



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2014**

**HISTORY**

**ROUTE 2**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

34 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. There is 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. With reference to *either* the First World War (1914–1918) *or* the Second World War (1939–1945), to what extent was the Allies’ success the result of their superior tactics and strategies?

This question deals with the reasons for Allied success in either the First or Second World Wars. “Strategies” may be defined as long-term planning for military success in a campaign or a war. “Tactics” would be more precise use of technology/troops to address the challenges posed in specific battles or to achieve certain military targets. Do, however, accept any interpretations that would be reasonable.

**With reference to the First World War**, many candidates may produce comprehensive responses which challenge the statement. This is acceptable but expect some explanation as to why they have rejected the role of tactics and strategies.

Material in support of the statement may include: Allied use of naval power to limit enemy supplies and trade; the development of technology such as tanks, which were used effectively at the Battle of Cambrai in 1917 and onwards; the use of sonar and the convoy system to counter U-boat warfare; the effective use of guerrilla warfare in the Middle East. Candidates may argue against the assertion by stating that many of the Allied strategies and tactics failed and support this with reference to the “war of attrition” that was a response to the failure to find effective strategies to bring about a decisive victory and, specifically, campaigns such as the Battle of the Somme where little was gained at the cost of many lives. In this way, it might be argued that Allied tactics during the war were largely futile and their victory was based on a war of attrition which they won based on superior manpower.

Other challenges to the statement may include: the Allies did not benefit from superior strategy and tactics but from the mistakes of their opponents; reference to the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the war on two fronts that resulted could be made; the German decision to use submarine warfare in 1917 brought the United States into the war against them. Also the economic and financial power of the United States was what made victory possible not Allied military tactics or strategies.

**With reference to the Second World War**, candidates may choose to challenge the question and focus on factors other than Allied tactics and strategies. Again, they should make reference to tactics and strategies in their response.

**Material in support of the statement may include:** strategic bombing to destroy the industry in Germany and Japan; cutting off resources to Japan by blockade; adopting a leap-frog strategy to seize key islands in the Pacific and avoid long costly battles on each island; providing strong economic support to the USSR to maintain their war effort and weaken the German army; maintaining naval power to allow transportation of goods and troops and limit enemy abilities to obtain resources or move troops to war-zones such as North Africa.

To challenge the statement, candidates may suggest that enemy errors in tactics and strategy not Allied successes were more responsible. These might include: Hitler’s failure to defeat Britain before attacking Russia; German failure to prepare for a long war in Russia; Hitler’s alienation of captured countries that turned them from supporters to opponents; failure to obtain oil supplies by reinforcing the German campaign in North Africa, the declaration of war on the United States which brought them into the European conflict; the failure to mobilize for total war from 1939 onwards; failure to mobilize women as a key element in the workforce; the Japanese

underestimation of the US was a major flaw that led to their decision to attack them; the Japanese war in China drained many resources and weakened their ability to resist the US.

In addition candidates may choose to argue that Allied victory was the result of superior economic and financial capacity, larger numbers of troops and advances in technology that surpassed their opponents. In addition the Allied control of large amounts of key resources such as oil was a factor as was the difficulty in communication and co-operation amongst the Axis powers. The weakness of Italy was a drain on Germany and weakened the Axis side.

*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. Assess the extent to which religious causes were an important factor in the origins of either the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) or the Indo-Pakistan Wars (1947–1949, 1965, 1971).**

As religious causes are mentioned in the question, it is necessary for candidates to identify the nature and extent of such causes rather than treating the question as a general “causes of the Spanish/Indo-Pakistan Wars”. While candidates may argue that other factors have to be considered, and indeed may be more important, the role of religious causation can neither be ignored nor dismissed without consideration of its significance.

For the **Spanish Civil War**, candidates could examine the role of the Church in Spain in terms of not only its spiritual influence, but also its involvement in education, the economy and political life in its defence of the social and political status quo. Anticlericalism or the desire for a secular state led to opposition to the Church, which was regarded as one of the pillars of an unjust system and an obstacle to reform. The linkage of the Church to the monarchy pre-1931 (and to the landed gentry, especially in the south of Spain) was especially resented by movements ranging from the Anarchists to moderate Republicans. Secularism and anticlericalism became platforms adopted by proponents of change. The reforms concerning the Church introduced by the first Republican administration (1931–1933), for example education, divorce and the separation of Church and state, antagonized traditionally pious Spaniards, as they were seen as a move towards a “Godless Spain” and a drift towards Marxism. Other factors that may be considered could be: economic and social inequality and the attempts to redress grievances, that succeeded only in angering and further polarizing those concerned; regional separatism; outrage produced by military reforms; increasing violence reflected through the growth of movements dedicated either to protecting or overthrowing the Republican administration after February 1936 (Popular Front).

**The Indo-Pakistan Wars of 1947–1949, 1965 and 1971** consist of separate, but linked conflicts. The strained relationship that existed from 1947 was a product of the stresses of the partition of British India that led to the emergence of both states. Pakistan was established as a Muslim state avowedly committed to “rescuing” the Muslims of India from the prospect of a “Hindu Raj”.

Each of the conflicts was accompanied by refugee flight and the rise of Islamic radicalism over the issue of Kashmir that has, to a certain extent, been mirrored by the growth of Hindu nationalism in an India which is nevertheless a self-declared secular state. Religion, in the sense of the liberation of Muslims who were being denied the right to accede to Pakistan, was used as a rallying cry in Pakistan to justify the measures taken to “free” their co-religionists from Indian

(or perceived Hindu) dominance. Yet religious differences alone were arguably only a part of the reason for the antagonism between both new nations.

From the outset economic and territorial issues bedevilled relations, as seen especially in the case of Kashmir, a princely state which, with its Hindu ruler and Muslim majority, was regarded by both New Delhi and Karachi as vital for their future. For both states Kashmir's location and control of the headwaters of the Indus was regarded as important for economic development because of the need for irrigation in the Punjab, the breadbasket of India. For India, the decision of the Hindu ruler to opt for incorporation into India despite the wishes of the Muslim majority was upheld for fear that any popular secessionist movements, such as those in Kashmir, could encourage similar secession (on religious, linguistic grounds) in other parts of the new nation.

The first clash between the two nations occurred over the issue of Kashmir, when a Karachi-supported tribal invasion of the territory resulted in an eventual ceasefire and the division of the state into Kashmir and "Azad" Kashmir (the latter in Pakistan). A promised plebiscite which was supposed to be held did not happen – possibly due to Prime Minister Nehru's anxiety that such a vote would produce a majority in favour of union with Pakistan. The "sore" of Kashmir continued to sour relations from then until the present.

