

MARKSCHEME

November 2007

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 reasons for, and the contribution of, guerrilla warfare to the outcome of *one* twentieth-century war.

Popular choices here are likely to be Vietnam or China or Cuba.

For Vietnam accept the First Indochinese War (1946–1954) against France – or the better known stages of US involvement from the early 1960s until 1975 – or both.

For China, accept either the longer term interpretation of civil war (1927–49) or a narrower interpretation of 1946–49.

Reasons for the adoption of guerilla warfare could include:

- lack of resources, arms, training, conventional military experience by opponents of the regime
- physical terrain limiting conventional military operations
- ideological support: leaders who view guerilla warfare as practical/necessary for gaining time to build popular support
- tradition of resistance by local groups to authority.

Guerrilla methods were political as well as military and recognition of the nature of such elements could be mentioned. Mass mobilization, the building of popular support through social and economic reforms *e.g.* in liberated zones, the winning of “hearts and minds” especially (though not only) of a peasant population by recourse to programmes/propaganda stressing land reform, egalitarianism, nationalism/anti-imperialism *etc.* proved effective in rallying support for guerrilla movements in both cases.

Candidates need to assess the relative contribution of this type of warfare in deciding the outcome of the political and military struggle. Note that even Mao recognised that guerrilla warfare, on its own, was rarely a recipe for success.

Other factors could be considered in explaining eventual victory in whichever war is chosen: the nature, extent and impact of outside intervention; the collapse of the existing regime due to political and economic bankruptcy; weariness of the regime and its domestic and foreign supporters in pursuing the prolonged and sapping war *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of either war with implicit assessment/evaluation.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate knowledge and some explicit assessment of the efficacy of guerrilla warfare. Some indication of other factors, but requiring more development.

[14 to 16 marks] for an analytical response which evaluates the role of guerrilla warfare and considers the contribution of other factors in a balanced manner.

[17+ marks] for thorough coverage, detailed and balanced in-depth analysis of the factors leading to eventual victory in the conflict.

2. **“Ideological differences were the most important reasons for both the outbreak of, and outside intervention in, civil wars.” Assess the validity of this claim with reference to *one* of the following: the Russian Civil War; the Chinese Civil War.**

Whichever war is chosen any competing ideologies or beliefs should be identified clearly – both in relation to the domestic circumstances that produced conflict and in the case of external interests which intervened and may have influenced the nature and duration of the conflict.

If there is a challenge to either part of the statement it needs to be supported by detailed information: it is not enough to dismiss the claim – either partly or wholly – without offering a well-substantiated argument indicating other factors.

Apart from ideology, themes such as strategic considerations, economic gain *etc.* could be emphasized for “outside intervention” depending on the conflict chosen.

For “reasons for outbreak”, depending again on the conflict chosen, these could include: religion; economic and social inequality; desire for national unity; resentment of vested interests politically dominating the state; (mis)treatment of groups in political life; chaos instituted by the existence of a power vacuum *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for poorly substantiated generalizations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate knowledge, explicit comment on ideology’s role – though unbalanced in treatment of the two parts.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, balanced responses which deal explicitly with both parts of the question, providing appropriate and accurate factual knowledge.

[17+ marks] for answers which reveal a clearly structured argument in relation to both parts of the question and a high level of analysis. May successfully challenge assumptions implied in the question or show good conceptual ability.

3. Analyse the economic and social results on the civilian population of *one* twentieth-century war.

“Results” could be taken to mean the effects on the civil population both **during** and **after** the conflict chosen.

For economic results **during** the conflict consideration could be given for example to: the increasing role of women in industry and agriculture, taxation, rationing, transportation, industrial reorganization to meet wartime demands.

After the conflict (depending on the war selected) coverage of the post-war economic problems affecting the populations – whether they were citizens of a victorious or vanquished power – could include: restructuring of the economy; the consequences of physical devastation of housing/factories; existence of refugees; demobilization and its effects on wartime employment patterns; unemployment; continued shortages *etc.*

For social results consideration could be given to the changing status of groups as a result of war: attitudes towards women/attitudes of women; treatment of minorities during conflicts (internment of “enemy aliens”); loss of civil liberties of the population during the conflict; demographic changes and gender imbalance *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate knowledge and explicit analysis. Not all implications considered. May be an unbalanced treatment of social and economic.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, analytical and balanced answers focused on results.

