

Markscheme

May 2015

History route 2

Higher level

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

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.

Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. **For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.**

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

Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the **“best fit”** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**. If an answer indicates that the demands of the question are understood and addressed but that **not all implications are considered (eg, compare or contrast; reasons or significance; methods or success)**, then examiners should not be afraid of using the full range of marks allowed for by the markscheme: *ie*, responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly.

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

1. “Economic problems were the main cause of the French Revolution.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates should have an understanding of the main arguments about the causation of the French Revolution. This question asks them to focus on how important economic factors were in the outbreak of the Revolution. These factors may include famine or hunger among the peasantry. They may also encompass the financial problems of the monarchy. For balanced answers, expect some treatment of other, “non-economic” factors, including Enlightenment ideas, the role of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, and discontent of the Third Estate. The role played by French involvement in military conflict and, specifically, the American Revolution may be treated as an economic or a non-economic problem. More sophisticated answers may argue that there was an interplay of different factors at work.

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

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

2. Examine the reasons for the restoration of the Bourbons in France.

Candidates may understand that the primary reason for the restoration of the Bourbons in both 1814 and 1815 was the military defeat of Napoleon. Following defeats in Germany and Spain in 1813, Napoleon abdicated in April 1814. In March 1815, Napoleon returned to power for the “Hundred Days” before his final defeat at Waterloo in June 1815.

Aside from the defeat of Napoleon, candidates should consider the extent of popular support for the Bourbons in parts of France. The attitudes of the victorious Great Powers may also be discussed as some, for example, Russia, wanted alternatives to the Bourbons on the French throne, while Britain was strongly in favour of a Bourbon restoration. Finally, the important roles of Talleyrand and Fouché could be discussed. The role of Louis XVIII and his decision to recognise some of the changes of the revolution (the manifesto of 1813, the *Charte Constitutionnelle* of 1814) could also be assessed.

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

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

Unification and consolidation of Germany and Italy 1815–1890

3. Evaluate the reasons for the 1848 revolutions in Italy.

Reasons were varied and included local factors (such as those in Sicily in January 1848), a dislike of foreign (Austrian) rule (for example in Milan and Venice in March 1848) and economic problems across Italy (poor harvests and taxes). Some consideration may also be given to the disenchantment in Rome with the actions of Pope Pius IX that led to the Roman rebellion of November 1848 and the flight of the Pope. Other reasons could be the ambition of Piedmont, (the role of Charles Albert leading his army against the Austrians at Custoza and Novara in 1848 and 1849) and the influence of liberal, nationalist intellectuals, for example Mazzini in Rome.

Note: This is not a question on the course of Italian unification between 1858 and 1861.

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

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

4. Examine the factors that contributed to Bismarck’s achievement of German unification between 1862 and 1871.

Candidates should assess rather than just list significant factors in Bismarck’s achievement of German unification. Factors could include: Bismarck’s diplomacy in this period, military success (Danish War, Austro–Prussian War and Franco–Prussian War), his resolution of the Prussian constitutional crisis in favour of von Roon, German nationalist sentiment across the German states, and the economic success of the *Zollverein*. Some reference may be made to the decline of Austria. At times there was an interplay between some of these factors, for example, the success of Bismarck’s diplomacy permitted Prussian military victories in the 1860s.

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

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

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

5. Examine the problems facing the Ottoman Empire c1800–1839.

There were internal and external factors that led to problems in the Ottoman Empire in this period. In broad terms, domestically, the Ottoman Empire struggled to exercise its power against overmighty local rulers, while internationally, the Ottoman Empire was a focus of conflicting interests for the Great Powers, especially Britain, Russia and France.

Domestically, Sultan Selim III was deposed in 1807 by a coalition of conservative *ulema* and janissaries who resented the reforms he had tried to implement (*Nizam i Cedid*). Local notables took the opportunity of disorder at the centre between 1807 and 1808 to seize local power. It then took a number of years (and the loss of some control over Serbia) for Sultan Mahmud II to re-establish control. This process was still under way when the Greek rebellions of 1821 broke out.

