



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2013**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

35 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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

*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.

*Following a review of marking practices it has been agreed that in order to add further clarity to the markschemes for Paper 2, all caveats with regard to the awarding of marks for questions that include more than one component (eg, compare and contrast; reasons and significance; methods and success) will be removed.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**. If an answer indicates that the demands of the question are understood and addressed but that **not all implications are considered (eg, compare or contrast; reasons or significance; methods or success)**, then examiners should not be afraid of using the full range of marks allowed for by the markscheme: ie, responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly.*

## Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of wars

### 1. Analyse the economic and political causes of *two* civil wars, each chosen from a different region.

Popular choices are likely to be the Russian Civil War, the Spanish Civil War, and the Chinese Civil War (candidates may choose to address either or both periods of the conflict in China pre or post Second World War). Some candidates may select Korea or Vietnam, but answers should focus on the civil war dimension and not produce responses which are narratives of the conflicts within the Cold War context.

For **economic causes** candidates could examine the issues of maldistribution of resources which caused tension and division. This could be illustrated, for example, by reference to the question of land ownership – the desire of the dispossessed to gain more and of the rural gentry or landowners to preserve their property rights. In the case of Russia, comment could be made on the attempt by elements of the White forces to overturn the agrarian reforms of Bolshevism, or even the resistance to war communism by peasants who, having received land found themselves subject to expropriation. For Spain the question of latifundism (in the south) and minifundism (in the north west) could be investigated. The monopoly of economic power by vested interests and the resulting discontent formed the basis for civil strife. China and the position of the peasantry which sought land reform at the expense of the rural gentry also forms a basis for treatment of economic issues. The question of aggrieved industrial workers in the aforementioned cases can also be an area for examination – or resentment of the economic power of religious institutions such as the church in Spain which contributed to a strong anti-clericalist movement that challenged the temporal power of the institution.

For **political causes** candidates could identify the rival political movements/ideologies which were involved in the wars. In Russia Reds versus Whites – the former a homogeneous group, the latter a much more heterogeneous grouping – could be examined. Whites pursued a common aim in destroying the Bolsheviks but their longer term aims for Russia differed greatly. Interestingly, Mensheviks ended up opposing the Bolsheviks despite ideological similarities. Spain provides an opportunity to examine a wide variety of political/ideological movements which sought to implement their own programmes: anarchists, socialists, Marxists (Moscow oriented and otherwise), liberals, conservatives and fascists/Falangists.

China too offers opportunities to comment upon the main political rivals – the Guomindang (GMD or Kuomintang/KMT) and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and their respective political stances: what they claimed to stand for, the policies they adopted.

Similarly the economic and political issues which existed and promoted tension can be addressed in other conflicts such as Korea, Vietnam, Greece or Cuba, after the Second World War. Whichever wars are selected note the need for the regional requirement and the provision of sufficient, accurate historical knowledge to substantiate arguments.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

2. **“The role of alliances in the origin *and* expansion of the war in 1914 was greatly exaggerated.” With reference to the First World War, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Note that the question refers to origin **and** expansion.

While “other factors” can be noted and commented upon critically, candidates should deal with the issue of alliances in the period pre-1914 and their impact in 1914: the way(s) in which such alliances acted as symptoms and/or causes of the tensions which led to a localized conflict spreading into a wider continental war (or world war if one includes the participation of the empires of the Great Powers in 1914).

In terms of “origin” candidates will, in some cases, identify the era of “secret diplomacy” associated with the period after 1871 and the establishment of a new balance of power in Europe. The terms of the treaties do not need to be extensively described, but their significance in shaping attitudes, suspicions and fostering fear (such as the fear of encirclement for example) could be noted. The formation of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century respectively will be well known but other alliances may also be relevant to this task insofar as some states used them to justify their entry into war in 1914.

As for “expansion”, outbreak of war in the Balkans in 1914 and its rapid development into more than a geographically limited conflict also requires consideration.

Having dealt with the issue of alliances, it is quite legitimate to examine “other factors” (arms race, Balkan nationalism, imperial rivalry, the drive for economic and political hegemony *etc*) and credit should be given for coverage and explicit linkage to the question.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

3. **Why, and with what consequences, was there so little opposition to aggressive expansionism in the period 1931–1939?**

“Aggressive expansionism” in this period could be identified at the outset in order to provide the basis for consideration of reasons/results. The phrase should be taken to mean more than a narration of Hitler’s foreign policy after 1933.

The starting point of 1931 allows for investigation of examples such as Japanese expansion in Asia (Manchuria) – and later in the Sino–Japanese war which broke out in 1937. The case of Abyssinia in 1935–1936 which was a victim of Italian Fascism could also be examined. The aims and progress of Nazi foreign policy and expansion will prove relevant and popular.

“Why there was so little opposition” invites candidates to consider factors which prevented effective countermeasures to deter aggressive expansionism such as the impact of the Great Depression which not only spurred expansionism in the case of Japan, but also prevented any effective response as states appeared reluctant to expend military effort at a time of economic uncertainty.

Candidates may also consider the failure of collective security (in the shape of the League of Nations) to deter aggressor states – partly due to structural weaknesses, partly due to the pursuit of self-interest by leading Great Power members.

Appeasement as a theme (both “passive” and “active” appeasement) can also be fruitfully explored and linked to the lack of resistance to expansionist measures undertaken in the period.

The “consequences” could be dealt with in relation to the immediate short-term results of the individual examples dealt with – but also (in the wider picture) to the outbreak of conflict in 1939, which developed into a second world war.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

4. **Assess the contribution of guerrilla warfare to the outcome of *either* the Chinese Civil War (1927–1937 and 1946–1949) *or* the Algerian War (1954–1962).**

Guerrilla warfare is undertaken by movements that are too weak militarily to confront the enemy in conventional warfare. Exhaustive and descriptive narratives of the techniques of guerrilla fighting are not vital and candidates should be aware of the significance of the political programme of the guerrilla movement which aimed to mobilize the population behind the guerrilla cause. The establishment of policies to win the “hearts and minds” of the population, to build a support base which could eventually, through prolonged warfare, enable the conversion to conventional warfare could be examined. In China guerrilla warfare allowed the CCP to survive from 1927 onwards and build military capacity and civilian support against the government of Jiang Jieshi.

In the case of Algeria, the adoption of irregular warfare against the French forces was the result of inability to match French military power. In both cases the practice of guerrilla warfare (the “War of the Flea”) with its emphasis on wearing down the enemy physically and psychologically while simultaneously promoting an image of constant success against the existing regime, helped to encourage support for the guerrilla movement. Such guerrilla warfare was not always militarily successful (Battle of Algiers) but repressive actions by the French in response to guerrilla activities often targeted innocent civilians thus providing “recruits” for the guerrilla’s cause.

