



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2014**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3 – Aspects of the history of  
Europe and the Middle East**

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

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

*Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate's work please contact your team leader.*

<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
<b>1–2:</b>	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
<b>3–4:</b>	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
<b>5–6:</b>	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
<b>7–8:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
<b>9–11:</b>	Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
<b>12–14:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary 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>15–17:</b>	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
<b>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is wellstructured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.

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

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

## The French Revolution and Napoleon — mid 18th century to 1815

### 1. Evaluate the causes of the Reign of Terror of 1793–1794.

The Reign of Terror may be dated from either June 1793 (the overthrow of the Girondins by the Jacobins), or more commonly from September 1793 when Terror was made the “Order of the Day”. Its end date is July 1794 with the execution of Robespierre and his supporters. The Terror saw many thousands executed with total estimates varying widely. Candidates’ explanations of reasons for the Terror may include: internal opposition to the Revolution, such as armed rebellion (for example, in the Vendée, Lyon) and possible links between internal opposition and those foreign powers at war with the Republic (for example, at Toulon in 1793); the power-struggle between Jacobins and Girondins; the role of the *sans culottes* under Roux and Hébert in that power struggle; and economic causes (rising food prices) that contributed to the radicalization of the *sans culottes*. Some candidates may also argue for the importance of the lack of a parliamentary tradition in the period; with France moving so rapidly from an absolutist monarchy to a form of popular sovereignty, there was a lack of experience of how to manage political opposition. In the context of internal opposition and war with foreign powers implacably opposed to the Revolution, it was all too easy for political opposition to be seen as treasonous.

*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. Analyse the reasons for the fall of the Directory in 1799.

Many candidates who answer this question may focus on the events of the coup of 18 Brumaire, the role of Napoleon and the military force he could command. However, answers may also include consideration of other factors: military reverses (in Egypt and elsewhere); domestic economic crisis; the need for the Directory to avoid the extremes of resurgent Royalism and Jacobinism; electoral manipulation and personal corruption, for example the lifestyle of Barras (perhaps the most well known member of the Directory). Divisions within the Directory also played their part. The coup of 18 Fructidor entailed a purge of conservatives, including Carnot and Barthélemy from within the Directory. It also highlighted the dependence of the Directory on the army who had carried out the purge. In the context of the military defeats of 1799, Talleyrand and Sieyès decided that France needed a stronger government paving the way for Napoleon’s coup. Candidates may also argue that as a reaction to the overbearing dictatorship of the Committee of Public Safety, the Directory went to the opposite extreme and/or that there was a fatal lack of strong executive powers that undermined the Directory.

*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. Analyse the reasons for Piedmont–Sardinia’s growth in power between 1815 and 1861.**

While some candidates may interpret this question as simply asking for an explanation of Piedmont–Sardinia’s leadership role in Italian unification, it is not asking for a narrative of that process. It is acceptable to analyse the relative success of Cavour’s diplomacy (role in the Crimean War, Pact of Plombières), as long as it is clearly linked to the terms of the question. However, this question also gives an opportunity for students to show what they know about domestic policy in Piedmont–Sardinia 1815–1861 (for example, Siccardi Laws, development of railways, industrial growth). Other responses may argue that the reason for the kingdom’s growth in power was largely fortuitous, and depended entirely on events beyond the control of the kingdom’s rulers.

*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. Assess the extent of continuity and change in Bismarck’s domestic policy in the years 1871–1890.**

Following the proclamation of the German Empire in 1871, Bismarck dominated domestic German politics until he was forced to resign by Wilhelm II in March 1890. This question asks candidates to focus on Bismarck’s domestic policy and assess the degree of continuity and change in that period. Candidates may divide the period chronologically into the Liberal period (1871–1878/9) and the Conservative period (1878/9–1890). Candidates may suggest that 1878/9 was the key turning point, with the introduction of the Anti-Socialist Laws in 1878 and tariff reform in 1879, and stress the extent of change after this point. Other factors which could point in this direction include the ending of the *Kulturkampf* and the introduction of social insurance legislation. For balance, candidates may argue for the degree of continuity throughout the period: the role of Bismarck and the Emperor, the relative lack of power of the *Reichstag* and the dominance of Prussia and its upper class.

