

# Markscheme

November 2020

History

Higher level

**Paper 3 – history of Europe**

21 pages

No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the IB.

Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits commercial use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, is not permitted and is subject to the IB's prior written consent via a license. More information on how to request a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite de l'IB.

De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation commerciale de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, n'est pas autorisée et est soumise au consentement écrit préalable de l'IB par l'intermédiaire d'une licence. Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour demander une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse suivante : <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin que medie la autorización escrita del IB.

Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso con fines comerciales de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales— no está permitido y estará sujeto al otorgamiento previo de una licencia escrita por parte del IB. En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given and **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 (for example, 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. Responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly. **If you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.**

Marks	Level descriptor
13–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses are clearly focused, showing a high degree of awareness of the demands and implications of the question. Answers are well structured, balanced and effectively organized.</li> <li>• Knowledge is detailed, accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is a clear understanding of historical concepts.</li> <li>• Examples used are appropriate and relevant, and are used effectively to support the analysis/evaluation.</li> <li>• Arguments are clear and coherent. There is evaluation of different perspectives, and this evaluation is integrated effectively into the answer.</li> <li>• The answer contains well-developed critical analysis. All, or nearly all, of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a reasoned conclusion.</li> </ul>
10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The demands of the question are understood and addressed. Answers are generally well structured and organized, although there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places.</li> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and relevant. Events are placed in their historical context, and there is a clear understanding of historical concepts. Examples used are appropriate and relevant, and are used to support the analysis/evaluation.</li> <li>• Arguments are mainly clear and coherent. There is some awareness and evaluation of different perspectives.</li> <li>• The response contains critical analysis. Most of the main points are substantiated, and the response argues to a consistent conclusion.</li> </ul>
7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response indicates an understanding of the demands of the question, but these demands are only partially addressed. There is an attempt to follow a structured approach.</li> <li>• Knowledge is mostly accurate and relevant. Events are generally placed in their historical context. Examples used are appropriate and relevant.</li> <li>• The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained.</li> </ul>
4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response indicates some understanding of the demands of the question. While there may be an attempt to follow a structured approach, the response lacks clarity and coherence.</li> <li>• Knowledge is demonstrated but lacks accuracy and relevance. There is a superficial understanding of historical context. The answer makes use of specific examples, although these may be vague or lack relevance.</li> <li>• There is some limited analysis, but the response is primarily narrative/descriptive in nature, rather than analytical.</li> </ul>
1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little understanding of the demands of the question. The response is poorly structured or, where there is a recognizable essay structure, there is minimal focus on the task.</li> <li>• Little knowledge is present. Where specific examples are referred to, they are factually incorrect, irrelevant or vague.</li> <li>• The response contains little or no critical analysis. It may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.</li> </ul>

**Section 1: Monarchies in England and France (1066–1223)**

1. “The main aim of William I’s foreign policy was to protect his conquest of England.” Discuss.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that William I’s foreign policy was defensive. Foreign policy issues to consider could include relations with Scotland, Wales, France, Flanders and Denmark. Rebellions in and attacks on Normandy could also be considered, for example in 1078 the French supported William’s son, Robert, in his rebellion. To support the statement candidates could discuss William I’s actions to prevent Scottish expansion in Cumbria and Northumbria. Similarly, he was anxious to resist potential threats from Denmark. Norman policy towards Wales was conducted more by the Marcher Lords who attempted to prevent Welsh incursions and who made some advances in South Wales. Some may argue that William was more concerned with his Norman territories than England. However, a counter argument is that a strong Normandy acted as protection from any aggression against England, which is why he had to deal effectively with rebellions. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

2. Examine the reasons for conflict between the kings of England and France between 1154 and 1216.

The question requires that candidates consider the underlying reasons for the intermittent conflicts between England and France over the time period. Some may argue that each conflict had a different cause, some were about the relationship between the kings of France and England and some were territorial disputes. For example, Henry II was reluctant to pay personal homage to Louis VII, there were disputes over the guardianship of Geoffrey of Brittany and Richard I broke his betrothal to Alys of France leading to conflict. Richard and John were in conflict with France to try and regain lost territories. Others may argue that there was one major underlying cause which was the desire of Louis VII and more particularly Phillip Augustus to extend the authority of the French Crown and to weaken the Angevin Commonwealth: a too powerful vassal of France. Phillip Augustus particularly exploited poor relations between Henry and his sons to extend French authority. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 2: Muslims and Jews in medieval Europe (1095–1492)**