[17+ marks] for balanced structure, in-depth knowledge and perceptive analysis.

4. Compare and contrast the reasons for Germany’s involvement in the First and Second World Wars.

Likely to prove a popular question. Hopefully candidates will avoid producing long sequential narratives and instead deal with themes.

Areas of **comparison** for both wars could include: economic motives – (*Mitteleuropa/lebensraum*); nationalism and the desire for world power status; fear of encirclement; the claim to be fighting a defensive war (First World War: Russian mobilization / Second World War: Polish “aggression”).

No doubt some students will argue that the Second World War was essentially a continuation (round two) of the First World War in terms of Germany’s desire for continental/world domination – but evidence/detail needed.

Areas of **contrast** could include:

Second World War: revanchism/revisionism as a result of the peace settlements following the First World War; ideology (*e.g.* anti-Communist/anti-democratic/Aryan superiority); genocidal aims; appeasement by Great Powers leading to encouragement of expansionist policies until 1939.

First World War: alliance “obligation” to Dual Monarchy; fear of Pan-Slavism; war of distraction from domestic political problems (rise of socialism in Germany); inept diplomatic policies pre-1914/ military mobilization which provoked a war on a continental scale.

If only one war is addressed mark out of a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate/inaccurate knowledge or if only one war is covered.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comment on both wars, though possibly unbalanced treatment. Not all implications considered.

[14 to 16 marks] for a comparative structure and a balanced treatment with accurate knowledge.

[17+ marks] for detail and depth of analysis and perhaps evidence of different interpretations to supplement (not supplant) the candidate’s argument.

5. Define the term “limited war”. With reference to *two* wars, each chosen from a different region, explain why they remained limited.

Definitions could include the “limited” nature of the war(s) in relation to: the number of participants; the geographical extent/location of the war; the aims of the participants; the use or type of weaponry/methods of fighting used.

Whichever wars are chosen candidates should, having given their definition, explain those factors – political/military/economic *etc.* – which led to the conflicts remaining “limited” in whatever sense they have identified. No doubt episodes from the Cold War will prove popular here (*e.g.* Korea, Vietnam) along with an emphasis on fear of weapons proliferation/nuclear war which helped keep conflicts from expanding. Other wars – for example Russo-Japanese, Italo-Abyssinian, Falklands/Malvinas, Arab-Israeli, *etc.* are acceptable.

Be generous in interpreting examples of “limited war” but obviously the First World War and the Second World War cannot be accepted. Nor can the “Cold War” as a whole be used as an example.

If only one war is addressed mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for ill-defined and generalized responses lacking depth/detail.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate definitions and explicit comments on reasons why the chosen conflicts remained limited.

[14 to 16 marks] for good understanding of the characteristics of a limited war and balanced coverage of the two regional examples selected.

[17+ marks] for depth of analysis, high level of accurate knowledge and perceptive coverage.

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

6. What were the main causes of the nationalist movements in *one* of the following: India until 1947; Indonesia until 1949; Kenya until 1963?

Students will have to explain a number of causes in whichever state they choose for their response.

The main areas that candidates could consider are: influence of a specific leader of the movement(s); the influence of the Second World War on the colonial power and on the people of the country; new ideological or religious influences; presence of active political movements or parties; examples of other countries which had similar experiences; influence of, or intervention by, other countries; changing world perspectives influencing the governments or populations of the colonial power; increased militancy amongst the citizens of the country being discussed; changing economic conditions which may lead to pressures for change; the influence of the Cold War.

Students will have to select a number of these influences depending on the country being discussed and explain fully how they influenced the nature, direction and structure of the independence movements.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis and content.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, analysis and detail.

7. Assess the impact of the Second World War on *two* independence movements, each chosen from a different region.

Students will have to consider a number of the effects of the Second World War and explain their impact.

