



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2013**

**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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

*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.

Following a review of marking practices it has been agreed that in order to add further clarity to the markscheme for Paper 3, all caveats with regard to the awarding of marks for questions that include more than one component (eg, compare and contrast; reasons and significance; methods and success) will be removed.

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.** If an answer indicates that the demands of the question are understood and addressed but that **not all implications are considered (eg, compare or contrast; reasons or significance; methods or success)**, then examiners should not be afraid of using the full range of marks allowed for by the markscheme: ie, responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly.*

## The French Revolution and Napoleon – mid eighteenth century to 1815

### 1. Assess the extent to which the demands of the French revolutionaries had been satisfied by 1794.

This is not a “causes” of the revolution question, although answers should consider the grievances that led to revolution in 1789. The date marks the death of Robespierre.

Demands could include reform of government/democracy, and detail regarding this could cover events such as: the meeting of the Estates General in 1789; the Third Estate becoming the National Assembly; reforms of local government; issuing of a new constitution and the establishment of the Constituent Assembly.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man 1789 stated that all were equal before the law, but did not abolish property rights, and there was no mention of one man one vote.

Feudalism was abolished and the monarchy ended after the execution of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette. The privileged position of the Church was altered by the confiscation of church property and the issuing of the civil constitution of the clergy.

There is much material to consider, but reserve higher level marks for those answers which make a real assessment of the extent of change in relation to the grievances pre-1789.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

2. **“The restoration of legitimate rulers was the main objective of the Congress of Vienna.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates will have to know the main agreements reached at Vienna in order to consider how far legitimacy was the main objective. Other objectives could include stabilizing Europe by ensuring a lasting peace, containing France and establishing a balance of power in Europe after twenty years of dominance by a militarily strong power.

The principle of legitimacy was applied in France, Spain, Sardinia/Piedmont/Tuscany and the Papal States *etc*, but not in Germany where the 300 old German states were replaced by the 39 states of the German Confederation.

Close examination of territorial change could indicate that containing France was a key objective. Holland gained the Austrian Netherlands, Prussia regained territory in the Rhineland (as well as much of Saxony), Sardinia regained Piedmont as well as Nice, Savoy and Genoa – all of which were established as buffer states along France’s borders.

Territorial change was also a consequence of victory – Russia kept territory in Poland gained during the conflict. It is also possible to argue that Prussia’s gains made her strong enough to act as a balance to Russian and French military potential.

There is much material to use here. Responses arguing for or against the statement should be supported with relevant detail.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

3. **“Economic weakness was the main reason for Austria’s decline in the years 1815–1866.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Answers should begin by showing the importance of Austria in 1815 as a powerful empire and also as head of the German Confederation. Then an examination should be made of changes in the ensuing fifty years until 1866, when Austria was clearly much weaker in Europe and also lost dominance in the German Confederation.

Reasons for this change could include: the rise of Prussia economically whereas the Austrian economy stagnated; problems within the empire caused by nationalism (examples could include problems in Hungary and losses in Italy); military weakness demonstrated by losses during the 1859 conflict with Italy; poor leadership in Austria after the departure of Metternich; and diplomatic isolation after the Crimean War.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

4. **“Bismarck was first and foremost a Prussian nationalist.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The events of the years 1862–1871 will be well known, and reward answers that clearly link Bismarck’s actions to the increased strength of Prussia within Germany and Europe. It would be legitimate for answers to also explore Bismarck’s views before he became minister president of Prussia. He was against the liberal nationalists of 1848/1849 but, during the 1850s, became a firm supporter of Kleindeutschland and the reduction of Austrian influence in the German states. This question provides an opportunity to explore the historiography of Bismarck’s aims – did he want unification or did he seize any opportunity to strengthen the position of Prussia? It would even be valid to make the point that the federal constitution ensured Prussian dominance.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

