

# **Markscheme**

**May 2016**

**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>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused, with a high degree of 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.
<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>12–14:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
<b>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>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. There is 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>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>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>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>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.

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 18th century to 1815

1. To what extent did social problems contribute to the outbreak of the French Revolution?

Candidates are required to consider how far social problems contributed to the outbreak of the French Revolution. It is likely that they will consider other factors in their responses and gauge the significance of social problems in the wider context; however, there is no prescribed response.

### *Indicative content*

- Social problems may be interpreted widely. They may include the divisions within French society into the three estates and the unequal treatment that these experienced, for example, in taxation. Alternatively they could be taken to mean the increasing wealth (without any accompanying political influence) of the bourgeoisie in the later 18th century.
- For balance, candidates could argue that political and/or economic problems were more important causes of the Revolution.
- For economic problems, they could highlight the poor harvests of the 1780s, although this had a social impact, for example the food riots in early 1789. The financial problems of the French state, aggravated by French intervention in the American War of Independence, could be seen as an additional economic problem.
- For political problems, candidates could draw upon the impact of ideas of the Enlightenment. They could also focus on the role of Louis XVI, the decision to summon the Estates General and the Tennis Court Oath of June 1789.
- Some candidates may note the interplay of different types of factors as a cause of the Revolution.

*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. Examine the reasons for the failure of the Constitution of 1791.

Candidates must demonstrate a clear understanding of why the Constitution failed to stabilize politics in France during this period, despite the king having accepted the Constitution that had been drawn up by the National Assembly between 1789 and 1791 and when some believed that the Revolution was over.

*Indicative content*

- The constitutional settlement collapsed on 10th August 1792 (the attack on the Tuileries). The Convention was elected and France was declared a Republic in September 1792.
- The role of the monarchy was significant; although the king had signed the new constitution, he appeared to want it to fail, hoping he could regain power. He failed to work consistently with “moderates” such as Lafayette.
- Royalist exiles (who advised the king) also had an important role; they were opposed to the concessions the king had made and did not want the constitutional monarchy to work.
- Within the Legislative Assembly there was a lack of political experience. None of the members of the National Assembly who had drawn up the Constitution were permitted to serve in the new Legislative Assembly (“self-denying ordinance”) and there were divisions within it between Feuillants, Brissotins and Jacobins.
- Outside the assembly, especially in Paris, there was a growing radicalization of politics (for example Marat in *L’Ami du Peuple* and Hébert in *Le Père Duchesne*) as a consequence of press freedom.
- The international situation could also be argued to have been significant: war with Austria was declared in April 1792; France was invaded in July 1792 and the Brunswick Manifesto was also issued that month. French military failures may also have featured, for example the fall of Longwy and Verdun led to a widespread belief that the French military effort was being sabotaged by a pro-Austrian committee linked to the Court.
- Economic problems also existed, with inflation and grain riots; the assignat fell to 47 per cent of its face value in March 1792.

*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. “The Austrian Empire maintained the dominant position among the German states between 1815 and 1848.” Discuss.

Candidates must offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that Austria dominated the German states during this period (from the Congress of Vienna to the revolutions of March 1848 in Germany). Austrian dominance under Metternich can be traced both in terms of locus of power (Vienna, Berlin or Frankfurt) and in terms of repressing Liberal/Nationalist movements (for example the Wartburg festival, October 1817).

#### *Indicative content*

- The German Confederation (Bund) was an association of 39 states set up by the Congress of Vienna. It included Austria and Prussia as well as an array of medium and small states (the Confederation’s Assembly or Bundestag sat in Frankfurt).
- In support of the statement are the Karlsbad Decrees of 1819; these included extra powers for the police, censorship and restrictions on the freedom of movement. They were instigated by Metternich in response to the murder of Kotzebue, who was in the pay of the Tsar, in March 1819. These decrees were passed into law by the Confederation’s Assembly in September 1819.
- Also in support of the statement, the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna, devised by Metternich between 1819 and 1820, was the constitution that the German Confederation adopted in May 1820.
- It severely restricted the powers of the Confederation, leaving *de facto* power with Vienna. Those who argued for a stronger and more liberal German state were arrested. Attempts at revolution between 1830 and 1831 in German states were generally unsuccessful; although a constitution did come into effect in Saxony in September 1831.
- For balance, candidates could argue that Austria maintained a dominant position in the early years of this period, up to about 1830. However, the degree of control was arguably declining after that date with the continued growth of German nationalism (for example the Hambach festival, 1832); the increasing economic power of Prussia and the creation of the Zollverein.

