



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2014**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

30 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>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.
<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>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>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>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>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>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>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.

*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 *one* Allied power *and one* Central Power, examine the reasons for their involvement in the First World War in 1914.

*Note – candidates who choose Italy or the US as an Allied power cannot receive credit since these powers did not enter the war in 1914. Similarly, Bulgaria did not officially declare itself at war until October 1915.*

For **Allied** powers the most popular choices are likely to be Imperial Russia, Britain (and by association its empire), France (and by association its empire). Some candidates may choose Belgium or Serbia as legitimate examples – or even Japan, which declared war in August 1914. Whichever is chosen the task is to examine the motives, overt and covert, of the selected state.

For **Central Powers** candidates may choose Imperial Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Empire or the Ottoman Empire.

Many candidates will respond to the task by addressing each country separately but a thematic approach is also possible – for example by identifying themes such as economic rivalry, territorial ambitions, the pursuit of nationalist goals, the attempt to prevent movements for self-determination that threatened the integrity of the state, arms races, the pursuit of a war of distraction from domestic problems, attempts to honour alliance or treaty obligations, to defend borders against invasion – or to defend perceived national interests then and for the future.

Some candidates may note that the justifications provided by the participants were often pretexts to disguise ulterior motives regarding their strategic needs *etc.* Whichever approach is chosen, candidates need to examine the factors that led states to enter the conflict in 1914 and make critical comment upon such 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.***

2. **Examine the reasons for, and significance of, foreign intervention in *two* 20th century civil wars, each chosen from a different region.**

Popular choices are likely to be the Russian Civil War (1917/18–1921), the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) and the Chinese Civil War (1927–1949 or 1946–1949 depending on the candidate’s interpretation). Accept the war in Korea (1950–1953) or the Second Indo–Chinese War (later 1950s–1975) as legitimate examples – or other civil wars such as the Nigerian or Greek Civil War (1967–1970 and approximately 1946–1949 respectively). The conflict in Nicaragua (1979 – 1982) would also be an appropriate example.

The treatment of the task could be to address each war separately or some candidates may choose to adopt a thematic approach – for example examining motives linked to economic, diplomatic, strategic, ideological aims that could be realized by the intervening power by supporting one particular side in the civil war. Whichever approach is taken, candidates are required to comment critically on the reasons for the decision to intervene in the fratricidal conflict.

For significance, candidates could estimate the extent to which such intervention proved responsible for extending the duration of the war, causing human and material damage to the country and contributing to the outcome of the conflict. In some cases such involvement did prove decisive – in others, not – despite the provision of military personnel and materiel. Significance could also refer to the importance of such intervention for international relations at the time or for the future (alterations in the balance of power and a legacy of insecurity or ideological mistrust that influenced the subsequent policies and perceptions of the chosen 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.***

3. **Compare and contrast the impact of naval and air power in *two* 20th century wars before 1945 or *two* 20th century wars after 1945.**

“**Naval power**” can include consideration of surface and submarine vessels and the contribution they made in the chosen conflicts. The impact could be addressed by reference to the role played by: warships in terms of naval battles or in protecting coastlines or supply routes; cargo vessels/merchant navy vessels used to supply personnel and military materiel to theatres of war; aircraft carriers or modified vessels which permitted their use for aircraft launches; the significance of naval blockade upon the economies of enemy states; amphibious assaults that were enabled by landing craft *etc.*

“**Air power**” can include the use of aircraft as reconnaissance, fighter, bomber, missile carrier or transport planes (for supplies and troop carrying). Accept also coverage of the use of rocketry or missiles in this category.

Having identified the elements of naval and air power candidates are required to indicate the similarities and differences in the impact of such military power. In some cases it may be argued that the impact of such power proved decisive in determining the outcome of the conflict – in other cases it may be argued that neither was significant in ensuring victory. Whichever wars are selected, candidates should provide specific detail of the naval and air power impact upon the conflict. Answers may also consider the co-ordination of air and naval 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.***

**4. Examine the successes and failures of collective security in the 10 years after *either* the First World War *or* the Second World War.**

The 10-year period after the First World War is taken to mean up to 1929 and for the Second World War up to 1955. Candidates are likely to focus on the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization but they could also deal with Locarno (1925) for the post-First World War period and NATO (1949) for the post-Second World War period. The Warsaw Pact may be mentioned (1955) but given the end date of the task for the post-Second World War, there is a fairly limited opportunity to develop this.

*For collective security following the First World War please note that the crises in Manchuria and Abyssinia are not relevant and cannot be credited.* Candidates are required to identify when and where crises were tackled – and why the outcome was either a success or failure. For the League, popular areas for investigation are likely to be the Aaland Islands dispute (1920); the Vilna dispute (1920); the settlement of the issue of Upper Silesia (1921); the Corfu Crisis (1923); the Greek–Bulgarian clash (1925).

Factors that explain the degree of success or failure attained may include: reference to the structure and Covenant provisions of the League; the willingness of states to accept League arbitration or in some cases weakness of aggrieved states to challenge League involvement; the predominance of national self-interest amongst leading League members; the growth of revisionist feelings following the peace settlements in Paris; the growth of aggressive and expansionist powers *etc.*

For collective security following the Second World War areas for consideration are likely to be: the involvement of the UN in Palestine and the subsequent Arab-Israeli conflict; the Indian subcontinent and the problem of Kashmir, in particular; the war in Korea. The structure and provisions of the Charter could be discussed as well as the impact of Cold War rivalry in terms of the (in)effective functioning of the organization.

