



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2006**

**HISTORY**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

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

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

**Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war**

1. **Examine the part played by *each* of the following in the outbreak of the First World War: alliances; mobilization; Balkan nationalism.**

*N.B. Candidates should note this is not an invitation to write generally on the origins of the conflict. Three areas are highlighted, each requiring critical examination: identification of the main elements associated with each category as well as an assessment of how exactly they contributed to the outbreak.*

**Alliances** – could include not only the well known “systems” (Triple Alliance, Triple Entente) but other alliances/agreements which played a role in the event – *e.g.* Britain’s arrangement regarding Belgian neutrality, Russia’s defence of Serbian interests in July/August 1914. Better answers could comment critically on the extent to which such agreements promoted conflict in 1914 – or whether their importance was less crucial in terms of the physical outbreak than has been claimed.

**Mobilization** – Russian and German plans will probably be well known. Did mobilization necessarily mean physical conflict in 1914? How inflexible were plans of the powers involved?

**Balkan nationalism** – what was its cause: its supporters, its opponents? The assassinations at Sarajevo will no doubt be stressed by many candidates as the “spark” – yet approximately six weeks elapsed between these and war spreading to become a continental conflict.

If only one of the factors is addressed mark out of a maximum of **[7 marks]**. If two of the factors are addressed mark out of a maximum of **[14 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague unfocused generalisations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit judgment of the three components.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for structured responses with explicit analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for clear, coherent and structured treatment, showing a consistent level of critical analysis and sound factual knowledge of all parts.

**[17+ marks]** for in-depth analysis and perceptive insight concerning each of the components.

**2. With reference to specific examples, account for the adoption of guerrilla warfare and assess its effectiveness.**

Popular areas for examples are likely to be China pre-1949, Cuba pre-1959, and Vietnam 1945/6 till 1975. An understanding of the theory and practice of guerrilla war in both its military and political techniques/aims could prove useful at the outset.

Reasons for the adoption of this style of resistance: initial weaknesses in military resources, lack of popular support, repression by existing regimes, the need to popularize a programme/political theory by establishing “liberated zones”, educating the masses by illustrating the possibility of successful social/economic and political change.

How effective the guerrilla methods were – both militarily and politically – in building/mobilizing popular support should be assessed as well as consideration of other factors which may account for the success or failure of those examples chosen. In some cases guerrilla warfare was not always successful – *e.g.* the Greek Civil War, Malayan Emergency, Hukbalahap rebellion in the Philippines after the Second World War.

Specific knowledge is necessary to support assertions made.

If only one example is chosen, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive accounts with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for adequate knowledge, structured coverage and explicit comment on reasons and effectiveness.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well balanced answers.

**[17+ marks]** for thorough coverage and in-depth analysis and treatment of both reasons and effectiveness in the examples selected.

- 3. In what ways, and with what success, did post-war peacemakers attempt to deal with the problems which produced the conflict? Specific reference should be made to *two* peace settlements.**

The Treaty of Versailles will probably prove a popular choice here but note the question does ask for two settlements. Accept any other of the Paris Peace Settlement treaties as a second choice. Treaties/settlements following other conflicts could include, *e.g.* Panmunjom (Korea), Geneva (Vietnam) Portsmouth (Russo-Japanese War). Be generous in interpreting/defining the term “settlement”. Yalta/Potsdam are legitimate choices but the question is not a question on the origins of the Cold War to the exclusion of all else.

Candidates need to identify what were perceived as the causes of the chosen conflicts: economic/territorial gain/drive towards self-determination/nationalism *etc.* and then assess to what extent the peacemakers tried to remedy such problems. Candidates will also need to comment on the level of success in dealing with the problems and could also identify unresolved and/or new problems arising from the settlement which produced continuing tension.

If only one settlement is addressed, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unfocused generalisations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive answers with implicit analysis, but unbalanced in treatment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comment on “ways” and “success” though there is some imbalance in treatment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced structure and perceptive explicit analysis.

**[17+ marks]** for thorough coverage, detailed knowledge and insight.

**4. Compare and contrast the reasons for, and impact of, foreign involvement in *two* of the following: Russian Civil War; Spanish Civil War; Korean War.**

Motives for foreign involvement and the effect of such involvement are the chief areas for examination. The response does not require a narrative coverage of the chosen wars.

**For reasons:** issues such as ideology, war by proxy, strategy, economic gain, enforcement of collective security *etc.* could be considered and compared/contrasted.

