



MARKSCHEME

November 2008

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 IB Cardiff.*

1. Why, and with what consequences for France, was Louis XVI executed?

Following the events of 1789 and the Constitution of 1791 four main reasons can explain why Louis was executed: the war with other European powers; the shift of power between the Jacobins and the Girondins; the revolt in the Vendée; and the emergence of radicals such as Robespierre and Danton.

When Louis tried to flee and was apprehended at Varennes his fate was sealed. The consequences include the Revolutionary Wars, the radicalisation of the Terror, the Thermidorean Reaction and the establishment of the Directory.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the “why” and “with what consequences”. 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. To what extent can it be said that Napoleon I was “the child of the French Revolution”?

The key word in the question is “child” and candidates are expected to explain what they understand by the word in this context. Children inherit a variety of abilities/beliefs from their parents and most candidates will probably take this position. What did Napoleon inherit from the Revolution? Some candidates might argue that it led to his rise to power. In his early years he supported many of its ideas but gradually become committed to a more authoritarian attitude. There are many different strands of argument – Napoleon’s attitude to the liberal aspects of the Revolution, the use of violence during the Terror, the use of war as a unifying factor for France and the return to autocracy after Napoleon proclaimed himself emperor.

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

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers relating explicitly to both the French Revolution and Napoleon: 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. **“Of the four congresses held between 1818 and 1822 the Congress of Troppau was the most significant for the Congress System.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

On the face of it the statement appears to be true. After the May 5 1820 Note and Metternich’s redirection of the Holy Alliance, following the Troppau Protocol, the Congress System gradually fell apart so that by Verona in 1822 it no longer had any real meaning. Candidates may reject the statement and argue that any of the other three congresses were more significant although the Congress held in Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 probably has the better counter claim. The consolidation of Metternich’s position in Europe as a consequence of the Congress of Troppau is also another possible line of argument.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the Congress at Troppau. 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.

4. Assess the influence of Benjamin Disraeli on British politics in the nineteenth century.

Candidates would be expected to include both foreign and domestic policies. Disraeli's foreign policies include support for Turkey, Egypt and the Suez Canal, action against the Dreikaiserbund, the Congress of Berlin, Afghanistan, South Africa, India, the desire for Britain to play a greater role in Europe, and Ireland.

Opposition weakened the Tory Party during his period as Prime Minister 1874–1880.

On the domestic front Disraeli opposed key issues such as the repeal of the Corn Laws leading to a split in the Tory Party until 1866. He piloted the 1867 Reform Bill through the Commons; and became Prime Minister briefly in 1868. His key policies were implemented from 1874 to 1880 and include housing, education, public health and factory legislation. He gave the Tory Party a clearly unified identity.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Disraeli's life, 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.

5. Evaluate the importance of Cavour’s contribution to the unification of Italy.

The question specifically mentions Cavour and he must be the focus of the question. Comparison with either Mazzini or Garibaldi is permitted, but only as a foil to Cavour. Candidates could include Cavour’s background in Piedmont and examine his aims and policies. They could also discuss his role in joining the Crimean War, his relationship with Napoleon III, the Sicilian campaign of Garibaldi, and Cavour’s intentions behind his invasion of the Papal States. It is important that candidates remember that Cavour died in 1861.

The question calls for an evaluation of Cavour’s policies and to reach markbands above *[8 to 10 marks]* candidates must not merely describe the policies.

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

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers dealing explicitly with Cavour’s contributions: 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. Why had Prussia, rather than Austria, emerged as the dominant German power by 1871?

The key date of 1871 should be noted and, although not specifically mentioned in the question, this should prompt candidates to examine the time period from 1815 to the Franco-Prussian War. Candidates could emphasise that it was Austria's weaknesses that led to Prussian strength. They could focus on the demise of Metternich, the consequences of the Crimean War, the Italian campaign, economic failings and the defeat in the Austro-Prussian War (1866). Other candidates might argue that the role of the Zollverein, the effects of the 1848 Revolutions, economic strength and the importance of Bismarck led to Prussian strength. Candidates must make an explicit analysis of these events/policies rather than leave it to the reader to judge through implicit statements.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on Prussia. 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.

