



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2012**

**HISTORY**

**ROUTE 2**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

29 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 *two* examples, each chosen from a different region, assess the factors which helped *and* hindered successful guerrilla warfare.**

Popular examples are likely to be guerrilla warfare in China (1927–1949 approximately), Vietnam (from the time of the First Indo-China War up till 1975), Cuba and the campaign in the Sierra Maestra (from approximately 1956/7–1959). Other appropriate examples could refer to the Malayan Emergency, the Hukbalahap movement in the Philippines, the Greek Civil War – all of which provide lessons on the barriers to success in achieving victory. Accept other examples as appropriate (Afghanistan, Partisan resistance during the Second World War *etc.*) but ensure that the regional requirement is observed for this question – and note that regions are defined in this case by the IB regional division of the world. Hence, candidates who choose say China and Vietnam are not fulfilling the demands of the regional requirement. Examiners need to scrutinise the map on the front of the Paper 2 exam to ensure consistency in terms of this regional requirement.

Depending on the examples selected, factors which may be considered as helping could include: – the existence of an unpopular and/or repressive regime which produces grievances (social, economic, political) which provide the basis for discontent, existence of outside support in terms of moral and economic backing, the existence of suitable terrain or geographic conditions which allows the guerrilla force relative safety from successful attack by regular or conventional forces, popular support gained by fighting the guerrilla war not just as a military war but also a political war. The provision, by guerrillas, of a political platform allows support to be gained from the populace in terms of food, intelligence/information, recruits *etc.*

Factors which may hinder successful warfare could include: failure of the guerrillas to win over popular support by resorting to intimidation of the local population (Greece for example), the attempts made by regimes to improve economic and political conditions – thus removing a main plank of guerrilla support, the provision of external aid (military and economic) to introduce schemes to physically combat the guerrillas or to improve conditions thus removing the base for grievances (Philippines for example), the introduction of schemes to physically separate the guerrilla from the population (Malaya, Vietnam) *etc.*

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

**2. Analyse the economic and social effects of *two* wars in the second half of the twentieth century.**

Wars selected must be 1950 and onwards – no regional requirement.

For economic effects candidates could address the ways in which the participant(s) organised/reorganised the economic system of the state to meet the demands of the war effort – this could include economic mobilisation of the nation/participants in terms of weapons production, food production, rationing of materials *etc.* “Effects” could also be dealt with in relation to the damage done to the infrastructure of the protagonists – human losses as well as physical damage. In some cases war may have contributed to a boom in economic development due to the demands of the war effort – in other cases the opposite may be true as pressures of war may lead to the destruction of the economy of the chosen example.

Social effects could be dealt with in relation to the impact of war on the societies involved: the demographic changes occurring; displacement of population as witnessed in the growth of refugee populations; the curtailing of civil liberties (partly political, but also affecting society in the sense of depriving populations of accepted freedoms such as freedom of speech *etc.*); dehousing due to policies adopted by the antagonist(s); the effect on minorities (religious/ethnic) perceived to be “disloyal” and which may have suffered due to war.

*The Cold War cannot be used as an example – though proxy wars within the Cold War are legitimate choices.*

*If only one war is chosen, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks]. The wars must be from the second half of the century. Credit for wars before this cannot be given.*

**3. To what extent were religious issues responsible for the wars between *either* India and Pakistan (1947–1971) or Iran and Iraq (1980–1988)?**

“To what extent” questions invite candidates to consider not only the stated themes/areas of investigation and make critical commentary upon them, but also to acknowledge “other factors” which may be considered significant. The nature and extent of “religious issues” needs to be explained and its importance in terms of causation examined.

Whether religious issues were a fundamental cause – or whether such issues masked larger issues at stake between the states needs to be addressed. Having commented upon the nature and extent of the religious issues in either case, candidates could examine whether such differences were of primary importance in leading to conflict and then consider “other factors”. These could include (depending on the war selected): economic ambitions/rivalry (the drive to secure natural resources or access to vital raw materials); national (or personal) prestige; the desire to establish regional hegemony; the need for a war of distraction to divert attention from pressing internal problems *etc.*

**4. Analyse the reasons for, and importance of, foreign intervention in *one* of the following: the Chinese Civil War (1927–1949); the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939); the Gulf War (1991).**

Depending on the war selected, reasons (or motives) for foreign intervention could include: ideological – in the sense of a willingness to promote or support one particular side in the civil war; the desire to seek access to material gain (raw materials for example) in the event of victory by the side which is backed; strategical (territorial acquisition/geopolitical benefits) which would accrue to the foreign power(s) in the event of a victory by the side they are supporting; the desire to use intervention to show military power and/or use the war as a testing ground for new technology; the opportunistic moves of particular powers to take advantage of civil strife to attain their own goals (for example in this latter case, Japan’s intervention in China – not intended to back either of the warring parties, but to take advantage of China’s division during a period of economic and political crisis).

The importance of foreign intervention (and an explanation of what form it took in terms of the nature and extent of intervention would be helpful here) could focus on areas such as whether intervention was responsible for extending or shortening the duration of the war, worsening the human and physical damages or ultimately deciding the outcome of the conflict. In some cases foreign intervention (militarily in particular) played a significant role in deciding the outcome, whereas it could be argued that in other cases, foreign intervention had little positive impact in advancing the interests of the foreign power or the side being supported.

*If only reasons or importance is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**5. In what ways did advances in technology affect the nature *and* outcome of warfare in the first half of the twentieth century?**

The nature of war refers to the ways in which the practice of war was affected – this could include reference to: the increasingly destructive nature of conflict in terms of casualties (civilian and military) and physical plant and infrastructure of the participants due to the ability to wreak more damage because of technological developments; the growing importance of new military fronts (especially aerial warfare), the involvement of whole populations – in the case of the world wars – as contributors to wars of attrition/total war; the changing nature of strategy – from the rapidly discredited “cult of the offensive” of 1914–1918 to the “cult of the defensive” which dominated military thinking in Western Europe post-1918 until that too was called into question by German “Blitzkrieg” tactics.