**For impact:** consideration could be given to issues such as the way in which involvement prolonged the war, the nature/level of destruction, the extent to which external involvement proved decisive in shaping the outcome of the conflict.

If only one war is chosen, no more than **[7 marks]** can be awarded.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for sequential (end-on) accounts with implicit comparison.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for full sequential (end-on) accounts of two wars with explicit attempts at comparing/contrasting, or unbalanced comparative structures.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for comparative structures with good knowledge, balance and analysis.

**[17+ marks]** for good balance, in-depth knowledge and perceptive analysis.

5. **With reference to *two* wars, each chosen from a different region, explain to what extent the role and status of women was affected.**

The Second World War may be accepted as a suitable example if the theatres of war in the Americas, Asia, and Europe are considered.

Candidates are advised not to attempt such a question unless they have specifically examined case-studies during their courses. The question requires detailed and accurate substantiation of points raised.

**Role:** could include the varied contributions of women to the war effort on both military (as combatants, auxiliary and support services depending on the conflict chosen) and home fronts (factory and agrarian production, transportation), changing patterns of employment due to demands of war.

**Status:** requires consideration of how attitudes towards women and attitudes of women were affected by the experience of war. Did their social standing, political standing, economic standing improve – temporarily/permanently in comparison to the pre-war situation? If so, how? If not, why not?

If only one war is covered mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalised assertions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit consideration in more detailed answers.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, structured and detailed responses.

**[17+ marks]** for responses exhibiting a high level of knowledge in a structured and balanced treatment which reveals insight and/or evidence of wide reading.

**Topic 2 Nationalist and independence movements, decolonization and challenges facing new states**

*N.B. Where the phrase “non-European colonial state(s)” is used in questions in this section, neither Castro’s Cuba nor China under Mao is an acceptable choice of example*

- 6. Examine the factors which favoured the emergence and growth of independence movements in non-European colonial states in *either* the period 1918–39 *or* the period 1945–65.**

For the inter-war period reference could be made to the impact of the Great War – the weakening of Great Powers economically and militarily, the disillusionment/frustration produced as a result of the peace settlements which failed to provide self-determination for colonial peoples, the growth and influence of socialism after 1917 *etc.* The emergence and growth of independence movements could be illustrated by specific reference to case studies – India, Indochina for example.

For the post-Second World War period candidates could refer to the impact of the United Nations and decolonization, the military/political/economic weaknesses of colonial powers following the conflict, the influence of the superpowers on the decolonization process – as sponsors of independence. Again, answers would benefit from reference to specific examples/case studies to illustrate arguments.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for largely descriptive answers with implicit analysis of factors.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with adequate detail of the different types of factors as applied to specific independence movements/colonial states.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for responses which clearly identify in a structured and focused manner the types of factors and link them to specific examples to illustrate.

*[17+ marks]* for answers revealing the above qualities and in addition a high level of knowledge and analytical examination.



**7. How successfully did governments in *either* Pakistan (1947–71) or Ghana (1957–79) deal with domestic problems?**

Pakistan emerged as an independent state in August 1947 with the partition of British India. Domestic problems include: the issue of separation of the two “wings” of Pakistan making administration difficult; the lack of economic resources; the demands placed upon the state by refugee influx; the loss of skilled tradesmen/commercial groups which fled to neighbouring India; the growth of regionalism in east Pakistan fuelled by claims of discrimination by the East Bengali population in respect of employment and political opportunities which led eventually to demands for an independent Bangladesh (established in 1971); the death of Jinnah and the failure of parliamentary government which rapidly gave way to more authoritarian rule under military leaders.

Ghana achieved independence in 1957 under Kwame Nkrumah who ruled, until deposed, by a military coup in 1966. There then followed three years of military rule, followed by three years of rule by Dr Kofi Busia who was removed by the military in 1972 and further military rule under Acheampong, Akuffo and Rawlings.

From the outset domestic problems included tribalism/separatism, the overambitious social and economic schemes of Nkrumah which were funded largely by foreign loans. Overdependence on cocoa exports and sharp falls and fluctuations in world prices revealed the problems of an ex-colonial economy. Parliamentary government soon gave way after independence to increasingly authoritarian rule under Nkrumah, leading to a one-party state and subsequently military rule with the overthrow of Nkrumah.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalised, unsubstantiated assertions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analytical and balanced responses.