Having failed to subdue the Greek rebellion, the Ottomans turned to Muhammad Ali and his Egyptian troops in 1825. Although they were much more successful, their repression of the Greek rebels attracted the attention of the European powers, especially Russia and Britain who were sympathetic to the Greek rebellion. This led to Great Power intervention, the defeat of the Ottoman fleet at Navarino in October 1827 and defeat on land by Russia in the war of 1827 to 1829. As a result, Greece became independent and Moldavia and Wallachia became autonomous in 1829.

Muhammad Ali now turned against the Sultan and in 1833 the Sultan was forced to give him control of Syria. It required further foreign intervention in 1833 (Treaty of Hunkar Iskelesi/Unkiar Skelessi) by Russia to defend the Ottoman Empire against further advances by the Egyptians. In 1839, Mahmud II attempted to retake Syria from Muhammad Ali but he died in June of that year.

Candidates should focus on the reasons for Ottoman problems in this period, rather than simply narrate events.

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

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

6. Evaluate the reasons for the growth of the Committee of Union and Progress up to 1908.

Short-term reasons for the growth of the Committee of Union and Progress could include: economic problems in the period 1906 to 1908 (rising inflation and delays in payment to army officers), the recruitment of officers from the Second and Third Army by the Ottoman Freedom Society and European proposals to settle the Macedonian Question (for example the Reval meeting June 1908), which would lead to the loss of Macedonia to the Ottoman Empire. There could also be consideration of a growing coalition between the middle class, town notables and the *ulema*.

Longer term reasons for growth include a wish to restore the Ottoman constitution suspended by Sultan Abdul Hamid II in 1878, and a desire for reform of the empire by an educated and foreign-influenced elite, which had been either imprisoned or gone into exile, (for example Ahmed Riza Bey, Mizanci Murat Bey, Prince Sabahaddin).

Rather than narrate the course of events, candidates should explain the reasons for the growth of the Committee of Union and Progress.

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

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

Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914

7. Discuss the reasons for the establishment of a secular state during the Third French Republic.

The establishment of a secular state in France includes, among other measures, the Ferry laws on education of 1881/1882, the Combes Law of 1904 that dissolved religious orders and finally the separation of Church and State in 1905 under Rouvier. Rather than narrating events, the main focus of answers should be a discussion of reasons for these measures being enacted. These reasons could include, in the short term, the Dreyfus Affair, the way anti-clericalism could be used to unite the French Left, the election of the more Dreyfus hardline Pope Pius X and his diplomatic disputes with France, for example, the recognition of the Kingdom of Italy. In the longer term, candidates could discuss the way in which the French Catholic Church was associated with the monarchy and was perceived to be “anti-Republican”.

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

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

8. Compare and contrast the imperial policies of Gladstone and Disraeli between 1868 and 1885.

Candidates should know the main features of the imperial policies of Gladstone and Disraeli.

For contrast: there is an obvious distinction to be made in the way that Disraeli defended the Ottoman Empire as a bulwark against Russia while Gladstone considered Ottoman behaviour over the Bulgarian Christians as fundamentally immoral. More broadly, Disraeli acted to buy shares in the Suez Canal Company in 1875, passed the Royal Titles Act in 1876 that made Queen Victoria Empress of India and pursued a forward policy in Afghanistan (the Second Anglo–Afghan War). It is arguable that Bartle Frere’s activities in South Africa, which led to the Anglo–Zulu War of 1879, were carried out without the support of the Disraeli government.

Gladstone criticised many of these policies on the grounds of expense and/or morality and a belief that peace would best help British trade. In his first ministry (1868–1874), Gladstone accepted Russian expansion (for example in Central Asia).

For compare: candidates could argue that for all the rhetoric, the imperial policies of Gladstone were not so different in reality. They could use the British occupation of Egypt in 1882 as an example.

Note: Irish policy is treated as domestic policy and is therefore not relevant to this question.

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

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

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

9. Examine the reasons for the growth of opposition movements in Russia between 1881 and 1914.

Opposition existed under Alexander II, but the reactionary policies of Alexander III and Nicholas II (for example the weakening power of the Zemstva, the refusal to set up a National Duma and Russification) contributed to the growth of opposition. Opposition groups spanned moderate liberals who wanted a constitutional monarchy to the revolutionary groups such as the Social Revolutionaries (formed in 1901) and the Russian Social Democrats (1900).