Guerrilla warfare (political and military aspects) was by Mao’s own admission not necessarily the most important reason for victory. “Other factors” could be considered in both the case of China and Algeria to explain the outcome. Such factors could include: the errors made by the enemy, for example lack of social and economic reform to honour the “People’s Livelihood” principle which the GMD claimed to stand for; of outside intervention which intentionally (in Algeria help from neighbouring states) or unintentionally (the influence of Japan upon the situation in China) influenced the outcome; the growth of war weariness induced by protracted war; the economic drain of war *etc.*

Whichever conflict is chosen, expect examination of the practice of guerrilla warfare (military/political) as well as a consideration of its relative significance in relation to other factors.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**5. With reference to the period 1945–1965, analyse the factors that helped *and* hindered attempts to promote collective security.**

For most candidates “collective security” is likely to be seen as an opportunity to examine the United Nations Organization (UNO) after 1945. The aim of peacemaking and peacekeeping was also accompanied by a more “functionalist” approach whereby states were encouraged to cooperate and collaborate on matters of mutual and/or global concern.

While the UNO is likely to be the main focus for this question, accept answers that may concentrate upon other examples of collective security – albeit on a regional rather than a global basis – North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Warsaw Pact *etc.* These latter organizations were, in their own ways and for their own ideological or strategic reasons, committed to ensuring defence of their respective members against external aggression.

For factors which helped promote collective security (or at least the belief in the principle of collective security which had been tried after the Great War) candidates could examine the mood of the major powers by 1945 – a mood reflected in the Charter of the UNO wherein it was stated that the primary purpose was to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war [and] reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights”. The costs of the Second World War in human and material terms, as well as the horrors perpetrated in the years before and during the conflict, led to a realization of the need for a more effective means of securing peace. The losses endured served as the basis for what was to follow in June 1945 when the UNO Charter was signed in San Francisco. For factors which hindered the promotion of collective security, candidates could refer to the rapid dissolution of the wartime spirit of unity and solidarity which occurred after the Second World War with the emergence of the Cold War. This conflict paralyzed the UNO as East–West rivalry often prevented the UNO from becoming involved in issues which were perceived as injurious to the interests of either superpower and its supporters/clients. With rare exceptions (Korea 1950), peacekeeping operations were hamstrung by the failure of Security Council powers to agree on combined action.

Some candidates may focus on the actual Charter itself and the fact that the organization found itself without a standing army to call upon; the fact that Article 2(7) prevented interference in the internal affairs of a state; or that Article 52 allowed for the establishment of regional agreements which could undermine the UNO and reflect ideological stances which were not conducive to the spirit of global collective security (for example NATO’s establishment, 1949).

Case studies of threats to peace/collective security in the period could be used to illustrate difficulties encountered – how the organization was effectively marginalized on many occasions (Berlin 1948/49, Hungary 1956, Cuba 1962 for example) as superpowers either ignored or flouted the provisions of the UNO Charter.

Examples where collective security was attempted, with varying degrees of success, could be: Palestine and Kashmir in 1948 and 1949 respectively; Korea and the outbreak of war in 1950; the Suez Crisis in 1956; the Congo 1960–1964/5.

Candidates are required to identify specific factors aiding and retarding the process of collective security.



*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**6. To what extent was the outcome of *either* the Falklands/Malvinas War (1982) or the Gulf War (1991) determined by technological developments?**

For technological developments candidates could identify and comment on the nature and variety of types of weaponry, communications/guidance systems which allowed for effective targeting of enemy installations *etc.*

In the case of the Falklands/Malvinas conflict candidates could refer to the task force composition dispatched by the Thatcher government: 70 vessels (40 of which had been requisitioned merchant navy ships and two aircraft carriers with 40 Harrier jets). The logistical problems facing such an undertaking were greatly aided by Washington’s decision to allow the RAF use of US facilities on the Ascension Islands: as well as US provision of satellite intelligence and Sidewinder air-to air missiles to British forces. Similarly, the willingness of Chile to provide intelligence concerning Argentinean radar and early warning systems aided the British war effort. The sinking of the Belgrano by a British submarine ensured that the Argentinean fleet stayed in port and played little role in the conflict. Despite the fact that the location of the conflict favoured Argentina, the war had been lost by June 1982.

Argentinean ground forces and naval forces were unable to be protected effectively. Despite the fact Argentina did have Mirage III and Mirage V planes, Super Etendard fighters, A-4 Skyhawks, Canberra bombers and locally manufactured Pucaros they were unable to compete with the technologically superior air force of a NATO power. Much of the Argentinean airforce’s preparations/planning had been based on possible conflict with neighbouring Chile – and not on a war with Britain which, it was assumed would not be able to retaliate. Lack of outside technical aid (some contributions from Libya, Peru) and the prohibition of US military supplies meant Argentinean military success was unlikely.

In the case of the Gulf War (January–February 1991), following the Iraqi invasion and subsequent annexation of Kuwait in 1990, a multinational force consisting of over three quarters of a million troops, approximately 1200 aircraft, 1800 tanks and 300 ships, including aircraft carriers, assembled and attacked on 16 January.

Superior air power of the multinational force not only crippled Iraq’s airforce, but also destroyed Iraqi economic infrastructure, military command centres and Iraqi morale prior to the massive ground attack in February. The land-based campaign lasted four days, with Saddam Hussein’s regime accepting Security Council resolutions to withdraw from Kuwait, renounce claims to Kuwaiti territory and pay for the damages caused in Kuwait due to the deliberate setting on fire of Kuwaiti oil installations by retreating Iraqi forces.

Computerized satellite guided missiles which were capable of precision bombing allowed for specific targeting of military bunkers, though only 10 % of the aerial bombing was of this particular type. Saddam Hussein’s Soviet-supplied Scud missiles were no match for superior US-supplied Patriot missiles.

Other reasons which may be considered, depending on the conflict chosen could be: economic weakness of one side, making it difficult to fund/pursue a longer term war effort; outside influence – in terms of provision of aid to one particular side or the refusal to trade with one particular side in the conflict; the importance of world opinion, as witnessed for example in the UNO in the case of the Gulf War; the underestimation of regimes and their leaders of the likely strength of reaction to their moves.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## Topic 2 Democratic states – challenges and responses

### 7. With reference to *one* democratic state in the period up to 1939, examine how successfully it was able to deal with the economic and political challenges it faced.

The challenges noted above could be interpreted as domestic challenges – or external challenges – to the selected state.

Popular, and appropriate examples, could be: the US, especially during the post-First World War era, with particular (though not exclusive) emphasis on the Great Depression/New Deal era; Weimar Germany (1919–1933); Spain (1931–1936); Britain and France, or any other democratic state up to 1939.

For economic challenges, reference could be made to problems arising from the Great War – in some cases physical devastation/demographic imbalance, in other cases a loss of traditional export markets to competitors during the war, reparations for defeated countries, problems of underemployment/unemployment made worse by demobilization. The impact of inflation/hyperinflation and the severe problems produced after 1929 with the onset of the Great Depression are also likely areas for examination.

A corollary of economic crisis was often political crisis. In this case candidates could refer to the growth of radicalism in the chosen state and how the existing democratic structure was able to withstand (or not) the pressures.

