

MARKSCHEME

May 2007

HISTORY – EUROPE

Higher Level

Paper 3

*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.*

1. Assess the importance of *two* causes of the French Revolution of 1789.

Some suggestions of causes that candidates could choose are: ancient regime; feudalism; monarchy; financial problems; economic problems; philosophers. Some of these, of course, overlap to a certain extent. Candidates can address the chosen causes separately or together. They should state or define the cause, then analyse it by covering all aspects and explaining why they were causing problems, distress, *etc.* in France in the years leading up to the revolution, which group of people they alienated, and what were the circumstances in which they led to the revolution.

They should also consider the importance of the selected causes. Evidence as to their importance should be weighed, and a judgment given. Candidates could, in this section, mention other causes briefly, which perhaps they consider more important than their selected ones. They must not however treat this question as one asking for all causes of the French Revolution.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations or inadequate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for general causes with too little focus and detail on two chosen ones.

[11 to 13 marks] for satisfactory focus on two causes and adequate knowledge and analysis.

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

[17+ marks] for balanced choice, interpretation and analysis.

N.B. If only one cause is considered mark out of *[12 marks]*.

2. Why, and with what results for France, did Napoleon I become emperor in 1804, and Louis XVIII king in 1814?

This is a wide question demanding specific factual knowledge of events leading to Napoleon becoming emperor and Louis becoming king, but more importantly, analysis of why the events produced that outcome.

For Napoleon, his military victories, overthrow of the directory, appointment as first consul, consul for life, and, his rule so far, should be analysed in the context of the lack of stability and order of the French Revolution.

The results of Napoleon's rule as emperor were reforms, arbitrary rule, military expenditure resulting in heavy losses in the Russian campaign, and defeat at Leipzig. This led to his abdication and the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty (context in relation to the situation in 1814 is required here) in the person of Louis XVIII. Louis retained the throne, in spite of Napoleon's escape from Elba and the Hundred Days, because the allies defeated Napoleon at Waterloo, and because the resumed Congress (at Vienna) supported the Bourbon restoration as the means of retaining the European balance of power, and prevention of an overmighty France.

Louis XVIII ruled moderately having issued a Charter guaranteeing the principal gains of the revolution. Some candidates might conclude with the point that his brother Charles X, however, lost the throne through his attempted return to more autocratic rule, but this is not necessary. A paragraph briefly commenting on Louis XVIII's reign/rule is sufficient.

[0 to 7 marks] for unfocused general answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives which give some of the main points.

[11 to 13 marks] for focused, accurate information with some explanation of the issues.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical answers that focus on why and with what results for both rulers.

[17+ marks] for balance, interpretation, coverage and depth of analysis.

N.B. If only Napoleon I or Louis XVIII is considered mark out of *[12 marks]*.

3. Analyse the impact of the Vienna Settlement (1814–1815) on Europe until 1848.

Candidates should first explain concisely what the Congress of Vienna was, why it took place and its aims. They should then discuss the main terms of the territorial settlement, and the restoration of former rulers. Other pronouncements such as the condemnation of the slave trade, and the establishment of a system for international diplomacy might also be mentioned by better candidates. Candidates must analyse the impact of the territorial settlement on individual countries, for example on the main powers, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia, and on those powers that had boundary changes, largely to restrain France, such as Belgium and the Netherlands.

Other more general points should also be analysed, for example, peace generally secured, restoration of monarchies, balance of power, slave trade. Do not demand or expect all of the above, but essays without specific evidence will not score well.

[0 to 7 marks] for generalised assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for a narrative of some main points with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the impact on Europe and some explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for sound knowledge, focus and analysis.

[17+ marks] for detailed specific knowledge used to focus on the set question, and in-depth analysis.

4. “Economic problems rather than political grievances were responsible for revolutionary outbreaks in Europe in 1848.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?

Candidates should refer to the main areas of revolutionary outbreaks: France, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Prussia. The main economic problems were: bad harvests; food shortages; famine; unemployment; trade recession. These hit both towns and countryside, in most parts of Europe. Candidates need to discuss to what extent they were behind the revolutionary activity in the above named countries. They can then discuss political grievances, especially those allied to foreign rule; the importance of middle class intellectuals, demands to have a greater share in government, *etc.* A final verdict should be given based on the specific evidence and argument given by the candidate.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalizations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for genuine attempts to treat economic problems and assess their importance.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which have wide knowledge of the different outbreaks, and specific knowledge of their causes.