The autocratic nature of the regime was one of the main reasons why opposition continued despite the difficulties faced. Both Alexander III and Nicholas II refused to consider constitutional reform that would have satisfied the moderate Liberals.

Industrialisation and the growth of the two major cities, St Petersburg and Moscow, contributed to the support for parties such as the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks; whilst in the countryside, the problem of Land Hunger (because of population growth) made the Social Revolutionaries relatively popular because they advocated land redistribution.

Opposition became open and widespread during 1905 as a consequence of social and economic problems being exacerbated by the strains of the Russo–Japanese War. Some narrative of the events of 1905 may be relevant here, but the main focus should be reasons for opposition.

The limitations of the reforms of 1905 and the Dumas continued to alienate groups such as the Kadets who wanted a real constitutional monarchy and who feared revolution if this did not happen. Poor living and working conditions in the cities and the failure of Stolypin’s attempts to solve the land question increased support for the radical parties.

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

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

10. “Strong political and military leaders were the main factors in Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Initially, the Bolsheviks appeared weak and outnumbered – controlling only one sixth of Russia. A number of factors acted in their favour so that by 1921 they had more or less dealt with the threat from the Whites. The Bolsheviks had the clear aim to protect the Revolution and they had strong leadership from Lenin and Trotsky.

Lenin provided the political and economic support for the Red Army via the dominance of the party and the policy of War Communism. Trotsky provided effective military leadership for the Red Army, which by 1921 was 5.5 million strong. He used former Tsarist officers to train the army and maintained strict discipline. He provided good strategic leadership, travelling in his special train to key areas for example.

The Bolsheviks also retained control of key areas such as Petrograd and Moscow (the main industrial areas) and had clear lines of communication with their army, whereas the armies of the Whites were physically divided. The Whites also lacked effective leadership (there were 19 governments in Siberia in 1918). External support from the Western powers had largely declined by the end of 1920.

In rural areas, although the policy of War Communism was extremely unpopular, the Whites tended to live off the land causing massive destruction. There was also a fear that a White victory would lead to the loss of land, granted by the 1917 Decree on Land.

Balanced answers should consider both the strength of the Bolsheviks and the weakness of the Whites.

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

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

European diplomacy and the First World War 1870–1923

11. To what extent did the European balance of power change between 1871 and 1900?

It is important to understand that the balance of power as established in 1815 had been shattered by the unifications of Italy and Germany between 1859 and 1871. The disturbance of the balance of power was caused by the fact that the new Germany was more powerful than Prussia had been. This caused anxieties for other states, especially France and Russia.

However, Bismarck attempted to create a new balance of power. In the Bismarckian system, Germany acted as “honest broker” between Austria-Hungary and Russia in their disputes over the Balkans as the power of the Ottoman Empire waned. In this way, Bismarck kept France isolated from both Russia and Austria-Hungary. Meanwhile, Britain worked with Bismarck to limit Russian gains in the Balkans but otherwise pursued her imperial objectives in Africa and Asia. It is arguable how successful this balance of power was, especially given Russo–German tensions in the 1880s, note, for example, the Lombard–Venetian War of 1866 by which German loans to Russia were severely restricted.

Change occurred in the 1890s. With Bismarck replaced by Wilhelm II, the Reinsurance Treaty between Germany and Russia was not renewed and Russia was allowed to conclude an alliance with France, ending the latter’s isolation. The search for a German “place in the sun” in the 1890s also led to tensions between Britain and Germany (1896 Kruger Telegram and 1898 Tirpitz Naval Law).

Note: The end date for this question is 1900; however, candidates may reasonably argue that changes in the balance of power in the 1890s prefigured the formation of the Anglo–French Entente in 1904 and the Anglo–Russian Entente of 1907. Nevertheless, this is not an origin of the First World War question.

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

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

12. Evaluate the causes of the First World War.

Candidates should attempt to evaluate the relative importance of the various causes of the First World War, the main causes of which should be well known. The most immediate short-term cause was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo leading to the July Crisis. Diplomatic attempts to defuse the situation failed (note, for example, the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia or the Blank Cheque) and mobilisation of various forces took place in August 1914.