*[17+ marks]* for thorough, perceptive coverage and a high level of knowledge and analysis.

**8. Assess the methods used by *one* nationalist leader to achieve independence in a non-European colonial state.**

Methods used by leaders could include the organization of physical resistance to the colonial power through urban/rural guerrilla warfare and insurrection, organization of economic boycotts, mass mobilization of the population in political parties, non-violent non-cooperation protests, propaganda.

As well as identifying the methods used “assessment” requires candidates to comment on the reasons why such methods were selected, how suitable they were, how effective they proved in terms of the attainment of independence.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate knowledge and unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with adequate detail and more explicit focus on methods and assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for thorough examination and clear and explicit assessment in structured and focused answers.

*[17+ marks]* for evidence of a high level of analysis/assessment of the efficacy of the methods.

9. **“Despite the achievement of independence, social and economic progress in most newly independent non-European states remained limited.” With reference to *either* Algeria or Indonesia, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates need to examine the extent to which political (or “flag” independence) resulted in the improvement of the conditions of the population in social and economic terms. “Social” in its wider sense could include health provision, education, social welfare provision, minority and gender treatment.

“Economic” could relate to the nature of the economy after independence – did it remain essentially a neo-colonial/client economy based on pre-independence production? What was the effect on employment? How did the new state cope in terms of maintaining or raising living standards of the people? There were problems of monoculture. World price fluctuations for basic commodities could also be made relevant – as could government expenditure on projects or schemes of development that were ill-advised or overly ambitious and hugely expensive.

**Algeria:** independence 1962, following debilitating war with France. Ben Bella was president until 1965. There was dislocation economically due to outflow of settler population (800,000). The legacy of colonialism included abandoned farms, factories, lack of a developed middle class or entrepreneurial or technical expertise to operate businesses. State control of abandoned enterprises, worker control of factories and profit sharing proved disruptive. Establishment of marketing and credit agencies occurred but low levels of education and corruption hindered progress. Massive emigration of Algerians to France: 700 000 by 1964.

1965 – military coup (Colonel Boumedienne) – 1967 – Development Plan: expansion of industrialization based on increasing oil revenues. Focus in 1968 – petroleum, gas, cement, textiles, canning. Nationalization (80%) of foreign businesses to eliminate competition with state run industries. From 1971, agrarian revolution: “Socialist villages”, cooperatives, land redistribution, water conservation and irrigation projects – e.g. “Green Dam” project. Educational programmes implemented to train students for careers in agriculture and rural trades.

**Indonesia:** formal transfer of sovereignty from Netherlands, (1949) following exploitation by Japan during Second World War and bitter war of decolonization. As part of the agreement with Dutch in 1949, Indonesia inherited debts for the “police actions” undertaken 1945–49. First president, Sukarno – until military coup in 1965. Suharto became President officially in 1968.

Legacy of colonialism: shortage of educated/trained personnel for economic as well as administrative purposes – this was to prove disastrous for a nation with vast resources. By 1950 only a few hundred out of a population of approximately 80 million had higher education qualifications. 90% illiteracy rate.

By 1964 government claimed illiteracy had been “eradicated” due to government initiatives in school provision.

Population growth rates threatened economic progress – estimated population of 220 million by early twenty first century. Agricultural poverty increased especially linked to overpopulation in central and eastern Java.

Exports – especially of rubber, petroleum and tin which accounted for 70% of foreign exchange earnings fell 1952–9 and again 1961–4. Imports rose. Sensitivity to commodity price fluctuations remained a problem. By 1964 Indonesia witnessed the highest rates of inflation in the world.

Simultaneously Sukarno embarked on prestige projects – a planetarium, national theatre, presidential residences and conspicuous consumption by presidential family and entourage. There were corruption levels of “fantastic proportions” according to General Nasution the then Minister of Defence.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive or narrative responses with implicit assessment of the statement’s validity or accuracy.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit treatment/coverage of the issue of validity/accuracy of statement.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, focused answers with detailed substantiation and explicit evaluation of the validity of the statement.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that are balanced, contain in-depth knowledge and reveal insight into the problems facing the newly independent state.

**10. In what ways, and for what reasons, were *two* newly independent non-European states affected by the Cold War?**

Post-colonial independent states often found themselves the objects of superpower attention. Sometimes the attention may have been welcome – at other times it was not.