[17+ marks] for balance and depth of analysis.

5. Explain and evaluate the view that the unification of Italy was helped not hindered by the disputes, differences and suspicions between leading Italian patriots.

A question like this has not been set before, but it is a view that is often argued today that those involved in Italian unification – Mazzini, Cavour, Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi – did not complement each other by their differences, in areas such as “Piedmontization”, nationalism, Republicanism, support for the monarchy, but that their disputes urged each of them to work against the other, culminating in the decisive move by Cavour to invade the Papal states in order to “save” them from Garibaldi. It was especially King Victor Emmanuel who was able to profit, because of the greater strength of Piedmont-Sardinia, and the failure of the republican ideals of Mazzini. Some candidates will probably contradict this view and argue that Italian unification was delayed by lack of agreement on how to proceed. Whatever their views, it is hoped that candidates will put forward an argument rather than narrating all they know about nineteenth-century Italian unification.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit explanation and evaluation.

[11 to 13 marks] for a genuine attempt to answer the set question.

[14 to 16 marks] for knowledge, focus, explanation and evaluation.

[17+ marks] for analysis and balanced or different interpretations.

6. To what extent was German unification under Prussia due to Prussian economic superiority between 1814 and 1866?

It is intended that candidates begin with Prussian gains in the Vienna Settlement, pass on to economic developments including the Zollverein and Prussian industrial expansion, explain how financial strength facilitated army reforms, and briefly show how Austria failed to develop economically. They could then weigh these economic gains for Prussia against Bismarck’s other policies, diplomatic and military, ending with the defeat of Austria in 1866 enabling a judgment to be made on “to what extent”. This is not intended to be a question requiring extensive coverage of Bismarck’s three wars.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated general accounts of Prussia, 1814 to 1866.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of Prussian advancement from 1814 to 1866, with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for specific assessment of Prussia’s economic development and some attention to other factors, especially Bismarck’s policies.

[14 to 16 marks] for sound knowledge and assessment of economic factors, and other reasons for Prussian final success in German unification.

[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis and/or different interpretations.

7. Assess the impact of rivalry between Whigs (Liberals) and Tories (Conservatives) on British politics in the second half of the nineteenth century.

A brief background could be given of the origin of these two British political parties, whose names were originally derogatory, and thus later changed to Liberal and Conservative. Peel split the party over the repeal of the Corn Laws, which led to a period of Whigs/Liberals in power. The first official use of ‘Liberal’ for a ministry was in 1868. In 1886 the party was split over Irish Home Rule, and remained weak for the rest of the nineteenth century; some opponents of Home Rule joined the Conservative Party. The word ‘Conservative’ rather than Tory was used in the Tamworth Manifesto of 1834, the party split over the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, and the Conservatives were in office for only three short periods until the 1870s. The rivalry during the second half of the century was highlighted by the personal rivalry of Disraeli and Gladstone. Gladstonian Liberalism included Free Trade Budgets, financial economy, political reform, and a pacific attitude towards foreign and imperial affairs. Disraeli established the Conservatives’ policies as the maintenance of British institutions, the protection of Empire and the improvement of social conditions. Candidates should use specific policies, legislation, events, *etc.* as supporting evidence for the rivalry.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate/inaccurate material.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of some aspects of British politics with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for essays focusing on rivalry with some explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured essays with specific evidence and assessment of the impact on British politics.

[17+ marks] for perceptive insight and analysis of the rivalry, and its impact.

8. “Considering the difficulties he inherited, Alexander II of Russia should be praised not criticised for his reforms.” To what extent do you agree with this judgment?

Difficulties inherited by Alexander II in 1855 included the Crimean war, which revealed Russian military weaknesses, an outdated and autocratic tsardom and nobility, archaic institutions, serfdom and a backward economy. Alexander tried to remedy the situation without weakening his position as tsar. His main reforms – which should be well known by candidates – included the emancipation of serfs, the reform of military, judicial, local governmental and educational institutions, but not a national government. He also tried to modernize the economy and infrastructure, especially railways.