3. “The main reason for hostility to Muslims was fear of their power.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that the main reason for the hostility to Muslims was fear of their power. Candidates may refer to European anxieties about access to Jerusalem and how this stoked their fears of Muslim power after the Seljuk invasions. Some may argue that economic power and the expansion of Muslim controlled lands was the reason for hostility as they controlled important trading routes. Clear examples of this are the tensions between Muslim traders and the important Christian cities of Pisa and Genoa. Another reason for hostility could be Muslim power in the Mediterranean. The Crusades in this respect can be viewed as a direct counterattack against their power. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example the economic decline of Europe or religion, which drove expansionism in the eastern Mediterranean to protect Eastern Christian people. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

4. “The persecution of the Jews had a negative impact on medieval European society.” Discuss.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that the persecution of Jews had a negative impact on medieval European society. Candidates may refer to their role as important traders or money lenders to merchants and kings and that their persecution often disturbed commerce or the flow of capital in many European countries. Some may argue that the segregation of Jews in particular districts and their exclusion from certain aspects of urban life had a negative impact on social and economic relations. Some may argue that rulers used Jews as scapegoats for economic problems to win favour with their population and candidates may consider this as having a positive effect for the rulers or a negative impact due to rulers’ failure to address the real cause. Other relevant factors, for example, religious fanaticism and violence between Christians and Jews in the context of the Crusades could be seen as drivers of persecution, but it could be argued that it had a unifying effect on Christians in society. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 3: Late medieval political crises (1300–1487)**

5. Discuss the causes of the first stage (1337–1360) of the Hundred Years' War.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the reasons why England and France first went to war in 1337. Some may argue the main reason was Edward III's claim to the French throne through his mother Isabella. The unexpected succession of Philip VI (Valois) was upheld by invoking Salic law, causing war between England and France. Others may argue that Edward initially paid homage for Aquitaine and did not make his claim until tensions with France increased over issues such as refuge being offered to David II in 1337 and the annexation of Aquitaine. Edward had to claim the throne to avoid excommunication for declaring war on his feudal overlord. Constant border tensions between France and Anglo-Gascon barons were a contributory factor. Some may point out that though the disputed succession was the main cause the underlying cause was rivalry between the French and English thrones for the rich territories of Aquitaine and Gascony. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

6. Compare and contrast the rule of Philip the Bold (Philip II) and Charles the Bold.

The question requires that candidates give an account of the similarities and differences in the reigns of the two rulers of ducal Burgundy. Philip was appointed Duke in 1363 with Burgundy remaining an appanage of France. Charles became Duke in 1467. Candidates may refer to the fact that both sought to increase Burgundian territory: Philip often through marriage, he acquired the counties of Burgundy, Artois and Flanders. Charles attempted to increase Burgundy's power through various military campaigns that were of limited success. Both encouraged merchants to trade actively to increase the wealth of Burgundy. Candidates may argue that the most significant difference between the two was in their relationship with France. Philip, as a French prince, was happy for the duchy to be linked to the French crown and much of his focus was on events in France. He was regent for Charles VI and he was determined to keep the Orleans branch of the Valois family from power. In contrast Charles wanted complete independence from France and was involved in various campaigns against France to achieve this. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 4: The Renaissance (c1400–1600)**

7. Compare and contrast the forms of government in **two** of the following Italian city states: Milan, Florence, Venice.

