

MARKSCHEME

November 2003

HISTORY – EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

1. What factors made it difficult to establish a limited monarchy in France between 1789 and 1792?

Candidates should first identify the key factors. These could include the character and actions of the king; divisions within the Assembly; fear of counter-revolution; the actions of revolutionary clubs; the discontent of the sans-culottes; the formation of the National Guard; the war and initial defeats. They should then explain why these contributed to the difficulty of creating a limited monarchy.

Candidates can and should identify both internal and external factors in their answer and these should be analysed. Merely descriptive accounts should not score highly.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which merely describe the events in France between 1789 and 1792.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which show some understanding of the factors involved but at a descriptive level.

[11 to 13 marks] for those answers which show some basic understanding of the factors involved and why they made it difficult to establish a limited monarchy.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with more sophistication and which demonstrate a clear relationship between the factors and the failure to establish a limited monarchy.

[17+ marks] essays would demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and may show evidence of outside reading.

2. To what extent did Napoleon apply the principles of the French Revolution in France and in the territories which he occupied?

Candidates should first identify what they consider to be the principles of the French Revolution. Many answers will focus on *Liberté, Égalité* and *Fraternité* although these were not uniform. Napoleon's actions in France and abroad can then be evaluated in light of these definitions. Candidates could include Napoleon's governmental, educational, legal and financial reforms but these were more consistently carried out in France than in the occupied territories. Better candidates will comment that the general applicability of these reforms was illusory.

Candidates should deal with both Napoleon's policies in France and abroad. No doubt more will be known about France, but reserve at least **[5 marks]** for "abroad".

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe Napoleon's policies but which do not relate them back to the French Revolution.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of principles with implicit connection between them and Napoleon's policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of principles and policies.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with greater detail, linked to principles, although the analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for essays which outline the principles, carefully select those policies which do/do not stem from the French Revolution and provide a clear analysis of the relationship between them.

3. Assess the influence of Metternich on Austria–Hungary and Europe between 1815 and 1848.

Candidates should first mention Metternich’s background and beliefs. He was born in the Rhineland and was an arch-reactionary. He believed that liberals and reformers were a danger to governments and to the monarchy and these beliefs guided his policies. In Austria–Hungary Metternich passed the Carlsbad Decrees, did not join the Zollverein, and his policies contributed to the outbreak of the 1848 Revolution in Austria. In Europe he was a mainstay of the Congress of Vienna and the Congress System, allowed Austria to become a member of the Holy Alliance, instituted the Troppau Protocol, and was instrumental in suppressing liberalism and nationalism in the Austro–Hungarian Empire. He was extremely influential although better candidates might note that his impact was greater in Europe than in Austria–Hungary itself.

Candidates must include both Austria–Hungary and Europe in their answers. If only one is included award up to a maximum of *[12 marks]*.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe Metternich’s policies at a simplistic level.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which show a more detailed knowledge of policies/events but which have not made any attempt at assessing Metternich’s influence.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account and some assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with a clear appreciation of cause/effect relationship between Metternich’s policies and events both in Austria–Hungary and Europe and assessment at a greater depth.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate cause-effect at a very sophisticated level, and may show evidence of outside reading.

4. Evaluate the success of the Chartist Movement in Britain between 1838 and 1848.

Candidates should first explain what the Chartist Movement was. They could mention that it was a popular movement for electoral and social reform and it came from the London Working Man's Association led by Francis Place and William Lovett. The House of Commons rejected the specific demands of the Charter and the movement became nationwide. When Parliament again rejected the Charter, the Chartists planned a general strike which failed. Despite further attempts with different petitions Chartism went into decline by 1848. Eventually all of its demands became law.

Candidates are required to evaluate the movement and should make some judgement that it had early successes, had ultimately failed by 1848, but that many of its proposals became law in the nineteenth century.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe the Chartist Movement briefly.