*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. Evaluate the importance of religion *and* economic factors as causes of *either* the Indo-Pakistan wars (1947–1949; 1965; 1971) *or* the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970).**

The Indo–Pakistan wars of 1947–1949, 1965 and 1971, while consisting of three separate conflicts, do have common themes regarding the origins of the wars as well as issues specific to each war. The focus should be on religious and economic factors in relation to the wars, though other factors such as the desire to acquire (or in India’s case retain) territory (Kashmir) and the pursuit of regional hegemony by 1971, for example, may be examined.

The hasty partition of the subcontinent in 1947 left a legacy of hostility. The two successor states engaged in disputes over the economic division of the assets – economic and military – of British controlled India. The bulk of the subcontinent’s industrial infrastructure remained in India leaving the new Pakistani state heavily reliant on primary production and an inability to develop its economy as well as cope with the massive problems associated with refugee displacement. In particular the issue of control of the headwaters of the Indus was important for both new nations.

Control of Kashmir was seen as crucial for both states because of its commanding position in relation to the Indus. Kashmir was also seen as important for India because its secession could encourage other regions of the newly-independent state to pursue separatist policies. For Pakistan, the inclusion of Kashmir (the “K” in Pakistan) was a matter of national pride as well as an economic necessity. Religion was used by propagandists, especially in Pakistan, to bolster their claims to the territory (the majority was Muslim though the Maharajah who agreed to accession to India was Hindu). Despite its being a secular state, accusations of Indian attempts to establish a Hindu Raj, which had partly led to the partition in the first place, continued to be uttered even after the establishment of Pakistan. The issue of Kashmir also acted as a form of “negative cohesion” for both states whose governments could use it as a means of establishing a sense of unity in the new states.

The first war (1947–1949) witnessed the invasion of Kashmir by Pathan militants and eventually, after ceasefire, the existence of two Kashmirs – Pakistan controlling the smaller “Azad Kashmir”. Despite both sides agreeing to a plebiscite to determine the wishes of the people of Kashmir the Indian leader Nehru failed to honour this agreement. The second war (1965) was a matter of opportunism in terms of timing (though the Kashmir issue was still the focus) as India was still recovering after a dismal performance in the Sino–Indian clash in 1962. A peace agreement was made in 1966 though the situation remained tense. The third war (1971) was in a sense a matter of opportunism for India this time to take advantage of the breakdown of East–West Pakistani relations. India’s support of East Pakistan’s claims for self-determination was a major contribution to the emergence of Bangladesh, the demographic and economic strength of Pakistan and a sign of India’s growing regional power in South Asia.

Civil war in Nigeria was precipitated by the breakaway of the Eastern Region in 1967 in an attempt to form the independent state of Biafra. The war’s origins lie in the discontent of the Igbo population of the Eastern Region (largely Christian) with the dominance of the largely Muslim populations of the Northern Region (Fulani) and the Western Region (Hausa). The demographics of the Nigerian federation ensured dominance of the politicians from the north and west of the state. An Igbo-led military coup in 1966 led to fears of an Igbo-dominated state and a backlash against the new military leader, General Aguiyi-Ironsi. Subsequent widespread persecution of Igbos living in the Northern Region acted as a catalyst in the declaration of independent Biafra in 1967. In economic terms the Eastern Region was the major source of Nigeria’s oil reserves – the loss of Biafra would not only destroy the political integrity of Nigeria but also deprive the Lagos-based government of General Gowon of vital economic resources.



*Whichever conflict is chosen candidates are required to identify and critically assess the stated factors as contributors to 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.***

**6. Examine the reasons for, and the consequences of, the war between Iran and Iraq (1980–1988).**

**Reasons for.** Candidates could identify a range of factors ranging from: largely unresolved border disputes between the two states (despite the Algiers agreement made with the Shah of Iran in 1975, tensions still remained over control of the Shatt-el-Arab waterway that provided an important outlet for the exporting of oil resources for both states); the attempt by the Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein to establish regional hegemony at a time when the Iranian Revolution temporarily weakened Iran’s capacity to wage an effective war; Iraqi resentment of the new Iranian government under Ayatollah Khomeini and its encouragement of Iraq’s Shiite majority to rise against Saddam Hussein’s regime; the desire of Iraq to seize Khuzestan’s oil resources *etc.*

**Consequences of.** Candidates could examine the physical impact of the conflict on both parties – the effect on oil production, the human costs estimated at approximately 367,000 dead and 700,000 wounded partly as a result of human wave tactics by Iran and the supply of military and financial support *to Iraq* by the US, the USSR, France, the Gulf States, Egypt, Saudi Arabia – and *to Iran* by Algeria, Syria, Libya and South Yemen. In July 1988 a UN ceasefire resolution came into force. Though grudgingly accepted by Iran, Iraq did not officially accept Iranian peace terms till 1990. Though Iraq claimed victory in this war of attrition and Saddam Hussein used it as an opportunity to further promote his cult of personality, both sides had suffered greatly.

Apart from the economic and human losses for both states, (the estimated costs for Iran and Iraq were US\$100 billion and US\$150 billion respectively according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) candidates may also examine the impact on Iraqi foreign policy and expansion for the future. Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait (1990–1991) was arguably an attempt to recoup the losses incurred by the Iran-Iraq War.

The internationalization of the war led to superpower involvement in this economically sensitive area which much of the world relied upon for oil supplies. Egypt’s support for Iraq allowed it to regain some of the prestige it had lost in the Arab world after Sadat’s peace treaty with Israel in 1979.

*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. Examine the reasons for the establishment of democracy in Germany in 1919, and evaluate how effectively it dealt with the economic and political challenges it faced up to 1929.**

To determine why democracy was established, candidates could examine why Field Marshal von Hindenburg and General Ludendorff sponsored the establishment of a democratic system, despite their commitment to the previous authoritarian Kaiserreich – whether this was a genuine attempt to transform Germany or whether this was designed to limit the degree of punishment of Germany in a future peace settlement and absolve the military of responsibility for the possible punitive nature of any such settlement. Mention may also be made of the terms of the armistice as well as the popular support for a more democratic system of government.