Longer term factors may include: the Alliance system; the arms race, especially, but not exclusively between Britain and Germany; the decline of the Ottoman Empire; militarism and arguably imperialism. Supporters of the Fischer thesis argue for the primacy of a German “will to war” as the cause of the First World War. Some candidates may argue for the primacy of domestic politics, and that German foreign policy decision-making in the run up to 1914 was shaped by the challenges that the German ruling class was facing at home, especially from the Social Democrats. More recent historiography has argued that the German elite was not the only one in pre-War Europe to feel under threat in 1914 and to have prepared aggressive plans to defend its position.

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

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

War and change in the Middle East 1914–1949

13. Examine the reasons for, and consequences of, Allied diplomatic activity in the Middle East during the First World War.

The main areas of diplomatic activity should be well known and they include the Sykes–Picot Agreement, Hussein–McMahon Correspondence and the Balfour Declaration. However the main focus of the essay should be on “reasons for” and “consequences”.

Reasons:

The Sykes–Picot Agreement, which was reached to try and clarify British and French post-war goals in the Ottoman lands. France was to retain some influence, and Britain wanted to protect Egypt and Suez.

The immediate reason behind the Hussein–McMahon Correspondence was to encourage the Arab revolt in the Hejaz which would weaken Ottoman forces and assist the British military campaigns in the region. A longer term goal for Britain was the establishment of the Caliphate in Mecca which would be popular with Muslim opinion in the British Empire.

For the Balfour Declaration 1917, there is some debate as to why Balfour promised a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Possibly, he really was personally supportive or he could have been lobbied by Weizmann. The declaration could have been an attempt to get the support of Russian Jews to pressure the Provisional Government to remain in the war; similarly it could have been an attempt to get the support of American Jews to push for US entry into the war.

Consequences:

The Sykes–Picot agreement was made public by Russia, and the most important consequence was the distrust felt by the Arabs towards both countries. Lack of clarity in the agreement also led to tensions between Britain and France.

The Arab Revolt did aid the Allenby campaign and contributed to the defeat of the Ottoman Empire. Longer-term consequences were in a way much more important as Hussein believed he had been promised control of Arab inhabited territories, which included Palestine. This led to instability in the Palestine Mandate after the war. The Arabs on the whole disliked the Mandate system and felt that wartime diplomacy had been dishonest.

A consequence of the Balfour Declaration was an increase in Jewish immigration to Palestine – although not in large numbers until the 1930s; the establishment of Jewish organizations such as the Jewish agency, for which the goal was a Jewish state.

Overall, Allied diplomacy, with its conflicting goals and promise, greatly contributed to tensions and unrest in the region in the post-war period.

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

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

14. With reference to the years 1940 to 1948, discuss the factors that led to the British withdrawal from Palestine.

It would be reasonable for candidates to set the scene by making reference to the problems experienced by Britain as the mandatory power in the 1920s and 1930s. However, the main focus should be on the 1940s.

Despite the fact that many Jews joined the British Army during the war, Britain continued to attempt to limit immigration to Palestine and maintained this policy as the war ended. This led to an increase in attacks on British forces in Palestine by groups such as the Irgun and Lehi. Key events such as the bombing of the King David Hotel in 1946, the hanging of British troops, and various other attacks can be used to illustrate the post-war problems. The Haganah assisted illegal immigration into Palestine wherever possible, increasing the difficulties for the British administration. Publicity regarding these difficulties undermined support in Britain for a presence in Palestine.

World opinion appeared to support the notion of a Jewish state and as early as 1942 the Biltmore Declaration supported this idea with President Truman also accepting it.

Adverse publicity such as the Exodus incident further contributed to a lack of international support for Britain. In the post-war world there was enormous sympathy for the survivors of Nazi anti-Semitic policies and Palestine seemed an appropriate haven.

Some answers may refer to British economic and strategic weakness post-1945, whilst others may indicate that problems elsewhere in the Empire contributed to a lack of domestic public support for British presence in Palestine.