**In what ways** could include examination of economic and political/ideological interference (invited or not), military involvement either in terms of the provision of weapons or with the new state becoming a victim of a superpower proxy war, technical assistance, economic aid/loans which were often conditional.

**For what reasons** could examine both the needs of the independent states (which may have needed and requested protection, food, technical expertise, in order to make progress) or the “needs” of the individual superpowers which saw in the new states potential diplomatic, economic, strategic advantages to be gained in the larger Cold War global struggle.

If only one state is used mark out of *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few generalisations about unnamed states.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers with implicit reference to “ways” and “reasons”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with more explicit consideration of “ways” and “reasons”.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused, structured and balanced coverage of both examples and clear and explicit consideration of “ways” and “reasons”.

*[17+ marks]* for responses revealing detailed accurate knowledge and a balanced and focused analytical treatment of the demands of the question.

**Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states**

**11. “It was personality and not circumstances that brought rulers of single-party states to power.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should discuss at least two single party rulers (as the question is stated in the plural) and both aspects need to be analysed *i.e.* personality and circumstances. Aspects of personality that could be included are leadership style, oratorical skills, strength of character, focus and commitment to political ideals *etc.* The circumstances that brought the leader to power need to be evaluated for their impact, with reference to specific economic/social/political circumstances that were in place. Some awareness of the impossibility of measuring support and the impact of personality would be an indication of higher level thinking in candidates.

If only one single-party ruler is discussed and covered comprehensively, it could reach a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations about one or more single party ruler, and inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts of one or more rulers rise to power, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments with little evidence on either personality or circumstances.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question and comment on both personality and circumstances for more than one leader. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused responses and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question in relation to all rulers discussed.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations or awareness of difficulty in measuring impact of personality and/or circumstances, and a response which addresses all aspects of the question.

**12. Analyse the methods used to maintain power in *two* single-party states, each chosen from a different region.**

A thematic rather than a narrative approach would be likely to obtain more credit. The themes that could be used include: use of military/police; curtailment of citizens' freedoms; treatment of opposition, manipulation of education; social/economic/cultural propaganda; control of the legal system; social and/or economic policies; creation/exaggeration/use of external threat *etc.* Not all need to be addressed and others could be discussed, but depth of detail and analysis of what methods were used, why and with what success, need to be present if the candidate is to achieve the best marks.

If only one leader is used, then a maximum of **[12 marks]** can be obtained.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts of methods used to maintain power, unbalanced answers, or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on maintaining power. Arguments with limited examples and analysis of methods.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant evidence, and a developed argument with balanced analysis of methods two leaders used to maintain power: answers may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**13. Examine the economic and social policies of *two* of the following: Lenin; Mussolini; Perón.**

A balanced examination of the economic and social policies is needed, with an equal amount of emphasis on each leader to obtain high marks. A detailed outline of what the economic and social policies were, and an examination of their impact and/or success would be expected. Some assessment of the reasons why they were implemented is needed for good marks (see below). An examination of the specific economic policies enacted could include detail on the economic plans, economic restructuring of economy, control of workers *etc.* Social policies could include removal of classes, equality between the sexes, and other more idealistic/unrealistic policies—for example the attempted creation of a new type of citizen and/or society. Not all policies implemented need to be assessed but a balanced amount on each leader is needed. Lenin 1917–24, Mussolini 1922–43 and Perón 1946–55, 1973–4.

For examination of only one leader, or if only one part of the question is answered, mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the questions. Arguments with limited examples and some analysis of either justification for policies or a measure of success.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all policies. Good detail on the policies discussed with assessment of the reasons why they were implemented and an analysis of their success or lack of it.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**14. Compare and contrast the global impact of *two* of the following: Castro; Hitler; Nasser.**

Some possible themes for comparison could include: attempted (or lack of) exportation of ideology to other countries; impact on regional politics and/or alliances; impact on world wars (hot or cold); impact on new/developing countries; relationships with major powers at the time and the effects of that on other countries *etc.* Accept a variety of themes for comparison and contrast depending on the leaders chosen, but depth of detail and analysis is needed for the higher awards. Castro's timeframe is large (1959 to present) with Hitler's being shorter but monumental, 1933–45. Nasser is less obvious but very influential, 1954–70.

Candidates must choose two single party leaders from the above. Sequential narratives without the comparison cannot score highly with this question.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments, or if only one ruler is addressed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts of global impact of two leaders with implicit or limited comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for adequate, explicit comparison and contrast of two leaders.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: comparing and contrasting two leaders, but some may not address all possible aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.



