



MARKSCHEME

November 2014

HISTORY

Route 2

Higher Level

**Paper 3 – Aspects of the history of
Europe and the Middle East**

20 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 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. 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.***

18–20:	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.
15–17:	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
12–14:	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary are used to indicate some in-depth understanding but is not consistent throughout. 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. Synthesis is present but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
9–11:	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 historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
7–8:	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. 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.
5–6:	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
3–4:	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
1–2:	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
0:	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.*

The French Revolution and Napoleon—mid 18th century to 1815

1. Discuss the reasons for the Thermidorean Reaction (1794–1795).

Candidates should understand why Robespierre was overthrown and executed in July 1794. They can also refer to the “White Terror” of 1795 against other Jacobins. In the case of the former, reasons could include a simple desire for self preservation, as many revolutionaries (*eg* Fouché and Tallien), feared that they would be next for the guillotine after the execution of the Danton faction in March 1794. It is possible to argue that by mid-1794 France was less threatened by foreign invasion than before, (*eg* victory at Fleurus June 1794 and fall of Toulon in December 1793) and therefore that the need for the Committee of Public Safety was much reduced. For the events of 1795 and the persecution of Jacobins in that year; revenge was a key motive, with royalists seizing this opportunity in many areas of France to settle scores with local Jacobins. More generally, political instability was rife in 1795 with pro-Jacobin riots in Paris. These were caused in part by the rising cost of food, (price controls on food were abolished in December 1794). A variety of reasons could be considered by candidates.

*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 the collapse of the Napoleonic Empire (1812–1815).

Responses can focus on events on the battlefield: French retreat from Russia 1812, Battle of Leipzig 1813, French defeat in the Peninsular War in 1813, the invasion of France in 1814 and then the final defeat at Waterloo in 1815 which ended Napoleon’s return to power from Elba. Candidates should also look at underlying reasons for French military defeats in this period: these may include the success of alliance-building against Napoleon (*eg* by Castlereagh), as well as the economic effects of the British blockade upon Napoleonic Europe. There was also the increasing unpopularity of French rule in many parts of the Empire especially in parts of Germany and in Spain, which undermined the idea that Napoleonic rule constituted some form of liberation from traditional elites. Better answers will avoid simple narratives of events and will include analysis along with detailed historical knowledge.

*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.***

Unification and consolidation of Germany and Italy 1815–1890

3. **“By 1862 the necessary conditions for German unification under Prussian leadership were in place.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This question allows candidates to range across the whole period 1815–1862. Arguments that Prussian leadership was most likely could include: Prussian territorial gains by the Congress of Vienna; Austrian focus on Italy and Austrian suppression of Liberal/nationalist revolts 1815–1849; Prussian economic growth 1815–1859 and comparative Austrian economic stagnation. Arguments that a Prussian leadership was not so likely could include: Prussian elite uncertainty about a leadership role; Frederick William IV rejecting the Crown offered by the Frankfurt Assembly; also the 1850 Punctation of Olmutz when Prussia was forced to abandon the Erfurt Union by Austria. While candidates may validly argue that Bismarck’s leadership was more significant to unification than other factors, they should link their analysis to the question.

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

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

4. **Discuss which Italian leader played the most important role in the unification of Italy.**

Candidates are likely to focus on Cavour, Garibaldi and possibly Mazzini and Victor Emmanuel II. Rather than narratives of events, detailed analytical answers are sought with an assessment of the importance of individual leaders. It could be argued that Cavour modernised Piedmont, enabling it to take on a leadership role and that he successfully positioned it diplomatically (the Crimean War and then the Plombières meeting with Napoleon III). After war with Austria in 1859, Lombardy and the Central Duchies joined Piedmont. How far Cavour intended a unified Italy rather than merely an expanded Piedmont could be debated. While Garibaldi was entirely committed to Italian unification, there was mutual distrust between Cavour and Garibaldi. Examination of his role could include the defence of the Roman Republic in 1849 and his strong international and national profile in favour of unification. He led the expedition of the Thousand resulting in his ceding of his Neapolitan conquests to Victor Emmanuel II at Teano in October 1860 and subsequent attempts to conquer Rome for Italy.

Mazzini was the intellectual of the *Risorgimento* and inspired many followers (eg Young Italy), but he had a limited political role and he was deeply mistrusted by Cavour. Victor Emmanuel II was significant in that he appointed Cavour as Prime Minister in 1852 and allowed him to pursue his modernising policies thereafter. He was also important in diplomatic and military events 1856–1870.