The question requires candidates give an account of the similarities and differences in the governments of two of the named city states referring to both throughout. Areas to discuss should include the size of the political class, which could include middle class merchants, a few wealthy families and possibly the guilds. Some may argue that all were similar in that they were oligarchies. Another area to consider could be the extent to which they were republics. There may be discussion of the dominance of one particular family such as the Sforza in Milan and the Medici in Florence. Some may argue that the *Doge* in Venice were an elective monarchy and that in Milan the Sforza were similar to a monarchy as power became hereditary, whereas Florence had a republican constitution that ensured that no one group or person had complete political control. The extent of similarities and differences will vary according to the chosen exemplars; do not expect an equal number of both. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

8. "The Renaissance had little impact." Discuss with reference to **one** European country excluding Italy, Burgundy and Germany.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that the Renaissance changed very little in the country they have chosen to consider. One approach could be to identify the main characteristics of the Renaissance and then to consider which of these, if any, had an impact. The main characteristics could include the move towards a more humanist education, developments in scientific knowledge, changing attitudes to religion, a more educated population as a consequence of developments in printing, support for trade and exploration, as well as changes in the arts and politics. The Renaissance is viewed as having transformed these areas and as being a period of cultural renewal. The extent of its impact will vary from country to country and candidates may offer some explanation as to why there was or was not a significant impact. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 5: The Age of Exploration and its impact (1400–1550)**

9. “The main reason for exploration was a desire to open trade routes for luxury goods.” Discuss.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that the main reason for exploration was a desire to open trade routes for luxury goods. Candidates may refer to the importance of luxury goods such as silk, gold, silver, ivory, porcelain and tea, which could be considered an impetus for exploration. Internal demand for these types of resources by certain social classes, such as the nobility and aristocracy, drove many of these classes to fund expeditions and also sparked the merchant classes to try to provide these goods. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example the Renaissance spirit linked to testing human ability; a desire to explore the unknown and to expand their knowledge of the world; economic expansion and competition particularly along Muslim and Italian trade routes; and the religious motive to expand Christianity also played a significant role. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

10. Discuss the consequences for European states of the exploration of the Indian Ocean.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the consequences for European states of the exploration of the Indian Ocean. Consequences may extend beyond the timeframe but they must be clearly linked to the issue raised in the question. Candidates may refer to the increased status of Portugal through the creation of new trade routes to India that broke apart the Arab–Venetian monopoly of the spice trade. Some may argue that a consequence was the arrival of various goods and their impact on the demand for certain commodities developed European markets. Candidates may refer to the transformation that took place in political and commercial organizations as important consequences of exploration. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example, a new world view of the globe and Europe’s place in it, and the power of European trading companies that monopolized trade for the mother country. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.



**Section 6: Aspects of the Reformation (1517–1572)**

11. Discuss the significance of Luther's three critical tracts of 1520 to the Reformation.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the significance of Luther's three critical tracts of 1520 to the Reformation. Consequences may extend beyond the timeframe but they must be clearly linked to the issue raised in the question. Candidates may refer to the challenge this represented to the very foundations of Catholicism in its attacks on the sacraments, particularly in the second tract. Some may argue that the third tract was significant as it concerned Christian liberty, focused more on political life, the Catholic system and the pope himself. Some may argue that the three tracts focused on faith and the word of God which helped crystalize the demands and logic of the Reformation and their significance as a call to action that proposed the separation of the spiritual and political realm. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example the role of the Christian nobility in challenging the position of the pope and demanding a sort of egalitarian relationship between priests and the faithful, but with a focus on the issue in the question. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

12. Evaluate the role of the Peace of Augsburg in resolving religious conflict.

The question requires that candidates make an appraisal of the role of the Peace of Augsburg, weighing up the strengths and limitations in resolving religious conflict. Candidates may refer to the important part it played in relieving some of the religious tension and in producing a certain level of tolerance. Some may argue the importance of allowing German princes to decide their religious affiliations in the sovereign territories and the fact that it did maintain the peace and save the Holy Roman Empire from serious internal conflict. Candidates may also refer to its limitations, for example, legalizing but not accepting all religious practices within the Protestant traditions, which can be considered a cause of the Thirty Years' War. Some may argue that the Peace of Augsburg did not address the important issue of reparations for some of the territorial possessions or ecclesiastical lands of Catholics in Lutheran territories. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

