



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2008**

**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 IB Cardiff.*

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

**1. Analyse the causes of *one* of the following: the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939); the Arab-Israeli wars (1948/9 and 1956); the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970).**

Whichever war is chosen, a thematic approach is more likely to produce a better response. Depending upon the example selected candidates could identify reasons for the divisions within the state such as ideological differences; regionalism / separatist tendencies; ethnic, religious and economic causes (land ownership, inequitable division and allocation of resources, *etc.*) The resistance of vested interests to change could also be considered a factor, for example in the case of Spain: the Catholic Church; the landed gentry and the military. The Arab-Israeli wars of 1948/9 and 1956 could be seen (in the longer term) as a result of vacillating Mandate policies practised by Britain, as a product of rival nationalisms (Zionism and Palestinian nationalism), as wars influenced and prolonged by outside intervention, and also as a result of mutual security fears concerning the strategic borders of the new Israeli state and the future of Palestinians affected by the refugee exodus from 1948/9 which provided the basis for Fedayeen activity in the period after 1948.

There is much to consider, but responses need to go beyond descriptive narratives of the wars themselves and concentrate on the issues of causation.

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

*[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 focused, structured analytical answers with explicit focus on the issues of causation. May not address all aspects of causation.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address comprehensively and accurately the issues of causation.

**2. Define “total war” and examine to what extent *either* the First World War *or* the Second World War was a “total war”.**

A clear working definition of “total war” at the outset is necessary for an effective response. Total war should be understood to mean more than simply a geographically widespread conflict and should show awareness of the wider dimensions of such a conflict. It refers to the mobilization of all aspects of society in such conflicts and includes the home and military fronts and the contributions made by both the military and civilian populations – as well as the social, economic and physical impact of such a conflict upon these groups.

Areas to explore in either example could include not only the technological and military aspects of these mass struggles (weapons development and usage/targeting of civilians) but also the impact on the economy (living standards, rationing, taxation, employment patterns, industrial and agricultural organization and production), the changing role of women, advances in medicine, effects on the arts and literature, *etc.*

There is much to choose from. Do not expect all, but answers need to go beyond the narration of battles/campaigns (descriptions of trench warfare in the First World War for example).

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

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for adequate definition and some explicit attempt to identify features/aspects of total war.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, focused, relevant and generally balanced answers. Not all aspects of the question are considered.

**[17+ marks]** for full, analytical and relevant answers with detailed substantiation and perceptive insight regarding the nature and extent of total war.

**3. To what extent did outside intervention contribute to the outcome of *two* civil wars, each chosen from a different region?**

Popular choices are likely to be the Chinese Civil War, the Russian Civil War and the Spanish Civil War. Korea and Vietnam may also appear and these are acceptable as long as some attempt is made to explain the civil war complexion.

The nature and extent of foreign involvement should be covered. Motives behind such involvement will no doubt be described but note that the emphasis is on the extent to which such intervention contributed to the victory/defeat of one side in the chosen civil wars.

Foreign involvement in terms of economic, military, moral support and the way in which such support was used/abused/misused by the recipients in the conflicts should be considered. Did such aid tilt the balance and ensure victory/defeat, or were other factors as important / more important in deciding the final outcome, for example internal unity of one side, errors made in terms of strategy, economic/political policies of one particular side, ideological attractiveness of one particular side?

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalized responses with little substantiation.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for adequate detail and more explicit focus on the question of outside intervention and some other possible factors which could be considered.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, balanced and analytical answers. Not all implications addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth, perceptive analysis and accurate supporting detail.

*N.B. If only one war or one region is chosen, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**4. Assess the economic and social results of *two* wars, each chosen from a different region.**

“Results” could be taken to mean results both during and after the chosen conflicts.

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

For **economic results after** the conflict coverage of post-war economic problems of victorious and/or vanquished powers could include: restructuring of the economy; the consequences of physical devastation of housing/factories; existence of refugees; demobilization and its effects on employment patterns; unemployment; continued shortages, *etc.*

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

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

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

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

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

*[17+ marks]* for depth of accurate and relevant detail and perceptive insight/analysis.

***N.B.*** Allow the Second World War to count as two wars, as long as it is separated into different regions, for example Europe, and/or Asia, and/or Africa. If only one war or one region is addressed, mark out of ***[12 marks]***.