*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.***

Ottoman Empire from the early 19th to the early 20th century

5. Examine the reasons why the European Powers intervened in the campaigns of Muhammad Ali between 1827 and 1841.

This question covers the European intervention in the Greek War of Independence (Treaty of London, 1827, of Britain, France and Russia) that led to the Battle of Navarino in October 1827. It also covers the First and Second Ottoman Egyptian Wars 1831–1833 and 1839–1841 and the roles of Russia, Austria, France, Britain and, to a lesser extent, Prussia in these crises. Candidates may reflect on the extent to which the Great Powers had interests in common during these crises (protection of Greeks and other Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire) and how far their policies differed (in the 1830s, there was some French support for Muhammad Ali, Russia had ambitions in the Mediterranean while Britain and Austria preferred the status quo. In the 1820s, Russia was enthusiastic about helping the Greeks, while British government policy was initially more lukewarm).

For the role of Russia in the First Ottoman Egyptian War, see the Treaty of Hunkar Iskelesi (Unkiar Skelessi) in July 1833. For the Austrian response, there was the Münchengrätz meeting September 1833 where it was agreed that Russia and Austria would work together if the Ottoman Empire collapsed. In the case of the Second Ottoman Egyptian War, France was out of step with the other European powers in being unwilling to limit the gains of Muhammad Ali after the Egyptians' victory over the Ottomans at Nizip in June 1839. A joint British-Austrian-Turkish campaign against the Egyptians took place September–November 1840, culminating in the bombardment of Acre and the defeat of Muhammad Ali's forces. Rather than narration of events, look for analysis of the European powers' interests and to what extent Muhammad Ali was perceived to threaten or help them. Candidates could analyse why the European powers' response was more rapid in the Second Ottoman Egyptian War than the First and why there was disunity in both cases.

*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 importance of the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) in the decline of the Ottoman Empire.

The loss of Tripolitania to Italy in 1911–1912 had shown the military and diplomatic weakness of the Ottoman Empire. In October 1912, Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro all declared war on the Ottoman Empire and the First Balkan War led to comprehensive defeat for the Empire and the loss of significant territory. The Second Balkan War in 1913 saw the Ottoman Empire take advantage of Bulgaria's defeat and retake the province of Edirne (Adrianople). It could be argued that the Balkan Wars were very important in the decline of the Ottoman Empire as they led to the loss of almost all its European territories: Macedonia, Albania and much of Thrace. These had been among the wealthiest provinces of the Empire. There was also significant disruption with thousands of Muslim refugees fleeing the territories the Ottomans had lost. Ultimately, it could be suggested that the diplomatic isolation of the Empire in 1912 made it desperate for a European alliance in 1914 and this is what led to the disastrous decision to ally with Germany in the First World War.

Some candidates may suggest that the Balkan Wars were just another stage in the long-term decline of the empire that had accelerated in the 19th century. Effective answers would need to identify significant events such as the loss of Greece and the various interventions of the Great Powers or other relevant material.

On the other side of the argument, one could plausibly maintain that it was only as a consequence of defeat in 1918 that the Empire was ended. In fact, the Empire demonstrated significant vitality in the early stages of the First World War – the Ottomans forced the British to withdraw from Gallipoli in January 1916 and captured the British Indian army at Kut-el-Amara in April 1916.

*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**.*

Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914

7. “The Boulanger affair showed the weakness of the Third French Republic.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Boulanger was Minister of War from January 1886 until May 1887. He promoted a policy of *revanche* against Germany and became extremely popular. His popularity coincided with the Honours scandal that led to the resignation of Grévy, President of France in December 1887. In 1888, Boulanger was not brought back into the cabinet and his political support grew as he denounced those in power. Boulanger was twice elected as a Deputy; on the second occasion in January 1889 some argue that he was on the point of launching a coup d'état. However, a warrant was issued for his arrest and he fled to Belgium in April 1889.

It could be argued that Boulanger's links with monarchist and Bonapartist circles and his evident popular support show that the Third Republic remained relatively weak, especially given the obvious corruption of some of its politicians. On the other hand, the period of mass support for Boulanger was rather brief and the Third Republic survived what were arguably greater tests (*eg* the Dreyfus affair and general strikes before 1914). Candidates could argue that the Third Republic also went on to demonstrate great strength in surviving both the First World War and the Depression.