In order to focus on the question, candidates should discuss the difficulties and their intended solutions and thus judge if Alexander achieved reasonable improvements for the Russian people, institutions and economy, in the context of the situation he inherited. It is hoped that the answers will be more than successes and failures.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of Alexander’s reforms with implicit judgment.

[11 to 13 marks] for attention to difficulties and attempted solutions with some explicit assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured focus on the quotation, reasonable factual knowledge and a verdict on the quotation.

[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis of the quotation based on specific details.

9. In what ways, and to what extent, did the internal and external policies of Austria-Hungary after 1867 lead to the First World War?

Candidates need to examine the internal and external policies of Austria-Hungary in order to decide in what ways they helped to cause the First World War. They then need to judge their importance, and mention very briefly other key causes, to satisfy “to what extent”.

The nineteenth-century Austrian Empire was troubled by disagreements between the different nationalities, which contributed to Prussia’s success in heading German unification. After Austria’s defeat by Prussia in 1866 the Ausgleich of 1867 tried to improve relations between Austria and Hungary. In spite of making them autonomous states under one sovereign, tension remained. Austria was more liberal than Hungary, where the policy of magyarization caused discontent with the minorities. But in spite of religious freedom and social legislation, the attempt to give equal status to German and Czech languages failed. Thus racial tension, a cause of the First World War, remained, but was not a dominant cause.

Foreign policy was more important as a cause. After defeating Austria and France, Prussia wished to keep Austria as an ally against possible French revenge. Beginning with the Dual Alliance of 1879, various treaties were signed. Also Austria, after being ousted from Germany, became more involved in the Balkans, administered then annexed Bosnia Herzegovina, but with the increasing rise of Serbia, and the Balkan Wars, felt threatened. This and other factors led to closer alliance between Germany and Austria, and the well known events that led to the outbreak of war.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of Austria-Hungary and implicit assessment of how this led to the First World War.

[11 to 13 marks] for attention to internal and external policies as a cause of the First World War.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of how far internal and external policies were a cause of the First World War.

[17+ marks] for balance, depth and detail and perhaps different interpretations.

10. Analyse the political changes in France between 1848 and 1871.

The political changes covered by this question are: Louis Philippe's unpopularity by 1847, leading to banquets, barricades, uprising and exile in 1848; Louis Napoleon's election to the Assembly, and President of the French republic in December 1848; his coup in 1851, as president for ten years; then as Emperor Napoleon III, in 1852, (confirmed by plebiscite); legislation to maintain his authority, including a new constitution in 1870; loss of Franco-Prussian War, deposition and exile 1871; and the foundation of the Third French Republic.

These changes should be analysed for their causes, both those resulting from the actions of individuals, and thematic, such as desire for glory, stability, republican values, relations with the Catholic Church, *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for sweeping generalizations, or lack of knowledge.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for specific detail of most of the changes and explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for clear focus on and analysis of, the relevant political changes.

[17+ marks] for depth, detail, balance and perhaps different interpretations.

11. For what reasons, and with what results, was the second half of the nineteenth century a period of social and economic change?

Candidates need to specify the nature of social and economic change, perhaps pointing out technological and intellectual changes that improved conditions for most people, account for it, and explain results.

Reasons could include: increase of education; political rights such as the franchise; end of serfdom and servitude; more democracy and freedom; growth of industry, towns and transport; better medical facilities.

Results could include: a freer, better educated, more widely travelled, and healthier population. On the other hand industry, transport, and urbanization had their down side: overcrowding; crime; diseases; poverty, *etc.* increased for many.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with little cause and effect.

[11 to 13 marks] for specific knowledge and understanding of change.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused understanding and analysis of cause and results.

[17+ marks] for perceptive, original, thoughtful essays.

12. Compare and contrast the development of the arts in *two* European countries during the nineteenth century.

The arts can include all forms: literature; plays; drawing and painting; sculpture; music; opera, *etc.* Candidates need to select two European countries and compare and contrast nineteenth-century artistic output, development, performance, appreciation, patronage, talent, neglect, building for performance or showing the arts – in fact, any aspect of the arts could be made relevant.