### 5. Analyse the reasons for the view that the Ottoman Empire was the “sick man of Europe” in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Reasons could include: internal weaknesses, including poor administration, inefficient and corrupt government; the Empire had a weak economy; repression of Christian subjects, which caused not only internal instability but external intervention; disturbances in the Ottoman Lands, *eg* Lebanon. The growth of nationalism within the Empire led to frequent crises, especially in the Balkans, which resulted in the loss of authority/territory for the Empire. Good examples would be in the 1876–1878 period when Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania gained either independence or autonomy, but also where the other major powers made gains at the expense of the Ottoman Empire, *eg* Austria’s protectorate over Bosnia and Herzegovina and even Great Britain gaining Cyprus. For the rest of the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire continued to decline as a consequence of internal problems, continuing nationalism and because of the fact that the other Great Powers were willing to intervene in Turkish affairs, particularly Russia and Austria–Hungary.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

### 6. Discuss the role of the Great Powers in Greece’s struggle for independence.

Events in Greece in the 1820s were complex; give credit for knowledge of the shifting attitudes of the Great Powers. Great Britain’s attitude shifted considerably at times in relation to the impact that events in Greece had on international affairs. Although there was some sympathy for the Greeks, British actions were driven by the desire to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Great Britain cooperated with Russia to force the Turks to grant autonomy (Battle of Navarino) but also cooperated with Austria to reduce Russian influence after the Treaty of Adrianople. Britain had the support of France; both were keen to weaken the congress system and pursue policies which suited their own nations.

Russia was generally sympathetic to Greek demands for independence, although not necessarily for revolutionary change in Greece. Russia was also keen to use the tensions to gain increased influence in the region and clear access to the Mediterranean. The Russo–Turkish War and the Treaty of Adrianople gave Russia clear gains in the area, but not to the extent that the Empire disintegrated.

Austria, under Metternich, was hostile to Greek independence because he feared the spread of nationalism elsewhere. However he also feared increased Russian influence and therefore cooperated with Britain to reduce that influence. Metternich wanted the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire to prevent the destruction of the balance of power in Europe. All the powers preferred the establishment of a monarchy in Greece rather than a republic.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914

### 7. Analyse the successes and failures of Napoleon III's foreign policy.

Successes could include: participation in the Crimean War and hosting the peace conference in Paris – raising France's status. His support for Italian nationalism gained France Nice and Savoy. Improved relations with Great Britain and the signing of the Cobden–Chevalier treaty 1860 greatly increased French exports to Great Britain. There were some colonial gains such as in Indo–China, Algeria and Senegal.

Failures: Anglo–French relations were tense over France gaining Nice and Savoy. Italy was not under French dominance and Franco–Italian relations were not improved by the presence of a French garrison in Rome.

A major failure was the attempt to establish Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico, which was not only costly but alienated the other powers; Austria was particularly hostile.

Other powers were suspicious of French ambitions and there was resentment of French interference in areas not considered to be of French interest, eg Schleswig–Holstein. This led to increasing French isolation, and diplomatic overtures to Bismarck (Biarritz) failed to gain any real rewards for France. Napoleon was forced into war by French public opinion in 1870, and this led to the collapse of his empire.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

### 8. Assess the extent of political and economic change in any *one* country of Western or Northern Europe between 1848 and 1914 (excluding Germany).

Political change could include: more democratic structures in some countries, such as Great Britain; change of regime in France from republic to empire to republic or the unification of Italy into a constitutional monarchy. Accept any valid example.

Answers should assess the extent of change. Some may point out that, on the whole, heads of state remained hereditary monarchs.

This question provides an opportunity for candidates to use material from their own national history, but answers should be supported with specific detail.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

### 9. “Alexander III was a political reactionary but an economic moderniser.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Political reaction could include: his refusal to enact the Loris-Melikov reforms, restoring the position of the nobility in local government by abolishing Justices of the Peace and introducing the role of Land Commandant which was reserved for the nobility. He passed laws (1890 and 1892) which restricted the size of the franchise. He wanted to maintain the position of the nobility and reduce the influence of popular opinion.

His education policies were designed to restrict access, except for the prosperous classes, and increase the influence of the Orthodox Church.

The policy of Russification was designed to maintain the Empire and to silence nationalist demands.

