has had beneficial and harmful effects throughout both centuries, from the Industrial Revolution to the digital age.

To give answers a framework it would help to structure them thematically. Some themes that could be included are: work/employment; agriculture; leisure, including sport; travel for work or pleasure; building techniques and buildings; tools and gadgets for house and garden; war, weapons, especially those of mass destruction; how technology made life easier; the negative aspects of technology, in peacetime and war.

Reward answers that show thought, specific evidence, in-depth analysis, especially in relation to “society”. Examples do not have to be selected from a set number of countries, but they do have to be specific and the focus must be on “society” in order to reach the higher markbands.

---