



MARKSCHEME

May 2001

HISTORY - EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

1. In what ways and for what reasons was the French Revolution, between 1789 and 1795, a period of constitutional and legal changes?

In what ways suggests the main changes in government and administration in the early period of the Revolution. These could include the Estates General 1789, the National Assembly 1789, the National Constituent Assembly 1789 to 1791, the Legislative Assembly 1791 to 1792, the Convention 1792 to 1795. Some might mention the beginning of the Directory 1795. Candidates should explain how the above affected France and its people; a wider franchise, equality before the law, abolition of feudalism and the monarchy, civil constitution of the clergy, administrative reforms *e.g.* in local government. Abler candidates might mention the various constitutions, *e.g.* 1791 and 1793 or the draconian laws associated with the terror.

Why this was a period of change (for what reasons) could include actions of the king and other individuals and groups who affected the course of the Revolution, their aims and policies, the clubs such as Jacobins, foreign powers. There is much material that could be used so do not demand all the above.

Short general accounts of events will probably not reach **[8 marks]**.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably describe some of the changes with implicit reasons.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will be fuller and contain more explicit explanations of the changes.

[14 to 16 marks] essays will be well structured and focused with analysis of change.

[16+ marks] answers may differentiate between constitutional and legal changes.

2. In 1810 Napoleon I wrote “My principle is France before everything.” To what extent did the career of Napoleon I from 1799 to 1815 follow this principle?

The wording of this question gives scope to all candidates to use what they have learnt about Napoleon I, but to score well they must decide which of his policies and actions benefited France - *e.g.* restoring order and stable government after revolutionary turmoil but keeping beneficial reforms, his administrative legal and economic measures, *la gloire etc.* and criticise policies in which he put his own position before that of France. These might include emphasis on war which drained France of men and resources, and his despotic or totalitarian measures at home.

[8 to 10 marks] might be scored by narrative accounts of Napoleon’s policies with some implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] by more detail and more explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] could be obtained by well structured and analytical answers.

[16+ marks] would perhaps be scored by those who consider one or two of the following, the meaning of principle, “France before everything,” or Napoleon’s motive in saying this in 1810.

3. “The success of the Congress of Vienna has been much exaggerated.” How valid is this assessment of the short-term and long-term results of the Congress?

Most candidates will probably understand the success of Vienna to mean no major European war for 100 years, restoring the equilibrium after the turmoil of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era, maintaining the balance of power, and allowing France to resume her position as a European power. Against this could be argued the selfish behaviour of the great powers, their refusal to acknowledge liberalism or nationalism and the overturning of some of the clauses *e.g.* with the separation of Belgium and Holland and the 1848 revolutions. Answers could legitimately support either success or failure or balance both.

[8 to 10 marks] answers may be thin on specific details with rather sweeping general reasoning.

[11 to 13 marks] should contain more accurate and precise details and better evaluation.

[14 to 16 marks] answers will be clearly structured, focused and analytical about success and failure.

[16+ marks] essays might consider “has been exaggerated” - by whom?

4. Compare and contrast the aims and policies of Louis XVIII and Charles X.

For comparison both Louis (1814 to 1824) and Charles (1824 to 1830) aimed to rule as Bourbon monarchs, restored the white Bourbon flag, supported the Catholic religion and to a varying extent gave way to the Ultras. In contrast Louis aimed to keep his throne by moderate policies whilst Charles aimed to return to a more autocratic monarchy. Charles’ support of both the nobility and the Catholic Church was more extreme. Louis agreed to preserve some institutions of the Revolution and the Napoleonic era by issuing and promising to keep the Charter. Charles and his ministers sought to abolish the Charter and issued the Ordinances of St Cloud.

If only Louis or Charles is tackled *[8 marks]* cannot be reached.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably be end-on accounts of both reigns with perhaps implicit comparison or linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] may be scored with better linkage and more explicit comparison.

[14 to 16+ marks] answers should have a focused and comparative structure, and a balanced approach.

