



MARKSCHEME

November 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 reasons for, and impact of, foreign intervention in *two* civil wars, each chosen from a different region.**

Popular choices are likely to be the Chinese, Russian and Spanish Civil Wars though Korea and Vietnam may also appear. In the case of the latter two, there should be emphasis on the civil war dimension and not merely a narrative of Cold War developments. Please note the need for two different regions.

Reasons could include: economic motives; diplomatic ploys of outside powers; strategic considerations; ideological reasons/proxy (surrogate) conflicts; military experimentation – *e.g.* in the case of German involvement in Spain *etc.*

Impact could relate to the physical impact of the foreign intervention on the state(s) concerned, in terms of lives lost and/or property damaged during the conflict. Some consideration may be given to the question of the duration of such conflicts due to outside involvement. The extent to which the outcome of the civil war was determined by foreign involvement could also be considered.

For China, accept the longer-term treatment of civil war from 1927 to 1949 and/or the 1946 to 1949 period.

N.B. If only one civil war or one region is dealt with, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments or if only one civil war or one region is chosen.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

2. **“The existence of a well-organized civilian war effort (home front) was vital to success in wars in the twentieth century.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?**

The emphasis is on the contribution of the home front to the war effort of states in the twentieth century. No doubt the First and Second World Wars will feature as popular examples but specific details need to be provided to support the claims being made concerning the efforts made by the civilian population which was often mobilized by the state under a war effort “umbrella”. The “organization” of the civilian population by the state requires comment – whether in terms of rationing or economic restructuring in terms of agriculture/industrial production *etc.* Other conflicts are of course also possible. For example Vietnam may be referred to.

Contributions may cover the shifting pattern of female employment due to the need for males to fuel the military effort, the use of scientists, technologists and academics in promoting victory in the “warfare” state.

As the question asks, “to what extent”, candidates could question the relative value of a civilian war effort in particular conflicts – for example in wars post-1945. Was the “civilian war effort” vital in the wars in the Gulf, in the various conflicts which make up the Arab-Israeli conflict, in proxy wars in the second half of the twentieth century?

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but it may not be fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

3. To what extent was the desire for economic gain the cause of Germany's involvement in the First World War *and* the Second World War?

The focus is economic motivations which may (or may not) have been the main reason behind Germany's participation in both conflicts. Candidates no doubt will indicate that there may be other reasons (depending on the war) ranging from fear of encirclement, revanchism, revisionism, ideology, honouring an alliance *etc.*, but there needs to be some consideration/discussion of the role of economic drives pre-1914 and pre-1939 (for example the programmes for Mitteleuropa or Lebensraum respectively). Whether candidates accept the primacy of economic motives or not in either or both wars, they should consider these motives before dismissing them and simply writing a narrative of Germany and both wars. Some candidates may of course expand on the question of economic motives to cover the Marxist/Marxian contention of the first (and even the second) war as the clash of rival capitalist states for the repartition of the world and the need to acquire resources in an increasingly competitive world economy.

Such a question requires effective planning/structure from the outset. The temptation to narrate the causes of the two wars should be avoided.

N.B. If only one war is dealt with, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

4. With reference to at least *two* peace settlements, in what ways, and with what success, have peace settlements resolved the issues which produced the conflicts?

Peace settlements may be interpreted as either formal treaties – as in the case of the Paris Peace settlements following the First World War, Brest-Litovsk in 1918 *etc.*, or accept a wider interpretation such as the conferences held in 1945 at Yalta, Potsdam. Obviously there are other settlements which may be legitimately chosen such as those after the Russo–Japanese War of 1904 to 1905, the Korean War in 1953, the First and Second Indo–Chinese wars in the post-1945 era.

Whichever examples are selected candidates should identify the issues which were held (certainly by the victors at least) to be those responsible for conflict and assess the extent to which the settlement attempted to deal with such issues in order to avoid future repetition. Candidates should exhibit a sound grasp of provisions/terms of the chosen settlement. Whether these issues were successfully tackled (and how/why not) needs to be explicitly considered. It may be argued (and hopefully with sound historical knowledge provided) that new issues arising from an unsatisfactory settlement were produced.