*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. Examine the significance of Garibaldi's leadership in the unification of Italy between 1848 and 1870.

Candidates must consider the importance of Garibaldi in the unification of Italy as opposed to that of other leaders both within Italy and beyond, or that of other factors, such as the weakness of Austria.

*Indicative content*

- In 1848, Garibaldi returned from South America and led a small group of Red Shirts in the defence of Milan against the Austrians. In 1849 he was a deputy in the Roman Assembly and he proposed that Rome become an independent republic. He led the defence of Rome against French and Neapolitan forces before leading a retreat of his men through Central Italy and escaping.
- In 1859, Garibaldi led troops successfully for Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont against the Austrians. In 1860 Garibaldi and his 1000 men set out to conquer Sicily and Naples. For the sake of Italian unification, he then handed these conquests to the Piedmontese king.
- He led attempts in the 1860s to attack the Papal States but was defeated at Aspromonte and Mentana. He also took part in the Piedmontese war against Austria in the Tyrol in 1866.
- His leadership was significant as he achieved many of the Italian military successes of the Risorgimento and he acted as an inspiration to Liberal and Nationalist Italians. On the other hand, he experienced many setbacks such as his defeats in the Papal States in the 1860s and the loss of his home town Nice to the French after the Franco-Austrian War of 1859.
- For balance candidates could argue that the role of Cavour was more important in that, for example, he was able to involve Napoleon III's France on the side of Piedmont against Austria in 1859; also there were his attempts to modernize Piedmont. Other candidates could stress the importance of the role of Victor Emmanuel or the weakness of Austria both diplomatically and militarily after 1849. Other relevant factors in the unification of Italy should also be allowed if coherently argued, for example the importance of foreign powers such as France in 1859 and Prussia in 1866.

*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 19th to the early 20th century

5. Examine the methods used by Muhammad Ali to establish **and** maintain power in Egypt.

Candidates are required to consider the ways by which Muhammad Ali established (for example militarily) and then maintained (for example economically) his power in Egypt.

### *Indicative content*

- Muhammad Ali came, with Albanian troops, to Egypt in 1801 to fight against French occupation. With the defeat of the French and the withdrawal of the British, a three-way struggle for power took place between the Ottoman rulers, the Mameluks and the Albanian soldiers sent by the Ottomans. After becoming leader of the latter, Muhammad Ali was appointed governor of Egypt by the Ottomans in 1805, ruling Egypt until 1848.
- He established and maintained power through a combination of methods, including those which demonstrated how ruthless he could be (March 1811 massacre of the Mameluks), and those where his military and political prowess came to the fore (the defeat of the British at Rosetta in 1807, which meant that he could be portrayed as defender of Egypt against foreigners).
- To maintain power he strengthened the state and improved the economy. To these ends, there were a series of reforms including the confiscation of land from the ruling class (and conversion of much of that land to state land), a reduction in the power of religious orders, the forcing of peasants to pay taxes directly to the state, and the establishment of a conscript rather than a mercenary army and navy. For the economy he improved irrigation, expanded the cultivation of cotton and tried to improve state administration and industry.
- Although he suffered military reverses in his campaigns beyond Egypt (his defeat at Navarino in 1827 and the opposition of the Great Powers to the expansion of his power to Syria in 1840), he remained in control of Egypt and this should be the focus of candidates' responses.

*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. “The main cause of the Crimean War was the rivalry of the European powers.” Discuss.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of the degree to which Great Power rivalry caused the Crimean War. The question invites candidates to make a judgment as to the significance and/or importance of a range of factors; however, emphasis must be on the importance of European rivalries.

*Indicative content*

- Hostilities began in 1853 with fighting between Ottoman and Russian forces (the Battle of Sinope). Britain and France declared war on Russia in March 1854. The war concluded in 1856 with the Treaty of Paris.
- In support of the statement, one could argue that an immediate cause of the war was French and Russian disagreement over the privileges of the Roman Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches in the Holy Places of Palestine. More broadly, both Britain and France feared Russian expansion at the expense of the Ottoman Empire and the danger that this would pose to their interests and their long-standing policy of preventing the breakup of the Ottoman Empire.
- For balance, candidates could argue that the fuel for the war was the clash between Russia and the Ottoman Empire over the status of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Russia wished to establish a Russian protectorate over them (the Menschikov Mission of 1853); however to the Sultan, this appeared to be a threat to Ottoman independence.
- Another line of argument could be that the war broke out, not so much because of entrenched rivalries, but rather because of diplomatic failure and diplomatic inconsistency. The Vienna Note of 1853 that was issued by the Great Powers was rejected by the Sultan and the Powers failed to co-operate to enforce it. Further, Aberdeen, then the British foreign secretary and later prime minister, had seemingly suggested to the Tsar that the British would not object to a partition of the Ottoman Empire in 1844. However, the British ambassador to Constantinople, Stratford Canning encouraged the Sultan to reject Russian pressure and promised British protection.