*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. Examine the effects of the Second and Third Reform Acts on British political parties.

The focus should clearly be on the effects of the Second (1867) and Third Reform Acts (1884–1885) on British political parties rather than a narrative of events, although some discussion of the main provisions of the Acts could be appropriate. One approach could be to show the role of popular mobilisation throughout this period. The Liberal Party successfully mobilised Nonconformists and a range of special interest groups under Gladstone's leadership. Meanwhile, popular Conservatism was also successful after both of these Acts. The Conservatives won election victories in 1874, 1886, 1895 and 1900. One could argue that through organisations such as the Primrose League and a well-organised party they were able to move away from their traditional position of defenders of the landed interest. Another approach would be to argue that the Third Reform Act had a greater impact, *eg* the emergence of the Labour Party (42 MPs elected in the December 1910 general election), bringing a new dimension to the traditional dominance of the Liberal and Conservative parties.

*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.***

Imperial Russia, revolutions, emergence of Soviet State 1853–1924

9. To what extent did Alexander II’s reforms improve the lives of the Russian peasantry?

The main focus of answers should be whether or not the lives of the Russian peasants improved as a result of emancipation in 1861. The details of the Emancipation Edict could be outlined – the granting of civil rights to peasants and the fact that land was redistributed from the nobility to the peasantry. Analysis could consider whether emancipation actually improved living standards. Issues to consider: the amount and quality of land redistributed; the fact that the Mir and not individuals held the land; the issue of Redemption Dues and its effect on the peasants.

Modern historiography suggests that peasant income fell and by 1870 only 50% of peasants were producing surplus. Many were working at subsistence levels and they lacked the means to improve farming. Thus, limited supplies of land and increased population led to Land Hunger, famines and peasant discontent by the 1890s.

Candidates may refer to other reforms that were necessary corollaries to emancipation such as local government, education, legal and military reforms *etc.* However the main focus should be on their impact on the lives of the peasants.

*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. Evaluate the factors that enabled Lenin to ensure the survival of the Soviet State.

Factors could include Lenin’s willingness to deal ruthlessly with potential opposition both within and outside the Bolshevik party – suppression of the Constituent Assembly; the establishment of the Cheka and the Red Terror. The harsh treatment of opponents during the civil war (the death of the Romanov family), the crushing of the Kronstadt Revolt when the sailors demanded a return to soviet power, the establishment of the one-party state and the Ban on Factionalism within the party itself followed by purges could all be considered.

Other factors could include: policies that were approved of by the Russian people or were effective in dealing with a particular crisis; decrees on Land and Peace 1917; the granting of workers control of economic enterprises. War Communism, although unpopular, was important in supplying the Red Army during the Civil War. This helped in defeating the Whites and their foreign allies. The adoption of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921 stimulated economic recovery and increased the popularity of the regime.

*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.***

European diplomacy and the First World War 1870–1923

11. Examine the importance of global colonial rivalry as a cause of the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.

It could be argued that Anglo-German colonial tensions (*eg* Kruger Telegram and more especially the naval competition, which was linked to British and German colonial ambitions) led to the initial move of Britain towards France, leading to the Entente Cordiale of April 1904. Furthermore, Franco-German colonial rivalry in Morocco led to the consolidation of the Entente between Britain and France during the crises of 1905 and 1911. While Russia had been allied with France since 1894 there was no agreement between Britain and Russia until the Triple Entente of August 1907 (after the resolution of colonial difficulties between the two). Global colonial rivalry played a role in establishing and strengthening the two blocs of powers that confronted each other in 1914.

On the other hand, one can argue that colonial disputes were not at all important in the actual outbreak of war in 1914. This was due in large part to events in the Balkans, Austro-Russian rivalries in the region and the European policies of the Great Powers. Some candidates may wish to stress the primacy of German policy as the main cause of the outbreak of war.

One could also argue that Britain and France and Britain and Russia had traditionally been colonial rivals, but were on the same side in 1914, suggesting that colonial rivalry was not an especially important cause of the outbreak of the First World War.

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

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

12. “German military and diplomatic errors were responsible for the defeat of the Central Powers in 1918.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

German strategic errors could include the actual execution and arguably the design of the Schlieffen Plan, (how far had it taken account of Russia’s improved ability to mobilize?). The provocation of the US, which brought her into the war, was a diplomatic error (*eg* the decision to attack US shipping and the Zimmermann telegram). The failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the US entry into the war could be argued to have been key reasons for the defeat of the Central Powers.

