



MARKSCHEME

May 2009

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. In what ways, and to what extent, was the French Revolution responsible for the rise of Napoleon I?

The demands of the question are that candidates analyse the aspects of the French Revolution which led to the rise to power of Napoleon I (Napoleon Bonaparte). It could be claimed that his rise was complete when he became First Consul after the coup d'état of Brumaire in 1799. Others may claim that his rise was not complete until 1804 when he proclaimed himself Emperor. Accept either, but candidates must address how the Revolution affected his rise, and not focus their answers only on the period 1799 to 1804. To what extent should be addressed by analysing Napoleon's actions which led to his rise. Napoleon was very active and successful during the period he was First Consul, so those who claim that his rise was only complete in 1804, could, after discussing how the French Revolution led to his appointment as First Consul, analyse this period.

The ways that the French Revolution led to Napoleon's rise could include: the early stages with bloodshed, factions, such as Jacobins and Girondins, and sweeping changes that became unpopular; failure of constitutional efforts to equate equality and stability, defeat of the monarchy with the execution of Louis XVI and death of his son, followed by the Verona Declaration of Louis XVIII, which enabled the republicans to stem the resurgent monarchists; periods of risings and terror, such as 1794, White Terror, 1796–97, Directory attacks on emigres and non-juring priests after coup d'état of Fructidor, 1797; failure of Directory to rule effectively so that France was suffering political and economic turmoil; foreign wars.

Finally Napoleon's actions should be considered: his military ability and success in the French Revolutionary Wars; his ambition as revealed on his return from Egypt; his and his brother's action in the coup d'état of Brumaire which made him First Consul. Those who claim 1804 as the end of his rise should briefly note his reforms and restoration of law, order and stability in his period.

Do not expect all the above; more able candidates will concentrate more on the period of the Directory (1795–1799) then describing the early revolution.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit focus on revolutionary responsibility for Napoleon's rise.

[11 to 13 marks] for analysis of revolutionary events that led to Napoleon's rise.

[14 to 16 marks] for clear focus and analysis on the demands of the question.

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

2. **Compare and contrast the policies of *two* of the following: Louis XVIII (1814–1824); Charles X (1824–1830); Louis Philippe (1830–1848).**

After the initial setback of Napoleon’s return, Louis XVIII ruled reasonably sensibly according to the Charter, Charles X favoured the ultras, tried to restore some royalist and religious measures in his ordinances, and was deposed. In spite of his revolutionary background, and early popularity, Louis Philippe’s reign was a disappointment for both domestic and foreign policies, and he too was deposed. Whichever monarchs are chosen, all aspects of their reign could be compared and contrasted.

N.B. Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one is addressed.

[0 to 7 marks] for bare comparison or if only one king is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential narratives of two monarchs with inadequate comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate and clear comparison and contrast.

[14 to 16 marks] for a structured comparison based on specific factual material.

[17+ marks] for detailed, balanced comparisons.

3. Analyse the causes and results of *two* 1848 revolutions.

The main revolutions that occurred in 1848 were in France, Italy, Germany, Austria and Hungary, but accept others. Causes were mainly nationalist, against foreign occupation and unpopular rulers; political, demanding constitutional rights, and showing opposition to conservative rulers; and economic, reflecting a period of poor harvests and lack of economic growth. Results included suppression, which was often brutal and acted as a spur for continued opposition and demands, especially when nationalism was a cause, some constitutional gains and economic improvement, which was, however, due to natural developments. Long-term results or developments could be made relevant and mention unification in Italy and Germany, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but the focus must be on 1848.

N.B. if only one revolution is addressed, mark out of *[12 marks]*.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of two revolutions with implicit focus on causes and results.

[11 to 13 marks] for specific details and focus on causes and results.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical treatment of causes and results.

[17+ marks] for full accurate details, analysis and balance.

4. “A great era for industrialization and social legislation.” To what extent do you agree with this judgment of Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century?