7. “Bismarck’s domestic policies in Germany between 1871 and 1890 were, in reality, a failure.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates should first identify Bismarck’s own attitudes and policies. He was a Prussian aristocrat, a Junker, conservative socially but not politically and desired unification of Germany under Prussian control. At various times Bismarck had difficulties with the Reichstag, the Kaiser, the Liberals, the Catholic Church, the Socialists, and the Conservatives. Candidates should carefully evaluate the extent to which these difficulties were caused by his attitudes and policies. Although the main focus of this question is domestic, better candidates will note that some of Bismarck’s foreign policies had domestic ramifications, *e.g.* the Balkans and Africa.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Bismarck’s life, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with explicit focus on the question of which policies were successes/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.

8. Assess the importance of the Crimean War (1854–1856) for Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Most candidates will probably know that the Crimean War showed up the weaknesses in the Russian army and government which lead to the emancipation of the serfs. They could also include its importance to Cavour and Italian unification as well as the weakening of Austria as a Great Power. The war also opened up the eastern question again leading to Balkan rivalries and the decline of the Ottoman Empire. The Treaty of San Stefano, the Congress of Berlin and Austro-Russian rivalry in the region could also be a focus. Ultimately, as a result of the Crimean War the balance of power shifted significantly in Europe.

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

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers clearly focusing on the importance of the 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.

9. To what extent did changes in agriculture affect the economic development of *one* European country in the nineteenth century?

Answers will vary depending on the country that is selected but general comments could be made on the enclosures (in Britain), mechanization, crop rotation, selective breeding, new technology (particularly in Flanders), and the destruction of the commons. The effects of these changes were many – emigration to the cities, the industrialization of many countries in Europe, increased poverty for some classes and increased wealth for others, and changes in the role of women.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, 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. Compare and contrast the impact of Marxism on *two* European countries in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The Communist Manifesto was published in 1848 but had little direct connection with the revolutionary wave that hit Europe in that year. Depending on which countries are chosen the impact will differ widely. Some candidates may focus on the Paris Commune of 1871, others might look at the relationship between Marxism and socialist movements, others could discuss the anarchist/nihilist movements in Europe and relate these back to Marxist roots.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, 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.

N.B. If only one country is dealt with candidates should not receive more than [7 marks].

11. Assess the effect of political changes in *either* Spain or France between 1848 and 1914.

Spain

Candidates should explain what political changes occurred by making reference to the following: the reign of Isabella, the “Glorious Revolution” of 1868, Amadeus and the Carlist movement, the proclamation of the First Spanish Republic, the Bourbon restoration, and the policies of Maura and Canalejas. There is a thread running through here of monarchy versus republicanism and this is the fundamental reason why changes occurred. Candidates may make reference to events outside Spain (*e.g.* Cuba) but only to the extent that they affected Spain internally.

France

Candidates should explain what political changes occurred by making reference to the following: Louis Philippe, the 1848 Revolution; Napoleon III’s policies; the war with Prussia; the Paris Commune; the Third Republic’s policies; Boulanger; the Dreyfus Affair; and early twentieth century events. Again the thread is monarchy/empire versus republicanism although the Third Republic had other issues which caused change. Again candidates may make reference to events outside France (*e.g.* Mexico) and events which led to the outbreak of the First World War.

It is important that candidates assess the effect of these changes rather than merely describing them.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, 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 either France or Spain. 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.

12. Analyse the impact of war in *either* the nineteenth *or* twentieth century on *one* of the following countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden.

There are a number of wars that could be included:

- Denmark: 1848, 1864 and the Second World War
- Finland: The First World War, the Russian Civil War and the Winter War
- Norway/Sweden: The Second World War.

Candidates must assess the impact of the wars on the respective country rather than merely describe the campaigns.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, 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. Assess the successes and failures of Nicholas II between 1894 and 1917.

Nicholas was opposed to the Westernization of Russia and appointed Plehve whose attempts at suppressing demands for reform were entirely unsuccessful. Defeat in the Russo-Japanese War (1905) and inflation in Russia led to the 1905 Revolution, which was suppressed by the military. Witte convinced Nicholas to publish the October Manifesto, which granted freedom of speech, meeting, conscience and association. These changes were illusory, the Duma was weak, and the Tsar still retained control. Stolypin's reforms, on the one hand gave the peasants more land, but on the other hand made it easier for the arrest of revolutionaries. Industrial unrest continued and Russia's involvement in the First World War with Nicholas' failures of leadership, the role of Rasputin, and military defeats led to his abdication in 1917. Most candidates will argue that there were many more failures than successes.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Nicholas' life, 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 focusing on Nicholas' successes/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.

