



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2009**

**HISTORY**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 2**

*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 IB Cardiff.*

**Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war****1. Compare and contrast the causes of *two* twentieth century civil wars.**

Any two twentieth century civil wars may be used including the two named in question 4, as in both cases these wars involved divisions in territory that was originally one country, but as noted below causes were partly due to superpower politics.

Causes could include some of the following:

- ideological differences
- economic differences, *e.g.* between rich and poor, town and rural/agricultural and industrial workers
- regional/geographical differences
- political problems
- Cold War issues

Civil war in China, Russia and Spain will probably be popular choices, and details for comparison and contrast will depend on wars chosen.

Maximum **[7 marks]** if only one war is addressed.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general inadequate comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a satisfactory comparison either in a comparative framework or a sequential one with excellent linkage.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for explicit comparison and contrast in a comparative framework.

**[17+ marks]** for a clear and balanced comparison and contrast.

**2. Define guerrilla warfare, and discuss its significance in *two* wars, each chosen from a different region.**

Guerrilla warfare could be defined as irregular warfare involving popular support, a high degree of politicization and tactical flexibility. It was generally used in the twentieth century by a small force fighting in difficult terrain, against larger conventional forces. At times it was successfully used in revolutionary and national liberation wars.

Some wars that could be used as examples would include wars by the Chinese Communists against Japan and the Nationalists, various partisan groups in the two World Wars, the Algerian war of independence, Castro in Cuba, and conflicts in Korea and Vietnam. Candidates may well note and use other examples.

Award up to **[5 or 6 marks]** for the definition, and expect analytical discussion of significance for high marks. If only one war or one region is addressed mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive accounts with minimal definition.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for satisfactory definition and discussion of two wars.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a suitable definition and clear focus and assessment.

**[17+ marks]** for a clear and valid definition and a wide ranging analytical discussion.

**3. Analyse (a) the short-term results, and (b) the long-term results up to 1935, of the First World War.**

It is intended that by dividing the question into two parts, (a) and (b), candidates will exercise judgment as to which results are long-term, and which are short-term, and give their reasons for this judgment. Do not penalise those who do not divide their answer, but if no judgment as to short- and long-term is given, this will weaken the answer and lower the mark. Candidates who describe everything that they know that took place between the two world wars, as a result of the First World War, will not score well. Clear analysis of why the event *etc.* was the result of war, must be given for a good mark.

There will be variations between what is considered a short-term result, and what is considered a long-term result, but as long as the argument is convincing, accept.

Some suggestions for short-term results:

- winners and losers
- Paris Peace Conference – its terms and effects could be in both (a) and (b)
- economic and financial effects on winners and losers
- war damage
- role of women, during and after the war
- political changes in the various countries involved; Weimar is very relevant, the Russian revolutions could be made partly so, but they were also the results of other factors
- foundation of the League of Nations – but not its successes or failures.

Some suggestions for long-term results:

- emergence of totalitarian states
- problems of disarmament and rearmament
- further economic, social and political problems
- stimulus to colonial nationalist movements
- alteration to the Balance of Power

**N.B.** Reserve at least *[7 marks]* for the weaker section of short- or long-term results, if one is weaker than the other. The end date is 1935, therefore the Second World War is not relevant although it may be noted in the conclusion.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate or irrelevant knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative causes, with implicit evaluation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for concise details and balance between long-term and short-term.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for good structure, focus and analytical evaluation.

*[17 + marks]* for analytical judgement, balance and perhaps different interpretations.

**4. In what ways, and with what results, did *either* the Korean War *or* the Vietnam War bring about social and cultural changes in the countries involved?**

This will probably not be a popular choice. Examiners must be sure that the changes are social and cultural, not political.

The Korean War lasted from 1950 to 1953. The main states involved were Korea, (North and South), China and the USA. Candidates should be able to explain how the changes resulted from the fighting caused both physical and psychological changes in the populations involved.