The term “technology” will doubtless produce identification of weaponry (innovations and improvements) used in the world wars especially – and how it was used. *This is not however a question about describing “Life in the trenches” on the Western Front 1914–1918.*

Candidates need to identify the relevant technological advances – whether in terms of weaponry – or for example in terms of advances such as radar, sonar, improved radio communication, cryptology (Enigma and its relevance?) and apply that knowledge to explaining how it affected the way in which the war was fought.

In relation to “outcome” candidates could comment on the extent to which technological advances were major contributors – indeed decisive contributors – to deciding which side won/lost – and why. Though this is not a “to what extent” invitation, some candidates may attribute outcome to “other factors” – please accept this while bearing in mind that the issue of advances in technology should be dealt with and not ignored.

*If only nature or outcome is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**6. Assess the importance of *each* of the following in causing the First *or* the Second World War: nationalism; alliances; economic factors.**

The basic structure for the essay is established by the task itself. Candidates are not required to deal with this as a “to what extent” question – there is no need to address other factors although some students with a pre-planned essay on the causes of the First World War will no doubt be determined to write all they have learned as a learned response.

The task is to identify and assess the nature, and hence the importance of the stated factors in explaining the cause of either war. This could include dealing with origins and outbreak of the conflict.

Candidates might do well to clarify/define the factors to aid in their “assessment” task – for example “nationalism” depending on the war chosen, could be interpreted and dealt with in a variety of ways: aggressive nationalism which sought to expand the nation’s political and territorial spheres of influence; revanchist-based based nationalism which sought to gain vengeance for past losses or defeats; thwarted nationalism (attempts to achieve self-determination); the attempt by empires to suppress nationalism to ensure self-preservation *etc.* Similarly, the “alliances” can be dealt with as both symptoms and also precipitants of war in either case. Whether alliances and alliance systems were responsible for exacerbating tensions or allowing for the extension of regional into continental or global conflicts could be addressed. “Economic factors” may be interpreted as the desire of particular states to achieve economic gains (raw materials, markets *etc.*) through a policy of war and aggrandisement – or possibly as solutions, in the case of some states, to existing socio – economic crises, which could be solved (war of distraction?) by resort to war.

Most candidates who choose to deal with the Second World War will probably identify 1939 as the start of the conflict. However if candidates comment on, for example, Germany’s war against the USSR or Japan’s attack on the USA in 1941 in an attempt to deal with nationalism – or more likely – economic factors in determining the causes for conflict, accept. Between 1939 and up to June and December 1941, there is a case to be made that the conflict was not arguably a world war.

*If only one factor is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks]. If only two factors are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [14 marks].*



## Topic 2 Democratic states – challenges and responses

### 7. Analyse the challenges faced by *one* democratic state in the *first* half of the twentieth century *and* the extent to which they were successfully dealt with.

Although the question says “in the first half of the twentieth century”, candidates do not need to deal with the entire period of 50 years! Coverage of a democratic state within this period is acceptable

Depending on the selected state, candidates can deal with a variety of “challenges”, both internal and external, to the democratic state. Such “challenges” could include: political instability due to the growth of extremist parties or movements which threatened to destabilize the state; economic crises which undermined the state’s wellbeing and required action; labour unrest due to dissatisfaction with existing social economic conditions; threats to the state from external sources *etc.*

No doubt the Great Depression and its impact upon the United States will be a popular choice – as could be Weimar Germany up to 1933. Accept any legitimate example – but answers which deal with examples such as Hitler’s Germany – or say Mussolini’s Italy or the USSR are invalid. The choice of such states reveals a lack of understanding of the question and cannot be credited.

Candidates, having identified the nature of the challenges, are required to comment upon the extent to which such challenges were dealt with – this needs reference to the methods/policies adopted and the degree of success achieved – or not.

*No credit can be given for answers which deal with a democratic state which is chosen from the second half of the century. If only challenges or the extent to which they were dealt with is done, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

### 8. “Proportional representation hindered rather than helped the establishment of a stable democracy.” With reference to *one* twentieth century democratic state, explain to what extent you agree with this statement.

Candidates could define/explain their understanding of the term “proportional representation” at the outset. The theory of proportional representation (in whatever form it existed) should be commented upon in relation to how the system functioned in practice. While such a system, according to its proponents, allows for a better representation of minority and or sectional/communal interests, it has sometimes been the case that the existence of a multiplicity of parties has proved detrimental to stable government. On the other hand, there have been states where coalitions, based upon the proportional representation system have functioned effectively and been able to pursue effective government through the necessary compromises being reached by coalition partners. The answer to the question obviously depends very much on the selected state and its experiences with the system.

**9. In what ways, and with what success, did Nehru deal with the economic and social problems facing India (1947–1964)?**

Candidates need to identify the specific economic and social problems facing India – and Nehru’s administration – upon India’s independence in 1947. While the bulk of such problems were internal, it is also the case that the dispute with neighbouring Pakistan certainly led to immediate economic and social problems in terms of the refugee problem accompanying Partition.

Specific problems – social and economic – could refer to: the economic system which India inherited from its Imperial past, problems of economic inequality in the new state, arguments with Pakistan over water supply via the Indus; the expenditure upon the military due to poor relations with Pakistan; linguistic tensions threatening to undermine the stability of the state; the issue of caste; communal/religious tensions within the new India; inequitable distribution of land *etc.*

Having identified the problems, candidates need to identify the methods/policies/legislation that the Indian state under Nehru’s leadership adopted to deal with these problems – and make a judgement as to how successful this was in the stated period.

*If only ways are addressed and no consideration of the degree of success is made, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**10. Compare and contrast the attempts of Eisenhower *and* Kennedy to deal with *two* of the following issues: civil rights; social welfare; education.**

The period 1953–1963 is the focus here and candidates are required to identify *specifically* the issues being dealt with as well as make reference to similarities/differences in the ways/methods both presidents (Eisenhower 1953–1961) and Kennedy (1961–1963) adopted to deal with the issues. Candidates may quite legitimately also compare and contrast the degree of success each leader had in tackling such issues, possibly noting the relatively brief period in office of Kennedy and the foreign policy “distractions” which he faced in these years.

