



MARKSCHEME

November 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. To what extent was the bankruptcy of the French Monarchy the main cause of revolution in France in 1789?

Candidates should make a linkage between the bankruptcy of the court and the need to obtain more financing. Reference could be made to the role of the aristocracy and the Church who refused to pay more taxes. The Assembly of Notables, the calling of the Estates-General, the position of the Third Estate, the unpopularity of the King and Queen, the Bread Riots, the general economic condition of France, the Tennis Court Oath, the National Assembly *etc.* could all be included to explain why it was that the Bastille was attacked on July 14 1789. It is possible to develop several different lines of argument here so ensure that the candidates are given credit for this.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of the causes of the Revolution, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative frameworks which have explicit focus on the effect of the bankruptcy of the monarchy on the French Revolution. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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.

2. **“Napoleon’s foreign policies were not nearly as successful as his domestic policies.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should be able to identify the various foreign and domestic policies introduced by Napoleon including the wars, the Continental System, the Concordat, through the respective reforms of the legal, administrative, educational and financial systems. These policies should then be analysed to see to what extent they succeeded or failed and a judgment should be made, based on the supporting material which has been included, as to whether Napoleon’s foreign or domestic policies were the most successful.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments concerning Napoleon’s foreign and domestic policies.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments which relate to Napoleon’s policies.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the success or failure of Napoleon’s foreign and domestic policies. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that include detailed specific examples: 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.

3. For what reasons, and with what results, did the Vienna Settlement of 1815 ignore liberalism and nationalism?

Candidates should identify the aims of both the Congress as a whole, and of the individual members, in entering into the Settlement. The terms of the Settlement should then be analysed in relationship to the aims of the Great Powers and whether or not liberalism and nationalism were ignored. Candidates could also mention the discrepancy between the treatment of the Great Powers and other countries/territories, the fact that there was no major European war until 1854 and any other relevant lines of argument. There is a considerable body of historiography about this question and better candidates would use this to support their analysis.

Maximum of **[12 marks]** if candidates answer only “for what reasons” or “with what results”.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments which refer to the question.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework which has explicit focus on the nature of the Vienna Settlement and some mention of liberalism and nationalism. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific details and sound analysis of whether or not liberalism and nationalism were ignored. If the candidates consider that they were then there should be some analysis of why this was the case.

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

4. Assess the influence of William Gladstone on British politics in the nineteenth century.

Candidates should consider Gladstone's work for the Board of Trade, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, his support of the 1867 and 1884 Reform Acts and the 1870 Education Act, the Bulgarian question, Parliamentary reform and Irish Home Rule. These actions/policies should not merely be described by the candidates but must be assessed to show their influence on British politics.

[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 concerning Gladstone's career.

[11 to 13 marks] for a narrative framework which has an explicit focus on the importance of Gladstone's policies/actions. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of Gladstone's influence.

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

5. Why, despite the opposition of the Republican movement, was Italy unified under the Piedmont-Sardinia monarchy?

Candidates should discuss the nature of republicanism in Italy, going back to the Carbonari and Mazzini to explain its origins. They should then examine the roles of Charles Albert, Garibaldi, Victor Emmanuel II, Napoleon III and Cavour as they relate to it. Key events such as the Roman Republic, the Crimean War, the Pact of Plombières and events in Italy between 1859 and 1870 should then be analysed to show why, despite the opposition of the Republican movement, Italy was unified under Victor Emmanuel.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for a narrative framework that has explicit focus on specific details relating to Italian republicanism. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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.

6. “The revolutions of 1848 in Austria and Prussia ended in total failure.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates should identify the aims, actions, policies and results of the revolutionary groups in Austria and Prussia. While it is true to say that by 1850 the revolutions were over it is arguable whether or not they totally failed. Candidates could argue that the Magyar uprising paved the way for the 1867 Ausgleich or that the Frankfurt Assembly indicated the direction that German unification might take or left residual groups which contributed to unification. Candidates might also argue that the forced resignation of Metternich was a crucial blow to Austrian attempts to control nationalism in its empire.

