



MARKSCHEME

November 2000

HISTORY EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

Notes on Individual Questions

These notes must be read in conjunction with the current mark bands.

- 1. Assess the importance of the Third Estate on the outbreak and development of the French Revolution between 1789 and 1795.**

The focus of the question must be on the role of the Third Estate. Candidates may legitimately include the Church and the Aristocracy, as well as the failings of the monarchy in the outbreak of the Revolution. It is possible that the second part of the question will either be ignored or turn into a narrative of events without any assessment. This type of response should not receive more than **[9 marks]**. Strong candidates will have a good knowledge of the Third Estate and of the split between the Girondins and Jacobins. Candidates who are able to analyse the role of the Third Estate, deal with both origins and development, and include the whole time period should receive **[16+ marks]**. Be wary of candidates who ‘name drop’ - Lefebvre, Schama, Rudé *etc.* - and ensure that these references are directed at the question.

- 2. Evaluate the foreign and domestic achievements of Napoleon I as Emperor of France (1804-1815).**

The dates are important here and candidates should not include material before 1804. This is normally a well-known topic but ensure that candidates deal with both foreign and domestic events and that these events are adequately assessed. Candidates frequently ignore ‘evaluation’ in a question like this. If the answer is merely a listing of policies/facts award no more than **[9 marks]**. Balanced assessment supported by relevant information should receive **[16+ marks]** if both aspects of Napoleon’s policies are covered.

- 3. How far do you agree with the statement that “security not revenge” was the main objective of the statesmen at the Congress of Vienna in 1815?**

Again this will be a popular question. Candidates are required to assess the aims of the respective members of the Congress of Vienna as well as make some judgement about the general principles which were its basis. The question of whether ‘security’ or ‘revenge’ were the prime bases for decision-making will depend on the viewpoint of the writer and how they have supported their arguments with well-selected examples. This is a topic which often produces a listing of the terms of the Congress without much attempt at assessment. Candidates who take this approach should receive a maximum of **[9 marks]** while coherent argument with selected evidence should be awarded **[16+ marks]**.

4. How far can it be argued that “Gladstone pursued a more successful foreign policy than Disraeli”?

This is unlikely to be a popular question for Southern Hemisphere schools. Candidates who choose it must be aware of Gladstone’s role in dealing with events in the British Empire, Egypt and Ireland. These should be compared with Disraeli’s major foreign interests, the Eastern Question (Congress of Berlin), the Suez Canal and his Imperial policy. Better candidates will make a running comparison between the two Prime Ministers and be able to make appropriate judgements. This should receive *[16+ marks]*.

5. How serious an obstacle to Italian unification was the Papacy between 1815 and 1870?

Unification questions are always popular but candidates are usually only prepared for questions on Cavour, Mazzini and Garibaldi. The focus of this question, both on the longer time period 1815-1870, and the specific mention of the Papacy, might cause weaker candidates some difficulties. Ensure that the whole chronology is dealt with and that the Papacy remains the focus of the answer rather than a peripheral topic. If candidates only include information after the Pact of Plombières (1858), they should not receive more than *[10 marks]*. Better candidates will deal with the role of the Papal States, Pius IX, and France’s claims as protector of the Pope. Some candidates may even go up to 1929 with the Lateran Pact and this should not be penalised providing that it is only briefly mentioned in passing. Perceptive answers should see that the Papacy alone was unable to stop unification but that it brought in outside factors and if these are well supported they should receive *[16+ marks]*.

6. Why was it that Prussia, rather than Austria, had achieved the dominant position in Germany by 1866?

This will be a popular question and the events will be well-known by the candidates. The key date of 1866 should be noted and, although not specifically mentioned in the question, this should prompt candidates to examine the time period from 1815 to the Austro-Prussian War. The role of the Zollverein, the events of 1848, the demise of Metternich and the success of Bismarck are all events which should be included in any answer. Candidates must attempt to explain why this occurred rather than leave it to the reader to judge through implicit statements. Reward well-reasoned argument and supporting evidence with *[16+ marks]* if all of the above points are made.