In 1965, the Pakistani leader Ayub Khan took advantage of what he perceived to be Indian weakness or unpreparedness (a poor Indian performance against China in 1962 and the death of Nehru in 1964) to renew attempts to "liberate" Kashmir. Pakistan misjudged India's strength and only a UN-organized ceasefire prevented a painful outcome for Pakistan.

The 1971 war was not essentially a religious war as its origins can be found in the attempt of East Pakistan to gain independence from West Pakistan and become an independent state. This led to a civil war in which the Pakistani army attempted to suppress the independence movement in East Pakistan. The violence led to a flood of refugees into India which caused severe economic problems for India and encouraged intervention to end the war. Other causes of the war were historic animosity between India and Pakistan and the fact that India wished to take advantage of the civil war to weaken Pakistan and become the leading state in the region. This greater strength would allow her to oppose Chinese ambitions in the region more effectively.

*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. **Assess the factors which determined the result of *either* the Falklands/Malvinas War (1982) or the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970).**

Candidates should focus on the reasons for the result of the war that they have chosen.

**In the case of the Falklands/Malvinas War**, Argentina was defeated in its attempt to acquire the Falklands Islands/Islas Malvinas.

The reasons for the result of the Falklands/Malvinas War may include : the strength of the British response was not anticipated by the Argentines who may have assumed an easy victory; Britain possessed superior technology in aircraft and missiles as well as highly trained naval and land forces; Britain had diplomatic support from the UN, Commonwealth and EEC; the United States provided advanced military material and prevented sales of equipment to Argentina; intelligence on Argentine operations was also provided by the United States and Chile, which allowed its territory to be used as a base for attacks by Britain; the aggressive attitude of Britain as shown in the sinking of the Belgrano may have undermined Argentine morale; the Argentine Navy did not leave port after the sinking of the Belgrano and that was a great benefit to the British.

On the Argentine side: they lacked the experience, training and technology of the British in some key areas; they seemed on occasion to suffer from low morale or a lack of dedication to the cause as resistance to British attacks was not always very determined; political divisions in Argentina and the unpopularity of the junta also undermined the Argentine effort and the popularity of the war.

**In the case of the Nigerian Civil War**, the rebel state of Biafra failed in its attempt to become an independent state.

The reasons for the result of the Nigerian Civil war may include: the rebel forces were outnumbered by the government forces and lacked military equipment throughout the war; they were quickly blockaded by government troops and were unable to attain a regular supply of food and war material. Starvation of the populace was the result of this and it undermined the resistance effort; the rebels had limited access to foreign support whereas the Nigerian government was supported by Britain and the USSR; military goods could be shipped to the Nigerian government very easily and this allowed them to develop overwhelming force both in men and material to use against the rebels.

*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. In what ways, and with what success, were attempts made to establish collective security in either the period 1920–1930 or 1945–1955?**

**For the period 1920–1930** candidates could examine the attempts at collective security by the League of Nations, which was formally established and operational by 1920. For many candidates the League will doubtless be the focus, but candidates could also consider: attempts at disarmament (for example, the London/Washington naval agreements); regional collective security arrangements, such as the Locarno Pacts of 1925 or the Kellogg–Briand Pact of 1928.

**For “ways”** candidates could identify the means by which countries hoped to promote peace and cooperation, for example: examination of the Covenant of the League, by which peacekeeping and conflict resolution could be obtained through mediation; the application of sanctions of an economic, cultural or military nature by the League; the provision of guarantees of protection (as in Locarno by Britain and Italy); through multilateral conferences and treaties to limit armaments *etc.*

**For “success”** candidates could identify specific cases where attempts were made to resolve conflict and/or deter aggression – in the case of the League for example, the Åland Islands dispute (1920), the Vilna dispute (1920), the Corfu Incident (1923), Greek–Bulgarian crisis (1925). During this period the specialized agencies and their achievements (or lack thereof, and why) could be examined.

As collective security did involve more than the League in this period, the reasons for and short-term effects (positive or negative, and why) of attempts by other agreements or pacts could be considered.

**For the period 1945–1955** the focus of answers for most candidates will be the work of the UN. Some candidates could also deal with regional security pacts or agreements such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (1949), the Australia New Zealand United States Defence Treaty (1951), Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (1954) and the Baghdad and Warsaw Pacts that were established at the end of the period (1955).

**For “ways”** candidates could identify the mechanisms provided in the Charter of the UN, which sought to improve upon the Covenant of the League. The encouragement of international cooperation through the work of specialized agencies was emphasized, alongside the provision of facilities for mediation/arbitration and enforced sanctions of an economic and military nature. Similarly candidates could comment on the provisions for collective security associated with the regional pacts or agreements noted above.

**For “success”** candidates could identify specific cases where the UN sought to promote peacekeeping and attempt conflict resolution or the deterrence of aggression, and to what extent it was successful, for example, its involvement in the Middle East (Arab–Israeli conflict from 1947), Kashmir from 1947, Korea 1950–1953. During this period the specialized agencies and their achievements (or lack thereof, and why) could be examined since, as in the case of the League, it was believed that functionalism – the encouragement of nations to work together on matters of mutual concern – was an essential building block to collective security and the promotion of international cooperation.

As collective security did involve more than the UN in this period, the reasons for, and short-term effects (positive or negative, and why) of, attempts by other agreements or pacts mentioned above could also 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**.*

**5. Examine the political and economic effects of *two* civil wars, each chosen from a different region.**

Whichever civil wars are selected, the task is to identify and make comment upon the effects of the conflict upon the participants in terms of how the political structure of the state was affected by the war, and in terms of the economic impact (demographic change, destruction of economic capacity, or the change in economic direction that occurred as a result of the war). Effects may be taken to mean those that took place during the war as well as after the conclusion of the war, when the successful side may have radically altered conditions, or, depending on the examples selected, restored conditions to the status quo ante.

While answers are likely to focus on the impact upon the specific states which fell victim to fratricidal conflict, some candidates may comment upon the effects of the chosen wars on a wider scale, noting the international impact of the war. For example, in relation to the Bolshevik/ Communist victory in Russia’s Civil War, the significance of the practice and outcome of Spain’s Civil War, or the Chinese Civil War. This is a legitimate area for consideration.

*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. With reference to *two* guerrilla wars of the 20th century, to what extent was the guerrillas' success due mainly to the mistakes of their opponents?

Candidates are asked to determine the importance of mistakes by the opponents of the guerrillas as opposed to other factors that may have led to their success. Candidates may challenge the statement but should address the issue raised in the question in their response.

**Mistakes made by opponents** may include: failure to address the economic, political or social demands of the population causing loss of support; using poor military tactics against the guerrillas; using repressive measures against the population causing widespread loss of life and property; failure to instil faith in the population that they will provide them with a better future; economic mismanagement and corruption destroying respect for the government; using foreign or mercenary troops, which caused resentment in the population.