Candidates should evaluate the successes and failures of both revolutions. If only one revolution is included the highest that can be awarded is **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the 1848 revolutions.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for a narrative framework with explicit focus on both revolutions. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that include specific examples: 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.

7. Evaluate Bismarck's use of war as an instrument of policy between 1862 and 1890.

Candidates should make note of the different uses of war before and after 1871. Between 1862 and 1871 war was used to eliminate external opposition to the German states or to intimidate weaker states to join with Prussia for defensive purposes. After 1871 Germany did not go to war while Bismarck was in office but used the threat of war as a means of influencing other states' actions. The League of the Three Emperors, the alliances and the conferences/congresses were devices through which Bismarck could achieve his policies.

[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 concerning Bismarck's use of war.

[11 to 13 marks] for a narrative framework which has an explicit focus on the importance of war as an instrument of policy. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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 Bismarck's use of war.

**8. “Despite his apparently liberal policies, Alexander II was just as conservative as Alexander III.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Alexander II’s policies include the emancipation of the serfs, the reform of local government, changes in the legal system, changes in educational policy and reforms in the military. Most of these had initial limited success but then created more problems later on. The emancipation was only a beginning. The local government reforms led to calls for a national assembly that was refused and many of these policies drew fierce criticism.

Alexander III was strongly influenced by Pobedonostsev who believed in autocracy, orthodoxy, restricting suffrage and censorship of the press. The office of Land Commandant was established to control the zemstvos. The Laws of 1890 and 1892 revised the franchise and education was restricted. The policy of Russification was also introduced. Social and political change was resisted wherever possible.

Candidates should assess the policies of the two Tsars and make a judgment as to their conservative nature.

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

[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 Alexander II and III’s policies. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that contain specific examples relating to the question: 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.

9. What effect did advances in industrialization have on the economic development of any *one* European country in the nineteenth century?

Candidates should be aware of developments in industrialization and how these affected the economic activity within European countries. Britain and Germany will be popular examples and there is a plethora of material that could be included. Marks will depend upon specific detail but the response must be focused on one country rather than be a general description of European economic progress.

[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 question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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.

10. Assess the contribution of music in promoting nationalist movements in *two* European countries in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries.

Candidates can choose from a multitude of examples: Sibelius; Greig; Borodin; Chopin; Verdi; Dvorak; Smetana *etc.* but links must be made between the composer and the nationalist movement in whichever countries are chosen. Marks will depend upon specific detail and the response must be focused on two countries rather than be a general description of European nationalism.

If the candidate writes about only one country [**12 marks**] would be the maximum that could be awarded.

[**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 question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[**14 to 16 marks**] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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.

11. Analyse the successes and failures of Napoleon III at home and abroad between 1852 and 1870.

Candidates should be able to identify the main policies of Napoleon III: the establishment of the Second Empire; the Constitution; the Press Decree; reforms of the banking system; railway expansion; economic liberalisation and the attempted reforms of education and the army. In foreign affairs: the Crimean War; Italy; the Suez Canal; Mexico and relations with Prussia were key areas.

Candidates should then make a judgment as to which of these policies were successes and which were failures. Maximum of **[12 marks]** if candidates only include successes or failures.

[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 relating to Napoleon III.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the policies of Napoleon III. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that relate both to Napoleon III's successes and failures: 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.

12. Compare and contrast the effects of Sweden’s policy of neutrality in the nineteenth century with that of the twentieth century.

The policy of neutrality started in 1812, carried on until the First War of Schleswig where Swedish troops supported Denmark against Prussia between 1848 and 1851 although they saw no combat. Sweden was then neutral in the Crimean War, the Second War of Schleswig and the First World War. Sweden supported the League of Nations, was neutral in the Second World War and, when Norway and Denmark joined NATO, Sweden abandoned any ideas of a Scandinavian Defence Union. The effects have generally been beneficial with Prussia controlling Northern Europe, Swedish industry has benefited through production of armaments and Sweden suffered little in the Second World War.