Civil rights can be dealt with in relation to the discrimination suffered by groups based upon race (or gender) – and linked to issues such as suffrage, lack of employment opportunities, segregated facilities based upon race/ethnic differences. Both presidents were linked, during their terms of office, to legislation which was intended to address these inequalities (1954 *Brown vs. Topeka* and the subsequent desegregation of schools which was enforced by Eisenhower in the case of Little Rock, Arkansas, 1957). Civil Rights Acts were passed (1957, 1960) which instituted government commissions and provided government support to examine irregularities in voting registration and the abuse of the suffrage. The appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice by Eisenhower could be seen as a step forward or, depending on interpretation of the candidate, a token gesture in advancing civil rights and racial equality.

Under the short lived Kennedy administration, the pressure of events such as the Meredith Incident of 1962, the Birmingham demonstrations in Alabama and the mass mobilisation of protesters by Martin Luther King in 1963 (March on Washington) was instrumental in Kennedy’s proposal of a Civil Rights Act (passed posthumously, 1964). Kennedy in 1963 claimed “that race has no place in American life or law”.

Candidates could comment upon the manner in which the issue of civil rights was addressed – the motives behind action, the inequalities that were addressed – and the extent to which legislative measures were successful in redressing the abuses.

Similarly, in terms of social welfare candidates could identify issues relating to health care provision, health insurance, unemployment insurance, minimum wage, old age pensions, housing. The “New Frontier” ideals of Kennedy and the barriers he faced could be compared and contrasted to the earlier attempts of Eisenhower to identify and deal with social welfare issues. In terms of either social welfare or civil rights legislation, some candidates may point out the difficulties both leaders faced as a result of strong Congress backing at times.

Education – as in the cases noted above, should identify the issues (no doubt there will be in some answers an overlap with civil rights and segregated schooling facilities and the way this impacted upon opportunities of the communities) – which relate to matters of primary/secondary/tertiary level education: – curriculum change of emphasis (for example following the 1957 launch of Sputnik), federal aid for education, the establishment of the Peace Corps under Kennedy *etc.*

*If candidates deal with only Kennedy or Eisenhower, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks]. If only one issue is compared and contrasted, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**11. By what methods, and with what success, was democracy established in South Africa 1991–2000?**

The period covered requires consideration of the transition of the Republic of South Africa from the apartheid regime to a multi-party state – and the degree of success achieved by the post-apartheid state in its move towards a democratic system.

Candidates could examine the dismantling (by F W de Klerk, the last National Party president), of the apartheid state in the period after his election in 1989. Actions that indicated the retreat from racially based government and acknowledgement of the need for majority rule can be seen in moves such as: the legalisation of the ANC along with the release from prison of N Mandela; the continued repeal of apartheid legislation (already underway since the premiership of Botha a decade earlier); the holding of talks to discuss a new constitution for a post-apartheid system, talks which were often met with resistance by groups who would benefit from the continuation of the apartheid state.

By 1993 the general election held returned an approximately two thirds majority for the ANC. The subsequent transitional, multiracial interim government formed was a coalition – ANC, NP and Inkatha. Mandela became president and de Klerk his vice president. Arrangements were made for the future elections of 1999.

The extent to which democratic principles were established and honoured in the period up to 2000 invites candidates to consider the way in which the multi-party system was able to offer the population (all of the population) the equality of opportunity (social, economic and political) which had been denied the majority since at least 1948. Arguments between Inkatha and the ANC and the flight of population and capital threatened the stability of the economy and led to the ANC adopting policies which differed from its original platform of socialism.

*This is not a question on the reasons for the fall of apartheid. Candidates need to focus on the period of transition and the consequent implementation of democratic/multi-party rule in South Africa.*

*If only methods are dealt with and no reference is made to the degree of success, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**12. To what extent have gender rights *or* religious rights been promoted and protected in *one* twentieth century democratic state?**

**Gender rights**

Refers to the provision, by democratic states, to ensure equality between males and females. Such equality can be examined in relation to matters such as: suffrage on an equal basis; employment practices (hiring, promotion for example) and pay; equal opportunity in education; in terms of inheritance of property *etc.*

**Religious rights**

Refers to the right of religious groups to practise their faith free from state or public persecution or discrimination; religious education in schools and/or the provision of funding for religious schools / educational establishments catering for a specific faith; the right to proselytize without fear of government interference *etc.*

The question requires candidates to consider how such rights have been promoted or supported (in some cases, initiated) by the state (by legislative means, by inclusion in constitutional guarantees, by court decisions that have been upheld in the interests of equality of treatment) and how the state has acted to protect those who have been deprived of such rights.

*N.B. The question requires candidates to do more than make generalizations – and to support their answers by reference to specific examples/historical knowledge from their chosen democratic state*

**Topic 3    Origins and development of authoritarian and single-party states****13.    Assess the contribution of economic instability and lack of a united opposition to the rise to power of *two* leaders of single-party states, each chosen from a different region.**

*Credit answers that use authoritarian leaders.*

“Economic instability” could refer to crises which weakened the existing state system and produced popular disillusionment or frustration with the governmental system. Often the corollary of economic unrest *i.e.* the result of economic crises as evidenced in: declining standards of living; shortages of essential goods; unemployment; inflation; anger over the maldistribution of resources (land for example), is the rise of political extremism – and/or the willingness of groups to support such extremes in the belief that they offer a solution to problems.

Candidates have a wide choice of examples here and it is important that the *nature and extent* of the economic unrest (and its origin and how it contributed to the increasing support of the chosen leaders) is dealt with.

The issue of the “lack of a united opposition” requires consideration of those individuals, parties, institutions which were unable, unwilling or simply incompetent in terms of organising themselves to offer effective resistance to the single-party leader. The reasons for lack of unity of opposition to the rise will differ according to the examples selected but candidates may identify themes such as *underestimation*, *complacency*, and *collusion* for example as playing important roles in aiding the ascension of the selected leaders. Subsequent illustration of exactly *how* such factors operated in favour of the aspiring leader are necessary for a convincing answer.