5. Why has it been claimed that Italian unification needed both a Cavour and a Garibaldi?

The wording of the question should suggest that neither Cavour nor Garibaldi could have achieved Italian unification alone, but the nature or character of both men with their different contributions brought about unification. Candidates need to plan their own structure as to how to tackle the question. Some may recount events from about 1848 until 1871, highlighting the contributions of both men. Others may compare and contrast the two, the work of Cavour the Piedmontese politician who probably at least at first sought only the expansion of Piedmont, with the actions of the Italian patriot Garibaldi whose main contributions were inspiration and fighting. Whichever structure is adopted accurate details of the main events as well as evaluation of them should be included.

[8 to 10 marks] answers may be chronological narrative with at least implicit understanding of “needed both”.

[11 to 13 marks] will be scored by those who explain the contributions of both and show their understanding of why both were needed.

[14 to 16+ marks] will be obtained by candidates with a well thought out structure and perceptive analysis.

6. Analyse the successes and failures of *one* British Prime Minister between 1837 and 1901.

The question asks for an evaluation of one Victorian Prime Minister. It is expected that the choice would be one from Peel, Palmerston, Disraeli and Gladstone. Key dates for them are: Peel 1834 to 1835 (allow mention of this although it is before the starting date) and 1841 to 1846, Palmerston 1855 to 1858 and 1859 to 1865, Disraeli 1868 and 1874 to 1880, Gladstone 1868 to 1870, 1880 to 1885, 1886, and 1892 to 1896. Domestic, foreign and imperial policies would all be relevant. Candidates should concentrate on the periods of premiership as there is adequate material to assess without for example discussing Peel as Home Secretary or Gladstone as Chancellor. Of course any other Prime Minister of this period would be acceptable.

[8 to 10 marks] could be scored by chronological narrative with implicit success and failure.

[11 to 13 marks] answers would require better focus on success and failure.

[14 to 16+ marks] would require structure directed towards success and failure, and depth of analysis.

7. How far is it true to say that Austria lost control of Germany rather than Prussia gained it?

This is by design a question covering a long period in order to encourage different approaches including saying that it was not very true, which probably many will. There could be two popular approaches; to focus the essay on the weaknesses of Austria, overstretched since the Treaty of Vienna, so that the situation was ripe for Bismarck to defeat Austria in 1866, or that 1848 to 1852 events suggested that Austria was still a powerful force in Europe and German dominance was secured because of Bismarck's policies. A third approach could be a balance between the two.

[8 to 10 marks] might be scored by a mainly narrative account of either the decline of Austria or Bismarck's wars provided there is focus on the question.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will perhaps concentrate on either Austria or Prussia but also evaluate 'how far?'

[14 to 16+ marks] will be obtained by those who write a clear structured response arguing a well supported case.

8. Evaluate the aims and results of Russian foreign policy between 1850 and 1900.

This question covers at least part of the reigns of Nicholas I, Alexander II, Alexander III and Nicholas II. Candidates need to select the main aims and results from the policies of these tsars. The main area was probably the Balkans where Russia wished to profit from the decline of the Turkish empire and keep Austria in check. Secondly Russia wished to expand eastwards and thirdly she wanted to obtain foreign capital for industrial and commercial developments.

Results should include some of the following: Crimean War, Russo-Turkish War, army reforms, Treaties with and by Bismarck, Trans-Siberian railway treaties with China and France.

Crimean War only would not reach *[8 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] for an account of some of the main events with implicit aims and results.

[11 to 13 marks] for fuller details of events linked to aims and results.

[14 to 16+ marks] for an answer structured and focused on aims and results with the higher marks for those who also analyse the effects for Europe.

9. **“Bismarck’s policies both at home and abroad, between the years 1871 and 1890, merely stored up problems for the future, both for Germany and Europe.” To what extent do you agree with this verdict?**

Bismarck dominated the domestic and foreign policy of the German Reich from its foundation in 1871 until his fall in 1890. The question demands an evaluation of policies at home and in the wider context of Europe, with a judgement as to which benefited, or harmed both Germany and Europe. For domestic policy candidates could include Bismarck’s wish to allow little power to the Reichstag which retarded their political growth, his disputes with all parties especially the Kulturkampf, state social welfare which formed a model for Europe, but did he leave a nation “accustomed to submit” which caused problems?