14. “The Bolshevik state under Lenin between 1918 and 1924 was a ruthless dictatorship, caring little for the Russian people.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates will probably agree with the general sentiments by making reference to the Cheka, suppression of religion, use of force against the civil service strikes, class warfare, continued political repression during the NEP, the crushing of the Constituent Assembly and the Civil War. The question remains whether these were pragmatic decisions to ensure the survival of the Bolshevik state, which cared little for the Russian people, or that Lenin felt that he was doing the best as he could for the Russian people. Evidence to support this would be the switching from War Communism to the New Economic Policy.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Lenin’s life, 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 explicitly deal with the varying historical opinions on Lenin: 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. Why did the Central Powers lose the First World War?

Candidates could include the following factors: the failure of the Schlieffen Plan which led to a two front war, the use of unrestricted submarine warfare, the entry of the USA, the military weaknesses of Germany’s allies, poor military tactics such as the failure of the March 1918 offensive, internal dissension at home due to hunger and inflation, Allied control of the sea and the leadership qualities of Allied statesmen. The question is not just about Germany so candidates should include the importance of the role of Germany’s allies.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of the First World War, 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 focusing on why the Central Powers lost: 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. Compare and contrast the political and economic impact of the First World War on *two* European powers.

The two most popular countries will probably be Germany and Russia although Britain might also be chosen. Candidates must show that there is an explicit cause and effect relationship between the consequences of the war and the political and economic structures/policies, which are followed by the countries they select. A common error is to include the Great Depression as one of the major effects of the First World War and argue that this had dire consequences for the Weimar Republic although there is only the most tenuous connection between the two. Ensure that both political and economic effects are equally covered, as there is a tendency for candidates to underplay economic events/policies.

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

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers comparing and contrasting two European countries: 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.

N.B. If only one country is discussed candidates should be awarded a maximum of [7 marks].

17. Compare and contrast the social and economic policies of Hitler and Mussolini.

Candidates should closely examine the policies of both leaders in the areas of religion, youth, media, women, anti-Semitism, education, the Dopolavoro, KDF, *etc.* Economic policies would include the Corporate State, The Ministry of Corporations, autarky, the Vidoni Law, Schacht and Göring's plans, the German Labour Front, *etc.*

Do not expect all of the above but ensure that candidates have a comparative framework.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of the policies, 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 comparing both the social and economic policies of both countries: 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.

N.B. If only one leader is discussed candidates should be awarded a maximum of *[7 marks]*.

18. Analyse the effects of the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression on *two* European countries (excluding Germany and Italy).

The immediate effect of the Wall Street Crash was the collapse of the US stock market and restrictions on American loans to Europe. The real impact was experienced in 1931 when the European banking system collapsed. The impact of the Great Depression varied. Some, such as France, were severely affected, others, like Sweden and Denmark, contained the crisis. Democratic governments came under attack. One country, Spain, actually benefited from the emergency. Some countries devalued their currencies. Others like Britain and France relied on cutting government expenditures. Ensure that candidates make an explicit connection between the Wall Street/Great Depression and the countries they select.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of the Great Depression, 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.

N.B. If only one country is discussed candidates should be awarded a maximum of [7 marks].

19. To what extent do you agree that Stalin’s foreign policy between 1928 and 1953 was inconsistent and unfocused?

Candidates should identify both the aims and achievements of Stalinist Russia. Aims would include Stalin’s move towards the left in 1928 at the Sixth Congress of Comintern, which had the aim of directing his foreign policy away from the West. Nazism was largely ignored until the mid-1930s where the line changed and foreign policy moved towards cooperation with Social Democratic governments in the West through Popular Front governments. The aim was to establish connections with pro-Soviet groups in the West. Stalin became involved in the Spanish Civil War as an ideological conflict and Stalin became increasingly concerned about external threats particularly from Germany and Japan. The signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact was a measure of convenience allowing the Soviet Union influence in Poland and Finland, which lasted until June 1941 when Germany attacked Russia and which had the aim of buying time for Stalin. The defeat of Hitler and the establishment of the Cold War in Europe should then be discussed. Candidates should then analyse whether these policies were inconsistent and unfocused.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive account of Stalin’s policies, 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 focusing on “inconsistent and unfocused”: 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. Assess the impact of Franco on Spain between 1936 and 1975.