This is not a “to what extent” question. The emphasis needs to be on assessment of the stated factors. While candidates may identify other factors, this should be only briefly. The bulk of the answer should focus on the key elements in the task.

***N.B.*** *This is not an invitation to write a general overview of the rise to power of two single-party or authoritarian leaders.*

*If only one single-party state leader or one region is chosen, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**14. To what extent were *either* Kenyatta or Nyerere successful in dealing with the social and economic challenges facing the state after independence?**

Identification of the social and economic challenges at the outset is necessary before a meaningful assessment of either leader's addressing of such challenges can be undertaken. No period of years is given for "after independence". Be willing to accept that candidates may treat such a question as covering the entire tenure of office of the leader selected.

**Nyerere**

As prime minister of independent Tanganyika (1961), president of the Republic of Tanganyika (1962–1964) and then Tanzania from 1964–1985 Nyerere inherited an economy which was previously tied to the imperial economy and reliant in large part on the production of crops for export (*e.g.* coffee, cotton, sugar, sisal). World commodity prices, which were variable, thus had a significant impact upon the economy of Tanganyika/Tanzania which had few other natural resources/raw materials. Nyerere initially expanded the production of export crops but by 1967 the conversion of Tanzania from a provider of cash crops/commodities to the world market to "African socialism" as outlined in Nyerere's Arusha Declaration led to economic problems. Nationalization of foreign enterprises, an end to dependency on foreign loans, cooperative farming and the concept of *ujamaa* or familyhood, the stress on self-reliance and the elimination of economic inequality were government targets. The social challenges relating to the provision of universal primary education, the reduction of infant mortality and the drive to increase life expectancy were also goals that were set. Candidates could examine the ways in which these challenges were addressed and whether the leader was able to achieve success (and *measured how?*) and if not, what were the barriers to such success (internal? external? economic? *etc.*). If candidates deal with Nyerere's full tenure they may consider the reversal of the nationalization programme by 1985.

**Kenyatta**

Became the prime minister of independent Kenya in 1963 and its president in 1964 (until 1978). Areas for examination in relation to the challenges could relate to the issue of land reform (since the pre-independence period had revealed the glaring inequality of land distribution on a racial basis in what had been to all intents and purposes a "settler colony" for whites – in contrast, for example, to Tanganyika), the question of rapid population increase and the growth of urbanisation and attendant problems in coping with the stresses of these (provision of housing, employment, equality of opportunity regardless of ethnic/tribal background). The nature of the economy – how it functioned (effectively or not) on both the level of domestic production and its links to the export economy and dependence on foreign custom could be examined and commented upon.

**15. Compare and contrast the treatment of religious groups *and* minorities in *two* authoritarian or single-party states each chosen from a different region.**

The most popular choices here are likely to be: the treatment of German and European Jewry and/or the Roma and Sinti communities by the National Socialist regime in Germany; dekulakisation undertaken by the Stalinist regime in the USSR; the elimination of landlordism in Mao's China immediately after the establishment of the PRC; the repression of minority nationalities which were seen as inimical to national unity.

Some candidates may deal with the treatment of religious groups by the authoritarian or single-party regime in terms of the persecution of specific denominations (Catholic Church, Orthodox Church *etc.*) or in terms of the attempt to discourage the practice of all religion in the selected state.

The term “minority” may be interpreted in its widest form here: – class, tribal, ethnic *etc.* Make sure that the selected group is indeed a minority – and that candidates do not use this as an opportunity to write about general persecution of the population.

*If only one region is chosen mark out of a maximum of [7 marks]. If two regions are chosen but only religious groups or minorities are chosen, mark out of [12 marks].*

**N.B.** *that women do not constitute a minority.*



**16. Analyse the methods used by *one* single-party ruler to establish totalitarian control.**

“Totalitarian control” refers *not merely* to the existence of a *one-party state* but also to the attempt of that single-party ruler to implement policies and use methods to ensure control over all aspects of the lives of the population. Whether this could ever be completely realised was doubtful, but candidates could explore and comment critically upon the methods of their selected ruler to achieve this goal.

*N.B. This is a question on the ruler “in power” and not a “rise to power” question. Answers which focus only on “rise” cannot be credited.*

Methods used could include investigation of the use of force to ensure the leader and the party’s dominance – through the suppression of rival parties which could form a potential opposition base, purges of specific institutions (civil service, religious, the military – even the party itself – when leaders perceived an internal threat to their power base). Intimidation or the use of violence – through the establishment of a police state and the encouragement of a culture of denunciation/informing can also be investigated and commented upon critically.

Other methods can be addressed such as: the use of propaganda; the establishment of a “cult of personality”; media censorship, the control of education and the establishment of youth movements to indoctrinate the population; the establishment of “scapegoats” to divert the population and provide a form of “negative cohesion”.

Not all methods are necessarily linked to force or violence however. The implementation of schemes to address economic problems (reduce unemployment), to redistribute resources, to offer the population “rewards” in the form of access to organised leisure activities, to provide health care, gender equality *etc.* can also be seen as methods to win over the population and make it favourable to the totalitarian regime.

*Although foreign policy is not included as a focus point in this Topic area, some candidates may point out that the pursuit of a successful foreign policy which restores national pride or honour can also be a method whereby leaders sought to secure acceptance of, and obedience to, totalitarian rule. This should where relevant to the answer, be credited.*

**17. Assess the extent to which ideological appeal aided the rise *and* rule of *one* of the following: Sukarno; Nasser; Perón.**

“Ideology” – the programme or beliefs of the above figures in relation to economic, social and political aims could be a starting point for discussion. The main elements or characteristics could be identified before an attempt is made to assess how appealing such ideas or beliefs were to the population (either generally or to specific sectors) of the chosen state. Without an explanation or definition of such beliefs, successful assessment is necessarily hindered.