[0 to 7 marks] for a few general comments, or if only one country is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for two sequential accounts with little linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for sound use of material in a comparative framework.

[14 to 16 marks] for balanced specific material, carefully compared and contrasted.

[17+ marks] for depth, detail and perceptive comparison.

13. Evaluate the successes and failures of German domestic policy between 1871 and 1914.

This question demands a critical evaluation or assessment, for example, strengths, weaknesses, results, *etc.* of the domestic policies of Bismarck after German unification and William II.

Bismarck's policies from the onset of unification until his dismissal by William II in 1890 could include: curbing the power of the Reichstag; persecuting political parties who opposed him, as the centre party, liberals and socialists all did at some stage; the Kulturkampf; state socialism.

Kaiser William II's major concerns were with foreign policy issues and he left his chancellors, including von Caprivi and Bethmann Hollweg, to handle domestic policies such as the increase in economic growth, industrialization and the growth of socialism in the Reichstag.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or irrelevant (*e.g.* foreign policy) material.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit evaluation.

[11 to 13 marks] for sound knowledge and evaluation of the whole period.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused knowledge and evaluation of effects of the policy.

[17+ marks] for detailed, balanced knowledge and analysis of impact on Germany.

14. Analyse political and social developments in *one* Scandinavian country *or* in Finland during the twentieth century.

Political developments would include: the constitution; parliament and form of central and local government; legislation in establishing a welfare state; diplomacy and loss of independence or neutrality during the two world wars; Nazi occupation; influence of the Nazis, and in the case of Finland, Russia, could all be relevant. All the countries emphasized medical, educational and social developments. Living standards were high, and poverty was rarely a problem at least in peace time. Details will of course depend on the country selected.

[0 to 7 marks] for uncoordinated generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for some explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for sound focus and analysis of specific evidence.

[17+ marks] for an extra or very well-developed skill.

15. Compare and contrast the roles of Lenin and Trotsky in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, and in the foundation of the new Soviet State until 1924.

This question requires a comparison of the roles of Lenin and Trotsky in the second or Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in October/November 1917, and in the foundation of the new Soviet State, until Lenin's death in 1924.

For comparison:

Both supported staging a second revolution and its timing, in face of some opposition from their party; both supported asserting Bolshevik control after the successful revolution, including the dismissal of the Constituent Assembly; both wanted to end Russian participation in the First World War; both played some part in obtaining peace with Germany in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk; both supported the idea of conscription for labour duties for those not fighting in the army; both contributed to the success of the Reds in the Civil War.

For contrast:

Lenin directed the October/November Revolution from the background, Trotsky was the immediate organizer and participator; Lenin was the party leader and driving force in obtaining Bolshevik control of the Constituent Assembly, and of Russia. Lenin ordered Trotsky, who was Commissar of Foreign Affairs, to negotiate for peace with Germany, and insisted that Trotsky agreed to terms that he personally disapproved of; as a result Trotsky resigned. However, during the civil war Lenin appointed Trotsky Commissar for War. Lenin proposed War Communism and other measures, but did not take part in the fighting; Trotsky built up the Red Army, directed operations, and savagely and successfully crushed the Kronstadt Rising. Lenin introduced NEP, Trotsky opposed it.

Candidates could also comment on their different personalities, as well as noting that Lenin probably favoured Trotsky as his successor. Their political aims and views, intellect, writings and oratory could be made relevant, and the impact of these on their respective roles could be commented on.

[0 to 7 marks] for inaccurate or irrelevant material or if only Lenin or Trotsky is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narrative of both with some linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for effective linkage or perhaps an unbalanced comparative framework.

[14 to 16 marks] for appropriate selective knowledge in a comparative framework.

[17+ marks] for balanced analytical comparison and contrast.