These effects could include: defeat of colonial powers such as Italy and Japan; the physical and economic weakening of traditional colonial powers such as France and Britain; the sense of importance that citizens of developing countries gained by participation in the war in a variety of roles; the destruction of the myth of racial superiority as a result of the Japanese successes against Britain and America; anti-colonial sentiments of the USA now the world's largest power; pro-democracy sentiments in the west; a major change in social attitudes in the West which included questioning colonialism.

Reference could also be made to: the emergence of local leaders who had gained prestige during the war along with associated political movements; armed uprisings using experience, equipment gained in wartime; necessary concessions/promises made by metropolitan powers to obtain support; movements for racial equality with the founding of the UNO and the influence of progressive political movements in the West.

Students could show how these effects were translated into resistance movements, political movements, demands for equality, demands for better treatment of colonial peoples, the filling of power vacuums created by the wars, nationalism raised by the war, greater self-confidence of colonial peoples.

If only one region or one independence movement is chosen, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague general responses.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reasons and results.

[14 to 16 marks] for good structure and clear focus on impacts.

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, depth of analysis and content.

- 8. With reference to *one* newly independent non-European state, assess the extent to which its colonial heritage both helped and hindered political and economic development.**

Students must deal with both parts of the question in order to achieve higher awards.

Examples of helping could be: creating a strong economic infrastructure, setting up a reasonable education system; creating a legal system and structure; providing education and training for government officials, technicians, military *etc.*; working to establish a viable political system; developing trade relations with other countries and mechanisms and products to trade. Working to establish civil rights for different groups in society and perhaps a tradition of progress.

These could all be hindrances if not undertaken or done poorly. In addition, hindrances could be: creating an atmosphere of violence; lack of respect for various groups; favouritism of one group over another; lack of interest in the future of the new state; failure to provide on-going assistance; destruction or removal of key infrastructure or resources prior to independence; failure to train local people to assume responsibilities of government in technical as well as political areas.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reasons of both help and hindrance.

[14 to 16 marks] for sound structure, analysis and clear focus on both parts of the question.

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, depth of analysis and knowledge in both aspects of the question.

9. Examine the impact of independence on traditional social and cultural life in *one* newly independent non-European state.

This is open ended as to choice of country.

The traditional areas of social and cultural life could include: family structures; role of women and children; place of religion; traditional lifestyles; rural communities; status of elders; political leaders; racial and ethnic relationships; traditional music and ceremonial occasions; religions; gender relationships.

Areas to examine for impact could include: importation of new ideologies or religions and their effect; pressures for change brought on by economic development; impact of new technology; new political structures such as democracy which impact rights of individuals; external influences and ideas spread by new media technology; influence of wider education; work of external agencies; the impact of foreign alliances or organizations that the country may have joined.

[0 to 7 marks] for general or irrelevant comments.

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

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

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

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, knowledge and depth of analysis.

10. **“No leader of a newly independent non-European state successfully honoured the promises made before independence.” With reference to *one* leader of a newly independent non-European state, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Students may note that political leaders seeking power often make promises that they cannot or will not fulfil. In this way leaders of developing states are no different from any other political leaders.

Nevertheless students must address a specific leader and country not merely engage in generalizations as to the nature of politics. They should state to what degree they feel the leader has been successful in fulfilling promises made **before** independence.

Answers should take note of the specific conditions in the country that influenced the leader’s decisions. These might include: the sophistication of the citizens in political terms; unforeseen changes such as natural disasters; external interference by other countries or groups; changing world economic circumstances *e.g.* energy crisis. They could also include what is known of the leader, his character, ideology and the influence of those around him in decision-making.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis of success and failure.

[14 to 16 marks] for strong structure and analysis of the extent of success or failure.

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, breadth of content and analysis of success and failure.

Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states

11. **“A vigorous foreign policy played a vital part in the maintenance of power of single-party regimes.” With reference to *two* examples, explain to what extent you agree with this statement.**

Candidates should focus on the aims of foreign policy in both states chosen and illustrate answers by reference to the pursuit of such aims. Was foreign policy a means to win domestic support, gain international respect, seize economic resources to aid in the strengthening of the prestige of the single-party regime, or was foreign policy meant to distract the population from a lack of internal offerings – or both at different times?