This is **not** an opportunity for candidates to provide an extensive treatment/narrative of the origins of the Cold War.

N.B. If a candidate chooses two treaties from the Paris Peace Settlement, accept as a valid choice.

N.B. If only one settlement is referred to, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

5. Analyse the results of *one* of the following: the Mexican Revolution; the Spanish Civil War; the Korean War.

“Results” are taken to mean the actual outcome of the chosen conflict, the effects upon the state and populations (economic, social, political, military) during and after the conflict. The victors need to be identified (although in the case of Korea it is perhaps less clear cut than in the other two) and accurate historical knowledge selected and deployed to illustrate the nature and extent of the results/impact of the war.

Depending upon the war selected, there could be consideration of the effects of the war on international relations during the period of fighting and in the future: Spain and Korea certainly offer a possibility to examine the results of the wars in a continental/global context.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

Topic 2 Nationalist and independence movements, decolonization and challenges facing new states**6. “While the First World War weakened colonial powers, it was the Second World War which led to decolonization in Africa and Asia.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The corrosive effects of both world wars on imperial/metropolitan states form the basis for investigation. Candidates should examine the ways in which both global conflicts weakened the control of colonial powers due to economic and military pressures. Imperial states found it physically difficult to hold on to colonies in some cases (Indo–China, Dutch East Indies post-Second World War for example) or governments simply lost the willpower to hold on to the empire after ruinously expensive conflicts and were prepared to grant independence.

The question does require that an assessment is made in relation to the comparative impact of both wars, and historical detail is required to support any claims made.

As there is a “to what extent” command, candidates could consider other factors promoting and accelerating decolonisation: the appearance of nationalist leaders and mass movements for independence; the influence of the UN; superpower involvement in the decolonization process albeit for their own ends *etc.*.

N.B. If only one war is dealt with or one region award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

7. Compare and contrast the methods used to achieve independence in India *and* in *either* Indonesia *or* Algeria.

For India accept the independence of Pakistan as a legitimate area for coverage since the term “India” arguably was used to describe most of the British controlled subcontinent (excluding Ceylon/Sri Lanka) until August 1947 and the partition which established two new successor states to British imperial rule.

For most candidates however, India will probably be taken to mean Gandhi and the activities of the Indian National Congress up until 1947.

When considering similarities and differences no doubt much will be made of the supposedly “peaceful” and “non-violent” methods used in India in comparison to the much bloodier course of the independence struggle in the Dutch East Indies and Algeria.

India too though witnessed considerable violence especially in the lead up to partition – sometimes in the context of clashes between the imperial authorities and nationalists, sometimes between rival nationalism/communal interests within the imperial state.

Methods could be compared and contrasted in relation to leadership, organization of independence movements, violent/non-violent opposition to the imperial state, attempts at constitutional progress towards freedom, outside aid to nationalists, superpower influence, the role of propaganda and international opinion *etc.*

N.B. If only one country is dealt with, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments or if only one state is referred to.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

8. Examine the economic and social challenges faced by *two* non-European newly independent states, each chosen from a different region.

Independence for many former colonies was often overshadowed by a colonial legacy which led to serious challenges for the nascent state. Additional challenges could be seen in the form of states troubled by leadership which was often inexperienced or corrupt.

Economic challenges could include reference to the nature of the economy left behind by the colonial state (often monocultural) and the dependency of the new state on fluctuating world commodity prices. Poverty, seasonal/underemployment, low levels of capital for investment, foreign aid with strings attached, lack of expertise in industry, the paucity of raw materials are all areas which could be addressed.

Social challenges could include coverage of problems in relation to the areas of education, health care, housing, social welfare, gender equality. Religious division and ethnic/tribal problems could be made relevant in terms of the lack of social cohesion and division in the new state.

N.B. Neither China under Mao nor Cuba under Castro is a valid choice of state for this question.