*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. How strong was Ottoman control over Lebanon in the years 1861–1914?**

The focus of the question is neither the conflict of 1860 nor the resolution of communal tensions but on the level of Ottoman control over Lebanon in the period. Answers may give details of the Settlement (*Montassarifiah/Mutasarrifiyya*), but these should be linked to an analysis of the degree of Ottoman control. Although the Sultan chose the *Mutasarrif* (the Governor), he had to be a Christian and he had to be approved by the European powers. There were also two councils; an Administrative Council and a Judicial Council. In both cases, all communities were represented. The Administrative Council was to advise the Governor on assessing taxes and administering revenue and expenditure. The Judicial Council was to help the Governor with legal disputes. Other issues to consider in assessing the strength of Ottoman control include the role of European powers in Lebanese affairs in the period, especially French investment in the silk industry and the role of missionary activity. More broadly Britain and France acted to guarantee the whole *Montassarifiah/Mutasarrifiyya* settlement. All of these points could be used to argue that Ottoman rule was relatively weak. On the other hand, continued Ottoman control of Lebanon could be demonstrated by a reliance on Ottoman troops to suppress disturbances, (for example the revolt of Youssef Bey Karam in 1866-7), the lack of a separate outlet to the sea and the fact the governor was chosen by the Sultan. Some candidates may also note the rapid abolition of Lebanon's semi-autonomous status in 1914 with 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.*

**6. Assess the importance of the Tanzimat reforms to the Ottoman Empire.**

Candidates should show an understanding of the major reforms and of their aims. Answers may consider the reforms in the context of the Ottoman Empire's international position. The *Gülhane Hatt-i Şerifi* (Noble Edict of the Rose Garden) (1839) and the *Hatt-i Hümayûn* (Noble Reform Edict) (1856) were both issued at critical periods when the Ottoman Empire was under severe external pressure. In the first case, this was after the Ottoman defeat by the Egyptians at Nizip. In the second case, this was to coincide with the Treaty of Paris at the end of the Crimean War. Candidates could discuss to what extent these reforms helped the Ottoman Empire in its relations with foreign powers.

However, the main focus for most candidates is likely to be on the domestic impact. There were a range of reforms including, military, legal, bureaucratic and governmental reforms. Analysis could examine change and continuity when trying to assess the importance of the reforms, especially in how far there was real change at the local level. Areas which could be examined include how far the empire was "modernized" as well as how far disaffected Christian subjects of the empire were won over. Another possible line of argument could be that the importance of the reforms depended very significantly on individual provincial administrators, for example the success of Midhat Pasha in Rumelia, Nis and Baghdad. Some candidates may also discuss the extent to which the Tanzimat reforms provided an important legacy for later reformers in the Ottoman Empire.

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

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

## Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914

### 7. Compare and contrast the reasons for the collapse of the Second French Republic in 1851 and the 1871 Paris Commune.

**For comparison:** events in Paris did not reflect the political attitudes of provincial France, as indicated by the results of the December 1848 presidential elections and the February 1871 Legislative Assembly elections, both of which showed support for conservative, moderate parties. In addition, both Louis Napoleon and Thiers gave clear leadership to moderate elements: while the former made reference to his uncle's legacy (Bonapartism), Thiers relied on his political experience over many years to enhance his status as leader. This could also be used as a contrast.

In both cases, violent events in Paris and fear of the Left opened the way for repression (June Days of 1848 and crushing of the Commune in May 1871). Repression was carried out by the military on both occasions.

**For contrast:** Louis Napoleon won the presidential elections of December 1848 after the repression of the June Days by Cavaignac, while Thiers was directly associated with the suppression of the Commune. Furthermore, the 1848 Revolution in France saw the creation of the National Workshops scheme to alleviate poverty and unemployment, which caused concern among rural property owners and weakened support for the 1848 Revolution in France. By way of contrast, the Paris Commune was in part a response to the failure to pay the National Guard and the ending of a moratorium on rent payments, but the implementation of an active social project was arguably less important as a reason for the collapse of the Paris Commune.

*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. How successful was Gladstone as prime minister?

The focus should be on Gladstone as prime minister. Candidates may reflect that successful aspects of his leadership included leading governments on four separate occasions, in 1868, 1880, 1886 and 1892. Other successful features to which candidates may refer include: the ability to unify (until 1886) a great variety of heterogeneous groups, including Whig aristocrats, dissenter middle classes as well as trades unionists; legislative achievements (for example, 1870 Education Act, 1884 Third Reform Act).

For balance, candidates may highlight his failures. These may include party disunity (culminating in the Liberal Unionists leaving the Party in 1886 and bringing down Gladstone's third government), as well as the failure to implement Irish Home Rule in 1893.

