



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2012**

**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.

## **The French Revolution and Napoleon — mid eighteenth century to 1815**

- 1. “The revolutionary wars of 1792–1796 were to defend France and not spread revolution.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The reasons for the declaration of war in April 1792 are varied – the Girondins hoped war would rally support for the Revolution, whereas the King hoped defeat would lead to the collapse of the Revolution. The early stages of the wars could be seen as defensive. However after success at Valmy in 1792 the war could be seen as both expansionist and revolutionary – Edict of Fraternity November 1792 and a declaration of French “natural frontiers” January 1793 support this view – 1794 could very much be seen as a year where the focus was protecting France from invasion. By 1795 the First Coalition had ended and France was successful in the Rhineland and Spain. Napoleon’s Italian campaign established the Cisalpine and Ligurian Republics, France also gained Belgium by the Treaty of Campo Formio. It is possible to argue either way in response to this statement or indeed that aspects of both were involved. The early years 1792-1795 were focused more on self defence. 1795-1797 were more expansionist.

- 2. How successful was the Congress of Vienna in achieving the aims of the peacemakers?**

The terms of the Treaty of Vienna will no doubt be well known but should be linked to the objectives of the Congress in order to assess success – objectives – restoration of legitimate rulers to control revolution, to contain France and reward the victors, to maintain peace in Europe.

Success could be defined as no major war in Europe until the Crimean War and territorial gains for the Great Powers. There were some concessions to liberalism in the German states. Limitations could include discontent with restored regimes – evidenced by troubles in France and Italy, and the short-lived Congress system.

There is much material to consider and higher marks should be reserved for balanced answers which focus on assessment of aims.

## Unification and consolidation of Germany and Italy 1815–1890

### 3. Analyse the causes and consequences of the 1848 revolutions in the German states.

Causes of revolutionary activity in the German states were varied. In most states economic crisis and poor harvests had increased the number of unemployed in the towns and cities causing disturbances and food shortages which put pressure on the various rulers. Liberals throughout the German states wished for a modern state structure with constitutional government and an elected parliament and the end of the feudal structure. They were encouraged by events in France and Austria to assert their demands.

Amongst the consequences were the granting of constitutions and reforms and extension of the franchise (mostly on the British model *i.e.* limited and based on income). The *Vorparlement* met in Berlin to decide the basis of elections for the representative assembly – the Frankfurt parliament. The Frankfurt parliament failed to reach clear decisions, argued about the merits of *Grossdeutschland* and *Kleindeutschland*, failed to deal effectively with the Schleswig-Holstein issue, it was also seen to be weak as it had to rely on royal armies to maintain order. Frederick William IV refused the crown of a federal Germany. By 1850 Austria was recovering her strength – Treaty of Olmutz forced the end of Erfurt Union. The main consequence of this for Prussia was the realization by Bismarck of need to reduce Austrian influence.

*If only causes or consequences are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

### 4. Assess the contribution made by other powers to the unification of Italy (1848–1871).

Many candidates will no doubt wish to focus on Cavour and his policies. However this should be linked to other European powers, actions and influence. *E.g.* Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War raised awareness of the question of Italy. France in particular was interested in reducing Austrian influence and gaining an ally – Pact of Plombières and 1859 war followed as Cavour was aware that Piedmont was unable to deal with Austria alone. The consequences were an enlarged Piedmont and in 1860 Britain exerted pressure on Napoleon III to accept annexation of the Central Duchies. In 1860 the presence of the British Navy seemed to be supporting Garibaldi's expedition to Sicily. Some dispute over this: Cavour's protection of Rome from Garibaldi prevented French intervention; in 1861 Kingdom of Italy established without Rome and Venetia. In 1866 Austria was defeated in the Seven Weeks War. Italy was rewarded with Venetia for her alliance with Prussia. In 1870 the withdrawal of the French garrison allowed the absorption of Rome into the Kingdom of Italy. Thus despite Cavour's strengthening of Piedmont, other powers were very important at key points in the Unification process.