[8 to 10 marks] for more detailed knowledge but evaluation might be minimal or implicit.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers with more detail and which have begun to evaluate the Movement's failure.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with more detailed knowledge and a deeper level of evaluation although not all of the points might be covered.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate detailed, well-selected knowledge and a high degree of sophistication in the evaluation of the Movement's failure. These answers should show awareness of the later success in achieving the aims of the Chartist movement.

5. Why was Mazzini disappointed by the united Italy that emerged after 1871?

Candidates should outline Mazzini's ideas of republican government and make reference to Young Italy and the Roman Republic in their answers. They should then carefully examine the form of government which Italy had adopted by 1871, the nature of the state which emerged after 1871, and see how far this met Mazzini's aims and principles. Better candidates will note that, although Italy was united in geographical terms there were divisions between the north and the south and governmental policies were not always national policies. The circumstances behind the formation of the new kingdom also created new problems for the state and its people.

N.B. Mazzini died in 1872. Many candidates will probably understand this question to mean: what were Mazzini's aims for a united Italy; why was Italy not united in the way Mazzini wanted, how was it united (and it is legitimate to introduce Cavour and Garibaldi here) and why did post 1871 Italy disappoint Mazzini?

[0 to 7 marks] for essays which demonstrate a simple descriptive knowledge of the state of Italy in 1871.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which outline both Mazzini's aims, and the way Italy was united.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which show how and why the Italy of 1871 disappointed Mazzini.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which demonstrate a clear relationship between Mazzini's goals for Italy and the failure of Italy to meet these goals, although the level of analysis might not be very sophisticated.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate cause-effect at a very sophisticated level, and may show evidence of outside reading appropriately applied.

6. What common factors caused the 1848/9 revolutions in Europe to fail?

Candidates should mention the role of the military, the ultimate strength of the governments, the lack of resolve among the revolutionaries and the conflicting aims of the revolutionary groups. Better candidates might note that, in the long run, it may be questioned whether the revolutions did fail in that they laid the foundation for future changes in government. Reference should be made to the revolutions in France, Italy, Germany and Austria–Hungary.

This is a very straightforward question and the only pitfall is that candidates may not include all of the revolutions. (Italy can be treated as a whole: do not insist on details of all the revolutionary areas in Italy.) The intention is for candidates to look at general European trends rather than specific countries and “common factors” should be the main focus of any answer. Candidates could note that there were specific factors, which applied to each country, but these should be placed in a wider perspective.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which only focus on one revolution at a descriptive level.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which begin to identify at a basic level some common relationships among two or three revolutions.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which include all of the revolutions, but where the identification of common factors is still relatively unsophisticated.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which identify at least three common factors among all revolutions and make a cause/effect connection between them.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate a sophisticated analytical approach with well selected supporting evidence.

7. “Alexander II had no one to blame but himself for his assassination in 1881.” How far do you agree with this statement?

The question requires candidates to identify and examine Alexander’s actions and policies, the motives behind them and the extent to which their results led to his assassination. Weaker candidates may limit their answers to the emancipation of the serfs whereas better responses would include an analysis of problems and attempted solutions which led to expectations of change by groups from differing backgrounds. These expectations were largely unfulfilled which led to radical revolutionary activity and attempts on Alexander’s life. Marks should be awarded for exact focus, clear argument and depth of analysis.

[0 to 7 marks] for descriptive and simplistic accounts of actions/policies carried out by Alexander which will be incomplete.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of Alexander’s actions/policies and their results but with only very superficial/implicit linkage to his motives/results.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of Alexander’s actions/policies and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement.

[14 to 16 marks] for appropriately selected actions/policies, where the line of argument is clearer and where it is supported by solid evidence of Alexander’s culpability although analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully select those actions/policies that support/refute the statement and which provide a clear, consistent and thorough analysis of the relationship between them and the question.

8. To what extent were Bismarck's difficulties inside Germany between 1871 and 1890 caused by his own views and policies?