The Vietnam War, from 1964 to 1975, was longer, so could be said to have caused more and more damaging social and cultural changes. Candidates will probably focus on the USA, but the impact on the population of Vietnam and other participants should be addressed – for example the effect on demographics, religious practice, resettlement, education and class structure in South East Asia post-1975 especially.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive answers focused on ways and results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus, detail and assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for clear focus on ways and results of social and cultural changes.

*[17+marks]* for depth of knowledge and analysis.

**5. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the nature of war in the air change between 1939 and 1990?**

This fifty year period covers the outbreak of the Second World War, to the “end” of the Cold War, and the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

Ways could cover bombing, from the mass bombing of the Second World War, which also saw fighter aircraft battles, and the atom bomb, to the so-called precision bombing of Iraq. Appropriate examples such as the conflicts in Korea and Vietnam could be used. The use of reconnaissance or spy planes, and air transport, could also be considered.

Reasons for change could include advances in technology and changes in fighting methods and strategy, hence the need for different types of aircraft.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate general comments and observations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative answers with some focus on ways and reasons.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers focused competently on ways and reasons.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well structured and focused answers.

*[17 + marks]* for wide accurate knowledge and pertinent analysis.

**Topic 2 Nationalist and independence movements, decolonization and challenges facing new states**

**6. Analyse the factors which helped the growth of *two* independence movements, each chosen from a different region.**

Factors favouring the development and success of independence movements could include some of the following: harsh/unpopular colonial regimes; colonies that had already received some share in government and administration, and wanted more; growth of education, training, political awareness *etc.* in colonies; the impact of both world wars; encouragement from the colonial power, or other states; foundation and work of the United Nations.

Do not demand all the above and reward other factors. Answers can consist of two separate parts, or an essay that addresses both, perhaps thematically.

Neither the rise of Castro nor the rise to power of Mao and the CCP is a valid choice.

**N.B.** If only one country or one region is addressed, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate or irrelevant material.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative answers with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for adequate knowledge and some explicit analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for relevant, focused, structured analytical answers.

**[17+ marks]** for perceptive analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

**7. For what reasons, and with what results, did Pakistan obtain independence as a separate state in 1947?**

For reasons candidates need to explain why the Indian sub-continent was granted independence, and why Pakistan became an independent nation split from India.

For the first part (independence for the whole sub-continent), candidates could explain the importance of the Indian National Congress, founded in 1885, and the work of Gandhi, who wanted independence for the sub-continent as a whole. For the second part (Pakistan as a separate state) candidates could address the work of Jinnah, foundation of the Muslim League, the predominance of Muslims in specific areas of the sub-continent, and the policies of the British government, influenced by Jinnah, who supported Britain in the Second World. The results included independence according to the Indian Independence Act of 1947, bloodshed between Muslims and Hindus, and boundary wars with India. In 1947 Pakistan became a Dominion in the Commonwealth, but became a republic in 1956 and left the Commonwealth. Political, social and economic problems of the new state should be addressed.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate knowledge of reasons and results.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of events leading to independence and its aftermath.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on, and understanding of, reasons and results.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis of reasons and results.

*[17+ marks]* for wide ranging knowledge and an analytical approach.

**8. Compare and contrast the methods used by *two* leaders of independence movements in their bid for power in *two* states, one in Africa and one in Asia.**

The wording of the question requires knowledge of the methods used by the two leaders during the campaign for independence. The emphasis is rise, not rule!

Methods to use in the comparison could include: peaceful or violent; gathering an army, and fighting an actual campaign or not; legal or illegal; oral and written campaigning; use of propaganda; treatment of supporters and enemies; use of foreign support. Actual details will depend on leaders chosen, one of whom must be from Africa and the other from Asia.

Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one leader is addressed or both leaders selected are from the same region.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate or irrelevant material.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit comparison.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for sound knowledge used in a comparative structure.

*[17+ marks]* for an extra quality, such as balanced comparative and contrasting evidence.