**Ottoman Empire from the early nineteenth to the early twentieth century**

**5. Assess the importance of the Eastern Question for major European powers between 1850 and 1880.**

The Eastern Question will need to be defined as a starting point with some clear explanation of the interests of the major powers. Comment on Russian and Austrian ambitions in the Balkans/Mediterranean. The British desire to maintain the Balance of Power to protect her interest. In the 1870s Bismarck's desire to preserve the peace of Europe by preventing conflict in the area shaped German foreign policy. Key events such as Crimean War, the Treaty of Paris, the Bulgarian revolts and massacres, Russo/Turkish War, Treaty of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin should be considered in terms of a broad European context. There is a lot of complex detail and candidates who keep a clear focus on importance for Europe should be well rewarded.

**6. Analyse the impact of the Committee of Union and Progress on the Ottoman Empire between 1908 and 1914.**

The aims of the CUP were to strengthen the Empire and end the corrupt inefficient government of Abdul Hamid II. Impact could include the succession of Mehmet V in 1909, the restoration of the constitution, elections were held, some reforms of the tax system, some secularisation. However after the Enver Bey coup the CUP became more authoritarian – so reforms were limited. In terms of the Empire's international position the CUP was unable to prevent further disintegration of the empire, virtually all European territories were lost in the Balkan Wars. Thus the empire remained weak and the government authoritarian in nature.

**Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914****7. Assess the successes and failures of Gladstone’s Irish policies.**

Candidates should know well the legislation pursued by Gladstone in his attempt “to pacify Ireland” from the Irish Church Act, the First and Second Irish Land Acts, Coercion Acts and the Home Rule Bills. Analysis could focus on the detail of each act and comment on what worked and what did not, what grievances were left unresolved and which therefore led to the demand for Home Rule with Parnell as a key figure. Successes might be considered to be some limited protection for tenant farmers and the removal of the burden of tithes. On a broader level Gladstone’s Irish policies were a failure because he was unable to maintain a unified Liberal party which could have passed a Home Rule Bill in 1893 and thus “pacified” Ireland. More perceptive candidates might argue that Gladstone’s Irish policies were doomed to failure as Irish demands were always more extensive than the issues resolved by each piece of legislation.

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

**8. Analyse the major political developments in any one country you have studied between 1848 and 1914.**

Political developments could include changes in regimes *e.g.* France, from Republic to Empire to Republic, the Ausgleich in Austria, unification of either Germany or Italy. Or in the case of Great Britain extension of the Franchise. They could also include the emergence of political movements/parties such as the growth of social democracy or socialism in Europe. Or indeed the emergence of Nationalism either as a unifying or destabilising factor. There should be a clear focus on one country with specific supporting detail.

This question allows for a flexible response from candidates; credit all well-supported answers.

*Vague generalized answers should not score more than [7-8 marks].*

### Imperial Russia, revolutions, emergence of Soviet State 1853–1924

**9. Compare and contrast the domestic policies of Alexander II (1855–1881) and Alexander III (1881–1894).**

Alexander II's reign will probably be known in more detail and most candidates are likely to focus more on the contrasts – Alexander II as the Reforming Tsar and Alexander III's as the Reactionary Tsar. Analysis of contrasts should be supported by reference to specific policies *e.g.* Alexander III's reversal of Zemstva power by the appointment of Land Commandants, increasing control of education, support for the Church, *etc.* Comparisons could include the key point that both were determined to maintain the monarchy, that both pursued Russian dominance and that both sought economic growth – it is often forgotten that Alexander III appointed Witte as finance minister.

*If only Alexander II or Alexander III is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [8 marks].*

**10. “Lenin was able to consolidate Bolshevik rule in Russia by combining popular policies and repression.” To what extent do you agree with this statement about Bolshevik rule up to 1924?**

Popular policies could include the Decree on Peace and Decree on Land in 1917, the New Economic Policy in the period 1921–1924 which established a compromise economy and ended the rigours of War Communism which was very unpopular. Currency reform also helped stabilize the economy.