*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. Examine the importance of left-wing movements in the Third French Republic.

Candidates must consider the importance of left-wing movements as a threat to the stability of the Third French Republic up to 1914. Other threats may be considered; however the focus of the response must be on the importance of left-wing movements.

#### *Indicative content*

- Some candidates may discuss the importance of the legacy of the Paris Commune in the early years of the Third French Republic and the ways this created a fear of the Left in some circles.
- The main focus of candidates' responses is likely to be the later period from c 1890 to 1914, as this is the period in which left-wing movements were especially strong and well organized.
- Left-wing movements may include the various socialist political parties and movements of the period. The Guesdists reached their high point as a separate party in the 1898 national elections, winning 13 seats. From 1905, the SFIO (*Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière*) was formed, and under the influence of Jaurès, this newly united socialist party tried to please all factions, although significant numbers of independent socialists remained. By 1914, the SFIO had 103 seats in the Chamber of Deputies.
- Constant internal divisions, in spite of attempts at unity, undermined the importance of the parliamentary Left.
- There should also be some consideration of the extra-parliamentary Left, including the trade union movement. Anarchosyndicalists such as Pouget dominated the General Confederation of Labour (CGT), the largest trade union, and in 1906, 1306 strikes were called.
- Internal division weakened the trade union movement and to compound the troubles of the Left, the French State was increasingly ready to use military force, for example, in June 1907 against the revolt by wine growers in the Midi.

*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. Evaluate the success of Disraeli's domestic policies.

Candidates are required to appraise the success of Disraeli's domestic policies. They may wish to outline what he wished to achieve and how far he met his aims, or they may examine the significance of his domestic policies in the wider context. Whichever method is chosen, the focus must be on Disraeli's key legislation and the impact those policies on Britain.

*Indicative content*

- Domestic policies could include the Second Reform Act of 1867 when Disraeli was instrumental in splitting the Liberals and enabling the Conservatives to pass this reform bill. He was prime minister from February 1868, after the retirement through ill health of Derby, losing power following the general election in December 1868.
- The main focus of candidates' responses is likely to be domestic policies while he was Prime Minister between 1874 and 1880, linked to the idea of whether Disraeli put into practice distinctive "One Nation" Conservative measures, as articulated, for example in his speeches in Manchester and Crystal Palace in 1872.
- Some may argue that his policies were successful: Disraeli's government did carry out a number of social reforms including the Artisans' Dwellings Act (1875), Agricultural Holdings Act (1875), Public Health Act (1875) and the Factory and Workshop Act (1878). Legislation that allowed trade unions to act more effectively was also passed: the Employers and Workmen Act (1875) and the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act (1875).
- However, it could also be suggested that little really changed as a result of this legislation as much of it was permissive, and allowed local authorities to respond to the legislation as they saw fit, rather than it being compulsory. Nevertheless, this could be argued as a success as stability at home was ensured and this was what Disraeli had promised to the electorate in 1874 after the upheavals of the Gladstone reforms of 1868 to 1874.
- Another argument could be that it was Richard Cross, the Home Secretary, who was responsible for much of the government's domestic legislation and that Disraeli played little part in its elaboration or implementation.
- Perhaps the success of his domestic policies was more apparent than real, creating the idea of a "One Nation" Conservatism.

*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. “The reigns of Alexander II (1855–1881) and Alexander III (1881–1894) were marked by political continuity but significant economic change.” Discuss.

Candidates are required to consider the merits or otherwise of the suggestion that while there was little political change across the reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III, there was a significant degree of economic change. Many candidates will no doubt make reference to the “Liberal” versus the “Reactionary” Tsar; however the question is inviting candidates to examine in more depth whether or not these labels are accurate.

