

INTERNATIONAL
BACCALAURÉAT
BACHILLERATO



BACCALAUREATE
INTERNATIONAL
INTERNACIONAL

N02/315/H(3)M+

MARKSCHEME

November 2002

HISTORY - EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

1. Why was Louis XVI executed in 1793?

Following the events of 1789 and the Constitution of 1791, it would appear as if the Revolutionaries should have been content with their successes. Four main reasons for the radicalization of the Convention can explain why Louis was executed:

- (a) The war with other European powers.
- (b) The shift of power between the Jacobins and the Girondins.
- (c) The revolt in the Vendée.
- (d) The ascension of radicals such as Robespierre and Danton.

When Louis tried to flee and was apprehended at Varennes, his fate was sealed.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events in the French Revolution is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some understanding of the direction in which the Revolution was heading and some understanding of Louis' role within it, but would not require all four of the factors listed above.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between Louis' actions and his execution but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate clear understanding and a sound analysis of the factors which led to Louis' execution.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

2. “When one thinks of Napoleon, one thinks of war.” Discuss Napoleon’s use of war as a means of achieving his goals outside France between 1800 and 1815.

Candidates will have to identify what they understand to be Napoleon’s initial goals which could include defeat of Britain and the establishment of a dynastic empire. Better candidates will realize that these goals changed after his defeat at Trafalgar which affected events in the Iberian Peninsula and Russia. The main emphasis must be on how Napoleon used war to achieve his aims. There might be passing mention of domestic issues but the question specifies “outside France” and this must be the main focus of the answer.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Napoleon’s policies is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some mention of Napoleon’s goals but the response might not have a clear understanding of how war related to them.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between Napoleon’s goals and his use of war, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear understanding and some assessment of the relationship between Napoleon’s goals and his use of war.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, linking cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

3. Why did the Congress System collapse after 1822?

Candidates should first define what they understand by the term Congress System. They might go back to the establishment of the Quadruple Alliance arguing that this was where there was a clear attempt at resolving issues through a Congress or they might start with Aix-la Chapelle in 1818 with the establishment of the Quintuple Alliance. Troppau, Laibach and Verona must be included along with an analysis of the role of the Holy Alliance and Castlereagh’s May 5 1820 note. Better candidates might discuss the differing aims of the Great Powers and the respective roles of their rulers.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the Congress System is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some basic understanding of the reasons behind the demise of the Congress System but still at a descriptive level.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed some basic awareness of the linkage between events and consequences by giving specific examples, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear understanding of the role of the leaders of the Great Powers and their differing reactions to events in Europe/South America between 1815–1822, which led to a division between them.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

4. How successful were the foreign policies followed by Palmerston both as Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister?

Candidates should be aware of Palmerston's role in both positions. He was Foreign Secretary in three Whig governments (1830–1834, 1835–1841 and 1846–1851) and Prime Minister between 1855 and 1865 when he died in office. Candidates must evaluate the success of his foreign policies which were involved with Belgium in 1830, British involvement in the Opium War, Egypt, Austria prior to 1848, the 1848 Revolutions, Greece, the Crimean War, Italian unification, and the American Civil War. While not all of these events need to be included, candidates must demonstrate a sound knowledge of several of them.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Palmerston's policies is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge and understanding of some of Palmerston's policies and might include a very superficial attempt at determining their success or failure.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a sound knowledge and understanding of Palmerston's policies and would include a clear attempt at determining their success or failure but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication in the arguments presented and include a sound analysis of the success of Palmerston's policies.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

5. How united was Italy by 1871?

Candidates should refer back to the Congress of Vienna to show the state of the Italian territories in 1815 and should chronologically discuss the stages through which Italy went before it was unified in 1871. These could include the Carbonari movement, the 1848 Revolutions, the effect of the Crimean War, the role of Napoleon III, the influence of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini and the role of foreign powers. Better candidates will realize that, although Italy was geographically and politically united, there was still some question about how united it really was as a nation in 1871.

[0 to 7 marks] if a simplistic listing of the events behind Italian unification is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge of the events, but also some basic understanding of how they related to the process of unification.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between events in Italy and unification, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require candidates to demonstrate a clear understanding of the complexity of the process of Italian unification including some, but not all, of the factors mentioned above

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, linking cause-effect relationships at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

6. Analyse the effects of the 1848 Revolution in Prussia on the eventual unification of Germany in 1871.

Candidates should discuss what actually happened in Prussia in 1848 and show what effects this had on Germany between 1848 and 1850. Mention should be made of the Frankfurt Assembly, the Erfurt Union and the Capitulation of Olmütz. Candidates should then discuss the role of Bismarck in German unification and the reasons behind the decline of Austria to the benefit of Prussia. Candidates are expected to focus their responses on the entire time period and not to make this question into a Bismarck and German unification question.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the events leading to German unification is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some understanding of the importance of 1848 to the political process, but at a very basic level.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear relationship between the events of 1848 and 1871, but in which any analysis was not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear analysis of the cause-effect relationship between 1848 and 1871.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for sound analytical responses which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

7. “The most dangerous moment for a bad government is usually when it begins to reform itself.” How far do you agree with this assessment of Russia under Alexander II?