### Section 7: Absolutism and Enlightenment (1650–1800)

13. “Enlightenment ideas had little impact on politics.” Discuss with reference to **two** of the following: Germany, England, Scotland, France, Spain, the Dutch Republic or Italy.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the extent to which Enlightenment ideas changed political activity/structures in their chosen exemplars. There may be discussion as to whether these ideas altered attitudes to social inequality and ultimately contributed to a revolution as was perhaps the case in France. In other exemplars anti-clericalism reduced the power and influence of the church. Arguably, Enlightenment ideas contributed to the emergence of an educated and prosperous middle class in many countries, who felt it was their right to participate in politics. Some may argue that this educated bourgeoisie meant that rulers/governments had to consider public opinion. The importance of scientific ideas also had some impact on politics, there was a growing expectation that political power should be implemented rationally and effectively. Some might argue that Enlightenment ideas had very limited impact in many states even where the ruler was interested in Enlightenment ideas, such as Frederick the Great in Prussia, as the political structure was unchanged. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

14. Examine the importance of monarchical patronage to the arts.

The question requires that candidates examine the interrelationship between artistic development and monarchical patronage. It could be argued that monarchical patronage was very important to the arts as it was the main means of financing artistic endeavor. The arts could be taken to include architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry, literature and even porcelain such as Sèvres and tapestries such as Gobelins. Responses could also highlight that monarchs supported the arts in order to enhance their own power. It could also be argued that aristocratic and even bourgeois patrons were as important as monarchical patronage. Examples of monarchs who were great patrons could include Louis XIV in France, where the building of Versailles supported a range of artistic activities (architecture, painting, sculpture); Frederick the Great’s support for music and poetry in Prussia; Augustus II in Saxony (Meissen china) and Goya as court painter in Spain. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 8: The French Revolution and Napoleon I (1774–1815)**

15. To what extent was Louis XVI responsible for the end of the monarchy in 1792?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the view that the actions of Louis XVI caused the collapse of the monarchy. Some may choose to set their responses within the context of Louis' reign with some discussion of the causes of the 1789 Revolution and argue for or against Louis' responsibility for these problems. Some may argue that his actions during the constitutional period were contributory factors to the end of the monarchy. Louis reluctantly agreed to his power being limited by the 1791 Constitution. The flight to Varennes in June 1791 caused much hostility towards the monarchy. Others could argue that the radicalization of the revolution was caused by the financial crisis and the fear of invasion and this had little to do with Louis, who was virtually powerless by then. Radicalization led to the Jacobin coup of August 1792 and the election of the republican-dominated National Convention which made the end of the monarchy much more likely. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

16. "The Revolution had a significant social and economic impact up to 1799." To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that the economy and social structure of France was affected by the Revolution. The impact could be both negative and positive. The economic impact was largely negative with growing inflation and the fluctuating value of the *assignat*, which collapsed in 1796. The war was costly and damaged manufacturing and trade (exports fell by 50%); this is directly linked to the revolution. Arguably there was significant social change with the end of the monarchy and feudalism. The bourgeoisie gained power, wealth and influence and dominated politics to a great extent. The peasantry was no longer restricted by feudalism and retained land gained, so a large class of small landowners was established. Despite the Terror and emigration (7–8%) the position of the nobility remained largely unchanged as they retained most of their landholdings. In the cities where the *sans culottes* gained little economically or politically, the Revolution had little permanent impact on their lives. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 9: France (1815–1914)**

17. To what extent were the policies of Charles X the main reason for the establishment of the July Monarchy?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the view that it was the policies of Charles X that led to his abdication and the establishment of the July Monarchy. Policies to consider could include: compensation for *émigrés*, the return of the Jesuits and the introduction of the death penalty for sacrilege; these all led to the growth of an opposition press led by Thiers. Polignac's appointment as chief minister increased criticism of Charles. The July Ordinances of 1830 (St. Cloud Ordinances) were an attempt to control the press and reduce the electorate, this led to increased opposition and a workers/bourgeois alliance calling for resistance to the reactionary policies. The regime lost control of the situation in July; Louis Philippe accepted the Tricolor flag and despite Charles' abdication in favor of his grandson, Louis Philippe was proclaimed King of the French in August. Responses could argue that the policies were largely responsible for the Revolution of 1830, but that it was a middle-class revolution not a republican one, that wanted a moderate monarchy. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

