



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2011**

**HISTORY**

**ROUTE 2**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

27 pages

*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.*

*Paper 2 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 2 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 71–74. They are intended to assist marking but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. **For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.***

<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
<b>1–3:</b>	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There are no more than vague, unsupported assertions.
<b>4–5:</b>	There is little understanding of the question. Historical details are present but are mainly inaccurate and/or of marginal relevance. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there is minimal focus on the task.
<b>6–7:</b>	Answers indicate some understanding of the question but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Historical context may be present as will understanding of historical processes but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
<b>8–9:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Historical knowledge is present but is not fully or accurately detailed. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
<b>10–12:</b>	Answers indicate that the question is understood but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context and understanding of historical processes, such as comparison and contrast are present. There may be awareness of different approaches and interpretations but they are not based on relevant historical knowledge. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach.
<b>13–15:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Specific knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary are used appropriately to produce a specific argument. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented.
<b>16–20:</b>	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Detailed specific knowledge is used as evidence to support assertions and arguments. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively.

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

- 1. With reference to *one* war before 1945 and *one* war after 1945, assess the significance of *either* air power *or* naval power in deciding its outcome.**

Air power can be taken to mean the use of aircraft in a variety of roles – as fighters/strafers, bombers, reconnaissance, transporters of supplies/equipment and troops, *etc.* Helicopters are obviously acceptable, as are rockets/missiles as examples of the use and deployment of air power. Those who choose Vietnam will no doubt emphasize the use of airpower not only as a strike/bombing force but will link it to tactics intended to combat guerrilla warfare (defoliation, napalm use). The First and Second World Wars will no doubt be popular choices for the pre-1945 example– or the Gulf War possibly.

Naval power can be taken to mean both surface craft (for military, but also accept merchant navy role) and the use of submarine warfare.

The use of aircraft carriers can be used for either naval or sea power purposes.

The contribution of air and naval power differs according to the war chosen – though there were often similarities in the use, for example, of naval power as an instrument of enforcing blockade as part of a war of attrition. This was certainly so in both world wars. Air power was greater in impact in the second of the world wars in terms of not only the type of military capacity which existed but also the way in which such capacity was used – for example in saturation bombing of civilian/economic targets. Such techniques were later used in other wars of the twentieth century.

Whichever wars are chosen (air/naval power) there needs to be specific knowledge exhibited of the nature and impact of the technology. “Assess” does invite consideration of other factors, but is not simply an invitation to write about other factors to the exclusion of those specifically mentioned in the task.

Mention could be made of the overextension of one particular side in the chosen conflict, diplomatic/military errors made, the economic capacities/advantages of the sides in what became wars of attrition, superior weapons/technological development; the use of guerrilla or “People’s war” tactics; the collapse of morale of one side *etc.*

*If only one war, before 1945 or after 1945 is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

2. **“The contribution of outside intervention to victory in twentieth century civil wars was greatly exaggerated.” With reference to *two* civil wars, each chosen from a different region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

A structured thematic answer is probably the best approach – dealing firstly with the nature/extent of intervention by specific participants and then dealing with other factors which might be considered relevant in explaining victory.

“Outside intervention” – its nature and extent in two different civil wars need to be clearly identified. The motives for intervention are **not** the focus, though some candidates may provide a background.

Popular choices are likely to be China (1927–1949 or 1946–1949), Russia 1917/1918–1921/1922, Spain 1936–1939. Accept Korea 1950–1953 as an example of civil war, albeit within the Cold War context, and Vietnam (pre- and post-1954).

“Contribution” could relate to financing, provision of military personnel/advisers, supply of weaponry *etc.* In some cases outside intervention was hugely significant in helping ensure an efficient war effort (Spain and the support for the Nationalists, for example). In other civil wars intervention was often badly organized or woefully inadequate (Russia). In this latter case, the very fact of a “foreign” involvement was used by the Reds as part of a propaganda campaign to rally support against the “enemies” of Russia. Sometimes intervention was quite unintentional in supporting one particular side but did produce advantages for a participant (Japan’s involvement in China from the 1930s to 1945).

The choice of examples naturally dictates the approach/judgement as to the level of significance of the contribution.

Other factors could also be commented upon – for example superior discipline/organization of one leader/movement, factionalism which may have caused weakness on one particular side, popularity of one side due to its offerings (socially, economically, politically).

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

**3. Analyse (a) the causes *and* (b) the short-term results of *either* the Algerian War (1954–1962) or the Gulf War (1991).**

Some candidates may choose a longer-term coverage of causation referring to the political and economic conditions in Algeria (imperial exploitation of the territory, resentment at the treatment of the indigenous population). Reference could be made to the level of representation in political terms of “natives” to “colons”, the inequality of wealth and opportunities (in land ownership and employment for example). Shorter-term causes could deal with: a failed wheat harvest in 1945; high unemployment; shortage of manufactured goods; the repressive nature of French rule exhibited in 1945 in the quelling of nationalists in Algiers, Oran, Setif and subsequent “ratissages”, which further alienated the population leading to an independence movement. The movement (FLN) received further encouragement from the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu in Indochina in 1954.

There is no need to go into a longer-term treatment for results: a maximum of 10 years would constitute more than enough for “short-term results”.