Candidates are expected to have a sound knowledge of the actions and policies of Alexander II’s government which should include the Emancipation of the Serfs, the educational, administrative, judicial and military reforms. Candidates should then be able to discuss the extent to which this government was ‘bad’- which would lead into a discussion of why it was that Alexander’s government felt it necessary to implement reforms. Better candidates will then examine the notion of why this may or may not have been dangerous to Alexander’s government.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Alexander’s reforms is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge of the reforms and a basic understanding of why they were implemented.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed an understanding of the effect that these reforms had on the people of Russia and, at a simplistic level, why these may have been dangerous.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear understanding of the relationship between the need for reforms, whether the government was indeed “bad” and the extent to which the implementation of the reforms was dangerous, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, linking cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

8. In what ways can the 1878 Congress of Berlin be seen as a turning point in the Eastern Question?

Candidates are expected to have some knowledge of what the phrase “the Eastern Question” involves. It would be possible to go back to the Congress System, but the majority of responses will probably start with the Crimean War. Candidates should then discuss the Balkan War and the Treaty of San Stefano, have some knowledge of the terms of the Congress of Berlin, and show how these terms affected countries and territories in the Balkans. Better candidates will develop this through the 1908 and 1912 crises in the Balkans which ultimately led to World War I. For high marks candidates should evaluate whether or not the Congress of Berlin can be seen as a turning point in European affairs.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the terms of the Congress of Berlin, without any discussion of what the “Eastern Question” entails, are given this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some understanding of the phrase Eastern Question and some knowledge of the terms of the Congress of Berlin.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which were able to discuss the notion of the Congress being a turning point in European affairs, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear understanding of the importance of the Congress of Berlin to Europe. There should be a clear attempt at arguing whether or not this Congress was a “turning point” although the analysis may not be fully developed

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, show the importance of the Congress of Berlin as a turning point, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

9. Assess the impact upon Germany and Europe, between 1888 and 1914, of Kaiser Wilhelm II's accession to power.

Candidates should be aware of the differences between Wilhelm I's and Wilhelm II's perceptions of the role of Germany in world affairs and the effect that this had upon policy making. Wilhelm II's relationship with Bismarck will be important, but this is only a small part of the question. Wilhelm's desire for an overseas empire and his relationships with later Chancellors and the military high command should be another key area upon which candidates should focus. The question also requires candidates to include Europe and not just Germany in their answers.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events in Germany between 1888 and 1914 is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge of events and a marginal understanding of the policies that Germany followed under Wilhelm.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a cause-effect relationship between Wilhelm's accession to power and his impact on Germany and Europe, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophisticated analysis and demonstrate both a sound understanding and a reasoned assessment of Wilhelm II's effect on both Germany and Europe.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for purely analytical responses which may show evidence of outside reading.

10. How successful, economically and politically, was European imperialism between 1885 and 1910?

Candidates who have studied this topic in depth should make reference to Hobson, Lenin and Robinson and Gallagher's analyses of the economic success of imperialism and responses such as these will receive appropriately high marks. Weaker candidates will attempt to twist their knowledge of the causes of World War I into a full answer, and it is unlikely that they will have sufficient depth of knowledge to produce more than a superficial response. It is intended that the Berlin Conference of 1885 be the starting point for most answers and that candidates will be able to cite specific details concerning a number of Great Powers in judging how successful their imperial policies were both economically and politically.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of imperial policies from a number of countries is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge and a basic understanding of what imperialism entailed and might make a superficial attempt at assessing either its economic or political success.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed greater knowledge and a deeper understanding of what imperialism entailed and which might make a superficial attempt at assessing both its economic and political success but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require answers to show a developed analysis of imperialism's economic and political success at a relatively sophisticated level.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which should show evidence of outside reading.

11. Assess the effects of any *one* of the following on nineteenth-century social and political thought: romanticism; the arts; scientific development.