18. Evaluate the successes and failures of the domestic policies of Napoleon III.

The question requires that candidates make an appraisal of Napoleon III's domestic policies, weighing up the strengths and limitations. He had promised peace, stability and economic growth. France experienced industrial growth and development of the railways. Improvement to financial credit systems (Crédit Mobilier, Crédit Foncier) encouraged investment. He pursued free trade, for example signing the Cobden–Chevalier Treaty, although this was not always popular. The 1850s were prosperous although not for the working class. There was political stability as Napoleon used some censorship to limit opposition, but repression was limited. Education was made compulsory and there was a great improvement in literacy. Napoleon also remodelled Paris with Haussmann's help, some might argue that this displaced many people in working-class areas and forced rents up. During the Liberal Empire, opposition groups were allowed a voice and in the plebiscite of 1870 some 7.3 million people supported the regime. Some may argue the policies were successful but that their impact was uneven across the population. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 10: Society, politics and economy in Britain and Ireland (1815–1914)**

19. “Social protest was the main reason for the repeal of the Corn Laws.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that social protest was the main reason for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Candidates may consider the nature and tactics of the Anti-Corn Law League: it was a very middle-class movement that relied on the press, petitions and some mass meetings to generate support. By 1845 there were 12 abolitionist MPs and Peel reduced some duties. Peel was convinced of the need for repeal but was worried about the unity of his party. The Irish potato famine caused him to bring a repeal bill to parliament with the support of the Cabinet, during the ensuing crisis the Conservative Party split and the bill was passed with Whig support. It could be argued that it was the Anti-Corn Law League with significant popular support that made repeal a live political issue leading to repeal. Others could argue it was Peel's determination to push repeal through parliament knowing it would split the Conservative Party that led to the repeal of the Corn Laws. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

20. Evaluate the impact of the Labour Party on British politics before the First World War.

The question requires candidates to make an appraisal of the impact of the emergence of the Labour Party on British politics prior to 1914, weighing up the strengths and limitations. In 1900, the Labour Representation Committee (LRC) was formed. The LRC made an electoral pact with the Liberals and contributed to the Liberal landslide of 1906. The pact ensured that 29 Labour MPs were elected, who were able to have some influence on Liberal policies. In support of this argument reference could be made to the Trades Disputes Act (1906) and the Workmen's Compensation Act (1906). However, some might argue that the Liberal government introduced reforms because they did not want to lose working-class votes to Labour and because of the need to improve the health and lives of the population in the national interest. It could be argued that after 1907 the Labour party had limited influence on Liberal reforms. In 1911, there were more than 40 Labour MPs, however they remained the fourth party in the House of Commons with limited impact on politics. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 11: Italy (1815–1871) and Germany (1815–1890)**

21. Discuss the reasons for the growth of nationalism and liberalism in the German states during the Vormärz period.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the reasons for the growth of nationalism and liberalism in the German states during the Vormärz period. Reasons may predate the timeframe but they must be clearly linked to the issue raised in the question. Candidates may refer to the growth of nationalism as a response to the earlier Napoleonic occupation, but that other events, in particular the Rhine crisis of 1840, contributed to nationalism. Some may argue that other reasons for the growth of liberalism were a reaction to the political structures of the individual German states themselves as obstacles for representative government or the support that the professional classes and intelligentsia gave to these ideas. Other relevant factors may be considered, such as the impact of the German confederation, the *Zollverein*, the role played by the Austrian Empire in fuelling nationalism and liberalism. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

22. Evaluate the contribution of Garibaldi to the unification of Italy.

The question requires that candidates make an appraisal of the contribution of Garibaldi to the unification of Italy weighing up the strengths and limitations of his contributions. Candidates may argue that his military contributions in the numerous wars of independence, particularly the Sicilian/Neapolitan campaign of 1860, were significant in the process of unification but might evaluate the relative importance of different actions. Some may argue that his obsession with Rome, from the Roman Republic in 1849 to the numerous attempts to gain control of the city thereafter, helped highlight its importance as a symbol of a fully unified Italy. Some may argue that while Garibaldi's contributions were significant the actions of Cavour and Victor Emmanuel in European diplomacy were a greater contribution to unification. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example Cavour's use of Garibaldi's actions for his own goals, the decline of the Austrian Empire or the need for economic consolidation and administrative centralization that pushed Italy towards unification. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 12: Imperial Russia, revolution and the establishment of the Soviet Union (1855–1924)**