Repression – Red Terror (Cheka) in 1918, reintroduction of censorship, the use of force to close the Constituent Assembly, the massacre of the Kronstadt Sailors 1921 and the elimination of Mensheviks and S.R's and the establishment of the One Party State by 1922.

More able candidates may also point to the fact that the death of the tsar and his family and success in the civil war had eliminated any realistic alternative to Bolshevik rule.

*If only policies or repression is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*



## European diplomacy and the First World War 1870–1923

### 11. Assess the importance of Balkan nationalism as a reason for the outbreak of the First World War.

The longer term underlying tensions in Europe which contributed to the outbreak of war in 1914 will no doubt be well known and could be made relevant, particularly the development of the Alliance system – where Russia made unlikely alliances with France and later Great Britain as a consequence of German support of Austrian ambitions and fears in the Balkans. Austrian anxiety over Serb nationalism led to full annexation of Bosnia in 1908 which led to the growth of nationalist groups such as the “Black Hand”. The Balkan wars led to the virtual expulsion of Turkey from Europe, a greatly enlarged Serbia and a very anxious Austria. The removal of Turkey meant that tensions in the Balkans brought Austria and Russia into direct confrontation, and after the assassination of Franz Ferdinand the failure to resolve the crisis brought the Alliance system into play. Thus it could be argued that instability in the Balkans was a key factor in the development of a crisis which led to war. If candidates challenge the question and provide well evidenced, well structured arguments then these should be rewarded appropriately.

### 12. Why were the Central Powers defeated by 1918?

Candidates should attempt to give an overview of the whole war and focus on key issues which contributed to failure. The main focus will no doubt be on Germany and those candidates who address the problems of her allies as well as Germany should be well rewarded (*e.g.* internal tensions in Austria such as Czech nationalism, the success of the British campaigns in the Middle East).

Key factors include: the failure of the Schlieffen Plan which led to a war of attrition; the imbalance between the sides; the Allies included Britain and the Commonwealth and her European Allies plus the US from April 1917 – which brought huge reserves of manpower and resources; the impact of the Naval Blockade and control of the seas; poor decisions on the part of the Germans *e.g.* unrestricted submarine warfare, internal problems within Germany; labour unrest and the threat of revolution – the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive 1918 increased internal problems in Germany and led to the request for an armistice which was an admission that Germany could no longer continue fighting.

**War and change in the Middle East 1914–1949**

- 13. “Economic and religious issues were the main cause of tension in the Palestine Mandate between 1920 and 1939.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Economic and religious issues were clearly a major cause of tension and there should be detailed material to support analysis on these. However other issues such as immigration, the role and policies and relationship with the mandatory power also need explaining before a judgement can be reached. Some answers may also argue that tensions emerged as a consequence of contradictory wartime promises by Great Britain and were exacerbated by the other factors.

*If only economic or religious issues are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

- 14. For what reasons, and with what consequences, was Reza Khan able to gain power in Iran in 1924?**

Reasons could include: the weakness of the Qajar Dynasty and the limited impact of the 1905 Constitutional Revolution; the impact of First World War and subsequent weak governments provided an opportunity for Reza Shah’s coup. Consequences were: attempts to modernize Iran by centralizing the state bureaucracy; secularizing the law courts and various social reforms such as banning the hijab, ending polygamy, *etc.* There was also some industrialization and foreign influence remained strong in the shape of the Anglo–Iranian Oil Company. Some section of the population became prosperous but in rural areas the population remained poor and heavily influenced by the Ulema.

### Interwar years: conflict and cooperation 1919–1939

#### 15. Compare and contrast the reasons for the rise to power of Hitler and Mussolini.

Comparisons are much more obvious – contrasts may be limited. Comparisons include: flawed political structures in both cases which led to weak coalition government. Economic crises include: in Italy post-war recession, in Germany the impact of the Depression, in both high levels of unemployment led to support for the left and fear of revolution. Increased disillusion with democracy. In Italy the Biennio Rossi and in Germany the continued support for the K.P.D. increased fear of communism.