Emphasis could be put upon the political as well as the military outcome of the conflict for victors and vanquished. The brutalization caused by military techniques used by both sides and the casualty rates (300 000 dead according to some estimates) could be noted as a result of the war. For the victors independence was achieved – but at what cost economically and socially? What measures were taken to try to stabilize the new nation? How important was Algerian independence in promoting other independence movements? For France, the war led to significant political changes, producing a potential civil conflict in mainland France due to disgruntled elements of the “colon” population in Algeria which, along with General Salan, helped bring down the Fourth Republic. Later, French military rebels (OAS) and those opposed to decolonization rejected metropolitan policies of de Gaulle’s Fifth Republic, leading to attempted seizure of power in Algeria and a terrorist campaign in mainland France itself.

The immediate cause of the Gulf War was the Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait in August 1990 and Saddam Hussein’s failure to accept UN resolutions requiring him to withdraw. What the motives were for such an invasion could be investigated: economic (oil resources of Kuwait to replenish lack of funds due to Iraq’s conflict with Iran 1980–1988); historical claims; underestimation of likely foreign intervention (especially by the US, which had supported Iraq in its war with Iran). Motives for the build up and use of forces against Saddam Hussein could be attributed to: Western fears of Saddam Hussein’s increasing control of Middle East oil; anxiety amongst other Arab states concerning Iraqi ambitions, resulting in their support for enforcement of the UN resolutions.

Results could include: reference to the restoration of Kuwaiti sovereignty; the survival of the Iraqi regime and impact on the Iraqi population – for example the Kurds and Shia Muslim population in particular, which rose against Saddam but found no outside support. Population displacement and refugee movement throughout the Middle East occurred. Mention could be made of the military losses/casualty rates of the two sides in the war and the impact of military technology.

On a geopolitical scale, some candidates may investigate the extent to which the UN was successful in applying collective security – or whether the result of the war was to reveal Western manipulation of Middle East politics in pursuit of larger economic and strategic concerns.

*If only causes or short-term results are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

4. **Compare and contrast the social and economic results of *two* wars fought in the second half of the twentieth century.**

Regardless of the wars chosen, the focus should be on social and economic results.

**Social**

This could refer to: the effect of the conflict upon the population in areas such as psychological changes; impact upon demography; patterns of settlement/refugee displacement/forcible resettlement; health issues caused by the use of new forms of warfare (Agent Orange, for example, in Vietnam).

**Economic**

This could refer to: the costs of the war; industrial capacity/production; economic mobilization of the population to support the war effort; gains/losses of territory/resources which may have economic implications for the future.

No doubt wars such as those fought in Korea or Vietnam could prove popular choices. There is no regional restriction.

**Candidates must deal with the second half of the century. No credit can be given for answers which are based on conflicts pre-1950.**

*If only one war is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**5. To what extent did the peace settlements after the First World War (a) deal with the issues which caused the war *and* (b) produce new problems, hindering future peace?**

The question requires candidates to examine the peace settlements after the First World War (not just Versailles) and identify those issues (or factors) which led to the conflict in 1914, as well as comment on the extent to which the peacemakers successfully dealt with such issues.

“Issues which caused the war” could include: reference to nationalism; revanchism; secret diplomacy; arms race; the attempt of powers to establish regional hegemony; the willingness of states to fight wars of distraction or wars to ensure self-preservation in the face of perceived threats to their existence; colonial rivalry *etc.*

In relation to “new problems hindering future peace”, candidates could refer to issues of unresolved self-determination or deeply resented selective application of the principle which paved the way for revisionism, resentment and sowed the seeds of colonial nationalism in some empires. Nationalism produced by treaties, which were seen as punitive or unfair, helped lead to the rise of extremist political movements dedicated to righting perceived wrongs. Both Fascism and National Socialism in Europe can be linked to the disillusionment caused by the settlements, for example.

Even victorious powers felt aggrieved at the outcome of the settlements, which failed to provide security (France) or sufficient rewards (Italy). This would have significant impact on the level of commitment to the principle of collective security.

The failure to solve “The German Problem” and the establishment of new, and often economically weak successor states, produced the potential for geopolitical instability.

The refusal of the US to ratify the settlements meant that Wilson’s “League” was denied a key member as the US retreated into political isolationism. Similarly, the failure to satisfy the USSR in relation to the question of whether to return territories lost at Brest–Litovsk, alienated Moscow. Lack of commitment to internationalism, compounded by the absence of a supranational collective security organization; the rise of aggressive and expansionist regimes; the growth of appeasement tendencies sometimes associated with guilt over the treatment of the vanquished and economic crises (1923, 1929 onwards, for example) subsequently weakened the basis for international security.

Some candidates may point out that the inter-war period did show some indications of peace – the “Locarno Spring” period for example – and credit this. Hopefully such candidates will explain why such a period then came to an end.

It is important to note that the impact of the settlements for the future was not limited solely to Europe. Credit those who apply their knowledge to the instability which resulted, for example, in the Middle East, South and East Asia.

Candidates who address this as a question on the Treaty of Versailles and the rise of Hitler will not score highly.

*If only part (a) or part (b) is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*



**6. Assess the importance of religious *and* economic factors in the origins of *either* the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) *or* the Indo-Pakistan wars (1947–1949, 1965, 1971).**

This is not a question which requires a “to what extent” treatment by candidates though, in the conclusion, candidates may point out other factors relating to causation. The focus is on identifying the role played by religion and economic factors in bringing about the conflicts.