**5. With reference to *two* wars examine the impact of technological developments in air and sea power.**

Whichever wars are chosen candidates should be able to identify specific technological developments and comment critically upon the ways in which such developments impacted upon the wars.

Examples from the world wars could include the development of fighter/bomber planes since the beginning of the century and the increasing importance of aerial warfare in deciding the outcome of conflicts in certain cases. The civilian workforce and industrial capacity as targets as well as traditional military objectives might be emphasized. The relative importance of sea power in the world wars might be considered in terms of battleships/destroyers, submarines, aircraft carriers, *etc.* The use of technology against civilian/economic targets through, for example, blockading might also be considered. The atomic bombings of August 1945 are likely to figure prominently.

Apart from the world wars examples of technological development in Vietnam (aerial especially), the Falklands/Malvinas War (aerial and sea), or conflicts in the Middle East could be examined and in some cases the efficacy of technology in the specific circumstances could be questioned.

Accept the use of missiles/rockets, *etc.* as part of developments in “air power” or even “sea power”.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive responses with implicit examination of impact.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers based on specific examples of developments and some explicit examination of the effect on the practice of warfare. May be some imbalance in terms of treatment of wars/air and sea power.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced coverage and explicit and well-structured treatment of the technological developments and impact.

**[17+ marks]** for clearly structured, balanced and focused responses revealing evidence of perceptive analysis and depth of historical knowledge.

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

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

**6. Assess the reasons for, and the results of, the successful independence struggle in *either* Pakistan *or* Ghana.**

The case of **Pakistan** is obviously linked to the wider issue of the independence movement in South Asia but candidates should not see this as an opportunity to deal with Indian independence / Gandhian methods. The question invites investigation of the reasons for the success of the Muslim League / Jinnah in gaining independence in what became a partitioned ex-British colony. Candidates could examine the role of Jinnah, the relationship between the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress especially after 1937, the existence (or not) of a sense of Muslim nationhood pre-1947, the impact of British policy on the nationalist movements in the Indian Empire, the impact of the Second World War, the errors of political leaders within the Congress movement, *etc.*

Results could include reference to the social, political and economic problems in the new Pakistan, which was divided by 3000 miles of Indian territory into two wings: refugee problems; lack of industrial resources; growing regionalist tensions between East and West; death of Jinnah and subsequent governmental instability; hostility with India and conflicts over Kashmir for example.

There is much available. Do not expect all, but remember the question does focus on Pakistan.

For **Ghana** / Gold Coast candidates could consider the role of Nkrumah and the CPP in the agitation for independence pre-1957 (strikes, boycotts, mobilization of mass support for independence) and the nature of British rule – especially in light of the pressures placed upon Britain by the Second World War, *etc.*

Results could consider the political, economic and social policies and progress made (or not) in the post-independence period (possibly up to 1966 and the overthrow of Nkrumah). Reference could be made to the establishment of a one-party state, the repression of political opponents, ambitious programmes for hydroelectric development, industrialization, transportation and education – much of which led to the dissipation of Ghana's wealth which was narrowly based on primary production (cocoa especially).

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit reasons and results.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit assessment and adequate knowledge of reasons and results of the successful struggle for independence.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced, analytical answers focused on the reasons and results of the struggle for independence.

**[17+ marks]** for depth of knowledge of reasons and results and depth of assessment.



**7. Analyse the contribution of *one* nationalist leader to the gaining of independence in *one* non-European colonial state.**

Popular choices are likely to be Gandhi, Nehru, Sukarno, Ho Chi Minh, Nkrumah, Nyerere or Kenyatta.

Consideration could be given to the policies, programmes and promises (political, economic, social) of the leader and the extent to which they produced a mass following. Similarly, candidates could identify and comment on the methods adopted in the struggle for independence – violent/nonviolent/constitutional – the reasons for such a choice and the effectiveness.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate responses.

*[8 to 11 marks]* for narratives with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit analysis of the contribution of the leader.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-structured, balanced and explicit analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive analysis/evidence of insight and detailed accurate and relevant knowledge.

*N.B. Neither Castro's **Cuba** nor Mao's **China** is a valid choice for this question.*

**8. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the methods used by nationalist movements in India until 1947, and in Indo-China until 1954, differ?**

No starting date is given. Candidates may begin their investigation with a longer-term treatment – for example from the post-First World War period in the case of India, or from the 1920s/30s in the case of Indo-China. However answers will probably tend to concentrate on Gandhi, the Indian National Congress and the largely non-violent methods of resistance to imperial rule from 1919, and in the case of Indo-China the period from Japanese occupation in 1941 to the battle of Dien Bien Phu and the Geneva Accords of that year (1954).