**9. To what extent was the colonial legacy responsible for problems in *one* non-European new state, in the first ten years after independence?**

Problems of the colonial legacy could include: an uneducated and untrained population; lack of political skills; dependence on one crop, which had been forced on the colony by the colonial ruler; lack of economic skills and knowledge; ethnic/racial problems due to metropolitan support for one ethnic group during the colonial era.

A thematic approach with specific examples of problems used as evidence to support the arguments made should lead to an analytical answer. Note the time scale.

**N.B.** Neither Castro's Cuba nor China under Mao is a valid example.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for limited or very limited knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of one new former colonial state, with implicit attention to "colonial legacy".

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on, and assessment of, colonial legacy.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analysis of the colonial legacy in an appropriate structure.

*[17+ marks]* for an added skill, probably thematic, and perhaps different interpretations.

**10. Examine post-independence economic and social problems in *one* of the following: Algeria; the Caribbean; Indonesia.**

Economic and social problems could include: parts of the colonial legacy, as in the previous question; poverty and unrest after a fight for independence; religious and/or ethnic divisions; gender issues; attempts at modernisation which conflicted with traditional culture; lack of adequate agricultural diversity, trade and industry. Actual details will depend on the country chosen.

**N.B.** Note that Castro's Cuba is not a valid example.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalisations and limited knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for attempts to focus on and examine specific problems.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus, structure and analysis.

*[17 + marks]* for in depth knowledge and analysis.

**Topic 3      The rise and rule of single-party states**

**11. Analyse the methods used by *either* Castro or Perón to obtain power.**

After studying law Castro attempted an armed rising in 1953 against Batista, failed, was imprisoned, but released under an amnesty. He fled to Mexico, landed in Cuba in 1956, with a small band of insurgents, gathered more support and was ready to mount a full-scale attack in late 1958. Batista fled and Castro became prime minister in 1959. Candidates need to analyse Castro's methods, the weakness of Batista, and explain why Castro's methods succeeded.

Perón, an army officer, helped plan the military coup in Argentina, in 1930 and also played a leading role in the army coup in 1943. He was an important member of the government, and as Minister of Labour and Social Security he gained popular support with his social reforms. He survived a US led attempt to oust him, and was elected president in 1946. Perón's army background, and early success through winning popular support and profiting from it should be analysed, as well as the situation in Argentina.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalisations and/or limited knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts with implicit assessment of methods.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on methods with specific evidence and explicit assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for clearly structured and focused analytical answers.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed knowledge to support in-depth analysis.

**12. “The aims and policies of single-party state rulers rarely followed their declared ideology.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?**

The number of rulers to examine is not stated, but as the plural is used, more than one would be expected. A thematic approach would probably be preferable. Points for consideration could be: a discussion on “declared ideology”; what was the ideology of the ruler being discussed? Did he believe in it, or was he using it to obtain support; did ideologies have specific aims and policies associated with them; was it easier to follow one ideology more closely than another; were there differences between left and right wing ideologies? Consideration of policies adopted for reasons of pragmatism, or expediency is relevant here.

**N.B.** If only one single-party state ruler is addressed, mark out of a maximum of *[12 marks]*

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated assertions or vague ideas.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts, of possibly two rulers, or an analysis focused on one ruler.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for genuine attempts to get to grips with the question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured thoughtful answers.

*[17+ marks]* for pertinent appraisal and in-depth analysis.

**13. Evaluate the domestic policies of *either* Hitler *or* Nasser.**

All aspects – political, social, economic, religious and cultural could be addressed. Candidates could also consider, in whose interests were the policies designed: to benefit the state, or keep the leader in power? They could also judge successes and failures, and for whom? Much should be known about both rulers; but do not expect that all issues will be covered.

Hitler became Chancellor of Germany in 1933 and committed suicide in 1945. War time domestic issues would of course be relevant, but a high mark could be obtained without reference to them. Nasser was prime minister of Egypt from 1954 to 1956 and president from 1956 to 1970.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated assertions or vague ideas.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts of either ruler.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for some explicit evaluation of key domestic policies.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured thematic analytical answers.

*[17+ marks]* for pertinent appraisal, balance and in-depth analysis.