Candidates should first identify Bismarck's own attitudes and policies. He was a Prussian aristocrat, (a Junker), conservative socially but not politically and desired unification of Germany under Prussian control. At various times Bismarck had difficulties with the Reichstag, the monarchs, the Liberals, the Catholic Church, the Socialists and the Conservatives. Candidates should carefully evaluate the extent to which these difficulties were caused by his attitudes and policies. Although the main focus of this question is domestic, better candidates will note that some of Bismarck's foreign policies had domestic ramifications *e.g.* the Balkans and Africa.

It is important that candidates make a clear connection between the two parts of the question.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which merely list Bismarck's policies.

[8 to 10 marks] should be given to answers which can identify what Bismarck's difficulties actually entailed.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which have begun to identify Bismarck's attitudes and policies and which have linked them to his difficulties within Germany, but have not fully developed them.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which carry out a deeper analysis using the same guidelines.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate a clear linkage between attitudes, policies and difficulties and a sophisticated analysis of the relationship between them.

9. Why was the Eastern Question so important to Europe in the latter half of the nineteenth century?

Initially candidates should explain what they understand by the term “Eastern Question” and give a simple definition of the phrase. They should then continue by detailing the issues which it involves. Mention could be made of The Crimean War, access to the Mediterranean, the Balkans, Bulgaria, Greece, and the Ottoman Empire - although not all of these need be included. Answers should then focus on the reasons why these issues were so important to Europe and mention the break up of the Holy Alliance, The Crimean War, the Congress of Berlin, and the Balkan issues. Ultimately, better candidates might note that the failure to resolve these issues led to the outbreak of the First World War.

It is crucial that in their answers candidates relate the Eastern Question to Europe and clearly demonstrate why it was so important. Responses, which omit this connection are unlikely to be awarded more than **[8 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers that can explain what the Eastern Question entailed or give a brief description of it.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which begin to explain the relationship between the Eastern Question and Europe.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which go into more detail and which have a deeper level of analysis although the arguments might not be fully developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with an analysis of the cause/effect relationship and a clear argument as to why the Eastern Question was so important to Europe.

[17+ marks] for essays demonstrating a balanced understanding of the issues including well developed analysis, supported by well-selected examples.

10. What impact did emigration have on any *one* European country in the nineteenth century?

Candidates should note that there were two types of emigration with different causes: voluntary emigration due to the desire for political or economic change (*e.g.* Ireland), and forced emigration due to war or occupation (*e.g.* Poland). The latter type of emigration will bring up the question of refugees. Candidates should not confuse migration and emigration. The question is focused on families or groups leaving a particular territory or country - not on the migration from the countryside to the cities which was a common feature of many nineteenth century European countries. Candidates have a wide degree of choice here but ensure that the responses discuss the impact of emigration on whichever country they choose, not the fact of emigration itself.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which simply describe emigration movements without much detailed knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for essays which attempt to define emigration and which begin to discuss how it affected a single country.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which extend this analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers that are analytical, balanced and supported by sound knowledge but which lack the sophistication to achieve the next markband.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate a cause-effect relationship at a sophisticated level, and which may show evidence of outside reading.

11. Compare and contrast the impact of nationalism on any two European countries in the nineteenth century.

Candidates should attempt to define the term nationalism in its nineteenth century context. It usually meant the desire for small states to assert their unity and independence in opposition to any ruler, (whether foreign or not), who was denying them this right. Candidates should note that nationalism took many forms - including cultural as well as political - and frequently was linked to liberal constitutionalism. They should then select two countries and show why nationalism was so important to them by making specific reference to policies and events within these countries.

The question deliberately asks for the whole of the nineteenth century to be included to prevent candidates from focusing on a very narrow time frame. If only one country is included candidates should not receive more than **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe nationalism but with little focus on the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which can define nationalism and which describe it in any two countries.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which move away from description to at least implicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which demonstrate deeper analysis and soundly selected supporting material from two countries.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate the multi-faceted nature of nationalism and include specific relevant knowledge which supports the arguments in the essay.