Candidates could identify the nature of the economic and political problems that the new Weimar Republic encountered and how it dealt with these. The economic problems associated with reparations repayments, the period of “currency delirium” or hyperinflation as a result of the invasion of the Ruhr in 1923 by French and Belgian forces, the impact of the Great Depression of 1929 compounded by the heavy reliance on US financial support could be considered. Political problems faced in the first decade included early opposition to the democratic government from extremists (Spartacus Rising, Kapp Putsch, Beerhall/November Putsch); the instability produced by weak coalition governments. The unwillingness and/or inability of political parties to work together to form stable governments as well as the existence of political leaders, bureaucrats and vested interests that were not sufficiently committed to the democratic system partly as a result of its association with defeat and a peace settlement, may 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.***

8. “The problems that arose from economic crises were the greatest challenge to democratic government in the first half of the 20th century.” With reference to *two* states, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

*There is no regional requirement but focus needs to be on the period up to and not beyond 1950.*

Economic crises or problems associated with the post-First World War or post-Second World War period could be considered – as could the crises linked with the onset of the Great Depression from 1929 onwards. The nature and extent of the crises upon the selected states could be investigated (unemployment, collapse of export markets, reduced output *etc*) as well as an examination of how such economic crises had an impact upon the political and social structure of the selected states. The question also invites candidates to consider other factors that may have provided challenges to the democratic states chosen. These may include the rise of political extremism in the period – internal or external – that threatened the existence of the democracies or, for example, the constitutions of such states that were ill-equipped to deal with problems such as ineffective coalition governments or the lack of commitment to the democratic system by leading political figures or parties. In some cases democracy was a victim of vested interests that sought by force (civil war) to halt political, social and economic reforms that were opposed to the beliefs of traditional institutions (church, monarchy *etc*).

Popular choices could be Weimar Germany, Italy, the US, Spain and the situation of western liberal democracies in the early years of the Cold 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.***

9. Evaluate the reasons for, and methods used in, the post-war reconstruction of Japan between 1945 and 1952.

**Reasons for** could refer to the desire of the occupying forces under General MacArthur and by 1951, General Ridgeway, to render impossible the re-emergence of Japanese militarism by firstly eliminating what were seen as the causes of such militarism: the limiting of the armed forces, the holding of war crimes trials and executions, the purging of the civil service of those identified with Japanese aggression; the dissolution of the zaibatsu (industrial combines implicated in the growth of an expansionist “Japanism” in the 1930s and 1940s). Reconstruction was hastened in 1947–1948 as Cold War tensions and the fear of Japan succumbing to communism. The “loss” of China in 1949 and the Korean War (1950–1953) acted as catalysts for economic and military reconstruction policies that in a sense reversed the initial policies of the occupation that ended with the San Francisco Peace Treaty and Japan–US Security Treaty of 1951–1952.

**Methods used** could refer to: the Anti-Monopoly Law of 1947 designed to eliminate the zaibatsu; the revival of pre-war political parties; the passing of legislation to legalise trade union activity (1945); the Labour Standards Law (1947), which mandated working hours, equal pay for males and females, annual holiday entitlement for workers; the imposition of a constitution establishing a bicameral system of government based on universal suffrage; the setting up of a Supreme Court; guarantees of freedom of speech, religion and assembly; land reform, which broke the power of absentee landlords and benefited tenant farmers; educational reforms, which expanded primary and secondary education as well as providing tertiary level opportunities.

Policies of demobilization and disarmament as well as economic changes in the early part of the occupation were reversed in the light of the tensions generated by the Cold War. Limitations on the military were dropped as the US encouraged the formation of a maritime Safety Force (1948), which was essentially a navy; a National Police Reserve (1950), which by 1952 became a Self-Defence Force, designed also to protect Japan from the spread of communism in East Asia.

*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. Examine the extent to which South Africa was successful in addressing the political, social and economic challenges it faced between 1991 and 2000.**

Candidates should clearly identify the nature and extent of the challenges that faced the newly democratic South Africa upon its emergence from racially-based minority rule.

**Political challenges** could be examined with reference to the attempts by Mandela and de Klerk to negotiate a new constitutional arrangement to end Apartheid and institute a multiparty state. This took place in the face of fierce opposition by some Afrikaners who resisted the end of a system that had been formally instituted in 1948 and that had benefited them materially, as well as hostility from the Inkatha movement of Chief Buthelezi, which was engaged in an armed struggle with the ANC (African National Congress) in Kwa-Zulu Natal. The emergence by 1993, of a power sharing agreement that satisfied the Inkatha, could be considered. The existence of extremist groups such as Eugene Terre'Blanche's AWB (Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging), with its calls for an independent Boerevolkstaat, threatened to undermine a peaceful transition to democratic rule. Armed resistance to the transition to majority rule was met partly by force but also by a policy of forgiveness as practised by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission which was set up as a way to express past and present grievances and to promote progress in South Africa.

**Social and economic challenges** may include areas such as: income disparity; inequitable land distribution; the need for improvement in facilities for health care, education, housing, running water, employment *etc.* High expectations in terms of improvements in the standard of living proved difficult to realise. Under Mandela (president 1994–1999) and his successor Mbeki, attempts to tackle social and economic problems by policies of affirmative action in the civil service, universities and state controlled industries produced an outflow of whites not only from managerial positions but from the country itself. In some cases where training and experience was not complete, there was some disruption with the smooth running of institutions. Talk of establishing a socialist style economy diminished as it became increasingly obvious that in order to deal with the demands for improvements in living and employment conditions, foreign investment was needed. Privatization of previously state controlled industries and a focus on exports as well as financial inducements to attract foreign investment were emphasized. One particular area for concern during the period was the spread of AIDS in the country – a spread which Mbeki did little to combat in terms of funding for treatment and education.