**14. For what reasons, and with what success, did rulers of single-party states use foreign policy to maintain their power? At least *two* rulers should be considered.**

The demands of the question require candidates to consider why rulers used foreign policy to maintain their power and position at home, and how successful they were. For reasons, the following points could be considered: to divert attention away from problems at home; to win prestige and glory, and thus enhance the ruler's reputation at home; lack of foreign involvement could also be considered as a means of concentrating all resources and energy on domestic policies and improvements, and thus maintaining power without an active foreign policy. Alliances/treaties could be considered as methods to ensure the security of the single-party states and rulers.

The degree of success attained will depend on the rulers chosen. Often rulers, *e.g.* Hitler and Mussolini used foreign policy successfully, at least partially so, then perished as a result of it. At least two rulers are required, but rather than taking just two examples, a thematic approach using several rulers to illustrate points made could prove a successful approach.

Note that different regions are not required, so Hitler and Mussolini or even Lenin and Stalin could be used together. Castro would be a suitable choice. If only one ruler is considered mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for uncoordinated comments and limited knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative of two rulers with implicit reasons and success.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for focus on and assessment of reasons and success.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for structured analysis of reasons and success.

**[17+ marks]** for focused analytical interpretations of reasons and success.

**15. In what ways did *two* rulers of single-party states, each chosen from a different region, (a) use, and (b) misuse, the arts and education?**

The clearest way to answer this question is to select two rulers, from different regions, then answer (a) for both, then (b) for both. Probably Hitler and Mao will be a popular combination.

(a) The arts could be used to protect and preserve national culture, and obtain internal and external prestige. Education was important for the economy, trade, industry *etc.*, and generally an educated population was the aim of most rulers.

(b) The arts were misused as propaganda: racial; political and nationalist. Often they were censored, and artists were persecuted if they did not follow official views. Education was misused when it became a tool for inculcating propaganda to enhance the ruler's personality cult/aims and policies. The distortion of facts was frequent.

Actual details will depend on rulers chosen, but specific evidence, is essential for good marks.

**N.B.** if only one ruler is addressed mark out of *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalities.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive/narrative answers.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on the question, *i.e.* use and misuse.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed specific evidence and assessment.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth, structured and analytical responses.

**Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states**

16. (a) **Explain the aims of *one* international organization.**
- (b) **To what extent were these aims implemented [carried out] in the ten years after the organization's foundation?**

Most candidates will probably choose the League of Nations or the United Nations, but other international organizations could be used.

For (a) The League was formally established in 1920 with the aims of preserving peace, after the horrors of the First World War, and settling disputes by arbitration. Functionalism (the work of agencies and commissions) and arms limitation were also important features of its work.

The United Nations was planned during the Second World War, as a result of the failure of the League. Discussions were first held in Moscow in 1943, then Dumbarton Oaks in 1944, and San Francisco in 1945, where the Charter was drafted and signed. It was finally ratified in London on 24 October 1945. Its main aims were to preserve peace, and avoid the weaknesses of the League by having stronger executive power. (Requiring member states to provide armed forces when necessary to preserve or restore peace.) It also aimed to improve social and economic conditions with the use of more specialised agencies.

For (b) Candidates must assess to what extent the aims of their chosen organization *e.g.* the League between 1919/20 and 1929/30, or the UN between 1945 and 1955, were successfully implemented.

Do not penalise candidates who do not answer (a) and (b) separately.

As a general guide award up to **[6 marks]** for part (a).

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate and/or irrelevant material.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative answers to both parts.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for satisfactory focus on, and knowledge of, the chosen organization.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focus on, and assessment of aims and their implementation.

**[17 + marks]** for in depth understanding and analysis of aims and implementation.

**17. Analyse the successes and failures of the United Nations’ peacekeeping activities up to 1973.**

Candidates should choose some of the many disputes or wars that were brought before the Security Council: Palestine 1947; Kashmir 1948; Korea 1950; Congo 1960–1964; Indonesia 1962; Cyprus 1964; the Middle East 1956, 1967, 1973, and assess their success or failure. Also the UN failed to halt Soviet military action in Hungary 1956 and Czechoslovakia 1968.