On the other side of the argument, there were factors that led to defeat in 1918 that were not German strategic/diplomatic errors, these could include: the blockade of Germany and its effects on the civilian population; the arguably greater mobilisation of the home front in Britain compared to Germany; the collapse of the Austrian and Ottoman Empires; and perhaps the generally greater resources of the Allied powers.

*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.***

War and change in the Middle East 1914–1949

13. Evaluate the impact of actions by European Powers on the problems in Palestine in the years 1914 to 1939.

Contributions to tensions could include the impact of wartime diplomacy (McMahon-Hussein Correspondence, Sykes-Picot Agreement, Balfour Declaration). All contributed to tensions as the expectations of both Jews and Arabs were raised and then unfulfilled. Changing British policy during the mandate years also raised tensions, as British rule seemed to favour one side and then the other.

In the early 1920s under Samuel there was limited violence and it seemed possible that the two groups might find a way to coexist. This relative peace ended with the Wailing Wall incident. There may be mention of the various White Papers and Commissions set up by the British.

Answers should also consider the impact of Nazi policies on Palestine, the massive increase in Jewish immigration certainly exacerbated tensions and contributed to the Arab revolt, 1936–1939. Furthermore British attempts to end the revolt only served to anger both Arabs and Jews.

*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. “Reza Khan’s modernization policies had limited success up to 1941.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Answers should identify what Reza Khan’s aims were: he wanted to westernize and centralize power in Iran to strengthen the state. Laws were passed to demonstrate how Iran was adopting western culture and values (banning the veil, ethnic dress and polygamy). The law courts were secularized at the expense of religious law and education reforms were implemented, which not only provided trained lawyers to administer the new legal codes but contributed to a decline in illiteracy especially in urban areas.

Answers might argue that establishing a monarchy, which relied to some extent on the army to retain power, was not modernizing the state. The *Majlis* had limited power and Reza Khan’s main supporters were the landlord class who limited the impact of any modernization in the countryside.

Economically Iran was hindered by unfavourable trade agreements with Russia and because Iran’s major resource (oil) was controlled by foreign companies, especially the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company whose profits went abroad. Other industrial activity remained fairly small scale – hindered by poor infrastructure, attempts to modernize the railways were costly and ineffective. Iran’s economy remained dominated by agriculture, which had low productivity levels. Modernization remained confined to the urban elites and the influence of the *ulama* remained strong.

*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**.*

Interwar years: conflict and cooperation 1919–1939

15. “Collective security failed because of the weakness of the League of Nations.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This is not a “successes and failures’ of the League of Nations question and the main focus should be on factors that limited international cooperation. Examples of where the League was seen to be weak such as Manchuria and Abyssinia should be linked to their impact on international affairs. Candidates may argue that the League was dominated by Britain and France that led to ineffective policies such as weak sanctions against Italy.

The impact of the Great Depression on cooperation is also important. Without the economic crisis in Germany, Hitler would probably not have gained power and Italy would perhaps not have pursued expansion in Abyssinia. Britain and France became more focused on internal problems and there was a tendency to erect tariff barriers which hindered cooperation.

Nations began to act outside of the League *eg* the Little Entente, the Balkan Pact, the Stresa Front and the Anglo-German Naval agreement in pursuit of national interests and security.

Fear of the Soviet Union was also a factor, Stalin joined the League in 1934 but despite signing agreements with both Czechoslovakia and France, he was still regarded with suspicion, especially by the British. Soviet support for the Republicans in Spain contributed to this suspicion.

By 1936 Britain and to a lesser extent France was pursuing a policy of Appeasement signalling the end of the search for collective security and underlining the weakness of the League of Nations.

*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. Evaluate the impact of Hitler’s social and economic policies in Germany up to 1939.

Impact on society is the key focus, analysis should relate to pre-1939 Germany, as the outbreak of war led to major change in social and economic policies.

Social policies to consider: youth and education; policies on women (Kinder, Küche, Kirche); policies on religion; anti-Semitic policies. Some might argue that there was the appearance of change because of propaganda, but that in fact there was limited change except as a consequence of anti-Semitic legislation. By 1939, Germany’s Jewish population was socially, politically and economically excluded from the Volksgemeinschaft.

Economic policies could include: reducing unemployment; Schacht’s New Plan, which attempted to balance the trade deficit; the 1936 Four Year Plan, which aimed to establish autarky and prepare Germany for war.