By 1999 South Africa witnessed worker unrest as noted in strikes organized by COSATU (Congress of South African Trade Unions) in response to lowered wages. Failure to deliver in terms of the provision of an improved standard of living for the majority led to dissatisfaction and an increase in crime.

*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. Examine the methods used, and the level of success achieved, by two 20th century democratic states in their efforts to address gender inequality.**

The nature of gender inequalities could be identified for the selected states. This could include reference to: suffrage; employment opportunities; equal pay; educational provision; contraception; abortion *etc.* Having identified the issues candidates are required to examine how such issues were dealt with by the state in order to reduce or eliminate discrimination and gender inequality and whether the measures adopted (specific measures of legislation) were able to remedy, with any degree of success, the problems faced by women.

*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. Examine the methods used, and the level of success achieved, by one civil rights movement in a 20th century democratic state.**

Popular choices may include: the civil rights movements in the US to deal with the plight of African Americans, Native Americans or Hispanic Americans; movements to promote the rights of indigenous peoples in Australia, New Zealand or Canada; movements to address inequalities between Catholic and Protestant communities in Northern Ireland. Other possible examples could be selected from democratic states such as India where the struggle for civil rights by the Scheduled Castes provides a legitimate example for investigation. Discontent over religious, ethnic, racial issues and the attempt to redress inequalities or discriminatory treatment should form the basis for investigation.

Whichever movement is selected, candidates need to make critical comment upon the methods used by the movement (use of propaganda, passive resistance, force, recourse to judicial proceedings *etc.*) and also make a judgement as to how successful the movement was in relation to attaining its goals to gain civil rights.

*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. Examine the importance of each of the following in the rise to power of *either Stalin or Hitler*: popular support for their aims; underestimation by opponents; economic conditions.

**“Popular support for their aims”**: candidates are required to identify the specific aims of the selected aspiring leader. Whether these aims were significant in garnering popular support – and why – needs to be addressed and supported by reference to specific evidence of how such support was manifested.

Popular support can, in the case of Stalin, also be taken to mean popular support within the party, since Stalin’s rise occurred in a single-party state where, arguably, mass support was less important. The aims of the selected leader could be considered in relation to economic aims, attempts to address issues of political instability *etc.* In the case of Stalin, the proclaimed aim to continue the legacy of Lenin could be considered.

For Hitler, the aims outlined in *Mein Kampf* may be discussed and the appeal of extreme nationalism in the wake of the First World War. Hitler directed his speeches towards all sections of German society with varying degrees of success.

**“Underestimation by opponents”** requires candidates to identify those individuals, parties, and institutions within the state that were hostile to the aspiring leader and to explain what errors were made by them in building an effective barrier to the rise of the aspiring leader.

For Stalin the succession dispute (already underway even before Lenin’s death) should be well known with reference to the Triumvirate, the lack of effective opposition from Trotsky and his supporters and the failure of party leaders such as Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Tomsky, Rykov *etc* to appreciate the nature and extent of the threat posed.

For Hitler underestimation could be addressed by reference to the lack of a united front by the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) and Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) to counter the rise of the Nazi Party (NSDAP) (and why) as well as the failure of parties such as the German National People’s Party (DNVP) and the Centre Party (Zentrum) to recognise the dangers posed by a regime led by Hitler. The collaboration and underestimation by leading figures such as von Hindenburg and von Papen by 1933 could also be examined.

**“Economic conditions”** requires identification of specific problems faced by the state and the inability of the existing leaders to adequately deal with them. Such problems allowed aspiring leaders to put forward policies and/or promises that were appealing to a party or population that sought security and material benefits.

For Stalin, the mixed reactions to the New Economic Policy (NEP) may be discussed, as well as his proposal for Socialism in One Country.

For Hitler, the impact of high unemployment, the failure of banks and fears of a repetition of the inflationary crisis of 1923, would be relevant. Specific details are required to support 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.***

**14. Compare and contrast the economic and social policies of *two* of the following: Mao; Nasser; Castro.**

For **economic policies** candidates could examine areas such as land reform, policies of industrialization, increasing state control and nationalization of foreign and local businesses, measures taken to promote employment, the promotion of indigenous products over imports, taxation, wealth redistribution, *etc.*

For **social policies** candidates could examine areas such as the treatment of youth and women, educational provision and literacy campaigns, health and social welfare provision, housing, measures taken in relation to religious institutions or groups that were seen as allies or as enemies of the state.

The task requires candidates to identify and comment on the similarities and differences of such economic and social policies – either in terms of the nature or extent of the policies. The degree of success attained in fulfilling the aims of the policies could also be investigated and commented upon.

*Reference to specific policies/programmes is required to substantiate the claims made.*

*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 *two* authoritarian or single-party states, each chosen from a different region, evaluate the effectiveness of the methods used to deal with opposition.**

The nature and extent of opposition (real or perceived) could be addressed at the outset. In some cases opposition could be seen as movements or institutions that actively challenged the existence of the regime – but it could also be taken to mean areas of society that the regime sought to pre-emptively deal with due to the potential for perceived resistance. Examples could include: inner-party opposition to the leadership of the single-party state; religious institutions and groups; youth movements; political parties or movements that rejected the ideology of the state and waged open or clandestine campaigns to subvert the single-party regime; elements of the military; victims of the economic and social policies of the state who sought to hinder the implementation of the aims of the state *etc.*

For “**methods**” candidates could examine the use of force to eliminate opposition, purges of society the party and civil service/bureaucracy, the provision of programmes to win support from the population; the use of propaganda, media control and control of education *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.***

16. **With reference to *two* authoritarian or single-party states, each chosen from a different region, evaluate the impact of domestic policies on the status of women.**

Whichever states are selected, an appropriate starting point would be the identification of the treatment and status of women prior to the establishment of the authoritarian or single-party state. This could involve a consideration of: the treatment and status of women in terms of ownership of property, inheritance, suffrage *etc.*; the employment opportunities available; educational provisions; the rights of women in relation to marriage, divorce, birth control and abortion.