N.B. If only one state or one region is addressed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

9. To what extent did *either* tribal influence *or* ideology hinder the political and economic stability of *one* new African state?

Often the legacy of “artificial” frontiers (which paid scant regard to ethnic/tribal conditions) imposed by ex-colonial powers produced the basis for separatist/regionalist struggles in newly independent states. Tribal groups were often linked with dominant ruling political parties/governments or the military and seen as partisan in terms of the wielding of political and economic patronage in the new state. Resentment over perceived injustices by other tribes which saw themselves as victims of such discrimination could result in the growth of movements seeking independence or union with tribal members in surrounding states.

Suitable examples for investigation in this respect are Ghana, Nigeria, Congo/Zaire Ruanda, Burundi *etc.*. Tanzania is an interesting example where candidates could challenge the common assumption that a large amount of different tribes must lead to division and disunity.

Ideology could be taken to mean the application of a particular “ideology” pursued by any particular leader/regime in the selected new state as well as the impact of outside involvement on the progress of the state – in the form of rival ideological enemies (the superpowers) interfering for their own reasons.

The “to what extent” element of the question allows for the identification of other factors which could be taken into account.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

10. Assess the successes and failures of the first leader of *one* of the following newly independent states: Indonesia; Ghana; Kenya.

The ruler needs to be stated (Sukarno, Nkrumah, Kenyatta respectively) and some indication given of areas for investigation. Aims of the leader – for the new nation, for his party/movement, for himself – could be identified. Domestic and foreign policies are relevant, and both deserve consideration.

Domestic policies could include reference to economic development in terms of agrarian/industrial programmes, attention to the legacy of economic, political and educational underdevelopment in each particular case, attempts to deal with problems caused by tribal/ethnic/religious differences in the new state *etc.*

Foreign policies could include: the relationship of the chosen leader and country with the former imperial state; the role of the leader and the state in the era of the Cold War; attempts by the leader to project himself as a regional or continental/world statesman, *etc.*

The question asks for assessment of successes/failures therefore an assessment/judgement should be made – and not simply a listing of some aspects of the chosen leader’s actions “home and away”.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states**11. Assess the importance of economic distress and ideological appeal in the rise to power of *one* left-wing and *one* right-wing single-party ruler.**

Popular examples are likely to be Lenin, Stalin, Mao and Castro as left-wing rulers, and Mussolini, Hitler and Franco as right-wing rulers. Perón is also acceptable as a right-wing leader. Approaches are likely to be either end-on sequential treatments of the two leaders or they will deal thematically with economic distress and ideological appeal. The latter approach might provide better structured responses.

The conditions for each area should be well known and historical knowledge/evidence is essential to convincingly substantiate the response.

Economic distress is often the twin of political unrest/extremism and the link between these two needs to be established in terms of examination of the material circumstances of the population. Economic crisis encouraged support for radical alternatives to an existing system which proved unable to meet the challenges of any such economic crisis – or may indeed be responsible for causing such a crisis.

The main characteristics or elements of the ideology need to be identified before a convincing assessment of its appeal can be undertaken.

N.B. If only one ruler is referred to, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

12. Assess the successes and failures of *one* of the following rulers of a single-party state: Perón; Nasser; Nyerere.

The question invites candidates to consider a variety of policies/programmes – domestic and foreign. Aims of the rulers may be considered and judgement made as to how successfully these were accomplished (with corresponding accurate detail) and when and why failures occurred. “Success” can be taken to mean success for the state and/or the leader concerned.

In domestic terms candidates could consider economic policies relating to agrarian and industrial developments, trade deals, communications infrastructure, employment *etc.*. Social policies relating to the provision of healthcare, education, status of women, relations with religious groups could also be considered. The nature and treatment of opposition and the mechanism whereby single-party governance was maintained (including propaganda/cult of personality) is also relevant here.