**Other factors** that may explain the success of the guerrillas may include: adoption of military tactics that weakened their opponents both physically and in terms of morale; better use of geography in their military tactics; effective use of guerrilla techniques of warfare to confuse and demoralize the enemy; support of the population as a result of providing assistance and promoting an economic/political plan that detailed a better life in the future; assistance from external sources; better leaders who inspired confidence in their troops and the population and demonstrated a commitment to eliminate corrupt and oppressive practices; assistance from foreign sources who supported their ideology or who were opposed to the regime in power.

*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. **“The failure of democracy in Weimar Germany (1919–1933) was not the result of constitutional weakness but the product of economic crises.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The question requires consideration of the constitutional provisions of the Weimar system and whether (and how) such provisions prevented the successful functioning of democratic government. Candidates could consider issues such as proportional representation and the existence of presidential emergency powers (Article 48), or the civil rights provisions that permitted avowedly anti-democratic political movements to exist and challenge the democratic structure. It may be argued that the constitution itself was inappropriate, or that it was the lack of commitment of leaders to fully support the constitution that led to its abuse/misuse by 1930–1933 in particular.

Economic crises (in 1923 and from 1930 onwards) could be examined and comment made on the impact these had upon popular support for those parties that were committed to the democratic process. Similarly, linkage could be made to the growth of non-democratic parties which gained electoral support during such periods of crisis – lending credence to the generalization that political extremism is frequently a corollary of economic crisis or despair.

“Other factors” can also be investigated in this “to what extent ...?” task, for example: the impact of frustrated nationalism following the Versailles “diktat”; the collusion of politicians with extremists because of a fear of the rise of Communism; the inability of the Weimar government to control the military, which was vital for the defence of the government against threats to democracy; the lack of experience of democratic government that was arguably established by Hindenburg and Ludendorff in 1918 as a way to avoid a punitive peace settlement for a Germany that was on the brink of surrender.

*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. Analyse the social and economic challenges faced by India in the period 1947 to 1964 and the extent to which they were successfully dealt with.

The period coincides with the premiership of Jawaharlal Nehru. The focus of the question is not political challenges, though candidates could refer to the initial economic and social problems that occurred as a result of the bloody partition and mass migrations that accompanied it, producing refugees and arguments over the division of economic resources between the two successor states of India and Pakistan. More specifically, for the newly independent state of India, however, were challenges associated with language (the proposal to adopt Hindi was met with much resistance from Tamil Nadu in particular, because of cultural nationalism and fears that the lack of Hindi would necessarily limit government employment opportunities), hence the decision to postpone the implementation and keep English as an official language. Attempts were made to outlaw discrimination against Harijans through the Untouchability Act of 1955, though legislation arguably failed to change the attitudes of many. Women were given the right to vote, the right to divorce and equality in terms of inheritance of property, allowing for legal equality, though once more the passing of legislation did not necessarily mean a swift change of attitudes. Free primary education was introduced, though quantitative expansion was not necessarily accompanied by qualitative improvement and many children (particularly in rural areas) failed to benefit.

Economically, the Government of India sought to restrict the activities and influence of multinational corporations, while at the same time promoting import–substitution programmes to encourage indigenous production. Central planning was adopted (in keeping with Nehru’s adherence to socialist ideals) in order to improve irrigation, hydroelectric power and transportation in the First Five Year Plan (1951–1956).

Agrarian reform, which was essential to deal with the demands of a population that grew from 361 million to over 430 million between 1951 and 1961, was undertaken as attempts were made to abolish the *zamindari* system that had led to the exploitation of cultivators by the rural gentry, but land redistribution (though it was a Congress policy) was often prevented by landlords and richer peasants who came to dominate the new government-sponsored cooperatives and local government bodies (*panchayats*).

*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. With reference to *one* democratic state in the first half of the 20th century, how effectively did it deal with *either* economic problems *or* political extremism?

Candidates must choose one democratic state on which to base their response.

Whichever state is chosen, candidates are required to identify either the nature and extent of the economic problems or the nature and extent of the problems posed by political extremism. The most popular examples are likely to be Germany in the period 1919–1933 or the US in the later 1920s and the 1930s, but there are many other legitimate choices.

**Examples of economic problems** may include: extensive unemployment; inflation; banking and/or stock market collapses; loss of foreign trade; government debts or loss of resources or industry.

**Examples of political extremism** may include: the rise of anti-democratic ideologies or political groups seeking to undermine democracies; the influence of external ideologies that supported anti-democratic institutions; the rise of influential and/or charismatic individuals who sought to eliminate democracy; ethnic, religious or social divisions in society that threatened the continuation of a democratic state.

Having identified the specific issues, candidates should examine the policies of the democratic state, how they were implemented and whether such policies were successful or not – and why.

*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. **“The attainment of civil rights for all was the most significant challenge to democratic states in the 20th century.” With reference to *one* democratic state, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This is a broad question that will require students to consider a number of challenges to democratic states that occurred in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These challenges may include: wars both internal and external; rival political philosophies and ideologies; economic collapse; changing industrial and technological structures; changing roles and responsibilities as well as civil rights, which may be understood as including the attainment of rights for all regardless of gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or political philosophy.

Students should select one state and then develop an argument that asserts which of the challenges was most significant for that state and why. The responses will depend on the state 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.***

**11. Assess the role of religious *and* economic factors in causing the tensions in Northern Ireland in the period 1967 to 1990.**

In 1921, Ireland was divided into the predominantly Catholic Irish Free State (which, in 1949, became the Republic of Ireland) and a predominantly Protestant Northern Ireland which remained a part of the United Kingdom. Tensions between the minority Catholic community and the Protestant community, which led to the period of “the Troubles” from 1967/68 onwards, were often cast in religious terms, though arguably the guise of religion was used to mask a variety of issues (often economic in nature) that divided the communities. Religion was a factor in the tensions based on the historical and cultural divisions that had developed over several centuries and were characterized by the triumph of the Protestants over the Catholics at the Boyne in 1690. The annual celebration of this victory in Ulster was a constant reminder the division between the two. In addition a history of reduced rights for Catholics in Britain until 1829 served to deepen the divide. The breakaway of Ulster from the remainder of Ireland in 1914 was also given religious overtones and added to the sense of division and hostility between the groups. Religious difference led to a ghetto effect where the two groups lived apart, communicated poorly and lacked positive social interaction. This led to increased ignorance, misunderstanding and suspicion that would have contributed to the outbreak of difficulties.

Nevertheless economic factors were also crucial; income and employment rates were much better for Protestants than Catholics in many industries with clear discrimination in hiring and promotion taking place on religious lines. Large enterprises were owned by Protestants and as such the troubles could be seen as “rich versus poor”. Catholics were also disadvantaged in housing and social benefits as they had limited representation in government. These economic differences and the failure of the government to address them contributed to the outbreak of the troubles. The level of violence was, no doubt exacerbated by the historical emotions and prejudices associated with religion. Candidates may also comment on the existence of other factors such as disputes over unifying Ireland or continuing association with Britain, lack of political power for Catholics, the influence of outside groups and ideologies, perceptions of inequality in the application of the justice system, use of police power and a lack of government support for education and other services in Catholic areas.