#### *Indicative content*

- Both Tsars believed in autocracy and the need for a hierarchical political structure with the monarchy at the top supported by the nobility, the Church and the army.
- Many of Alexander II’s reforms were in fact designed to strengthen the monarchy; emancipation of the serfs was designed to quell peasant unrest while the establishment of the Duma and Zemstva were designed to strengthen authority and were dominated by the nobility. Alexander III’s re-establishment of the post of Land Commandant merely strengthened that authority.
- In 1881 Alexander II was prepared to grant the establishment of a national assembly (the Loris-Melikov reforms); however, Alexander III immediately cancelled the reforms and reduced some of the powers of the Zemstva and Duma.
- Both Tsars were keen to encourage industrialization, expanding the railways, encouraging the growth of factories in the cities, and increased production of major industries such as coal and iron.
- The reign of Alexander III saw major industrial growth, in the latter years of his reign Witte’s policies helped industrial expansion.
- During both reigns agriculture formed the basis of the economy but government requisitions limited the modernization of agriculture, which remained backward because of the burden of Redemption Dues. Even in the reign of Alexander III reductions in the Poll Tax failed to stimulate investment in agriculture.

*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. Examine the view that the October/November Bolshevik Revolution was caused by the poor decisions of the Provisional Government.

Candidates are required to consider the relationship between the mistakes made by the Provisional Government and the October/November Bolshevik Revolution. They may also consider the increasing support for the Bolsheviks and whether that was as, or more, significant to the outbreak of the revolution. Some may argue that without the errors of the Provisional Government the Bolsheviks would have remained a small revolutionary party with little or no influence since the Mensheviks had far greater numbers.

*Indicative content*

- Candidates could point out that the Provisional Government was always weak, having to exercise power with the Soviets, and that it was self-appointed and lacked legitimacy.
- There were mistakes in terms of policies, including no land reform and the continuation of the war, which was increasingly unpopular especially after the failure of the spring 1917 offensive.
- The delay in holding elections for a constituent assembly and announcing a political amnesty enabled revolutionary parties to campaign openly.
- There were no clear economic policies; bad working conditions remained and there was continuing inflation.
- There were inconsistent policies with regard to opposition, for example freeing and arming the Bolshevik Red Guard to help counter the threat from Kornilov's attempted coup.
- For balance an examination of the strengths of the Bolsheviks may be provided. The Bolsheviks advocated popular policies, "Peace Land and Bread" and "All power to the Soviets", and these led to increasing support for them. They had majorities on both the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets by the summer of 1917.
- There was effective leadership from both Lenin and Trotsky. Lenin was more important in convincing the Central Committee to risk a seizure of power. Trotsky was the military leader of the revolution establishing the Military Revolutionary Committee (MRC) and organizing the actual events of October/November 1917.

*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. “Diplomatic crises in the period from 1905 to 1913 were the main cause of the outbreak of the First World War in 1914”. Discuss.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of the suggestion that, collectively, the various international and diplomatic crises during the period from 1905 to 1913 were the key factor in the outbreak of war in 1914 as opposed to the alliance system or militarism. The July Crisis of 1914 is deliberately excluded from the statement as the question seeks to understand how far it was the case that the crises between 1905 and 1913 led to war.

### *Indicative content*

- Diplomatic crises could include: the First and Second Moroccan Crises, (1905–1906 and 1911), the Bosnian Crisis (1908–1909), the Italo-Ottoman War (1911) and the First and Second Balkan Wars (1912–1913 and 1913).
- It may be argued that Russia felt humiliated after the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1908–1909), believing that it had let its ally, Serbia, down. This meant that Russia would not back down in the July 1914 crisis and mobilized in support of Serbia.
- Other ways in which candidates may agree with the statement could include the way in which the First and Second Moroccan Crises strengthened the ties between Britain and France as they worked together against Germany.
- Some candidates may dispute the statement, instead arguing that factors other than the crises of the period led to war. Example arguments could point to long-term stresses in Europe that existed prior to 1905.
- The alliance system was already largely in place before 1905, Anglo-German naval rivalry was entrenched and there had been a lengthy period of antagonism between France and Germany.
- Although the focus of the question must be the period from 1905 to 1913, candidates may argue for the primacy of events in July 1914 and suggest that it was crucial misjudgements in this period that caused the outbreak of 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**.*

12. Evaluate the reasons for Allied victory in the First World War.

Candidates are required to appraise a range of factors that led to Allied victory in 1918. Responses are likely to balance the advantages that the Allies had and which facilitated victory with the problems experienced by the Central Powers that led to their request for an armistice in 1918. However, there is no prescribed response.