Candidates are required to examine how and why the regime implemented changes that affected the status of women by referring to specific details of the regime’s legislation and/or ideology. Popular choices for this question are likely to be Hitler’s Germany, Stalin’s Soviet Union, Mao’s China and Peron’s Argentina. In some cases the rights of women were curtailed, in others actively promoted – for ideological or practical considerations. Specific historical knowledge should be used to substantiate general claims as to the treatment/status of women.

*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 Nyerere successful in achieving his domestic policy aims in Tanzania?**

Candidates are required to identify the specific aims of Nyerere upon his election as president of Tanzania in 1964 following Tanganyika's union with Zanzibar. Candidates who deal with his aims from 1961 to 1964 when he was president of Tanganyika should not be penalized but good focus on the demands of the question would require that attention be paid to the period from 1964 up to 1985.

**“Aims”** for consideration over the period could be: the establishment of a one-party state with the claim that this would ensure political stability in an ethnically diverse country – thus avoiding the growth of divisive political parties that represented tribal rather than national interests; the drive for Africanization of the economy; the establishment of African socialism (ujamaa) in order to eliminate the gap between rich and poor as made clear in the Arusha Declaration of 1967 – this resulting in nationalization of foreign businesses and state control of banking and large scale businesses; collectivization of agriculture; the organization of self-sufficient villages; the implementation of educational policies focusing especially upon universal primary education; health care provision to reduce levels of infant mortality and increase life expectancy.

Given the fact that the nation was limited in terms of resources and capital the ambitious programmes were often unable to achieve the targets set. Drought, the rise of oil prices in 1973 and the reliance of the state upon the export of primary products such as cotton, coffee and tea (the prices of which were subject to the vagaries of the world market) all contributed towards a lacklustre economic performance. The resettlement of peasants into ujamaa villages – at first voluntarily and then by coercion – caused not only disruption to production but also resentment by many of the 3 million people affected. Corruption, which had been identified in the Arusha Declaration as one of the enemies of the nation, was not successfully controlled but in terms of some of the more ambitious social policies Tanzania did witness improved literacy levels (85%) and the provision of an infrastructure for schooling at primary level that compared well with other African states.

By 1985 Tanzania was obliged to appeal for aid to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) though such aid was provided only when state control was loosened following Nyerere's resignation.

*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. “The use of force was the most important factor in the maintenance of power of the authoritarian or single-party leader.” With reference to *two* authoritarian or single-party leaders, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

*Note that there is no regional requirement.*

For “**maintenance**” of power candidates could examine the repressive measures adopted by the leader: the use of the purges (both within the party/ movement itself to ensure the paramount power of the leader as well as amongst the general population); control and censorship of the media; the establishment of a system of organized terror and intimidation by means of a secret police or the military *etc.*

**Other factors** could also be considered such as: the appeal of policies or programmes that addressed grievances and produced employment opportunities and material rewards; the use of propaganda; the control of education and the creation of youth movements to bolster the leader and his movement.

*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 importance of leadership in the achievement of independence in either: *two* colonial states in Asia or Africa; or *two* Soviet-controlled states in Central/Eastern Europe.**

Whether choosing to discuss movements to achieve independence from colonial rule or from Soviet control, candidates will need to select two appropriate states and to structure their response appropriately. The question asks specifically about leadership and this must be addressed, although other factors may also be discussed.

With regard to colonial states, leaders may have provided ideological instruction, military expertise and/or political representation. Also, violent or non-violent methods may have been promoted to good effect (or not). How significant such leadership proved to be can be measured in terms of: the relative popularity of the leaders; their access to colonial authorities; their ability to persuade, cajole or threaten; support that may (or may not) have been forthcoming from ideological allies. Other factors that could be included to compare and contrast *importance of leadership* may include: the readiness of colonial authorities to accede independence; the way in which war (such as the Second World War) may have loosened the grip of the metropolitan or encouraged opposition to arise; economic hardship engendering discontent or economic success making independence seem feasible; growing literacy and levels of education *etc.*

With regard to independence from Soviet control, leaders may have provided ideological dissent by circulating *samizdat* or by forming underground movements; leadership for workers movements such as *Solidarity*; adherence to religious values that resonated with the population; the ability to voice popular concerns about the economy. Other factors that could be included to compare and contrast “relative importance” may include: latent nationalism; religion as a rallying point for opposition; economic hardship; past events (such as the Katyn Massacre or the Hungarian Revolution) that were censored but lay dormant in the collective memory; the weakness of the Party; fading adherence to ideology; the removal of Soviet force; the so-called “Sinatra Doctrine”.

*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. Evaluate the role of mass movements and economic factors in the growth of independence movements in either *one* colony in Africa or Asia or *one* sovietized state in Central/Eastern Europe or the Balkans.

For mass movements, candidates may refer to methods used to achieve this such as: the distribution of illegal literature; the organization of strikes and demonstrations; the growth of pro-independence political structures that raised political consciousness; reaction to oppression.

For economic factors, candidates may mention: the presence of valuable commodities, such as minerals as a spur to external assistance; the burden of economic problems as a reason for opposing the government; high unemployment might encourage membership of opposition movements.

*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. With reference to *one* independence movement in either Asia or Africa, examine the impact of armed struggle on the overall success of that movement.