External political challenges, depending on the selected example, could also be investigated: the growth of anti-democratic/expansionist movements which threatened international peace, and how democratic states responded to these (for example through appeasement, declarations of neutrality, confronting aggressor states, *etc*).

It is not necessary to cover the entire period from 1900/01 to 1939 in the chosen state – case studies of democracies and the economic and political challenges they faced (and how they coped with them) within the period are acceptable.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**8. By what methods, and with what success, did Nehru deal with the internal *and* external problems facing India (1947–1964)?**

Candidates could identify, at the outset, the domestic and external problems which faced the new state.

For internal problems candidates could consider: the vexed question of the Princely States in the wake of independence in the subcontinent – and what their future should be; the question of language in the new state; the control of foreign businesses by restricting foreign investment in India's economy; the need to legally outlaw discrimination against Harijans; the improvement of the status of women in terms of suffrage, inheritance, marriage and divorce.

For external problems reference could be made to the problems with neighbouring Pakistan which were to produce long lasting bitterness and war in 1947–1949, and even after Nehru's death (in 1965, 1971). Nehru's attempts to steer a course of non-alignment and to escape being trapped in the Cold War divisions can be made relevant. Relations with China, which had seemed good, deteriorated by the late 1950s and culminated in a humiliating war with the People's Republic in 1962.

Having identified the problems, the task requires candidates to examine the methods which Nehru adopted to deal with these issues and to reach a conclusion as to the level of success achieved.

In terms of dealing with the Princely States, the bulk of the 562 states acceded to either India or Pakistan relatively smoothly though Muslim anger was roused by Indian military intervention to ensure the accession of Junagadh, Hyderabad and, above all, Kashmir and Jammu. The decision not to make Hindi the national language was done in order to allay the fears of other linguistic groups which feared possible disadvantages in employment. The agreement not to phase out English was also intended to placate opponents of what was perceived as a potential cultural dominance from the north of the state.

The constitution of 1950 banned discriminatory treatment, introducing positive discrimination whereby the renamed "scheduled castes" would have 15 % of seats in national and state assemblies. Yet while legislation such as the Untouchability Act of 1955 was intended to end discrimination against Harijans, changing attitudes required more than a legislative enactment.

Similarly the progressive measures regarding women did not necessarily revolutionise their role and status especially in traditional and rural areas. Five Year plans initiated by Nehru helped establish a heavy industrial base in India. This emphasis on industrialisation was responsible for less attention to the agrarian sector where landowner dominance in the countryside tended to hinder successful implementation of cooperatives and village councils.

With regard to external problems, Nehru was unable to reach any agreement with Pakistan over Kashmir and the failure to solve such an issue of contention led to conflict and significant military expenditure for both parties. Non-Alignment, which allowed Nehru a platform to advocate a "third way", peaked for Nehru at Bandung in 1955. The breakdown of relations over disputed territory in the NEFA and Aksai-Chin plateau led to an embarrassing conflict with China and, even after Nehru's death, a poor relationship between the two powers in future decades.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**9. Evaluate the measures undertaken by the governments of Eisenhower and Kennedy to promote the attainment of civil rights in the United States (1953–1963).**

During the Eisenhower administration candidates could refer to the major issues faced by his office: the bus boycott in Baton Rouge and the Terry versus Adams case which ruled that segregated primary elections breached the Fourteenth Amendment. Both of these events were in 1953, but candidates may have more knowledge of areas such as the landmark Brown versus the Board of Education decision in 1954 which accelerated the drive for desegregation of schools – or the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama 1955. Such events, and the resistance to them in the South in particular, form the background to Eisenhower’s attempts to ensure that desegregation and equality were implemented. Candidates could refer to the 1957 Civil Rights Act and Eisenhower’s sending in troops in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957 as examples of how attempts were made to promote rights though arguably the changes in legislation were more to do with the Supreme Court rather than Eisenhower’s own initiative. For some critics, civil rights issues were seen as the “Achilles heel” of his period in office.

Kennedy’s administration saw the appointment of some Black officials to high government posts (Thurgood Marshall for example) and like Eisenhower he was willing to dispatch troops, in this case to enforce the admission of a Black student to the state university in Mississippi, but critics of Kennedy pointed out that measures such as passing Executive Orders (banning segregation in public housing) fell far short of what was necessary to ensure equal rights. By 1963 however, and the images of the treatment of civil rights marchers in Birmingham, Alabama, Kennedy was moved enough to request Congress to support a proposed Civil Rights Act – which was passed after his death.

In both cases there are grounds to indicate real movement towards the attainment of civil rights but also a certain gradualism of approach by both presidents for a variety of reasons ranging from unwillingness to disappoint potential political supporters, to distraction because of other issues (foreign and domestic).

Civil rights here have been interpreted to mean basically the struggle of African Americans in the period to achieve equality but credit any other civil rights issues discussed and ably supported.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**10. Analyse the reasons for, and the results of, the breakdown of democracy in Nigeria (1961–1966).**

Nigerian independence occurred in 1960 under the leadership of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa. With considerable oil resources the new state appeared to have a promising and a prosperous future. The democratic, federal state was divided into regions – the Northern, the Western and Eastern Regions (the latter being the source of most of the oil reserves). Regions were associated with major tribal and/or religious groupings: in the Muslim North, Fulani and Hausa; in the West, Yoruba; and in the East the Igbo (or Ibo). The more populous North dominated the federal system causing growing resentment exacerbated by economic problems associated with a recession by 1964.

The problem of regional disunity was compounded by a military coup in 1966. Balewa – a Northerner and a Muslim – was killed by the largely Igbo led coup leaders and a military government was established under General Ironsi (an Igbo).

Northern fears of possible Igbo domination produced a Northern military officers’ counter move which removed Ironsi replacing him with General Gowon – a Northerner and a Christian. Attacks in the Northern Region upon Igbos working and resident there could not be prevented by Gowon. In May 1967 General Ojukwu, military governor of the Eastern Region declared independence on behalf of the newly named state of Biafra. The three year civil war which followed led to an estimated two million deaths – civilian and military as a result of a particularly bitter civil war.

By 1970 the war was over. Gowon pursued a policy of reconciliation to heal the rifts established over the previous decade. A new federal system, recognition of the need to conciliate the defeated Igbo population and an upturn in the price of oil helped contribute towards recovery though democratic/civilian rule was not restored.

Candidates could identify areas such as: the relevance of parliamentary government for Nigeria at the time of independence; the issue of tribalism/regionalism; the role and involvement of the military as self-appointed guardians of the state in terms of its claims to rescue the state from crisis *etc.* Results of the failure of democracy obviously will focus on the breakdown of consensus and the emergence of tensions leading to conflict and war. It is not necessary to cover the course of the war.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**11. With reference to the period *after 1950*, assess the effectiveness of movements to promote *either gender equality or civil rights in one democratic state.***

Popular choices could be the situation in democratic states such as the US, which offers much opportunity to examine the growth of movements which advocated either gender equality or civil rights, Australia, Canada, New Zealand (and the question of aboriginal rights/rights of the indigenous population), Britain and the question of civil rights in Northern Ireland, India and attempts to ensure an end to discrimination based upon caste or gender.

