



MARKSCHEME

MAY 2008

HISTORY

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war

1. Compare and contrast the causes of the First World War and the Second World War.

For comparison candidates could include: both wars were to some extent caused by German aggression and ambition; both involved nationalism; both involved alliances which led to greater participation than the original immediate cause; both involved a build up of arms, and fear of this.

For contrast: the cause for the First World War was the shooting of two individuals, the Second World War started with the invasion of a country. The First World War was caused by a combination of actions by various governments, especially Germany and Austria-Hungary, the Second World War was largely caused by the aggression of Hitler. Colonial rivalry was important for First World War but not for Second World War. The Second World War was partly the result of the failure of the settlements that ended First World War (Versailles *etc.*), and the failure of appeasement. The alliances were different, at least partially for the two wars.

[0 to 7 marks] if only one war is addressed, or insufficient/inaccurate material.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narratives of both with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for a comparative structure containing relevant knowledge.

[17+ marks] for an analytical approach within a comparative structure.

2. To what extent did changes in military tactics and strategies determine the outcome of twentieth century wars?

This is an open question, which does not specify the number of wars to be considered. An effective approach would be to answer the question thematically. For example tactics and strategy could be divided into ground forces, naval usage, war in the air, and nuclear war. Candidates would then need to name the war in which the tactics/strategies that they are explaining were used. Technology and weaponry would come into the answer, but how these are used is needed for focus on tactics and strategies. There is, of course, no one answer to this question. Marks will depend on specific details used in a convincing argument.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of perhaps two or three wars, with implicit focus.

[11 to 13 marks] for a clear focus on tactics and strategies.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured focus on the question.

[17+ marks] for balance, analysis, and perhaps showing how different types of wars could produce a different conclusion to the question.

3. **“Even in the twentieth century the term ‘total war’ could not be applied to any war.”
To what extent do you agree with this judgment?**

This question is intended to make candidates think about the concept of “total war”, for which the Second World War is usually used as an example. Examine the definition, argument and specific details which are usually put forward for total war, and decide on a verdict. In the past many candidates have confused “global” with “total”, so it will be interesting to see if they do in this case. An argument can be made to agree with or to challenge the quotation. Marks will depend on specific detail and analysis. A probable conclusion for some is that it was total for some countries but not for others. Better candidates will use examples other than the Second World War.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused, structured, well argued essays.

[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis of specific and balanced evidence.

4. Analyse the results of *either* the Mexican Revolution *or* the Russian Civil War.

The Mexican Revolution lasted from 1910 to 1940. Candidates could give as results some of the immediate results of different phases, which led to its continuance: attempts at agrarian reform; labour unions; a new constitution and separation of church and state. Cardenas, who was president of Mexico 1934–40, continued and increased the pace of the social revolution by reviving land reform, and redistributing eighteen million hectares to three-quarters of a million peasants. This led to a fall in production, but reduced the dominance of large estates. He tended to support labour unions in labour unrest, nationalized the railways and oil companies, which led to a boycott of major oil companies for 30 years. The results of the Mexican Revolution could be said to be thirty years of fighting combined with a social revolution, followed by reconciliation and reconstruction under Comacho.

The Russian Civil War 1918 to 1921/2 resulted in victory for the Reds against the Whites (and Greens). This meant confirmation of power for Lenin and the Bolsheviks, although Lenin had to replace War Communism with his New Economic Policy as the economy was devastated. About 800 000 troops died in the fighting or from disease, but the total loss of population was probably between seven and ten million. Bolshevik victory meant the establishment of a Bolshevik dictatorship, with coercion, terror by the *Cheka*, a centralized administration, and opposition from and towards the West. (Candidates might suggest roots of the Cold War, but should not continue to write an answer based largely on the origins of the Cold War.)

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative and implicit assessment of results.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment of results.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured answers focused on results.

[17+ marks] for balance, in-depth analysis, or perhaps different interpretations.

5. In what ways and with what results did *two* wars, each chosen from a different region, affect the role and status of women?