Candidates are required to select one independence movement and to examine the impact (importance) of armed struggle on its success. It is likely that the Algerian War of Independence or the Indochina/Vietnam War (either will be acceptable) will be popular choices. The impact of armed struggle may include the following: the use of successful guerrilla tactics to fight a more powerful, better resourced enemy, and the support this may have garnered among the population; the use of armed struggle against the government resulting in harsh reprisals and increased opposition; armed struggle may have provided focus for a population that had no recourse to democratic methods for change; armed struggle may also have led to foreign involvement that could have either supported the movement, providing it with arms and resources or supported the government and so aroused feelings of resentment among the population *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.***

**22. Evaluate the social and economic challenges faced by either *one* former Soviet satellite state in Central/Eastern Europe or *one* successor state of the former Yugoslavia.**

For social issues, there could be a discussion of minority languages and their recognition as symbols of ethnic diversity; the changes to education (and the revision of history textbooks, for example); the challenges posed by the free movement of people across borders; the discrimination practised against minorities such as the Roma people. The practice of different religious faiths may also be a challenge in Bosnia, for example, where Catholicism, Orthodox Christianity and Islam co-exist, albeit uneasily and where political institutions that accommodate these have had to be constructed. For economic issues, mention may be made of the difficulties of adjusting to a free market system; the incidence (often high) of unemployment; the absence of young people of working age who go abroad for education or work; the expense of having to modernize infrastructure and to clean up a polluted environment; the cost of recovery from conflict.

*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 impact of the Cold War on post-independence conflicts in *either* Angola or the Belgian Congo/Zaire.**

Patrice Lumumba was the first Prime Minister of an independent Republic of Congo and Joseph Kasavubu, its first President. Within days of independence, granted on 30 June 1960, there was a mutiny in the army. Belgium sent in soldiers to protect the Belgian citizens living, mostly, in the capital of Leopoldville. This presented a challenge to Congolese sovereignty but matters were made worse by the secession of Katanga, led by Moïse Tshombe. The conflict was further fuelled by external aid given to Tshombe by companies (and countries) hoping to benefit from the potential wealth of this mineral-rich territory. The UN then became involved sending a mission to restore peace but refusing to use force to suppress Tshombe. Lumumba then appealed to the USSR for aid (adding a Cold War element to the conflict), launched an attack against Tshombe, failed, was dismissed by President Kasavubu and replaced by Mobutu. Lumumba attempted to set up his own break away government in Stanleyville but was assassinated. Different factions (with the exception of Tshombe) finally agreed to set up a new government. The competing ideologies of the US and USSR fuelled the conflict and candidates may focus on how this affected both the outcome and the duration of the war.

For Angola, the focus of the response should be the Angolan Civil War and not the War of Independence fought against the Portuguese **prior** to independence. The civil war broke out soon after independence was granted by Portugal in 1975. The Marxist group, MPLA (People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola – Labour Party) led by Agostino Neto were prepared to take power but were challenged by the FNLA (National Liberation Front of Angola) led by Holden Roberto and UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola), led by Jonas Savimbi. External involvement played a major role in fuelling the conflict with the US supporting both UNITA (also supported by China and South Africa) and FLNA (less so), and the USSR (and Cuba) supporting the MPLA. Some candidates may also mention the FLEC (Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda) that led an attack on Mobutu's regime in the neighbouring state of Zaire. This is quite acceptable, as it also played a part in the civil war and, to some extent, was a reaction to Mobutu's support for UNITA. There was also a tribal/class division with UNITA claiming to be the party of "true Africans" meaning the rural, as opposed to the urban, population that was considered to be pro-MPLA. Specifically, candidates may structure their answers to include the following factors: the presence of competing ideologies represented by the MPLA, UNITA and FLNA; the support of the US and the USSR, Cuba (and others) that fuelled divisions by providing arms and soldiers; the legacy of the struggle against the Portuguese; the presence of oil and other mineral deposits that made this a potentially wealthy country and increased the likelihood of superpower involvement.

*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. “Separatist movements were the main reason for the dissolution of Yugoslavia (1991–1992).”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Several factors may be cited as reasons for the dissolution of Yugoslavia but this question requires that separatist movements be discussed and their significance assessed. There is much to be discussed and candidates will probably analyse the resurgence of nationalism after the death of Tito and the threat this posed to the federation. The different motives for separatism may be analysed including economic, religious, linguistic and cultural factors. Also influential in the growth of separatism was the bitter legacy of the Second World War (or, indeed, the First World War and the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes); the financial assistance from emigre communities assisted in the resurgence and promotion of ethnic divisions; the nationalist aspirations of certain leaders, although, in some cases, the willingness to use force to **prevent** dissolution was itself a spur to independence elsewhere.

Other factors that may be considered to be of greater or lesser importance could include the support given by the EU and US to the dissolution of the federation; the economic problems that deepened resentment in the wealthier regions that were subsidising the less wealthy; the collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe weakened the legacy of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (YCP) and the uniting force of the ideology bequeathed by Tito.

It is not expected that the war would be discussed here in any great detail but expect a well-supported analysis of factors that gave rise to the call for dissolution.

*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. To what extent did decisions about post-war Germany contribute to the breakdown of East–West relations between 1945 and 1949?

With regard to decisions made about post-war Germany, candidates may begin with those discussed and finalized at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Following on from 1945, reference may be made to the following: the policies outlined in Secretary Byrnes’s speech at Stuttgart; the mutual support of the US and Chancellor Adenauer making reunification less likely; the pillaging of their zone by the USSR; the friction caused by the failure to support agreements on the exchange of food and goods; the Marshall Plan and its impact on currency reform; the breakdown of the Allied Control Council; the Berlin Blockade; the establishment of the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany) and the GDR (German Democratic Republic).