**15. In what ways, and for what reasons, were culture and education controlled by rulers of single-party states?**

The way the leaders have controlled education could include: public education provided/ compulsory; the inclusion/exclusion of some subjects; rewriting of texts to support the state's interpretation of events; the creation of universities and emphasis on different degrees *etc.* Other relevant ideas can also be mentioned. Some of the ways culture was controlled could include: the attempted creation of a "new man" or creating/maintaining a revolutionary citizen mentality; creation/removal of equality of sexes, racial groups, *etc.*; removing or attempting to destroy religions in the state and replacing them with near worship of the state leader or the state; heavy emphasis on nationalism *etc.* With each of the above, a detailed list of what happened is not enough. To complete the question, an explanation must be made of "for what reason(s)" these two were controlled.

If only one part is answered, mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts of how they were controlled, unbalanced answers focusing on only one of the aspects, or for implicit or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the control of culture and education by two leaders. Arguments with few examples and limited analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant assessment of how and why culture and education were treated as they were, by two leaders; some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states**

**16. How successful was *one* international organization in *either* improving economic and social conditions *or* encouraging trade and regional cooperation?**

The question requires consideration of the more “functionalist” approach of organizations such as the League of Nations or United Nations – or indeed any other organization established by sovereign states with the aim of encouraging and implementing social and economic improvements and cooperation between states.

Candidates could use examples from the various specialized agencies of the League or United Nations to illustrate and support arguments – whether it be in connection with health, refugees, transportation, working conditions, child welfare or famine relief *etc.* Similarly, organizations such as the IMF, GATT, EU *etc.* could be used.

Details of aims/goals need to be identified and an examination of how exactly attempts have been made to reach them – and with what degree of success – or lack of success.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general answers with inadequate knowledge of organizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers which are descriptive with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for adequate knowledge and some explicit evaluation of level of success.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, focused responses with clear analysis of level of success.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed responses and in-depth treatment of level of success and why/why not.

**17. Compare and contrast the peacekeeping efforts of the League of Nations and the United Nations in their first ten years of existence.**

*N.B. Coverage of Manchuria/Abyssinia is not relevant.*

The League of Nations formally came into existence in January 1920. Candidates are required to go no further than 1930 in their treatment of League peacekeeping activities. Collective Security attempts by the organization met with varied success – suitable case studies for treatment are the Aaland Islands dispute, the Vilna dispute, the Corfu incident, the Greco-Bulgarian dispute *etc.*

The United Nations Organization formally came into existence in October 1945. During its first decade it was involved with varying degrees of success in operations in Palestine, West Irian (West New Guinea), Kashmir and above all, Korea from 1950–3.

Both organizations met with a degree of success in peacekeeping operations during their first decade. Candidates could identify successes for both organizations and comment on the circumstances (economic, political) which allowed for such success. Less successful attempts, and the reasons why, could also be identified and commented upon.

*[0 to 7 marks]* if only one organization is covered.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for sequential accounts with good comparative linkage or a slightly unbalanced comparative structure.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for good comparative structures with explicit analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for effective and detailed answers with evidence of insight.

**18. Account for the establishment of a multiparty state in *either* Japan or South Africa.**

Candidates are invited to investigate the reasons for the transition of either state from its previous unrepresentative/authoritarian regime or system to a democratic, accountable, multiparty state. Some identification of the nature of the previous political system would be useful as a starting point.

Consideration may be given to economic, political, military factors – internal and/or external – which encouraged the establishment of the multiparty system. Was the transition the product of popular desire or imposed from outside? Did previous regimes willingly concede or resist the process to a multiparty system? Actual methods used, type of institutions set up and constitution *etc.* could be examined.

**Japan** – defeated 1945, occupied by Allied (American) forces under MacArthur (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers) who instituted a democratic/multiparty state from above. Diet established. Divine status of Emperor ended. Constitution of 1946 gave sovereign power to the people. Bill of Rights announced by MacArthur and elections with universal suffrage held 1946. Fundamental Law of Education enacted 1947 to promote equal rights and to encourage belief in “truth and justice” and “a deep sense of responsibility” amongst the people. By 1949 with onset of Cold War restrictions were placed upon Communists, trade unions and encouragement of traditional concepts of duty and stability.