Candidates should address how the role and status of women was affected both during and after their chosen wars, but must take care to ensure that the changes were due to the wars, and not just natural developments. Education, opportunities for careers and work, political rights, position in society, in the armed forces, *etc.* would all be relevant, but changes must be accompanied by specific evidence and explanation.

[0 to 7 marks] for sweeping generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit ways and results.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on ways and results.

[14 to 16 marks] for structure, focus and analysis, backed by specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for perceptive and balanced analysis.

N.B. If only one war or one region is used, mark out of [12 marks].

Topic 2 Nationalist and independence movements, decolonization and challenges facing new states

6. Assess the success of *one* independence movement *either* in Africa *or* in Asia.

Candidates need to select one independence movement, in either Africa or Asia, during the twentieth century, and assess its successes, and by implication also its failures. The ultimate success is acquiring independence, and forming the government, of a new state. Candidates do not need to continue beyond this point, into ruling the new state.

Areas to cover could include aims, ideology and appeal, early formation, leadership, membership, methods used to obtain independence, final achievement of independence. These should be assessed to judge if they were suitable, brought much bloodshed, bitterness, economic problems *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate knowledge and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of the movement with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for structure and assessment based on specific knowledge.

[17+ marks] for balance, detailed analysis, or different interpretations.

7. For what reasons, and with what results, did *either* Ghana *or* Indonesia obtain independence?

Ghana (originally Gold Coast) obtained independence in 1957. A constitution securing an African majority in the Gold Coast legislature had been granted in 1946. This led to an increased demand for independence, especially by the Convention People's Party, founded by Nkrumah in 1954. This party won the 1954 election and Nkrumah became prime minister. Pressure continued and Britain, now favouring independence for colonies, granted it Dominion status, and Nkrumah became president. He dominated Ghana for the next nine years, proclaiming a republic within the Commonwealth in 1960 and a one party state in 1964. Nkrumah's pan-Africanism won him respect, but the cocoa price slump, and his increasingly dictatorial rule, including strengthening links with the Soviet bloc, brought inflation and economic chaos. He was overthrown in 1966.

Indonesia, formerly the Dutch East Indies, became independent in December 1949. Nationalism and opposition to increasingly repressive Dutch rule had been growing since the formation of the Indonesian Nationalist Party in 1926. Many collaborated with the Japanese, and independence was declared when Japan was defeated. The Dutch objected, and fighting broke out. A truce was arranged in 1946, and a United States of Indonesia was agreed, but fighting broke out again. A conference met in The Hague, and independence for a unitary state (but dominated by Java) with Sukarno as president, was declared. Problems with the Dutch, with the Commonwealth forces in Malaysia, the dissolution of the assembly (1959), pro-communist policies, and a weakened economy led to the ousting of Sukarno. Indonesia became more settled under the next president (from 1967), Suharto, and rejoined the UN, which Sukarno had left.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate knowledge.

[8 to 11 marks] for narrative with implicit reasons and results.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reasons and results.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured answers which analyse reasons and results.

[17+ marks] for balanced arguments and perhaps different interpretations.

8. Analyse the social changes in *one* new non-European state in the ten years after independence.

This question allows candidates to select any new non-European state and examine the social changes that have taken place since independence. The explanation and analysis should cover how and why the changes took place, and their effect on the population. Whether these changes benefited or harmed the people should be considered. Areas to analyse could be education, training, employment, religion, the arts, gender issues, tribal and cultural issues, *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis of a wide range of changes.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured answers with perceptive analysis of the changes.

[17+ marks] for balanced analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

9. Examine the form of government established after independence in *two* countries in South Asia (Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka).

It is expected that most candidates will address India and Pakistan, and top marks can be obtained by full knowledge of these two. The Indian Independence Act was passed in 1947, but it did not decree the form of government to be introduced, and the 1935 Government of India Act remained in force until new constitutions were agreed.

India remained a dominion accepting the former emperor, George VI as king. The constitution of 1950 established a centralized government, which included the former princely states. The Federal Parliament consisted of a lower house of 500 members and a Council of State, with 250 members elected by the state legislatures. It dealt with foreign affairs, defence, communications and tariffs. The state legislatures dealt with public order, health, agriculture and education. The president was elected every five years by both legislatures. The electorate for the first election numbered over 170 million. Nehru was the first premier and politics were dominated by the Indian National Congress.