16. Analyse the effects on *two* European states (excluding Germany), of the Paris Peace Settlements, 1919–1920.

Candidates need to select two countries, excluding Germany, and show how the Paris Peace Settlements affected them. What the settlement omitted as well as what it included would be relevant, also how the settlement treatment of Germany affected other states could be considered. As well as Versailles, the settlement included the Treaties of St Germain, Trianon and Sèvres, which had economic, social and political effects on the countries concerned. The settlement is often neglected except for Germany, but effects on Austria, Poland, France and Britain should be known and they would be suitable states to analyse. Political effects could include changes in government, political crises, changes in the franchise. Social changes could include effects of boundary and national changes and economic changes resulting from financial and economic losses from the geographical structure of the new Europe. Specific details will depend on countries chosen.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive or narrative answers with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for specific factual evidence well used and analysed.

[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

17. Why was the Weimar Republic so short-lived?

Candidates need to explain, and assess, why the Weimar Republic lasted fewer than fifteen years. The Republic was set up after the abdication of Kaiser William II, 9th November 1918. The Assembly met in Weimar in 1919 and moved to Berlin in 1920. It ended with the passing of the Enabling Act in March 1933. The reasons for its short existence were: it was unpopular because it was associated with German defeat (“stab in the back” and “November criminals”) and the Treaty of Versailles, which Germany regarded as unfair; it was elected by proportional representation, which led to short weak coalition governments (fifteen in all), with none lasting longer than 18 months, between 1919 and 1928; the German people were unused to democracy; it was hated by left and right parties, who tried to overthrow it. Conditions improved under Stresemann, but with his death and the Wall Street Crash and Great Depression, inflation ruined the progress made, and helped the Nazis to gain power. Hitler became Chancellor in January 1933. He was determined to impose autocratic rule in a one party state, this was consolidated in March 1933 with the Enabling Act.

[0 to 7 marks] for some general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit explanation.

[11 to 13 marks] for relevant knowledge and explicit explanation for Weimar’s short existence.

[14 to 16 marks] for exact focus and clear knowledge and explanation.

[17+ marks] for depth and detail.

**18. “Mussolini’s greatest skill lay in projecting himself through propaganda as a great leader.”
How far do you agree with this assertion?**

There are three elements to this question: that Mussolini did project himself successfully as a great leader, that he did this through propaganda, and that this was his greatest achievement – thus implying that his other policies were slight. Do not expect all candidates to address all three, or address them in this way.

Mussolini’s propaganda was based on portraying himself as a great leader, Il Duce. Propaganda was spread by radio, films, the press, speeches, photographs, *etc.* How well he did this is debatable, but at least in the early thirties, many in Europe did regard him favourably, especially when he opposed Hitler and joined the Stresa Front with Britain and France. Mussolini often based his image on being the inheritor of the ancient Roman Empire. Roman achievements, buildings, civilization, *etc.* were used effectively to this end. Italian expansion was sought to emulate the Roman Empire. He also embraced the Italian renaissance: in 1929 he moved his office to the restored Palazzo Venezia, and gave populist speeches from its magnificent balconies. He refused mention of his age, and, as he became bald, the most used portrait and photograph of him was as a military leader in a helmet. He also associated himself with a more recent military hero Napoleon, and convinced many that he was a wise and benign European statesman. He tried to improve the economic situation in Italy; at home his domestic policy including his battles for grain, births *etc.*

Finally, candidates should consider whether Mussolini had worthwhile achievements: his conquests and attempted conquests were condemned; much of his domestic policy criticized as “worthless window dressing”; his form of government was autocratic. Perhaps his most laudable policy was his religious one, including his concordat with the Pope. Finally a verdict on the quotation should be given.

[0 to 7 marks] for a few general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with some implicit assessment of the quotation.

[11 to 13 marks] for sound, focused treatment of the quotation.

[14 to 16 marks] for an analysis of Mussolini based on propaganda, as in the quotation.

[17+ marks] for perceptive treatment of the views expressed in the quotation.

19. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Hitler and Stalin in Europe, up to the invasion of Russia in 1941.

This should be a straightforward comparison between the foreign policies of Hitler and Stalin. Stalin was in power before Hitler, and for eight years after his death, but the question ends with the invasion of Russia by the German army in 1941.

For comparison:

Both were involved in the Spanish Civil War; both were interested in taking over part of Poland; both signed the Nazi Soviet Pact in 1939 and invaded Poland; both made some preparations for war in the 1930s; both were involved in the Second World War; both directed their sides in the war.