**South Africa** – Apartheid – unrepresentative system since 1948. Relaxation of restrictions under Botha from 1979 and de Klerk after 1989. Acceptance of principle of Black majority rule, release of Mandela 1990 and legalization of ANC. 1993 talks between government and ANC and Inkatha produced coalition government and agreement on a new constitution to come into force by 1999.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalisations with insufficient substantiation.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts of the foundation of the multiparty system.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better and fuller explanations of the circumstances of foundation.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for explicit analysis of the circumstances leading to and the actual establishment of the multiparty systems.

*[17+ marks]* for answers which reveal a detailed, structured focus and high level of analytical/critical commentary.

**19. With reference to *one* multiparty state, assess the methods used to deal with economic and political problems which threatened its stability.**

Whichever multiparty state is chosen candidates need to identify the nature of the economic and political problems facing the state and the extent to which the state's existence was threatened because of them.

An assessment of methods adopted by the state needs to be undertaken: this could include specific policies relating to trade, agriculture, industry, welfare programmes, unemployment relief, job creation *etc.* as well as techniques used to combat political extremism which threatened political stability.

“Assess” does require candidates to comment on how successful or suitable such methods were in fending off challenges.

The Roosevelt administration in the United States 1933 onwards and Weimar Germany could prove popular choices.

If only political **or** economic problems are dealt with mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague assertions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative accounts with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for adequate knowledge of problems and policies and some explicit assessment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for good knowledge of problems and methods, clear structure and focused critical commentary.

**[17+ marks]** for in-depth knowledge and analysis of the nature/extent of problems and thoughtful consideration of the effectiveness of the methods adopted.

20. **“Unrealistic aims and weak structure have prevented international organizations from achieving their goals.” With reference to *one* international organization, explain to what extent you agree with this statement.**

The League and the United Nations are likely to be the most popular choices here. The question requires clear identification of what the aims/goals of the organization were – whether political, military, economic, social, diplomatic *etc.* The structure of the organization also needs to be covered – how it was organized, what its Covenant/Charter, organs, agencies *etc.* were empowered to do – or not – as the case may be.

Whether the aims were realistic in the circumstances of the time of foundation and/or subsequently needs comment. Did the structure of the organization cause problems when dealing with issues? How? Why? Specifics are necessary to illustrate arguments.

Some candidates will interpret this question as a “failures of the League/United Nations” type of question and write accordingly – but the emphasis is on aims/expectations and issues of structure as factors hindering effectiveness – and these do need to be addressed and not ignored.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague assertions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with adequate knowledge of aims/goals and structure and explicit assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured and focused answers, specific detail and analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for responses with a high level of analysis and perceptive comment which is well substantiated.

## Topic 5 The Cold War

### 21. Analyse the responsibility of the USA and the USSR for the outbreak and development of the Cold War, up to 1949.

This question allows for some analysis of longer term relations between the two countries. This could include issues such as US intervention in the Russian Revolution on the side of the Whites, the Nazi-Soviet Pact, eventual Allied status and issues related to the extent and nature of US support for the Soviet war effort and lack of trust on both sides *etc.* Wartime conferences of Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam, the Marshall Plan, COMECON, issues in Berlin and other policies up to 1949 can be detailed. Analysis of the importance of the above will be found in the better answers, not simply a narrative of events and growing mistrust. The question also requires assessment of responsibility for the development as well as the outbreak of the Cold War. Better candidates might discuss the difficulty of allocating responsibility.

If only one country is assessed for responsibility, then a maximum of **[12 marks]** is possible.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations of responsibility, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts of some events, or implicit or undeveloped arguments with limited evidence.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus. Unbalanced treatment of component parts.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant responses. Well developed argument and balanced assessment, although not all aspects of the question are covered.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations which address all aspects of the question.

**22. Compare and contrast the economic policies and military alliances of the USSR and USA after 1947.**

The opposing economic and military alliances created by the USA and Soviet Union need to be outlined, and compared. NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the Marshall Plan and COMECON would be the most likely basis for comparison although others may be included. The rationale given by both sides for the creation of these groups/plans, and the membership and operation could be compared. Some comparison of the impact of these plans and alliances could be included. Given the detail possible in the answer, candidates may be tempted to write narratives, but the focus is on comparison and contrast. Themes could include rationale for the plans/alliances both publicly stated and those not publicly admitted, membership, organisation, implementation/actions taken, impact on superpowers and members, *etc.*

If the alliances or policies of only one state are covered, no more than **[7 marks]** can be awarded.