If only one century is included candidates should receive no more than *[7 marks]*.
Comparison or contrast only should receive no more than *[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 question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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.

13. Why was the Provisional Government in Russia unable to consolidate and maintain its power in 1917?

After the March Revolution the new republic was in the hands of two powers, tolerating but not supporting each other. The Duma did the work of the government while the Petrograd Soviet had most of the practical power. Their inability to deal with the questions of land and the maintenance of the war effort was the first major failure of the government. The July offensive failed and Kornilov's attempted coup weakened the provisional government even further. Lenin's arrival in Petrograd in April and his reorganisation of the Bolshevik Party was a major turning point with the pronouncement of the April Theses. Trotsky's preparations for revolution, the persistent social and economic problems in Russia, and the refusal of the army to support it brought the Provisional Government down.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for a narrative framework with an explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with detailed reference to the reasons behind why the Provisional Government could not consolidate or maintain its position: 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

14. Assess the relative importance of the long-term and short-term causes of the First World War.

Candidates should examine the fundamental long-term issues of militarism, the Alliance System, imperialism showing their connection to nationalism in Russia, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and the territories in the Balkans. Candidates should then examine the short-term causes which would include the July crisis. It is important that these issues are assessed and that the term “relative importance” be the focus of the answer.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the causes of the First World War.

[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 role of long-term causes and short-term causes of the First World War. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers which develop a soundly constructed argument: 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.

15. What were the main factors that led to the foundation of the League of Nations in 1920?

One key factor was Woodrow Wilson's vision of remaking the world after the First World War along the lines of a new diplomacy based on his 14 Points Address of January 1918. In Britain pro-League movements led by Grey and Cecil supported this idea. The Phillimore Committee announced its support for the League in Britain, which was supported by many smaller states. The horrific nature of the First World War and the perception that secret diplomacy and spheres of influence were bound to lead to conflict gave the League further moral support. The League was supported, in general terms, by the nations represented at the Versailles conference although there were two distinct schools of thought about its form. One, supported by the French, involved the League having armed force to realise its aims. The other, supported by the British and Americans, was that this might lead to international control of policies. The Covenant of the League ensured that it would be a forum to which nations in dispute could bring their problems for advice and settlement.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the League of Nations.

[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 foundation and structure of the League. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers which evaluate the reasons behind the foundation and structure of the League: 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.

16. Why did international diplomacy fail to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939?

Candidates should identify the key elements of international diplomacy which were prominent at the time – the League of Nations, the Locarno agreements, the disarmament conferences, the Four Power Pact, the Stresa Front, collective security and appeasement – and demonstrate how the flaws in these events/policies led to the outbreak of war in 1939. Other contributory factors such as the role of Hitler and Mussolini’s aggressive foreign policies, the importance of the Treaty of Versailles and the weakness of France and Britain in the 1930’s could also be included.

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

[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 question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers which argue why international diplomacy failed to prevent war: 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.

17. “Foreign policy is the area which especially preoccupies us.” To what extent do Mussolini’s actions and policies between 1922 and 1939 reflect this statement?

Candidates should identify the key areas of Mussolini’s foreign policy: Corfu; Locarno; the Four Power Pact; the Stresa Front; Abyssinia; Spain; Munich; and Albania. Candidates should then examine Mussolini’s domestic policies and make a judgment as to whether foreign or domestic issues were the major preoccupation of Mussolini.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about Mussolini’s actions and policies.

[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 whether foreign or domestic policies were most important to Mussolini. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that indicate an awareness of the debate: 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.

18. Assess the importance of indoctrination and propaganda in maintaining control in Germany under the Third Reich between 1933 and 1945.