Foreign policy aims and the extent to which they were achieved will vary according to the example selected. Aims could range from rejection of neo-colonialism, to pan-Arabism and the relationship of the ruler to the superpowers during the Cold War.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

13. Examine *either* the role of education *or* the treatment of minorities and religious groups in *two* single-party states

Single-party regimes attempted to control education for a variety of purposes. Indoctrination of youth for example occurred within the formal school systems established under the control of the state and also in the various youth movements established outside of the primary/secondary/tertiary educational institutions. Whether the aim was to promote the ideology and belief system of the particular movement or to promote the cult of the individual (personality), candidates need to provide sufficient historical detail to substantiate the answer.

Not all efforts at controlling education were meant exclusively for political purposes however, and not all efforts were necessarily focused on youth. Literacy programmes and the development of training in science and technology *etc.* were implemented to aid in the growth of economic development.

The treatment of minorities and religious groups could include the ways in which such minorities (ethnic, socio-economic – *e.g.* Kulaks in the Soviet Union, cultural – *e.g.* Catalans, Basques in Spain) were targeted (and why) and dealt with under the regime.

Religious groups were often perceived as barriers to the single-party's aim of full totalitarian control and accordingly were discriminated against – or ferociously persecuted. No doubt the issue of Anti-Semitism will prove popular in the case of those dealing with Hitler's Germany, but there were others worthy of consideration (Catholics, Lutherans/Evangelicals, Jehovah's Witnesses *etc.*)

N.B. If only one state is dealt with, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

14. **“Successful domestic policies kept single-party regimes in power.” With reference to *two* single-party states, each chosen from a different region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should identify the areas of domestic policy to be investigated and comment critically on the extent to which such policies or programmes endeared the regime to the general populace – and why/why not.

Relevant areas could include: policies relating to agrarian reform; industrial development; reduction of unemployment; provision of education and welfare programmes; housing; medical provisions, *etc.*.

Whether such programmes were indeed successful and constituted a sufficient basis for the maintenance of the regime in power could be questioned, and the role of propaganda, the use of terror/violence and the appeal of a dynamic foreign policy might be considered.

N.B. If only one state or one region is dealt with, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

(0 to 7 marks) for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

(8 to 10 marks) for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

(11 to 13 marks) for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

(14 to 16 marks) for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

(17+ marks) for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

15. Analyse the nature and extent of internal opposition *and* the methods used to deal with this opposition by *one* of the following single-party rulers: Lenin; Hitler; Mao.

Answers should focus on the period “in power”. This can be taken to mean the period of consolidation following the seizure of power by the ruler (or his appointment by semi-legal means) and the subsequent period of single-party rule until the demise of the chosen leader.

For “nature and extent”, candidates could identify the types of opposition which the ruler faced: religious; political; military; perceived challenges from groups or individuals within the leader’s own party, and how widespread or significant this opposition was (*i.e.* “extent”) in terms of numbers or impact.

The “methods” used to counter opposition obviously vary according to the leader but themes/areas for investigation could include: war (*e.g.* Russian Civil War); use of the secret police/agents provocateurs; propaganda; purge; mobilisation of youth (*e.g.* China’s Cultural Revolution); the distraction of a population by targeting scapegoats or introducing programmes of reform to win over popular support *etc.*.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers, vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states**16. Explain why *either* the League of Nations *or* the United Nations found it difficult to preserve peace.**

This question will require knowledge of the organizational structure of the chosen organization and how it may have limited its ability to prevent wars. It will also require an understanding of the historical period in which each organization operated and how this influenced its ability to prevent wars.

League of Nations – structural problems would include but not be limited to: a limited membership lacking a number of Great Powers at various points in the 1920s and 1930s; the need for unanimous decisions before taking action; lack of an enforcement arm.

Historical period – this could include but not be limited to: economic depression which weakened members and destroyed international cooperation; the emergence of aggressive countries (Japan, Germany, Italy); growth of extremist political movements; weakness of Britain and France as supporters of the League; the unpopularity of the Paris Peace settlement; growth of appeasement.

United Nations – structural problems could include but not be limited to: lack of financial and military power to enforce resolutions; reliance on the cooperation of members to provide resources for peacekeeping; domination of the Security Council by more powerful countries.