Economically the reign of Alexander III saw a great increase in production from heavy industries such as coal, iron and oil plus expansion of the railway system. However, this was not accompanied by an increase in manufacturing until Witte’s policies of the 1890s encouraged foreign investment.

Agriculture remained stagnant with peasants still suffering the burden of redemption dues and heavy indirect taxation. Despite some reduction of the Poll Tax and the introduction of land banks there was little modernization of agriculture. The government policy of seizing grain to sell abroad discouraged domestic investment.

There will be little debate that Alexander was politically conservative, but more able answers may point out that, on the whole, he was not so different from his father in that both desired to maintain the monarchy. Analysis of economic policies is also likely to lead to the conclusion that he was fairly conservative, despite the appearance of modernization.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**10. Compare and contrast the role of the Soviets in the February and October revolutions of 1917 in Russia.**

Comparison: In both cases the Soviets were the elected representatives of workers and soldiers, especially in Petrograd. In both cases the support of the Soviets was important in establishing change in Russia. The Provisional Government could not have been established or functioned without the support of the Petrograd Soviet. Bolshevik control of the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets encouraged Lenin to attempt to seize power. In October the Second All Russian Congress of Soviets approved the Bolshevik seizure of power. At both times the Soviet was the forum for expressing the grievances of soldiers and workers.

Contrast: In February the Soviets were the leaders of opposition to the Tsar and were to some extent instrumental in the collapse of the regime. In October the Soviets did not lead revolutionary change, but approved the Bolshevik actions after the event. They supported the Bolshevik policy of seeking peace, whereas in February the demand was not yet for peace but defending the revolution. In February the Petrograd Soviet, which was dominated by Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, was willing to co-operate with the Provisional Government to some extent because they believed that Russia was not yet ready for extreme revolution. In October the Petrograd Soviet was dominated by the Bolsheviks, with Trotsky as chairman.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

### 11. To what extent were the policies of Germany responsible for the outbreak of war in 1914?

German policies: In the longer term, Wilhelm II's policies of Weltpolitik, his colonial ambition, caused tensions with both Britain and France (Boer War, Morocco, *etc.*). Naval expansion led to more tensions with Britain, contributing to the signing of the *Entente Cordiale*. Wilhelm's failure to renew the Reinsurance Treaty led to the Franco-Russian Alliance which was later extended to the Triple Entente.

In the shorter term, Germany's military strategy (Schlieffen Plan) was likely to lead to British involvement in any Franco-German conflict. Wilhelm's so called "blank cheque" also encouraged Austria to take a hard line with Serbia in the crisis of 1914.

Candidates should also consider the role of Austria. Austrian ambitions in the Balkans had led to tensions with Russia since the 1870s. The annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 increased tensions between Austria and Serbia and with Russia. The Austrian response to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, and the harshness of the ultimatum issued to Serbia, increased the likelihood of conflict in the Balkans and the bringing into play of the alliance systems.

Answers may also want to consider the actions of the other powers, both in the longer term and as a response to the July Crisis, before reaching a judgment. However the policies of Germany should be the main focus.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**12. Assess the successes and failures of the Paris Peace Settlement at the end of the First World War.**

The key terms of the settlements (not just Versailles) should be well known. Credit accurate detailed knowledge which supports analysis. However the focus should be on the successes and failures in relation to the aims of the peacemakers and the achievements of the Settlement as a whole.

Aims varied, but a broad aim was to stabilize Europe, to prevent the spread of Communism and to try to restore economic activity. More specific differences could include Clemenceau's aim to weaken and punish Germany, Lloyd George's aim to restore trade, *etc* and Wilson's aim to make a peace that was fair and lasting based on the Fourteen Points. In the Middle East the aims of Britain and France were somewhat different from the other peacemakers and could be criticized as being neo-colonial. Italy sought to gain territories (from the collapse of Austria–Hungary) as promised in the Treaty of London.