For Spain, candidates could refer to the role and status of the Church pre-1936 and the bitter division between believers and anticlericalists, which spilled over into the Republican years (1931–1936). The secularization policies undertaken by the first administration of the Republic were bitterly resented – and resisted – by those who saw the attack as the work of “Godless atheism”. The issue of religion also encompassed the control of education, the institution of marriage (and divorce) and the attempt to strip the Church of economic and temporal power.

Economic issues could deal with the question of the distribution of land and the economic imbalance witnessed in Spain pre-1936. Specific details are required to illustrate the divisions and animosity fostered by the divisions and reflected in the programmes of different political parties (some seeking to maintain the status quo, some to alleviate the worst effects, some to destroy the existing social and economic system).

The Indo-Pakistan wars dating from partition up until 1971 are easy to characterize as religious disputes/conflicts since at first glance the opposing sides did, at least superficially, seem to represent two different religious beliefs. Yet this is possibly rather simplistic. India was a secular state and even Pakistan, despite its very existence being predicated on the basis of religion, was not necessarily brought into conflict by solely religious considerations. Other factors such as control of resources ranging from the reallocation of the assets of the Raj, to control of the headwaters and tributaries of the Indus and the territorial disputes over Princely States such as Kashmir and Hyderabad, *etc.* led to arguments and war. The geopolitical struggle for South Asian domination could also be seen in the emergence of a Bangladeshi nationalism sponsored by Delhi, but much feared by Karachi. Sub-continental political and economic considerations provide areas for consideration in the explanation of war over the period.

*If only religion or economic causes/issues are focused upon, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

## Topic 2 Democratic states – challenges and responses

7. **“Weaknesses in the constitution *and* the failure of political parties to support democracy caused the failure of the multiparty state in Weimar Germany (1919–1933).” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Knowledge of what the main elements of Weimar’s constitution were (especially clauses relating to proportional representation and the application of rule by emergency decree) could be expected along with consideration as to why such measures, with hindsight, proved harmful to the effective functioning of democratic government. Candidates could argue that the clauses/provisions themselves were less problematic than the individuals/parties, which at times abused the spirit of the constitution.

The failure of political parties to “commit” to the democratic system could be illustrated by the actions and attitudes of some, but by no means all, of the parties in Germany in the period: some were bitterly opposed from the outset (KPD, NSDAP), others were arguably ambivalent (DNVP, *Zentrum* (Centre Party)) but there were parties willing to support the new democratic republic (DDP, SPD).

Other factors that could be considered in addition to the specific areas noted in the question could be revanchist/revisionist sentiments promoting nationalist feelings and bitterness towards the supposed “traitors” of Weimar; economic crises; the conditionality of the armed forces in their support of the governmental system; the actions of individuals who abused/misused the provisions of the constitution – Hindenburg from March 1930 onwards, for example.

*If only constitutional weaknesses or the failure of political parties is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

8. **In what ways, and with what success, did *one* democratic (multiparty) state deal with issues of *either* gender inequality *or* the inequitable distribution of wealth?**

The nature and extent of “gender inequality” and “the inequitable distribution of wealth” would be appropriate starting points for answers. In the case of gender, consideration could be made of issues such as: employment opportunities (in both public and private sectors); equal pay for work; educational provision; inheritance laws; suffrage; marriage/divorce; *etc.* Candidates should provide specific details as to how the democratic state sought to redress any imbalance in terms of discriminatory treatment *e.g.* by legislative means and measures taken to ensure successful implementation of such legislation. Whether the objectives were successfully reached needs to be dealt with.

Similarly, in terms of the issue of the inequitable distribution of wealth, candidates need to show awareness of the existence of such discrepancies – and which groups were economically disadvantaged and why. How states sought to deal with this could include: consideration of tax/fiscal policies meant to ensure fairer income distribution; the provision of social security allowances to reduce the gaps between groups; the provision of grants to target groups to encourage study or retraining for employment *etc.*

**9. To what extent were the problems faced by Nigeria between 1961 and 1966 successfully resolved?**

Nigeria achieved independence in 1960. In January 1966 a military coup led by General Ironsi ended the Federal government of Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa. The prime ministers of both the Northern Region and the Western Region were assassinated along with Balewa. The majority of the officers who carried out the coup were Igbo (Ibo).

In 1960 the newly independent state instituted a parliamentary system of government, which permitted considerable autonomy for the three main regions. Tribal/ethnic rivalries and tensions were reflected in the political parties (*e.g.* NPC, NCNC and AG) which represented Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba's respectively. The establishment of a Federal Republic in 1963 did little to resolve the tensions between the regions with bitterness over economic and educational development between northern and southern parts of the nation. The coup of January did little to resolve problems and was followed by a second military coup in July 1966, leading to the takeover of General Gowon. Following massacres of Igbos in the Northern Region, an Igbo secessionist movement in the Eastern Region grew – resulting in the outbreak of the Nigerian Civil War of 1967–1970.

Candidates could identify a variety of problems of the new nation: tribalism/regionalism; economic reliance on relatively few resources (*e.g.* oil accounting for 80% of Nigeria's income) which were subject to price variations on the world commodity markets; shortage of trained personnel; the inexperience of political leaders; the validity of the Westminster model of parliamentary-type democracy for Nigeria; the role and status of the military in the new state *etc.*

**10. Analyse the methods used to attain civil rights in *two* democratic (multiparty) states, each chosen from a different region.**

Civil rights movements may be taken to mean those movements which sought to end discrimination in relation to race, religion, gender and class. Such discrimination could be seen in terms of political, economic and social spheres where groups were excluded from full equality of treatment.