*Indicative content*

- Long-term factors, such as Allied naval power, which protected the convoys maintaining supplies and implemented the Naval Blockade that undermined the German war effort could be mentioned.
- Support from the US in terms of food, merchant ships and war loans is also a valid factor for discussion.
- Short-term factors may also be discussed. These could include the entry of the US—with their vast resources of men and materiel—into the war on the Allied side, or the effective political leadership from Lloyd George and Clemenceau.
- In terms of the weakness of the Central powers there are further long- and short-term factors. Over the long term, the initial failure of the Schlieffen Plan, which led to a two-front war for Germany, is significant as was poor political leadership. Note, for example, the decision to implement unrestricted submarine warfare, which brought the US into the war.
- Weak allies could be deemed another long-term factor as German resources were used to assist both Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria.
- In the short-term, the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive in the spring of 1918 meant that the German army retreated behind the Hindenburg Line. Very high casualties were experienced with limited reserves and this contributed to low morale. By this time Ludendorff and Hindenburg were concerned to avoid the invasion of Germany.
- In the autumn of 1918, Bulgaria (September) and Austria-Hungary and Turkey (October) were defeated.
- Political instability in Germany as a consequence of the impact of the war could also be referenced, note the food shortages in 1917 (known as the Turnip Winter), and the constant labour unrest that made revolution seem a real possibility.
- Candidates may argue that at the beginning of 1918 the war was a stalemate and that it was the short-term developments that led to Allied victory.

*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. Examine the strengths and weaknesses of British policy in Palestine between 1922 and 1939.

Candidates are required to consider the strengths and weaknesses of British policy during the Mandate. Reference to contradictory wartime promises (the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence and the Balfour Declaration) should be linked to actual policies adopted by Britain as the mandatory power. Key issues such as immigration and land purchase may be identified and policy examined in relation to them.

### *Indicative content*

#### **Strengths:**

- For the 1920s, attempts at institution-building (the Jewish Agency and the attempts to establish an Arab Council) could be mentioned. The 1922 White Paper tried to regulate immigration and some local self-government was established.
- British policy attempted to balance the demands of the Zionists with the possible impact of these demands on the Arabs. This was successful as the mid to late 1920s were relatively peaceful.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- Policy alternated rapidly after the Wailing Wall Riots (1929), for example, the Passfield White Paper proposed restrictions on land purchase and immigration but this was rapidly rescinded by the MacDonald Letter (or Black Letter) so there was little clarity for either Arabs or Jews.
- Between 1935 and 1939 the lack of clarity continued as tensions increased because of rising Jewish immigration and contradictory attempts to establish political stability. For example, there was a plan to establish a legislative council (which failed), followed by the Peel Commission and the 1939 White Paper.
- Candidates may argue that whatever policy Britain chose to pursue it was unlikely to be successful because both Arabs and Jews felt that Britain had let them down.

*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. “Atatürk made Turkey a modern, secular, democratic state.” Discuss.

Candidates must focus on the statement and offer a considered and balanced review of how far it could be applied to Turkey as a result of Atatürk’s leadership. There may be some reference to the perceived backwardness of the Ottoman state in order to reach a judgment on the extent of change.

*Indicative content*

- Democratic policies such as the constitution granted equal rights, but women did not actually gain the vote until 1934. However the Republican People’s Party (RPP) dominated politics and Atatürk faced little opposition to his dominant rule.
- Other areas to consider are the development of new industries such as the textile industry via statist policies and the encouragement of urbanization and education. However, economic activity was still dominated by agriculture and there were still considerable levels of illiteracy.
- In order to secularize Turkey, the Caliphate was abolished, Sharia law was replaced by civil law, the fez was forbidden and Latin script was introduced.
- It may be argued that the extent to which these various policies had an impact throughout Turkey was variable; that secularization was much more successful in towns than in rural areas where change was slow and the Ulema remained influential.
- Atatürk’s policies were a break with the past. He established Ankara as the capital and his policies led to the development of a Turkish national identity.

*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. “Political divisions between 1929 and 1933 were the main cause of the collapse of democracy in Germany.” Discuss.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of the suggestion that the political crisis that occurred in Germany was a consequence of the divisions amongst Weimar political parties: that these divisions contributed to the weakness of democratic government and led to a political vacuum that was filled by the extremism of the Nazis and the German Communist Party (KPD).