12. For what reasons did political change occur *either* in Spain *or* in France between 1848 and 1914?

Spain

Candidates should explain what political changes occurred by making reference to the following: the reign of Isabella, the “Glorious Revolution” of 1868, Amadeus and the Carlist movement, the proclamation of the first Spanish Republic, the Bourbon restoration, and the policies of Maura and Canalejas. There is a thread running through here of monarchy versus republicanism and this is the fundamental reason why changes occurred. Candidates may make reference to events outside Spain *e.g.* Cuba but only to the extent that they affected Spain internally.

France

Candidates should explain what political changes occurred by making reference to the following: Louis Philippe, the 1848 Revolutions, Napoleon III’s policies, the war with Prussia, the Paris Commune, the Third Republic’s policies, Boulanger, the Dreyfus Affair and early twentieth century events. Again the thread is monarchy/empire versus republicanism although the Third Republic had other issues which caused change. Candidates may make reference to events outside France (*e.g.* Mexico) and events which led to the outbreak of the First World War.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe some changes in either country.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which begin to identify some reasons for change but which lack analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which are able to illustrate the cause-effect relationship between events and change but are under developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which show better linkage of cause-effect supported by a clear explanation of why changes occurred.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate sophisticated analysis with explanation and justification of change which is supported by relevant examples.

13. Assess the importance of *either* any *one* Scandinavian country *or* Finland in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century.

Candidates are at liberty to choose any country from Norway, Sweden, Denmark or Finland. Answers must be related to the time period between 1900 and 1950 and candidates must ensure that there is an explicit connection made between the selected country and its importance in European affairs. Obvious relationships can be made with individual countries and events in the First and Second World Wars. Finland's relationship with Russia and the Soviet Union would also be an appropriate choice.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which identify or describe the events that occurred in their chosen country.

[8 to 10 marks] for essays which link these changes to Europe but which lack explicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which begin to assess more explicitly the importance of their chosen country.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which demonstrate deeper analysis of the importance of the country with a clear linkage of this analysis to well chosen examples. Not all points are covered.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate sophisticated analysis, with a balanced assessment supported by well selected examples.

14. Why did Germany sign an armistice with the Allies in November 1918?

The answer can be divided into two sections: military and non-military. Firstly, military/tactical which could include poor tactics, the strength of the Allies, British control of the seas, the U-Boat campaign and the entry of the USA to First World War in 1917, weakness of Germany's Allies and military defeats. Secondly, internal disorganization and economic collapse - which could include the resignation and abdication of the Kaiser, the Republics set up in Berlin and Munich, the refusal of sailors/soldiers to fight, economic bankruptcy and fear of a Bolshevik-style Revolution in Germany. Better candidates might include German negotiations with the USA over expected peace terms. If answers include only the military aspects or the internal disorganization within Germany they should probably receive no more than *[12 marks]*.

[0 to 7 marks] for limited accounts of events in the First World War which may not be entirely relevant to the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers which begin to investigate why Germany signed the armistice but at a very superficial level.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of the reasons behind the signing of the armistice and which start to develop arguments explaining why Germany signed it.

[14 to 16 marks] for essays where the line of argument is more developed and where clearer lines of analysis are included.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully analyse the reasons which explain why Germany signed the armistice and which provide a clear, consistent and thorough analysis of them, (perhaps concluding that it was, and has continued to be, a very controversial issue).

15. What was the impact of the First World War on Russia between 1914 and 1921?

Candidates should be able to identify the basic events and their consequences. Mention could be made of the war itself and early campaigns; the economic effects of the war which led to hardship; the political effects which ultimately led to the February and October Revolutions and the establishment of the Bolshevik state; the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; the failure of Russia to become a member of the League of Nations; and the attitude of former allies to the Civil War.