Pakistan became a dominion under the Indian Independence Act, a republic in 1956, and left the Commonwealth in 1972 in protest at the recognition of Bangladesh as an independent nation. Jinnah became Governor General, but he died in 1948 and the Muslim League lost mass support. Liaquat Ali Khan was prime minister 1947–54. The 1935 Government of India Act remained as a means of government until a constitution could be agreed. This took until 1956, and was abolished in 1958 by General Ayub Khan, who became head of state and ruled mainly through martial law. He tried to develop local democracy with a system of Basic Democracy. Another constitution was adopted in 1962 whereby the central legislature was elected by the Basic Democrats. Political parties were allowed by 1965, and full elections were held in 1970.

East Bengal (East Pakistan) was joined to Western Pakistan after the Indian Independence Act of 1947. The People's Republic of Bangladesh was established in 1971, and was recognized by most countries in 1972. Mujibur Rahman, as prime minister wanted to establish a parliamentary democracy, fundamentally socialist in character. He failed to do this satisfactorily, and in 1975 introduced a form of one party government, giving him dictatorial powers. Violence and bloodshed followed.

Sri Lanka which had enjoyed universal suffrage since 1929, was granted independence in 1948. The transfer of power was smooth, and Sri Lanka became an independent multi-party parliamentary democracy.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments and lack of specific knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate knowledge of two countries.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused structured essays, of the form of government of at least two countries.

[17+ marks] for detailed analytic response.

N.B. *If only one country is addressed mark out of [12 marks].*

10. What were the main problems faced after independence by *one* non-European new state, and how successfully were they tackled?

This is a straightforward question where candidates can select any newly independent non-European state and indicate what problems the state faced after independence, and assess how successfully these problems were tackled. Some suggested areas for investigation are: relations with the former colonial power; form of central and local government and administration; former supporters and opponents; cultural and social issues; gender issues; education and training; economic development; finance; poverty; foreign relations including perhaps the Cold War / superpower rivalry, *etc.* Actual details will depend on the country chosen, and the timescale chosen will probably be about ten years.

N.B. Neither Castro's Cuba nor Mao's rule in China is a valid choice.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit focus and assessment of success.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on problems and resolving them.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured answers focused on problems and attempted solutions.

[17+ marks] for essays which also indicate different interpretations or depth of specific knowledge and analysis.

Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states

- 11. Compare and contrast the rise to power of *two* rulers of single party states, each chosen from a different region.**

Areas to compare and contrast could include: ideology, aims and personal attributes of the person seeking to become ruler; nature of the situation, type of existing government, *etc.* within the state that is being targeted; composition of his supporters; methods used to gain power, such as legal or peaceful; the extent of foreign backing. Actual details will depend on the choice of rulers, and better responses will be in a comparative format.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments or if only one ruler or one region is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate specific evidence and explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for good knowledge in a comparative structure.

[17+ marks] for detailed analytical comparison and contrast.

12. To what extent was *either* Mussolini, between 1922 and 1945, or Nasser, between 1954 and 1970, successful in achieving his aims?

Candidates need to state the aims of their chosen leader and assess the extent to which these aims were realised.

Mussolini was appointed prime minister of Italy in 1922 by King Victor Emmanuel II, he assumed the title *Duce* (leader) and remained ruler (although from winter 1941–2 he was virtually Hitler’s pensionary) until his murder in 1945. His first aim was to become leader of Italy, which he achieved, and as prime minister of a coalition, he aimed for full Fascist control of government. This was established by 1928–9. It could be argued whether he aimed to become a totalitarian ruler, and to what extent he did become one. He aimed to restore Italian greatness at home and acquire an empire through his foreign policy. Both domestic and foreign policy need to be assessed for his successes and failures, and a final verdict given. Candidates will probably agree that finally he paid the price of his aims and ambitions.