*Indicative content*

- There may be consideration of the economic crisis and its consequences. The context for the political crisis can be gauged from the removal of foreign investment, rising unemployment, the collapse of business, the collapse of banks such as Credit Anstalt in 1931 and the deepening recession (not inflation).
- The problem for the government was how to deal with the increasing burden of welfare spending: unemployment rose and there was a danger that the state may have gone bankrupt.
- The response of the various Chancellors, Müller, Brüning, von Papen and von Schleicher may be examined as may the response of the various parties. The German Social Democrats (SPD), for example, would not accept a reduction in benefits and the Centre Party and the German Democratic Party (DDP) would not accept tax rises. These factors led to the collapse of the Müller government, which was the last truly democratic government.
- Brüning (the Hunger Chancellor), relied on Article 48 (109 times) to pass legislation and this undermined democracy. Von Papen also relied on presidential support and lacked any real political credentials (the SPD and the Nazis combined and passed a vote of no confidence); Schleicher was in a similar position.
- The increasing support for the Nazis did not make Hitler’s appointment as chancellor inevitable and the Nazis never gained a majority in the Reichstag. In fact, support for the Nazis was declining by November 1932.
- The failure of the more moderate parties to cooperate meant that Weimar politics was discredited. Advisors to Hindenburg convinced him that Hitler could be controlled and he was appointed chancellor, at the head of a coalition, in January 1933.

*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. Examine the successes and failures of Mussolini's domestic policies.

Candidates are expected to consider the successes and failures of Mussolini's domestic policies. They may do this by addressing his aims and gauging the extent to which these were achieved. Some candidates may argue that his main aim was to remain in power and strengthen Italy after the instability pre-1922 and that he was successful in that he remained in power until 1943. Others may argue that his policies were a failure as he did not strengthen Italy and he was easily removed from power.

*Indicative content*

**Successes:**

- His retention of power and the establishment of a one-party state provided political stability and dealt with the threat of a revolution. He also brought extreme elements of the Fascist party under control (Fascist Grand Council).
- The Lateran Accords settled the friction between Church and State and reconciled many Italians to Fascist rule. The retention of the Monarchy also led to support for the regime.
- The Corporate State was not entirely successful economically but it satisfied big business and the middle classes, both of whom benefitted. Corporatism destroyed the power of the Trade Unions (Vidoni and Chigi Palace Pacts). The Industrial Reconstruction Institute (IRI) was able to soften the worst impact of the Depression.

**Failures:**

- Fascistization policies, such as education policies, youth policies and Dopolavoro were not always successful. They were pursued enthusiastically by many Italians for the cheap leisure opportunities they presented; however most participants had limited ideological commitment to the regime. The Church remained influential especially in secondary education.
- Various "Battles", such as Births, Grain, Lira and land reclamation may be examined. However, were they just propaganda? Did they help support the goal of autarky? Did they create more problems than they solved (for example, turning over vineyards to grain production led to a reduction in valuable exports)?

*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. Examine Stalin's foreign relations up to 1941.

Candidates may argue that the aims of Stalin's foreign relations were the security and survival of the Soviet Union rather than an effort to spread the Communist revolution. They might also argue that in order to achieve this Stalin's relations with foreign powers appeared at times to be inconsistent. Please note that the focus is on foreign relations up to the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941.

#### *Indicative content*

- In the Far East the Soviet Union had encouraged the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) to collaborate with the Guomindang, GMD (Kuomintang, KMT) to counter the potential threat from Japan. After the 1931 invasion of Manchuria, Stalin pursued a policy of appeasement of the Japanese (selling them the Manchurian Railway). However, by 1937 Stalin was encouraging the formation of the United Front against the Japanese and by 1939 there was open conflict between Japan and the Soviet Union.
- In Europe, Stalin initially underestimated the threat from Nazi Germany; by 1934 he was pursuing a policy that sought collective security. He joined the League of Nations and signed various mutual assistance and non-aggression pacts with other powers (such as France, Czechoslovakia and the Baltic States).
- Comintern was advocating the formation of a Popular Front against Fascism and even Soviet intervention in Spain was arguably intended to prevent extreme revolution (which would have further alarmed Britain and France).
- Post-Munich, intentions once again changed. Stalin sought to delay an attack on the Soviet Union (International Brigades were withdrawn from Spain). Molotov became Foreign Minister (Litvinov was Jewish) so the Soviet Union was on better terms with Germany. But Stalin was still flexible, negotiating with Britain and France in 1939. However the lack of enthusiasm of the western powers, plus the refusal of Poland to give Soviet troops permission to cross Poland, contributed to the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939. This delayed the German invasion of the Soviet Union and also enabled Stalin to gain territory in the Baltic states.
- Arguably, and Stalin did argue this, the takeover of eastern Poland was defensive, as was the attack on Finland (the need for Naval bases). They were both driven by the need for security from a German attack.

*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. To what extent did economic weakness contribute to political developments and change within the Soviet Union between 1982 and 1991?