*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. “The existence of a written constitution is necessary for a successful democratic state.” With reference to at least *one* democratic state of the 20th century, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates may refer to more than one state in their response but there is no requirement to do so.

**In support of the statement** candidates may assert that a written constitution sets out a blueprint for a democratic state including civil rights, electoral systems, powers and responsibilities of government and legal systems. Constitutions may provide the basis for political education of citizens in order that they may better understand how government works and be able to understand and comment on its effectiveness. A well educated population, which understands rights and the operation of government, is important to a functioning democracy.

**The statement may be challenged** by candidates who assert that there are other factors of equal or greater importance than a constitution. These may include: a tradition of respect for the rights of individuals in a society; a well-educated population that is aware of its rights and the responsibilities and limits of government; an absence of influential extremist groups which promote intolerance and division in the society; a good economic structure that encourages a positive attitude in the citizens; the existence of a strong and independent legal system that promotes respect for the rule of law and individual rights; a tradition of power being in the hands of the populace to some degree; legislation over time which increases the power of the public and limits arbitrary power by elite groups.

Written constitutions may fail if some of the above elements are not present. A constitution must be supported by other aspects in society and may be ignored or weakened if the country falls into crisis, be it economic, political or social.

*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. “The rise to power of authoritarian or single-party leaders was the result of the failure of existing regimes to address the economic problems of the population.” With reference to *two* leaders, each chosen from a different region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

For the leaders chosen, candidates are required to examine the nature and extent of the economic problems that confronted the existing regime and the extent to which they aided the growth in support for the single-party leader. Specific detail of such problems is required (unemployment, inflation, inequitable distribution of income or resources, shortages of fuel/food *etc.*). The inability of existing regimes to cope with these problems (and why) could be noted. Generally the consequence of economic distress or crisis was the rise of political extremism (such as the emergence of Nazism, Fascism or Communism) or the willingness of sections of the population to pay heed to leaders who made attractive promises to rescue the population from distress.

Since the question is “to what extent ...?”, candidates are invited to offer other reasons for the rise to power of the chosen leaders, for example: political paralysis, which produced no effective programme of reforms; disillusionment with existing ideologies or forms of government; the appeal of a charismatic personality; the catalyst of war and grievances over unsatisfactory peace settlements *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.***

14. Identify the nature and extent of opposition to *one* authoritarian or single-party ruler, and assess the methods used to deal with such opposition.

Candidates could identify the different types of opposition that the chosen ruler faced. Opposition could take a variety of forms, ranging from the use of physical resistance, economic sabotage, underground press and external propaganda (in the form of radio/film/newspaper propaganda by exiled dissident groups), religious opposition, resistance by elements within the military – or even the party itself *etc.*

The methods used to suppress or eliminate opposition should be identified, for example: the use of force; the indoctrination of the population through education and propaganda (including the attempt to establish a cult of personality); the implementation of social and economic policies that offered a solution to social and economic problems or which provided access to cultural and/or leisure activities *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.***

### 15. How successfully did Hitler implement his religious policies in Germany?

Candidates will need to be familiar with Hitler's religious policies in order to be able to assess the extent to which they were successful.

In general, the aims of Hitler's religious policies were similar to those of many single-party states. He wished to eliminate all religious denominations as they represented rival ideologies and value systems as well as ideas about ethics and morality that might clash with those of his party. He wished to replace all established Christian Churches with his own faith movement that supported the ideals of the Nazi party.

In the case of Judaism, Hitler simply wished to eliminate it from Germany through discrimination and persecution. In this area he was largely successful as many Jews left Germany or were forced to cease the public practice of their religion as the result of persecution, violence and ultimately, the extermination of many Jews.

In terms of the Christian Churches, Hitler was not able to eliminate the Churches or gain many adherents to the new pagan German Faith Movement. The reasons for this may include but not be limited to: Hitler's reluctance to take harsh measures against the Churches in the early years of his regime as he needed their political support (as shown by the Concordat that he signed with the Catholic Church in 1933); his attempts to take over the Protestant Churches were not successful as many clergy rejected the attempt and, under Martin Niemöller, formed the Confessional Church, which rejected Nazi beliefs; Nazi religious policy was attacked by Pope Pius XI in an encyclical in 1937; the need for popular support for the war limited Hitler's desire to take harsher measures against the Churches; the German Faith Movement's attempt at a revival of Teutonic pagan beliefs to replace Christianity did not prove popular amongst Germans.

The Christian Churches were well established in Germany and formed an integral part of German culture and could not be easily eliminated. Most Germans, even during the Third Reich, considered themselves members of a Christian denomination. In addition the Churches possessed wealth, educated and articulate leaders and their own long-established ideologies and rituals to rival those of the Nazis. Evidence of their continued influence on moral issues can be seen in their role in ending the Nazi euthanasia programme in 1941.

Hitler did limit the influence of the Churches as the Nazis dominated education, eliminated rival youth groups in favour of the Hitler Youth and imprisoned the most outspoken opponents amongst the clergy such as Niemöller. In addition many churches were closed, property was seized and religious communities harassed. Nevertheless, whilst the influence of the established Churches was weakened it was not eliminated.

The Nazi defeat in the war ultimately brought an end to the policy that had repressed and weakened the Churches but had failed to eliminate them from German life and failed to remove them as a source of resistance to Nazi ideals. The short life of the Nazi regime also makes it difficult to assess whether or not Hitler would have had any greater success had his regime survived. Candidates should not focus solely on the persecution of the Jews and the Holocaust, they should also examine policies towards other religious groups.

*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. Compare and contrast the economic and social policies of Stalin and Mao.**

There ought to be a thematic treatment of, rather than an end-on and/or sequential approach to, this question. Similarities and differences could include coverage of specific aims and methods of the identified policies, as well as a discussion of the degree of success achieved by the policies implemented.

