



MARKSCHEME

November 2009

HISTORY

Higher Level

Paper 3 – EUROPE

*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. To what extent were economic rather than political factors responsible for the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789?

Although the focus should be placed on the immediate outbreak of the revolution in 1789, credit relevant references to the long and short term causes provided they are effectively linked to events in 1789 and show how these longer term causes culminated in the outbreak of the revolution in 1789.

The economic reasons behind the outbreak of the French Revolution are numerous: inefficient taxation system; court luxury; wars; failure of ministers and kings to modernize *etc.* The royal bankruptcy led to the calling of the Estates-General and this was a direct cause of the revolution but other longer-term causes were needed to explain why it was that the revolution broke out in 1789. Political factors include: the autocratic nature of the monarchy; the Revolt of the Nobles; the nature of the French State; the Estates General *etc.*

N.B. If only economic or political factors are dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 French Revolution, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the “to what extent”. Arguments may have 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. In what ways did France benefit from the rule of Napoleon I between 1799 and 1814?

Napoleon overthrew the Directory in November 1799 and became Emperor in 1804. It could be argued that Napoleon restored order, law, the economy, the banking system, the administrative system, public works, education, religion and government. It could also be noted that, despite these improvements, he was autocratic: the Civil Code had negative aspects and Napoleon introduced a police state. While his foreign policy was ultimately a failure and therefore not beneficial, candidates may argue that his earlier policies, up to the Peninsular Campaign, were of benefit to 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 about Napoleon, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers relating explicitly to Napoleon’s rule: 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. “The Congress of Vienna resolved nothing that was important, but merely laid the foundations for future conflicts.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates need to identify what issues were important to Europe and the delegates of the Congress of Vienna when it first met in November 1814. The securing of peace and what to do with France/Napoleon were two important issues. Candidates may discuss the handling of liberalism and nationalism and the territorial settlements that were made in June 1815 and whether or not these laid the foundations for future problems. The question of the restoration of monarchies *e.g.* legitimacy may also be included. There are many areas of investigation that the candidates may undertake. Credit solid analysis supported with relevant examples.

[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 of Vienna, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the Congress of Vienna. Arguments may have 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 importance of Gladstone’s policies for Britain and Ireland in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Gladstone’s policies include military, educational, legal, social and political reforms within Britain and Ireland. In foreign affairs he was involved in the British Empire, Bulgaria, Sudan, Afghanistan, Egypt and the Suez Canal. Candidates should select policies/actions from the above list and demonstrate their importance to Britain and Ireland.

N.B. If only Britain or Ireland is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 Gladstone’s life, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments may have 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. “Garibaldi’s contributions to the unification of Italy in 1871 have been greatly overestimated.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Garibaldi supported Mazzini’s Young Italy movement, led an unsuccessful revolt in 1835 and returned to Italy after 1846 where he set up the Roman Republic with Mazzini in 1849. Garibaldi was also involved in the Austrian War and led the expedition to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies in 1860, culminating in the meeting at Teano with Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont. In 1862 and 1867 he led two attacks on Rome, both of which failed. Candidates should judge which of these actions contributed to Italian unification and how his actions have been subsequently viewed. There is considerable debate about Garibaldi, which better candidates should be able to identify.

[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 may have limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers dealing explicitly with Garibaldi’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 did revolutions break out in both Prussia and the Austrian Empire in 1848?

Candidates could go back to 1815 to set the scene, but the more immediate causes should be the focus of the answer. Economic distress, demands for constitutional reform, the growth of nationalism and events in Italy and France may be included. More specifically in Prussia the disappointment with the policies of Frederick William IV, movements towards liberal reform and the failure of the potato crop could be included. For the Austrian Empire candidates could mention Metternich's policies, Bohemian and Hungarian nationalism, local uprisings in Italy and other relevant factors.

N.B. If only Prussia or the Austrian Empire is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 1848, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with explicit focus on the question: some may not address all aspects of the question.

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

7. To what extent did Alexander II's policies succeed in fulfilling his aims?

Candidates must first identify what Alexander's aims were. His key aim was to ensure the preservation of autocracy by introducing limited reforms to mollify disaffected elements of society. He needed to improve the state structure which resulted in his emancipation of the serfs, reforms in education, army and the judiciary. Zemstva and local Dumas were introduced by 1870. Candidates should make a judgment about the extent to which these reforms addressed Alexander's aims or produced new problems for Russia.

[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 Alexander, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on Alexander's aims. Arguments may have 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.