For contrast:

Hitler, in spite of restrictions imposed by the Treaty of Versailles, prepared for war, and followed an aggressive foreign policy; Stalin purported to follow his policy of “socialism in one country”; Hitler supported the Nationalists and Stalin the Republicans in the Spanish Civil War; Hitler invaded and took over Austria and Czechoslovakia before the Second World War; Hitler invaded western Europe in the first part of the Second World War, and the USSR in 1941; Stalin invaded and fought Finland in 1939, but his foreign policy was mostly concerned with security. Russia was invaded by Germany in 1941.

[0 to 7 marks] for lack of knowledge or if only Hitler or Stalin is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative sequential accounts and some linkage.

[11 to 13 marks] for relevant material and appropriate linkage.

[14 to 16 marks] for detailed knowledge in a comparative framework.

[17+ marks] for balanced, perceptive comparison and contrast.

20. Analyse the causes and results of the Spanish Civil War.

Candidates must analyse, not just recount, causes and results for good marks. Causes could include: continuation of the troubled 19th century; country split by divisions; regional divisions; Basques and Catalans wanted more autonomy; class divisions of rich landowners and poor peasants and towns and countryside; Church was regarded as pro-nobility – many lower clergy were dependent on them financially, as state stipends were inadequate, and conservative; left right division in politics; series of unstable governments; backward economy; powerful but often dissatisfied military. Candidates might also explain events 1932 to 1936, culminating in the military rising in Morocco, where the African Army was joined by Franco, flown in from Tenerife, who took command.

Results could include: victory for the Nationalists, casualties, atrocities, bitterness – still a divided society; Franco – dictator of Spain, repression, gradual liberalization and economic progress, did not enter Second World War but Germany profited from military trials during the Civil War; Cold War meant Spain's re-entry into the Western community; ultimately Spain became a constitutional monarchy.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] narratives of war with implicit analysis of causes and results.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on causes and results with some analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for exact focus and specific details well analysed.

[17+ marks] for balanced treatment of causes and results and perceptive analysis.

21. In what ways, and with what results for Europe between 1939 and 1949, was the Second World War a “total war”?

Candidates should begin with a definition of “total war”, and then explain how some of its aspects affected Europe, between 1939 and 1949.

Two key features of total war are: the entire mobilization of the resources of the countries involved, and the exposure of civilians to the effects of fighting. The first aspect includes: conscription of men and women to the forces, and direction of those unable to fight to other war work, such as nursing or work in munition factories or other war related industries; the assumption of governmental powers to control all aspects of life and resources; the use of all the country’s financial resources to fighting the war. The second aspect (mainly but not completely resulting from new methods of fighting caused by new technology) includes: bombing, and the methods used to try to make these less effective, such as blackout, evacuation, air raid wardens and the efforts made to make them more destructive with research and production of even deadlier bombs; rationing, which was also affected by torpedoing food supply ships; travel restrictions including petrol rationing with few car owners even qualifying for petrol coupons.

Some of the above should be expanded into specific details about actual effects in named European countries. Examples could include: the effects on women; effects on children with evacuation and/or disruption of education; effects of bombing especially on cities *e.g.* Dresden and Coventry; total destruction of cities under siege, *e.g.* Stalingrad and Berlin; statistics of injury and death; use of atom bombs, *etc.*

For the post war situation to 1949: continuation of food shortages and rationing; psychological damage to families after separation; rebuilding; re-employment; lack of money to rebuild therefore Marshall Plan; even the Cold War or Britain’s introduction of the welfare state might be made relevant.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate general statements.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive answers with implicit effects.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on and attention to all the demands of the question.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused, knowledgeable and structured answers.

[17+ marks] for specific knowledge analytically and perceptively treated.

22. Compare and contrast the political careers of Adenauer in Germany and de Gaulle in France after 1945.

Adenauer (1870–1967) was Chancellor of the German Federal Republic from 1949 to 1963. De Gaulle (1890–1970) was President of France briefly in 1945 and from 1958 to 1969.

For comparison:

Both were politically adroit and important European statesmen; both were concerned with foreign policy – Adenauer was foreign secretary 1951–1955 and De Gaulle directed France’s foreign policy throughout his presidency; both were at one stage members of NATO and concerned with European co-operation.