**Reasons** for the adoption of differing methods may be linked to the colonial power in each case, the nature of its rule and its willingness/reluctance to consider the notion of independence for the colony, as well as the strategy of nationalist leaders themselves. Gandhi and Ho Chi Minh for example both believed in the efficacy of particular methods in their struggles based on previous experience and their own belief systems.

The obvious contrast regarding **ways** is in the role of violence/non-violence in the struggles in Indo-China and India respectively, though it might be noted that in India alternatives to Gandhian methods did exist, *e.g.* the Indian National Army of Bose or the earlier violent methods of Tilak. Details of the major techniques of resistance adopted in both colonial states should be provided – whether civil disobedience, passive resistance, boycott in India, or the use of guerrilla warfare in French Indo-China.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalized, inadequate responses.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential narrative/descriptive accounts with implicit comparisons/contrasts.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit comparison/contrast with adequate knowledge.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for comparative structures based on sound knowledge.

*[17+ marks]* for depth of detail and comparative analysis of methods.

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

**9. With reference to *two* new non-European ex-colonial states examine the reasons for political and economic instability in the ten years after independence.**

The question does assume, in a sense, that political and economic instability were corollaries of decolonization. Some candidates could challenge such a premise though the likelihood is that most attempts will probably concentrate on the obstacles to stability post-independence.

Areas for investigation could be the effects of the colonial power's legacy – economically, politically, educationally, *etc.* To what extent was the new state adequately prepared to undertake a successful transition to full independence? Did it inherit the financial and administrative means to establish stability?

Other areas could include the problems of regionalism/separatism, the issue(s) of tribalism, ethnic minorities or religious division, refugee influx/outflow. The role of the military, the corruption of political leaders, basic inexperience of government or the effects of outside influence (Cold War politics) could also be considered depending on the examples chosen. Fluctuations in prices for commodities on the world market and extravagant expenditure by new regimes could also be noted.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for lack of appropriate knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit treatment of reasons for political and economic instability.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced coverage and explicit coverage of the reasons and sound detail to convincingly substantiate.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed knowledge, balanced treatment and insight.

*N.B. If only one state is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

10. “Independence of new non-European ex-colonial states was rarely followed by improvement in the social and economic position of women.” With reference to *two* states, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Knowledge of the status and role of women in the pre-independence period is needed before effective treatment of the question can be undertaken.

Areas for investigation and comment could include family structure, educational and employment opportunities in industry/agriculture/commerce, inheritance, religion and cultural fields.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for poorly supported generalizations.

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for sound knowledge, balanced treatment and explicit assessment.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed accurate knowledge in a focused, balanced assessment of two states. The answer may reveal evidence of insight or a successful challenge to the premise of the question.

*N.B.* Neither Castro’s *Cuba* nor Mao’s *China* is a valid choice for this question. If only one state is addressed mark out of *[12 marks]*.

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

#### 11. To what extent did the following aid the rise to power of *either* Lenin or Mussolini:

- (a) the First World War
- (b) weakness of the existing regime
- (c) ideological appeal?

The structure for the essay is clearly established in the question. Candidates are required to examine the three main areas and assess the significance of each.

For the **First World War** the impact of the war itself on the chosen state can be extended to also consider the aftermath of the war and the impact of peace treaties/settlements on the situation and the ways in which immediate post-war economic and political developments affected the support provided to either Mussolini or Lenin. Whether war was a “mighty accelerator” for the collapse of the existing regime (and how/why), as well as the ways in which the aspiring leader took advantage of the situation need addressing.

**Weaknesses of the existing regime:** the paucity or inappropriateness of political/economic/social reform could be investigated, along with the errors of existing regimes in failing to fulfill the expectations of either the general population or important sections within the population.

The question of **ideological appeal** requires identification of the main strands of the selected ideology and consideration of how important it proved in garnering support, or whether ideology was largely abandoned or altered by the leader in the quest for power. This could raise the question of whether ideology or pragmatism was predominant – or a mixture of both.

“To what extent” also allows for other factors to be mentioned (for example collusion of vested interests, fear of the alternatives, use of violence, *etc.*) though the three main areas noted in the question should form the main areas for treatment.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate generalized responses.