For foreign policy candidates could consider Bismarck’s aims to avoid war because he had upset the balance of power in Europe and especially feared retaliation by France, a country he felt he must keep isolated, hence his alliances including the Dreikaiserbund 1871, the Dual Alliance 1879, Triple Alliance 1882. The Berlin Congress 1878 revealed the difficulty of maintaining good relations with both Austria and Russia because of the Balkans *etc.* Should Bismarck be applauded for keeping the peace, or blamed for the First World War?

[8 to 10 marks] could be gained for some details of both domestic and foreign policy with an implicit judgement of the verdict.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will contain better detail and some explicit evaluation.

[14 to 16 marks] could be scored with clearly structured and analytical essays.

[16+ marks] answers will probably consist of focused analysis of both long and short term effects of both domestic and foreign policies on Germany and Europe.

10. **In what ways did developments in transport and industry increase the prosperity of *one* European country in the nineteenth century?**

This open ended question allows candidates to utilise the economic and social history of their own country. Transport developments could and should include road, rail and water, and how the movement of raw materials, finished products and the workforce, helped to increase output. There could be a survey of all aspects of industry, raw materials, inventions, machinery, new products *etc.* both for home consumption and export. Marks will depend on specific detail and focus and the clear connection of transport and industry with increased prosperity.

[8 marks] will not be reached by unsubstantiated generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] could be scored by a description of some developments with increased prosperity implied.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will contain accurate relevant details and explicit comments on prosperity.

[14 to 16 marks] could be obtained by full balanced and structured accounts of developments in both transport and industry which explain and analyse the increase of prosperity in the chosen country.

[16+ marks] answers might also analyse the problems and disadvantages caused by some of the developments.

11. What were the important trends of intellectual and cultural developments in Europe in the nineteenth century?

This is another open ended question and past experience suggests that it will be neither popular nor well done. No specific number of countries to be used or areas of intellectual development are demanded. Candidates might include universities, the expansion of education, increase of literacy, philosophy, science, mathematics, and all forms of literature and art. Reward original and thoughtful essays, but sparse pedestrian generalisations will not be satisfactory.

[8 to 10 marks] would probably be awarded to those who describe some mainstream nineteenth century intellectual developments and imply that they are important.

[11 to 13 marks] responses will be more discerning in their understanding of intellectual development.

[14 to 16+ marks] answers will be structured, contain carefully selected evidence which is analysed and perhaps, at least for the top bands, may consider the interaction of intellectual and cultural.

12. Analyse the successes and failures of Napoleon III's domestic policies.

The dates for Napoleon III as emperor are 1852 to 1870, but allow discussion of events, 1848 to 1852. Judgement of which policies were successful and which were failures will no doubt vary, and the selection process will contribute to the assessment of the quality of the answer. Probably most candidates will call Napoleon's restoration of security against social unrest, the Paris Exhibition, various economic measures such as commercial treaties with Britain (e.g. the Cobden Treaty) and Russia, and his fiscal measures, a success. More debatable are his constitutional measures, the 1852 Constitution and the "liberal empire" with the relaxation of censorship.

Failures could be censorship, banishment of opponents, imprisonment without trial and the very nature of Napoleon's rule

[8 to 10 marks] would probably be awarded to narratives of the period with implicit comments on success or failure.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to answers with fuller accurate details and explicit distinction between success and failure.

[14 to 16+ marks] might be obtained by candidates who structure and focus well and carefully analyse Napoleon's rule pointing out that France was a prosperous country, trade had increased five fold, railways spread all over the country and emigration was low compared with Britain and Germany. But the question remains did domestic policy contribute towards the demise of the empire?

13. Examine the impact during the nineteenth century of (a) *one* Scandinavian country on Europe, and (b) Europe on *one* Scandinavian country.

This is an opportunity for Scandinavian students to use the history of their own country. Allow the widest interpretation of Scandinavia, and note that either the same country can be used for both (a) and (b) or a different one can be used for each. (a) requires specific details and analysis of events where the chosen country affected general European history, such as Denmark with Bismarck and German unification. (b) could include specific events - again Denmark and war with Prussia and Austria over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein or general movements such as the spread of railways or the industrial revolution.