Successes could include: Actually reaching terms relatively quickly (the Treaty of Versailles was signed six months after the conference began. The other treaties (Saint Germain, Neuilly, Trianon and Sèvres) were all signed by 1920. The Treaties established a forum for the resolution of disputes (the League of Nations). The Treaties met the demands for national self determination of many groups (Poland, Czechoslovakia, *etc*). The left wing threat at the end of the war rapidly diminished as Europe stabilized.

Failures: The Treaties left several key nations dissatisfied – Germany, Hungary, Italy and Turkey were all revisionist powers. The reparations issue remained a hindrance to re-establishing international trade. The Treaty of Sèvres had to be revised fairly soon (1923). A number of vulnerable Central European states were established.

Key nations: Germany, Russia and the USA were not committed to maintaining the Settlement as they were not initially members of the League.

There is much material which could be considered and a great deal of historiography. Answers which take the line the settlements were unsuccessful because they did not prevent another war are unlikely to gain many marks.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

### 13. How successful was the mandate system in the Middle East? Refer to specific examples to support your answer (excluding Palestine).

Examples could include British control of Iraq and Transjordan, and French rule in Syria and Lebanon.

Reasons why there were difficulties could include: contradictory promises made during the war about Arab independence – it seemed that Arab nationalist goals were only granted in a rather *ad hoc* manner (Ibn Saud gained power in the Hejaz and eventually established Saudi Arabia); resentment that Ottoman rule had been replaced by Western rule for reasons of imperial prestige; fear that the mandatory powers were keen to exploit their mandates economically (Iraqi oil for example).

However candidates could argue that in both Iraq and Transjordan Britain did to some extent fulfill its mandatory role and oversee a gradual and relatively peaceful transition to independence – Iraq became independent under Feisal in 1932, although British access to Iraqi oil was safeguarded, and Jordan became independent under Abdullah in 1946.

The French were much more reluctant to relinquish control in either Lebanon (1943) or Syria (1946). French rule had also been much more colonial in nature, with administrators from French colonies elsewhere setting up a structure which was designed to reduce nationalist aspirations.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

### 14. Examine the reasons for changing British policy in Palestine in the years 1917–1939.

The various policies from the Balfour Declaration through to the results of Hope Simpson and the Peel Commissions and the White Papers up to 1939 should be known. Reserve higher levels for answers which focus closely on the reasons for changing British policies, placing them both in the context of governing the mandate (*eg* in the 1920s the Jewish population helped establish an institutional structure in the mandate) and the wider international context. Concern for Muslim opinion in neighbouring countries and within the Empire had an impact on British policy. There was also pressure internationally which tended to support Jewish immigration to Palestine, especially in the 1930s, which led to contradictions. The 1939 White Paper can be seen as the direct result of a looming war, fear that Arab states would support the Axis, fear for oil supplies, *etc.*

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**Interwar years: conflict and cooperation 1919–1939****15. Compare and contrast the economic and political problems facing Germany in the years 1919–1923 and 1929–1933.**

Comparisons: Political problems, including threats from extremist parties in the early years, Spartacus Week, the Kapp Putsch and the Munich Putsch. In the 1930s, growing support for anti-republican parties such as the Nazis and KPD. Coalition governments which had to rely on Article 48 (emergency powers to govern). Anger at the Treaty of Versailles led to criticism of republican governments, who were often referred to as “the November Criminals”. Political violence made the governments look weak – eg Rathenau’s assassination in 1922; frequent clashes between the various paramilitary groups in the 1930s.

Economic problems, including government budget deficit because of high welfare spending (Ruhr Crisis in 1923 and mass unemployment from 1930 onwards). Reparations were seen as an economic problem – in the early period they seemed to be hampering economic recovery from the war and, in 1929, the need to continue making payments exacerbated the budget crisis.

Contrasts: In the years 1929–1933 what appeared to be similar problems were actually on a much greater scale. Politically, there was a much greater use of non-democratic methods of government (Article 48 used by Brüning 109 times). By 1932 anti-republican parties were in the majority in the Reichstag (230 Nazis, 89 KPD). In the early period international action probably would have helped the republic survive. In the early 1930s Britain and France were too preoccupied with internal problems to be involved. Politically in the early period President Ebert used his powers to protect the republic; in the 1930s, Hindenburg used his powers to protect Germany from the left wing threat.