Historical period could include but not be limited to – the Cold War promoting conflicts; proxy wars supported by the USA and the USSR; extremist positions based on religion or ethnicity leading to conflict; growing nationalism leading to conflict; inability of international organizations to confront great powers due to lack of supranational authority.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

17. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of *two* multiparty states.

Common themes for comparison and/or contrast may include, but not be limited to: alliances and participation in international organizations; military intervention or participation in wars or similar conflicts; trade relations with other countries; cultural relations with other countries; foreign aid policies; ideological or religious influences on foreign policy; changes in policy and reasons for these changes; significant influences on the formation and direction of foreign policy.

N.B. If only one state is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments, or if only one multiparty state is chosen.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

18. Assess the extent to which *two* international organizations improved the status of women.

This question will involve an examination of the work of various international agencies and organizations. These might include, but not be limited to: UN; UNESCO; WHO; ILO; EU; Amnesty International; World Court; League of Nations.

Students should select two agencies or organizations and analyse to what extent they have been successful in improving the status of women. Areas to examine could include: voting rights; access to education; property rights; marriage laws; employment opportunities; leadership opportunities.

N.B. If only one organization is addressed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

19. Analyse the major factors that changed South Africa from an apartheid state to a non-racial, multiparty democracy.

There are a number of significant factors from which to choose. Answers should include both internal and external influences on the apartheid state which brought about a change in the nature of the government.

Internal pressures could include, but not be limited to: formation of the African National Congress (1952) which began campaigns of civil disobedience leading to the Freedom charter of 1956 and harsh government responses as at the Sharpeville Massacre in 1960 which produced further internal resistance in the form of strikes, marches and protests.

The ANC organized a militant wing in 1961 under Nelson Mandela which engaged in a campaign of sabotage and bombing of government offices, as well as hotels *etc.* Collaborators were often murdered. The leadership of Mandela, Stephen Biko and Desmond Tutu maintained pressure for change on the government. Opposition also came from white citizens of South Africa opposed to apartheid.

External pressures could include, but not be limited to: condemnation of South Africa by the British Commonwealth and the UN; a UN arms embargo; widespread boycotts of South African products and removal of foreign investment as part of the anti-apartheid movement. In addition South Africa was banned from many international events particularly in sports. (*e.g.* the Gleneagles Agreement). The ANC was given arms and money by Cuba and the USSR and supported by a number of African states. Militant anti-apartheid pressure groups were formed in the UK and US that were linked to the civil rights movement. In the 1980s both the UK and US applied strong pressure on the regime to change.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

20. Account for the emergence of multiparty states in the second half of the twentieth century.

This is a general question which allows students to identify and make critical comment upon a number of developments in the second half of the twentieth century.

These could include but not be limited to: decolonization and independence movements; collapse of support for both left- and right-wing authoritarian regimes; international emphasis on democracy and individual rights; better informed populations demanding rights and freedoms that existed in other countries; agitation by religious and ethnic minority groups for rights and recognition.

N.B. Since the question mentions “states”, it is expected that more than one example will be referred to.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

Topic 5 The Cold War

- 21. “The events of 1945 marked both the high point and the breakdown of East–West relations.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This question on the origins of the Cold War requires understanding of how the apparent unity of the Allied Powers collapsed into mistrust and suspicion.

Students could comment on the apparent optimism and cooperation which existed at Yalta. This might include but not be limited to: the Declaration on Liberated Europe; the agreement to aid in the war against Japan. The breakdown became evident at the Potsdam Conference. The US mistrusted the USSR over policies in Eastern Europe, violation of the Yalta agreements, disagreements over reparations and the future of Germany. The change of leadership in the US (Roosevelt to Truman) may be seen as significant. The USSR was concerned about the US atomic bomb, the rebuilding proposals for Germany, reparation issues and the exclusion of the USSR from Japan.

Students may extend the period of mistrust and suspicion beyond 1945 to include events in the early years of the Cold War up to 1950. These might include, but not be limited to: the Truman Doctrine; the Marshall Plan; the Czech coup; the Berlin Blockade; the Korean War.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

22. For what reasons, and with what results, did *either* the USA or the USSR enter into a period of détente from 1970?

This question allows students to examine what each country hoped to gain from the détente process and to what extent its goals were achieved.