Desire for a strong leader and lack of support from the elites, undermined democratic governments. The fear of a coup contributed to the appointment of leaders who were hostile to democracy. In both cases the class based nature of political parties in coalitions made effective government difficult and weakened support for democracy.

Contrasts: In Germany Hitler had much greater popular support, thus appearing more democratic. Mussolini, in contrast, only had 35 Fascist deputies in 1921. This could be explained by the fact that Hitler had a clear programme which attracted mass support. Mussolini's tactics were much more overtly violent than Hitler's – Squadristo was used to undermine the Liberal governments in Italy in the years 1919–1922.

Candidates may refer to the period of the consolidation of power, the main focus should be on the rise to power.

*If only Hitler or Mussolini is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [8 marks].*

#### 16. “The policy of appeasement was a major cause of the outbreak of war in 1939.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This is a “causes of the Second World War” question and will allow candidates to use their knowledge of the historical debate on appeasement. It is not a “failure of the League of Nations” question and answers which focus on this should not score highly. Although appeasement is most closely associated with Chamberlain it could be argued that it was followed earlier on issues such as rearmament and the reoccupation of the Rhineland and the Anschluss. However Chamberlain was more definite in his pursuit of appeasement as was seen in his willingness to negotiate over the Czech crisis in 1938. He even accepted the German occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1939 as Czechoslovakia had not technically been invaded. The Nazi–Soviet Pact could also be seen as Stalin temporarily appeasing Hitler. Candidates could argue that war was inevitable as a consequence of Hitler's goal of *Lebensraum* in the east. However they could also argue that appeasement allowed Hitler to gain confidence in pursuit of that goal and undermined potential military opposition in Germany who were satisfied with the gains of German foreign policy up to 1938. In that sense it was a cause of war as Hitler remained in power. If there is reference to historians' views then they should be discussed, challenged or supported.

## The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe 1924–2000

### 17. Analyse the reasons for Stalin’s emergence as Lenin’s successor by 1929.

Balanced answers should consider Stalin’s strengths as well as the weaknesses of his opponents and make a judgement as to which factors were most important.

Stalin’s strengths: his position as party secretary allowed him to build a power base within the party – the 1924 Lenin Enrolment led to a more manageable membership. His positioning of himself as Lenin’s Apostle and chief mourner also allowed him to gain support. Shifting alliances (first with Zinoviev and Kamenev – later Bukharin). His flexibility on policy – posing first as a moderate and later adopting the radical policy of rapid industrialization and Socialism-in One -Country could be seen as political cunning or flexible responses to changing situations such as the grain crisis of 1927.

Opponents’ weaknesses: Trotsky was regarded with suspicion by many – because of his Menshevik past, his apparent disrespect for Lenin – not at the funeral, questioning Lenin’s policies, *etc.* Agreeing with the *Politburo* not to publish Lenin’s Testament meant Stalin remained in place. Kamenev and Zinoviev left it too late to form the Left Opposition with Trotsky. By then Stalin had a strong grip on the party – they were accused of factionalism. Bukharin was never a major threat, he was too “capitalist” in his ideas.

### 18. “The main aim of Brezhnev’s policies was to maintain the Soviet System.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Brezhnev replaced Khrushchev as first secretary in 1964 sharing power with Podgorny and Kosygin. Brezhnev survived a dispute over economic decentralization and was clearly the dominant politician until his death in 1982. Brezhnev relied on provincial party secretaries and his main focus was on internal stability and not innovation – there were some profit incentives and wage differentials but very slow growth in Russian industry. Brezhnev was unwilling to allow any real market influence on the Soviet Economy. Despite signing the Helsinki Agreement on Human Rights dissent was repressed within the Soviet Union with many well known dissenters (Sakharov, *etc.*) persecuted.

In foreign policy reference may be made to Detente. The Brezhnev Doctrine of 1968 made very clear to the satellite states what the Soviet Union would tolerate in terms of independence. Thus Brezhnev clearly aimed at maintaining the status quo but it also could be argued that the stagnation of his regime paved the way for Gorbachev and the collapse of Soviet Union.