[8 to 10 marks] will be awarded to answers which tend to narrate but contain at least implicit mention of impact.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will be fuller, more balanced between (a) and (b), and have better focus on impact.

[14 to 16+ marks] should be scored by well structured and analytical essays. If only part (a), or part (b) is attempted mark out of *[12 marks]*.

14. Account for the weakness and decline of Austria-Hungary between 1867 and 1914.

The dates 1867 to 1914 cover the period from the Ausgleich (Compromise) to the outbreak of the First World War. Reasons for weakness could include the actual terms and nature of the Ausgleich whereby Hungary felt disadvantaged and tried to change the terms such as the economic clauses in 1897, and relations with the military, as well as reasons for the joining of the two countries, and defeat in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. Other causes include the distrust of the smaller and weaker nationalities, the European situation especially in relation to the decline of the Turkish Empire, the strength of Bismarck's Germany, politically and economically which left Austria behind, rivalry with Russia in the Balkans *etc.* No doubt candidates will then recount the causes of the First World War! Candidates could of course always challenge "weakness and decline" and proclaim her strength in 1914.

[7 marks] maximum should be given for causes of the First World War.

[8 to 10 marks] might be awarded for a narrative of 1867 to 1914 with emphasis on events leading up to 1914, and implicit weakness.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will be more balanced, with better focus on weakness and decline.

[14 to 16 marks] answers will probably cover the whole period with full accurate details and some depth of analysis.

[16+ marks] answers could stand out because of perceptive comment and analysis about the relations between Austria and Hungary, or because of a challenge to the assumption of a steady decline between 1867 and 1914.

15. **“Much of Lenin’s success was no doubt explained by his towering domination over his [Bolshevik] party.” To what extent does this explanation account for his rise to power and rule, 1917 to 1924?**

This quotation gives candidates the opportunity to analyse the reasons for Lenin obtaining power in the second (October/November) revolution, establishing Bolshevik control, and keeping himself and his party in power and ruling the USSR until his death in 1924, in spite of civil war, famine, and opposition inside and outside the country. Lenin’s character, relationship with his party, was he a despot who managed to gain his will always within the Bolshevik party, and was there potential opposition there? External factors such as the failure of the Provisional government, and both the First World War and the Russian Civil War could all be considered.

[8 to 10 marks] will probably be awarded to those who narrate the period 1917 to 1924 with only implicit reference to the quotation.

[11 to 13 marks] answers will display better detail and explanation of Lenin’s superiority within the Bolshevik party.

[14 to 16 marks] could be scored with structured analytical responses which consider in a balanced way Lenin’s strengths, the Bolshevik party, and other factors.

[16+ marks] answers could answer clearly “to what extent” and note that Lenin was scarcely in control after his stroke in 1922.

16. **In what ways and for what reasons did the Treaty of Versailles cause political problems in the 1920s in Europe, for both the victorious and the defeated nations?**

The question asks how and why the Treaty of Versailles (and not the other treaties after the First World War) caused political problems in Europe. Thus social and economic troubles caused by this treaty would only be relevant in so far as they brought about political problems. Answers confined to Germany would probably not deserve more than **[10 marks]**, but would be adequate for ‘defeated’ nations. The victorious nations should include Britain, France and Italy.

In what ways could include formulating the treaty, which caused political problems in Britain, France, Germany and Italy; the terms *e.g.* German losses, the war guilt clause *etc.* antagonised the German people and weakened the Weimar Republic; reparations were criticised by both winners and losers for different reasons; boundary changes divided nationalities, *eg.* Danzig, the Saar. For what reasons could include war losses hence the demand for reparations; Germany was not allowed to attend; wish for revenge; boundary changes; used as a scapegoat by the Nazi *etc.* This subject should be known well, but do not demand all the above.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably describe the treaty and imply some reasons for problems.

[11 to 13 marks] will be scored with adequate accurate detail and some explicit reasons for the problems the treaty caused, and some separation of victors and defeated.

[14 to 16+ marks] could be obtained with structured and analytical treatment of ways and reasons and in the top bands some sophistication or perhaps historiography would be apparent.