Indoctrination of a population involves regular exposure to propaganda but there is a difference in how these policies were carried out. Indoctrination was a continuous long-term process carried out through education, the youth movements, the workplace and the armed forces. Propaganda was short-term involving direct use of radio, cinema and the press. The Ministry for People's Enlightenment and Propaganda was established in 1933 and controlled the press, radio, theatre, music, creative arts and film. A Reich Broadcasting Corporation was also set up in the same year which controlled broadcasts and was the most effective instrument of propaganda. There was limited success with the press and film but the arts and literature were heavily censored.

Indoctrination through education and the youth groups (Hitler Youth *etc.*) was initially very effective but later on alternative organizations (the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates) gained support. Ultimately indoctrination and propaganda helped to maintain control, but there were other means of control (the Gestapo) and there were resistance movements.

[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 use of indoctrination and propaganda. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that includes specific policies: 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.

19. In what ways, and to what extent, did social and religious divisions lead to civil war in Spain in 1936?

In the 1930's Spain had a number of governments that struggled to deal with a range of problems: regionalists versus centralists; anti-clericalists versus Catholics; landless labourers versus great landowners; and workers versus industrialists. Reforms did not satisfy all parties and economic distress and financial collapse exacerbated the situation. Gradually the political opposition was fused into a right versus left struggle with the army supporting the right and a coup d'état took place, which led to war between the two factions in 1936. Candidates should weigh up the extent to which these social and religious factors led to the outbreak of war and consider any other factors that might have contributed for the second part of the question. Maximum of **[12 marks]** if only "in what ways" or "to what extent" are answered.

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

[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 tensions in Spain which led to war. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that discuss why the year 1936 is so important: 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.

20. Compare and contrast the political and economic consequences of the Second World War on any *two* European countries (excluding Germany).

Specific details and content will depend upon which two countries are chosen. Candidates should ensure that both political and economic factors are identified and that a clear causal link is made between these and the Second World War.

If candidates write about only one country [**7 marks**] would be the maximum that could be awarded.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments with little comparative/contrast.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the political and economic consequences for the two countries. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific details in a comparative framework: 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.

21. Analyse the successes and failures of Soviet policies towards Germany and the eastern European satellite states during the regimes of Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

Khrushchev's de-Stalinization program had repercussions in other communist countries, creating unrest that exploded in the Polish defiance of the USSR in 1956 and in the quickly quelled Hungarian revolution of the same year. In foreign affairs Khrushchev's announced policy, was one of "peaceful coexistence" in the Cold War. His threat (1958) to sign a separate peace with East Germany increased tensions. In 1960, however, Khrushchev cancelled the Paris summit conference after a US reconnaissance plane was shot down over the USSR. International tension was created by Khrushchev's adamant stand over Berlin, but was lessened somewhat by his withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba in 1962 and by small compromises in the Soviet proposals for disarmament.

Although sharing power with Alexei Kosygin, Brezhnev emerged as the chief figure in Soviet politics. In 1968, in support of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, he enunciated the "Brezhnev Doctrine," asserting that the USSR could intervene in the domestic affairs of any Soviet bloc nation if Communist rule were threatened. While maintaining a tight rein in Eastern Europe, he favoured closer relations with the Western powers, and he helped (1972–74) bring about a détente with the United States. In 1977 he assumed the presidency of the USSR, thereby becoming head of state and head of the party. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, Cold War tensions returned with an acceleration in the arms race, and the continued intransigence toward political and economic reform within the Soviet bloc, such as the imposition of martial law in Poland. Under Gorbachev, Brezhnev's regime was criticized for its corruption and failed economic policies.

Candidates should make reference to the above events and policies and determine to what extent these were successes or failures. A maximum of *[12 marks]* should be awarded if only successes or failures are dealt with.

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

[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 successes and failures of the two leaders. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific details in a comparative framework: 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.

22. Compare and contrast the policies of Salazar and Caetano in Portugal between 1933 and 1974.

Salazar established an authoritarian regime in Portugal after the constitution of 1933. The basis of his dictatorship was stability, and reforms which privileged the upper classes. Salazar introduced corporatism and kept Portugal neutral in the Second World War. He also wanted to retain colonial control of the Portuguese empire and also joined NATO in 1949. Economically the Salazar years were marked by stagnation.