USA: Reasons for entering into a period of détente might include, but not be limited to: a desire to end the Vietnam War which would require assistance from Russia; a desire to reduce the defence budget to aid the economy (arms limitation would be a step in this direction); American willingness to recognize USSR's strategic parity in return for a deal to reduce world tensions and prevent further wars to which sections of the American public were increasingly opposed. Sino-Soviet hostility opened the way for a new US relationship with China which might push the Russians to an agreement. The idea of linkage was promoted: US technology in return for a Soviet agreement to reduce its support for revolution in the Third World.

Results: Early successes: SALT I agreement; joint space missions; better relations with Russia and China; more summit meetings to discuss major issues; improved communication between leaders. Subsequent disappointments: Soviet actions in the Middle East annoyed Americans; Soviet development of weapons systems; Soviet establishment of Communist regimes in Africa; Soviet expansion of influence in the Third World – linkage was not obtained.

USSR: Reasons: desire for recognition of strategic parity with the US; the US approach to China caused fear in USSR; continued fear of nuclear war; a desire for increased trade and technology from the USA as Russia fell behind in technology. A resolution of the German situation was desired as well as a final European settlement obtained at Helsinki.

USSR: Results: genuine arms control was not achieved; SALT II was not ratified; trade did not develop as it was hampered by US legislation linking it to human rights; US Congress developed anti-Soviet stance on human rights and emigration; Soviets took advantage of US weakness to make gains in Africa; détente became less popular in USA; President Carter's criticism of Soviet stance on human rights. The US, becoming more anti-Soviet, led to Ronald Reagan and a second Cold War, producing a setback for the USSR.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

23. **Assess the economic impact of the Cold War on *two* countries, each chosen from a different region.**

Economic impact might include, but not be limited to: foreign trade or influence by political alliances or ideology; economic growth and development affected by foreign aid; subsidies; access to technology from friendly countries; government expenditure affected by Cold War requirements or priorities, *e.g.* arms, bases, armed forces preventing spending on health, education; economic impact of arms spending; participation in wars – leading to inflation, recession or economic dislocation; impact on employment and price levels of the injection of external funds; foreign aid; presence of foreign garrisons/bases; impact on government fiscal and monetary policy.

N.B. If only one country or one region is addressed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

24. Analyse the role of *either* Korea or the Middle East in the development of the Cold War.

Korea: Korea played a significant role in the development of the Cold War after 1945. This included but was not limited to: the division of the country after 1945; rivalry between US and Soviet backed regimes. Korea became an area for the extension and application of the Truman Doctrine/containment policy.

The Korean War extended the Cold War beyond Europe, reinforced US views on Soviet expansion, led to further emphasis on what was later (1954) called the Domino Theory and containment and encouraged the rearming of Japan and Germany which further alienated the Soviets. US hostility towards the PRC increased. Anti-Soviet attitudes in the US increased through McCarthyism and the belief in Soviet aggression led to NSC-68 which increased the arms race. The US developed a number of anti-Soviet alliances: SEATO; CENTO. This was a limited, proxy war which provided a pattern for further Cold War conflicts. Post-Korean War, Korea remained divided and a symbol of Cold War division and confrontation until the end of the Cold War. This contributed to the state of tension throughout the period.

Middle East: the Middle East contributed to the development of the Cold War from its inception until the end, in 1991. Early years: Russian reluctance to evacuate Iran and its attempts to influence Turkey raised concerns in the US, contributing to the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine. The Suez crisis led to “threats” of nuclear war and the expansion of Soviet influence caused concern in the US. The Eisenhower Doctrine may be seen as a response. Arab-Israeli conflicts in the 1960s and 1970s were also examples of proxy wars between the US and USSR, leading to heightened tension and risk of war. The US increased its presence in the Middle East to protect oil supplies. Camp David Accords 1978 were a major attempt by the US to reduce Soviet influence. Middle East tensions undermined the détente spirit in the 1970s.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

25. To what extent was the arms race the principal reason for the end of the Cold War?

This question requires students to explore reasons why the Cold War ended. A number of theories may be presented but the response should include discussion of the role played by the arms race in the process. Students may see it as of limited importance but it should receive attention in their answer.