Victorian Britain is noted for its “industrial revolution”, and the changing social conditions caused by the developments in industry necessitated social legislation. Britain led Europe in the second half of the century. Areas in which Britain excelled included: coal, steel, iron, machinery, railways, ship building, woollen and cotton goods. It would be relevant to note the geographical areas in which nineteenth century industry developed, as well as the expansion of existing towns and cities, and the growth of new ones. Industry produced wealth but also poverty and squalor. Social legislation was necessary to alleviate the latter. Laws regulated working hours and conditions, and health regulations. Disraeli and his home secretary Cross were responsible for laws regulating slum clearance and new dwellings, public health, factories, sale of food and drugs, river pollution, merchant shipping, *etc.* Education acts could also be made relevant. Do not expect or demand all the above. Also some candidates might note that other countries, for example Germany, unified in 1871, were catching up at the end of the period.

[0 to 7 marks] for general statements and comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts of some industries and laws.

[11 to 13 marks] for attention to, and some specific examples of, industries and laws.

[14 to 16 marks] for an understanding and analysis of the quotation.

[17+ marks] for focus on, and analysis and judgement of, the quotation.

5. Assess the positive and negative contributions of the following to Italian unification: separatism, republicanism, foreign involvement.

Candidates could either address the three parts separately, or integrate them into an essay. Separatism suggests the divided nature of the “geographical area known as Italy”, with its different states, rulers and languages. This could be said to be an obstacle to unification. But it could be claimed that foreign rulers and Austrian dominance was so unpopular that opposition to these elements helped eventual unification.

Republicanism and the wish to remove monarchs also hindered unification, with its movements which failed. But its very failure in some ways helped pragmatic support for the Piedmontese monarchy.

Foreign involvement will probably be the best known of the three, and produce analysis of the parts played (both positive and negative), by Austria, Britain, France and Prussia – or at least two or three of these.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge, or if only one section is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of Italian unification with implicit attention to at least two of the three sections.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment of at least two parts of the question.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused, balanced assessment of the three areas.

[17+ marks] for analytical answers that show real understanding of the issues covered.

6. Why was Germany unified by Prussia and not Austria?

The question naturally lends itself to three main parts, the weakness of Austria, the strength of Prussia, and the work of Bismarck. Candidates should not give too much background, but could point to the overstretching of Austria after 1815, with its problems with Italy, its ethnic mix, its backward economy and failure to join the Zollverein, and the constitutional and political problems, including 1848.

Prussia gained from the Congress of Vienna, and developed its economy steadily, with the benefits obtained from industry and the Zollverein. Although 1848 was a problem for both countries, economically and politically Prussia was stronger. This strength was recognised by Bismarck, whose diplomacy and three wars were important in delivering German unification under Prussia. Better candidates could point out that the decline of Austria and advance of Prussia were by no means inevitable, or apparent, and analyse Bismarck’s aims and policies to consider if they were planned or the result of opportunism.

[0 to 7 marks] for general/unsubstantiated assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts of German unification.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers which explain why Prussia and why not Austria.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers based on specific evidence.

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

7. Analyse Bismarck's impact on Germany between 1871 and 1890.

Bismarck is usually praised for his part in achieving German unification, but often criticised for domestic policies after unification was achieved. This question asks candidates to explain his main policies, domestic and foreign, and analyse their positive and negative impact on Germany during the years when he was chancellor of Germany.

Policies which could be analysed include the following **domestic policies**: the new constitution; relations with all political parties, liberal, centre and socialist; relations with William I and William II; the *kulturkampf*; social and economic matters.

Analysis of Bismarck's foreign policies must relate to their impact on Germany between 1871 and 1890. The alliances are only relevant in that during these years war was avoided enabling the consolidation of the united Germany, and its economic and political progress as a leading German power.

It is not expected that candidates should tackle all the above. They should select those policies which had the greatest impact on Germany between 1871 and 1890, and perhaps consider them for their judgment of the strength and weakness of Germany in the final decade of the nineteenth century.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit analysis of Bismarck's impact.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis of some policies and their impact.

[14 to 16 marks] for focus on impact and a final judgment of Bismarck's chancellorship.