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for sound knowledge, clear and explicit analysis of the importance of the three areas. Not all areas dealt with in a balanced manner.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed knowledge and a balanced and focused treatment of the areas indicated. Other factors are also noted. The answer reveals evidence of insight and/or historiographical detail.

*N.B.* If only one of the main areas is addressed mark out of a maximum of *[7 marks]*. If only two of the areas are addressed mark out of a maximum of *[12 marks]*.

**12. Analyse the methods used to eliminate opposition by *two* single-party rulers, each chosen from a different region.**

The question focus is on “single-party rulers”, that is to say rulers in power; it is not based on a ruler’s rise to power. Therefore, for example, Stalin’s succession dispute with Trotsky is not really relevant.

Popular choices are likely to be Hitler, Stalin (but see note above), Mao and Castro.

Whichever rulers are chosen, candidates should be able to specify a variety of types of opposition and then identify and make critical comment on the differing methods whereby the ruler eliminated/neutralized the threat from such institutions/groups/individuals. Elimination can be taken to mean not just the physical liquidation of opposition (real or imagined) but also the removal of the grounds for opposition to the ruler due, for example, to popular policies being implemented.

Methods may include: the use of force/purges; repression by the secret police with arbitrary arrests/random punishment creating an atomized society; use of censorship; control over education/youth; propaganda; adoption of policies/programmes in domestic and foreign policy which may appeal to much of the population; exiling of opponents; re-education programmes; accommodation of vested interest groups (church/army), *etc.*

There is much to choose from but answers dwelling on the use of force alone are unlikely to result in awards in the higher bands.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate responses.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for adequate knowledge and explicit analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced, focused responses with explicit analysis. Not all implications addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed accurate knowledge and focused analytical treatment. Answers reveal insight and/or good historiographical knowledge.

*N.B.* If only one ruler is addressed, or one region, mark out of maximum of *[12 marks]*.

**13. Compare and contrast the treatment of *either* women, *or* religious groups, in *two* single-party states, each chosen from a different region.**

The attitude towards, and treatment of, **women** in the single-party states forms the basis for comparison/contrast. Did the single-party state improve the opportunities for women or not? How/why is this the case? Depending on the states selected areas for consideration could be: the state's policies in relation to the social and political status of women, the role of women in the economy, education, involvement in political leadership. Were women subject to discriminatory treatment in relation to civic/legal rights – *e.g.* marriage, divorce, inheritance – or did the state attempt to restore/establish some form of equal gender treatment, even if only on paper?

Alternatively, if the candidate chooses **religious groups**, the answer should specifically identify the religious groups – whether Churches and/or religious minorities in the single-party state – and examine the ways in which their position was affected. The treatment of, and relationship of the regime to, established religions like Catholicism, Orthodox Christianity, Christian missionaries, Judaism, Buddhism, or Jehovah's Witnesses could be examined. Did the regime repress, collaborate with, or co-opt these groups? How and why was this done?

The answer does require specific detail to allow for successful comment and subsequent comparison/contrast.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for weakly supported / generalized coverage.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential or end-on narratives with implicit reference to treatment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit comparison of treatment of women or religious groups in two states. May be unbalanced.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced, structured comparisons with sound supporting material.

*[17+ marks]* for full comparison based on detailed specific knowledge.

*N.B. If only one single party state is addressed, or one region, the maximum award is [7 marks].*

**14. Assess the global impact of *one* left-wing and *one* right-wing leader of a single-party state.**

Popular choices here could be Mussolini, Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Mao, Castro, or Ho Chi Minh.

No doubt choosing Hitler will result, in some cases, in the provision of narrative/descriptive accounts of the origins of the Second World War. Hopefully some candidates will deal more thematically with the task but probably a sequential/end-on treatment will prove more popular.

The impact of ideology and its appeal outside the borders of the state could be considered. Attempts to imitate a leadership style (both left and right) could be seen in the growth of Soviet style putsches in post-First World War Germany and Hungary. Similarly the impact of / attempt to imitate socialist developments in the Americas could be linked to Cuban/Soviet influence post-1945. For right-wing leaders reference could be made to the growth of fascist movements in the inter-war years in Spain, Austria, *etc.*

Attempts to forcefully export ideology by the leaders could also be examined – the consequences being either global conflict, as in the Second World War, or regional/limited wars, as in Abyssinia. An area for investigation could be the expansion of the leader and the regime’s political and economic influence, *e.g.* the post-1945 expansion of the Soviet Union in Europe and Asia, and attempted expansion in the Americas.