23. Compare and contrast the rule of Alexander II and Alexander III.

The question requires that candidates give an account of the similarities and differences in the reigns of the two tsars. Candidates may choose to examine domestic policies, the nature of their rule and foreign policies. The major difference was that Alexander II was a reformer and Alexander III a reactionary; some may argue that both were autocrats. There should be reference to Alexander II's major reforms and how Alexander III reversed them to some extent. For example, the appointment of Land Captains by Alexander III undermined the *zemstvo*, he also increased church influence over education as well as increasing censorship. Both were keen to promote economic growth (emancipation of the serfs, the development of railways and the promotion of industrialization) and there may be some discussion as to how far this was achieved. In foreign policy both were concerned to recover Russian status as a great power (Russo-Turkish War, membership of the *Dreikaiserbund*) and both were keen to extend Russian influence in the Balkans. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

24. "The Bolshevik seizure of power was not based on widespread popular support." To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that the Bolsheviks did not have huge popular support when they seized power in Oct/Nov 1917. To agree with the statement there could be discussion of the extent of popular support for the Bolsheviks, they had majorities in the Moscow and Petrograd Soviets but only gained 25% of the vote for the Constituent Assembly. There may also be discussion of Lenin's decision to seize the opportunity presented by the disintegration of the Provisional Government and the careful planning of Trotsky to ensure the Bolsheviks gained political power swiftly with the help of the Red Guards. It may be argued that the Bolshevik seizure of power was a political conspiracy. Some may argue that there was popular support to some extent; the unrest in Petrograd indicated discontent with the Provisional Government and the lack of resistance to the Bolsheviks showed a measure of support for Bolshevik actions. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 13: Europe and the First World War (1871–1918)**

25. To what extent was the decline of the Ottoman Empire the most significant long-term cause of the First World War?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the view that the decline of the Ottoman Empire was the most significant long-term cause of the First World War. Candidates may refer to the decline of the Ottoman Empire as a major reason for geopolitical expansion on the part of all, or nearly all, the major powers. Some may argue that the importance of the “Eastern Question” and the rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary that developed as a consequence of the decline of Ottoman power was a major cause of the war. These tensions were also fuelled by key political and economic interests in the region. Some candidates may mention that the political vacuum that the Ottoman Empire left, after the loss of Balkan territories in the Balkan Wars, had an emboldening effect on Slavic nationalism which contributed to the outbreak of war. Some may argue that Austria–Hungary’s annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 angered the Russian Empire and increased tensions between the two major alliances. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example, German imperialism and expansionism, or the general atmosphere of militarism linked to the arms race, but with a focus on the issue in the question. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

26. “The strategic errors of the Central Powers were the most significant reason for their defeat in 1918.” Discuss.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that the strategic errors of the Central Powers were the most significant reason for their defeat in 1918. Candidates may refer to military tactics and errors such as the Schlieffen Plan; events such as the battle of the Marne or Verdun; or unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany, which could be considered a cause of the US entry into the war and significant to their defeat. Some may argue that the continuation of German offensives in 1917–1918 contributed to their defeat or that the weakness and different power balance between the Central Powers and the Entente was a significant reason. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example, the internal domestic challenges within the Central Powers, the crumbling of Germany’s allies or the differing levels of economic resources on both sides. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.



**Section 14: Inter-war domestic developments in European states (1918–1939)**

27. “Hitler’s pre-war social and economic policies had popular support.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that Hitler’s pre-war social and economic policies had popular support. Candidates may offer equal coverage of social and economic policies, or they may prioritize their assessment of one. However, both aspects will be a feature of the response. Candidates may refer to the New Plan of 1933, the Four-Year Plan of 1936 and attempts at autarky, the extent to which these resolved economic depression or unemployment together with their relative popularity. Some may argue that social policies such as the Nuremberg Laws were largely popular but obviously not with the Jewish minority. Candidates may refer to opposition being present but that it was either ineffective or not significant in size and scope. Some may argue that the Catholic Church opposed some Nazi policies such as the removal of crucifixes from schools. Some policies were unpopular with youth groups, in particular the Edelweiss Pirates, who rejected joining the Hitler Youth. Others may argue that despite the various plebiscites supporting the Nazis, the nature of the Nazi state means it is difficult to judge the level of popular support. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