Since the question asks “to what extent” candidates should also be aware of other factors which were necessary to maintain the regime – whether it be domestic economic policies, control of the media, education, repression/purges, social reform programmes, propaganda *etc.* Popular choices are likely to be Mussolini and Hitler where knowledge of foreign policy is likely to be greater – but successful challenges to the question could be made by reference to regimes which were less prominent in terms of an active foreign policy (*e.g.* Franco) or in cases where though active, foreign policy was largely unsuccessful in meeting its aims, even though the ruler/regime remained strong (*e.g.* Nasser).

If only one example is used mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized responses.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment and some recognition of other factors.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and well-supported answers which reveal awareness and evidence of other factors.

[17+ marks] for perceptive/insightful responses which provide full and convincing substantiation of foreign policy’s role in relation to other factors.

12. To what extent was ideology an important factor in the rise to power of *one* of the following: Lenin; Mussolini; Nyerere?

Candidates should identify the key points associated with the ideology of the chosen leader. Which sections of the population were especially attracted to such elements – and why? What were the circumstances which allowed the appeal to become so widespread? Was it the case that the ideology of the chosen example was seen as a replacement for existing ideologies which were perceived as inadequate for the state/population? And did the ideology of either of these leaders remain constant during the struggle for power, or was it a case of ideology being compromised by pragmatism?

“To what extent” provides opportunities for the candidate to identify and explore other factors which may account for the rise to power of the leader: war weariness; material/economic suffering; disillusionment with existing political systems; errors/inadequacies of preceding regimes; collusion of vested interests for whatever motive (*e.g.* fear of the alternatives) in times of crisis; the use of violence/intimidation/bribery.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalizations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reference to aims and role played by ideology but lacking adequate coverage of other factors/circumstances.

[14 to 16 marks] for balanced treatment and analysis in which ideology is clearly identified and its relative status in the rise to power is examined.

[17+ marks] for structured, detailed and thoughtful responses which evaluate convincingly the extent to which ideology *vis-à-vis* other factors was responsible for the rise of the chosen leader.

- 13. By what methods, and with what success, did single-party rulers in power establish totalitarian regimes? Reference should be made to *two* examples, each chosen from a different region.**

“Totalitarianism” should be understood as being more than just the existence of a one-party state. Effective or successful totalitarianism – the attempt to control every aspect of the population and its life in the interests of the party/leader (*i.e.* in the areas of social, cultural, economic, religious, educational as well as political life) should be considered.

Methods by which single-party rulers attempted to establish effective totalitarian regimes should be well known but the extent to which totalitarian goals were realised (or even realisable) requires examination – and substantiation. A thematic approach rather than end-on or sequential treatment is likely to provide more satisfactory answers.

If only one example or one region is used mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for balanced responses with explicit comment on the nature and success of the chosen regimes. Not all implications considered.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and balanced responses with good supporting detail/historical knowledge.

[17+ marks] for balanced treatment and perceptive explicit analysis supported by accurate and relevant substantiation.

14. Compare and contrast the economic and social policies of *one* left wing and *one* right wing single-party ruler.

The emphasis is on economic and social policies.

For economic policies candidates could examine issues such as: central planning; command economy; autarkic aims and reasons for these; agricultural and industrial policies and their emphases; employment; extent of success/failure of such policies *etc.*

For social policies: role of women, education, health, youth programmes, religion *etc.*

Thematic structure, rather than end-on or sequential treatment is likely to produce better responses.

If only one single-party ruler is addressed the maximum award is **[7 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate, general responses.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive responses with implicit comparisons/contrasts.

[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit commentary. May be an imbalance between treatment of economic and social policies.

[14 to 16 marks] for informed and balanced responses with explicit treatment of similarities and differences.

[17+ marks] for structured and thoughtful responses showing a detailed knowledge of types of policies in both examples.

15. Analyse the conditions which led to the establishment of *either* Perón’s regime in Argentina *or* Nasser’s regime in Egypt.

Whichever is chosen candidates need to identify and critically comment on those conditions – social, economic, political – which provided the background, and opportunities, for the coming to power and establishment of the chosen regime.