It is not expected that all of the above will be used.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit success and failure.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on success and failure.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured answers which analyse reasons for and examples of success and failure.

*[17 + marks]* for wide coverage, analysis or different interpretations.

**18. “In spite of occasional failures, the democratic multiparty state was the most successful form of government in the twentieth century.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This question demands that candidates assess the nature, successes and failures of twentieth century democratic multiparty states. Weaker candidates may describe or narrate some events or policies in one or two states, implying success or failure. More able candidates could structure their answers thematically giving specific points from several states, as evidence to support their arguments or analysis of the successes and failures of multiparty states. Explanatory comments on democracy and the format of multiparty states would be relevant and useful. The USA and European states will probably be used as examples, but many more exist.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general comments, or perhaps an answer limited to one state.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of two states with implicit focus on the quotation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit attention to the quotation and a reasonable argument.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for thoughtful analysis focused and structured on the quotation.

*[17 + marks]* for originality, and/or an analytical interpretation of the quotation.

**19. Compare and contrast the role and status of women in *two* multiparty states in the second half of the twentieth century.**

This is a straightforward comparative question on the role and status of women. Usual areas such as education, work opportunities, political rights, position and role in the family, education *etc.* could be considered, in two multiparty states. The time scale is limited to the second half of the twentieth century. It is probable that candidates will find more to compare than to contrast.

Maximum [7 marks] if only one state is considered.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague assertions.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for specific details in a comparative structure.

[17 + marks] for an analytical and balanced comparison and contrast.

**20. Account for the foundation of a multiparty state in *either* Spain in 1975, *or* South Africa in 1994, and evaluate the success of your chosen state.**

Spain became a multiparty state as a result of Franco's nomination in 1969, of Juan Carlos I to succeed him. Juan Carlos I acceded to the throne in 1975. A democratic constitution was implemented in 1978. In spite of an attempted coup in 1981, Spain remained a democratic multiparty state. Candidates could evaluate Spain's success up to about 1995. Specific details should be given and evaluated.

South Africa became a multiparty state as a result of various factors pressing for reform and the end of apartheid. President de Klerk's government began to dismantle apartheid in 1990, but negotiations for a non-racial democracy were hindered by violence. The first non-racial elections took place in 1994, and Nelson Mandela was elected president. Candidates need to evaluate the success of the early years of the multiparty South African state.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or limited knowledge.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of either Spain or South Africa with implicit evaluation.

[11 to 13 marks] for accurate knowledge and explicit evaluation.

[14 to 16 marks] for balance between the sections and analysis of success.

[17 + marks] for in depth analysis and perceptive interpretation.



**Topic 5      The Cold War****21. For what reasons, and with what results, were there disagreements between participants at the conferences of Yalta and Potsdam in 1945?**

Candidates should be able to explain why there were disagreements or grounds for possible antagonism between Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin at the conference of Yalta, and Attlee, Truman and Stalin at Potsdam, which took place in order to plan for the situation at the end of the Second World War. The meeting at Yalta in the Crimea took place between 4–11<sup>th</sup> February 1945. Among matters agreed were the disarmament and partition of Germany, the establishment of the United Nations, and the declaration by USSR of war on Japan after Germany was defeated. The Potsdam Conference lasted from 17<sup>th</sup> July to 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 1945. It was confirmed that Germany should be temporarily divided into four occupation zones, but political differences began to emerge. Reasons for disagreements could be: clash of personalities; different ideologies; past actions, before and during the war; mutual suspicion and fear; illness; change of participants at Potsdam.

Policies which caused disagreement included: post-war settlement of Europe; treatment of Germany; reparations; Poland.

Results could include: break up of war time alliance; increase of mutual fear and suspicion; onset of the Cold War; division of Germany; establishment of Soviet satellite states.