7. **“The establishment of the Dual Monarchy in 1867 delayed, but could not prevent, the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.” How justified is this view?**

Candidates should be aware that many of the problems that had led to the establishment of the Dual Monarchy still persisted after 1867. Among these the racial composition of the Empire was particularly troublesome. The rapid growth of industry, while providing economic expansion, brought an influx of immigrants from the Balkans. This led to fragmentation with Germany and the development of new political parties. Rivalry between the Czechs and the Germans became sharp and racial issues in Hungary exacerbated the situation. Foreign policy was not always successful despite the Dual Alliance, the Congress of Berlin and the Triple Alliance. The Eastern Question was a perpetual thorn in the side of Austro-Hungarian politics. The final blow to the Empire came with the defeat of the Central Powers in 1918. Ensure that candidates have covered both domestic and foreign issues and reward clear analysis supported by comprehensive detail with *[16+ marks]*.

8. **What factors led to the increase of opposition to the ruling Romanov dynasty in Russia between 1855 and 1905?**

Candidates should include Alexander II and III and the beginning of Nicholas II. Opposition increased due to a number of causes - the failure of the Emancipation Edict, The Imperial Manifesto of 1885, anti-Semitism, the increase in the Anarchist movement, increasing population, minorities, industrialisation, populism, the rise of Socialist groups, the League of Liberation, and the defeat by Japan in 1905. These are all generally well known although ensure that the entire chronology is dealt with. Answers on Alexander III and Nicholas II are not usually as comprehensive as those on Alexander II. Cause-effect explanation should receive *[16+ marks]*, narratives with only implicit analysis no more than *[9 marks]* and, if only part of the question is covered, award no more than *[10-12 marks]*.

9. **Explain the impact of developments in transportation in the nineteenth century on industrial expansion in Europe. You may choose to limit your answer to *one* country.**

Answers will vary greatly here. The key focus must be the developments in roads, railways, canals, shipping, *etc.* which assisted industrial growth. It is more likely that candidates focus on one particular country rather than on a Europe-wide answer. Ensure that this focus is on the question and not on a side issue *i.e.* German expansion under Bismarck through industrial growth. The question asks for the nineteenth century so answers should deal with most of the century not just on a narrow focus *i.e.* 1850 to 1880.

10. What factors contributed to the demand for the reform and extension of education in the nineteenth century?

Answers here will vary but generally speaking urbanisation and industrialisation created the need for a skilled workforce. Nineteenth century liberal ideas (Robert Owen) became increasingly prevalent, initially in Great Britain and Germany, and called for equality of opportunity. In other countries factors varied, *e.g.* in France there was an attempt to counter the influence of the Church, while in Russia education became linked to modernisation. There is a plethora of information but candidates must focus their answers. If only one part of the question is attempted award no more than **[12 marks]**.

11. How stable was the Third French Republic in the years before and after the First World War?

This question is complex as it includes analysis and a lengthy time period. Candidates should be aware of the Paris Commune, the monarchical movement, the 1875 Constitution, clericalism, Boulangism, Dreyfus and the crises of the 1890s, socialism and the lead up to World War One. After 1918 France had to deal with economic crises, Poincaré-Briand-Herriot, the fragmentation of the political system leading to the Popular Front government of Blum in the 1930s, and the effect of foreign affairs on internal politics. Candidates should analyse rather than merely describe events. Reward balanced essays which cover all aspects with **[16+ marks]**. If candidates only describe award up to **[10 marks]**.

12. By referring to any *one* Scandinavian country explain the processes which led to the development of constitutional government in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Recent experience has shown that candidates are not entirely certain which countries belong in Scandinavia. Allow Finland to be included as it is listed in the History Guide under this section. Evaluate the quality of the response and ensure that the candidate explains the process rather than simply describing it. The time spread is wide but that is deliberate as the process has taken place over both centuries rather than in either the nineteenth or twentieth century depending on which country is chosen.

13. “The fact that Stalin became the dominant leader of Russia by 1929 indicates that he was a more skilful politician than Trotsky.” How far do you agree with this statement?

Candidates should consider whether political skill was a sufficient explanation for Stalin’s victory in the struggle for power 1929. Some discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of those ‘struggling’ (Trotsky, Stalin, Bukarin, Zinoviev and Kamenev) is needed. Trotsky was too radical as were Kamenev and Zinoviev. This weakness of the rivals enabled Stalin to manoeuvre between groups and eventually emerge victorious. Candidates should focus on whether this achievement was due to Stalin’s skilful politics or whether other contributory factors were important. Trotsky is not normally well known, particularly in this period of Soviet history so ensure that he receives approximately equal treatment. There must be analysis if candidates are to receive **[14+ marks]**.