Nasser entered the army and from 1942 encouraged cadets and junior officers to join a republican, nationalistic, and anti-British movement (thus revealing his aims) known as the Free Officers Movement. He fought against Israel in 1948, and helped to force the abdication of King Farouk. Nasser became Minister of the Interior and deputy to Neguib, in the new ministry in 1952, he then succeeded Neguib as prime minister in April 1954 and as president in November. As ruler he secured British withdrawal from Suez, later nationalising the canal, and aimed to implement a social revolution. He also pursued a pan-Arabist policy establishing the United Arab Republic in 1958. His prestige was high in Africa. He accepted help from USSR but later forged better relations with USA. He became increasingly hostile to Israel, but Egypt’s defeat in the Six Day War in 1967 lessened his influence, although he remained head of a reconstituted government until his death in 1970.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or incorrect knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit assessment of aims and success.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for structure, focus and assessment.

[17+ marks] for additional skills such as balanced analysis or different interpretations.

13. In what ways did *one* ruler of a single-party state try to use education to support his regime?

Education was used by rulers of single-party states in the following ways:

- as propaganda to achieve support for his rule and policies;
- to stir up opposition for enemies at home or abroad, especially in times of war;
- to ensure the curriculum teaches what he wants and omits what he dislikes;
- to shape the minds of children for his support later;
- to turn children against their parents;
- to train children in professions and occupations that are needed;
- to improve literacy and modernize the country.

Candidates are usually well informed with the education policies of Hitler and Mao, and to a lesser extent Stalin. Specific details of the above should be given as evidence.

Stronger candidates will probably assess, or at least conclude with a verdict on how successful the chosen ruler was in using education to support his regime.

[0 to 7 marks] for sweeping generalisation.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit ways.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on ways.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured specific evidence of ways.

[17+ marks] for analysis of detailed specific examples.

14. Analyse the successes and failures of the political career of *either* Lenin *or* Nyerere.

For Lenin, candidates should analyse: Lenin's actions as a revolutionary leader before the 1917 revolutions, for example his writings and leadership of the Bolshevik faction; his contributions to the October/November 1917 Bolshevik Revolution; his return to Russia; his slogans, especially "peace bread and land"; his determination, against party opposition, to stage the second 1917 revolution and finally his "rule" from 1918 to his death. This last section will probably be the longest, with his establishment of Bolshevik power, civil war, War Communism, and the New Economic Policy. Candidates should be well informed about all the above, and must analyse his policies and actions for successes and failures for top bands.

Nyerere was important as a nationalist and independence leader in Tanganyika (later Tanzania), in organising the Tanganyika African National Union in 1954–55, leading the party to success in the 1958 and 1960 elections, and as prime minister preparing for independence, which was granted in 1961. The second part of his career and importance is his work as president, seeking to build a socialist state. He was re-elected as president in 1965, 1970 and 1975.

It is expected that candidates will include material from before the chosen leader achieved power, but award what is there without penalising omissions.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or incorrect knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of the chosen leader's career with implicit successes and failures.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on successes and failures.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and analytical treatment of successes and failures.

[17+ marks] for in depth, perceptive analysis or different interpretations.

15. Assess the importance of foreign policy for rulers of single-party states.

This is an open-ended question as no set number of rulers are demanded, but it does stipulate rulers not ruler, so more than one is required. It could be more satisfactory to assess two or three in depth, or to answer it thematically with reference to those to whom it was important and those who thought that it was better to concentrate on domestic policies. Both Mussolini and Hitler used their ambitious/aggressive foreign policies to retain support at home; Lenin, Stalin and Mao claimed to put improving conditions for their own people first, although the Cold War could be said to have changed this. It could be asserted that peace, in order to concentrate on home affairs, is also a form of foreign policy. What candidates must do is produce factual evidence to support their argument.

[0 to 7 marks] for scant general material.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of two or three rulers with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment of the importance of foreign policy.

[14 to 16 marks] for a balanced, structured, analytical answer.

[17+ marks] for a well thought through perceptive or original argument.

N.B. if only one ruler is used, mark out of [12 marks].

Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states

16. To what extent did international organizations find it difficult to achieve peace and cooperation in the twentieth century?

The wording of this question suggests that it requires candidates to examine the efforts of international organizations and determine if and why they found it difficult to achieve peace and cooperation. For most candidates this will mean an assessment of the successes and failures of the League of Nations with the probable verdict that the organization failed because the Second World War broke out and the United Nations, where they will probably find more success. However the real focus of the question should be “to what extent did they find it difficult”, and this implies analysing the barriers that hindered them, such as dictators, superpower rivalry, the Cold War, even traditional diplomacy and balance of power. “Cooperation” may be taken to mean cooperation in mutually beneficial areas of social and economic work and not just in relation to dealing with threats to international peace.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of the League and United Nations.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on the set question.

[14 to 16 marks] for a structured and balanced argument base on evidence.

[17+ marks] for perceptive or original thinking, perhaps challenging the question or introducing a variety of international organizations.

17. Compare and contrast the foundation and structure of the League of Nations and the United Nations.

For comparison: both were founded after a war; a prime aim of both was to prevent war; both sought to solve dispute by arbitration; both aimed to improve working conditions with the International Labour Organization; both worked with refugees or displaced persons; both had a Secretary General; both could be used for national interests.

For contrast: the League's headquarters were in Geneva, the United Nations is in New York, but there are also agencies elsewhere. The United Nations has stronger executive powers and better organisation with six organs including the powerful Security Council. The League was smaller and important states did not join, whereas USA and USSR joined the United Nations from the outset and most countries belong. Although the League pioneered the ILO the United Nations has many agencies for social, economic, cultural and financial affairs.

[0 to 7 marks] for generalisations or if only one organization is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narratives with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for comparative structures, with balanced evidence.

[17+ marks] for analytic, balanced comparison and contrast.

**18. “A twentieth century multiparty state was government by the people for the people.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates first need to define or explain a multiparty state and their understanding of government by the people for the people. Most will probably write that a multiparty state is a democracy, whereby all citizens over a certain age vote for their chosen candidates in their constituency. They could add that most candidates belong to a political party, although a few might be independents. The term multiparty infers that more than one political party exists. Further details could be added such as the necessity of the election being fair and free of corruption or intimidation, the laws governing the length of time between elections, and other guiding principles. Candidates should then agree, or disagree with the quotation.

It will probably be stated that government by and for the people is democratic and is considered to be fairer than an autocratic state/government, because it gives the people a say in government. It could also be argued that by delegating government to constituency members, and through them to a cabinet composed of either the party with the majority vote, or a coalition government, government is at some distance from individuals having an effective say in government, or that direct democracy is impossible with the size of the populations in twentieth century states. Those challenging the assertion might argue on the grounds of the lack of political acumen and judgment of much of the population of many states, or the necessity of imposing law and order by an authoritarian system. Actual examples of successful and unsuccessful multiparty states would be relevant.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive/narrative answers with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which focus explicitly on the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical essays.

[17+ marks] for perception and originality.

19. Analyse the social and economic policies of *two* multiparty states, each chosen from a different region.

Candidates must select two multiparty states, each from a different region, and analyse, *i.e.* point out and explain the successes and failures, effects and consequences of the states' social and economic policies. It should be evident in the analysis how a multiparty state develops and attempts to deliver a sound economy and a social policy which benefits its citizens. Analysis could also reveal the disadvantages, or at least question if for example party politics impinge on the well-being of either the state as a whole, or a certain sector or class of its people.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations, or inaccurate or inadequate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of two states with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, balanced and analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for full specific knowledge and/or in depth analysis.

N.B. If only one multiparty state is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

20. **Assess the successes and failures of *either* F D Roosevelt’s government of the USA (1933–45) *or* South Africa’s transition from apartheid to a non-racial democracy under Nelson Mandela (1985–95).**

Candidates can assess all aspects of the periods asked for: political, economic, social and foreign policies would all be relevant. The years for the USA cover the emergence from the *Depression*, the New Deal, and the Second World War, so there will probably be emphasis on economic and foreign policy. Roosevelt’s direction of the policies, for example how far he was personally responsible for them, should be assessed, in order to judge how far the successes and failures were due to him or to the government as a whole.