Economically, the Depression and its consequences was causing unemployment on a massive scale (6 to 8 million people were out of work by 1932). There was a crisis in the banking system, with German banks collapsing. By 1932 reparations had been suspended by the Hoover Moratorium.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

16. “The Spanish Civil War was caused by divisions in Spanish society, not ideology.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Several key divisions could be identified: poor peasants versus landed aristocracy; urban workers versus big business; regional divisions; the desire of Catalonia and the Basque region for autonomy; anti-clericals versus the Catholic Church. Answers should link these divisions to the various political parties in Spain and the events of the years 1931 to 1936, from the establishment of the republic to the outbreak of civil war in July 1936. The best answers will be able to link the broad divisions to the polarization of politics, which made compromise at the political level difficult. Reference could be made to the limited nature of Azana’s reforms up to 1933, the *bienio negro*, the Asturian Rising and the Popular Front victory in the February 1936 elections.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe 1924–2000

### 17. To what extent is it possible to argue that Stalin’s political, economic and social policies transformed the Soviet Union?

A definition of “transformed” might be a good starting point here – in other words, was there extreme change in the Soviet Union as a consequence of Stalin’s policies?

The major policies of the Stalinist period will be well known, and detailed knowledge of key policies should be reasonably rewarded. Political policies could include: strengthening of his personal power by strengthening his control of the party and pursuing the cult of personality; destroying potential opposition using the NKVD, purges and Gulags; increasing the dominance of the state into all aspects of daily life (work, leisure, education, *etc*). It could be argued that Stalin was the “Red Tsar” and the party members’ position was not dissimilar to that of the nobility – thus little change in the political structure of the Soviet Union

Economic policies: The Five Year Plans and Collectivization can be considered both from the perspective of changing the basis of economic activity in the Soviet Union and also how their implementation increased state control. The Five Year Plans transformed the Soviet Union into an expanding industrial power.

Social policies: In some areas there was a more egalitarian system (greater access to health care, education, housing) for some of the population, especially in urban areas. However these benefits were only available if one conformed.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

### 18. Examine the extent of Soviet dominance in the years 1945–1991 in *one* European satellite state (excluding Germany) you have studied.

Examples could include: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania (the Baltic States are not legitimate examples).

Answers should be supported with specific detail and could include material on economic links to the Soviet Union – Comecon *etc*, political interference and control – especially in the immediate post-war period. Military links: the presence/use of Soviet troops to maintain control. Answers may point out that the level of control was variable (possibly because of different phases of the Cold War or the views of Soviet leaders) and by the mid 1980s was beginning to decline.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

### 19. What were the main problems facing post-war Western Europe, and to what extent were they overcome by 1949?

The main problems could be identified as political, economic and social. They could include the need: to revert to a peacetime economy; to deal with food shortages; to rebuild infrastructure damaged in the war. In the case of occupied countries, the main problems could include the need: to establish stable government; to provide employment for returning soldiers; and to deal with the issue of displaced persons. The threat of Communist expansion could also be identified as a problem but should not be the sole focus.

Candidates will no doubt discuss the European Recovery Program or Marshall Aid and how it assisted recovery in the short term. Relatively stable governments were established in West Germany, France and the other previously occupied states of Western Europe and from this a general economic recovery occurred, *eg* German and Italian industrial production was double that of 1937, while Britain and France had improved production by 50%.

Answers may well argue that the changes in the immediate post-war period were merely the starting point to the full recovery that occurred in the 1950s. Points should be supported with specific evidence.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**20. Why was Britain’s membership of the European Economic Community (EEC) delayed until 1973?**

Answers could include a narrative chronology of the various European organisations which were formed in the post-war period prior to the establishment of the European Economic Community (EEC) – such as the Council of Europe and the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC, from which Britain was excluded) up to and including the Treaty of Rome.

The main focus should be on why Britain was not involved at various stages or why Britain was not allowed to join the EEC.