The arms race could be seen as crucial to the end of the Cold War as it contributed to economic pressure on the USSR, led to heightened fears of nuclear war and put pressure on leaders to negotiate an end to confrontations that could precipitate war.

Other theories suggest that the Cold War ended due to: the general economic collapse of the USSR; the decision of Gorbachev to change Soviet policy in Eastern Europe; pressures on the Soviet Union from its own people; the rebelliousness of Eastern European satellite states and poor relations with China.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

Topic 6 The state and its relationship with religion and with minorities

- 26. With reference to *two* countries, each chosen from a different region, analyse the reasons for discrimination against religious minorities.**

This question requires candidates to identify and comment upon a range of causes for discrimination against religious minorities.

These could include, but not be limited to: historic or inherited bias based on traditional stereotypes; lack of knowledge or understanding of the religious beliefs of the minority; resentment or fear of different cultural, legal, social or political values associated with the minority religious group; a monocultural society which rejected all different groups; a view that minorities harboured extremist views hostile to the society; fear of change associated with the presence of a minority.

N.B. If only one country or region is addressed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

27. In what ways, and with what success, did *one* racial or ethnic minority attempt to overcome discrimination?

This question requires students to examine both the methods used to overcome discrimination and the extent to which these methods proved successful. Methods to overcome discrimination might include, but not be limited to: learning the language and customs of the majority; not isolating themselves physically; using education and economic success to gain respect as valuable contributors to society; opening their communities to others to increase awareness and understanding; committing themselves to the political, legal and social values of the country of residence; refusing to support hostile or disruptive behaviour.

N.B. If only the ways or successes are dealt with, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

28. In what ways, and for what reasons, did *one* state use religion to support its authority?

Students should comment upon both the methods used, and reasons why, a state used religion to support its authority.

The methods used may include, but not be limited to: requiring compulsory observance; compulsory religious study in schools; placing social and cultural activities under the control or influence of the Church or religious institution; giving all holidays and festivals a religious theme; demanding that all citizens embrace the same religion; combining religious and political leadership in one individual or group; giving all charitable and community service activities a religious theme.

The reasons for the use of religion may include but not be limited to: the reinforcement of state authority – legal, social, political; the elimination of sectarian strife; eliminating the power of non-conformist groups in society; supporting the authority of the hierarchy; desire to establish a uniform set of values in society.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

29. **“Economic rivalry rather than religious belief was the most important reason for religious conflict in the twentieth century.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This is an open-ended question which allows candidates considerable choice regarding the examples they wish to discuss. Two examples would be sufficient for this response although a strong analysis based on one case study would also be acceptable.

Candidates could identify and comment upon theories on the reasons for religious conflict but the response should include reference to the role played by economic rivalry. The nature and direction of the response will be determined by the example(s) selected, but all responses should be well structured and adequately supported by accurate, relevant and detailed historical knowledge.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.

- 30. With reference to *two* examples, each chosen from a different region, compare and contrast the reasons for discrimination against *either* ethnic or racial minorities.**

This is a general question which allows students considerable choice.

The reasons for discrimination may include, but not be limited to: theories of racial superiority; economic rivalry; ignorance of each other's beliefs; traditional rivalries and animosity; different social customs, dress *etc.*; fear of loss of political power by the majority groups.

N.B. If only one example or one region is used, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate general answers, vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments, or if only one example or region is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, which may contain some implicit or underdeveloped arguments and may be unbalanced.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. There may be arguments but with limited examples and analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical well-focused, relevant, developed and generally balanced answers: may not address all aspects of the question. There may be a challenge to the question but not fully developed.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant balanced answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. A successful and convincing challenge to the statement may be provided.