**N.B.** if only one conference is mentioned mark out of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague general sweeping assertions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative accounts of the conferences, with implicit disagreements.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for focus on reasons and result with explicit attention to disagreements.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for structured analysis of reasons, results and differences.

**[17 + marks]** for perceptive analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

22. Define, and analyse the importance of, *two* of the following: (a) the formation of NATO  
(b) the Warsaw Pact  
(c) non-alignment  
(d) détente.

In this context “analyse” means “offer a considered and balanced review that includes a range of arguments and factors”. Opinions or conclusions should be presented clearly and supported by appropriate evidence.

NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was a permanent military alliance, established by treaty in 1949. Its purpose was to defend Europe against Soviet aggression. Its institutions included a council, international secretariat, headquarters, bases and committees.

The Warsaw Pact was a delayed Soviet response to NATO. It was formed in 1955 like NATO all members were obliged to come to the aid of any member which was attacked. Unlike NATO it was also used to keep its members under control.

Non-alignment in the early years of the Cold War refers to states which decided not to take sides in the major division in world politics between the USA and the USSR, and formed the Non-aligned Movement which tried to mediate between the superpowers, and thus make a contribution to world peace. It was particularly associated with India and Nehru. Attempts by Mediterranean, African and Asian countries in the 1960s to renew the movement failed to reduce continuing superpower hostility. However conferences of the Non-alignment Movement were still held in the 1980s.

Détente means a reduction of conflict and tension between states. The term is usually applied to improved relations between East and West in the Cold War, especially to arms limitation. In the 1970s détente led to several agreements between the USA and USSR, including SALT I (1972) and SALT II (1979), as well as the Helsinki Conference on economic and technological co-operation 1975. The 1980s saw a challenge to the process of détente until later in the decade.

**N.B.** if only one of the above is addressed mark out of *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate knowledge and discussion.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive answers which lack discussion.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for balanced discussion of two of the above.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analytical responses.

*[17 + marks]* for answers which fully apply the above definition of “analyse”.

**23. Examine the role and importance of fear and suspicion in the development of the Cold War between 1953 and 1975.**

Questions on the role of “fear and suspicion” often refer to the origin of the Cold War, but this one begins in the year of the death of Stalin and end of the Korean War, and ends with the final departure of US advisers from Vietnam after the Vietnam War.

Candidates could include the attitudes of US presidents and soviet leaders towards each other, the persistent rivalry, claims and counter claims, the Warsaw Pact, arms race, space race, efforts to influence developing countries or obtain more satellite states, containment – all were grounded in fear and suspicion. The main crises and conflicts were: Hungary and Suez 1956; Berlin; Cuban missile crisis 1962; Vietnam War 1965–73. Détente in the early 1970s might also be mentioned. There is much material that candidates could use, so do not expect all the above.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for sweeping general statements, and limited knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts of Cold War developments, 1953–1975.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for genuine attempts to focus on and answer the set question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well structured thoughtful answers.

*[17 + marks]* for balance and/or different interpretations.

**24. In what ways were social and gender issues affected by the Cold War in *two* countries, each chosen from a different region?**

Social issues could include all aspects of life which were affected by the existence of the Cold War. The split of Germany and the Berlin Wall, the terror felt in USSR and the east European satellite states, fighting in the “hot wars”, such as Korea and Vietnam – both in combat areas and states whose soldiers were involved in the fighting, such as the USA. Many people were affected by fear – of nuclear bombing, by propaganda, which engendered hatred, by loss of homes, illness and poverty. Some lost their trust in governments. Gender issues would cover the impact on women, fear for husbands and sons fighting, fighting themselves, nursing the wounded, *etc.*

Of course not all experienced all of the above. Actual details will depend on the two countries chosen.

**N.B.** If only one country or one region is considered mark out of *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate knowledge and sweeping statements.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative or descriptive answers with implicit focus on social and gender issues.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for relevant knowledge and some analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well structured, knowledgeable and analytical essays.

*[17 + marks]* for clear arguments based on specific details which are analysed in depth.