## **The Second World War and post-war Western Europe 1939–2000**

### **19. Why had Germany been divided into East and West by 1949?**

This is not a broad “causes of the Cold War” question although this will be the underlying theme in candidates’ answers. The focus should be on events in Germany and how they were influenced by other tensions. Material to be considered could include the economic administration of Germany by the Allied Control Council, disputes over reparations. Anxiety by the western powers about the merger of the KPD and SPD into the Socialist Unity Party (SED). Establishment of Bizonia in 1947, impact of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan on the attitude of the USSR. Introduction of the Deutschmark to the Western zones and West Berlin. All of which could be considered by the Soviet Union as an attempt to revive Germany as a major power.

The Berlin Blockade and Airlift led to fear of a Soviet takeover, increasing tensions between the occupying powers making solutions to problems more difficult and precipitating the division.

### **20. Assess the extent of economic integration in Europe by the 1990s.**

Candidates should know the various economic bodies established to promote economic co-operation including Benelux Union, ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community) the EEC (1958) or Common Market with six members as well as EFTA (1959). In 1972 negotiations were completed for Britain’s entry with special arrangements alongside Eire and Denmark with Greece, Spain and Portugal joining later. However analysis should consider the economic issues which caused problems within the community such as Common Agricultural Policy, over production “butter mountains”, *etc.* fisheries quotas and constant disputes over Britain’s budget contributions/rebates.

Descriptive detailed narrative can gain *[12 marks]*.

**Post-war developments in the Middle East 1945–2000**

- 21. “The impact of the White Revolution was a major factor in the overthrow of the Shah in 1979.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The White Revolution brought about limited land reform, farms were too small, agricultural labourers were left out causing problems in the countryside and the growth of the urban population. The Ulema was hostile to the secular state which was replacing their role in the bazaar. Even religious moderates objected to the activities of the Literacy Corps. Thus there were underlying discontents which became more open in the mid 1970s as economic disparities increased. Discontented unemployed workers turned to religious leaders – protests which were originally led by the middle classes criticising the authoritarian and corrupt nature of the regime, were increasingly led by religious leaders. They were criticizing westernization and secularization much of it led by Khomeini from exile and the cycle of riot and demonstration continued through 1978–1979. Attempts at conciliation and concession were limited and too late. It could be argued that the limitations of the White Revolution helped to destabilise the regime by leading to an increase in size of the urban poor who were the main participants of the demonstrations of 1977–1978. Some may argue that in the very short term the inconsistent policies of the Shah contributed to his overthrow but it is difficult to see how he could have dealt with popular discontent on such a scale.

- 22. Analyse the nature of political developments from 1945 to 2000 in any *one* Middle Eastern state you have studied (excluding Egypt).**

Answers should be supported with specific detail related to the chosen state. Change could include more democracy or the establishment of dictatorial regimes such as in Iraq. The key point is that there must be detailed knowledge and developed analysis and not unsubstantiated generalisations to achieve higher marks.

**Social and economic developments in Europe and the Middle East in the nineteenth or twentieth century**

- 23. Assess the impact of educational change on society over a fifty year period in any *one* country you have studied up to the year 2000.**

A fifty year period in either the nineteenth or twentieth century within the region is legitimate here. Educational change would generally mean the expansion of educational opportunity. Impact could consider consequences for the economy, for political change or impact on social structure. One good example might be post 1945 Britain but the key words are change and impact and there should be detailed knowledge of both.

*Generalized answers should not achieve more than [8 marks].*

- 24. Examine the impact of religion on society in any *one* county you have studied up to the year 2000.**

This could be argued either way with candidates seeing religion as a cohesive unifying factor in their chosen state. Others might see religion as a cause for conflict (*e.g.* Northern Ireland) and some might see religions as a hindrance to modernization. All perspectives are legitimate as long as the answers contain detailed material and are not unsubstantiated assertions. The example chosen must be from Europe and the Middle East.

---