The emphasis here is on the movements rather than the governments (which may of course have been influenced by such movements into introducing legislative changes). Effectiveness could be examined by investigating the methods used by the movements chosen (legal? forceful?) and assessing to what extent such movements and their specific goals were successfully propagandised, accepted and subsequently implemented in legislation which addressed the issue of unequal treatment and/or discrimination based on gender, colour, religion *etc.*

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**12. In what ways, and with what success, have *two* democratic states dealt with the challenge of internal political extremism in the second half of the twentieth century?**

Note there is no regional requirement, but examples that do not focus on the period after 1950 cannot be credited.

Before addressing “ways” candidates would be well advised to examine the nature and extent of “internal political extremism” in the selected states. Relevant examples for consideration could be: Great Britain and Northern Ireland 1967–1990, the challenge to the post-Franco democratic Spain by separatist movements (ETA); separatist movements and the resort to violence in Canada (during the Trudeau era in particular); secessionist/regionalist movements threatening the unity of the democratic state as witnessed in Nigeria 1961–1966, or in India.

Please ensure that the chosen state is a democratic one and that the political extremism is internal.

Having identified cases of “internal political extremism”, candidates could examine the way in which governments responded to the extremism – whether by adopting military solutions/force, by negotiation, by concessions to those challenging the status quo, by inviting mediators from outside to promote a settlement *etc.*

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***



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

13. **“Their rise to power was made possible because of the failure of existing governments to deal with economic and political problems.” With reference to *two* single-party leaders, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Note there is no regional requirement in this question.

Candidates are required to examine the extent to which aspiring single-party leaders benefited from circumstances – economic, social, political – which preceded their rise, and over which such aspiring leaders had no real control, though their pragmatism or opportunism in adapting to such circumstances may have been significant in explaining their eventual rise.

The issues of “economic and political problems” could be examined in relation to the atmosphere of dissatisfaction which provided the opportunity for extremist views to gain support within a population. Such dissatisfaction could be the result of: the strain (economic/military) of war; anger because of a humiliating peace treaty; the inability of an existing governmental system to deal with urgent economic and social problems; an existing governmental system unrepresentative of, or unresponsive to, the desires of the population; failure of a government to protect its people from outside attack *etc.* Popular choices are likely to be: Lenin; Mussolini; Hitler; Franco; Mao; Castro.

In relation to the “existing governments” noted in the question, candidates could identify and comment upon specific political leaders/regimes and their failure to resolve problems which provided the basis for widespread grievances.

The “to what extent...?” command invites candidates to challenge the premise and indicate ways in which the aspiring leaders contributed towards their own rise to power. The articulation of popular discontent via popular slogans, the use of propaganda, force and willingness to cooperate with vested interests/other parties to gain power could be considered.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**14. In what ways, and with what success, did *either* Perón or Castro deal with the economic and social problems they faced in power?**

The question requires identification and detail of the policies of both leaders during their period of rule. Background to Castro's rise to power in 1959, for example, is not the focus and answers which deal with this do not address the task.

Perón was president of Argentina from 1946 to 1955 and from 1973 to 1974. Most candidates will probably focus their answers on the earlier period. Castro's period of rule lasted from 1959 until 1976 as prime minister, and then as president from 1976 until 2008. Do be aware, however, that this is a twentieth century paper.

Candidates could examine areas such as: agricultural policy; industrialization attempts; nationalization of foreign and/or domestic businesses; social policies in relation to education, health, housing, employment, gender equality, religion, *etc*.

**For Perón**, candidates could refer to: the measures undertaken to reduce neo-colonial influence over the Argentinean economy and schemes to encourage industrialization, “technical modernization” and self-sufficiency.

Profits made through exports during the war contributed to a post-Second World War boom, which was further helped by the availability of capital for investment in industrialization. This was accompanied by nationalization of shipping, railway and public utility companies. Protectionist policies in the first Five Year Plan (1947) were intended to encourage the growth of domestic industries, while a second Five Year Plan (1952) focused more on agriculture, which had been neglected in the earlier plan. The IAPI (Argentinean Institute for the Promotion of Trade), established in 1946 was a state initiative to set up a central purchasing agency for agricultural exports, the profits of which were partly used to fund generous social welfare provisions for the population. The recovery of European agricultural production and US competition meant, however, that by the late 1940s the profitable export market enjoyed by Argentina began to decline.

By 1953 a shortage of capital led to Perón actively inviting foreign investment – for example the invitation extended to Standard Oil to participate in exploration, drilling and refining in Argentina. Government expenditure increased, as did the printing of more currency to meet the demands of state spending. Frustration amongst industrialists, agricultural interests and workers at what they saw (for differing reasons) as a floundering economy led to disgruntlement and attempts by Perón to distract attention by resorting to attacks on the Church and increased repression. In 1955 Perón fell from power.

In terms of social policies, candidates could refer to the schemes to improve healthcare facilities, the provision of nursing/teaching colleges, public housing programmes and employment opportunities for the industrial workers, and no doubt candidates will be familiar with the work of Evita Duarte de Perón, whose aid to the *descamisados* helped provide a support base for her husband. Mention could be made of her charitable foundation which involved itself in supporting hospitals, schools, housing, *etc*, as well as her promotion of women's rights which resulted in female enfranchisement.

**For Castro**, candidates could refer to economic policies designed to limit/eliminate foreign influence over the Cuban economy. US influence was challenged by programmes of nationalization and expropriation of land for purposes of redistribution. Major US corporations (banks, insurance, oil companies) as well as the US stranglehold on Cuba's sugar crop were affected by legislation to remove foreign ownership and end the position of dependency which existed prior to 1959. This resulted in a confrontation with the US and eventual reliance upon the USSR for economic support. Plans to diversify the economy and break the reliance on sugar (accounting for 80 % of Cuba's exports) were undertaken – for example, under Guevara's Four Year Plan, which faltered and failed because of lack of capital and expertise. Failure to industrialize meant a return to sugar exports as a mainstay of the economy as well as reliance on Moscow's economic help which consisted of providing a market for sugar and a source of oil in particular. With the collapse of the USSR in 1991, Cuba's erstwhile reliance on Moscow was to prove problematic, and while tourism became a major focus it did not significantly alter the fact that Cuba was limited in its potential to develop by the continuing US embargo and reliance on cash crop agriculture for exports.

In terms of social policies, the areas of health provision (medical services which accounted for an impressive drop in the mortality rate and an increase in life expectancy), educational provision (which reduced levels of illiteracy and provided access to higher education for all), programmes to eliminate racial discrimination and the promotion of equal rights for women could be examined.

Whichever leader is chosen, candidates should provide specific evidence to support their arguments in relation to the degree to which success was achieved or not.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

15. With reference to *one* single-party state, examine the nature and extent of internal opposition *and* the success of the single-party state in dealing with this opposition.