The years for South Africa are of course years of great change, from apartheid and White supremacy to non-racial democracy. Candidates need to assess whether the change did benefit the whole country, whether the great difficulties incumbent in the change were overcome, and whether a working solution was obtained. Mandela’s part in the transformation, and how he succeeded in bringing about much goodwill in, and for, South Africa must be examined as well as the nature of the state in 1995.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for focus, structure and analysis.

[17+ marks] for perceptive comments and in-depth analysis.

Topic 5 The Cold War

21. Analyse the origin of East-West rivalry and explain why it developed into the Cold War.

This should present few problems for most candidates, as the origin of the Cold War appears to be one of their favourite (and most taught) topics. They need to explain briefly and concisely relations and animosity between East and West from the second/Bolshevik revolution in 1917, until 1941, the Grand Alliance of the Second World War. Candidates could then explain and analyse the ideological differences between the two sides, perhaps also pointing out old diplomatic rivalries. Development into the Cold War covers the period 1945, with the break down of the war time alliance, until about 1950 and should cover the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, problems with Germany, the growth of the Eastern Bloc, Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine. Specific material mentioned above should provide a base to analyse ideology, fear, aggression, *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate material, or uncoordinated comments on the whole Cold War.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of perhaps 1917 to c. 1950, with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis of a suitable period.

[14 to 16 marks] for a tightly structured and focused analytical essay.

[17+ marks] for an added dimension such as different interpretations (but not for the usual three learnt theories with no historical evidence.)

22. For what reasons, and with what results, did the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan affect Cold War development?

Another question that will probably be popular. For reasons, candidates need to explain the European situation which caused USA to adopt a policy of containment and offer aid for both political and economic reasons: the devastation in many countries; economic and financial weakness of France and Britain caused by the Second World War; the attitude to, and the overrunning of, Eastern Europe by the USSR. The Doctrine and Plan should be concisely explained, then the results in developing the Cold War, hardening of attitudes, *etc.* should be analysed.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit reasons and results.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reasons and results.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, balanced essays, with analysis of reasons and results.

[17+ marks] for balance and perhaps different interpretations.

23. Compare and contrast the roles of Korea and Vietnam in the Cold War.

For comparison:

- both countries were divided and each had one part under Soviet influence and the other under US influence;
- both were episodes of actual warfare in the Cold War;
- both widened the war (geographically);
- both wars involved Communist and Western powers seeking to retain their influence;
- both involved US forces but not Soviet troops officially;
- both caused many casualties and raised tension.

For contrast:

- the US forces fought under the UN banner in Korea, but as American forces in Vietnam;
- Vietnam was more of a Communist victory and US defeat, whereas Korea ended with an armistice;
- the Korean War marked an important stage in Chinese involvement in the Cold War;
- Vietnam had a greater impact on US domestic issues and US attitudes to the Cold War.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge or if only one country is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for a comparative structure with specific details.

[17+ marks] for good balance, details and judgment.

24. Explain the meaning of *two* of the following and show how each affected the development of the Cold War: containment; brinkmanship; non-alignment; détente.

Candidates need to give a clear definition of the two policies they have chosen then explain how the policy affected the Cold War, for example who pursued the policy, did it fulfil its aims, did it cause more or less tension in the Cold War, did it lead to the end of the Cold War? Actual details and assessment will depend on the two policies chosen. Briefly, containment was US policy to limit the expansion of communism; brinkmanship was forcing a rival power to reach an agreement by instigating a dangerous situation; non-alignment was not supporting either side; détente was seeking to lower tension and strained relations between opposing sides.

[0 to 7 marks] for lack of understanding and knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers.

[11 to 13 marks] for some definition and effects on the Cold War.

[14 to 16 marks] for clear definitions and assessment.

[17+ marks] for definition and perceptive analysis.

N.B. If only one policy is addressed mark out of [12 Marks].