With a clear focus on the time period from 1982 until 1991, candidates are required to consider the merits or otherwise of the suggestion that political development and change in the Soviet Union was, in part, caused by economic weakness. Responses are likely to consider how the need to reform the stagnating economy led to policies that ultimately caused the end of the Communist regime. They are also likely to consider the internal political changes that occurred during the Gorbachev period.

*Indicative content*

- There were substantial economic problems, for example, the huge amount spent on the military, low production levels, the fact that they were falling behind technologically and the low standard of living.
- Gorbachev was already aware of the need for change (he had removed some of the gerontocracy from the Central Committee and the Politburo) but the Chernobyl accident convinced him of the need to move rapidly. Thus he introduced the policies of glasnost and perestroika and an element of democracy into the Party.
- 1987 and 1988 saw further attempts at reform (the Law on State Enterprises and reform of the Supreme Soviet). These were attempts to end stagnation within the party and to encourage economic growth.
- The economic crisis of 1989/1990 caused declining living standards and open discontent (there were strikes in many mining areas). The elections to the People's Congress in 1989 resulted in some non-party members being elected.
- The weakening of party dominance and open discussion resulted in the emergence of potential rivals such as Yeltsin and there was a weakening of central control (the Union Treaty gave more economic and political control to the Soviet republics).
- The 1991 attempted coup gave Yeltsin the opportunity to gain power, thus in six years politics changed from a tightly controlled one-party state to a system where public opinion could have a significant impact on politics.

*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. “Poor military leadership led to the defeat of the Axis powers in Europe.” Discuss.

Candidates must offer a considered and balanced review of the range of factors that led to the defeat of the Axis powers with a focus on military leadership. Hitler and, to a lesser extent, Mussolini dominated their armed forces and very often did not take the advice of military professionals when making decisions.

### *Indicative content*

#### **Poor military leadership:**

- Can be seen in a number of ways: Hitler’s decision to halt the advance on Dunkirk; the invasion of the Soviet Union while Britain was still undefeated; Hitler’s refusal to allow strategic retreat, for example at Stalingrad, and the use of almost the last of Germany’s resources in the Battle of the Bulge. During the Battle of Britain, the Nazis’ decision to bomb London rather than continuing with attacks on the airfields is further evidence of poor military leadership. In the case of Mussolini, launching attacks on Greece and the British in Egypt when Italian forces had not recovered from fighting in Spain and Abyssinia would be appropriate examples.

#### **Other areas for discussion:**

- Resources on both sides were also crucial in the early stages: Britain had the resources of her empire as well as US support (Lend-Lease for example) once the US entered the war the Allies were able to produce weapons in far greater numbers. The contribution of the Soviet Union was also extensive in terms of resources. Italy had limited resources and although Germany adopted a wartime economy, it was unable to replace lost materiel as rapidly and in such volume as the Allies.
- In terms of manpower the Axis powers were completely overstretched fighting on too many fronts simultaneously whereas the Allies had infinite sources of manpower from the US, the Soviet Union and the British Empire.
- As the war became a war of attrition these factors were very significant and some may argue it was crucial decisions such as that taken at Dunkirk that extended the war. Whereas others may argue that the decisions to invade the Soviet Union and to declare war on the US were key to the defeat of the Axis powers.

*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. Examine the contribution of King Juan Carlos to the establishment of democracy in Spain.

Candidates are required to consider the process by which democracy was established in Spain and how far Juan Carlos played a crucial role in this process.

*Indicative content*

**The impact of King Juan Carlos:**

- Juan Carlos was designated as heir to Franco in 1969, which pleased conservative elements and the army. He supported the appointment of Suarez as prime minister because he was skilled and realistic enough to steer reform through the Cortes. Juan Carlos made his support for constitutional monarchy clear, and he rejected publically the attempted coup of 1981. The king was very aware of the public demand for democracy and thus made no attempt to retain the powers that Franco had enjoyed as head of state.
- Some may argue that Juan Carlos's main contribution was his role as a unifying figure: conservatives, the Army and the Church were happy to see the return of the monarchy. The Left perhaps saw him as a temporary compromise before Spain became a republic again and most Francoists were satisfied as he was designated Franco's heir.

**Other factors:**

- Political groups such as the Socialists and the Trade Unions were willing to work with the technocrats to find ways to move away from Francoism without risking violence.
- The role of politicians such as Suarez was also crucial. Suarez was able to steer through the Law of Political Reform and the new Constitution of 1978 without alarming the more conservative elements in Spanish society because of his Francoist past.