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

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

Interwar years: conflict and cooperation 1919–1939

15. Examine the reasons why the democratic government in Germany was able to survive the various crises it faced in the years 1919 to 1924.

Crises could include: Spartacus week in January 1919; the establishment of the Bavarian Republic; the publication of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles; the Kapp Putsch, 1920; problems over reparations (and other factors) that led to the occupation of the Ruhr; the policy of Passive Resistance and the hyperinflation of 1923; the Munich Putsch, November 1923.

The Weimar Republic faced threats from both extreme revolutionaries and extreme nationalists. In the case of revolutionary threats politicians such as Ebert and Scheidemann took decisions that gained them support, for example declaring a republic rather than trying to retain a constitutional monarchy. Ebert also made pragmatic deals such as the Groener-Ebert Pact that meant he could rely on the Reichswehr and the Freikorps to protect the Republic from extreme revolution.

In the case of extreme nationalist threats such as the Kapp Putsch, the republican government could rely, to some extent, on public support (the general strike in Berlin) and the forces of law and order (Munich Putsch). Additionally, the Reichswehr was unwilling to side openly with extreme nationalists because of the presence of occupation forces in Germany and the possible risk of renewed international conflict.

Ebert was also willing to use Article 48 to deal with a crisis, for example the appointment of Stresemann as chancellor to deal with hyperinflation (which he did by introducing the Rentenmark and entering into negotiations that led to the Dawes Plan of 1924).

The Republic survived because both extreme revolutionaries and extreme nationalists had limited support. Astute decisions by moderate politicians also contributed to the survival of the Weimar Republic.

Note: Answers must be confined to the dates in the question.

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

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

16. “The Republicans lost the Spanish Civil War because they lacked international support.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

International support:

Aid to the Nationalists came from Germany and Italy. The impact of the Non-Intervention Pact meant that the Republic found it very difficult to purchase weapons from Britain and France. Germany and Italy simply ignored the Non-Intervention Pact and supplied the Nationalists with military equipment and troops. The Republicans did receive some arms and equipment from the USSR but this was limited and had to be paid for by shipping Spain’s gold reserves to Moscow.

Military inferiority:

Initially the Republicans lacked a disciplined army and relied on untrained militias. The Popular Army was established by autumn 1936, but still lacked clear effective leadership whereas Franco unified all the elements of the Nationalist side. Italian and German troops played a significant role in the conflict. The Republic only had external support from the International Brigades.

Economic weakness:

Nationalists controlled all the main food producing areas by 1937. They had credit facilities with Germany and Italy. Fear of communism meant foreign businesses were more willing to trade with the Nationalists. The Republic lacked resources – the gold reserve had gone to Moscow, and Britain and France refused to extend credit.

Political divisions:

The Republican side consisted of a wide range of groups from the CNT (National Confederation of Labour) to moderate republicans with differing aims. Some, such as the POUM (Workers’ Party of Marxist Unification) and the CNT wanted social revolution whereas moderates wanted to defend the republican constitution. These divisions were exacerbated by the interference of the Soviet Union via the PCE (Spanish Communist Party) – their aim was to control revolutionary elements to prevent Great Britain and France from becoming anxious about revolution in Spain. This interference led to the May Days of 1937 in Barcelona – “civil war within a civil war”. The Republicans’ most effective leader, Largo Caballero, resigned in protest and his successor Negrin continued repression of the Left to try and win help from the democratic states. However, in November 1938, the International Brigades were withdrawn – Madrid fell in March 1939.

In contrast, the various elements on the Nationalist side had one goal – the overthrow of the Republic. There was also clear leadership with Franco assuming the role of *Caudillo* from September 1936.