The movements selected, and the methods pursued, could be analysed in relation to their organization; the specific areas of concern which were targeted; the extent to which the methods employed were forceful or not and whether the movements were able to appeal to the government and/or public opinion inside the state – or whether external pressure was brought to bear on governments to deal with the lack of civil rights.

A popular choice is likely to be the Civil Rights Movement in the US whereby African Americans sought to end segregation and racial discrimination in the fields of politics (suffrage), education and employment, for example. Examples of movements and the types of approach adopted could refer to organizations such as the NAACP, CORE; the work of individuals such as Dr Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael in relation to specific methods of agitation and subsequent legislation in the 1950s and 1960s especially. Affirmative Action as seen in the case of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 may also be considered.

Other examples could be seen in the case of Northern Ireland, where the struggle for equality was undertaken by a variety of methods, often violent, from the late 1960s especially – or in any democratic (multiparty) state where an aggrieved section of the population has attempted to gain redress for real or perceived grievances in specific areas.

The plight of the indigenous inhabitants of Australia, New Zealand and Native Americans in the US/First Nation in Canada is a valid choice – as is the coverage of social, religious or caste groups in South Asia. The answer requires emphasis on methods: why and when they were adopted.

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

**11. Evaluate the domestic, social and economic policies of two of the following leaders of the United States between 1953 and 1969: Eisenhower; Kennedy; Johnson.**

The main domestic policies, social policies and developments for the presidencies are noted below. Evaluation requires an awareness of the motives behind the policies and comment as to how/if the goals/objectives were reached. While the question stresses “domestic”, candidates may refer to foreign policy decisions/financial implications that hindered successful implementation. A thematic approach rather than a narration/end-on approach is likely to produce more satisfactory responses.

**Eisenhower (1953–1961)**

Reference could be made to his attempts to alter the focus of his predecessor’s “Fair Deal” legislation. His “dynamic conservatism” resulted in less government intervention in the economy and a willingness to work with business interests. Specific policies could include: foundation of Department of Health, Education and Welfare; increase in unemployment and social security benefits; efforts to end agrarian overproduction; the Tidelands Oil Act; government subsidizing of suburban housing developments *etc.* Whether all sections of the population benefited equally could be investigated. The issue of civil rights could be dealt with under social policies and there is much in the period 1953–1961: the bus boycotts; the significance of Brown vs. Board of Education ruling; the Civil Rights Act.

**Kennedy (1961–1963)**

Reference could be made to his “New Frontier” concept designed to deal with “unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and status”. Specific areas of focus could include: the planning for an anti-poverty programme (inherited by Johnson); educational initiatives to improve teacher salaries and school construction; civil rights (the appointment of Thurgood Marshall as a Circuit Court judge); the dispatch of troops to Mississippi to ensure the admission of a black student to the state university. To what extent there was significant development in eliminating discrimination or whether this constituted tokenism could also be investigated.

**Johnson (1963–1969)**

Reference could be made to the “Great Society” and the “unconditional war on poverty” it was intended to wage. Specific areas of focus could include: education (Elementary and Secondary Education Act 1965) and increased federal funding; Economic Opportunity Act (Jobs Corps, VISTA); Medicare and Medicaid; voting rights and the removal of socially discriminatory restrictions based on race; the Civil Rights Act 1968 *etc.*

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

**12. Compare and contrast *either* social welfare systems *or* education systems in *two* democratic (multiparty) states.**

An understanding of what constitutes “social welfare” would be an appropriate starting point, with reference to constituent parts of systems such as: healthcare programmes/provision; insurance against accident/injury in the workplace; unemployment schemes (retraining and benefits/offering); family/child allowance; provision for the physically/mentally challenged; pension schemes *etc.*

“Education systems” can cover education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels and provisions made for the students involved in the system. Areas for consideration could include: similarities and differences in the aims/goals (academic and social) of the system; the successes/failures in attaining goals; funding of such systems; the prevalence of public/private educational facilities *etc.*

Education can also be extended to the provision of retraining for adults/unemployed people offered opportunities to learn new skills.

*If only one state is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

### **Topic 3    Origins and development of authoritarian and single-party states**

#### **13. In what ways, and with what success, did *either* Sukarno *or* Nasser deal with domestic challenges after gaining power?**

The focus here is rule, not rise, so any background provided should be brief.

For either leader, candidates need to identify the major issues/challenges that confronted the leader on accession to power.

Depending on the selected leader, these areas could refer to: economic problems (agrarian development/land ownership/redistribution); problems with orthodox religious groups; regionalist pressures threatening the integrity of the state; the role and status of the military leadership in the state; political opponents/movements; social conditions of the population – the expectations of the populace whether it be in terms of income, education or employment; the absence of an experienced and educated group to implement government policy; *etc.* The challenges, the methods (policies, programmes) adopted and the extent to which the goals of such programmes were achieved – or not – have to be considered for effective responses.