Candidates should only select one of the three options and then explain/define it, and clearly demonstrate its effect on both social and political thought. Candidates are expected to give several examples through which they can support their arguments.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description is given without any attempt at discussing its effect this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge of the chosen subject and a basic understanding of the effects of the candidate's choice on either social or political thought in the nineteenth century.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between the chosen subject and its effects on both social and political thought, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear understanding of the effects on both social and political thought, supported by three or four soundly documented examples.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for purely analytical responses, linking cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which will show evidence of outside reading.

12. “He was out of touch with reality.” How far do you agree with this assessment of Louis Napoleon?

Candidates should be aware of Louis Napoleon’s role in French politics from *circa* 1836 to his overthrow in 1870. Although it is unlikely to be the entire focus of the answer better candidates should be aware of his attempted coups in 1836 and 1840. Most answers will deal with the time period from 1848 onwards and his victory in the presidential election. Following his coup d’état in 1851 and his becoming emperor in 1852 Louis Napoleon’s reign can be divided into two parts: the dictatorship which lasted until 1860; and his liberal period which included labour legislation, policies of free trade and the revival of political opposition parties which lasted until 1870. Louis Napoleon’s foreign exploits involve his role in the Crimean War, Italian unification, Mexico, Prussia and his involvement in German unification. Candidates should weigh up the relative success of his domestic and foreign policies and better candidates will be aware of the recent re-evaluation of his place in history. Whether candidates see Louis Napoleon as being out of touch with reality or not will depend on their assessment of his pragmatism.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Louis Napoleon’s policies is included this could receive up to **[7 marks]**.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge and a deeper understanding of the policies although there would not be an explicit linkage to their appropriateness for the time.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear understanding of the cause-effect relationship between policies and events. There would be some mention of their appropriateness but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require candidates to demonstrate a clear analysis of Louis Napoleon’s domestic and foreign policies, their appropriateness and include some assessment of how relevant they were.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses which demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, have a balanced assessment of his policies and which may show evidence of outside reading.

13. Assess the political and economic developments in any *one* Scandinavian country in either the nineteenth or the twentieth century.

Candidates should only select one country in one century and identify its political and economic developments. These developments should then be soundly evaluated to assess their effect on the respective country. Finland is considered by the History Guide to be in Scandinavia along with Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events in one country is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge and a basic understanding of either/or the political and economic developments in one country.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which show both knowledge and understanding of economic and political developments in one country, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication, understanding and assessment of both political and economic developments.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, linking cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

14. Assess the effects of the creation of the Bolshevik Party on Russia up to 1921.

Candidates should be aware of when the Bolshevik Party was formed-at the 1903 London Conference with the split between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. Lenin's role became important as the Bolshevik programme became more revolutionary with its ultimate aim being the establishment of a Communist society through revolution. The Bolsheviks played a minor role in the 1905 Revolution and the final split between the two groups occurred in 1912. The Bolsheviks opposed World War I and, following the March 1917 Revolution, promoted a radical programme attempting to expand the revolution towards socialism by establishing soviets of workers and soldiers. The Bolsheviks numbered about 240,000 by July 1917 and seized power in November 1917. Candidates should then be aware of their policies, the ending of World War I, and their resultant victory in the Russian Civil War. It is important that the full chronology be included in candidates' responses.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge and a basic understanding of the effect of the creation of the Bolshevik Party. Not all elements would be present.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed both understanding and some assessment of the effects on Russia that the Bolshevik Party had, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require a sound understanding, and a balanced assessment of the Bolshevik Party. The entire chronology would be included.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses at a sophisticated level and which may show evidence of outside reading.

15. How effectively did Stalin deal with domestic opposition between 1924 and 1953?

This will be a very popular question and Stalin is well known. Candidates should include Stalin's dealings with other members of the Communist Party, the kulaks and those who opposed his economic policies, his role in the Purges and Show Trials, his use of the secret police, his relationship with Beria, and his increasing fear of revolt from within the Soviet Union. The question asks for candidates to explain the effectiveness of Stalin's policies towards his opposition and candidates must not merely describe the policies. An analysis of their effectiveness is required to reach the higher mark bands. The question has a very specific chronology and candidates' responses must include mention of the time period following the end of World War II.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Stalin's policies is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge and a basic understanding of Stalinist Russia but would not include all of the chronology or all the events/policies.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed knowledge and understanding which would include a simple assessment of whether the policies were effective or not.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and demonstrate a clear understanding and a balanced assessment of the effectiveness of Stalin's policies towards his domestic opposition.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which assess Stalin's policies at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