Depending upon the example chosen, beliefs (or ideology) may include the following: anti-colonialism; non-alignment; nationalism; regional unity (for example Nasser’s Pan-Arabism), land reform / redistribution of resources; nationalization; industrialization; *etc.*

As this is a question which asks about “*extent*”, candidates need to consider not only how far the ideology was important in *both* rise and rule but also “other factors” which contributed towards the rise and maintenance of power. These, again depending upon the selected leader, could include: the use of military power to achieve control, external support pre- and post- rise to power; propaganda, education; successful social/economic policies; the use of repression to eliminate or diminish challenges to the leader *etc.*

*The question requires coverage of the period pre- and post- assumption of power. If only rise or rule is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**18. “Successful economic and social policies were essential for the single-party leader’s maintenance of power.” With reference to *either* Mao or Castro, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The longevity of the rule of either leader needs examination in regard to the extent to which they dealt with the social and economic ills of the state when they assumed power in 1949 and 1959 respectively. A suitable starting point could be identification of the problems (social and economic) that either leader inherited from the previous regime. Depending upon the leader chosen, the areas to be addressed could relate to: the question of inequitable land distribution; industrialization; the existence of opposition by supporters of the previous regime; economic dependence on foreign powers; social inequality in terms of gender or racial/ethnic discrimination; low levels of literacy and health care which hampered individual and national development *etc.*

In either case, candidates need to examine how either leader attempted to deal with such problems – and the extent to which their goals were achieved. Given that economic problems were not always successfully tackled in either case in terms of establishing a stable economy which was not reliant on outside powers (indeed the results of some economic plans were disastrous in human terms or in meeting the projected quotas) attention could be paid to other methods or policies implemented by the leader to ensure the maintenance of power. These methods/policies may be linked to the use of force/repression, purges, propaganda, censorship, education, the conjuring up (or utilization of) of an outside enemy – neo-colonialism / imperialism – to unite the population behind the leader and the regime.

Social policies – in terms of gender equality, health provision, increased literacy and educational opportunities, advancement of previously disadvantaged classes or social groups can be examined. In many cases these policies were popular with sections of the population and could be said to have aided in strengthening the support base for the leader despite the lack of civil liberties available.

**Topic 4 Nationalist and independence movements in Africa and Asia and post-1945 Central and Eastern European states****19. Assess the significance of the two world wars in hastening the independence of one African *or* one Asian colonial state.**

Consideration of the importance – or significance – of both world wars is necessary. The wars could be seen as catalysts for the decolonisation process, which resulted in the eventual independence of many African and Asian states. Only one state is required, but there is a need for responses to illustrate the general points raised about the wars by providing *specific evidence* relating to the African or Asian state chosen.

The Great War, with the enormous economic demands placed upon imperial powers arguably began a process of imperial retreat as commitment to the retention of empire was reduced – or in some cases the financial and military capacity to deal with colonial nationalism was reduced. The Great War and Allied talk of self-determination in the event of victory – coupled with the reality that self-determination post 1918/19 was never intended for the indigenous population of colonies – helped ignite a tide of nationalist and independence movements in Asia particularly. The rise to power of communism in Russia, partly a result of the strains of 1914–1917, also helped in the spread of anti-imperialist movements in colonial territories.

The Second World War completed a process increasingly evident by the end of the First World War. The destruction caused by the war, the weakness of the European colonial powers militarily and financially, the unwillingness of some powers to spend effort on repressing colonial nationalism led, in some cases, to the decision to quit. While some imperial powers did make a desperate attempt to hold on to possessions – in Indo-China, in Southeast Asia, in North Africa – the war weariness of the population of metropolitan powers, the lack of financial resources and the fact that pressure for decolonisation could now be successfully applied by the two new superpowers via the newly established UNO led to the dwindling of empire.

In the colonial possessions themselves, populations which had contributed to victory in both wars, and which had been under the impression that the victors of both wars had been fighting for freedom (as stated in Allied propaganda) organised, mobilized and pressured colonial authorities for freedom. These demonstrations could often take the form of violence – for example in the Gold Coast where nationalist aspirations combined with the frustrations of returned, but unemployed, indigenous troops.

Sometimes independence occurred quickly (India 1947 for example) though on other occasions brutal wars of decolonisation/liberation were required (Indo-China, Dutch East Indies, Algeria *etc.*).

*If only one world war is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**20. “The contribution of Gandhi to the gaining of Indian independence was much exaggerated.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Many students adopt an almost hagiographical approach to the role of Gandhi in relation to the gaining of independence in India in 1947. The question requires candidates to make a balanced judgement as to the factors responsible for the attainment of independence – as indicated by the “to what extent” invitation.

Gandhi’s contribution could be examined in terms of his ability to unite much (but certainly not all) of the population behind the INC in a mass movement and in terms of his methods (which gained much publicity both in India and world wide). Passive resistance / civil disobedience and the abjuring of force were used as moral “weapons” in the freedom struggle and did allow for the mobilisation of large sections of the population. These did put pressure on Britain and world opinion and, as witnessed in the press, was arguably a contributing factor in undermining Britain’s claim to rule.

“Other factors” could be dealt with in explaining Britain’s decision to “Divide and Quit” by 1947 in a hasty departure from its Indian empire. Such factors could be related to the impact of the two world wars which weakened Britain economically. By the time of the Labour government of 1945, the will as well as the desire to hold on to India was declining – along with financial weakness – instrumental in helping decolonisation in India. Communal tensions exhibited by growing antipathy between the Congress and Muslim League (from 1937 onwards especially) made continued possession of the sub-continent increasingly difficult. Britain’s post-war government was focused on internal reconstruction rather than the continuation of imperial control.

The role of Gandhi could therefore be seen in a wider perspective – indeed some students may emphasise the role of Nehru (the younger), or Patel in accelerating India’s independence – or even the role of Jinnah, whose calls for an independent Pakistan hastened the desire of Britain to leave – and Congress to settle quickly on the details (timing for example) of independence.