*N.B.* Topic 3 does not require knowledge of external challenges/policies but some candidates may legitimately link domestic to external concerns/challenges in, for example, the case of Sukarno's relationship with the Communist movement inside Indonesia (PKI), which had repercussions for Sukarno due to Cold War considerations. Similarly Nasser's domestic policies to deal with agrarian/economic development overlapped with Cold War entanglements, which earned Nasser both rewards and opposition actively sponsored by outside forces. While domestic concerns are the focus therefore, accept a well-linked response in this case.

#### **14. In what ways, and with what success, did *one* authoritarian *or* single-party ruler deal with internal opposition?**

Internal or domestic opposition can relate to individuals or groups that actively resisted the rule of the regime. The nature of resistance could be explained – whether in the production of an underground press, sabotage of economic facilities, spreading of anti-government propaganda through poster, radio, *etc.*; espionage; assassination attempts. The emphasis is on the period of rule – not rise – and the focus needs to be on the period in power. Opposition may be considered to arise from: religious groups; economic interest groups; ideologically opposed political movements; students; inner-party opponents of the single-party leader; opposition from within the armed forces.

The leader of the regime often launched attacks on imagined, rather than real opponents in a system of preventive purging – or by targeting groups indiscriminately, fostering a climate of insecurity.

The methods used may be related to: the use of force; the implementation of a secret police state; arbitrary arrest and punishment; censorship of the media; control of education; promotion of a Cult of the Leader; the provision of economic/social policies to win popular support. In short, a combination of stick and carrot (incentives and disincentives).

Whichever leader is chosen, specific, accurate detail of a variety of opponents is necessary, as well as specific methods to deal with opposition (or how to obviate/prevent it).

**15. To what extent was the maintenance of power by *either* Mao or Castro a result of successful economic policies?**

The maintenance of power by single-party leaders may be achieved through a variety of methods. In some cases the single-party leader rose to power on the basis of promises to address economic crises which caused popular discontent. Once in power such leaders were obligated to deal with (or at least pay lip service to) economic issues.

Candidates could identify the nature of the economic policies of their chosen leader. Was the emphasis on industry, agrarian reform, the implementation of an anti-imperialist/socialist economy? What specific programmes were undertaken during the period of rule of either Mao or Castro – and how successful were such policies for the leader and for the nation?

Was the position of the leader strengthened domestically by economic successes? Did standards of living and levels of employment rise? Was popular support (and party support) for the leader evident at any point; if so, when? If not, what other factors need consideration to explain the survival of the leader?: purges; propaganda/cult of the individual; use of secret police/specific sections of the population (Red Guards in China) to eliminate opponents – real or imaginary; a popular foreign policy; outside aid?

The candidate is required to consider the central theme of economic policies – not merely to dismiss them and produce a narrative of the career of either leader from beginning to end of their period of rule.

**16. “The rise to power of authoritarian or single-party leaders depended upon the use of force rather than popular support.” With reference to *two* leaders, each chosen from a different region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The focus is the period of rise, not rule.

The two factors indicated in the question – the “use of force” and “popular support” – form the basis for the response. Whichever examples are selected, candidates must examine the extent to which each factor contributed to the rise of the leader. Candidates can of course introduce “other factors” but should not ignore those noted above, or simply dismiss them and embark upon a narration of the rise of two leaders from different regions.

Obviously the nature and extent of the contribution of each factor varies according to the examples chosen. For some aspiring leaders (Mussolini, Hitler, Mao and Castro, for example), both factors noted in the question offer a good opportunity for candidates to examine how, when and why they were significant, or not. Other factors such as external support, the collaboration of vested interests or institutions and economic crisis could also be referred to.

Regardless of the examples chosen answers should show evidence not only of accurate and specific detail about the named factors but also evidence of critical consideration as to their relative importance in the coming to power of the aspiring leader.

*If only one example or one region is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*



**17. Compare and contrast the status and treatment of women *or* minorities in *two* authoritarian or single-party states, each chosen from a different region.**

Popular choices are likely to be Hitler’s Germany, Mao’s China, the USSR under Lenin/Stalin, Castro’s Cuba. Perón’s Argentina and Mussolini’s Italy may also appear as examples .

Whichever states are chosen, and whether the choice is made for “women” or “minorities”, there must be accurate historical detail to substantiate arguments.

For women, their status in the single-party state may be considered in relation to that under a previous regime. Did women receive improved treatment in terms of employment, education, marriage/divorce legislation and inheritance laws – or did their social, political and economic status deteriorate under the new authoritarian/single-party state due to the withdrawal of rights previously held? What was the ideological view of the role/status of women in the selected states and to what extent was ideology, as opposed to pragmatism, present in the treatment of women – for example in the field of employment, in the interests of literally “building” the state or during time of conflict?

Minorities may be taken to mean religious, ethnic, political/economic (*e.g.* Kulaks) groups that often bore the brunt of persecution in the single-party state. The popular choices are likely to relate to anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany and the treatment of Christian groups in the USSR, Germany and China.

*If only one state or one region is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**18. Assess the role of each of the following in the rise to power of Stalin *and* Hitler: ideological appeal; underestimation by opponents; propaganda.**

“Ideological appeal” requires identification of the ideology of each of the aspiring leaders and the extent to which it was received by both the party and, where relevant, the population.