For Perón: consideration of circumstances leading to the 1943 coup d’etat; power base of Perón within the Ministry of Labour and Social Security; building of support amongst workers through programme of paid holidays, medical insurance, pensions, security from arbitrary dismissal. Election to presidency in 1946 after surviving (with trade union support) an attempt to remove him from the ministry in 1945. Slogans of “social justice” and “economic independence” led to popular support.

For Nasser: consideration of circumstances leading to the 1952 coup by “Society of Free Officers”, which overthrew dissolute King Farouk and a corrupt “parliamentary system” that had failed to solve inequitable land distribution system or achieve full sovereignty for Egypt (imperialist presence of British in Canal Zone). Military rule through Revolutionary Command Council imposed under General Naguib. Naguib removed 1954 for supposed collusion with Muslim Brotherhood. Nasser became president – purges of army to ensure future loyalty to Nasser.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized responses.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit analysis and adequate detail.

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

[17+ marks] for responses indicating a structured and detailed knowledge base and evidence of perceptive analysis.

Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states

16. “The United Nations was no more successful than the League of Nations in maintaining international peace.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This could be an interesting comparison question or an analysis of the ability of international organizations to be truly effective in this area.

Students could show that there have been many wars since 1945 which the UN has not prevented. They have not become world wars, yet this may have nothing to do with the UN, but rather the superpowers.

Students could comment on the unwillingness of nations to surrender sovereignty or accept outside direction, a general unwillingness to engage in collective security unless one’s own interests were at stake – a problem common to the League and the UN.

Students could comment on similarities in the organization, decision-making process and military or financial power of the two organizations that prevented them from intervening effectively – especially when major powers are involved.

The Cold War proved a further complication for the UN, preventing international action in some cases and proving an obstacle to international co-operation.

The question can be challenged to the extent that the UN has been successful in some cases in maintaining peace or limiting violence through peacekeeping operations in contrast to the League.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general comments or only addressing one organization.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive accounts with some implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reasons and comparison.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, organization, content and comparison.

17. In what ways, and with what success, did F.D. Roosevelt address the domestic problems of the USA, 1933–1945?

This question requires a response which demonstrates knowledge of the specific problems of the period, the policies adopted to address them and the relative success or failure of these policies. Students should select problems that reflect the entire period and go beyond simple economic issues such as unemployment. In addition to problems associated with the economic depression other areas involving social, political and ideological issues could be addressed.

These might include but not be limited to: discrimination and equality issues, including African-Americans and the Japanese-Americans during the Second World War; the prohibition issue; worker's rights and unions as well as aid to specific groups such as farmers; the internal migration of the poor and dispossessed.

Issues in domestic politics could also be noted: rise of extremist groups of the left and right; violent groups such as the Ku Klux Klan; demagogic leaders such as Huey Long; debate over government involvement in the economy.

To obtain higher awards students should choose a range of domestic problems and then assess the effectiveness of the measures undertaken to deal with them.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general descriptive comments, irrelevant material.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive comments with some implicit analysis or comments focussed on a single issue or type of issue *e.g.* economic.

[11 to 13 marks] for clear description and analysis of a variety of issues.

[14 to 16 marks] for strong analytical structure, knowledge and range of material.

[17+ marks] for excellent analysis, content and variety of issues.

18. Explain how *one* international organization has contributed to the social and economic development of *two* countries, each chosen from a different region.

This question allows students considerable choice as to organizations and countries.

The organizations might include the UN, GATT, IMF, European Union.

The areas of economic contribution might include: trade development; education; infrastructure development; health and welfare; technological development; foreign aid; loans and investment; debt cancellation/restructuring.

On the social front: education, women's rights; sex education; new intellectual movements; children's rights; health and safety education and services; housing.

Students might show that an organization did not have a positive impact on a country in some cases, although this might be limited to stronger students.

If only one country is attempted, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive account with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for clear explanation of the impact on two countries.

[14 to 16 marks] for a well-structured analysis of the impact in both countries.

[17+ marks] for excellent structure and analysis of the impact of both countries.

19. Why did so many multiparty states emerge in the period after 1975?

This is a broad question that will require careful thought.