Caetano replaced Salazar in 1968 and, despite expectations that he would soften the regime, initially carried on many of Salazar's policies such as staunch anti-communism, the suppression of dissent and the retention of the colonies. Caetano did introduce some political changes allowing electoral commissions of the opposition to take part in elections. He relaxed secret police activity and gave priority to economic development rather than political matters. There were also some changes in education and social security. There was still discontent among many factions of society and in 1974 the military overthrew Caetano in the "Carnation Revolution".

If the candidate writes about only Salazar or Caetano [*7 marks*] would be the maximum that could be awarded.

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

[*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 two leaders. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[*14 to 16 marks*] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with specific details in a comparative framework: 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.

23. Evaluate de Gaulle's contribution to France.

In 1943 de Gaulle moved his headquarters to Algiers, where he became president of the French Committee of National Liberation. On September 9, 1944, he and his shadow government returned from Algiers to Paris. He headed two successive provisional governments but, on January 20 1946, abruptly resigned, apparently owing to irritation with the political parties forming the coalition government. Until 1958 he opposed what became, in November 1946, the Fourth French Republic. He campaigned against the new constitution, which he disapproved of as being likely to lead to a repetition of the political and governmental inadequacies of the Third Republic. In 1947 he formed the Rally of the French People, a mass movement that grew rapidly in strength and that to all intents and purposes became a political party in 1951, when it obtained 120 seats in the National Assembly in the elections of that year. The movement expressed de Gaulle's hostility to the constitution, to the party system, and, in particular, to the French communists, because of their unswerving loyalty to Moscow directives. He became dissatisfied with the RPF, however, and in 1953 severed his connection with it. In 1955 it was disbanded. On December 21, 1958, de Gaulle was elected president of the Republic. The powers given to the president in the new constitution, which had been approved by referendum on September 28, 1958, and especially those providing for the use of the referendum and for presidential rule during a state of emergency, reflected his firm conviction that a strong state required a leader with power to make decisions. Candidates could focus on de Gaulle's "special election" of 1962 which attempted to reinforce his authority and his second term from 1965 to 1969, which culminated in his defeat in a national referendum forcing his retirement. The 1962 election was a repudiation of the traditional parliamentary leadership and showed that the voters wanted change. De Gaulle's nuclear policy was the catalyst for much opposition. By 1965 Mitterrand was becoming a clear threat, and was rallying support against de Gaulle. Policies such as advocating a return to the gold standard; support for the autonomy of French Canada; the withdrawal from NATO; and the events of May 1968 which reduced France to virtual anarchy led to increased discontent in France. Despite a year's reprieve, the high costs of wage increases, de Gaulle's refusal to devalue the franc and the proposed administrative change for France cost de Gaulle the referendum.

[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 which relate to de Gaulle.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that specifically demonstrate the contribution de Gaulle made to France: 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.

24. Analyse the impact of the ending of the Cold War on *one* European state (excluding the USSR) between 1990 and 1995.

Specific details will depend upon which country the candidate chooses. A clear relationship must be shown between the ending of the Cold War and its impact on the state. Ideally candidates should be able to analyse the impact by reference to events preceding the ending of the Cold War. References could be made to the nature of the regime, the policy of Russia towards that state, how the movement towards European unity affected that state, or the policies a government (new or otherwise) introduced following the ending of the Cold War.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments about the end of the Cold War.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for a narrative framework which has an explicit focus on the effect of the Cold War on any European country. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers making specific reference to events/policies in any European country: 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.

25. Assess the success of movements for the emancipation of women in *one* European country during the twentieth century.

Candidates must be able to produce specific evidence from any European country to obtain marks in the upper bands. Exact material will depend on the country that is chosen. Marks will be awarded according to knowledge, relevance and focus on an assessment of the success or failure of emancipation movements. The entire chronology should be included.

[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 question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: 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.