“Underestimation by opponents” could cover the case of Stalin, discussion of the succession dispute which began even before the death of Lenin (Triumvirate/Troika, Trotsky’s failure to recognize and react to the Stalinist threat, *etc.*). For Hitler, consideration could be given to the failure of the Left (a split between KPD/SPD dating back to the Spartacus Rising) and arguably the failure of institutions such as the military, Big Business, vested interests to recognize the nature and potential of National Socialism. Though “opponents” could be taken to mean those who actively opposed National Socialism on the basis of political beliefs, candidates should not be penalized if they refer to the fatal underestimation of Hitler and his movement by individuals, such as Hindenburg or von Papen, who had been dismissive, arguably resistant, to the ideology of National Socialism before 1933.

“Propaganda” could include: reference to the establishment of a “cult of Lenin”, which Stalin assiduously cultivated; the propounding of policies showing Stalin as the disciple and natural successor of Lenin *etc.* For Hitler, reference could be made to: the campaigns undertaken by Goebbels; the use of the press (in collaboration with Hugenberg); the mass rallies organized to provide the spectacle of unity *etc.*

“Assess” is an invitation to comment on the extent and significance of each factor in explaining the rise to power of both Stalin and Hitler.

*If only one part is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks]. If only two parts are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [13 marks].*

**Topic 4 Nationalist and independence movements in Africa and Asia and post-1945 Central and Eastern European states**

**19. For what reasons, and with what results, was Soviet influence challenged in *two* countries in Central or Eastern Europe between 1945 and 1970?**

Candidates may choose any **two** countries in Central or Eastern Europe that came under Soviet influence after 1945. Yugoslavia could be used as an example but its relevance to the question would probably not go beyond 1948.

In general, “for what reasons” could include the treatment of local populations by the Red Army as they “liberated” Central and Eastern Europe between 1944 and 1945, and the fear and resentment engendered as a consequence in some sections of the population. Also of relevance would be: the imposition, in some cases, of Communist rule and the attendant policies of state ownership of industry; the confiscation of private property; the collectivization of agriculture. Specifically, the denial of access to the Marshall Plan could be discussed with particular reference to Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet zone of Germany/Soviet sector of Berlin. Similarly, Stalin’s death, to some extent, sparked the riots in East Berlin in 1953 and Khrushchev’s speech triggered disaffection in Poland and Hungary in 1956. In relation to Czechoslovakia, the events of the Prague Spring of 1968 and the Warsaw Pact invasion may also be examined.

The purges of Communist Party officials, as well as opponents to Communist rule, could be seen as a reason for, and a result of, the challenge to Soviet influence. Other “results” could include the use of force to suppress opposition and some candidates may link these to the impact such events had upon Cold War superpower relations.

Do not expect all of the above as they may not be relevant to the examples chosen.

*If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**20. “Walesa’s leadership was the most important factor in the achievement of Poland’s independence from Soviet control.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should discuss the role of Walesa in the movement towards the recovery of Poland’s independence from Soviet control by 1989.

A controversial figure, some candidates may argue that Walesa was vital to the origin and the survival of Solidarity through the period of martial law, whereas others may see his role as being less significant. Expect a discussion of other factors such as the role of the Catholic Church and of Pope John Paul II, as well as the strongly nationalist tradition in Polish culture. Of relevance would be the economic problems that undermined the authority of the Polish Communist Party as well as the policies of Mikhail Gorbachev that influenced, and were influenced by, events in Poland.

**21. In what ways, and with what success, did *one* Central or Eastern European state deal with social and economic problems after independence from Soviet control *or* the removal of centralized control?**

Candidates may choose any Central or Eastern Europe state but will need to focus on events after 1989/90. If Yugoslavia is chosen, however, relevant material could also be selected from the 1980s, as greater autonomy was given to the Federal States at this time.

For economic problems, expect some reference to the debt accumulated during the 1980s, the challenge of deconstructing centralized planning and the introduction/restoration of the free market system.

For social problems, mention could be made of: emigration to the countries of Western Europe; the treatment of minorities, an issue that became contentious at a time of reinvigorated nationalism; the consequences of a greater disparity of wealth and, in some cases, an increase in organized crime.

**22. “Charismatic leadership was essential to the growth of independence movements in African and Asian colonial states.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

There is no limit here to the number of examples that a candidate may use but there must be more than one. Examples of leaders may be chosen from either Africa or Asia but countries chosen must have been colonies.

If India and Pakistan (they may be discussed separately) were chosen for example, the influence of Gandhi, Nehru and Jinnah would all be relevant. In Africa it is possible that Mugabe, Kenyatta, Nkrumah, Nyerere and Nasser, will be popular choices.

Candidates are expected to focus on the importance of charismatic leadership and so will need to demonstrate evidence of such “charisma” and how this was applied to win support for independence. Specific supporting evidence would be required here. Other factors would also need to be discussed to address “to what extent” and mention may be made of: ideological opposition to the doctrine of imperialism; the experience of the both World Wars and the Cold War. Economic factors may also be discussed.

Do expect candidates to give good supporting evidence for their arguments and to focus closely on the question.

Answers which focus only on African or Asian leaders or a mixture of the two are acceptable.

*If only one movement or leader is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**23. Compare and contrast the methods used to achieve independence in the Gold Coast (Ghana) and the Belgian Congo (Zaire).**

**For “compare”**

Mention could be made of how both Ghana and Zaire were colonies of European countries and had movements that helped hasten the process of independence. Both countries had regional divisions, based on economic activity, and had potential leaders – Nkrumah and Lumumba – who established political parties. In each case, there were also nationalist parties that organized strikes and protests to persuade the colonial authorities to grant independence.