**Nature and extent** requires candidates to clearly identify the types of activities, which were practised by individuals and/or groups and the degree of threat they provided to the regime. Such opposition could take the form of challenges from religious institutions, political parties/movements which despite repression and/or banning continued to work in a clandestine fashion, youth movements, the military and opposition from within the single-party to the leadership. Such challenges could be seen in terms of underground resistance, assassination attempts, veiled criticism in public pronouncements, distribution of pamphlets, declarations condemning policies implemented by the single-party state *etc.*

An assessment of **success** could be dealt with by identifying the methods used by the state to remove real (or perceived threats) and how far such methods were able to eliminate/reduce threats. On the other hand it could be the case that the single-party state did make concessions to opposition – for example by moderating policies (euthanasia in Nazi Germany for example).

Popular choices are likely to be Lenin/Stalin’s Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Mao’s China, Castro’s Cuba. Note that the question does say “single-party state” and that some candidates may choose to deal with a period of rule in that state rather than a specific individual – for example USSR 1917–1953. This is perfectly acceptable.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

16. By what methods, and with what success, did *either* Hitler *or* Stalin attempt to establish a totalitarian state after coming to power?

A definition/explanation of what is understood by “totalitarian” would be a sound starting point. “Totalitarianism” was the attempt to control all aspects of society in order to ensure that no rival groups/parties could exist to challenge the regime/regime leader. It involved the ruling party’s involvement in, and control of, areas such as economic life, political organization, education, propaganda, the establishment of a cult of the leader, media control, religion, *etc.* The use of force and repression was an ever present deterrent in both states to ensure acceptance of the ideology of the state and obedience to the will of the leader.

Candidates should have plenty of material to choose from in either case – from Hitler’s accession to dictatorial power in March 1933 (Enabling Act) after his brief position as coalition Chancellor, the process of *Gleichschaltung* in 1933/34 and the subsequent attempts to cajole or force the population into acceptance. Specific details are necessary to illustrate policies which were used in above noted areas to ensure support (or at least minimal resistance) amongst the population and the party itself.

With regard to Stalin, please note that the question is not about the rise of Stalin but the period of rule. Details about the succession dispute 1924–1928/29 are unlikely to be relevant. Focus should be on an examination of the methods used in a variety of areas to attempt to impose totalitarian control. Again – whether economic, educational, cultural or repressive policies (use of terror, purges/show trials of the 1930s) are considered – there needs to be sufficient accurate historical knowledge shown to substantiate claims made.

In both cases the task requires candidates to estimate whether the attempt to establish such a totalitarian state was successful. Consideration could be given to: the nature and extent of any resistance that was encountered by the regime and how/if it was effectively extinguished; evidence of popularity of the regime; the longevity of the regime – how long the leader and the ideology were able to survive in comparison to the (often millenarian) goals espoused for example.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**17. To what extent was a successful domestic policy the reason for the maintenance of power of one of the following: Sukarno; Nasser; Nyerere?**

The focus is the period of rule and candidates are required to identify particular aspects of domestic policy adopted by the selected leader and how successful they were in ensuring the survival/maintenance of power of the leader. Such aspects could be related to economic policies which sought to benefit specific sections of the population (*eg* agrarian reform), policies associated with the provision of social/educational benefits, political reforms to ensure greater participation of the populace in government. When addressing “To what extent”, candidates may refer to the use of propaganda to unite the population against a common enemy and/or the use of force or repression to eliminate real or perceived rivals.

Candidates should be able to illustrate the identified policies by reference to accurate historical detail. “Other factors” which may be credited **but are not required** could relate to issues/aspects such as external support in the form of military and/or economic aid, a foreign policy which rallied national support against “enemies” *etc.*

Sukarno was president of Indonesia 1945–1968 (though the conflict with the Netherlands was not resolved until 1949 when the sovereignty of Indonesia was recognized). A multitude of political parties were represented in the early parliamentary system which was adopted – leading to an unstable political system. Democratic government ended after regional revolts in Sumatra and Sulawesi in 1956/57 gave Sukarno the opportunity to declare martial law and establish a National Advisory Council representing “functional groups” (peasants, workers, religious groups, *etc*) but presided over by himself as chairman. This system of “guided democracy” gave way to more extensive personal power – with army support – in 1959. In terms of economic policy Indonesia’s progress was limited by the expulsion of foreign companies and state takeovers. Sukarno relied heavily on Soviet economic aid as well as military supplies. By 1965 inflation ran at a level of 650 %. He was able to gain support by working with the PKI (Communist Party) but such support was countered by fears of those who suspected his attempt to “domesticate” the PKI simply played into the hands of the Communists. This partly helps explain the military coup of 1965 which led to the destruction of the PKI and the decline of Sukarno. His foreign policy gained him some popularity – his link with the Non-Aligned Movement, his stance in relation to Irian Jaya, Confrontation (Konfrontasi) with Malaysia in 1963–1966 – as well as hostility as his links with the PRC, North Vietnam and Cambodia increased in the 1960s.

Nasser was prime minister (1954–1956) and president (1956–1970) of Egypt. He enjoyed “extensive executive and legislative powers” from 1956 onwards. Private enterprise was initially encouraged but lack of private capital led to increasing state control and a policy of nationalization of banks and insurance companies. Progressive taxation and confiscation of property of the landowning class went hand in hand with land reform and plans for industrialization, though rapid population growth jeopardized economic progress. Religious institutions were brought under control, the Muslim Brotherhood was banned and a new political organisation (Arab Socialist Union) was established in 1962 effectively turning Egypt into a single party regime. Nasser’s anti-imperialism, witnessed in his nationalization of the Suez canal earned him the antagonism of Britain and France, but gained him popular support in Egypt and throughout the Middle east. His Pan-Arabism and anti-Israeli policy proved popular, though leading to tension and involvement in unsuccessful military campaigns in Yemen’s civil war and the Six Day war with Israel. Despite military defeats his assertion of Egyptian independence and attempts to achieve Arab unity led to continued support for his regime – as well as financial and military backing from the USSR.

Nyerere was President of Tanganyika (1962–1964) and of Tanzania (1964–1985). His policy of Africanisation was partly a response to trade union pressures but such trade unions were effectively brought under control when they were amalgamated into an “umbrella union” whose officials were government appointees and whose right to strike was limited. Tanzania was declared a one-party state. As “Mwalima” (or “Teacher”) he tried to close the gap between rich and poor through a policy of African Socialism (ujamaa). State control of banks and businesses followed and reliance on foreigners in the economy was minimized. Cooperative farming was planned – resulting in the movement of approximately three million peasants into planned villages. The result was hostility and a fall in production due to lack of material incentives, the impact of oil price rises in 1973 because of the OPEC price rise and a fall in commodity prices for coffee and cotton. Appeals for help from the IMF were answered only in 1986. The introduction of universal primary education, a significant reduction in infant mortality and a rise in life expectancy helped mitigate the poor economic performance. Despite such progress in these areas of social policy, however, he stepped down from power in 1985. His foreign policy ventures in terms of linkage to the Non-Aligned Movement, support for the ANC in South Africa, for the struggle of Mugabe and Nkomo’s Patriotic Front in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe, opposition to Amin’s regime in Uganda were insufficient to prop up support for his rule.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**18. With reference to *one* single-party or authoritarian leader, assess the extent to which the promises made during the rise to power were kept after they came to power.**

Candidates could examine the situation in the state preceding the rise to power, *ie* the circumstances which allowed the aspiring leader to take advantage of discontent with the previous system to build a platform offering solutions to specific problems. Such promises often referred to the claims of the aspiring leader to address issues such as: economic inequality, unemployment, political instability, inadequate social welfare provision, foreign threats and exploitation, humiliating treatment in war and/or subsequent peace treaties *etc.*

Having identified the promises made – and why they were made – candidates should then investigate whether the promises made before the coming to power were honoured (and how) or not. This requires candidates to identify specific measures adopted to satisfy the population and/or sectional interests – or to explain why these promises were only partly honoured – or not at all.