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

8. **“What happened in Russia during the reign of Alexander II (1855–1881) was more of a revolution than many that went by that name elsewhere.” To what extent do you agree with the assertion that Alexander II’s policies were revolutionary?**

The demands of the question are to analyse Alexander’s policies and produce an argument as to how far they were revolutionary. Some questions which could be asked are; did they change and improve the lives of the people, did they modernise the country, did they change tsardom and introduce some democracy? It is not necessary to comment on “revolutions elsewhere” although candidates could explain their understanding of “revolutionary”.

The main policies that could be mentioned and analysed are: the emancipation of serfs; some introduction of local assemblies – but no national duma; military reforms; reform of the judiciary; educational reforms. Candidates could also explain Alexander’s economic expansion, especially the importance of railway construction, from 660 miles in 1855 to 14 000 in 1881, which facilitated agricultural improvements, and industrial development *e.g.* of coal and iron. His later repressive policies could also be considered.

For higher bands candidates must focus on revolutionary, not success and failure.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate limited knowledge and comment.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for relevant specific evidence and some analysis of revolutionary.

[14 to 16 marks] for well structured answers focused on revolutionary.

[17+ marks] for an extra dimension such as different interpretations or perceptive analysis.

9. Discuss the importance of *either* imperialism *or* emigration for nineteenth century Europe.

Candidates are asked for importance for Europe so more than one country should be considered.

Imperialism could be defined as the acquisition and rule/administration of an empire. Reasons for seeking an empire could include commercial and industrial expansion, especially to obtain raw materials, financial gain, trade, in order to obtain ready markets, and as a status symbol – to suggest power. The main imperial powers at the beginning of the nineteenth century were Britain, France, Holland, Portugal and Spain. Towards the end of the century they were joined by the newly unified Germany and Italy. Importance could include economic gain – or financial drain, expansion, and rivalry, even a cause of war. The so-called “scramble for Africa” could be examined.

Emigration will probably not be a popular choice, and candidates should not attempt it unless they have done a case study. Again the question states Europe, so addressing one country only would not be satisfactory. The reasons for people leaving Europe were largely concerned with finding a better life, to escape famine, poverty, unemployment, overcrowding *etc.*, and hopefully to find work, financial stability, better health, *etc.* In some ways Europe was helped, with fewer people to feed, as it was on the whole the poor who emigrated in large numbers. Evidence for this is that by far the highest number of emigrants were from Britain and Ireland. Europe was also helped by increasing trade, money sent home, and even the provision of penal settlements. Between 1821 and 1851 European emigrants averaged 110 000 a year. This rose to 900 000 a year by the end of the century.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for specific evidence and explicit attention to importance.

[14 to 16 marks] for wide ranging discussion based on specific details.

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

10. For what reasons, and in what ways, did education develop in *one* European country during the nineteenth century?

This question demands material from only one country. Reasons could include the necessity of a literate population for industry and for voting, with the increase of those eligible, and the work and persuasion of educationalists and the founding of new schools. Ways could include legislation, growth of societies promoting education and literacy, widening of the curriculum, provision of universal education and the raising of the school leaving age. Specific details will depend on the country chosen.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge.

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for answers with a special quality or dimension.

11. In what ways, and to what extent, were Napoleon III's policies responsible for his downfall and the establishment of the Third French Republic?

In 1870 Napoleon lost the Franco-Prussian War and thus ended the Second Empire, which was followed by the Third French Republic. Napoleon was exiled, and died in England in 1873.

The wording of the question suggests that candidates could explain how Napoleon contributed to his downfall, what other factors also helped to bring it about, and finally some comments on whether the loss of the Franco-Prussian War was solely responsible for the end of the Second Empire and the return of France to republican rule.

Candidates are not expected to narrate Napoleon III's rule at length, but to select and focus on key events and policies that were unsuccessful, and contributed to losing the war. Probably his ambitious foreign policy, and his failure to keep Bismarck in check will be emphasised, but his authoritarian actions and rule, before the so-called liberal empire, could also be included. Other factors could address Bismarck's policies towards France, and the reluctance of Napoleon to go to war – he was ill and overruled by 1870. Finally, candidates should briefly consider why France became a Republic and not an empire or monarchy. The empire had been discredited and defeated, there was no suitable heir for either the empire or a restored monarchy, so republicanism prevailed. Do not expect or demand candidates to address all the areas suggested, or follow that line of argument.