**21. Analyse the reasons for the failure of movements to successfully challenge Soviet control in Central and Eastern European states between 1945 and 1968.**

The period offers a variety of examples which candidates could use to illustrate the response. Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968) will almost certainly prove the most well known examples, though candidates may refer to the events of 1953 in the GDR/DDR or 1956 in Poland. “Movements” which challenged “Soviet control” were not necessarily anti-communist or anti-socialist movements but could be seen as movements that challenged and/or rejected centralised control from Moscow. Tito’s Yugoslavia for example could be legitimately referred to as an example of a state where the centralising tendencies of Moscow control were resented and rejected *with success*. Candidates who use this to challenge the premise of the question that movements were failures should be credited. Similarly the purges of “Titoist” leaders in Bulgaria (Slansky), Hungary (Rajk), for example, illustrate the manner in which Moscow (in this case Stalin) was determined to eliminate “movements” or factions which were considered a threat to Moscow’s policy of control of satellite states.

Depending on the examples selected –*and the question does state “failure of movements” (plural)*– so expect coverage of at least two examples, candidates could refer to the nature and strength of the movements themselves (numbers, leadership, popular support – or lack thereof, the adoption of policies, which antagonised or threatened Moscow’s security needs), the use of military strength by the USSR and, in Czechoslovakia 1968, Warsaw Pact forces to crush such challenges – real or perceived. The effectiveness of internal forces of surveillance and repression might also be referred to, partly as a catalyst for risings in some cases and as an explanation for the failure of risings or opposition in other cases.

The role of outside intervention could also be commented upon. In most cases the West recognised the existence of the Soviet sphere of influence and made little attempt to defend movements challenging Soviet control. In at least one case (Yugoslavia and Marshall aid) the support provided helped amongst other factors to ensure freedom from Soviet control.

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

**22. Analyse the extent to which the dissolution of Yugoslavia was the result of (a) internal factors and (b) external factors.**

While the break-up of Yugoslavia occurred in the 1990s, internal tensions in the state were present much earlier. Some candidates may trace these tensions back to the establishment of the state as a result of the Paris Peace Settlement. Yugoslavia – or Greater Serbia – was dominated by Serbs for much of its existence and resentment by Slovenes, Croats, Bosnians, Montenegrins *etc.* was present from the beginning. During the Second World War the bloody antagonism between Croats and Serbs revealed some of the division existing in the state. Under Tito's regime, until his death in 1980, the post-Second World War Yugoslav state evidenced few examples of internal dissension. In the decade or so following however, economic problems (unemployment – with wide regional disparity – and inflation) were aggravated by the emergence of political leaders who played upon nationalism to boost popularity and gain support. Tudjman in Croatia, Milosevic in Serbia pursued policies which threatened the fabric of the federal Yugoslav state. The tension which was present between different “nationalities” was exacerbated by the fact that in the six federal “republics” making up Yugoslavia (and the two provinces of Vojvodina and Kosovo) there were ethnic minorities which permitted political leaders seeking power to exploit the situation by alleging the need to “rescue” compatriots from the unfair treatment it was claimed they suffered.

Longer term problems together with shorter term problems after 1980 were compounded by the appeals to nationalism and inability or unwillingness of leaders to reach a compromise on matters relating to the distribution of power in Yugoslavia.

In terms of external factors, the European Community moved rapidly in 1991 to avert what could have been an outbreak of civil war when Slovenia declared itself an independent state. When Croatian independence was declared at the same time, it was much more of a problem since the presence of a significant Serb minority in Croatia led to its invasion and the seizing of approximately 33 % of the self – proclaimed independent Croatia. While the UNO did become involved in the arranging of a ceasefire and dispatch of peacekeeping forces in early 1992 it did little to halt the slide to dissolution of the Yugoslav state. The war breaking out in the ethnically and religiously mixed area of Bosnia in March 1992 led to further bloodshed up into the late 90s.

Arguably, foreign intervention (by the EC or UNO) – in terms of recognising the independence of states such as Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia encouraged the rate at which dissolution occurred and, because of the inability of the international community to effectively support these states (militarily, economically) or ensure protection of minorities it determined the bloody course which such declarations led to.

*If only internal or external factors are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**23. Assess the social and economic challenges faced by *either* one post-colonial state *or* one new state in Central or Eastern Europe.**

The nature of the economy inherited from the previous regime and its suitability for the new state (*i.e.* the colonial or a former satellite state was invariably part of a large “plan” or scheme instituted by the metropolitan or dominant state and the economic clientship of Central or Eastern European states in the past) meant problems in readjusting trade patterns and accessing established markets and raw materials.

Structural changes and the opening up to free markets often resulted in problems competing – with resultant failure and rising unemployment which led to social discontent. The need to adapt from centrally directed/command economies to a more free market system meant that management expertise, techniques and equipment were in short supply. The de-collectivisation of land and the privatisation process to replace state owned industry also caused short-term problems – as well as allegations of carpetbagging.

Post-colonial states too found that the imperial economic legacy could lead to reliance on the vagaries of world commodity markets unless the economic relationship with the metropolitan state could be continued even after political independence (*e.g.* Francophone West Africa). The new post-colonial state required improved educational facilities to provide trained personnel for future economic development, the improvement of transportation infrastructure, attention to health and welfare provision – at a time when there was often a shortage of available funds. Stated aims to reduce infant mortality, to increase life expectancy, to provide universal primary and secondary education while laudable, were often unsuccessful due to lack of funding.

Issues of corruption, inequalities in living standards, the emergence of new “elites” to replace the previous ones could be considered.

Specific knowledge needs to be selected and applied to illustrate the challenges of the one selected state.

*If only social or economic challenges are dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**24. Assess the importance of the leadership of *one* of the following in the attainment of independence from colonial or Soviet control: Jinnah; Nkrumah; Walesa.**

This is a question about the attainment of independence and not about how the leader maintained power. “Leadership” could be examined in terms of: how, why, and with what results the individual identified and articulated grievances about the existing regime; the methods used to promote and publicise the programme of the movement that each leader was associated with; the extent to which the leader and the movement were able to achieve mass mobilisation and support for the programme. Whether the leader was charismatic, ably assisted by other figures in the movement they were associated with – or the beneficiary of outside factors which they recognised as providing opportunities to achieve their goals – are also areas which could be explored.

While not a “to what extent” question, candidates may identify a raft of “other factors” and attempt to evaluate the contribution of “leadership” in relation to these. This is acceptable.