Areas for investigation with regard to economic policies could include: industrialization and urbanization; agrarian reform (land redistribution/cooperatives/collectivization/communes); the methods used to build a trained work force to carry out the policies; the mass mobilization of labour; the establishment of a system of central planning/command economy; transportation and the development of a modern infrastructure; the different emphases on the role of the peasantry in building a modern state *etc.*

For social policies candidates could examine: the treatment of women; youth; religious groups; the nature and role of educational policies (partly linked to economic needs as well as political ends); the provision of social welfare measures; the elimination of class differences through purges and the use of force (*kulaks/gentry class*) *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.*

**17. Examine the successes and failures of *either* Perón *or* Castro as leader of an authoritarian or single-party state.**

Whichever leader is selected, candidates could identify the range of issues/policies which are to be examined, for example the aims and efforts of the leader in relation to: ***economic policies*** (relating to employment, agrarian reform, the nationalization of foreign owned and controlled businesses, programmes to promote industrialization, attempts to achieve a more equitable distribution of wealth amongst the population *etc*); ***political measures*** relating to methods adopted to consolidate the leader’s authority (use of force, propaganda, the cult of personality, censorship *etc*); ***social policies*** designed to improve the status of previously disadvantaged classes/groups through universal education and programmes to increase literacy, the provision of employment opportunities, health care, gender equality *etc*).

Candidates could examine the nature and extent of opposition to specific policies and how the regime was able to deal with such resistance, or why the antagonism exhibited by institutions such as the Church or the military, in the case of Perón, proved insurmountable.

While foreign policy is not included as an area of study for explicit examination in the Guide for Topic 3, some candidates may legitimately point out that the various economic reforms undertaken by either regime were designed to eliminate external control over the economy, and such reforms did have repercussions for the leaders in terms of external challenges from foreign powers. In the case of Cuba, this resulted in a realignment of previous foreign relations and the provision of military and economic aid for the regime from the USSR. Such aid allowed for the survival of the regime, though it later proved problematic with the fall of the Soviet Union.

Critical comment should be made as to why, and how, such policies were successful (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**.*

*Candidates should refer to the policies of the leader **in power as this is not a rise to power question**.*

**18. Analyse *either* the changing status of women *or* the treatment of religious groups in *two* authoritarian or single-party states, each chosen from a different region.**

For the changing status of women, an appropriate starting point could be to indicate their status prior to the establishment of the chosen authoritarian or single-party states. Areas for consideration of the status of women during the new regime could include factors such as: suffrage; educational and employment opportunities; attitude to traditional roles of the woman within the family structure; policies to promote or restrict births; legal rights (marriage/divorce, property and inheritance, for example).

The invitation to **analyse** offers the opportunity to critically comment on the reasons for the adoption of specific measures of the authoritarian or single-party states and whether the objectives of specific policies were realized.

For the treatment of religious groups (in the plural, so more than one should be examined), candidates should identify specific groups and consider why and how the authoritarian or single-party state considered it necessary to control, or collaborate, with such groups. In some cases the beliefs of religious groups could be seen to be antithetical to the ideology of the selected states, and any institution which promoted such religious beliefs was seen as potentially a barrier or source of opposition to the establishment of an effective single-party or totalitarian state. In other cases religious groups were demonized in an attempt to distract the attention of the population and offer scapegoats for past or present ills.

*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. With reference to *one* African or Asian independence movement after 1945, assess the internal *and* external factors that led to its success.**

**For “internal factors”** candidates could consider areas such as: the emergence of political parties and/or movements and/or (charismatic) leaders that were able to mobilize the colonial population; the use of force or non-violent methods, for example non-cooperation, to undermine the colonial regime; the existence of policies, economic and/or political, implemented by the metropolitan power that were regarded as discriminatory or unjust *etc.*

**For “external factors”** candidates could consider areas such as: the impact of the Second World War, which weakened the economic and military resources – and in some cases the resolve – of the metropolitan power and prevented it from asserting its power over indigenous nationalist movements; the weakening of the myth of military, racial and cultural superiority of metropolitan powers that were unable to defend their colonies against aggression; external support from neighbouring states for colonial nationalist movements (economic/military); the role of the UN with its emphasis upon decolonization; the role of the superpowers that supported independence movements often for their own geopolitical interests as well as for ideological reasons; the failure of colonial powers to honour the principles of democracy and self-determination that were stated goals in the struggle against the Axis powers *etc.*

*Please note that China cannot be considered a valid example for this 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.***

20. “The gaining of independence from Soviet control in Central and Eastern Europe after 1968 was the result of the strength of opposition movements.” With reference to *two* newly independent states, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Soviet control over the satellite states of Central and Eastern Europe before 1968 was based either on the presence of Red Army troops, the existence of leaders in these states who were loyal to Moscow or the use of force by Soviet troops and/or Warsaw Pact allies to crush resistance or opposition movements, as in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956) or Czechoslovakia (1968). The basis of control was essentially that of force and/or intimidation, rather than widespread support for the USSR. After 1968 however, movements arose in the Central and Eastern European states that were often a result not just of the rejection of socialism (Moscow style) but a reaction to declining living and working standards. Candidates should identify such movements and their leaders and provide detail as to the growth and impact of these movements in opposing the regimes. No doubt organizations such as Solidarity in Poland from 1980 onwards will be selected – an organization that began as a workers’ movement and developed into a political party. Similarly some candidates could refer to Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia, founded in 1977 to criticize the Czech regime’s failure to honour human rights agreements that had been agreed following the Helsinki Agreement of 1975. While numbers in the latter organization remained small, its influence was significant both in the state and in other satellite states where their example and suffering (imprisonment, discrimination in housing/education *etc.*) produced both admiration and emulation.

Whichever states are selected, consideration of the nature and extent of the opposition is required, as well as examination of reasons why Moscow or leaders of the regimes in the specific states did not apply military pressure, as had previously been the case. The failure of Moscow to apply the Brezhnev Doctrine (1968) and the changed status of the USSR, with the coming to power of Gorbachev in 1985 with his “Sinatra Doctrine” and declared intention not to interfere with developments in satellite states, could be considered as major contributions to the gaining of independence of the states.

*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. Compare and contrast the methods used in the struggle for independence in the Gold Coast (Ghana) and Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).**

The most obvious contrast between the two independence struggles relates to the use of force to attain the goal of freedom. While the struggle for independence in the Gold Coast (Ghana) was not entirely free from the use of force (for example, the Accra riots of disillusioned ex-servicemen after the Second World War), for the most part the movement led by Nkrumah and the Convention People's Party was not one of violence. The "Positive Action" campaigns which consisted of strikes and boycotts were reminiscent of the types of methods used in India by Gandhi, and Nkrumah, though jailed upon charges of sedition by the colonial government, was able to contest elections in 1951. His success in the elections led to his release and invitation to form a new government. Following more elections in 1954 and 1956, Britain handed over power to an independent Ghana in 1957.

In Rhodesia independence was a two-stage process; the first independence movement was the seizure of power and declaration of independence by Ian Smith and his Rhodesian Front that opposed the African independence movements. The second part of the independence struggle was the fight against Smith's racially-based government. In Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), the struggle was characterized by a bruising conflict (the Chimurenga) that involved the guerrilla forces of Robert Mugabe (ZANU; Zimbabwe African National Union) and Joshua Nkomo (ZAPU; the Zimbabwe African People's Union). The military wings of both movements, which united on a fragile basis in 1976 to form the Patriotic Front, waged war against the White minority regime. An estimated 27,500 died in the conflict, with over 750,000 being displaced. From bases in Mozambique as well as inside Rhodesia itself, the guerrilla campaign was able to force Smith's government to the negotiating table in London, where Britain brokered the Lancaster House Agreement resulting in independence and Black majority rule.