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

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

The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe 1924–2000

17. “The most important reason for Stalin’s rise to power was the weakness of his opponents.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Stalin’s political strength was largely due to his position as General Secretary of the Communist Party. He controlled, amongst other things, membership and meeting agendas. He positioned himself as Lenin’s Apostle and was chief mourner at Lenin’s funeral, thus gaining support within the party. He increased his power-base with the Lenin Enrolment and he worked with Kamenev and Zinoviev initially in order to block Trotsky. When Zinoviev, Trotsky and Kamenev formed the Left Opposition he used the 1921 ban on Factions to remove them from the Politburo. Stalin was also flexible in his approach to policy, arguing for Socialism in One Country rather than Trotsky’s call for permanent revolution. Once the radicals were no longer a threat he reinterpreted Socialism in One Country to mean radical economic change (Five Year Plans and collectivization). Some might argue that this was a response to the worsening economic situation in Russia. At this stage, the struggle was carried on within the Party and the Russian people were not fully aware of what was going on.

Opposition weakness could include: the fact that Trotsky was viewed with some suspicion within the Party because of his Menshevik past; he failed to attend Lenin’s funeral (appearing disrespectful); he had limited support within the Party as he often appeared intellectually arrogant; there was a fear that he might use his support within the Red Army to establish a dictatorship (Bonapartism); he chose not to demand the publication of Lenin’s Testament to maintain party unity – this would have ended Stalin’s career; he left it too late to ally with Zinoviev and Kamenev. Essentially he underestimated Stalin.

Neither Kamenev nor Zinoviev were regarded seriously as potential leaders (they had been cautious in 1917 about attempting revolution) and, initially, they feared Trotsky more than Stalin. By 1926, when they realised the threat, Stalin had strengthened his hold on the party.

Bukharin, although a member of the Politburo, was not regarded as a contender because his economic policies were viewed as verging on capitalism, and Stalin was easily able to quash the Right Opposition.

Stalin had political skills and strengths that helped him to emerge as the dominant politician. However it is also possible to argue that it was the weakness and misjudgment of the opposition that allowed him to exercise those skills, for example they all agreed not to publish Lenin’s Testament. It is not valid to argue that Stalin used the cult of personality to gain popular support.

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

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

18. With reference to any **one** Sovietized/satellite state, examine the strength of opposition and dissent during the years 1945 to 1989.

Poland and Czechoslovakia are likely to be popular choices but any Eastern European state is acceptable. This could include the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia that were independent prior to the Second World War but were subsequently sovietized.

The strength of opposition should be considered: Was there popular support or was opposition confined to specific groups? Candidates may well argue that the strength of opposition was always limited by the authoritarian nature of the state in Eastern Bloc countries and the fear of Soviet intervention if opposition seemed to be pushing for radical change. Thus opposition movements only gained real power when Gorbachev made it clear that the Soviet Union would not intervene in the internal affairs of other states.

There may also be some comment on the “nature of opposition”; was it Trade Union-based such as Solidarity or was it religious opposition? Was it relatively limited, for example the Intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia?

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

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

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

19. Evaluate the reasons for the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany by 1949.

This is not a “causes of the Cold War” question, although Cold War issues are relevant. The focus should be on the reasons why, by 1949, it had become clear that Germany would not be reunified, and thus, the Federal Republic was established in the former western zones of occupation.

In the immediate post-war period the aim of the Allies was to demilitarise and denazify Germany, and to establish political structures that would eventually enable self-government. This happened initially at local government level in the Laender. Once the immediate post-war chaos had been brought under some control, it became clear that the Allies had differing views on reunification. The US and Britain favoured assisting economic recovery, France feared a restored Germany, and the Soviet Union, although it initially supported reunification hoping for a Communist victory in elections had, by 1946, begun to resist it. By 1947 it became clear that for Marshall Aid to be effective there had to be more economic unity. The three Western powers were also resisting the Soviet Union’s demands for reparations believing that the economic recovery of Germany was vital. In 1948 talks began on currency reform and the establishment of Bizonia (later Trizonia). The Soviet Union played no part in these discussions. The Deutschmark was introduced in 1948, initially in the western zones and later in Berlin. Talks also began on drafting a constitution. West German politicians were actually reluctant to establish a western state but a consequence of the Berlin Blockade was that they now accepted the idea in return for US protection from the Soviet Union. Ultimately, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was established in May 1949.

Reasons, therefore, include: the need for economic recovery both in Germany and Europe, which required a more unified Germany; fear of the Soviet Union; differing views of the Allies on the desirability of reunification – Soviet resistance meant this was unlikely to happen in the short term. Candidates may also argue that one reason for the establishment of the FRG was that it was viable as an independent state, containing 75 per cent of the population and the important industrial regions such as the Ruhr.