8. “There is little doubt that Bismarck’s policies between 1862 and 1890 were far less successful than Bismarck himself claimed.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Bismarck claimed that his policies, from his appointment as Chancellor of Prussia in 1862, were aimed at a Prussian dominated state eventually to be unified in 1871. His domestic policies after 1871 were intended to increase German strength, while his foreign policy was intended to maintain a European balance of power that could be manipulated by Bismarck, whereby Germany would become the dominant European. Historians have since disputed the veracity of this viewpoint and there are many conflicting assessments of Bismarck. Whether Bismarck during the period was eventually a pragmatist in his approach to domestic and foreign policy is an area which could be investigated.

[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 policies, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers clearly focusing on the discrepancy between Bismarck’s stated success and his real success: 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. Assess the impact on any *one* European country of *either* urbanization, *or* population growth, in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Candidates are required to explain how either urbanization or population growth developed in any one country in the second half of the nineteenth century and show what impact this development had on the country. This is an opportunity for candidates to use the social and economic history of their own country if they wish.

[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 may have 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. Analyse the importance of developments in science for nineteenth century Europe.

Candidates must not merely list the advances in science but should make judgment on their importance. Material that could be chosen includes Pasteur, penicillin, *etc.*

[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 may have limited examples and analysis.

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

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

11. How successfully did the Third French Republic overcome the problems it faced before the outbreak of the First World War in 1914?

The initial problems dealt with the aftermath of the 1871 Paris Commune and constitutional issues, which were finally resolved in 1875. Later problems that were faced were the Boulanger affair, the Panama scandal, Dreyfus, religious tensions, colonial questions and foreign affairs (Germany, Russia, Britain and Fashoda, Morocco). There is a plethora of material. It is important that candidates make judgments rather than merely describe the 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 about the Third Republic, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the problems faced by the Third Republic. Arguments may have limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers, which specifically focus on the “success” or otherwise: 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. Assess the impact of political developments in *either* the nineteenth *or* twentieth century, on *one* of the following countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway, or Sweden.

Candidates are expected to identify the political developments that occurred in any of the four countries, the causes and consequences of these developments and their importance to the chosen country. Ensure that the whole chronology is dealt with in the answer.

[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 one country, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers focusing on assessment: 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. To what extent was nationalism the major factor behind the outbreak of the First World War in August 1914?

Weaker candidates will produce a list of the basic factors, which would include the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, militarism, imperialism, nationalism and the Alliance System. Stronger candidates should examine the relative importance of both long- and short-term factors.

[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 first World War, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers that explicitly deal with the varying historical opinions on the causes 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.

14. Analyse the causes and immediate consequences (up to 1921) of the October 1917 Russian Revolution.

Causes would include: Russia's problems in the First World War; the abdication of the Tsar; the problems of the Dual Authority; Kornilov, Lenin and Trotsky's role in the Revolution and the actual outbreak of the October Revolution.

Consequences could include: Lenin's assumption of control; the Treaty of Brest Litovsk; the Civil War and its consequences, including War Communism and the nature of the Bolshevik state up to 1921.

N.B. If only causes or immediate consequences are included, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 1917 Revolution, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers focusing on both causes and consequences: 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. Analyse the impact of any *two* post-First World War settlements (excluding Versailles) on new and successor states in central and eastern Europe.

Some candidates have argued in the past that Germany is in central Europe, which is why the exclusion is included in the question. Settlements include Saint Germain, Trianon, Neuilly and Sèvres Lausanne and the new and successor states include Austria, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Candidates must select two of these states and make a direct cause-effect linkage between the peace settlements and any consequences that evolved from them.

N.B. If only one settlement is included, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 may have limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers on two settlements: 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. “The organization of the League of Nations, as laid out in its Covenant, was the main reason for its failure.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question has two parts. First, what were the provisions of the Covenant that were later to cause the League problems? Second, how the League was set up, the lack of a military force, The unanimity rule (article V), confusion about which article to use (as evidenced by China in 1931) *etc.*

Better candidates will recognize the importance of other factors, which include: the absence of major powers; the League’s inability/inconsistency with sanctions; the policies of aggressive leaders and so on.

[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 League of Nations, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers focusing on the Covenant: some may not address all aspects of the question.

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

17. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Hitler and Mussolini between 1933 and 1943.

Candidates should identify the aims of the two leaders: for example, antagonism to the Paris Peace Settlement and the establishment of an Empire. Reference could be made to the two leaders' attitudes to, and involvement, with the following: the Geneva peace settlement; the Four Power Pact; the Stresa Front and legacies of Locarno; Spain; the Rome-Berlin Axis; the *Anschluss*; Munich; aggression in 1939 and campaigns in the Second World War in western and eastern Europe and North Africa. The key date is 1936 as this is when Mussolini broke with Britain and France, choosing to ally with Hitler instead, although the aims of the leaders had different motivations.