Some areas to consider could be: demise of totalitarian states with the end of communism; ethnic and religious minorities within states demanding representation; pressure from international organizations and human rights groups; rising expectations in many countries assisted by the spread of information through modern technology; powerful example of other nations used as a template; demise of right wing totalitarian states *e.g.* Spain, Argentina.

The economic failure of totalitarian states led to a search for alternatives. The liberalization of business practices supports a move to multiparty states. Higher levels of education making people more aware of their rights and the influence of international agencies for economic and social change might also be considered.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on reasons.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, knowledge and analysis.

20. Explain how and why the political structure of *either* Spain after 1975, or South Africa after 1990, changed.

This is a challenging question requiring both strong content knowledge and analytical skills.

The key issues in Spain would be: the death of Franco and the decline of the National Movement; the return of the constitutional monarchy; the role of Franco in arranging the return of the monarchy; emergence of a democratic government; the declining influence of conservative institutions such as the Catholic Church and the army; economic reforms which encouraged political change; pressure from dissident groups; a desire for better relations with the outside world and especially the EU; the increasing demands for change of young people, women and minorities; greater urbanization leading to more progressive ideas.

In South Africa, the change was from an apartheid state with unequal rights and widespread repression of dissent and demands for change, to a multiparty democracy on the basis of political and legal equality for all, regardless of race. This change meant the replacement of the White leadership with native African leaders and the legalization of previously banned political parties.

Reasons for this are numerous. These could include: increasing international economic, diplomatic and social pressure to end apartheid; loss of US support for the regime at the end of the Cold War; a weakening economy; internal resistance movements such as the ANC as well as White and Asian groups seeking a change in the system; increasing levels of protest inside the country; the increasing prestige of Nelson Mandela in the international community as well as in South Africa; changing attitudes of the political leaders of South Africa; increased education and awareness in the country because of modern technology. The failure of the war in Namibia, continuing boycotts and travel bans which impacted upon many areas of South African life such as sport could also be noted.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on explanations with good structure.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent detail, structure and analytical skills.

Topic 5 The Cold War

21. **“The breakdown of East-West relations was due to the failure of both sides to appreciate the fears of the other.” With reference to the period 1945–53, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Essentially an origins (and early development) of the Cold War question. Candidates could identify the respective leaders and fears of/perceived threats to both sides in this period. Truman and Stalin are likely to be the main leaders identified but some candidates may include Roosevelt and Churchill in responses.

No doubt some will argue that the breakdown was simply the resumption of a more long-standing animosity or fear dating back pre-Grand Alliance but the emphasis is on the 1945–53 period and developments which led to the (re)emergence of East-West hostility.

Arguments/suspicion over issues raised and discussed at Yalta, and especially by the time of Potsdam, should be well known. Coverage of the German Question, Poland, Greece and Turkey, the “liberation”/“occupation” of Eastern Europe, Containment policies (Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan) and Soviet moves (Cominform and Comecon), NATO, and the spread of conflict to Korea (given the 1953 date), are all relevant.

The respective “fears” of both need to be addressed – what was the perception of both sides in relation to such events? Were leaders simply reacting to perceived aggression (military, economic) of the other – or were both sides deliberately pursuing aggressive and expansionist policies in their own interests?

The “to what extent” invitation allows for the identification of other factors which initiated a breakdown – *e.g.* ideology, deliberate pursuit of aims by one side or the other in an attempt to spread their respective values system.

[0 to 7 marks] for unfocused generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of the origins of the Cold War with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit identification of fears and assessment.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured and focused responses with a sound historical knowledge base and awareness of other factors.

[17+ marks] for full analytical and detailed answers which address the issue of fears and also other factors and offer a perceptive judgment of their relative importance.

22. How effective was the United States policy of containment up to 1962?

Candidates could explain the circumstances in which the policy was adopted, the aims of the policy and the methods involved.

The adoption of the policy in its European context, and its subsequent expansion to a global policy by 1950, could include reference to: US perceptions of Soviet policy in the post-war era (reference to the Sovietisation of E. Europe, Soviet “involvement” in Greece and Turkey; fears relating to developments in post-Potsdam Conference Germany); Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan as “two halves of the same walnut”; Berlin crisis of 1948/9; NATO; establishment of the PRC 1949; Korea; Indochina; Berlin 1958–61; Cuba.