16. “The Treaty of Versailles was fatally flawed.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates must be able to explain the background to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in June 1919 and then have a sound knowledge of the terms of the Treaty. Whether or not these terms were flawed can only be determined by assessing their impact in the time period 1919-1939, both on Germany and Europe. Candidates are expected to be able to identify which terms were flawed and give explanations as to why they did not produce their intended results. Some candidates may also argue that the Treaty was essentially sound, but that events/personalities affected whether or not the Treaty was able to fulfil its expectations.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the terms of Treaty is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge of the terms of the Treaty and a limited understanding of the question.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed both knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Versailles and a clear attempt at relating its effectiveness to the period but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require candidates to adopt a more analytical approach and to have a balanced assessment of whether Versailles was flawed or not, but not all aspects of the question might be included.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses which understand all the demands of the question, are focused on assessment, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

17. How far do you agree that the principles upon which the League of Nations was based were unsuitable for the political and economic realities of the 1920s?

Candidates are expected to be able to identify the main principles of the League of Nations and may make direct reference to its Covenant. These principles could include unanimous consent, abhorrence of war, disarmament, collective security, and the idealism of Wilson's 14 Points. Better answers might include recognition of the non-political aspects of the League's programme which would include the establishment of the ILO and the League's economic principles. Candidates should then determine whether or not these principles were unsuitable or unrealistic in the light of events in the 1920s. They must bear in mind, however, that the founders of the League did not have a crystal ball, and little of what is now known to us could have been predicted in 1920.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the policies of the League of Nations is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of the principles of the League but the full demands of the question would not be fully addressed.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between the realities of the time period and the effectiveness of the principles of the League, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require candidates to demonstrate a balanced analysis of the principles of the League, and relate these in an effective way to the exigencies of the time.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which include a sophisticated level of argument, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

18. How far do you agree that the Spanish Civil War was really an ideological struggle between fascism and communism?

Candidates should be aware of the fundamental causes of the Civil War in 1936 and it is unlikely that many of them will argue that, from its outset, the war was ideologically polarized between communism and fascism, although they might argue that the Cortes elections of 1936 showed the division between left and right. Candidates should be able to discuss the political stance of the governments in Spain between 1934 and 1936, and should conclude that the outbreak of the war had more to do with perceptions of Republicanism rather than being purely ideological. Candidates are then likely to argue that the war became more of an ideological struggle with the assistance of Italy and Germany to Franco's forces, and the support of the International Brigades and Russia to the Republican side.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the causes (or events) in the Spanish Civil War is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some understanding of the causes of the Civil War and relate these at a basic level to the notion of left/right.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which demonstrate a clearer understanding of the complexity of the Spanish Civil War although this would still be at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more analysis and an assessment of left/right or communist/fascist in ideological terms.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which completely understand the demands of the question and which may show evidence of outside reading.

19. In what ways did Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany differ ideologically?

This is a relatively straightforward question although candidates are frequently ill-prepared to answer questions on ideology. Weaker candidates will argue that the two ideologies are almost identical, the only difference being Nazi anti-Semitism. This type of analysis will usually only refer to policies/events and argue backwards e.g. “This event happened in Germany and because it happened Germany was Nazi”. Better candidates will recognize that, although having no clear spokesman, Italian Fascism has an eclectic strand to it by which its ideological basis can be discerned. They might make reference to the respective influence of Gentile, Pareto, Machiavelli, Sorel and von Treitschke in creating the national and anti-democratic basis of Fascism. Candidates could then demonstrate that Nazism built upon this foundation, but that it then included other components which clearly distinguish it from Fascism such as the emphasis on the Aryan concept, supported by the writings of Nietzsche, and a specific eugenic focus.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events/policies is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require some knowledge of the differences between Fascism and Nazism.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which begin to separate the two ideologies and have an understanding of their differences, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication and include an assessment of the differences between the two ideologies backed by well-selected supporting evidence.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses which demonstrate a sound understanding of the ideological differences between the two countries, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

20. Why, and with what effects on Europe, was the Nazi-Soviet Pact signed in August 1939?

Candidates should be able to explain the signing of the Pact from both the German and the Russian sides. Germany signed it to safeguard itself from Russia supporting the Poles, while Russia's signature had to do with policies towards Finland and the Baltic States, the desire for Polish territory and Russia's need to buy time to build up its military forces. The effects include the outbreak of World War II, the elimination of Poland, and Germany's attack on Russia in 1941. Better candidates will mention that this led to the development of the "Big Three" – Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, and, they could go on to argue, the direction this had on the Post-War settlements. It is important that candidates include both parts of the question for them to receive high marks.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events which led up to the Pact is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of the reasons why the Pact was signed.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which included the "why" and "with what effects", but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophistication, and a balanced assessment of both parts of the question, backed by well-selected evidence.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