Popular examples are likely to be: Lenin; Stalin; Mussolini; Franco; Perón; Mao; Castro.

***N.B.** This question requires coverage of both rise and rule periods. Answers which do not go beyond the period of rise will not score well.*

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

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

**19. Compare and contrast the contributions of the following to the independence movements in their countries: Havel (Czechoslovakia) and Walesa (Poland) or Ho Chi Minh (Vietnam) and Ben Bella (Algeria).**

This question would best be answered using a comparative structure but do not insist upon it.

There will be much to discuss including possible areas of contrast and comparison such as the education, class or career(s) of the leaders as relevant background to their roles in the independence movements.

**Havel and Walesa**

To compare, candidates may mention that both Havel and Walesa came to fame during the 1980s when they played significant roles in the liberation of Czechoslovakia and Poland, respectively, from Communist control. Further comparisons could be made as both leaders came to prominence at the end of the 1970s emboldened by Helsinki Final Act that led to commitments by Communist regimes to guarantee human rights; both took risks in opposing their governments; both suffered imprisonment; both looked for ways to publicize their cause; both received recognition and support from the West; both became the voice of their opposition groups (Walesa and Solidarity, Havel and Charter 77); both were prominent in the planning of the political system that took over from Communism. For contrast, mention could be made of the following: Havel came from the Czech intelligentsia whereas Walesa was a worker at the Gdansk shipyard; Havel called for human rights but Walesa was the leader of a trade union asking, primarily, for improved working conditions; Walesa was sent to prison during the military crackdown that imposed martial law on Poland whilst there was no military crackdown in Czechoslovakia after 1970; Walesa had the support of the workers while Havel was working within a system that went to some lengths to keep the acquiescence of the working class; Walesa was a staunch Catholic and was able to use this to rally support but Havel was not identified with a religious movement; Walesa was known throughout Poland as the leader of Solidarity whereas Havel was identified more with Charter 77, that was predominantly Czech rather than Slovak. There is no end point stated in the question but expect candidates to go up to 1989.

**Ho Chi Minh and Ben Bella**

For Ben Bella and Ho Chi Minh, candidates may compare these two leaders by referring to both having rebelled against French colonialism; being influenced by wartime experiences (First World War for Ho and Second World War for Ben Bella); spending many years in exile because of their opposition to the French colonial government; being founder members of the organizations that fought for independence (Ben Bella and the FLN, Ho Chi Minh and Revolutionary League); wanting to focus upon land reform; ending up as political leaders; receiving outside assistance in their struggle (Ho Chi Minh from the USSR and China, Ben Bella from Egypt, Pakistan *etc*).

For contrast, mention could be made of the following: Ben Bella was in prison during most of the period of the Algerian War, but Ho was active in the planning of the Indochinese war against the French; Ben Bella had fought, with distinction, in the French army during the Second World War whereas although Ho had spent some of that time in China, nevertheless, he established a revolutionary guerrilla force in North Vietnam and, furthermore, attempted to negotiate with the French for a transfer of power; Ho was a member of the French and (later) the Vietnam Communist Party and, although Ben Bella was a socialist and did have connections with the USSR, he was not a Communist. (Candidates may use this as a point of comparison or a point of contrast.)



With regard to Ho Chi Minh, candidates may decide to discuss events up to 1969 (when Ho died) and this would be quite acceptable, they may stop in 1965 for Ben Bella, when he was deposed.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

- 20. In what ways, and with what success, did two post-independence states deal with either ethnic tensions or separatist movements? Support your answer using examples from any Asian, African or Central and Eastern European states.**

Do note that “ethnic tensions” would refer to racial or cultural groups and would not, usually, include religious minorities, unless they also belonged to a different race/tribe/national community.

Examples of ethnic tensions could be taken from many post-independence countries that experienced conflict between rival groups. Conflicts in Rwanda, Kenya, India, Pakistan *etc* would be relevant or, in Eastern and Central Europe, tension over minority rights in Slovakia, Romania and Hungary. “In what ways” could be addressed by giving examples, where relevant, of the following: legislation that was implemented to support minority rights; the provision of separate educational facilities to ensure the communication of culture and history to successive generations; the introduction of language policies to accord status to minority languages; the application of positive discrimination in the workplace; the enshrinement of minority political rights in the constitution; the distribution of political office in such a way as to ensure representation of minorities; the use of force/military suppression.

Separatist movements were important in post-independence Congo, Pakistan, India and Sudan, (to name but a few) as well as post-Titoist Yugoslavia.

Whichever examples are chosen, expect candidates to address “in what ways” and to assess the success of the methods that were chosen.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

21. “Both religion and economics were equally important to the success of the independence movements.” With reference to *one* Central and Eastern European state, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

For “religion”, candidates may well choose to discuss Poland, the role of the Catholic Church and, specifically, the election of Pope John Paul II and the impact this had upon nationalism and opposition to the Communist government. Mention may be made of the murder of Father Jerzy Popielusko in 1984 and how this galvanized many Poles into openly opposing the government. In East Germany, the role of the Lutheran church may be discussed, as could the importance of Catholicism in Slovakia. The presence of Hungarian non-conformist communities in Romania (especially Transylvania) and their link to the outbreak of the revolution would also be relevant and be suitable examples, depending on the state chosen.

For “economics”, candidates may refer to the straitened circumstances of the 1970s experienced by the satellite states of Eastern and Central Europe, followed by the inflow of credit from the West. These loans helped to finance an improved standard of living but created problems when they had to be repaid. In Poland, the GDR and Hungary, the repayment programmes led to economic crises and increasing unrest and some candidates may link this to divisions that began to form within the Party hierarchy, for example, in Hungary. Reference may also be made to Gorbachev’s “perestroika”, although this was a programme designed specifically for the USSR (and, to a certain extent, borrowed from Hungary) and did not automatically apply to the satellite states. Furthermore, the rapid repayment of loans by Romania resulted in severe hardship that contributed to the uprising against Ceaucescu.

Expect good knowledge of the importance of both economic issues and religion as a spur to political change.