Candidates should briefly assess Franco’s role in the Spanish Civil War. Following his success in 1939 Franco established a fascist single-party state. In the Second World War Spain was a “nonbelligerent”, but was favourable to Hitler and Mussolini. Surprisingly, for some people, Franco remained in power after 1945 and Spain was “quarantined” by the United Nations, which had the effect of increasing Franco’s power. Conservative forces such as the army, the church and landowners gained influence and a two-party system of government was established although the power still belonged to Franco. Later the church opposed his policies. Poverty increased although popular discontent remained under control until 1955 when widespread strikes took place. Eventually Carrero Blanco took over much of the administration until 1969 when Juan Carlos was named as Franco’s successor taking over in 1975. Candidates must assess rather than merely describe Franco’s policies.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Franco’s life, 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 ranging over the entire chronology: 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. To what extent was the Second World War caused by Hitler’s policies?

Candidates will disagree on this. The majority opinion seems to be that it was. *Mein Kampf* focuses on militarism and unlimited expansion, together with the notion that war and struggle are fundamental human activities. Hitler wanted war to achieve the objectives of his foreign policy, obtain Lebensraum and to strengthen and purify the Aryan race. Historians such as Trevor-Roper and Hildebrand would support this thesis. On the other hand A J P Taylor refutes this perspective arguing that Hitler had no long-term objectives. Another line of argument would apportion responsibility for the war on other powers – particularly Britain and France.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of the causes of the Second World War, 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 on whether the war was “Hitler’s war” or not: 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. “The Marshall Plan promised much but achieved little for Western Europe.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates must be able to identify the intentions behind the Marshall Plan (June 1947) in terms of its role in Europe. The stated idea was to restore the war-damaged economies of Western Europe by a massive injection of foreign aid. Revisionist historians have argued that this was a blatant attempt by the USA to introduce economic imperialism to support domestic industrial output after the war and was driven by Cold War issues. Candidates should evaluate the Marshall Plan’s effectiveness in rebuilding Europe focusing on the key phrase “promised much for Western Europe but achieved little” and the most popular examples will no doubt be France and Germany.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of the Marshall Plan, 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 with a clear focus on the main issues: 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. To what extent did the states of central and eastern Europe benefit from Soviet control after 1945?

This question assesses the influence of Cominform, COMECON, the Warsaw Pact and the Brezhnev Doctrine on the eastern and central European satellite states. The benefits gained from membership of these organizations are debatable and will depend on the individual country and the time period. Candidates should be aware that there were long periods of stability and order in this part of Europe after the crises in East Germany, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The positions of Yugoslavia, Albania and Rumania might merit inclusion in any response. Some candidates will argue that benefits were few, but these assertions must be supported with evidence.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, 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.

24. Assess the effects of Gorbachev’s policies of perestroika and glasnost on the Soviet Union and Europe up to 1995.

Gorbachev’s greatest problem in the Soviet Union was to change the stagnant Soviet economy. To do this a change in the political and social structure was necessary. Gorbachev’s policies of glasnost and perestroika democratized Soviet society and improved relationships with capitalist countries. Gorbachev reshuffled the Politburo, became Chairman of the Communist Party and eventually President of the USSR. Gorbachev’s abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine with the resulting turn to democracy by Eastern European countries was hailed by the West as it led to a series of non-violent revolutions which ended the Cold War and for which Gorbachev received the Nobel Peace Prize. While Gorbachev is generally well regarded in the West, in Russia his reputation is very low. It is perceived that he brought about the collapse of the country as the economy crashed and he was forced to resign in 1991. The Communist Party was abolished. Candidates will be expected to analyse his success outside the USSR with his perceived failure within, despite the establishment of a democratic government.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of Gorbachev’s life, 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.

25. Analyse the importance of leisure and sport on European society after the Second World War.

Complex patterns of leisure and sport activities have emerged in Europe during the second half of the twentieth century. One line of argument is that technological and social developments have enabled people to enjoy increasing quantities of leisure time. A second view is that patterns of economic consumption and production are actually reducing the quantity and diluting the quality of leisure time. Access to televisions and CD players has expanded. So too has the range of people enjoying activities from playing sports to eating out. Candidates will have to support whichever line of argument they take with specific examples, which extend over a reasonable period of time.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, 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.