**Jinnah**

Regarded as the founder of modern Pakistan, and “The Great Leader” was leader of the Muslim League which competed with the INC, from 1937 onwards especially, in the drive for decolonisation in the Indian subcontinent. Controversy exists regarding the extent to which his goal was really an independent “Pakistan” or whether his claims for such constituted a bargaining chip for Muslim guarantees in a future independent Indian state. Candidates could examine the manner in which the League under Jinnah transformed itself into a mass political movement which was able to negotiate, from a position of strength, with both the INC and the colonial government. His push for political power was aided not only by the establishment of a programme based on “religion under threat” but also by his ability to recognise the errors of others and take advantage of them (the policy of the INC during the Second World War for example with its Quit India programme – or the desperation of London by 1946/7 to “Divide and Quit” in the light of the physical, economic and military impact of the Second World War upon Britain).

**Nkrumah**

Served his apprenticeship in anti-imperialism during his student years in the USA and Britain. Involvement in Pan-Africanism and with the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) preceded his establishment of a much more popular and populist nationalist movement: the CPP (Convention People’s Party). Campaigns of “Positive Action” helped propagandise the demand for freedom and mobilise the population especially in the urban centres. Despite imprisonment for sedition his influence was great enough to have him released from jail in order to form an administration following elections in the Gold Coast in 1951. Independence was granted in 1957.

**Walesa**

Was involved as a worker in the Lenin Shipyard leading strikes as early as 1970–1971. He re-emerged, after a 4 year period of “enforced unemployment” when he became leader of a new strike movement in 1980. His main achievement has been seen as his organisation of the Interfactory Strike Committee which became the Solidarity trade union which managed to negotiate directly with the state on Solidarity’s right to exist and strike. In 1981 when martial law was proclaimed Solidarity was banned and Walesa like many of its leaders was detained. Walesa emerged one year later to lead anti-Jaruzelski opposition. It was not till 1988 following popular discontent over economic conditions – and political conditions – that Solidarity was once more made legal. Solidarity won elections in 1989 leading to the beginning of the end of non-Communist rule in East and Central Europe. Walesa has been blamed for causing a subsequent schism in Solidarity by establishing his own movement – the Centre Alliance. He was elected president 1990, losing the presidential election of 1995.



## Topic 5 The Cold War

### 25. Assess the role of Truman and Stalin in the origins and development of the Cold War.

Truman's presidential period extends from 1945 till 1952. Stalin died in 1953 but was ruler of the USSR from 1928/9 arguably. The period under discussion in the question is likely, for most candidates, to be interpreted as the years 1945–1953. There is much material available for consideration in this period, which should allow for answers to go beyond the “historiographical” responses which are still produced by too many candidates. *\*(See comment below in italics)*

#### Origins

Could refer to the events of the year 1945: Yalta Conference (and Roosevelt), Germany's surrender; Potsdam Conference (the differing stance of Truman – and why); the contrasting views as to what constituted “security” for the members of the Grand Alliance; issues relating to Germany, Poland *etc.* Some candidates will doubtless go back to 1917 and the Bolshevik revolution as their starting point, then work through the interwar years up to 1945. While this may be acceptable, the focus should be on Truman and Stalin and the period 1945 onwards should be the main focus.

#### Development

Could deal with the course of events from 1945/6 up till the Korean War as the conflict between East and West moved from Europe to East Asia. The flashpoints and issues in this period are numerous and provide sufficient detail for selection and deployment to support arguments: possession of atomic capability and arms race; the clash over the future of “liberated Europe”; confrontation over Iran; Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan and Soviet reactions; Germany and the Berlin crisis of 1948/9; Korea *etc.*

The question asks about the *role* of two leaders so credit candidates who attempt to focus on the role of each. Stalin, given the continuity of his period of rule and his control of Soviet policy over a longer term was arguably at a greater advantage in being able to articulate Soviet foreign policy and goals. As a single-party ruler he faced few challenges to implementing domestic or foreign policy. Soviet policy was much more Stalin's policy than US policy could be said to be Truman's policy. Truman came into office with little experience after Roosevelt's death: he was more reliant on foreign policy advisors – whether Kennan or those who advocated the “Riga Axioms” – upon whom Roosevelt had not been dependant.

To what extent was the conflict– in terms of origins or development– linked to the decisions arrived at by each leader, or were there other factors or individuals guiding foreign policy and determining the path pursued by US and the USSR?

*\*N.B. Questions on the origins and development of the Cold War sometimes reproduce “learned” or “prepared” responses based upon a standard “historiographical” treatment: the “orthodox”, “revisionist” and “post-revisionist” interpretations. While these can be made relevant, it is important that such answers make a genuine attempt to address the central theme/focus of the question and not simply regurgitate a generic answer on the origins and development of the conflict.*

*If only Truman or Stalin is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

26. **“The sovietization of Eastern and Central Europe after the Second World War was undertaken as a defensive measure by the Soviet Union.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The liberation of the states of Eastern and Central Europe from Nazi occupation by the Red Army was initially welcomed but the establishment of what became known as Moscow’s “satellite states” in the period 1945–1948 was regarded with trepidation by the Western allies of the former Grand Alliance. Washington perceived the “sovietization” of these states as not only contrary to the Declaration on Liberated Europe but as the beginnings of Soviet expansion in pursuit of ideological goals as well as immediate material resources.

Candidates are required to examine whether the process of “sovietization” (a working definition of the term at the outset would be helpful) was undertaken by Moscow as part of a strategy of territorial aggrandisement based on the expansion of communist ideology in the pursuit of Marxist-Leninist goals, or whether such acquisition was the result of the desire to attain security.

The state – and status – of the USSR in the period could be examined to determine the extent to which Moscow was capable of undertaking expansion in the aftermath of the Second World War. The impact of the war upon the USSR psychologically and physically could be investigated. The fears of Moscow for the future – in relation to developments in Europe (German Question, Polish issue, US economic and military aid) and the increasing strain between former allies in the period also could be identified. By February 1948, the last piece of what became a “curtain” fell into place with the coup in Czechoslovakia.