The content/impact obviously depends on the regime selected

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalized responses lacking sufficient specific details.

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit assessment and adequate knowledge of the global impact.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced, analytical answers focused on the regional/global impact of two regimes.

**[17+ marks]** for detailed knowledge, balanced treatment and depth of assessment.

**N.B.** *If only one regime is addressed mark out of [12 marks].*



15. **“Charismatic appeal rather than successful domestic policies enabled single-party leaders to maintain power.” With reference to *one* of the following, to what extent do you agree with this statement: Castro, Nasser, Perón?**

A useful starting point could be a definition/explanation of what is understood by the term “charismatic appeal”. What characteristics are associated with such a leadership style? What, if any, were the reasons for the magnetism of the leader and what qualities enabled him to impress followers?

To cope effectively with the demands of the question the candidate should identify and evaluate the importance of domestic policies implemented by the leader. These could include policies of economic/agrarian reform, social policies favouring specific groups in the population, policies/methods of control (for example propaganda/education/indoctrination, *etc.*)

“To what extent” also offers the possibility of identifying other factors, which might have helped in the maintenance of power, *e.g.* an energetic foreign policy, aid from foreign supporters.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate/generalized responses.

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced, focused responses with explicit judgment and sound detail.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed knowledge, balanced analysis/judgment and possibly awareness of other factors and/or different interpretations.

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

**16. What were the major obstacles faced by the League of Nations *and* the United Nations in their attempts to maintain peace?**

This could prove a popular question. Candidates should understand that both organizations experienced similar obstacles in achieving peace yet each had unique problems to deal with.

The major obstacles faced by **both** could include: lack of independent armed forces; inability to control or confront major powers engaged in aggressive actions; national self-interest which often took priority over the need for collective action; ideological differences amongst nations which made cooperation difficult; fear of war which caused many nations to avoid confronting aggressors and economic differences and disparities which increased sources of conflict.

Difficulties of the **United Nations** could include: the Cold War; the increasing number of member states.

Difficulties of the **League of Nations** could include: being identified with an unpopular peace settlement; the Great Depression 1929 which helped increase conflict and reduced international cooperation and major countries which either did not join or dropped out of the League.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on reasons, some attempt at comparative structure.

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

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

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

**17. “The multiparty state was the best form of government to ensure economic and social progress.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This question allows candidates to investigate how/if multiparty states succeeded in providing social and economic progress in comparison to other forms of government.

Candidates may challenge the question by arguing for example that some single-party states had considerable success in providing social and economic progress for the population.

Reference should be made to specific examples of policies which may have provided social and economic progress in multiparty states.

Candidates may also show how these policies have been more successful in multiparty states than those in single party states.

Candidates who wish to challenge the question should provide specific examples of the successes of alternative systems of government.

*[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, clear focus and analysis.

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

**18. Assess the extent to which *one* international organization, *other than* the United Nations or the League of Nations, has been successful in achieving its aims.**

This question offers a wide degree of choice but students may not use the United Nations or the League of Nations in their response

Students may select any international organization subject to the limitation mentioned above. They must define the aims/goals of the organization and present an analysis of how well these have been met.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for good structure, content and analysis.

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

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

**19. How and why did political change occur in *either* Argentina (1983–1995) or Japan (1945–1952)?**

Candidates should present an analytical response showing an understanding of the causes of political change in the country selected.

Reasons for change in **Argentina** could include: the loss of prestige by the military government in the Malvinas campaign; the deteriorating state of the economy; the protests against the military junta over human rights abuses; the military government's failure to solve Argentina's foreign debt problems; the presence of credible political leaders and parties as an alternative to military rule and desire to return to the original democratic principles of Argentina.

Reasons for change in **Japan** could include: defeat in the Second World War; defeat and disgrace of the right-wing military group which had surrounded the emperor; change in the role of the emperor; new constitution which was developed during the American occupation; emergence of new political leaders and parties; the need to integrate with the West, the Cold War which increased support for democracy and strong anti-war sentiments in the population.

*[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 focus on reasons.