28. To what extent were economic conditions in Spain the main cause of the Civil War in 1936?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the view that economic conditions in Spain were the main cause of the war in 1936. Causes may predate the timeframe but they must be clearly linked to the issue raised in the question. Candidates may refer to the lack of economic development; the asymmetrical nature of development and the north–south divide such as *minifundios* and *latifundios*; and the failure of the 1932 Agrarian Reform Act to effectively address the land question. Some candidates may argue that the poverty and inequality of the peasants and large rural populations were used by radical political organizations such as the CNT (*Confederación Nacional del Trabajo*) or FAI (*Federación Anarquista Ibérica*) to gain support. Other relevant factors may be considered, for example events such as the *Bienio Negro* or the Asturian Uprising, and the fear of revolution, which mobilized right-wing parties such as CEDA (*Confederación Española de Derechas Autónomas*) leading to political polarization. Others may also argue that causes were linked to the inability of Socialist-Republican leaders such as Azaña or Largo Caballero to effectively address political and economic grievances; or the failure of sections of the Right to accept the Second Republic. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 15: Diplomacy in Europe (1919–1945)**

29. “The Paris peace treaties (1919–1923) caused more problems than they solved.” Discuss with reference to **two** treaties.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that the Paris peace treaties (1919–1923) caused more problems than they solved. Candidates may offer equal coverage of two treaties or they may prioritize their discussion of one. However, both treaties will be a feature of the response. Candidates may refer to the general principles and political considerations of the treaties that led to hostility and instability; the contradiction of the principle of self-determination, such as the Anschluss which was forbidden by Versailles. Some may argue that the problems emerged from the fact that the defeated powers were not invited to the negotiations in Paris or that the harshness of the various treaties in terms of war reparations or territorial changes became important grievances for Austria, Hungary and Germany leading to demands for revision of the treaties. Some may argue that security guarantees were not sufficient such as the failure of Versailles to safeguard France against a future German attack. Some could argue that the treaties did solve some problems of national self-determination such as the establishment of an independent Poland and the Baltic states. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

30. “The main aim of Russian/Soviet foreign policy in Europe between 1919 and 1941 was to promote collective security.” Discuss.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that the main aim of Russian/Soviet foreign policy in Europe between 1919 and 1941 was to promote collective security. Candidates may argue that the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922 and the Treaty of Berlin in 1926 helped resolve tensions between Germany and the USSR, advancing collective security in the early part of the inter-war years. Candidates may refer to individual non-aggression pacts (i.e. with France and Czechoslovakia) as well as the USSR’s entry into the League of Nations in 1934 as also promoting collective security. Some may argue that Soviet disillusionment with the British and French appeasement of the fascist powers affected collective security and altered the aims of Russian foreign policy. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example the non-aggression pact with Germany in 1939; Soviet involvement in the Spanish Civil War and the breaking of the non-intervention pact in 1936 could be seen as not pursuing collective security. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 16: The Soviet Union and post-Soviet Russia (1924–2000)**

31. “Propaganda was not a major factor in Stalin’s maintenance of power between 1929 and 1953.” Discuss.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the statement that propaganda was not a major factor in Stalin retaining power in the Soviet Union for 24 years. In challenging the statement some candidates may discuss the cult of personality with Stalin presented as Father of the People and Generalissimo during the Second World War. This emphasis on Stalin as a great figure who was leading the Soviet Union to prosperity, security and victory overshadowed other politicians thereby maintaining his dominance. In agreeing with the proposition, it could be argued that it was his dominance of the Communist Party and his willingness to use the party and the NKVD to purge potential rivals such as Kirov, the old Bolsheviks in the Show Trials and even war heroes such as Zhukov, that ensured his continuing in power. In the post-war period, Stalin was able to invoke Cold War tensions to reassert control. It may be argued that propaganda was a product of his power rather than a tool to maintain his position. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