**For “contrast”**

It could be argued that in the Gold Coast, by 1947, Britain had introduced a Legislative Assembly to pave the way for greater independence. It also encouraged the education of potential leaders. Meanwhile, the Belgian government neglected to introduce any form of self-government, nor did it encourage the education of a local elite. Kwame Nkrumah and Patrice Lumumba were quite different in their backgrounds and provided a different style of leadership. Unlike Lumumba, who had not received a university education, Nkrumah had been educated both in Britain and the US before returning to the Gold Coast (Ghana).

The following is a brief guide to the kind of detailed evidence that may be included to support arguments.

**The Gold Coast (Ghana)**

The United Gold Coast Convention was set up in 1947 calling for independence with Kwame Nkrumah as its Secretary General. The Christianburg riots in Accra in 1947 would be important as well as the arrest of Nkrumah, who formed the Convention People’s Party on his release from prison. “Positive action” was set up as a campaign to encourage the use of civil disobedience to persuade the British government to grant independence. A general strike was organized in 1950, after which Nkrumah was again sent to prison. When the CPP won the elections for the Legislative Assembly in 1952, he was released from prison to take office as prime minister. After the elections of 1952, the colonial government still controlled most of the economy (especially cocoa) and this led to continued discontent. The Legislative Assembly voted for independence in 1956 and this was granted in 1957.

**The Belgian Congo (Zaire)**

This had been a Belgian colony since 1908 (though a fiefdom of King Leopold since 1884) and there were only very limited efforts made by the Belgian government to prepare the colony for independence. Little effort was made to identify, educate and train leaders from the local population. Patrice Lumumba established the first nationalist party in 1958 but faced opposition from *Alliance des Bakongo* (ABAKO) led by Joseph Kasavubu. Riots in 1959 persuaded the Belgian government to grant independence. Lumumba won the election in May 1960 as leader of the MNC (*Mouvement National Congolais*) and became prime minister with Joseph Kasavubu of ABAKO as president. Independence was declared in June 1960 and the state was renamed the Republic of Congo. Almost immediately, there followed secessionist struggles in Katanga, led by Moïse Tshombi. A crisis in leadership developed when Kasavubu dismissed Lumumba in September 1960 and civil war followed over mineral-rich Katanga.

*If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**24. To what extent were economic issues the most important challenge facing *two* post-colonial governments in Africa *or* Asia?**

This question requires some assessment of the importance of economic issues that confronted post-colonial governments. Such issues could include: the cost of providing infrastructure, schools, hospitals, *etc.* to provide necessary services for the population; the problems associated, in some cases, with the replacement of foreign-owned industry/business with locally-based institutions; dependence on commodities which were subject to global fluctuations in prices. Some candidates may also discuss ideological influences on economic policy.

Other factors would also need to be discussed and these could include: the challenge posed by conflict caused by political, religious, tribal or ethnic divisions in society and the challenge of maintaining stable political institutions.

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

## Topic 5 The Cold War

25. **“The Potsdam Conference marked the end of the wartime alliance and laid the foundations for post-war hostility.” With reference to the period up to 1949, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates are expected to address the causes of the Cold War in their answers to this question. Events up to the Potsdam Conference should be well known and it is likely that mention will be made of the introduction of Truman and Attlee (less on Attlee perhaps) to the peacemaking process as well as their relationship with Stalin. The structure of the question invites candidates to argue in favour and/or against the statement.

In agreement with the statement, candidates may argue that ideological differences were fundamental obstacles to continued cooperation once the common enemy was defeated. It may be that some candidates will go back to the 1917 revolution to support this analysis. This is acceptable as long as the focus remains firmly on the question. Candidates may also argue that Truman had a different approach from Roosevelt, which meant that US–Soviet relations were likely to worsen. Evidence for this may include Truman’s meeting with Molotov in April 1945 as well as Truman’s mention of a “new weapon” to Stalin at Potsdam. Also, disagreements over the future development of war-ravaged Germany could be mentioned, including the discussions over reparations and how these contributed to post-war tension.

Against the statement, it could be argued that by the meeting at Potsdam there was already an understanding among the Big Three that post-war Europe would be restructured along the lines of “spheres of influence”, as indicated by discussions at Teheran and Yalta. It was already clear that Stalin wanted new borders for the USSR and Poland, and the Moscow Conference of 1944 had touched upon “spheres of influence” throughout Eastern and Central Europe. The USSR had also agreed to join the United Nations and was planning to enter the war against Japan. The Allied Control Council was in place and Germany divided into zones of occupation. In this way, it could be argued that there was broad agreement on significant issues. Candidates may then go on to propose that it was not until 1946, or after, that relations worsened, and this argument could be supported by an analysis of the Long Telegram, Iron Curtain Speech, Truman Doctrine, COMECON, Berlin Blockade, *etc.*

Do not expect all of the above but do expect good factual supporting evidence. Historiography should complement rather than dominate the answer.

26. **With reference to *two* countries, each chosen from a different region (excluding the US or the USSR), assess the social and economic impact of the Cold War.**

This is an open question that will allow candidates to choose two countries, each from a different region, that were influenced by the Cold War. There are many suitable examples as few countries were unaffected, to some degree, by the events of the Cold War. There is an opportunity here for candidates to use knowledge gained from individual study or from national curricula, so some well-supported answers can be expected. Focus must remain, however, on social and economic issues and lengthy discussions of political events will not be relevant.