N.B. The League of Nations was incorporated into the treaty so it could be made relevant but do not demand it, and note the time period, 1920s.

17. What is meant by a search for collective security, why was it necessary and how successful were European countries in their search between 1919 and 1939?

Collective security suggests preserving peace through international treaties and agreements, settling disputes through negotiations, reducing armaments and conducting open diplomacy as stated in the covenant of the League of Nations. Why it was necessary could be explained as a means of avoiding another war of the horrific proportions of the First World War and avoiding the mistakes of 1914. This could be adequate but also credit those who understand it to mean lack of confidence in the League of Nations, hence the other treaties and alliances such as Locarno and Rapallo. How successful could include twenty years of peace, some successes of the League, the spirit of co-operation with Locarno and Rapallo, but the rise and rule of various dictators and war in 1939 showed its failure. Be flexible in marking; the question could be answered in three parts or as a whole.

[8 to 10 marks] essays will perhaps describe events 1919 to 1939 with implicit focus on the question.

[11 to 13 marks] responses should be better balanced between the three parts, and be more explicit in assessment.

[14 to 16+ marks] could be scored by those who define collective security, evaluate its necessity and analyse its success and failure.

18. Evaluate Mussolini's rule in Italy between 1922 and 1940.

Candidates should understand this to begin in October 1922, when King Victor Emmanuel asked Mussolini to form a government, and end in 1940 when Italy entered the Second World War.

Rule could encompass all policies, domestic and foreign. A selection to evaluate could include, Mussolini's autocratic regime with intimidation and propaganda, the one party state, relations with the Catholic Church and the Concordat with the papacy, social and economic measures including the 'battles'. Mussolini exhibited fierce nationalism at home and abroad but there was little overt expansionism until the mid 1930s, when policies included Abyssinia, the Spanish Civil War and the Pact of Steel with Hitler.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably consist of a chronological account with comments.

[11 to 13 marks] answers could be more critical and discriminating.

[14 to 16+ marks] essays should be structured, balanced with both domestic and foreign policy addressed and the evaluation will contain some depth of analysis.

19. Assess the impact of political and constitutional developments in *either* Spain between 1930 and 1939, *or* Portugal between 1968 and 1976.

The main developments in Spain that should be assessed are: 1930 the resignation of Primo de Rivera; 1931 the abdication of King Alfonso XIII; 1931 to 1936 changes of government and left and right policies; 1936 to 1939 civil war; 1939 Franco in power.

For Portugal developments to be discussed are: 1968 fall of Salazar and Caetano in power; 1968 to 1974 Caetano largely follows Salazar's policies; 1974 military coup; 1974 to 1976 political instability; 1976 Antonio Eames elected president and a more stable democracy began to emerge.

[8 to 10 marks] answers may describe developments between the given dates.

[11 to 13 marks] will probably be chronological, but will have some explicit assessment of political and constitutional developments.

[14 to 16 marks] for well focused, detailed assessment; higher with fuller detail and analysis.

20. Examine the effects of Nazi Germany on *either* one Scandinavian *or* on one east *or* central European country (excluding USSR and Germany).

The intention of this question is to give candidates in for example Scandinavia, Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, an opportunity to use their knowledge of their own country, but to avoid overlap, hence the rather cumbersome phraseology. The period covered is 1933 to 1945, pre-war and during the Second World War. The pre-war period could include Nazi infiltration, the Anschluss for Austria, Sudetenland for Czechoslovakia. War time might cover Nazi occupation, concentration camps, resistance movements, and use of resources. Specific details will depend on the country chosen.

[8 to 10 marks] will probably be awarded to answers which highlight the main events and at least imply their effects.

[11 to 13 marks] could be gained with good detail and comments on immediate effects.

[14 to 16+ marks] answers will focus on effects for both the short and long term. Answers will address both political and constitutional elements and assess their impact on the chosen country.