32. Evaluate the impact of political and economic developments in post-Soviet Russia between 1991 and 2000.

The question requires that candidates make an appraisal of the consequences of political and economic change in post-Soviet Russia, weighing up the strengths and limitations. The move to market economics with the “shock therapy” of abandoning price controls led to rising prices, unemployment and homelessness. The key economic impacts were uncertainty, inflation and a poor standard of living for large numbers of the population. With the privatization of state enterprises, the oligarchs emerged and there was industrial decline because of the lack of investment, increasing crime and corruption. From 1993 onwards, politics became less democratic following the attack on the White House (the Russian Parliament building). The new constitution gave the presidency enormous power and limited that of the Duma. There was an element of democracy as parties were still functioning, but they were increasingly subject to interference from the state. The fact that Boris Yeltsin was able to virtually nominate his successor is an indication of the level of presidential power. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

**Section 17: Post-war western and northern Europe (1945–2000)**

33. “The breakdown of the wartime alliance was the main reason for the division of Germany by 1949.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that the breakdown of the wartime alliance was the main reason for the division of Germany by 1949. Candidates may refer to the continuous series of meetings between the major powers after 1945 in which major differences emerged; the initial agreement around unity of the German state breaking down in the Potsdam Conference; larger issues of cooperation between the occupational forces were never fully resolved. Some candidates may argue that the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers in 1947 showed considerable disagreement between Soviet demands for reparations and the Western policy of making Germany self-sufficient or the Soviet division of Berlin being directly linked to no final agreement around reparations. Other relevant factors may be addressed, for example Cold War tensions or Stalin’s desire for a buffer zone between east and west could be considered equally important in the division of Germany. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

34. Examine the role of the Marshall Plan in the reconstruction of France and West Germany (1945–1963).

The question requires that candidates examine the interrelationship between the Marshall Plan and the reconstruction of France and West Germany (1945–1963). Candidates may offer equal coverage of France and West Germany, or they may prioritize their examination of one. However, the reconstruction of both countries will be a feature of the response. The plan consisted of \$1.4 billion of economic assistance for West Germany but the figure was higher for France. Some may argue that it sparked the industrial renewal of France as it received \$2 billion in grants and was the second highest beneficiary of Marshall Aid. Candidates may refer to the interrelationship between the Marshall Plan and the political imperative of stopping the spread of communism. This was the case with the reconstruction of West Germany, as it was bordering the Soviet sphere of influence. Candidates may explore its impact regionally in catalysing economic unity in Europe by helping to spark the birth of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC). Other relevant interrelationships may be considered, for example the link between aid and economic recovery as France began to recover even before the Marshall Plan was put in place. Candidates’ opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

### Section 18: Post-war central and eastern Europe (1945–2000)

35. Discuss the reasons why Tito was able to resist Soviet control of Yugoslavia.

The question requires that candidates offer a considered and balanced review of the reasons why Tito was able to resist Soviet control of Yugoslavia. Candidates may argue that one reason for his successful resistance to Stalin's plans for the Yugoslav economy was his development of his own brand of communism. He denationalized industry and put workers in control, which improved the economy. Some may argue Tito's introduction of a semi Marxist system with capitalist elements and his internal popularity as a war hero were key factors that helped him resist Soviet control. Some may argue that his foreign policy initiatives and membership of the Non-Aligned Movement were also reasons for his successful resistance. Others may argue that the Soviet Union was distracted by events in the rest of the Eastern bloc and was unable to invade Yugoslavia. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

36. "Walesa was the main reason for successful Polish resistance to Soviet control." To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The question requires that candidates consider the merits or otherwise of the statement that Walesa was the main reason for successful Polish resistance to Soviet control. Candidates may refer to the early resistance attempts by Walesa in the 1970s, when he mobilized workers' strikes. Candidates may refer to his role as founder of the Solidarity movement, which became a major challenge to Soviet control. Jaruzelski imposed martial law in 1981 and banned Solidarity, however, by 1988, Walesa was able to form the Solidarity Citizens' Committee. This became a political party and won the June 1989 elections, becoming the first non-communist government in the Soviet bloc. Other relevant factors may be considered, for example the various resistance groups and many other civil organizations, such as the Church, that resisted Soviet control. Candidates' opinions or conclusions will be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

---