21. Assess the impact of Nikita Khrushchev on both the Soviet Union and Europe between 1953 and 1964.

Candidates tend to remember Khrushchev primarily for his role in the Cuban Missile Conflict, which only has partial relevance to this question. Responses should make mention of his economic policies in the Soviet Union, Sputnik, "de-Stalinization", Peaceful Coexistence, the Hungarian Revolution, Khrushchev in Vienna, the Berlin Crisis, COMECON, Rumania and the movement away from the Warsaw Pact, and the effects of Khrushchev's resignation in 1964.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Khrushchev's policies is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of Khrushchev's role for Europe or the Soviet Union but at a relatively simple level.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear understanding and a balanced assessment of Khrushchev although not all aspects would be included.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more analysis and demonstrate a clear assessment of the impact of Khrushchev on both the Soviet Union and Europe.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which understand all of the demands of the question, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

22. Why did it take so long for Great Britain to become a member of the European Economic Community?

Candidates could start their responses in 1945 with the formation of the Council of Europe and subsequent developments which led to the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) from which Britain was excluded. The importance of the Commonwealth was another key factor in Britain's perception of her role in Europe and the World. The European Economic Community (EEC) was formed in 1967 and merged with the ECSC although Britain had already formed the European Free Trade Association. Britain's scepticism about the EEC and de Gaulle's opposition proved crucial in delaying its decision to join in 1973. American reactions and NATO are also factors which candidates should include.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of the reasons behind British policies.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between British policies and other factors, but at a relatively simple level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require analysis of British policies towards Europe and include an assessment of the importance of the role of other countries' attitudes as an explanation for the delay. There should be a focus on the chronology.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for analytical responses, which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

23. Why was the relationship between western and eastern Europe so hostile between 1946 and 1961?

This is really a question about the Cold War couched in a different framework. Candidates must include the entire chronology in their responses and could start with Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech in 1946 and culminate with the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961. The key focus must be on the positions of western and eastern Europe, and although the role of the United States is important with the Truman Doctrine and the establishment of Marshall Aid and NATO, the focus must be on Europe and European events. Candidates should include the formation of the Soviet bloc and the results of countries trying to break away from it and the reaction of western European countries to events in the east.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of events within Europe is included, or the essay is unfocused on the question, this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of the relationship between western and eastern Europe.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear cause-effect relationship between events in the west and east, and these would include assessment but it would be at a relatively simplistic level.

[14 to 16 marks] would require more sophisticated analysis, demonstrate a clear understanding of the factors which led to a hostile relationship, and include balanced assessment supported by well-chosen examples.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for entirely analytical responses, which link cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

24. Assess the influence of Tito on internal Yugoslav affairs between 1946 and 1970.

This is a very specific question on Yugoslav history and must be answered with direct reference to events within Yugoslav borders. Candidates should focus on Tito's desire to establish a cohesive state and create a distinctive Yugoslav identity within the Yugoslav state. Tito established a constitution in 1945, developed agricultural policies which were limited in their success, and encouraged industrial expansion. The constitution was later modified and Tito allowed open debate until it became dangerous to his position. He dealt with the problem of decentralization by creating a federation and renamed the Communist Party the League of Communists.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of Tito's policies is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of Tito's policies although at a fairly general level.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which showed a clear understanding of Tito's role in the development of Yugoslavia, although the assessment would not be fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] would require a more sophisticated analysis, deeper understanding and a sound evaluation of Tito's influence.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for purely analytical responses which may show evidence of outside reading.

25. “The impetus behind the movement for social and political equality between men and women has gone.” How far do you agree with this statement when analyzing the role of the feminist movement in Europe between 1975 and 1990?

Responses to questions on this subject tend to be rather subjective and unsupported by sound evidence and reasoning. Candidates must ensure that their answers are focused on the issues. There is increasing evidence that, despite the gains made by the feminist movement in the 1960s and 1970s, its relevance and political importance has declined in the last 25 years. Candidates must evaluate how true this statement really is by providing specific evidence to support or refute it. It is likely that candidates will refer to their own country, but the question requires responses to focus on Europe, and therefore examples should be drawn from several countries.

[0 to 7 marks] if a mere description of the issues involved in the feminist movement is included this could receive up to *[7 marks]*.

[8 to 10 marks] would require knowledge and some understanding of the issues involved in the feminist movement.

[11 to 13 marks] could be awarded to those answers which focus clearly on the question although any analysis is not fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] would require candidates to have a more sophisticated level of understanding and analysis. Responses would focus entirely on the demands of the question and specific examples would be included to support their arguments. Not all issues might be included.

[17 to 20 marks] should be reserved for purely analytical responses, which include reasoned arguments soundly supported by examples and which may show evidence of outside reading.