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

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

20. With reference to any **one** Western European country (excluding Germany and Spain), examine the reasons for opposition and dissent.

This question gives candidates the opportunity to examine their own national history if relevant. Answers may focus on the student demonstrations of the 1960s, which were sparked by a combination of factors such as hostility to US actions in Vietnam as well as the rapid and massive expansion of higher education provision in many countries. This meant that institutions were often unable and/or unwilling to adapt to this increase and student anger focused on maladministration, poor teaching, poor course organization and poor accommodation.

Candidates may also explore levels of labour unrest. Here, working hours and poor pay and conditions were a cause of confrontation with management structures that had failed to take account of the social and cultural changes that had occurred in the late 1950s and 1960s. The typical autocratic management structure was at odds with a work force that wanted to participate in decision-making, and was no longer deferential to "top down" management.

Politically, there may also have been a feeling that it was time for change, as the political structure was often still dominated by the wartime generation.

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

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

Post-war developments in the Middle East 1945–2000

21. “The PLO was the main reason for the breakdown of the confessional state in Lebanon by 1975.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The political structure of Lebanon as established by the National Pact of 1943 was based on Confessional Groups. This structure was also geographical as on the whole each group lived in different areas of Lebanon. Stability relied on an unchanging balance of religious groups within the population. Political parties were based on religious groups and often had militias to protect them.

After 1948 Lebanon had experienced an influx of Palestinian refugees, 100 000 in 1949 and more with each Arab-Israeli conflict. In 1970 the expulsion of the PLO from Jordan and the move to Lebanon meant that the Palestinians were much more overtly political. The PLO used bases in southern Lebanon to attack Israel and this led to Shia Muslims moving away from areas of conflict to North Lebanon and Beirut, thus destabilizing these areas. There was also now a Muslim majority in Lebanon.

Other issues to consider may include: there was tension between the Maronites and the Muslims because the Maronites considered themselves to be more modern and westernised, and therefore, more capable of governing the country; there was economic disparity, as Maronites and Sunni Muslims were more prosperous and with the movement of Shia Muslims to the North this became more obvious. The actual spark for conflict was a dispute over fishing rights that brought the Lebanese National Army (most officers were Christians) into conflict with the militias and the PLO. The attempted assassination of Gemayel, the Phalangist leader, also exacerbated tensions.

Candidates should weigh up whether the Confessional state was inherently unstable (they could point out that Lebanon was relatively peaceful and prosperous up until the 1970s). They could also consider whether economic differences were a key factor or whether the numbers of Palestinian refugees was the catalyst for civil war.

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

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

- 22.** Examine the impact of domestic policies on any **one** country in the Middle East (excluding Egypt) in the years 1945 to 2000.

Domestic policies could include: policies on the political and legal structure; economic policies; education and religious policy. Social policies such as gender equality could also be relevant. Domestic policies may also include the treatment of opposition; constitutional change; and the role of religion in politics.

Whichever state is chosen it is important that there is relevant specific and supporting detail to underpin an analysis of impact. The focus could be on whether the life of the population as a whole changed and/or improved as a result of domestic policies.

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

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

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

- 23.** Examine the impact of the expansion of education in any **one** country of the region over a 50-year period.

Candidates should support their answers with specific, detailed evidence from whichever country is chosen. Possible countries and periods include Britain in the second half of the 20th century or Germany 1871 to 1914. Answers that focus on a country for a much briefer period than fifty years, for example on Italy between 1922 and 1945 or Germany between 1933 and 1945 do not fully address the question.

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

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

- 24.** Evaluate the reasons for emigration from any **one** country of the region over a 50-year period.

Candidates should not only give reasons for emigration but also evaluate them. Again, specific detailed knowledge is required rather than vague generalizations about better economic prospects or freedom from persecution. Possible countries and periods could be Germany in the second half of the 19th century or Italy 1880 to 1930. Answers that focus on emigration over a much shorter time period, for example flight from Hitler’s Germany between 1933 and 1945 do not fully address the question.

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

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