**27. Analyse the reasons for, and consequences of, the breakdown of Sino-Soviet relations in the 1950s and 1960s.**

**Reasons**

Candidates could identify the factors which led to a breakdown after what appeared– at least on the surface– to be an amicable relationship as indicated by the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Alliance of 1950. Some candidates may comment upon the relationship between Stalin and Mao even before this (Stalin’s view of Maoism as “the peasant heresy”) and the fact that the relationship was not as solid as outsiders (US) perceived given that Stalin arguably saw– and treated– Mao as a junior partner in the world communist movement.

Candidates could then examine the post-Stalin years and the widening gap, in terms of ideology, personality clash of leaders and strategy for the expansion of communism which opened between Khrushchev and Mao. Issues such as destalinisation, the introduction of what were interpreted as “deviationist” or revisionist policies by Moscow (Peaceful Co-existence, Goulash Communism), the failure of Moscow to back China in the Taiwan crisis of 1958, the different perceptions of the Great Leap Forward (regarding its ideological purity), the Sino-Indian war of 1962 and the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 could be examined and commented upon.

**Consequences**

Candidates could focus on results for the worldwide communist movement, international relations and the changing balance of Cold War alignment, the economic development of China (withdrawal of Soviet aid for a programme– the GLF– considered by Moscow to be “faulty in design and erroneous in practice”), the physical clashes by the later 1960s on the border of the USSR and the PRC which were a symptom as well as a further reason for antagonism between Moscow and Beijing *etc.*

*If only reasons or consequences are dealt, with mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**28. Assess the economic and social impact of superpower involvement in one of the following: Cuba (after 1959); Congo (after 1960); Afghanistan (after 1979).**

The treatment of the question needs focus on *“economic and social impact”*. Candidates who use this as an opportunity to narrate/describe the origins and course of the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 are unlikely to score well.

Whichever of the three is selected, the effects economically – in areas such as dislocation of/or shifting trading patterns, structural reorganisation of the economy, the provision of foreign aid, destruction of physical plant or resources *etc.* could be examined. Social impact refers to how the involvement of superpowers may have contributed to a change in the lives of the populations of the respective states. This could lead (depending on the example chosen) to consideration of: religious issues; educational programmes – influenced by ideological beliefs associated with a particular superpower; social welfare programmes; changes in patterns of employment; the establishment of refugee/exile populations *etc.*

No end date is provided and candidates may choose for themselves what they consider an appropriate end point. Dwelling mainly upon the last 10 years is not however appropriate.

Better responses will identify the significance of the given starting dates.

*If only economic or social impact is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**29. In what ways, and with what significance, did either Kennedy or Reagan influence the development of the Cold War?**

Candidates need to consider “how” either leader impacted the development of the East–West conflict – and the importance of the decisions/policies undertaken by the chosen leader in terms of exacerbating and/or reducing Cold War tensions in the short or longer term.

**Kennedy (1961–1963)**

The main areas for investigation are likely to be Berlin (1961), Cuba – in terms of the Bay of Pigs and Missile Crisis and its immediate aftermath (1961–1963) and South East Asia – Laos and Vietnam (1961–1963). Some candidates may include reference to spending on the space race and the increased spending on arms programmes that could be used to illustrate the abandonment of Eisenhower’s arguably more cautious policy towards the perceived Communist threat. An assessment of the significance of Kennedy as a “Cold Warrior” and the extent to which he increased the tensions– or not– should be based on evidenced study of incidents noted above.

**Reagan (1981–1989)**

The main areas for investigation are likely to focus upon the increase in defence spending from the beginning of his presidency (SDI and Cruise missile deployment in Europe), rejection of détente, involvement in the civil war in Angola through sponsoring of UNITA, provision of aid to anti-Soviet forces in Afghanistan, support for anti-communist regimes in the Americas (El Salvador, Grenada), involvement in Nicaragua to undermine the Sandinista government.

Candidates may make a case for Reagan’s pressure (economic and military) upon the USSR as being a major contributing factor to the decline of Soviet power and the demise of the USSR.

*If only ways or significance is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**30. For what reasons, and in what ways, did Cold War tensions hinder the work of the United Nations?**

The UN (1945–), successor of the League of Nations (1920–1946) was charged both with resurrecting the concept of “collective security” which had been abandoned by states in the inter-war period as well as in promoting “functionalism” – *i.e.* encouraging states to cooperate in attempts to solve social, economic, humanitarian problems.

The desire to “*save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ... and ... reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights*” was laudable – and understandable in the light of the devastation of the Second World War.

The Cold War that developed more or less simultaneously with the establishment of the UN prevented the organisation from becoming actively involved in major issues or crises in succeeding years. The exercising of veto power (the non-concurring vote) in the Security Council by the permanent members (East and West) meant the UN was unable to pass resolutions and implement action. While the UN was able to play a role in Korea (1950) – because of the unusual and never to be repeated circumstances of Soviet absence from the Security Council over the issue of Taiwan’s (Republic of China’s) place in the Council – the UN found itself incapable of acting in subsequent crises: Hungary (1956), the Middle East (with the exception of Suez (1956) which allowed the UN to become a face – saving instrument for British and French withdrawal in many ways), Cuba and the Missile Crisis, Southeast Asia, Southern Africa (the Rhodesian and South African minority regimes). On those occasions when it did manage to involve itself (Congo, Angola, Mozambique) the results were often slow in being realised due to Cold War rivalries interfering with the mandate of the organisation to promote collective security.

Mutual suspicion of the superpowers and the changing nature of UN membership as the century progressed (the growing number of ex-colonial states– some of which supported the US, some the USSR) also led to a fall in budgetary contributions from leading members which impacted upon expenditure on “functional” work of the UN.

Candidates could use case studies to illustrate the reasons and ways in which the work of the UN has been hindered. It is unlikely that candidates will cover almost 45 years of UN/Cold War inter-relationship.

Some candidates may go on to comment on and compare the progress made by the UN after the end of the Cold War.

*If only reasons or ways is dealt with, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*