*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. To what extent did the reforms of Alexander II achieve his aims?**

The details of the reforms should be well known: emancipation of the serfs (1861); local government (establishment of *zemstva* and the Duma); independent judiciary; trial by jury; education reforms (more schools and freedom for the universities); military reforms (reduction of the military service period and the introduction of universal conscription). There were attempts at economic reform, including developing infrastructure for both industrial and financial growth. Candidates may also consider the extent to which his reforms were diluted by his later reaction. However the key word in the question is “aims”, these should be clearly identified as modernising Russia whilst maintaining autocratic power. Discussion of the reforms should focus on consideration of how far each reform helped or hindered the achievement of these aims

*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. “The First World War was the main cause of the 1917 February/March Revolution in Russia.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The question invites candidates to examine a range of causes and then to make a judgment on which was the most significant. Many will no doubt accept that the war was the main cause of the February Revolution. Other causes could include: longer term discontent with limitations of political change after 1905 (Duma power was limited and by 1914 political parties were legal but political power still rested with the autocracy); the impact of industrialization and urbanization (leading to overcrowded conditions for workers in the cities) causing discontent, for example, the strikes of Lena goldfields and over 1.5 million industrial workers in the last few months of peace. Peasant revolts were also prevalent. Thus on the eve of war, Russia was unstable with much discontent. There was potential for revolution without the added stresses of war.

On the role of the war itself, initial enthusiasm was rapidly destroyed by the failure of the Tsar’s regime to fight effectively. Evidence could include: defeats at Tannenberg and the Masurian Lakes; high casualties; the failure to logically support the army; shortages of weapons at the front; failure to provide food and medical supplies to the troops. In the cities, high inflation and food shortages, coupled with the role of Rasputin and the Tsarina, led to increasing criticism of the Tsarist regime. Nicholas II’s assumption of military command and his refusal to share power with the Duma meant all discontent was focused on the monarchy.

Candidates may well argue that the regime was inherently weak and that revolution would have happened because of this at some point, and that the stresses of war merely acted as a catalyst for 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.*

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

### 11. Analyse the main objectives of German foreign policy between 1890 and 1914.

This is not a question on the causes of the First World War, rather, it gives an opportunity for candidates to show their knowledge of German foreign policy between 1890 and 1914 and asks for an analysis of the main objectives. Some may focus on German naval and colonial policy (the claim for “A Place in the Sun” was stated by Bülow in 1897), while others may focus more on German support of Austria–Hungary in the Balkans and the desire for a *Mitteleuropa*. Others may highlight the unpredictability of German policy and comment on the character of Kaiser Wilhelm II (*Daily Telegraph* affair). Other approaches could emphasize how objectives shifted over time within this period, or how foreign policy was driven by domestic concerns – specifically by what was seen as the threat of the rise of the SPD. Fear of a two front war and the resultant military planning (Schlieffen Plan) could also be discussed as well as the view that Russia would only become industrially and militarily stronger over time (War Council meeting of December 1912 and Moltke’s view that war was inevitable and “the sooner the better”).

*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. Compare and contrast the contribution of the British and German home fronts in determining the outcome of the First World War.

The First World War was the first “total” war in history. For comparison between Britain and Germany, candidates could focus on conscription, propaganda and the degree of suspension of domestic political conflict, among others. Britain and Germany could both be examined for reorganization of the economy, rationing and the extent to which women were incorporated into the workforce.

**For contrasts:** candidates might choose to focus on specific episodes during the war. For example, in Britain, the Shell crisis of 1915 and the emergence of the Ministry of Munitions, which supported the British military effort. For Germany, candidates could assess the *Burgfrieden*, conditions from 1916 onwards, including the “Turnip Winter”, the growth of the black market and the way in which labour unrest (strikes and the Kiel Mutiny) contributed to political instability and an eventual willingness to seek an armistice, implicitly conceding defeat.

*Comments on comparisons and contrasts should be linked to the outcome of the 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.*

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

### 13. “The post-First World War settlement in the Middle East was based on the imperial ambitions of the victors.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Answers should focus on the details of Sèvres and Lausanne and decisions reached at San Remo with regard to the establishment of mandates in Palestine, Transjordan, Syria and Lebanon, as well as British control in Mesopotamia.

Wartime diplomacy can be made relevant, showing how promises made were largely ignored if they went against the interests and ambitions of the victorious powers, especially with regard to Palestine. Interests and ambitions could include the protection of oil supplies (Iraq and Mosul oilfields) and Suez for Britain. The French desired to extend their influence beyond their colonies in North Africa. Analysis could also discuss the length of time that the mandatory powers took to relinquish their control: Iraq gained independence in 1932 and the other mandates were only surrendered in the post-Second World War period.

This is not a question on the causes of the conflict in Palestine, but looks at the region as a whole.