**25. Why did the Cold War spread from Europe to other parts of the world after 1950?**

This question requires thought and planning, and candidates would be advised to structure it thematically. Students may begin with the Korean War, and continue with Vietnam, but the demands of the question require more. Some ideas and reasons which could be developed are: the Second World War left both US and USSR involved in Asia; European colonial powers were weakened by the Second World War and decolonisation left a vacuum which USSR, China and US sought to fill; US fears of communism's spread in Asia, and policy of containment; communist takeover of China under Mao; Mao's policies in Asia; USSR, USA, and China sought to expand spheres of influence, especially in non-aligned and developing countries; Castro's adoption of communism in Cuba. Although the Cold War began in Europe, it quickly spread throughout the world.

Do not demand or expect all the above.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for irrelevant, vague or limited material.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of the world wide spread, with implicit "why".

*[11 to 13 marks]* for reasonable attempts to explain the spread.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured essays which explain the spread analytically.

*[17 + marks]* for perceptive arguments which explain why the Cold War spread.

**Topic 6      The state and its relationship with religion and with minorities****26. Compare and contrast the treatment of religious minorities in *two* countries.**

This should be a straight-forward comparative question comparing and contrasting the treatment of religious minorities in two countries. Both countries may discriminate and persecute or both may be tolerant and treat them well, but it might be easier to select two countries that acted differently.

Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one state is considered.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inaccurate or irrelevant material.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sequential accounts and implicit comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit comparison.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for specific details in a comparative structure.

*[17 + marks]* for a well balanced analytical comparison.

27. **For what reasons, and with what results, were ethnic/racial minorities persecuted in two countries, each chosen from a different region?**

The demands of this question are that candidates select one country from two different regions, and explain why they both persecuted ethnic/racial minorities. They should then assess the results for both the persecuting authority and the persecuted minority.

**N.B.** If only one country or one region is addressed, mark out of *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for sweeping generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts of the situations in two countries.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit reasons and results.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well structured analytical answers.

*[17 + marks]* for good balance and perceptive analysis.

28. **In what ways did social and economic differences of minorities (a) hinder integration, (b) lead to discrimination?**

(a) requires discussion of how the social position, which was probably based on former cultural differences, perhaps including religion, led the minority group to wish to retain their former identity, and perhaps also caused fear of trying to integrate because they would be thought of as “different”. Economic differences probably suggest poverty, thus it would be difficult to afford integrate successfully.

(b) is from the other side: social and economic differences provoked discrimination because they led to the minority being looked down upon and despised, and not therefore given full rights because they were not considered worthy of them.

Mark as a whole, and do not demand equal treatment of (a) and (b), or penalise candidates who do not divide the answer into (a) and (b).

*[0 to 7 marks]* for uncoordinated comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive answers, with implicit focus.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers which satisfactorily address both parts.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analytical answers.

*[17 + marks]* for specific evidence to support a clear argument.

**29. “Religious and ethnic/racial minorities always suffered from social and economic disadvantages in the twentieth century.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates may agree or disagree with this assertion, but either way, they must find evidence to support their view. They could disagree with “always”, and find specific data to support this argument.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general and vague claims.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers with implicit attention to the quotation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for satisfactory attention to the quotation.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analysis soundly focused on the quotation.

*[17 + marks]* for a clear and balanced argument.

**30. Analyse the main reasons for state persecution of religious or ethnic/racial minorities in the second half of the twentieth century.**

It would be impossible to find any morally justifiable reasons for state persecution of any minority. Some suggested ones for which examples could be found, are fear – perhaps the minority originally came from a large, powerful neighbouring state; revenge for past real or supposed wrongs; lack of understanding of their culture or religion; religious differences; greed – wishing to take away their wealth, possessions *etc*; state poverty, thus not wishing to allow the minority jobs which state nationals want, even need.

*N.B.* that the time span of the question means that Nazi Germany is not a valid example.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive or narrative answers, with implicit reasons.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit reasons supported by evidence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for an analytical and focused structure.

*[17 + marks]* for in-depth analysis or different interpretations.

---