There is much to choose from. Do not necessarily expect all, but the emphasis should be on judging the effectiveness of the policy after it was adopted. Did it halt expansion – how, where, why? Examples where it proved less successful – how, where, why? **Specific** details/examples are needed for substantiation.

[0 to 7 marks] for poorly substantiated or inadequate responses.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts with implicit assessment of effectiveness.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate detail and explicit focus. Not all implications considered or sufficiently developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for informed, well-focused and explicit assessment of the effectiveness of the policy.

[17+ marks] for analytical, knowledgeable responses which reveal insight into the functioning of the policy in the period.

23. For what reasons, and with what results for East-West relations, did the superpowers become involved in the affairs of *one* of the following: Korea; Vietnam; the Middle East?

A two-part question requiring candidates to explain the motives behind involvement in either area of conflict and what result this had for East-West relations. It is **not** an invitation to detail or recount the course of the conflicts in either area.

For Korea, accept answers which use either the start of the Korean War in 1950, or the “liberation” from Japan in 1945 as a starting date. For Vietnam – accept starting date from either 1946, or from 1960–61. Middle East – could include the Arab-Israeli dispute characterized by a series of wars since 1948 and/or Iran/Iraq/Afghanistan.

Reasons could include: ideology; strategy; mutual fear of perceived rival expansion; prestige; proxy/surrogate conflict; economic resources *etc.*

Results could include: intensification of tensions; economic and political burdens placed upon superpower participants; arms/technological development; realisation of risk of direct confrontation leading to periods of peaceful co-existence/détente; increasing role of PRC in East-West confrontation *etc.*

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalization.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit coverage of “why” and “results”. Not all implications considered or developed sufficiently.

[14 to 16 marks] for a structured, balanced and explicit analysis/assessment of motives and results.

[17+ marks] for answers revealing insight, in-depth knowledge and well-substantiated historical judgment.

24. To what extent was the collapse of communist regimes the result of domestic problems rather than external pressures?

Candidates should identify and explain the domestic problems which beset the chosen regimes. Material shortages, production problems, the difficulties of maintaining a satisfactory level of consumer goods whilst maintaining expenditure on military/defence budgets, ossification of the command economy and central planning systems could all be examined and commented upon.

“External pressures” could be seen as linked to economic pressures since they required the regimes’ expenditure to the disadvantage of the population – leading to dissatisfaction, demonstrations or a need for restructuring which opened the gates to political reform. Other external pressures (the role for example of religious institutions) could be considered – *e.g.* in Poland or the GDR/DDR.

Other factors could also be identified: disillusionment with ideology; the “domino effect” of reform on regimes following the collapse or weakening of the regimes in USSR, Poland *etc.*

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

[0 to 7 marks] for poorly substantiated and generalized responses.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment but imbalanced treatment of two examples.

[14 to 16 marks] for responses which are balanced, with adequate and accurate detail and explicit assessment.

[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis of the impact of domestic problems and perceptive comments on their role and/or linkage to other factors.

25. Compare and contrast the role of education and the arts in *one* communist and *one* non-communist state.

For education: answers could consider issues such as indoctrination; the promulgation of desired citizenship values; technical/scientific programmes and their purpose; “education” not only for youth but for an adult population; the concept of a “liberal education” for the sake of the individual as opposed to the ideological needs and dictates of the state.

For “arts” interpret in its widest sense – literature, painting, theatre, film, sculpture *etc.* What did the state see as the function of the arts? For example, in a communist regime art could be used as a tool for the promotion of party values (the artist as “an engineer of souls”). In a non-communist state was freedom of expression of the individual observed/encouraged? Censorship?

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalizations or if only one state is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive responses with implicit compare/contrast.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison/contrast. Not all aspects considered or developed.

[14 to 16 marks] for a comparative structure and specific detail.

[17+ marks] for a balanced comparison based on specific detail, revealing a thoughtful or insightful analysis.