This is a “to what extent” question and so candidates would need to assess the respective importance of religion and the economy. They may also refer to other factors such as: the growth of human rights movements in the wake of the Helsinki Accords of 1975; the growing concern over the environment and health issues resulting from pollution; the recovery of forbidden history and the open discussion of the 1956 Revolution (Hungary), the 1940 Katyn Massacre (Poland), the suppression of the 1968 Prague Spring (Czechoslovakia).

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

22. **Examine the impact of the Second World War on the growth of the independence movement in *two* colonial states in Africa or Asia. Support your answer using examples from any Asian or African states.**

This question gives candidates the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of the political, economic and/or social history of post-colonial states. Some candidates may choose to focus primarily on the period up to 1945, but others may reflect on the impact of the Second World War over a longer period. Either approach would be acceptable providing arguments are well supported and relevant to the question.

A possible approach would be for candidates to outline the influence of the Second World War on an independence movement mentioning the experience of colonial regiments who fought in Europe or who were caught up in the war in Asia or Africa. Also of relevance might be the opportunity given by the Second World War for independence movements to flourish as they did in India, the Dutch East Indies, and Indochina *etc.* The changes that came about after 1945 leading to the eclipse of the former imperial powers such as Britain and France and the Netherlands and so on could also be mentioned, as could the emergence of the USSR as a world superpower and the impetus this gave to the spread of Communism as an anti-imperialist ideology.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**23. Examine the social and economic consequences of independence for *two* successor states of the former Republic of Yugoslavia up to 2000.**

Candidates may choose from a number of states including Serbia, Bosnia (you may accept the Republic of Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as two separate entities, as long as there is a clear distinction between them), FYR Macedonia, Slovenia, Croatia and Montenegro. Kosovo would not be acceptable, as it would require discussion of events after 2000.

Also, be aware that social and economic issues are often inter-related and that candidates do, in general, have some difficulty distinguishing between them, so some blurring of the lines may be expected.

Economic consequences may include: the transition from a planned economy to a free market economy; the aftermath of war that may have damaged infrastructure, factories, *etc*; the difficulty in finding sources of investment from outside the region; the absence (in some cases) of assistance from other regions of the former Republic of Yugoslavia that had, prior to independence, formed a mainstay of the economy.

Social consequences may include: the impact of war on ethnic tensions, especially where minorities remained in situ; the challenges facing re-settled populations that were the victims of ethnic cleansing; the focus, in some cases, upon the development of a recovered/new national identity through education, *etc*; the economic impact of adjustment to independence; the loss of refugee populations that did not return after the war; the importance of religion as it resumed/assumed a greater role in national identity.

There is much to discuss and analysis will vary according to the states chosen.

There is no need for candidates to use a comparative framework, so do not expect this.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**24. To what extent was the independence of India (1947) the result of Gandhi's leadership of the nationalist movement?**

Of relevance would be the skill with which Gandhi turned the call for independence into a cause that resonated across regional, religious and caste boundaries. Candidates could mention Gandhi's success with his call for satyagraha; organizing of the salt marches; publicizing of easily identifiable trademarks such as the homespun dhoti and the spinning wheel that made him instantly recognizable; making the independence movement inclusive and not limited only to the educated classes; willingness to go on hunger strike and to suffer imprisonment. Also of relevance would be his efforts to bridge the Moslem -Hindu divide and his leadership of the Quit India campaign. These are some of the factors that contributed to the success of the nationalist movement and made it difficult for the British government to oppose non-violence and to consider (even before the Second World War had begun) the inevitability of Indian independence.

The response should not be a narrative biography of Gandhi's life as the question demands that the importance of his leadership be assessed in relation to other factors that were also significant for the achievement of independence. These may include: the role of other leaders such as Nehru and Jinnah; the role of the British government; the impact of the Second World War; the role of the INA (Indian National Army) led by Subhas Chandra Bose; the INC (Indian National Congress) and so on.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the 'best fit'** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## Topic 5 The Cold War

25. “The claim that the breakdown of superpower relations between 1945 and 1950 was the result of mutual fear and suspicion has been greatly exaggerated.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This is likely to be a popular question and candidates may be expected to demonstrate sound knowledge of events up to 1950. Some may attribute the breakdown of wartime relations to the defeat of the common enemy and a return to the pre-war status quo, and so may refer to the Western involvement in the Russian civil war, citing this as the beginning of a “breakdown” that was temporarily interrupted by the Second World War. Others may choose to mention the Teheran Conference (1943) and/or the Moscow Conference (1944) as demonstrating underlying disagreements. These starting points are quite acceptable, as long as there is also good coverage of the period 1945–1950.

The focus of the question needs to be on the importance (or not) of “mutual fear and suspicion”, a reference to the post-revisionist interpretation and one that candidates are likely to identify. Events to be mentioned could include: the growing disagreements over post-war Europe that were simmering at Yalta and Potsdam; the A bomb; the Long Telegram; the Iron Curtain Speech; the Stuttgart Speech of 1946. These could be used to demonstrate how rhetoric contributed to worsening relations, possibly fuelling fear. Similarly, the Marshall Plan and the Molotov Plan (COMECON) could be seen as evidence of “mutual fear and suspicion”, although both could also be seen as pragmatic efforts to secure markets and resources (or, indeed, as a reflection of fear by one superpower but not, necessarily, by the other).

Candidates will need to consider other possible reasons for the “breakdown of relations” such as: ideology; Great Power rivalry; the need for economic expansion by securing resources and markets; imperialism; a clash of personalities. They will need to assess if such factors were of greater (or lesser) importance than “mutual fear and suspicion” in causing the breakdown of relations. Some candidates may argue that fear may have been a motivating factor for the USSR, with its badly damaged infrastructure and population loss, but that the US, with its economic and military capacity, had no such concerns. Alternatively, it may be argued that the USSR, with its domination of Central and Eastern Europe had little to fear whereas the US saw its economy and ideology to be under threat.

The question asks candidates to go up to 1950, so references to the establishment of the People’s Republic of China, as well as the outbreak of the Korean War, would be appropriate. A narrative of events would probably not score well, unless links are made to the question. Historiography could be used very effectively here, but expect more than a mere recounting of the orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist interpretations.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**26. In what ways, and to what extent, did the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence affect superpower relations from 1956 to 1964?**

Candidates may be expected to identify “peaceful coexistence” with the period of Khrushchev’s leadership of the USSR and may demonstrate some recognition, therefore, of the start and end dates included in the question: 1956 may be regarded as the time when Khrushchev finally emerged as the “leader” of the USSR following the death of Stalin in 1953; 1964 is when Khrushchev was “retired” from his positions as general secretary of the party and prime minister.

“Ways” could include improved relations leading to official visits by Nixon to the USSR and Khrushchev to the US; the willingness to meet to discuss policies at Paris (1960) and Vienna (1961); the improved relations after the Cuban Missile Crisis resulting in the installation of a “hot line” and the signing of the Test Ban Treaty (1963).