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

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

### 14. Examine the methods used by Ibn Saud to gain and consolidate power in Saudi Arabia.

Methods used to gain power could be his gaining control of Riyadh in 1902 and becoming leader of the Wahabis. He founded the *Ikwhan* in 1912 and used them to gain support amongst the Bedouin, thus he had military power and religious influence.

Conflict with Husayn in the years 1919–1925 led to Husayn’s exile and the proclamation of Ibn Saud as king of Hejaz in 1926.

He reached an agreement with the British in 1927, gaining British recognition if he accepted the British-supported Hashemite Kingdoms in Jordan and Iraq. He was thus willing to compromise with major powers to establish and consolidate his rule.

He also dealt with the *Ikwhan* when they caused conflict with Britain (Battle of Sabila, 1929). Ibn Saud retained support because of the religious basis of the state. He protected the Holy Places and the notables supported his strong rule. In 1932 he became king of Saudi Arabia with both internal and external support.

*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. “Hitler’s rule in Germany gave most Germans what they wanted in the years 1933–1939.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Answers will have to identify the problems that faced Germany in the years before Hitler gained power and the extent to which Hitler resolved these problems (including: economic crisis; mass unemployment; weak governments; lack of law and order because of political violence; threat of revolution; national humiliation, *ie* Versailles).

The main focus should be on how these problems were or were not dealt with: unemployment fell because of Schacht’s New Plan, which included public works schemes, conscription and rearmament; the one-party state and dictatorship (fully established by August 1934) ended political violence on the streets and gave the impression of strong, stable government. From the beginning, Hitler pursued a foreign policy designed to remove the Versailles settlement and restore national pride, including leaving the League of Nations, ignoring the military clauses of Versailles and remilitarizing the Rhineland, *etc.*

All of these actions were popular. Plebiscites and levels of collusion with the regime also indicate that most Germans were willing to support the regime for the benefits it brought. Levels of opposition could also be considered: repression dealt with overt opposition, but there was little covert opposition within Germany until Hitler began to move towards 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.*

- 16. Analyse the political impact of the Great Depression on any one country of the region.**

Case studies might include Germany, Spain, Britain or France, but accept any valid example. For Germany, candidates may focus on Nazi electoral gains and their links with the level of unemployment. The failure of the Müller, Brüning, Schleicher and Von Papen governments may also be outlined. In other cases, it could be argued that the impact was to strengthen the Left, for example in France, with the formation of the Popular Front government in 1936. In Spain, the Great Depression contributed to general political instability with both right-wing and left-wing governments in power during the Second Republic. Another point of view would be that, in general, all governing parties of whatever political persuasion were undermined as a result of the Great Depression.

*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. Analyse the effects of the Great Patriotic War on the Soviet Union in the years 1941–1945.

There is much material here and answers could focus on three key areas.

**Military impact of the war.** The initial success of Operation Barbarossa, which resulted in millions of casualties; the retreat of Soviet forces; the siege of Leningrad; and the threat to Moscow. These all resulted in large-scale destruction of infrastructure. Key points of Soviet recovery (Stalingrad, Kursk etc) were only achieved through the massive mobilization of the civilian population.

**Economic and social effect of the war.** Despite the retreat of production east of the Urals, by the end of the war the Soviet Union had suffered the destruction of much industrial capacity as a consequence of conflict (25 percent of pre-war industrial capacity lost). The civilian population suffered devastation because of harsh German rule in occupied areas and the “scorched earth” policy adopted by the Soviet Union. Civilian casualties in Leningrad were enormous, and deaths as a consequence of the war are estimated at 20 million or more.

**Politically,** the Soviet Union was not altered by the war. Stalin, as *generalissimo*, remained the dominant leader, a position reinforced by propaganda. The party remained powerful, with party commissars attached to army units etc. The army, under leaders such as Zhukov, was important but did not threaten Stalin’s position.

*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. Evaluate the success of Khrushchev's foreign policy.**

Khrushchev's aims should be identified in order to assess success. Aims could be: maintaining Soviet dominance over the Eastern Bloc states and hence Soviet security; extending Soviet influence globally while avoiding nuclear conflict, *ie* peaceful coexistence.

**Foreign policy success:** Allowing Gomulka to come to power in Poland to avoid further instability; crushing the Hungarian Uprising (1956); improving relations with Tito in Yugoslavia. Having failed to push Western powers out of Berlin in 1958, he allowed the construction of the Berlin Wall (1961) to close a gap in the Iron Curtain.

After the Cuban Missile Crisis peaceful coexistence was once more pursued with the signing of the Test Ban Treaty (1964) and the establishment of the "hotline" between Washington and Moscow.