Other contrasts may include the fact that in Ghana, independence was obtained legally by the Ghanaian population from the British colonial administration which supported the movement. In Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) independence was the result of a coup by the white population which declared an independent state. The African population obtained independence as a result of an armed struggle against the non-African government not the British colonial authorities.

Comparisons may include: in both cases the British government had decided to grant independence to these states as it had to others. In the case of Rhodesia, the process was subverted by the seizure of power by the Smith government. In both cases the struggle for African independence was led by charismatic, western-educated individuals who organized effective campaigns to support their cause.

*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. In what ways, and with what success, did Nkrumah deal with the challenges faced by the newly independent state of Ghana?

Nkrumah was leader of independent Ghana from 1946 until the military coup that overthrew him in 1966. Upon independence, the Gold Coast/Ghana inherited a relatively healthy Treasury surplus, but the economy of the state was based largely upon the production and export of cocoa, making it dependent upon the vagaries of international commodity prices. The narrow base of the economy, which had been developed originally as part of an imperial trading system, became apparent when prices for cocoa fell by approximately 75 per cent between 1955 and 1965. Loss of income from exports produced major economic problems that were exacerbated by Nkrumah's spending on infrastructural developments and prestige projects, which in turn placed an enormous financial burden on the state (for example, the Volta River dam and projects such as the motorway construction between Tema and Accra, or the Black Star shipping line). In his attempt to promote industrialization, massive borrowing of foreign capital coincided with the slump in cocoa prices to produce huge debts. While he tried to diversify the economic base of the state by investing in the extraction of gold and bauxite, the belief that this could be done on the basis of cocoa proved erroneous.

Apart from the economic challenges noted above, Nkrumah also faced problems of tribalism (Asante opposition to his increasingly dictatorial rule) and regional separatism (Togoland Congress). His introduction of the Preventive Detention Act (1958) which allowed for the arresting and imprisonment of opponents for five years without trial and his assumption of the title *Osagyefo* (*he who is successful in war*) marked the erosion of democratic government and the establishment of personal dictatorship and a cult of personality. It was the military, which claimed it intended to return the country to democracy, that was responsible for the removal of Nkrumah in 1966.

*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. How successful were the methods used to deal with the political challenges faced by *one* Central and Eastern European *or* Balkan state after it achieved independence?**

The achievement of independence by these states marked not only a period of political freedom from domination but the need for each new nation to deal with a variety of political problems in order to ensure the stability of the nation.

The political challenges that new nations faced may include: the existence of disaffected religious or ethnic minorities in the state; difficulties of establishing new political structures and systems acceptable to the population; the influence of members of the previous regime; difficult or hostile relations with neighbouring states; lack of experience by the leaders and the populace in administering an independent state; developing a sense of nationalism and loyalty to the new state amongst the populace.

Candidates must assess how well the new state was able to deal with the problems that it experienced.

Some of the ways that their success may be measured may include: their ability (or otherwise) to maintain internal unity, establish an effective government, develop a national consciousness and defend themselves against external pressures. In addition the success of their methods in suppressing the influence of the previous regime or groups associated with it should be assessed. The methods used may involve: propaganda and education to explain and promote the working of the new state and its government; armed force; the return of previously ousted leaders to provide experience, inspiration and knowledge; establishment of laws to prohibit the activities of the previous regime or other disruptive groups; seeking assistance of other friendly states to provide assistance in transforming the state.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, the list 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. Assess the importance of the leadership of *either* Gandhi in the organization of resistance to colonial control *or* Walesa in the organization of resistance to Soviet control.

Whichever leader is selected the invitation to “assess the importance” requires candidates to identify the **nature and extent** of the contribution of the leader in the struggle against colonial or Soviet control.

**Gandhi** was responsible for the transformation of the INC (Indian National Congress) from its origins as a fairly elitist organization into a mass movement committed to freedom for India. Candidates could examine the methods used to effect this transformation in terms of popular participation in the anti-colonial movement: the identification of issues which were appealing to the population (economic exploitation by the metropolitan power and the emphasis on the production of indigenous goods by Gandhi); the failure of Britain to honour pledges regarding the pace of political change in India; the repugnance at British attempts to exploit Hindu and Muslim communities by tactics designed to divide and rule (communal electorates); the outcry against the use of force, for example in Amritsar, *etc.* Candidates could also identify the tactics associated with Gandhi that were used to apply pressure against the colonial regime, such as economic boycott, passive resistance, civil disobedience *etc.*, and comment on the extent to which these were important in undermining British authority in India as well as internationally due to world media attention. Not all tactics were carried out in the Gandhian spirit of non-violence, and not all of Gandhi’s policies proved beneficial for the independence of a united India (for example, the Quit India Movement of 1942, which was exploited by the growing forces of Muslim separatism to push for Pakistan).

**Walesa**, an electrician in the Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk, achieved prominence with his involvement in the strike movement of 1980. This movement, which spread from Gdansk, witnessed Walesa’s successful organization of the Interfactory Strike Committee which developed into Solidarity. Walesa became chairman of Solidarity’s National Coordination Committee, which organized the expansion of the movement across the country. Beginning as a free trade union, it was given official acceptance as long as it did not adopt any programme that could be seen as “playing the role of a political party”. The programme issued by Solidarity in February 1981 was seen by the regime as overtly political with its references to the need for “civil democracy”, an end to censorship, the establishment of “authentic workers”, self-government and “a complete renewal of the country”. Walesa played an important role in exposing the weakness of the socialist system in Eastern Europe and inspiring international support and sympathy for the plight of ordinary people in Poland and Eastern Europe. This was an important propaganda defeat for the USSR at the time of the renewal of the Cold War under Reagan.

The rapid growth of Solidarity (10 million members by 1981) and the fear that it was planning a general strike to bring down the regime led to the imposition of martial law (1981) by General Jaruzelski, who declared Solidarity illegal and imprisoned its leaders. Walesa himself was detained for almost a year. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1983, but up till 1988 he played a fairly minor part in organising challenges to the Jaruzelski regime.

Economic decline, the deterioration of living standards seen especially with the rise in food prices, the coming to power of Gorbachev , whose more “liberal reforms” were welcomed in much of the Soviet Bloc, combined to produce strikes and demonstrations in Poland. The “unbanning” of Solidarity by Jaruzelski and announcements of elections in 1989 brought Walesa back into prominence. Walesa played an important role in negotiating the government’s decision to legalize Solidarity as a political party in 1989. The election of Mazowiecki as prime minister was a triumph for Solidarity. It should be recognized that Walesa’s ability to play a role after 1988 was dependent on outside forces and that his efforts to resist Soviet control would have been limited without the changes taking place in the USSR and the rest of the Soviet bloc.