Initially the political leadership in Britain was not keen on close British involvement in Europe – Britain favoured free trade, and there were anxieties about surrendering British sovereignty. There was also a feeling that Britain had such close trade links with the Commonwealth (50% of British trade) that it could afford some distance from Europe.

In 1961 Britain applied for membership of the EEC, but the application was vetoed by de Gaulle because he felt Britain was too close to the US and French/US relations were very poor at that stage. The application was also vetoed because of the various preconditions demanded by MacMillan and Heath. Wilson’s government also applied for membership in the late 1960s but it was vetoed by de Gaulle, and it was not until 1973 when Pompidou was French president that the application was successful.

Key reasons: Initial British reluctance, links with the Commonwealth and later French hostility.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

21. “The 1979 Revolution in Iran was largely caused by social and economic tensions.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Answers will have to examine the social and economic tensions in Iran and assess their contribution to the unrest that led to the collapse of the Shah’s regime. Economic tensions could include the impact of land reform and the growth of an urban population which, by the mid 1970s, was experiencing rising unemployment and inflation. The failure to distribute Iran’s oil revenues effectively contributed to urban poverty. Some may even refer to the huge expenditure of celebrating the dynasty in 1971.

Social tensions were, to some extent, a consequence of the economic problems but there was also the issue of Western influence in a society which was very conservative and, outside the cities, much influenced by Islam. This influence continued as the population moved into the cities, especially Tehran, and this social group was by far the largest involved in street demonstrations in 1978/1979. Khomeini and Muslim associations became the voice of these demonstrations.

The Shah was attempting to conciliate the middle class by limited reform, and also to conciliate the moderate ulama, but his policies were inconsistent.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**22. Explain the changing causes of tension between Israel and its neighbours from 1948 to 2000.**

This is a broad question, and those answers which identify changes and can offer some explanation for the change supported by accurate knowledge should be well rewarded.

Reasons for tension in the early part of the period include the refusal of Israel's neighbours to acknowledge its right to exist, leading to the 1948/1949 war. Tensions over Palestinian refugees were an ongoing problem; these tensions were also exacerbated because of the issue of the occupied territories and Israel's refusal to hand them back despite United Nations (UN) resolution 242.

Some improvement in relations after the 1973 War and the Camp David Accords and Washington Treaty meant that Egypt recognized Israel in order to regain Sinai and reduce tensions in the region.

Tensions often increased because of the issue of Palestinian refugees – and because of the actions of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Various areas to discuss could include: Israeli athletes killed at the 1972 Olympics; Israeli invasions of Lebanon in 1978 and 1982, with the massacres in Sabra and Shatila camps and their impact.

Problems arose as a consequence of the Intifada and the continued presence of Israelis in the occupied territories. However the Intifada also encouraged Israel to become more open to the idea of a Palestinian state – this was partly due to US pressure on Israel; the US also pressured the PLO to recognize Israel.

The 1990s saw mixed relations; the Oslo Accords (1993 and 1995) were signed and the Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty (1994). The problem of the Palestinians remains an issue, as does the continuing activities of Israeli settlers. Changing situations can often be linked to leading political figures such as Sadat, or changes in Israeli leadership. The end of the Cold War also had an impact, as the US no longer unconditionally supported Israel because of fears over Russian influence in the region.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

- 23. Examine the reasons for, and the impact of, health reforms over a fifty year period in any *one* country of the region you have studied.**

Healthcare reforms can cover a wide number of policies, from the provision of clean water and the development of sewage systems and good housing, to vaccination programs and medical provision, all of which have an impact on health.

Answers should be supported with accurate relevant detail and can cover either the nineteenth or twentieth century.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

- 24. Assess the extent of change in the social structure of any *one* country in the region you have studied in the years 1950–2000.**

Changes in social structure could include: the erosion of class differentials, which is arguable; greater social mobility because of wider access to educational opportunities, changing the demographics of class (growing middle classes); social change as a consequence of immigration (more diverse societies); more urbanized societies; demographic change because of increased living standards/life expectancy.

Accept any reasonable selection of the above and other valid suggestions, as long as they are supported with factual detail.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

---