“To what extent” may be addressed with reference to “crises” such as: Poland and Hungary (1956); Suez (1956); Berlin (1958–1961); Congo (1961); Cuba (1961–1962).

Candidates may also refer to the impact “peaceful co-existence” had upon Sino–Soviet relations as Mao Zedong was very critical of this policy and, it may be argued, used it as evidence of “revisionism” on the part of the USSR obliging Khrushchev to demonstrate his willingness to support revolution/revolutionaries outside the traditional sphere of Soviet influence.

Do expect a definition of “peaceful coexistence” and a good focus on both parts of the question.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**27. Analyse the reasons for the adoption *and* abandonment of the policy of détente (1969–1979)?**

Détente can be defined as a relaxation of tension between the US and the USSR during the 1970s although its “adoption” could be traced back to the start of SALT I talks in 1969 whereas the (final) “abandonment” is usually linked to the outbreak of the Soviet–Afghan war in 1979. Do accept well supported arguments that may consider an earlier/later, start/end point, however.

Reasons for the adoption of détente may include: the US desire to broker peace with the government of North Vietnam and so needing the support of the USSR (and China) to accomplish this; the preparedness of the USSR to discuss arms limitations (SALT) now that they had achieved parity with the US; the mutual desire to address the development of ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missiles) defence systems and the impact this had on MAD (Mutual Assured Destruction); the Sino-Soviet split was also edging the USSR closer to better relations with the US; trade agreements and the need for the USSR to have access to better technology from the US; the desire of the USSR to secure recognition of the post-war borders in Europe; Ostpolitik and the threatened “de-coupling” of Europe from the US also had an impact on US support for détente.

Reasons for “abandonment” may include: US objection to the involvement of the USSR in the Horn of Africa; President Carter’s proposal to re-negotiate the Vladivostok Agreement (SALT II) and how this unsettled Brezhnev, whose worsening health may also be considered a factor; the US fear that détente was a cover for Soviet expansion; the deployment of SS20s in Eastern Europe; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Some candidates may also refer to the failure to ratify SALT II and the boycott of the Moscow Olympics in 1980, although (strictly speaking) these were consequences rather than reasons for the abandonment of détente.

Do not expect all of the above, but candidates should address both parts of the question.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***



**28. Compare and contrast *two* of the following as Cold War conflicts: Korea (1950–1953); Congo (1960–1964); Vietnam (1965–1973); Afghanistan (1979–1989).**

Candidates have a choice of two out of four wars in this question and many comparisons and contrasts may be made. There is a specific instruction to approach the wars in question as Cold War conflicts, and so expect more than a narrative of events.

A comparative structure would work well and candidates may consider a comparison/contrast of the following characteristics: the role of the US and the USSR (and/or China) in the outbreak and/or the continuation of the conflicts; the involvement (or lack of) the UN as a peacemaking and/or peacekeeping organization (this could be linked to the difficulty of avoiding a veto of a resolution in the UN Security Council by one or other of the superpowers); the risk of the conflicts escalating from a conventional to a nuclear war and how this may or may not have affected strategy; the risk of conflicts spreading to neighbouring countries with consequences for superpower involvement (as with US reluctance to risk ground troops in North Vietnam due to its proximity to China – a strategy influenced by the experience of the Korean War); the support given to the particular political or military leaders by one or more superpowers; the role of ideology in the outbreak of the conflicts; the use of guerrilla warfare by one (or more) of the armies involved and “backstage” support for guerrillas by a superpower; the reasons for the US/USSR being drawn into pre-existing conflicts in the first place; the impact of the Cold War on the outcome of the conflicts; the impact of the conflicts on superpower relations. There is much to be discussed and do not expect all of the above, especially as some factors may be more/less relevant than others, depending on the conflicts that are chosen.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**29. Account for the changing nature of Sino–Soviet relations from 1949 to 1976.**

This question asks candidates to begin their analysis with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 and continue up to the death of Mao Zedong in 1976. Broadly speaking, the question alludes to the worsening of relations leading to the Sino–Soviet split and offers an opportunity for candidates to explain why this took place. Candidates may begin with an analysis of relations between Mao and Stalin, referring to the support (or not) offered to Mao during the Chinese civil war as well, perhaps, as some reference to the different ideologies espoused by the two leaders. This is acceptable as long as it is made relevant and that the focus does remain on the time period stated in the question. The following factors may be included to account for the gradual changing nature of relations: the signing of a Treaty of Friendship in 1950; China’s participation (at the behest of Stalin) in the Korean War (1950–1953) and the consequent souring of relations; the technological aid given to China by the USSR, and the adoption by China of the Five Year Plan model; the death of Stalin and the impact this had upon relations; Mao’s critical response to Khrushchev and his policy of de-Stalinization and peaceful co-existence; the withdrawal of Soviet support for the building of a Chinese A bomb; China’s efforts to rival the USSR as the supporter of communist parties in newly independent states. In the 1960s, relations continued to worsen and mention may be made of Mao’s criticism of the outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis; the condemnation of Soviet “revisionism” during the Cultural Revolution in China; the Ussuri River border conflicts; Soviet overtures to the US to join them in an attack on Chinese missile bases (China had the bomb by 1967). Also of significance was the Vietnam War, during which North Vietnam was given assistance by both China and the USSR. Mention may also be made of the US–USSR détente and how this provided an impetus for improved relations between the US and China. In general, relations did not improve despite Brezhnev’s efforts to mend fences before 1976.

There is much to discuss so do not expect all that is mentioned above.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**30. Examine the role played by economic factors *and* the arms race in the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War by 1991.**

It is clearly stated in the question that candidates are required to go up to 1991 (rather than to stop at 1989) and to link the collapse of the USSR to the end of the Cold War.

Economic factors could include the following: the increasing slowdown of productivity in the USSR; the need to reform, as demonstrated by “perestroika”; the impact reforms had upon the speeding up of “democratization” with, perhaps, unforeseen consequences; the unrest caused by severe economic hardship; the impact of economic conditions on revolutions in the satellite states and how this affected the USSR; the cost of the war in Afghanistan that helped push the fragile economy into a downward spiral. Candidates may also mention the reluctance of the US to help Gorbachev financially in 1990/91 and how this may also have been a significant factor in the final collapse of the USSR.

Linking both parts could be a reference to the cost to the USSR of keeping up with the arms race as the pace was set by the US. The importance of the arms race may also be assessed with reference to the following: the development of Satellite Defence Initiative that was seen as a real threat (and beyond the economic and technological capability of the USSR); the INF and START treaties that were negotiated and signed in 1987 and 1990 respectively, and the impact these had upon limiting arms production. Candidates may reflect on how the scaling down of arms production was not so popular with the army (or indeed, the KGB) and may have added to the unpopularity of Gorbachev inside the USSR. The arms race, however, did come to an end in a peaceful way and was an important factor in improving relations between the USSR and the US and so certainly contributed to the end of the Cold War. Candidates are expected to “examine” the role played by both factors, so expect arguments to be well supported.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide **the ‘best fit’** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

---