*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 conferences of 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam marked both the high point and the breaking point of the wartime alliance of East and West.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

At **Yalta** (February 1945), with the defeat of Germany imminent, Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill reached agreement on: the establishment of a successor to the League of Nations (the United Nations Organization); the temporary division of a defeated Germany (and Austria) into zones of occupation, with similar arrangements for sectors in Berlin and Vienna (the intention being to demilitarize, denazify, disarm and democratize a defeated Germany); reparation arrangements that would entitle the Soviet Union to half of a sum set at \$20 billion; the Declaration on Liberated Europe, which was intended to provide for free elections in the states of Central and Eastern Europe that had been freed from Nazi occupation; the formation of a Polish government, which would consist of “London” and “Lublin” Poles; and the entry of the USSR into the war against Japan after Germany’s surrender, in exchange for the South Sakhalin and Kurile Islands.

At **Potsdam** (July–August 1945) circumstances had changed. The death of Roosevelt (April) and his replacement by Truman, Germany’s defeat (May), the defeat of Churchill in a general election in Britain and his replacement by Attlee and the news of a successful atomic bomb test formed the background for a less harmonious meeting. Issues arising (and producing grounds for potential conflict) at Potsdam included: further discussion over details concerning reparations to be extracted from Germany (including the agreement that the USSR would receive 25 per cent of the reparations from the western zones in exchange for providing food supplies to the western zones); Western disquiet over Soviet policies in Poland (border changes and the failure to carry out democratic elections); the increasing Sovietization of Central and Eastern European states, which was felt by Truman to be a breach of the Declaration on Liberated Europe agreement made at Yalta; the revelation that atomic tests had been successful followed by the dropping of two bombs on Japan in August, less than a week after the conclusion of the conference.

Candidates could examine the extent to which the terms **“high point”** and **“breaking point”** are accurate descriptions of the relationship at these two conferences and may argue that the **“breaking point”** came later and so suggest that this was a description more appropriately applied to the aftermath of the event such as the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Blockade, the division of Germany 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**.*

26. **In what ways, and with what success, did the US attempt to prevent the global spread of Soviet influence between 1945 and 1962?**

The period extends from the end of the Second World War up to the Cuban Missile Crisis – but the Missile Crisis should not be the only focus for responses. The perception of the Soviet

Union as an expansionist power (partly driven by ideology) galvanized the US to adopt a series of measures to halt what was seen as the creeping advance of Communism, at first in Central and Eastern Europe and the Balkans/Eastern Mediterranean and, by 1949, also in SE and East Asia. Moscow's involvement in the Western hemisphere (Cuba) by 1960 was regarded as confirmation of the need to enforce the policy of containment first enunciated by Truman in 1947 and given teeth by the measures indicated in the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, which were meant to hold back the tide of territorial acquisition.

The question states “global spread” and candidates would be expected to discuss events in more than one region (*eg* in Europe, the Middle East, Asia, the Americas, Africa)

The “ways” as noted above could be seen in military involvement and financial assistance provided to governments or regimes that were considered to be under threat from the expansion of monolithic Communism. Examples of this could be: Greece; Turkey; the efforts taken to preserve the Western presence in Berlin in 1948–1949; the establishment of NATO as the “shield of the West” and the efforts expended to support France in Indo-China (until 1954) and defend the Republic of Korea after its invasion by North Korean forces in 1950. The “loss” of China to Communism in 1949, which followed the “loss” of Czechoslovakia in 1948, indicated that the policy of containment had not always been successful, and it was in this light that containment evolved from a European to a more global policy. The events in Cuba during 1959–1962 (the fall of Batista, rise of Castro, deteriorating relations with Castro's government because of what were perceived as anti-American economic policies, the Bay of Pigs episode in 1961 and the Missile Crisis itself in 1962), illustrate the extent to which the US committed itself to preventing what was interpreted as Soviet inspired and sponsored aggressive expansionism.

In some cases the policy to halt the spread was successful, in others less so. Candidates should identify and comment on these cases and why 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.***

**27. Examine the social and economic impact of the Cold War on two states (excluding the US and the USSR) each drawn from a different region.**

Candidates are required to focus specifically on two countries. Both may be selected from the Eastern or Western Bloc, or one from either.

For **social impact**, candidates could consider areas such as: education; the impact on religion; censorship of the arts and (limited) access to information; propaganda and indoctrination designed to demonize the “enemy”; the extent to which living standards were affected in terms of housing; health provision and welfare programmes for the population; how the role of women may have been affected in the states concerned.

For **economic impact**, candidates could examine: the ways in which adherence to a particular bloc determined the nature of development, for example whether private ownership or public ownership predominated (and with what effect); the types of industrial/agrarian policies adopted and the advantages or disadvantages associated with the choices made; the availability of consumer goods – whether the state was able to produce surpluses for the population, or whether shortages

resulted as a consequence of the inability to maintain defence production and consumer production concurrently; employment opportunities *etc.*

Candidates may not always draw a clear distinction between “economic” and “social” and, in some instances, where economic issues have an impact on social issues, for example, this is quite understandable. The political or diplomatic impact of the Cold War, however, is unlikely to be relevant.

*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. Assess the significance of events in *either* Korea (1950–1953) or the Congo (1960–1964) on the development of the Cold War.**

A narrative of the war in Korea or the conflicts following the independence of the Congo is not necessary. Candidates are asked to examine the events in either case in the wider context of the development of the Cold War conflict.

**Korea** was described by Truman as “the Greece of the Far East”. The invasion of the south by North Korean forces was interpreted as a Moscow sponsored move. Given the “loss” of China in 1949, the Korean War was seen by Washington as an opportunity to geographically expand the policy of containment. The conflict, which started as a civil war, became a proxy war with the involvement of the US/UN (essentially, though not exclusively, the Western allies) on the side of Rhee’s Republic of Korea and the support of Moscow and the People’s Republic of China for the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. The three-year conflict ended with both sides claiming victory – South Korea had been “saved” from the “communist monolith” and North Korea had been “rescued” from the forces of Western imperialism.