**Limits to success:** Soviet influence in post-colonial countries such as India, Egypt and some African states was weak. In terms of global influence, Sino-Soviet relations became tense and distant. Mao Zedong accused Khrushchev of revisionism over his 1956 speech. He also criticized Khrushchev for his "weakness" over Cuba – Mao felt he had backed down to avoid nuclear war.

The results of the Cuban Missile Crisis are a matter of debate. He failed to establish a Soviet base in the Western hemisphere; however, he did succeed in gaining the removal of NATO missiles from Turkey.

Mention of both China and Cuba is legitimate, as they are mentioned in the guide.

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

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

**The Second World War and post-war Western Europe 1939–2000****19. What were the main factors in the consolidation and maintenance of Franco's regime (1939–1975)?**

After victory in the Civil War, Franco ruled Spain from 1939 until his death in 1975. The question is focused on reasons both for the consolidation and the maintenance of his power. For consolidation, expect some discussion of repression. This included physical elimination (many thousands of republican supporters, or those associated with the Republic, were executed in the regime's early years), forced labour, imprisonment and deprivation of livelihood. Another factor for consolidation could arguably be the decision to keep Spain out of the Second World War. For maintenance, aspects which could be discussed include Franco's positioning of his regime as an anti-Communist bulwark in Cold War Europe (1953 Pact of Madrid between Spain and the US); economic growth ("Spanish Miracle" from 1959) or the role of the Catholic Church within Spanish society. Some candidates may also examine the centralization of power in Madrid and state control of all forms of media, or the relative weakness of the opposition to the regime after 1945. There is controversy over how important repression remained in preserving Franco's power in later years.

*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. "The dominant motive for the formation of NATO in 1949 was to contain Soviet expansion." To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should show knowledge of what, as far as the West was concerned, constituted post-war Soviet expansion. Examples could include the overthrow of the Czechoslovak government (February 1948) and the Soviet Blockade of Berlin (June 1948), but allow other instances. For balanced answers, candidates could discuss other motives for the formation of NATO: the wish to prevent any possible future resurgence of European militarism through a strong US commitment to Europe and the desire in some quarters to encourage European political integration. Candidates may also present a revisionist point of view that Truman wished to assert US economic and political power in Europe (Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan) and that the formation of NATO was part of this strategy.

Some candidates may also integrate knowledge of the Treaty of Brussels (March 1948), and its creation of the Western Union (later Western European Union) by Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg. This was absorbed by NATO.

The question is not asking for a summary of the causes of the Cold 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.*

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

### 21. Analyse the political and economic impact of Nasser's domestic policies.

**Political issues include:** the role of the army; control of potential opposition groups (such as the Muslim Brotherhood and movements on the left); control of the press and provincial and municipal councils; powers of the president, which were established by the 1956 constitution; the issuing of the National Charter (1962); levels of bureaucracy; expansion of the public sector.

**Economic issues to consider are:** standards of living; the extent of land reform; nationalization of the Suez Canal, banks, insurance *etc*; state control of imports and exports.

Analysis should focus fully on impact.

*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. Assess the reasons for the failure of the Arab–Israeli peace process in the years 1978–2000.

The various agreements should be well known, from Camp David in 1978, to the various Oslo Accords, the Israel–Jordan Peace Treaty (1994), and Clinton’s final attempts to broker peace at Camp David in 2000. However the focus of the question is why all of these attempts have failed to resolve the conflict and candidates will need to identify the key obstacles to lasting peace. These could include: the issue of the Occupied Territories and Jewish settlements there; the issue of Jerusalem; the right of return *etc*.

Other factors contributing to tensions could be: the growth of militias such as Hamas and their activities; Israeli rule in the Occupied Territories; the assassination of Rabin; the election of more hard-line Israeli governments. All of these made the peace process more difficult.

*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. Analyse developments in the arts in any one country of the region over a fifty year period.

Either the 19th or the 20th century is legitimate as a focus. The arts can be considered to include visual arts, music, theatre, film and literature. Detailed material and analysis should be present, not unsubstantiated generalizations. Discussion of major trends may form the basis of the answer, with some reference to specific works. Any country within the region is valid.

*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. Analyse the reasons for industrialization in any one country of the region over a fifty year period.

Either the 19th or 20th century is legitimate here. The key word is “analyse” and therefore a number of reasons should be discussed in some detail. Well known cases are Britain, France, Germany and Russia. This question gives candidates the opportunity to use their knowledge of their own national history in analyzing their society’s industrialization (as long as it is within the region). Reasons for industrialization could vary widely between different 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.*

---