Candidates should cover the entire chronology (and not limit themselves to an answer which focuses almost entirely on the Russian Revolutions) in order to reach the higher bands.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe the events that are applicable to Russia.

[8 to 10 marks] for answers which begin to show how events in Russia were linked to the First World War. Any analysis might be implicit.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which develop the relationship between the war and events in Russia in more detail.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with more detailed analysis supported by relevant specific material.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate a perceptive analysis of the interrelationship between the war and Russia, supported by well-selected examples and which may show evidence of wider reading.

16. What were the main factors that enabled Mussolini to rise to power, and consolidate his position in Italy, between 1918 and 1926?

Candidates should be able to identify the main contributory factors behind Mussolini's accession to power. These include dissatisfaction with the results of the First World War; economic depression; political instability; support by industrialists; the weakness of the monarchs and the rise of Fascism. Candidates should go beyond the March on Rome in 1922 and should include post-1922 events such as the Acerbo Electoral Law; the Matteotti affair; the Vidoni Agreement and the consolidation of Mussolini's Fascist state. Fear of communism and the elimination of opposition are also important points which should be mentioned.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe events in Italy between 1918 and 1926.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which provide a simple linkage between these events and Mussolini's accession to power.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which develop this linkage in more detail.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which develop an analysis and support for a thesis backed up by evidence.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate sophisticated analysis supported by relevant material and a balanced assessment of how Mussolini rose to and consolidated power.

17. What were the aims and achievements of Stalin's foreign policy between 1928 and 1941?

Candidates should identify both the aims and achievements of Stalinist Russia prior to the German invasion. Aims would include Stalin's move towards the left in 1928 at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern which had the aim of directing his foreign policy away from the West. Nazism was largely ignored until the mid-1930s and there were instances of Germano-Soviet cooperation. The position then changed dramatically and foreign policy moved towards cooperation with Social Democratic governments in the West through Popular Front governments. The aim was to establish connections with pro-Soviet groups in the West. Stalin became involved in the Spanish Civil War as an ideological conflict and he became increasingly concerned about external threats - particularly from Germany and Japan. The signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact was a measure of convenience allowing the Soviet Union influence in Poland and Finland and which had the aim of buying time for Stalin. It lasted until June 1941 when Germany attacked Russia. Candidates should then comment on the success or otherwise of these events/aims.

It is important that the entire chronology be covered and that both Stalin's aims and achievements are included.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which list the events/policies followed by Stalin.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which make a limited attempt at assessment of these events/policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for essays which have identified the basic aims and achievements but which lack in-depth explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers where a clear relationship has been made between the aims and achievements and a deeper analysis of their impact in the USSR and abroad.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate a sophisticated account of Stalin's aims and achievements accompanied by a balanced analysis of their significance.

18. “Hitler’s control and organization of the Nazi State was less effective than is commonly believed.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This question is focused directly on the structuralist claims of Mommsen who argues that the statement is accurate. Candidates should be able to discuss to what extent this is the case by referring to Hitler’s Third Reich between 1933 and 1945. Specific examples should be given to support or refute the statement and these may refer to any aspect of Hitler’s policies. Weaker candidates who are not aware of Mommsen’s claims will dismiss the statement, but more able candidates should be able to debate the issue.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which list events/policies but without understanding the question.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which begin to identify the structure and organization of the Nazi state.

[11 to 13 marks] for essays which begin to explore the effectiveness of this structure and organization.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which require a deeper analysis of this effectiveness with relevant supporting evidence.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, and may show evidence of outside reading.

19. Why did the policy of “collective security”, established by the League of Nations, fail to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939?