*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. Examine the importance of economic and political factors as causes of the 1979 revolution in Iran.

Candidates must demonstrate a clear understanding of the importance of economic and political factors. The main focus should be on these; however a range of other factors may be considered in order to reach a judgment on “importance”.

### *Indicative content*

#### **Political and economic factors:**

- There may be discussion of economic issues such as the total dependency on oil, high military spending, inflation of 20 per cent by 1977 and high unemployment, especially in Tehran. The perceived extravagance of the regime also led to criticism.
- Political issues such as limited civil rights, the fact that Iran was a single-party state from 1976 and the use of the political police (SAVAK) to stifle dissent caused discontent amongst more liberal Iranians.
- Further to the above, there was the alienation of different groups such as the bazarri, the Ulema, unemployed workers and young educated Iranians who wanted political reform.

#### **Other factors:**

- The impact of westernization also played a role, although this was largely in the cities and did not extend to rural areas. Westernization tended to be limited to urban middle and upper classes and was seen by traditionalists as anti-Islamic, particularly by the clergy.
- The events of 1978/1979 were the culmination of a range of factors, including political, economic and religious. The inconsistent response of the regime, which veered between repression and conciliation raised the levels of tension and led to the Shah leaving the country.

*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. Examine the reasons for Israel's military dominance in the Middle East between 1949 and 1973.

Candidates may focus more closely on particular conflicts to support their analysis. Key factors may vary from conflict to conflict; however conclusions should try and determine whether or not there was continuity throughout the period with regard to one or two key factors. Arguments should be supported with detail from specific conflicts.

*Indicative content*

- Arab disunity was certainly a factor in the 1948/49 conflict. There was no unified military leadership and there was also suspicion as to the motivation of King Abdullah of Jordan who seemed more focused on gaining territory. In the Suez conflict Egypt was acting alone although Nasser had the support of Arab states in the United Nations. Jordan was to some extent a reluctant ally in 1967 whereas in 1973 Arab nations worked together and Sadat had the support of Syria and financial support of Saudi Arabia.
- Israeli military experience and training could be seen a key factor in 1948/49 as much of the Israeli army had fought with the Allies during the Second World War and were well trained and experienced. On the Arab side only the Jordanian Arab Legion was well trained and led. Subsequently the IDF (Israeli Defense Forces) were formed with the ability to rely on well trained reserves. The IDF had a highly-trained leadership with well-developed strategies.
- Superior equipment could also be considered. Israel, although lacking arms initially in 1948/49, was able to use a ceasefire to buy more with the assistance of overseas funding, largely from the US. The US continued to supply aid throughout the 1950s and 1960s, enabling the IDF to purchase the most up-to-date armaments. Furthermore, Israel's developed economy also supported defence spending. Arab nations tended to rely on Soviet support, which was not always consistent. In 1973 the Egyptian forces were well equipped and had the element of surprise but were still defeated.

*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 19th or 20th century**

23. “Religion became much less important in society.” Discuss with reference to **one** country over a period of approximately fifty years.

Candidates are required to consider the merits or otherwise of the assessment that, in one state of the region, religion became considerably less important across a period of approximately fifty years (within the timeframe of the 19th and/or 20th centuries). This is an opportunity for candidates to discuss their own national history, so any country within the region is valid.

#### *Indicative content*

- The focus for the exemplar country should be on whether religion became less important or not during the chosen period.
- Standard accounts could focus on the decline of religion and the rise of secularization over a fifty year period.
- A counterargument to the statement could be made for some countries. In some countries of the region and during some periods, one could argue that religion became more important.
- For some countries, it could be argued that there were periods where there was both an increase and a decline in the significance of religion, for example Spain and the United Kingdom.

*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. Evaluate the significance of changes in leisure and sport in **one** country over a period of approximately fifty years.

Candidates are required to appraise the importance of changes in leisure and sport in one state, across a period of approximately fifty years (within the timeframe of the 19th and/or 20th centuries). They should not simply describe sporting/leisure activities, nor should they focus on a specific sporting event or an individual sport or leisure activity. This is an opportunity for candidates to discuss their own national history, so any country within the region is valid.

*Indicative content*

- Possible arguments could include the growth of leisure time across all classes and, in some cases, an increase in participation in sports.
- In some country cases, the role of the state in the organization/promotion of sport and leisure could be examined for change and importance.
- Instances of the use of sport for political propaganda purposes could also be assessed.
- Another area of change could be the increasing role of women in sport and leisure in the case of some countries.

*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**.*

---