Candidates may consider the following as reasons why such decisions affected East–West relations: post-war Germany had to be occupied and governed, at least temporarily, as the call for “unconditional surrender” had removed all vestiges of the Nazi regime. Furthermore, Germany’s geopolitical importance meant that all of the Allied Powers wanted to have influence over its post-war developments. The US and Britain rapidly came to support the economic revival of Germany whilst the USSR was concerned about the revival of Germany as a military power, as, indeed, was France. Both countries, but especially the USSR, were also concerned about security and feared another invasion. There was a growing divergence of views about the future of Germany and suspicion was reflected in the pragmatic union of British and American zones into Bizonia and the adoption of the Truman Doctrine by the US and, later the Marshall Plan.

Along with the Marshall Plan (ERP or European Recovery Program), came the need for a stable currency and, with France now on board, the emergence of Trizonia. The adoption of the Deutschmark in the West was a major reason for the Berlin Blockade. Re-unification was now unlikely to happen and candidates may discuss Stalin’s argument that the Yalta agreement had been ignored by the US that moved ahead with plans for the establishment of the FRG, rather than the reunited, but neutral, Germany favoured by Stalin.

“To what extent” invites candidates to consider other factors that may have contributed to the breakdown of East–West relations. These may include: ideology; mutual fear over expansion of influence; issues of security; the nuclear arms race *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. Evaluate the reasons for the adoption by the Soviet Union of peaceful coexistence and the impact of this policy on Cold War relations between 1956 and 1964.**

The policy of “peaceful co-existence” is usually ascribed to Khrushchev and his de-Stalinization speech at the Twentieth Party Congress of February 1956. It established that the USSR, although confident of the eventual triumph of communism, could, nevertheless, co-exist with the US and that peaceful relations were possible. It would be expected that candidates will know this and so be able to contextualise this topic. It is also assumed that the dates, given as a guideline, will indicate a starting point of the twentieth party congress and an end point of Khrushchev’s enforced retirement.

For “**reasons**”, candidates may refer to Khrushchev’s adoption of a policy originally promoted by Malenkov on his becoming Prime Minister in 1953 and so indicate that this initiative had been aired prior to Khrushchev’s emergence as the leader of the Soviet Union. Additionally, candidates may offer reasons such as Khrushchev’s policy of “New Thinking” in foreign relations whereby the USSR still maintained its ideological stance of achieving world revolution but that a violent confrontation with the capitalist states was not imperative. The USSR also wanted to cut back on spending on defence, as did the US and so warmer relations were in the interests of both sides. Another factor would be the fear of a Third World War. Candidates may also mention that relations between the two superpowers had already started to improve with the signing of the Austrian State Treaty in 1955 and the Geneva Summit. Other reasons may include the less cordial relations between China and the Soviet Union in the wake of the Korean War and the death of Stalin and so the USSR may have been more inclined to look for better relations with the US. Also, Khrushchev used “peaceful co-existence” as a way to challenge Molotov (soon to be removed as Foreign Minister) who supported the continuation of a hard-line, anti-capitalist policy.

For “**impact**”, candidates may refer to events that demonstrated better relations with the US such as the exhibition of American products held in Moscow; Khrushchev’s visit to the US; the “peaceful” resolution of crises such as the confrontation by tanks at Checkpoint Charlie; the improved relations between Kennedy and Khrushchev after the Cuban Missile Crisis, including the commitment to “peaceful co-existence” of the US, the hot line and the Test Ban Treaty. To address the less peaceful consequences of the policy, candidates may mention the Suez crisis; the Polish and Hungarian Uprisings; Sputnik; the question of Berlin (1958 and 1961); the Eisenhower Doctrine; the U2 incident and the Paris Summit; the Cuban Missile Crisis. All of these could be said to have increased tension and worsened relations between the superpowers.

In addition, candidates may refer to the ever-worsening relations with China as Mao disapproved of “peaceful co-existence”.

There is much to discuss here so do not expect all of the above but the response 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**.*

**27. Evaluate the successes and failures of the policy of containment up to 1973 in *either* the Middle East *or* Asia.**

The policy of containment is usually associated with the US Truman Doctrine of 1947 but also accept arguments that demonstrate the application of this policy by the USSR during this period.

**The Middle East**

Relevant events may include the removal of the Prime Minister of Iran in 1953 and firm alliance between the Shah and the US; the establishment of the Baghdad Pact in 1955, although the subsequent re-naming of this as CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) reflects the “loss” of Iraq and a partial failure for the US. Another event would be the Suez Crisis (Sinai War) of 1956 when the US responded to Egypt’s purchase of Soviet arms by withdrawing funding for the Aswan Dam. Given that, in its aftermath, Nasser proceeded to draw closer to the USSR, this could be seen as a failure for the US and a success for the USSR. The Eisenhower Doctrine and the subsequent US intervention in Lebanon in 1958 could be seen as a determination to uphold its sphere of influence in the Middle East. It is likely that most candidates will focus upon the 6-Day War of 1967 and the October War of 1973, both of which involved the superpowers, at least on the sidelines. Both conflicts ended with an enhanced presence of the US in the Middle East. In 1967, this was reflected in the resounding, US-backed victory for Israel and, in 1973, by the shift, by Sadat of Egypt away from Soviet influence. Candidates may offer differing points of view and interpretations of events that continue to be controversial so accept all well-supported arguments.