25. When and why did the Cold War end?

There can, of course, be no one specific date for the end of the Cold War, but most candidates should be able to point to the period 1989–90. Many may give November 1989 with the opening of the Berlin Wall, or early 1990, with the break up of the Soviet Union. They can also indicate events earlier in 1989, such as the opening of Hungary's borders with the West, and Solidarity's election victory in Poland, as the beginning of the end.

Most of the answer should be devoted to the second part of the question, which requires candidates to assess why Communism collapsed. Candidates can discuss economic weaknesses, the Communist bloc's financial debt to the West, political problems, the impossibility of keeping the people in ignorance of Western standards, growth of opposition, (especially in Poland and Czechoslovakia), policies of the Soviet leader Gorbachev, (from 1985), of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika*.

[0 to 7 marks] for inaccurate or inadequate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit "why".

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit attention to "when and why".

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for perceptive analysis, balance and chronology.

Topic 6 The state and its relationship with religion and with minorities

- 26. Assess the impact the relationship between religion and the state has had on social and economic issues in *two* countries, each chosen from a different region.**

This question requires knowledge and assessment of how the relationship of religion and state affects the economic and social life of the state, different religious groups, (which can be allied to the state, or persecuted minorities), and especially the lives of the people. Education, employment opportunities, living standards, right to worship, *etc.* would be relevant. Specific details from two countries, each chosen from a different region, must be provided.

[0 to 7 marks] for sweeping generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus and assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for focus and assessment of impact on economic and social issues.

[17+ marks] for perceptive detailed assessment.

N.B. if only one state or one region is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

- 27. Compare and contrast the treatment of religious minorities in *two* countries during the twentieth century.**

Areas to compare and contrast could include: political rights; freedom of worship; toleration; persecution; discrimination; career and work opportunities; education; economic status; social status; position in society. Specific details will depend on countries chosen, which do not have to be from different regions. Candidates may find it easier to select two countries where the treatment of religious minorities is different.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge or if only one country is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for two sequential narratives with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison and contrast.

[14 to 16 marks] for well focused and detailed comparative structures.

[17+ marks] for analytical comparisons.

28. **“The twentieth century was a century of intolerance and persecution of ethnic, racial and religious minorities.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should have no difficulty in finding evidence to support this assertion ranging from Nazi persecution of Jews to American treatment of Japanese during the Second World War. More must be done than describing various examples of persecution. Candidates must consider the question as a whole. Was the twentieth century dominated by persecution of minorities, or was it a case that violence is always newsworthy? Did tolerance increase or decrease as the century progressed? What were the political, social and economic circumstances that induced persecution of minorities?

Candidates must ensure that the cases they have selected as evidence did concern minorities and not for example, women as a whole, or black people in South Africa.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of the quotation based on relevant specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for a perceptive original argument or a challenge to the question.

29. **Why did some majorities fear minorities in the twentieth century?**

An effective way to tackle this question would be thematically, but specific examples/evidence must be given to support points being made. Fear could be based on politics, or political ideology, when the minority was for example allied to an outside power, or the majority state feared it might be. Economic considerations often led to fear when the minority was strong, better educated, or richer than the majority of the population. Examples here would be Jews in Nazi Germany (and other countries) and Asians in several African states. Strong religious minorities caused problems, with the fear that co-religionist majorities in a neighbouring country, could intervene, as in Northern Ireland.

[0 to 7 marks] for generalized answers lacking evidence.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit focus.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit explanation and assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for structure and analysis based on specific relevant knowledge.

[17+ marks] for perceptive insight.

30. In what ways, and for what reasons, were gender issues important for ethnic/racial minorities?

The position and role of men and women sometimes varied between the majority and minority, and this caused problems in some states. This was most likely to occur when the majority was better educated or of a different culture or religion than the minority. In the second half of the twentieth century especially, many states passed and imposed legislation for gender equality, and this led to conflict in some cases.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague/general unsubstantiated assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of one or two cases.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on ways and reasons.

[14 to 16 marks] for focus on ways and reasons in a structured and analytical essay.

[17+ marks] for balanced judgment, perceptive insight, or different interpretations.