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

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of Napoleon III's rule and loss of the Franco-Prussian War.

[11 to 13 marks] for answers that address most of the perceived demands of the question.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers.

[17+ marks] for perceptive understanding and depth of analysis.

12. Assess the effects of outside events on *either one* Scandinavian country *or* Finland during the twentieth century.

Details will depend on the country chosen, but the rise of Nazi Germany, the Russian revolutions and adoption of communism, the Second World War and the Cold War will probably be relevant, and could be considered. Other events could be technological and economic changes, and the European Union.

[0 to 7 marks] for general answers, with little specific knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives based on a discussion of effects.

[11 to 13 marks] for clear focus on the demands of the question.

[14 to 16 marks] for comprehensive analytical discussions.

[17+ marks] for balance and perceptive or different interpretations.

13. Why did the First World War break out in 1914?

Weaker candidates will probably relate the causes of the First World War; more able candidates should analyse carefully the importance of causes, in order to judge if and how, each one was a genuine cause of the war. The real distinction between moderate and good to excellent answers is 1914; why 1914 and not earlier, or later? Candidates should analyse why earlier disturbances and crises did not lead to an outbreak of war, and why the assassination at Sarajevo did. How and why had circumstances changed?

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of causes with some focus on 1914.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate analysis and attention to 1914.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers, with sound treatment of 1914.

[17+ marks] for in depth analysis and focus on 1914.

14. Analyse the causes of the 1917 February/March Russian Revolution.

As this is a straight-forward question, which should be well known, expect or demand analysis for a “good” mark. Some suggestions of causes to analyse are: the nature of tsarist rule, which was outdated, autocratic and unpopular, in spite of attempts to reform and modernise it; specific criticism of Nicholas II, Alexandra, Rasputin; economic problems and poverty among the peasants (about 80% of the population), including inefficient farming methods, and demands for land, and industrial workers suffering from poor conditions at work and overcrowded living conditions; growth and increasing activity of opposition parties; entry into, and losses in, the First World War; immediate events causing the outbreak, strikes, bread riots, behaviour of Nicholas II.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate knowledge.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analysis of relevant specific details.

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

15. Analyse the causes and results of economic problems in *one* European country between 1919 and 1939.

Exact details will depend on country chosen, but the following points would be relevant for most of the likely choices.

Causes: effects of taking part in the First World War, including finance, loss of manpower, industry, infrastructure, devastation of land, towns, *etc.*; effects of the Treaty of Versailles; political changes and uncertainty, caused by economic problems; Wall Street Crash.

Results: poverty, strikes; unemployment, difficulties and unpopularity faced by governments; financial expediences such as loans, leaving gold standard, stock market crashes, increased taxation; social upheaval.

Causes and results may be intertwined, but mark what is there. Weimar Germany will probably be a popular choice, but the focus must be economic, and not just the rise of Hitler.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit analysis, or if only causes or only results are addressed.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for exact focus on economic problems with analysis of a range of causes and results.

[17+ marks] for perceptive analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

16. Compare and contrast the repressive policies of Hitler and Stalin.

Both Hitler and Stalin were, and still are, notorious for their terror and repression, but to obtain a good mark, specific details must be presented as evidence. Candidates will probably know this subject well. Some suggestions follow, but do not expect them all to be addressed.

For comparison:

- both used terror for support, against opponents, and to bolster their regimes;
- collapse of the justice system;
- concentration or work camps;
- inmates forced to work;
- many were executed, killed or died of camp conditions;
- opposed Jews and religion; purged part of the army;
- censorship imposed;
- arts made to conform;
- brutality and fear were always present.

For contrast:

- Jews were main targets of Hitler, political opponents of Stalin;
- Hitler sent Jews to concentration camps without trial, Stalin conducted “show trials”;
- apart from the “Night of the long knives”, Hitler did not persecute Nazis, Stalin purged many of his Bolshevik supporters;
- Nazi camp work was for war, weapons *etc.*, Stalin’s camp work was often on infrastructure;
- Stalin imposed collectivisation and persecuted those who opposed it, Hitler did not;
- Stalin opposed all religions, Hitler had a state church.