*If only one country or one region is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*



**27. In what ways, and with what success, did the US and the USSR attempt to reduce Cold War tensions between 1956 and 1979?**

This question requires candidates to examine attempts to reduce Cold War tensions from Khrushchev's policy of "peaceful coexistence" in 1956 through to the end of détente in 1979.

"In what ways" could include the policy of peaceful coexistence and the summits held in Paris and Vienna. Other points to mention could be the arms treaties of 1963 and 1968 and the policy of détente that led to arms reduction and almost a decade of eased tensions certainly at an official level.

"With what success" may prompt candidates to consider: the Suez Crisis (Sinai War) of 1956; the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution; the tension over Berlin, leading to the construction of the Wall in 1961 and, of course, the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. Candidates may also refer to Vietnam, as well as the superpower response to the wars of 1967 and 1973 in the Middle East, as further evidence of how tension was not reduced. Such arguments may be counter-balanced, however, by the recognition that relationships between Khrushchev and Kennedy, Nixon and Mao, and Nixon and Brezhnev were relatively good and that, overall, the threat of nuclear war did recede somewhat.

**28. For what reasons, and with what results, did the Cold War affect the Middle East between 1956 and 1979?**

As the question clearly states "for what reasons" and "with what results", expect a structured response.

"For what reasons" could include:

- the existence of the state of Israel and its impact upon neighbouring states;
- "Arab nationalism" spearheaded by Gamal Abdul Nasser;
- oil and a perceived need to ensure the support of the oil-producing countries;
- the appeal of socialism (the Ba'athist movement), which gave the USSR an opportunity to increase its influence in the Middle East;
- the willingness of the Soviet leadership to expand Soviet interests abroad.

"With what results" could include:

- the establishment of the Baghdad Pact and then CENTO;
- the Suez Crisis/Sinai War;
- the Eisenhower Doctrine;
- US involvement in Lebanon;
- Soviet bases established in the Middle East;
- superpower involvement in the wars of 1967 and 1973 ;
- shuttle-diplomacy by Henry Kissinger;
- the Camp David Peace Accords.

There is much to discuss here therefore do not expect all of the above. Do expect a structured answer that clearly addresses both parts of the question and goes up to 1979.

**29. Compare and contrast the impact of *two* of the following leaders on the Cold War: Mao; Castro; Kennedy.**

Candidates have a choice of two out of three here but, as all three should be well-known, any combination is likely to prove popular. The question does ask for a comparison and so a comparative structure could be used to good effect. It is possible that some candidates may choose Castro and Kennedy and so use this opportunity to discuss the Cuban Missile Crisis. This is acceptable as long as the answer goes beyond 1962 (especially in the case of Fidel Castro) and includes other relevant information.

Castro had an impact upon the Cold War by using (and being used by) the superpowers as a way to assert or to challenge spheres of influence. He made use of Soviet support to introduce communist policies into Cuba, which worsened his relations with the US. The Cuban Missile Crisis was a direct consequence of this. Beyond 1962, mention could be made of Castro's policies in Africa as well as in Latin America. His role in the Non-Aligned Movement could also be mentioned.

Kennedy's time as president from January 1961 to November 1963 provides plenty of material for discussion: his visit to Berlin; his policies on Laos and Vietnam; the summit in Vienna and the events leading up to the Cuban Missile Crisis and its aftermath. These are all worthy of consideration discussion and can provide some useful comparisons and contrasts with either Castro or Mao.

Mao should be well-known, although focus here must remain mostly on his foreign policy. Candidates may begin with the Korean War and go on to discuss Sino–Soviet relations ( especially with Khrushchev) whose impact would provide some interesting contrasts with Castro or Kennedy, and Mao's response to such events as the Brezhnev Doctrine that was not welcomed in Beijing although welcomed in Havana. Policies regarding the production and control of nuclear arms could also be discussed and would invite comparison/contrast.

A candidate will have to plan this answer carefully but there is much room for analysis.

*If only one leader is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**30. To what extent did (a) ideological *and* (b) economic factors contribute to the ending of the Cold War?**

Candidates can be expected to focus on the 1980s here and may choose to argue that the Cold War ended in either 1989 or 1991. Either end-date would be acceptable.

For “ideological factors”, consideration could be given to the attempts made by Soviet leaders, especially Gorbachev, to reform a Communist system without destroying its ideological base. Candidates may mention the challenge of adopting perestroika for instance and how this led, arguably, to political changes. Furthermore, mention may be made of the resurgence of nationalism, both in the Soviet satellite states and also within the USSR, and the ideological challenge this presented to Communist parties. Of relevance also, is the leadership of President Reagan, who took an ideological stance against Communism. For economic factors, candidates may mention the economic problems experienced by the Soviet Union and its satellite states during the 1980s. These would include: stagnation, as economic growth slowed down; the cost of fighting the Soviet–Afghan War and upheavals in satellite states which precipitated the decline of the communist system politically and economically. Gorbachev also felt pressured to match (unsuccessfully) increased US defence spending.

Economics and ideology influenced each other and candidates may comment on this.

*If only ideological or economic factors are discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

---