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

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

**20. Analyse the impact of *one* international organization on the economic and social progress of *one* country.**

Candidates have a broad choice of organizations. The organizations might include: the United Nations (UN), the League of Nations, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the Commonwealth of Nations, the European Union (EU), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Organization of American States (OAS), the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon).

Candidates should produce a well-organized response which clearly shows the influence of the chosen organization upon the country. Attention must be given to economic issues and social issues.

*[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 the effects/impact though there may be an imbalance in treatment of economic and social.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for good structure, clear focus and analysis and a balanced structure.

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

**Topic 5 The Cold War**

- 21. “The importance of ideology as the major cause of the Cold War has been greatly exaggerated.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This will be a popular question which provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of the origins of the Cold War.

The answer would benefit from a strong analytical format, which addresses the role of ideology as well as providing other significant reasons for the emergence of the Cold War.

There should be clear demonstration of significant causes other than ideology which led to the confrontation. Answers should demonstrate a sound knowledge of the significant events and attitudes of the countries and leaders involved.

*[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 ideology as a cause and an attempt to comment on its comparative importance.

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

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

**22. For what reasons, and with what results, did the Soviet Union become involved with Cuba after 1959?**

This could prove a popular question. Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the Soviet reasons for venturing into the Western hemisphere.

**Reasons** for involvement could include: Khrushchev's personality as a risk-taker, looking for a personal triumph to establish his leadership; the desire to break containment imposed by US; the American rejection of Castro which created an opportunity for the USSR; Castro actively seeking assistance to break the American economic grip; Soviet desire to improve their image in the Third World, especially in light of Chinese criticism; the opportunity to gain a foothold in the Western hemisphere from which to spread communism and undermine US influence in Latin America; a possible method of putting pressure on the US over the issue of Berlin and a base from which to address the Soviet strategic disadvantage in terms of long-range missiles.

**Results** of involvement could include: Soviets negotiated economic agreements with Cuba; Soviet troops were stationed in Cuba; Soviet naval bases were established, Soviet missiles were installed, which brought on the missile crisis; the fall of Khrushchev by 1964; Cuba became a major source of anti-US propaganda in Latin America as a model for Latin American nationalists; Cuba was a base for the spreading of communism in Latin America (Che Guevara), however this proved largely unsuccessful; Cuba provided troops to support Soviet incursions into Angola and Ethiopia; Cuban economy became a major drain on Soviet finances and Soviet presence in Cuba undermined their relations with the US.

*[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 focus on reasons and results.

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

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

**23. Explain how the Cold War affected the art and culture of *one* country from 1945 to 1991.**

This is a question which offers a wide choice to students.

Ways in which the Cold War affected the arts might include: censorship of ideas/materials which criticized government or supported the other side, imprisonment or other restrictions on artists, government funded art projects for propaganda, banning of foreign influences, funds from foreign countries to support politically acceptable art projects, foreign media bringing new ideas and techniques, imitation of art/culture from Cold War allies. Cold War ideology might require art and culture to promote specific ideas and demonise others.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptions with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit explanation of effects.

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

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



**24. In what ways, and with what results, did the US implement the policy of containment in Asia between 1950 and 1975?**

This may prove to be a popular question. Candidates must explain both ways and results in order to reach higher mark bands.

The **ways** in which containment was implemented could be considered under the following thematic headings: military; economic and political/diplomatic.

**Military:** intervention in conflicts or potential conflicts to prevent spread of communism, *e.g.* Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam; rearming Japan; providing arms to non-communist countries in the region; putting US garrisons in certain countries.

**Economic:** rebuilding economies as a bulwark against communism (Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, Taiwan, *etc.*); aid programs to encourage development of / friendship with countries in the region.

**Political/diplomatic:** treaties to support countries in the region: (SEATO, ANZUS); supporting anti-communist leaders in Asian countries; opposing communists or sympathisers.

An analysis of **results** could include comments on relative successes and failures of US policy.

**Successes:** establishment of strong anti-communist states in the region, *e.g.* Japan, South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia, continued independence of Taiwan.

**Failures:** communism spread to Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos; the US was humiliated by loss in Vietnam War – internal discussions in US populace; the loss in Indo-china forced US to change China policy; SEATO alliance broke up; US economy weakened by the expense of the containment policy.

*[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 focus on reasons.

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

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

## 25. Why did the Cold War end?

Candidates should produce well-structured analytical responses which clearly demonstrate knowledge of the major events and personalities involved.