No doubt candidates will suggest other examples.

N.B. Maximum *[7 marks]* if only Hitler or Stalin is addressed.

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

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

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

[14 to 16 marks] for knowledgeable structured comparison and contrast.

[17+ marks] for in-depth analytical comparison and contrast.

17. Evaluate the impact on Italy of Mussolini’s domestic and foreign policies between 1922 and 1939.

This is a straightforward question on the impact of Mussolini’s policies, domestic and foreign. For domestic the nature or ideology of his rule, fascist/authoritarian, economic, propagandist, self-promotional, support of Catholic church, attempted control of workers and education, *etc.* should be analysed for their impact on Italy. Their impact on Italy included encouraging pride in Italy and seeking identification with the ancient Roman Empire, the growth of militarism, and its personal and financial impact from Mussolini’s wars. Foreign policies changed from seeking support of democratic powers to imperialism, to finally allying with Hitler.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for satisfactory specific material, explicitly evaluated.

[14 to 16 marks] for focus, specific details and analytical evaluation.

[17 + marks] for an additional, or very well developed skill.

18. “The Spanish Civil War was a disaster not only for Spain, but also for Europe.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?

The effects on Spain could include: three years of bitter fighting; many years of bitterness following the war; death and destruction; rule of Franco – with comments on his authoritarian rule, but also modernisation; neutrality in the Second World War. Candidates need not go as far as the restoration of the monarchy, but some might.

Effects on Europe could include; tensions due to support of Germany and Italy for Franco, USSR for the republicans and the neutrality pact observed by Britain and France; effects on events leading to the Second World War, and the war itself; some direct analysis should be included as to its actual impact. Was it really a factor in encouraging Hitler to start the Second World War, and thus a disaster, or was its effect minimal. Did it delay Italy’s entry into the war because Italian resources and manpower had been weakened, and did this also weaken Nazi forces and thus help avoid a disastrous Nazi victory? How did it affect Britain, France and USSR’s treatment of Franco’s Spain after the war? It should be easier for candidates to deal with the question in two parts, but do not penalise those who do not.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate answers.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts.

[11 to 13 marks] for satisfactory treatment of both parts.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused assessment of both parts.

[17 + marks] for balanced answers with perhaps different interpretations.

19. Compare and contrast the governments of Salazar (1932–1968) and Caetano (1968–1974) in Portugal.

For comparison:

- both were autocratic rulers, but attempted some reforms;
- both had problems with Portugal's African colonies;
- Portugal remained inefficiently governed and backward under both;
- both were involved with *estado novo* politics.

For contrast:

- Salazar was previously finance minister and foreign minister and continued to control both when in power;
- Caetano was in charge of colonies and Salazar's deputy prime minister;
- Caetano was more of an extrovert, and tried some liberalization;
- Caetano tried to replace Salazar in 1951. Salazar was succeeded by Caetano, due to illness, but Caetano was ousted by a military coup.

N.B. Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one government is addressed.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments or if only one ruler is addressed.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured specific comparisons.

[17 + marks] for in depth analytical comparisons.

20. With reference to the Second World War in Europe, explain the main features and effects of “total war”.

Total war signifies a war in which all the country’s resources: human, economic, financial, ideological are mobilized in the war effort. The term could be applied to the war efforts of Britain, Germany and USSR during the Second World War. Some areas that could be examined are: conscription; direction of labour; home defence organisations; government rules and regulations for citizens’ behaviour, *e.g.* blackout, evacuation, internment of aliens, taxes, rationing, land and building usage, armament production, censorship, propaganda, *etc.* Specific details for individual countries should be explained and analysed, and a verdict given on the effects of “total war” both in winning or losing the war, morale and post war circumstances.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalisations.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit explanation of a number of features of “total war”.

[14 to 16 marks] for specific details and explanation of features from countries concerned.

[17 + marks] for an additional quality, such as different interpretations, or detailed knowledge of one or more individual countries.

21. “A natural development of the Second World War.” To what extent does this assertion explain the causes of the Cold War?