For contrast:

Adenauer was less explosive and controversial than de Gaulle both at home and in foreign affairs; Adenauer joined NATO in 1955, de Gaulle withdrew France from NATO in 1966. De Gaulle was involved with colonial/imperial affairs, especially Algeria; Adenauer was involved with the German Democratic Republic. De Gaulle tried to obtain more power for the president with a new constitution, and resigned when he lost a referendum; Adenauer built up the Christian Democratic Party, and retired after two terms in office.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate material or if only Adenauer or only de Gaulle is addressed.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison, either sequentially with very good linkage or in a comparative framework that may be unbalanced.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused knowledge in a comparative framework.

[17+ marks] for balanced comparison and judgment.

23. To what extent did Gorbachev overcome the internal problems he faced as leader of the USSR between 1985 and 1991?

The demands of the question are what internal problems did Gorbachev face/inherit when in 1985, as General Secretary of the Communist Party, he became leader of the USSR (in 1988 he also became Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and in 1990 the first executive President of the USSR), and how far he had solved them by 1991, when in spite of surviving a coup, he lost power to Boris Yeltsin in August, and resigned the presidency of the USSR in December. Internal means within the Soviet Union, thus foreign policy and relations with the Soviet-dominated states in Eastern Europe are only relevant in so far as they affected the USSR internally.

His problems included a severe economic and financial crisis, largely because of military expenditure and the war in Afghanistan, poor living standards and its resultant popular discontent, as well as general discontent because of the lack of political, religious and cultural freedom. There were increasing demands for more civil liberty, public debate, and consumer goods.

Gorbachev launched a radical programme of reform and restructuring – perestroika – of the Soviet political and economic system, and allowed a greater degree of political participation, public debate and journalistic and cultural freedom – glasnost. He also reduced military spending, withdrew from Afghanistan, and accepted the break up of the Warsaw Pact and Comecon, hoping to improve the economic situation at home. But he failed to fulfil his promise to reform the economy and improve living standards, and after he fell from power, the Soviet Union disintegrated.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or irrelevant material.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for specific details and some assessment of problems and attempted solutions.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused material that is explained and analysed.

[17+ marks] for in-depth consideration, perhaps different interpretations.

24. Explain and account for the decline and fall of *two* communist regimes excluding USSR.

The downfall of communist regimes/Soviet Satellites took place between 1989 and 1990. Candidates must select two states and explain how and why communism collapsed. Reasons were political: the desire for some share in government and to remove a repressive regime; social: the wish for greater personal freedom, for example the right to travel abroad, and economic: to obtain better living conditions, wages, *etc.* Many communist states had tried to obtain freedom and independence before, but had been forcibly suppressed. Conditions had however changed, including Gorbachev's policies of perestroika and glasnost. The formation of the trade union movement in Poland, Solidarity, led to increasing opposition and protests. The election of a Polish Pope also influenced the situation, as did the increase of mass communications, which made people in the communist regimes realize the difference in life styles beyond the Iron Curtain.

Exact details will depend on the countries chosen; probably most candidates will know more about Poland and Czechoslovakia.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for reasoned knowledge and explanation.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured essays focused on explaining how and why two communist regimes fell.

[17+ marks] for perceptive understanding and analysis.

N.B. Mark out of *[12 marks]* if only one communist regime is addressed.

25. In what ways, and for what reasons, did *either* gender issues *or* terrorism affect life in twentieth-century Europe?

Here candidates have a choice of two very different topics, to explain how and why one of them affected life in the 20th century. "Affect" means change for the better, or the worse. Gender issues will for many candidates suggest improvement in the lives of women, with more freedom, education, career choice, health care, *etc.*, but it also includes changes for men. The growth of terrorism, with peaks and troughs, rather than a continuous ascent, will surely be regarded as a negative twentieth-century development, and the ways that it affected twentieth-century life, political changes, governments, *etc.* should be assessed.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague general assertions.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for assertions supported by specific evidence and some assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for focus, structure and analysis.

[17+ marks] for answers based on a serious analytical study of the chosen topic.