This will be a very popular question. Candidates should first explain what they understand by the term “collective security” and should place it in its historical context by referring to the foundation of the League of Nations. Better candidates will make reference to its aims as identified in the Covenant. Candidates should then explain the weaknesses behind the structure and organization of the League of Nations and relate this to the replacement of collective security with the policy of appeasement in the 1930s. Points such as the need for unanimous agreement, the lack of a military force and the non-participation of key nations contributed to the abandonment of the policy. It is important that responses go further than merely arguing that the failure was due simply to weaknesses in the League and candidates should argue that aggressive foreign policy and both the rise of single party states in Europe and Japanese expansionism were contributing factors to its failure.

Responses, which focus entirely on the League of Nations without mentioning the foreign policies of totalitarian states such as Japan, Italy and Germany, will not score well.

[7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of actions/policies of the League of Nations without any clear focus on “collective security”.

[8 to 10 marks] for some explanation/definition of what is understood by “collective security,” and an implicit connection between this term and why the Second World War broke out.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of the actions/policies of the League of Nations within the framework of “collective security” and which start to develop arguments explaining the relationship between these and the outbreak of war in 1939.

[14 to 16 marks] for essays where the line of argument is more specific and where there is a clear attempt to explain that “collective security” needed a catalyst to break it down such as the rise of leaders with aggressive foreign policies.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully identify why it was that “collective security” failed and which provide a clear, consistent and thorough analysis of the reasons behind this failure.

20. To what extent was the involvement of foreign powers decisive in securing a Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939)?

Candidates should refer to the policies and actions of Germany and Italy and identify in what ways they were important contributors to Franco's victory. They should also make mention of the lack of action of other powers such as Britain and France which, by not intervening directly, contributed to the Nationalist victory. Mention should also be made of the role of the Soviet Union which supported the government cause and of the International Brigade.

Candidates tend to over-exaggerate the role of Germany in the Spanish Civil War and ignore the fact that Italy was far more involved, particularly in supplying military forces to support Franco's cause.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe events that occurred during the war.

[8 to 10 marks] for essays which link these events to foreign powers.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which investigate the importance of these foreign powers in the war.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with a greater depth of analysis of the role of foreign powers and a balanced assessment of their importance.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate sophisticated analysis and assessment supported by well-selected material.

21. Why, and with what consequences for Europe, was the Warsaw Pact signed in 1955?

Candidates should refer to the East German uprising of 1953 and the change in policy in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death in 1953. Weaker candidates will argue that this was only due to the formation of NATO in 1949 and the need for the Soviet Union to keep control of its client states. Better candidates will place the formation of the Warsaw Pact in the context of events in the mid-1950s. The consequences will be well known and candidates should make reference to Berlin, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, the Brezhnev Doctrine. Responses could go up to 1990.

It is important that candidates answer both parts of the question. If only one part is answered candidates should not be awarded more than **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which merely describe events in Europe after 1945.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which identify the Warsaw Pact correctly and provide a simple explanation behind its formation.

[11 to 13 marks] for essays which develop this explanation and begin to investigate the notion of consequences.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with a balanced explanation and analysis of both the reasons behind the Warsaw Pact's creation and its consequences.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate explanation and cause-effect at a sophisticated level and which should show evidence of wider reading.

22. **“Although his contribution to France was significant, its importance has been exaggerated.” How far do you agree with this assessment of the role of de Gaulle between 1945 and 1969?**

In 1945 de Gaulle was elected President of France but he resigned in 1946 as he considered his powers were too limited. For over a decade he played little direct part in French politics, re-emerging in May 1958 after forming the government of “national safety”. In October 1958 he became President of the Fifth Republic with enhanced power and he continued in office until 1969. His most important policies and problems had to do with Algeria, NATO, bilateral agreements with West Germany and the USSR and opposition to Britain’s entry to the EEC. Criticism at home included neglect of health, education and social issues. His failure in a referendum on changes in regional institutions led to his resignation. His taxation policies and the 1968 student riots contributed to his fall from power. De Gaulle certainly helped restore France as an important European power though large sections of the French people felt that he had abandoned their causes.