21. Account for the defeat of Germany and her allies in the Second World War.

Germany's allies at some stage in the war included Finland, Hungary, Italy, Japan, and USSR. Some comment should be made about them, whether they helped or hindered Germany's war effort. The main reasons for Germany's ultimate defeat could include an examination of some of the following: the larger forces of the allies, with the British Commonwealth and especially with the entry of the United States and her resources; Germany was overstretched firstly in North Africa and most of all in Russia; failure of German tactics especially the blitz on Britain and the invasion of Russia; failure of command with Hitler in control and not trusting his generals; failure of war materials and other resources; loss of morale; resistance movements.

N.B. this is a European paper and need not include the defeat of Japan.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably outline some of the above reasons or perhaps some of the events implying that the failure of these campaigns accounted for Germany's defeat.

[11 to 13 marks] might be awarded to more discerning narratives which emphasise German failure.

[14 to 16 marks] would be scored by structured analytical and convincing arguments.

[17+ marks] could be reached with depth of analysis and insight.

22. For what reasons and with what results was western Europe affected by the Cold War after 1945?

Reasons could include the obvious, the split between east and west after 1945 and the situation with two super powers; ideology communism versus democracy; practical points, the nearness of the "iron curtain"; fear; dependence on American aid *etc.* Results should include both those general to western Europe and those relating to specific countries. General results to discuss could be anti-Communist feeling, American support such as Marshall Aid, US troops in western Europe, money and resources allocated to defence. Discussion on specific countries could include how the general areas affected for example France or Germany, Germany split into east and west, the problems of countries bordering the Soviet satellites, and the Berlin Wall.

N.B. no end date is given in order to allow candidates to utilise their own knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably recount some of the main events in the Cold War and describe how they effected Western Europe.

[11 to 13 marks] could be scored with clearer emphasis on reasons and results.

[14 to 16 marks] answers should be structured and analyse the reasons and results.

[17+ marks] might be given to well balanced answers which also grasp finer points in perhaps foreign policy and the tensions caused by the Cold War in the west.

23. Compare and contrast the policies of Khrushchev and Gorbachev.

Khrushchev's period in power was 1958 to 1964, and Gorbachev's 1988 to 1991.

For comparison both leaders distanced themselves from Stalin, Khrushchev with destalinisation, and Gorbachev with perestroika [reform] and glasnost [openness]; both tried to implement various economic reforms and generally failed; both at least favoured some detente. In contrast the policies of Gorbachev were much more radical and his period as head of state of the Soviet Union saw the collapse of communism both in the USSR and in Eastern Europe and thus the end of the Cold War - at least in theory. Khrushchev blew hot and cold in relation to the Cold War and detente. He made various overseas visits but crushed the Hungarian Rising and installed missiles in Cuba after which a hot line was established with the USA. Gorbachev ended the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and withdrew Soviet troops from Eastern Europe.

If only Khrushchev or Gorbachev is addressed **[8 marks]** cannot be reached.

[8 to 10 marks] answers will probably consist of end on accounts of both leaders with some linkage either throughout or at the end.

[11 to 13 marks] could be scored by fuller end on accounts with better linkage or, a comparative structure that has some weakness.

[14 to 16+ marks] answers will be clearly structured in a comparative framework, and contain relevant details and analysis.

24. Analyse political and economic changes since 1953 in either one central or east European country (excluding USSR).

The years 1953 to about 1990 which is the end of the syllabus cover the later communist era from the death of Stalin to the uprisings and the demise of communism in complete control of the USSR and its satellites. Political changes and economic advancement were in many countries slow and attempts to introduce them painful, but trade union growth such as Solidarity would be relevant. Of course using a non communist country, for example Austria, would be valid. The USSR is excluded from this question in order to avoid overlap with question 23.

[8 to 10 marks] answers would probably be mainly narrative, with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] would be more detailed and the assessment more explicit.

[14 to 16+ marks] should be awarded to well structured answers, focused on changes which will be analysed, with some depth at least for the top bands.

25. Examine the impact on *one* European country of, *either* educational reforms *or* artistic movements.

This is a completely open question, any European country, at any period during the syllabus can be chosen. Marks will be awarded according to knowledge, relevance and focus on impact.

[8 to 10 marks] answers may be mostly descriptive.

[11 to 13 marks] will examine their chosen topic and country.

[14 to 16+ marks] may be specific, relevant, perceptive and include analysis and perhaps originality.