If only the alliances or policies are compared a maximum of **[12 marks]** is possible.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts of the plans and alliances, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with adequate detail, explicit focus on the question of contrast and comparison.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers contrasting and comparing both the economic policies and military alliances. Answers may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.



**23. To what extent was the movement for non-alignment a development of the Cold War?**

The reasons for the first meeting of some of the non-aligned countries in Bandung should be outlined. Mutual problems included: resisting pressure from the major powers; maintaining independence and opposing colonialism/neo-colonialism and these can be linked to the Cold War/superpower pressures. The preparatory meeting in Cairo and later the first meeting in Belgrade in 1961 set out criteria for membership which clearly outline the link between the movement and the Cold War and would need to be included for a thorough assessment.

Other interests of members could be considered as reducing the total responsibility of the Cold War, *e.g.* developing economic and social strengths in their own countries and with other like minded ones. However, the focus must remain on the extent of the Cold War creating the need for the group and members developing independence from the superpowers. Details on specific leaders and/or countries' motivations are necessary for better marks. Some of the leaders that could be mentioned include early founding members, *e.g.* Nehru, Sukarno, and Nasser, and later on influential members like Castro.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, implicit or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question, or arguments with limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical and relevant answers with detail and insight.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive comments which address all aspects of the question, and perhaps different interpretations

**24. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the Vietnam War affect superpower relations?**

Students will probably interpret the Vietnam War as US involvement in Vietnam 1961–75 but this can be expanded to include the French war in Vietnam after the Second World War up to Dien Bien Phu. This time frame would allow for comment on US involvement with the French and later in Vietnam during the 1950s and the effects this had on superpower relations. This is not however compulsory for a good answer.

Answers which are narratives of the battles of the Vietnam War(s) cannot score well. There must be analysis of how and for what reasons the war affected superpower relations. Initially the effects of the war were to antagonize each other, and relations deteriorated, especially with China. Later, with the war dragging on unsuccessfully, the US needed to build relationships with China and the Soviets in order to force an end to the war, and to try and obtain something positive out of the situation, hence the development of more cordial relationships.

“What ways” and “for what reasons” could include:

- Support for France by the US because Chinese support for Ho Chi Minh was seen as Chinese communist expansion and therefore a threat.
- North Vietnam being helped by China and the Soviets. US perceived this as communist expansion and aggression and became more determined to increase involvement and thus strengthen the containment policy. US became more heavily committed to military involvement in Vietnam.
- Continuing problems of failure of the war and increasing anti-war movement in US led to the need for re-assessment of involvement which led to the inauguration of détente with the Soviet Union and rapprochement with China *e.g.* U.S.A dropped objections to China becoming a member of the U.N.O in 1971. Nixon visited Moscow and Peking. Later the SALT I and Helsinki accords occurred. Sino/Soviet relations were also affected with some distrust developing as China improves relations with US.

Do not expect all the above.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative of the war or international relations, implicit or undeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question, or arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical and relevant answers with detail and insight.

**[17+ marks]** for perceptive comments which address all aspects of the question, and perhaps different interpretations.

**25. Assess the importance of economic issues in ending the Cold War.**

Candidates may concentrate on only the USSR, but the topic should be understood as wider, with economic issues worldwide being the focus. Assessment of other reasons for the ending of the Cold War may be considered.

Economic issues in the USSR could include: economic troubles related to the restructuring under Gorbachev; the cost of the war in Afghanistan; increasing dissatisfaction with the socialist economy *etc.* Other factors could include: general dissatisfaction of citizens; the resultant political pressures on the leadership; alternative political leadership with ideologies based on economic change arising in communist countries; the need for economic support from the non-communist world for failing communist governments/economies and the resultant need for rapprochement; growing worldwide recognition of the economic cost of wars *etc.* Not all of these aspects need to be addressed for a good response, but the focus must be on assessment of the importance of economic issues on the ending of the Cold War.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts of the ending of the Cold War, with implicit undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with adequate detail and explicit focus on economic reasons for the end of the Cold War.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced assessment of economic reasons, with some comment on other reasons.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments or perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

**Topic 6 The state and its relationship with religion and minorities**

**26. Analyse the part played by religion in Middle East conflicts since 1945.**

Middle East conflicts could be interpreted as the Arab-Israeli dispute which has been characterized by a series of wars since 1948 and also in relation to conflict between religious movements organized against foreign intervention – *e.g.* Afghanistan – or conflict caused by doctrinal differences within, for example, the Islamic world (Sunni/Shiite).