Ideas to consider could include: the Cold War ended because the Soviet economy was too weak to sustain a worldwide confrontation with the US, which was pursuing a more confrontational approach during the 1980s. This involves consideration of the cost of the arms race and new technology that the Soviets could not afford.

The invasion of Afghanistan was costly and also damaged Soviet claims to moral superiority and the death of three Soviet leaders in quick succession caused a loss of direction.

Eastern Europe was increasingly difficult to control in the 1980s (Polish Solidarity as an example). Gorbachev's central role and his "New Thinking" – Gorbachev realized that to achieve the restructuring of the Soviet economy and society the USSR would have to shed many costly burdens, for example the war in Afghanistan and subsidies to communist states like Cuba. A loosening of military and political control over Eastern Europe was also necessary.

A new approach in Soviet society would require a new approach to foreign relations, a more cooperative attitude. Arms limitation, détente and a more cooperative attitude in the 1970s signalled the end of the confrontation of the Cold War. Gorbachev rejected the Brezhnev Doctrine, which led to the fall of the Berlin Wall and liberation of Eastern Europe, thus symbolising the end of the Cold War. The collapse of the USSR, as a result of internal crisis, meant that the Cold War was over.

*[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 of reasons.

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

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

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

**26. Analyse the reasons for discrimination against native peoples in *two* countries.**

Candidates have a number of choices for this response. Popular selections are likely to be: Australia, South Africa, United States, or Canada.

The most common points would include, but not be limited to: lack of respect for natives due to poor economic, technological or educational development; the view of natives as a conquered people lacking in courage or military skill; racial and/or religious prejudice towards native peoples; attitude of superiority; history of conflict between the two sides; ignorance of native history, social structure and values and an unwillingness of native people to integrate.

*[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 focus.

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

*N.B. If only one country is selected, mark out of [12 marks].*

**27. “Religion can either support or oppose state authority.” With reference to *two* examples, to what extent do you agree with this assertion?**

Candidates are required to show clearly how religion either supported or opposed government authority/power in the examples selected.

There are a number of cases from which to choose. These might include, but are not limited to:

**Religion supporting the state:**

- Tsarist Russia 1900–1917
- Spain 1939–1975
- Iran 1979–
- Afghanistan 1989–2001
- Italy 1922–1943

**Religion opposing the state:**

- Nazi Germany
- South Africa opposition to apartheid
- Poland 1980s
- Iran pre-1979
- Afghanistan 1979–1989

Candidates should explain clearly in what ways religion challenged or undermined state authority.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on explanations.

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

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

*N.B. If only one example is used, mark out of [12 marks].*

**28. For what reasons were religious minorities in *two* countries the victims of persecution and discrimination?**

This question asks students to identify and comment upon the reasons for discrimination against religious minorities.

Reasons could include: economic rivalry (jobs, land, capital); struggles for political power; ignorance of the minorities' customs, values and beliefs; the influence of charismatic leaders using conflict to gain power; historical antipathy, superstition and misinformation; majority leaders spreading propaganda about minorities; majority fear of loss of power and influence; jealousy over financial or other forms of success by the minority group(s).

*[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, clear focus and analysis.

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

*N.B. If only one country is addressed mark out of [12 marks].*

**29. To what extent did peaceful methods prove to be more successful than violent methods in overcoming discrimination in the twentieth century?**

This question provides candidates with a number of choices and requires structured answers which present clear comparisons between the two methods.

Examples of countries from which relevant material could be drawn could include:

- USA
- India
- South Africa.

Answers should display knowledge of the principal leaders and/or organizations which advocated peaceful or violent methods in the selected examples. Candidates should describe and comment on the effectiveness of both approaches, peaceful and violent.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on reasons, some attempt at comparative structure.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for good comparative structure, reasons, analysis and knowledge.

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

**30. What were the main obstacles to the integration of minorities in the twentieth century?**

Obstacles caused by **majorities resisting integration with minorities**: the attitude of the majority, or significant parts of it, towards minorities; xenophobic attitudes; attitudes of racial superiority; historical antipathy; ignorance of the minority's customs, habits, *etc.*; fear of the loss of economic and political power, or social status.

Obstacles caused by **minorities resisting integration with majorities**: religious differences; rejection of the moral/societal values of the majority; history of conflict or violence with the majority; minority feelings of pride in their society; minority support and/or encouragement from abroad, minorities' feelings of superiority.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptions with implicit analysis.

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

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

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

---