N.B. If only one leader is discussed, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[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 two leaders' policies, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers comparing and contrasting the policies of the two leaders: some may not address all aspects of the question.

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

18. Compare and contrast the role that propaganda played in the establishment of any *two* single-party states in Europe between 1919 and 1939.

Candidates should select two single-party states and may depart from the traditional choices of Russia, Italy and Germany and include states such as Romania, Spain, Portugal and Hungary among others. The question asks about the establishment of the state and a judgment needs to be made by the candidate as to when the state is established. For example, it could be successfully argued that the Third Reich was not established fully until August 1934.

N.B. If only one state is included, award up to a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[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 states, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers comparing and contrasting two states: some may not address all aspects of the question.

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

19. “The contribution of foreign powers to Franco’s victory in the Spanish Civil War has been greatly exaggerated.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

It is generally considered that there were five powers which contributed in one way or another to the Spanish Civil War: Germany; Italy; the Soviet Union, Britain and France. Candidates should refer to the policies and actions of these five countries and identify in what ways, and to what extent, they contributed to Franco’s victory. It is important to note that a country’s lack of action may also have been significant. It is common for candidates to overemphasize the role of Germany in the conflict so ensure that any assertions are supported by solid 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 account of the Spanish Civil War, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers focusing on “exaggerated”: 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. Analyse the political and economic consequences of the Cold War on *two* European countries (excluding West Germany).

Candidates should select two countries. A clear connection must be made between events/actions/policies in the chosen countries and the fact that these were a direct consequence of the Cold War. This should be apparent through the candidate's clear cause/effect analysis.

N.B. If only one country is chosen, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 explicit focus on the question. Arguments may have limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers of the economic consequences: 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. How successful were Tito's policies in Yugoslavia between 1945 and 1980?

In 1945 Tito was the head of a new federal government in Yugoslavia and became president in 1953. He attempted to establish a unique form of socialism allowing workers self-government, with as much decentralization as possible within a single-party state. He proclaimed "positive neutrality" and was critical of Soviet actions.

[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 Tito, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with some assessment of Tito's success: 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. “Stalin’s domestic and foreign policies between 1945 and 1953 lacked consistent aims.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates must identify the policies followed by Stalin and then assess their aims and objectives. In domestic affairs the five-year plan, atomic arms development, the Doctor’s Plot, the Leningrad Affair and post-war reconstruction could be included. In foreign affairs the importance of Yalta, Potsdam, Poland, Greece, Berlin, Czechoslovakia, COMECON, and Cominform could be examined. In both cases candidates need to make a judgment about whether the aims were consistent.

N.B. If only domestic or foreign policies are dealt with award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[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 Stalin’s policies, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers focusing on Stalin’s policies: some may not address all aspects of the question.

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

23. “Ultimately the Warsaw Pact was unable to fulfill the expectations that the Soviet Union had for it when it was created in 1955.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates must be able to identify the intentions behind the Warsaw Pact (1955) in terms of its role in Europe. The basic idea was for the Soviet Union to better keep control of its satellite states although the Soviet Union saw the Pact as a response the federal Republic of Germany joining North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Candidates could make reference to events in Hungary, Berlin, Romania, Albania, Czechoslovakia and the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine, and eventually 1989 onwards leading to the collapse of the Warsaw Pact.

[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 Warsaw Pact, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments may have 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.

24. Compare and contrast the relative success of Chancellor Adenauer’s policies in West Germany with those of President de Gaulle in France.

Both men took office in times of crisis, believed in Franco-German cooperation, sought some cooperation with the Soviet Union and achieved economic progress. Adenauer was more successful economically, more friendly with the US and the federal Republic joined NATO. He wanted Germany to play a prominent role in European politics and presided over the end the Allied occupation in 1954. De Gaulle followed more controversial policies at home and abroad (particularly in Algeria) and left NATO. Candidates will probably conclude that, relatively speaking, Adenauer was more successful than de Gaulle, although this will depend on their perspective.

N.B. If only one leader is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[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 Adenauer or de Gaulle’s lives, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

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

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers with an explicit compare/contrast framework: some may not address all aspects of the question.

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

25. How has twentieth century Europe been affected by *either* terrorism *or* peace movements since the Second World War?

Candidates should show knowledge about the impact of either terrorism or peace movements after 1945 and assess their impact on Europe as a whole.

[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 may have 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.