While other factors – economic, anti-imperialism, foreign encouragement and exploitation of religious differences may be relevant, the emphasis should be on assessing the issue of religion as a contributory factor. Did it play a leading role? Was it used as a cover/excuse?

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague assertions and insufficient substantiation.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive responses with some implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for fuller answers with more explicit focus on assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers which are structured, focused and deal explicitly with the relative importance of the religious issue in terms of causation of conflict.

*[17+ marks]* for answers revealing insight, in-depth knowledge and possibly different interpretations of the reasons for conflict.

**27. For what reasons, and with what results, were racial, ethnic and religious minorities persecuted in *two* states, each chosen from a different region?**

A two part question – note the regional requirement.

Reasons could include economic (jealousy), political (use of minorities as scapegoats, fear of minority nationalism or separatist tendencies which threaten the integrity of the state), religious (doctrinal differences and disagreements between “orthodox” and “schismatic” groups).

Results could include methods adopted by the state to repress the minority and the repercussions of such policies ranging from discriminatory legislation concerning civil rights, education, employment *etc.* to extremes such as ethnic cleansing, genocide, expulsion, and dispossession.

If only one state is dealt with mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague, unsubstantiated assertions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative treatment with implicit reasons and results.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for adequate detail and explicit focus on reasons and results.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for good detail, structure and focus.

**[17+ marks]** for a balanced, structured response which reveals evidence of insight and perception.

**28. In what ways, and with what success, did *one* minority (racial, ethnic or religious) attempt to gain equal rights?**

A popular choice is likely to be the struggle by African Americans for equal rights in the United States though the efforts of indigenous populations in Australasia/Oceania could also prove popular.

Methods for consideration could include: peaceful protests; boycotts; civil disobedience; the use of militancy/riots; resort to world opinion to pressure governments or states. As well as identifying the range of tactics or methods used candidates are also required to make an assessment as to how effective such methods were in minorities achieving their goals in terms of ending discriminatory practices and gaining equality. Did other factors also play a role *e.g.* the desire of governments to legislate to end discrimination for reasons of conscience, to improve the governments' image *etc*?

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague general comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative response with implicit assessment of “success”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for fuller detail of “ways” and more explicit assessment of the extent of “success”. May be unbalanced in coverage.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for structured answers with specific detail and analytical treatment.

*[17+ marks]* for focused, balanced responses that show evidence of insight and/or wider reading.

**29. “Government persecution of minorities was always undertaken to distract attention from unpopular policies and gain support.” To what extent does the study of minorities in the twentieth century support this view?**

An opportunity for thoughtful candidates to examine – with specific details – government sponsored persecution of minorities. States often used persecution of minority groups as a means of distracting the population from other domestic/foreign problems, to implement ideological goals of racial/ethnic purity, to eliminate perceived class enemies which supposedly threatened the security of the state *etc.*

Popular examples here are likely to be Hitler and the experience of German Jewry, the position of Jews in Imperial Russia (and even the Soviet Union), the plight of the Armenians within the Ottoman Empire.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague general comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for fuller answers with more explicit assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed answers with clear, focused analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for evidence of insight and/or wider reading.

**30. In what ways were educational and cultural developments affected by policies in *one* state which upheld and supported an official religion?**

For most candidates a “state upheld and supported by an official religion” is likely to be interpreted as an Islamic state.

Educational developments could include: reference to the type of curriculum offered in state/religious supported schools; educational opportunities available to both genders – and any differences in programmes/approach; the goals of such an educational system.

Cultural developments could include consideration of the impact of such states upon literary publications, artistic works (artistic – in the widest sense – painting, sculpture, theatre, film *etc*). Did the state encourage specific types of cultural development? Has it been critical of, or opposed to certain types of cultural activities?

Whichever state is chosen specific examples are required to substantiate arguments.

If only educational **or** cultural developments are addressed, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalized comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for adequate detail and explicit assessment, though perhaps unbalanced.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for detailed, structured and balanced answers.

**[17+ marks]** for responses that reveal a high level of awareness of the demands of the question and evidence of a high level of conceptual ability in treatment of the issues.