- 14. “Of all the factors that led to the outbreak of World War One in 1914, imperialism was by far the most important.” How far do you agree with this statement?**

This is a very straight-forward question and will be well known by candidates. Weaker answers will produce a listing of the basic factors: the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, militarism, nationalism and the Alliance System. Stronger candidates might examine the relative importance of short-term and immediate factors such as the July Crisis and the role of individuals in the events of the summer of 1914. If candidates quote historiography ensure that the arguments are used properly rather than simply ‘name dropped’. Make certain that candidates evaluate the factors rather than merely list them and reward analytical essays which weigh the evidence carefully before making a judgement with *[16+ marks]*.

- 15. What was the significance of the Locarno Agreement (1925) for European affairs between 1919 and 1939?**

Candidates should be aware of the terms of Locarno and its role in reintegrating Germany back into European affairs after 1919 following Versailles and the French occupation of the Ruhr. They should be aware of the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Geneva Disarmament Conference and the role of the League of Nations following the Ethiopian crisis and the occupation of the Rhineland in March 1936. The effect of this latter on the foreign policies of Mussolini and Hitler through the Anschluss, Munich, Czechoslovakia and the Nazi-Soviet Pact should then be evaluated. Ensure that candidates use Locarno as the basis of the essay rather than merely using it as an aside. Analytical cause-effect essays which are centred on Locarno’s role should receive *[16+ marks]*. Narrative description could get up to *[10 marks]* if well done.

- 16. Critically evaluate the successes and failures of Mussolini’s domestic policies in Italy between 1922 and 1939.**

Mussolini’s policies are usually well known and candidates will include most of them from the March on Rome in 1922 through the Lateran Pact to the role of the Fascist Grand Council and the Corporate State in 1939. What is less well known is their success or failure in that, apart from a few simple comments on the economic weakness of the state, critical evaluation is generally lacking. Ensure that there is evaluation and analysis of Mussolini’s policies and reward this with *[16+ marks]* if it is supported by well selected evidence. Foreign policies deserve no credit unless there is a clear linkage back to internal affairs in Italy. Mere listings of policies will not receive more than *[9 marks]*.

17. Why did the Constitutional Monarchy in Spain collapse in 1931?

Most candidates will probably confine their answers to the period 1918-1931. There should be reference to economic problems/regional differences. There was also a failure of the main political parties to develop a clear identity. Criticism of the Government emerged due to its weak foreign policy which led to the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera which was supported by the monarchy. He remained in power while the economy was healthy despite repression and censorship up to 1925. The Wall Street Crash of 1929 showed that the differences in Spanish society were unresolved and the failure to address these led to Rivera's downfall. Alfonso's solution was to bring in General Berenguer and a promise to return to constitutionalism. In April 1931 the local elections showed the unpopularity of the monarchy. There is a wealth of information here so ensure that candidates have selected it well and focused their essays on the question. Reward analysis and accurate knowledge with *[16+ marks]*.

18. "In reality Hitler and the Nazi Party were far less totalitarian than is commonly believed." By referring to events in Germany between 1933 and 1945 comment on the truth of this statement.

This question has a slightly unusual tack in that candidates will have to attempt to define totalitarianism in the early part of their essays. Most will do this through Friedrich's classificatory system and candidates who take this approach, carefully evaluating Hitler's policies and the Nazi Party in the light of this definition should receive *[16+ marks]*. There is a tendency for candidates to waver in their chronology and this question specifically goes up to 1945. Ensure that candidates do not stop in 1938 with the Reichskristallnacht or after Wannsee (1942) but include the whole time period. There is recent historiography here which could be usefully incorporated into an essay. Essays which focus entirely on the Röhm Putsch and the Holocaust will not receive much credit as the question will not have been understood.