This question gives candidates an opportunity to express their views about the “unnatural alliance” during the Second World War, of Britain and USSR, (be careful how US is to be brought into the answer, as this is the Europe Paper) to defeat Hitler and the Nazis; and in those circumstances, was it likely to fall apart after the end of the war? Candidates can analyse earlier enmity, disagreements of policies during the war, relations between Churchill and Stalin, the wartime conferences, and disagreements arising from opposing ideas and policies for treatment of Germany, events in Berlin and arguments about Poland and other Eastern and Central European states. There is obviously no right or wrong answer. Marks will depend on the quality of analysis, evidence and argument.

“To what extent” also allows some discussion/analysis of earlier disagreements between USSR and European states, but the Second World War and its aftermath must be the main focus of the answer.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of relations between USSR and her Western allies.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the quotation.

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

[17 + marks] for original or perceptive treatment of the quotation.

22. Assess the policies of *either* Adenauer in Germany *or* de Gaulle in France.

Adenauer led West Germany, as Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany between 1949 and 1963. He helped German post-war recovery and democracy. He established closer links with France and aimed to rebuild West Germany on a basis of partnership with other West European countries through NATO and the EEC. Under him relations with the Soviet Union improved, but not those with the Soviet satellites. The German economy and standard of living improved considerably.

De Gaulle was briefly President of France, 1945–1946, resigned when his proposals for the powers of the presidency were refused, founded an anti-communist political movement, but in spite of the party’s electoral successes, remained out of government until after the Algerian crisis led to the fall of the Fourth Republic in 1958. A constitution for the Fifth Republic strengthened the executive, giving de Gaulle the powers he was earlier refused. He fought the Algerian War, pursued an independent foreign policy, opposed Britain’s application to join the EEC, and left NATO. French trade and industry improved, but public services were neglected. He resigned in 1969, after his referendum for changes in regional institutions was rejected.

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

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

[11 to 13 marks] for intelligent discussion of key areas.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured focussed discussion.

[17 + marks] for sound knowledge and analytical discussion.

23. Explain the reasons for, and results of, the Sovietization of *one* Soviet satellite state in Europe, between 1945 and 1990.

This question demands that candidates select one Soviet European satellite state, explain how it came under Soviet control during and after the Second World War, the nature of the control, such as political, economic and cultural measures, whether the state tried to obtain freedom and was “invaded” again, and the reasons for, and rise of, opposition which led to the break up of the USSR and freedom for its satellite states. Specific details will depend on the state chosen. Probably East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia will be popular choices.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsupported generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit reasons and results.

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

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

[17 + marks] for in-depth analysis and reasoned perception.

24. In what ways, and to what extent, was Gorbachev responsible for the break up of the USSR?

Gorbachev became General Secretary of the Communist Party in the USSR, 1985–1991, and launched a radical programme of reform and restructuring (perestroika) of the Soviet economic and political system. His policy of glasnost allowed more political freedom and participation, public debate and journalistic openness, and civil and cultural liberty. He reduced military spending, withdrew troops from Afghanistan and Eastern Europe, and accepted the break up of Comecon and the Warsaw Pact, *etc.* He sought détente with the West. He also became Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet in 1988, and in 1990 President of the Soviet Union, but his policies failed to raise living standards, and did not stem nationalism, hence the break up. Candidates need to assess how far Gorbachev and his policies were responsible for this break up. Was it likely to happen anyway because of the financial drain of maintaining superpower status? A brief mention could be made about opposition from its satellites, but on the whole the USSR had profited from them financially.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit ways and extent.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit ways and extent.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused analytical answers.

[17 + marks] for balance and varied interpretations.

25. Analyse gender issues in *one* European country during the twentieth century.

Gender issues could include: equality for men and women in the following areas: education; training; employment including promotion and reaching the top level; duties in the home; health care; pension rights; religion and religious ministry; marriage rights; divorce and child maintenance; property rights; role and status in the community; political rights. Candidates are only asked for material in/from one country, but they can address difference in different communities in the chosen country. They can also consider not only women's rights, but men's rights, which may be "at risk" in some ways.

[0 to 7 marks] for general statements.

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

[11 to 13 marks] for relevant discussion of some of the above points.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical discussion.

[17 + marks] for pertinent and balanced analytical discussion.