[7 marks] maximum for descriptive accounts of actions/policies carried out by de Gaulle.

[8 to 10 marks] for some mention of de Gaulle’s position as a statesman, but only passing connection between this and his actions/policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that include a more detailed account of de Gaulle’s actions/policies and which start to develop arguments either supporting or refuting the statement.

[14 to 16 marks] for essays where the line of argument is clearer and which analyse de Gaulle’s contributions to France more critically although this analysis might not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for answers which carefully select those actions/policies that support/refute the statement and which provide a clear, consistent and thorough analysis of the relationship between them and the quotation.

23. Evaluate the relative achievements of the governments of Salazar *and* Caetano in Portugal.

Candidates should enumerate the policies followed by the two Prime Ministers and then comment on their success or failure. They should start in 1932 when Salazar first came into power and continue until 1968 when he was replaced, following a stroke, by Caetano. During this time Salazar established himself as a virtual dictator and created the single party “New State”. Trade unions, the press and political opposition were all suppressed but the economy was kept relatively stable. Salazar kept Portugal neutral in the Second World War and established a Concordat with the Catholic Church.

Candidates should be aware that Caetano initially liberalized Portugal after Salazar’s stroke changing the Constitution and allowing the introduction of opposition parties but he could not control inflation. Caetano was overthrown by a military coup in 1974 and exiled.

It is important that candidates make a relative evaluation of the two leaders. This can be done either by an end-on description of their policies followed by an evaluation, or candidates may choose to make a running comparison of Salazar and Caetano.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which list the policies of the two governments.

[8 to 10 marks] for a narrative with limited analysis of the achievements of the governments.

[11 to 13 marks] for responses which develop this analysis further.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with an assessment of the relative achievements of the two governments.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate a sophisticated analysis of the relative achievements of both governments, supported by well-selected material.

24. What were the causes and consequences (to 1995) of the 1991 conflict in the Balkans?

Candidates should mention the splintering of Yugoslavia after Tito's death and the ending of the Cold War which led to the decline of Communist power and increasing nationalism in the Balkans. Serbia wanted to keep control of the federation but other nations such as Croatia and Slovenia wished to assert their independence. Serbia and Montenegro announced the formation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia but its failure to become a member of the United Nations led to a crisis. Relations between Serbia and Kosovo soured and there was a crackdown on Kosovan nationalist groups which led to the flight of ethnic Albanians. Milosevic's policies became more radical and war eventually broke out.

Candidates may mention more recent events to illustrate points in their essay but the main focus of any answer must be 1991–1995.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe events in the Balkans.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which begin to investigate the causes behind them.

[11 to 13 marks] for essays which identify the causes and begin to explore the consequences.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with a deeper analysis of both causes and consequences.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate balanced analysis, a clear awareness of the importance of the consequences, well-selected evidence and a sophisticated argument.

25. What economic and political impact did the movement towards worldwide globalization have on Europe between 1985 and 1995?

Candidates should initially explain what they understand by the term “globalization” and relate this to specific events and policies which have occurred in Europe. Reference might be made to the role of multinational companies and their relationship with specific states. Mention could also be made of rapid technological change and the role of computers/Internet. It is likely that candidates will include the importance of the G-7 group as a political entity although responses should not overemphasize recent opposition to its meetings.

There is a wide range of material, which might be included, but candidates should ensure that the focus of their response is historical and that answers do not drift entirely into the field of economics. Responses which do so should be awarded a maximum of *[12 marks]*.

[0 to 7 marks] for answers which describe what globalization entails.

[8 to 10 marks] for responses which begin to explore its impact on Europe.

[11 to 13 marks] for essays which develop an assessment of this impact.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers with a deeper analysis and a balanced argument as to its impact.

[17+ marks] for essays which demonstrate cause-effect at a sophisticated level, show clearly the impact of globalization and which may show evidence of wider reading.