19. Analyse the factors which enabled the USSR to survive the German invasion of 1941.

Candidates should include the extension of the Soviet industrial base under the 5-Year Plans, Stalin's role, patriotism, determination of the people to resist, support from the Allies (Murmansk Run), and US efforts in the Pacific which diverted Japan from concerted aggression in the East which allowed the USSR to concentrate on the Western front. Some candidates might include Hitler's failure as a leader and the over-extension of Germany's forces beyond her capacity to wage war on such a scale. Ensure that there is assessment and analysis of these factors and reward balanced argument with *[16+ marks]*.

20. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

Candidates might have difficulty comparing these two leaders. Khrushchev is usually well handled although many candidates dwell too long on Cuba at the expense of other areas. Apart from Czechoslovakia in 1968 Brezhnev's foreign policies are rather superficially known. Candidates should make mention of Khrushchev's role in the Suez Crisis, the Sino-Soviet split, Berlin, and the Warsaw Pact. Brezhnev played an important role in Sino-Soviet relations, the West German Non-Aggression Treaty, détente with the US and Spain, the Middle East crises, Afghanistan, the Gulf War, and reductions in nuclear armaments. Candidates should select material carefully to support whichever tack they are taking and must compare and contrast to receive *[16+ marks]*.

21. How far did the Marshall Plan succeed in fulfilling its objectives for Western Europe by 1955?

Candidates must be able to identify the intentions behind the Marshall Plan in terms of its role in Europe. The stated idea was to restore the war-damaged economies of Western Europe by a massive injection of foreign aid. Revisionist historians have argued that this was a blatant attempt by the US to introduce economic imperialism to support domestic industrial output after the war. Candidates should evaluate the Marshall Plan's effectiveness in rebuilding Europe and the most popular examples will no doubt be France and Germany. Ensure that candidates include all of the time period and that they do not get bogged down in events between 1945 and 1949. Candidates who fall into this trap are unlikely to receive more than *[10 marks]*.

22. To what extent did the establishment of the communist bloc between 1945 and 1950 represent the failure of democracy in Eastern Europe?

Candidates will probably select one or two countries to support their arguments. However only Czechoslovakia can justifiably be considered to have effectively established a democratic structure. There is a need to go back to 1919 and briefly outline how and why the independent states of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia *etc.* were created. Candidates should then make the point that, by 1930, all eastern bloc countries had centre-right regimes (Pilsudski, Horthy, *etc.*). Candidates should then link this with the Cold War and the role of the Soviet Union in the establishment of non-democratic governments after 1945. This is not an easy question so be certain to mark positively.

23. Examine how and why the position of women in European society has changed since 1945.

The question gives a lot of scope for candidates to discuss women at work, women in the home, women's legal position, and their increased presence in the political arena. More able candidates might refer to the 'glass ceiling' but essays should focus on history not sociology! In some cases improvements in women's position were more apparent than real. This helps to explain the emergence of the feminist movement. The question calls for a general answer relating to European society but candidates may also focus on their own country to provide specific examples. Ensure that both parts of the question are included and mark positively rewarding analysis and well-supported arguments. Candidates can, at times, become emotional on questions of this nature so ensure that their views are objective and historically supportable.

24. By referring to any *one* European country after 1945 analyse how developments in domestic politics were affected by the Second World War.

France or Germany will probably be the most popular choices although candidates may, of course, choose their own country. If Germany is chosen be careful that this does not turn into a Cold War essay, but that candidates clearly show the effect of the War on domestic politics. It is too simplistic to say that the Second World War resulted in the Cold War and then write about the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Essays should cover most of the time period between 1945 to 1990 although it is legitimate for candidates to more narrowly define the chronology if they deem it appropriate. A clear cause-effect relationship must be established to receive more than *[16+ marks]*.

25. Why did so many countries in Eastern Europe turn away from communism in the 1980s?

Material on this topic is becoming more and more available but it remains an unpopular choice. Poland will probably be the starting point with Solidarnosc and Walesa, and answers could then deal with Czechoslovakia and Havel, and the relaxing of relations with the West by Hungary in the late 1980s. No doubt the main focus will be the role of Gorbachev following Andropov and Chernenko and the importance of Glasnost and Perestroika as catalysts for the events of 1989. Economic factors are of key importance in explaining the actions of many countries. Look for a clear explanation supported by well-chosen material for marks of *[16+ marks]*.