Both Japan and West Germany emerged from the period of the Korean War as firm allies of the US. Japan had benefitted economically from the war and the role of West Germany as a key ally in Western Europe had been consolidated. The war also prompted the formation of the South East Treaty Organisation (SEATO). For China, its military involvement boosted its confidence as it claimed to have stood up to the US and demonstrated that the nuclear supremacy of the US was nothing more than a “paper tiger”. The war did have a negative effect on Sino-Soviet relations, however, with Mao lamenting that he had been given the task of “pulling Stalin’s chestnuts out of the fire”. This led the way to worsening relations on the death of Stalin in March, 1953. The war did allow China to portray itself as a state committed to the defence of developing countries against capitalist aggression and this was to be projected to influence other “Third World” countries in the future. The role of the UN, within the context of the Cold War, was also affected by the Korean War. The absence of the USSR in the Security Council for some crucial months in 1950 allowed for the rapid passing of the Uniting for Peace resolution that both highlighted and (partly) resolved the deadlock in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) given that both the US and USSR had vetoing rights. The USSR viewed UN intervention in the Korean War as a demonstration of partiality in international affairs, although candidates may mention that this was alleviated by the number of newly independent countries who joined the UN in the wake of de-colonisation.

**The Belgian Congo** achieved independence in 1960. The rapidity with which Brussels decolonized was based on the belief that the newly independent state would still need to rely upon Belgium for support given the lack of experience of Congolese politicians and administrators. The desired neo-colonial relationship based on dependency did not happen as Brussels hoped. Congolese political parties/movements based on regional and ethnic support emerged – Kasavubu’s Abako party, Tshombe’s Conakat, Lumumba’s MNC (Congolese National Movement) and the resulting coalition government failed to promote stability. Military mutinies and the secession of the mineral rich province of Katanga under Tshombe, supported by the Belgian mining corporation Union Miniere, led to appeals by Kasavubu (president) and Lumumba (prime minister) for UN intervention to prevent the total collapse of the new state. UN Secretary General Hammerskjöld agreed to provide a UN force (United Nations Operation in the Congo; ONUC) to help resolve the crisis.

Superpower involvement took the form of Soviet claims that the UN was working under US influence, and that the UN itself was guilty of being an agent of Western imperialism due to its reluctance to act against the secessionist government of Tshombe. For Moscow, the Congo crisis offered an opportunity to attack the UN, which it believed was a tool of Washington. When Lumumba, angered that the UN would not countenance action to end Katanga’s secession (since it was an internal matter and therefore beyond the mandate of the UN) appealed for Soviet aid, Kasavubu sacked him. The United States, worried by Lumumba’s socialist leanings, supported the move. In September 1960 a military takeover led by Mobutu Sese Seko occurred, backed by Washington. Soviet personnel were expelled from the Congo and Lumumba was arrested and assassinated by Tshombe with the alleged help of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The problems of the Congo continued until late 1964/1965 when Mobutu declared himself president.

The events in the Congo allowed Moscow to portray the UN as a partisan organization and to appeal to the newly-emerging decolonized states as the friend and defender of such states against Western imperialism – to establish its revolutionary credentials in the “Third World”. For the US, the Congo represented an attempt to halt the possible spread of socialism (via Lumumba and Soviet involvement) as well as to safeguard the valuable resources of the Congo for the West.

*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. Examine the changing nature of US-Chinese relations between 1949 and 1972.**

The “loss” of China with the coming to power of Mao and the establishment of the People’s Republic in 1949 was regarded (erroneously) by Washington as part of a Moscow-sponsored attempt to spread world revolution after Communism had been contained in the European theatre. Previous US support for the Nationalists in China during the civil war had failed to promote victory for Chiang Kai-shek (Jiang Jieshi). The US refused to recognize the legitimacy of Mao’s government, continuing to recognize Chiang and his government of the Republic of China (Taiwan) as the legal representatives of the Chinese people – and opposing the right of the People’s Republic to take China’s seat in the UN Security Council until 1971.

Relations between the powers continued to deteriorate following China’s invasion of Tibet (1950), China’s entry into the Korean War in support of North Korea (1950–1953) and the US commitment



to defend Taiwan from any attempt by Mao to “recover”, the territory which led to tension in 1954 and 1958. For Washington, the People’s Republic throughout much of the 1950s and 1960s, was seen as a threat to its containment policy and US attempts to prevent the “domino theory” (enunciated 1954) from becoming a reality. Hence the US became actively involved in building defence mechanisms such as SEATO to hem in perceived Chinese expansionist tendencies.

Distractions caused by internal problems (failure of the Great Leap Forward, the attempt by Mao to regain authority via the Cultural Revolution) did however lessen China’s attempts to pursue any forceful foreign policy measures in the 1960s. Combined with Washington’s needs to reduce its presence in, and commitment to, South Vietnam by the later 1960s – as well as Washington’s attempt to pressure Moscow into entering into détente by improving its stance towards China – rapprochement with China was undertaken. For China, whose relations with Moscow had worsened since the death of Stalin (Sino–Soviet dispute), the prospect of a better relationship with the US was attractive.

In 1969 the US economic embargo with China was relaxed, the US Seventh Fleet activity in the straits of Taiwan ceased and secret talks between the US and Mao’s regime took place resulting in President Nixon’s visit to Beijing and, at least on the surface, a more harmonious relationship between the two based on mutual interests.

*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. Evaluate the role of internal problems in the break-up of the Soviet Union.

The focus is on the identification of domestic factors that led to the fall of the Soviet state. “Evaluate” does permit candidates, however, to consider other factors (external developments, for example) which also contributed significantly to the break-up.

For “**internal problems**”, candidates could consider the economic condition of the USSR in relation to the existence of a creaking centralized or command economy, which proved unable to meet both the demands of Soviet consumers as well as achieving nuclear parity with the US. It would be quite relevant for candidates to trace internal problems back as far as the Brezhnev era (1964–1982) that saw some improvements in living and working conditions but also witnessed the stagnation of the economy. Social problems such as alcoholism, falling life expectancy and increasing rates of divorce illustrated a society badly in need of reform and modernization.

These problems of a stagnating economy and social malaise, (that remained unresolved during the brief tenures of Andropov and Chernenko) as well as a lack of encouragement of any political or economic initiative in the regions for fear that it would result in loss of centralized control, were inherited by Gorbachev (1985) alongside a draining Afghan War (1979–1989). The war absorbed funds and produced popular discontent in the USSR due to military casualty rates, as well as disgruntlement amongst Muslims in the southern republics. Candidates could consider the role of Gorbachev – his declared aims and specific policies for tackling the economic and social problems and the extent to which glasnost and perestroika catalysed the collapse of the single-party system (with accurate detail concerning how and why).

The significance of the forces of minority nationalism inside the USSR (particularly evident later in the Baltic states, Armenia, Azerbaijan, for example), the impact of a foreign policy requiring major expenditure, which proved taxing for the USSR, and the weakening of control over the satellite states of Eastern and Central Europe (acting as both a symptom and a cause of Moscow’s declining power) could also be examined.

The attempted coup of August 1991 by those seeking to turn back the clock and restore Soviet power after a period of liberalization was a failure, but marked the dissolution of the Soviet state as the individual republics of the (former) Soviet Union broke free.

*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**.*

---