Answers should be well-balanced and assess impact: (was unemployment ended? was Germany self sufficient and ready for war in 1939?). There is an opportunity here to consider the views of economic historians such as Mason, Overy, Twose.

*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.***

The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe 1924–2000

17. Examine the ways and extent to which *two* countries in Eastern Europe (excluding East Germany) experienced liberation between 1944 and 1948.

As the Red Army moved westwards anti-fascist coalitions were established but as Cold War tensions emerged Stalin ensured, with the threat of the Red Army, that local Communist parties gained more power and influence.

Some detail of events is required to support analysis. For example: in Poland in July 1944 the Lublin Poles (pro-Soviet) set up a provisional government and in August 1944 the Red Army failed to assist the Warsaw Uprising in order to limit the influence of the London Poles. Tensions arose at Yalta and Potsdam over Poland (Oder–Neisse Line *etc*) and Stalin agreed to hold free elections. These were held in 1947 and were clearly rigged in favour of the Communist candidates.

Events in Czechoslovakia are also likely to be well known. Czechoslovakia was the only fully democratic state pre-war and initial elections were probably reasonably free – the Communists were popular winning 38% of the vote in 1946 and a coalition was formed with Gottwald (Communist) at its head. Discontent rose because of the rejection of Marshall Aid. The Communist party staged a coup supported by five Red Army Divisions, Jan Masaryk was killed and in the May 1948 elections the Communists were the only party to stand.

It could be argued that to some extent Poland was more clearly occupied because of the political interference as early as 1944, whereas in the case of Czechoslovakia there were free elections and the Soviet Union only encouraged the Czech Communists when there was a danger of a less friendly government being elected. Other valid examples could include Hungary or Romania.

*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. Examine the role played by the Cold War in shaping Brezhnev’s foreign policy.

Key areas of foreign policy should be well known: Czechoslovakia 1968; the Brezhnev Doctrine, Detente and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) agreements; the Chinese-Soviet split and Brezhnev’s response to it; better relations with West Germany; 1970 Moscow Treaty and 1972 Basic Treaty; Helsinki Agreements 1975; the search for allies in the Middle East and Africa *etc*; and the Soviet move into Afghanistan in 1979.

Candidates may not know all of the above but they should consider whether it was Cold War tensions or other factors such as domestic concerns or consideration of the Soviet Union’s global position that drove Brezhnev’s foreign policy.

*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.***

The Second World War and post-war Western Europe 1939–2000

19. Evaluate the reasons why the Allies were victorious in Europe in 1945.

A relatively straightforward question that requires candidates to consider a number of factors that led to Allied victory.

Factors could include: the failure to defeat Britain in 1940, the decision to invade Russia with Operation Barbarossa, the declaration of war on the US all of which led to a very strong alliance against Germany and Italy. Italy's military weakness meant that Nazi Germany's forces were overstretched; the potential of the Allied powers both in men and resources was much greater than the Axis powers; clear policy making (Stalin focused all economic activity on fighting the war as did Great Britain and the US), whereas Hitler failed to put the German economy on a total war footing until 1944; the Allies had air and naval superiority for much of the war, which facilitated the supplying of Britain and the Soviet Union as well as the preparations for invasion in 1944.

Other factors to consider could be: the nature of the Nazi regime meant that there were active guerrilla resistance movements in occupied territories that tied up large numbers of troops; the German response to the D-Day landings was limited because troops were engaged in such great numbers on the eastern front and elsewhere in Europe. In addition, Hitler's military decisions arguably contributed to defeat, *eg* the refusal to allow a retreat from Stalingrad.

Answers may not cover all these factors but there should be some analysis as to which were more significant.

*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. Examine the factors that led to German reunification in 1990.

The sequence of events should be well known; however answers should not only focus on Gorbachev's reforms but should consider factors within East and West Germany and the international response to reunification.

Events: abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine in 1985 by Gorbachev, the reduction in size of the Red Army by 1988, and the promise of withdrawal of the Red Army from the GDR. These all created the potential for change in the GDR.

Knowledge of reforms within the Soviet Union stimulated popular protests in the GDR with demands for economic reforms. There was an economic crisis in 1989 when thousands of East Germans crossed to the west via Hungary and Austria, seeking a better standard of living. There were massive demonstrations in Leipzig in October 1989. Honecker resigned and in November Krenz decided to open the Berlin Wall (it collapsed on 9 November) as the government was unable to resist the scale of the demand for reform. Attempts at political change (free elections *etc*) were too late and in December the demonstrators in Leipzig began to demand reunification.