**Asia**

Candidates may choose to go back as far as the “loss of China” in 1949 as an example of the failure of containment for the US, although it could be argued that the US abandoned Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai-Shek) by 1948. The Korean War is likely to be included as this was, indeed, an example of US containment in action, albeit under the flag of the UN. This should not be an invitation to launch into a description of the war, however, but rather to analyse how far containment succeeded or failed. Certainly, the war ended where it began, on the 38th parallel and so demonstrated that communism had been “contained” but candidates may also argue that China came out stronger from this conflict and buoyed by its having confronted the US without losing. More in-depth answers may go on to discuss the Indochinese War, the Malayan Emergency and the conflict in Indonesia. The emergence of communist sympathizers in Laos, in particular was of concern to both Eisenhower and Kennedy but this looming crisis was quickly overshadowed by the Vietnam War.

Some candidates may approach this period from the perspective of the USSR and its attempts to contain China *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.***

**28. To what extent did the arms race influence the development of the Cold War after 1970?**

There are a number of treaties that signpost stages in the arms race. These might include the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) I and II, the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) and Strategic Arms Reduction (START) Treaty. Detailed statistical evidence is not necessary but a good understanding of the nature of the discussions and their implications would be expected for the higher mark bands.

SALT began in Geneva in 1969, in tandem with the negotiations to limit the number and use of ABM sites. Candidates may argue that these talks that continued until 1972, were one of the main accelerators of detente and, despite the concurrent Vietnam War, offered opportunities for the US and USSR to sit around a negotiating table. The aim was to ensure that the principle of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) remained in force (by limiting the use of ABMs) and that intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) *etc* could be discussed, inspected and limited. Candidates could argue that the success of SALT I was, in part, due to its having ignored more recent technology, such as multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs). Furthermore, its impact upon the Cold War was positive in that the US and USSR were able to reach an agreement when the US was also seeking better relations with China. For the US, this was a win/win situation. For the USSR, it was useful to reach an accord with its old enemy at a time of deepening tension with China.

SALT I was quickly followed by new negotiations that led to SALT II. These began in Vladivostok in 1974 when, following the resignation of Nixon, Ford became US President. He lost the election of 1976 and Carter upset the renewed negotiations by pushing for deeper cuts. This dramatic departure from the agreed script was not helped by Brezhnev's worsening health. In this way, SALT II was almost a dead letter before it was signed in 1979 and its fate was sealed by its not being ratified by the US Senate. SALT II did not improve so much as worsen relations, especially as there was criticism in the US of a treaty that was seen to be all one-sided, in favour of the USSR. The placing of SS-20s in Eastern Europe by the USSR would be relevant as this led to retaliatory policies by the US (NATO) in the early 1980s and their significance for the period known as the "Second Cold War" when it seemed that a Third World War would start, not with an exchange of nuclear warheads between the USSR and US, but with land based conflict on the border between the FRG and the GDR.

As there is no end date included, candidates may refer to Reagan's support for the SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative) project and the very significant impact this had upon US–USSR relations from 1985 onwards, when it dominated the Geneva and the Reykjavik Summits. The arms race played a very important role in the ending of the Cold War.

The question does ask, "to what extent" and candidates may discuss **other factors** such as the expansion of conflict into Africa; tension in the Middle East; the Sino–Soviet split; the policy of detente and so on as being of greater or lesser significance. Expect an analysis of the arms race, however, and a sound assessment of its importance.

*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. Compare and contrast the economic impact of the Cold War on *two* countries (excluding the USSR and the US), each chosen from a different region.**

Possible choices could be countries caught up in Cold War conflicts such as Vietnam, Korea, Angola and so on, or states that benefitted from the economic support of a superpower, such as countries in Western Europe (or Japan in Asia) that received aid from the US in the form of the Marshall Plan or the members of COMECON (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) that had strong trade links with the USSR. Another example could be Cuba, as it shifted from economic dependence on one superpower to the other.

For **comparison/contrast**, possible factors could include: the impact upon trade; the availability (or not) of loans and aid; membership in an alliance such as NATO or the Warsaw Pact and the necessary expenditure on defence that this entailed; employment opportunities in countries where the right to work was guaranteed; participation of women in the workforce as was often the case in socialist countries; membership (or not) of international organizations such as GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) or the G7; expenditure on social policies that may be cut (or boosted) by Cold War concerns (an example could be the emergence of social systems in Western Europe that offered a degree of socialism to offset the attraction of communism). Where there was war (proxy Cold War conflicts), there can be comparison/contrast of factors such as: the destruction of infrastructure; reduced employment; the emergence of black market economies; the absence of trade; post-war aid to help recovery; the surge of economic refugees seeking asylum 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.***

**30. To what extent were Reagan’s policies responsible for ending the Cold War?**

The focus here needs to be on the policies of Reagan in relation to how they may have contributed to the end of the Cold War. Reagan began his first term as president in 1981, so expect some reference to the pre-Gorbachev era of the USSR.

**Policies to be discussed** may include the following: the Reagan Doctrine; the increase in the US defence budget; SDI; hard-line anti-communist rhetoric (“the evil empire” and so on); support given to the mujahedeen in Afghanistan that helped tie down the USSR in this long-running conflict.

This is a “to what extent” question so expect candidates to also consider **other factors** that would, most likely, include an analysis of Gorbachev’s policies. These may include the following: Chernobyl, which influenced Gorbachev’s determination to reduce nuclear weaponry; Glasnost, which opened up discussion of links with the West; the so-called “Sinatra Doctrine”; the abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine; the impression made by Gorbachev as a “new” kind of Soviet leader who was amenable to change and improved relations with the West.

**Other factors** may also include: the growth of independence movements in Central and Eastern Europe; economic pressures on the Eastern Bloc that loosened ties with the USSR; the structure of the EU that provided post-Soviet possibilities of making the break from Moscow easier and possibly less threatening than a US-dominated Europe may have been; the rapid disintegration of Communist Parties in the satellite states that left little time for deliberation *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.***

---