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

26. Why did minority groups place great emphasis on acquiring education? Examples must be provided from at least *two* ethnic or religious minorities.

This question requires the student to consider how education might be an antidote to discrimination, prejudice or other forms of unjust behaviour.

Answers might consider the following areas in relation to the desire for the acquisition of education: Education might make it easier for a minority to emigrate to a more welcoming environment. It might gain some respect for their community or allow them to establish international contacts and support. It may be all that they are permitted to do by the society. Their religion or belief system may honour the better educated over others. Education could allow groups to earn a better living, maintain the integrity of the community or minorities may believe that a good education will win the respect of the majority.

Examples should be drawn from at least two minority groups. A challenge may occur in that it might be shown that education has not been pursued avidly by some groups and reasons for this could be advanced.

If only one minority group is discussed, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for general, vague, irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for clear focus on explicit reasons.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent knowledge, structure and analytical ability.

27. In what ways, and with what success, did *two* religious or ethnic minorities attempt to overcome discrimination?

The points made will depend on the countries selected but some common themes might be: lobbying government agencies and political leaders; petitions; protests *e.g.* civil disobedience; sit-ins *etc.*; asking for help from external sources of various types; terrorism or armed insurrection; economic boycotts; strikes *etc.*; using media to publicize the issue; religious leaders as spokesman; publicizing the extent and nature of the discrimination inside and outside the country. Other factors might include asking for intervention by international agencies or other countries or publicity campaigns in other countries to generate international protest against governments.

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

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for clear analysis and focus on methods.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent knowledge, structure and analysis.

28. “Religious conflict was rarely caused by solely religious issues.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This is a challenging question as it asks students to understand the underlying reasons for conflicts which appear to be based on religion but which could be caused by other factors.

Students should be able to explain to what extent the conflict they have chosen to analyse is the result of genuine religious antipathy, and to what extent other factors play a role.

Non-religious causes could include: a desire by one group to maintain economic superiority over others; resentment of immigrants; ignorance of other cultures and their values; racial theories of superiority; conflicting political ideologies; historic prejudices; jealousy of one group towards another with respect to money, land *etc.*; fear of foreign influences; using one group as a scapegoat for problems; conflicts over social practices such as treatment of women; demagogic leaders using religious strife to obtain power.

Religious reasons could include: intolerance of each other’s beliefs; conflicting value systems in the religions; historical factors or disputes; intolerant leaders of religious groups; lack of multi-faith or multi-cultural traditions in the society; a belief that one religion is innately superior to another.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for clear analysis of a variety of reasons.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent understanding, analysis and knowledge.

29. How and why did minorities resist integration in the twentieth century?

This is a challenging question requiring an understanding of why minorities wish to remain separate instead of being integrated with the majority. Candidates should consider at least two minority groups and countries.

Some reasons could include: rejection of the social, cultural, family and religious values of the majority; desire to retain ethnic purity; belief in the minorities superiority; community philosophy which works to isolate the minority from the mainstream; history of bad relations with the majority; resentment over past treatment; belief that they will ultimately overcome the majority if they remain separate; fear of loss of their own identity and values.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on reasons.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent structure, detail and analysis.

30. For what reasons, and by what methods, did a religious *or* ethnic movement challenge the authority of the state?

This question requires knowledge of specific rebellions or insurrections both successful and unsuccessful. The overthrow of the Shah of Iran might be a popular topic. The Taliban might be considered amongst others.

Reasons might include: government corruption; disagreement with social and cultural values; disagreement with laws; foreign policy; presence of foreign influences; anti-traditional trends; religious differences between rulers and ruled; external examples or ideology; racial antipathy of an historic nature. Other reasons might include: government persecution and discrimination in a variety of areas; emergence of inspirational leaders determined to bring change; ideas imported from other countries; support of co-religionists or members of the ethnic group in other countries; international condemnation of the government in power.

Methods: popular protests; political activism; armed insurrection; civil disobedience; involvement of leaders from other countries; material support from other countries.

If only one of “what reasons ” or “what methods” is discussed, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague, general, or irrelevant comments.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for clear focus on reasons.

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

[17+ marks] for excellent analysis, knowledge and structure.