Chancellor Kohl of West Germany hoped that reunification would stabilize the flow of economic migrants to the west. In 1990, in both East and West Germany, the idea of reunification and how to manage it became the main focus of politicians. In October 1990 East and West Germany were formally reunified.

It is also important to note that other powers were willing to accept a reunified Germany within the EU and to relinquish their obligations to Berlin, which was still technically under Four Power administration. The US was particularly supportive of reunification and Gorbachev was realistic enough to realise that there was very little the Soviet Union could do despite anxieties about a reunified Germany as a member of NATO.

This is not an end of the Cold War question; the focus should be on events in Germany.

*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.***

Post-war developments in the Middle East 1945–2000

21. Examine the role played by the confessional state in the outbreak of the civil war in Lebanon in 1975.

An outline of the structure of the Confessional State would be a useful starting point here with some links to the various population groups in Lebanon. Political roles were dictated by confessional identity. The President was Maronite, the prime minister a Sunni and the speaker a Shia and the Maronites were the largest group in the assembly. By the mid 1970s Shia Muslims were the largest population group. Population balance had been destroyed by the influx of Palestinian refugees post-1948 and by 1970 their numbers were between 300,000 and 400,000. This imbalance was exacerbated by the movement of the PLO to Lebanon after Black September and in the early 1970s southern Lebanon was dominated by the PLO. Their presence and actions caused frequent tensions/incidents with Israel.

In 1975 the government tried to regain control of the south – PLO resistance led to clashes with the army (the officer corps was largely Christian and the rank and file were largely Muslim). Maronite militias became involved and, in response, the radical militias who were sympathetic to the PLO became active. Thus it is clear that the attempts by a Maronite-dominated state to establish control were resisted by other confessional groups.

Confessional tensions were also increased because of economic disparity; the Maronites and Sunnis were far wealthier than the Shia population many of whom had moved to urban areas with little opportunity for economic improvement. The government did little to implement social and economic reforms that may have prevented many of the urban working class from supporting the radical militias.

This is a complex issue and answers should focus on the factors that upset the delicate political balance in Lebanon leading to civil 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.***

22. Compare and contrast the nature and consequences of the 1967 and 1973 Arab–Israeli conflicts.

For compare: both conflicts were relatively brief; Israel used US-supplied equipment and was able to defeat or weaken Arab forces; both conflicts were ended by a UN demand for a ceasefire; both conflicts were regarded as military successes for Israel; both conflicts left the Occupied Territories as a cause of tension.

For contrast: 1967 was a pre-emptive strike by Israel whereas 1973 was an Egyptian-led offensive to regain lost territory; 1973 could be seen as a diplomatic victory for Sadat; in 1973 some territory was returned to Egypt (Sinai); the 1967 conflict led to increased tension in the region whereas 1973 contributed to movements towards peace talks.

*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.***

Social and economic developments in Europe and the Middle East in the 19th or 20th century

23. Evaluate the reasons for changes to the suffrage in any *one* country you have studied.

Britain is likely to be a popular choice; but allow any country in the region. Detailed knowledge rather than vague generalisations are sought. In Britain, changes in suffrage can include: the gradual extension of the franchise to remove property qualification between 1832 and 1928; giving women the vote; reducing, in 1969, the voting age from 21 to 18. Reasons could include: demographic change; the Suffragette movement and the impact of the First World War. There should be a clear focus on reasons for change rather than just a list of alterations to the suffrage.

If other exemplars are chosen, both changes to the suffrage and the reasons for that change should be clearly outlined.

*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. Examine the reasons for changes in social welfare policy over a fifty year period in any *one* country you have studied.

Germany and Britain are likely to be the most popular choices, but allow any country within the region. For Germany, candidates may discuss Bismarck’s social insurance legislation and contrast it with what went before. For reasons, they could place the social insurance measures in the context of his Anti-Socialist campaigns. For Britain, there could be material on social welfare policy under some of the following: Asquith; Attlee; Thatcher; Major; Blair (up to 2000). A wide variety of reasons could be examined for the changes in British social welfare in the fifty years following the Second World War.

Candidates could choose to consider reasons for change in social welfare policy in either the 19th or the 20th centuries.

*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.***