

Markscheme

November 2016

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. “Failure to solve the political challenges of the *ancien régime* caused the French Revolution.” Discuss.

Candidates are required to consider the merits or otherwise of the argument that the French Revolution was caused by the failure to resolve the political problems of the *ancien régime*. Other possible causes of the Revolution could also be discussed such as economic and social factors and the impact of new ideas from the Enlightenment.

Indicative content

- The political challenges of the *ancien régime* may be interpreted broadly. They could include the weakness of Louis XVI, the unpopularity of the queen, the division of French society into the three estates and the rising power of the bourgeoisie. They could also cover the various attempts at earlier reform, for example, by Turgot, as well as the events of 1789 such as the Tennis Court Oath and the fall of the Bastille.
- For balance, candidates could argue that economic problems were more important causes of the Revolution and/or that Enlightenment ideas played a key role.
- For economic problems, they could discuss the poor harvests of the 1780s and/or the food riots in early 1789. There were also the financial problems of the French state, aggravated by French intervention in the American War of Independence, although arguably this factor could also be tied to political challenges.
- Enlightenment ideas, again linked in some cases to French experience in the American War of Independence, could also be argued to have played a significant role in the genesis of the Revolution.
- Candidates may note the interrelated nature of various types of factors and argue that it was a combination of factors that caused the Revolution.

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

*Examiners 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. “Napoleon’s domestic and foreign policies underwent major change after his coronation as Emperor in 1804.” Discuss.

Candidates will focus on Napoleon’s domestic and foreign policies before and after his coronation as Emperor and examine to what extent there was continuity and change in these policies before and after that event. Opinions and conclusions should be presented clearly and supported with appropriate evidence and sound argument. Candidates should be able to discuss continuity and change for both foreign and domestic policy and should not focus solely on one of these areas.

Indicative content

- Napoleon was crowned Emperor on 2 December 1804 in the presence of Pope Pius VII, famously taking the Crown from the hands of the Pope and crowning himself.
- Candidates could argue this question in several different ways. There are arguments that after 1804 Napoleon moved away definitively from being the inheritor of the Revolution, for example, the decision to re-establish an aristocracy and the growing opulence of the Imperial Court.
- In foreign policy, there are many instances of a more aggressive foreign policy after 1804. In 1805 the Italian Republic was replaced by the Kingdom of Italy, of which Napoleon made himself king, and Liguria and Parma were both annexed to France. In 1806, in the case of Germany, the Confederation of the Rhine was established under Napoleon’s leadership. In addition, the Batavian Republic was replaced by the Kingdom of Holland with Napoleon’s brother Louis being made king. There was also the invasion of Spain in May 1808, with another of Napoleon’s brothers, Joseph, being made king of Spain.
- Another point of view could be to suggest that his coronation did not really make much difference in that he had already moved away from the Revolution. Domestically, he had already been named First Consul for life in 1802 and had the right to choose his successor.
- Foreign policy, it might be argued, was already expansionist and already did more than merely defend the Revolution. Examples to support this view could include the French annexation of Piedmont and the reoccupation of Switzerland (Act of Mediation), which both took place in 1802.
- Although candidates may focus their arguments in terms of the extent to which Napoleon moved away from the ideals of the Revolution, this is just one possible line of argument. Candidates could also focus on discussing foreign and domestic policies, before and after the coronation, without direct reference to the ideals of the Revolution.

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

*Examiners 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. To what extent did Mazzini's ideology contribute to Italian unification?

The focus must be on the importance of Mazzini's Republican ideology in the unification of Italy. Candidates are required to show an understanding of what this ideology was and the extent to which it inspired other leaders in the unification process. Other factors leading to unification could also be examined such as the roles of Cavour and Garibaldi; however, the main focus of responses should be Mazzini's ideological contribution to unification.

Indicative content

- Mazzini believed in a united Republican Italy, as such, he founded Young Italy in 1832. He was linked to various Italian nationalist rebellions before and after his time as a Triumvir of the ill-fated Roman Republic of 1849.
- Even after the Piedmontese-led unification of Italy, completed with the addition of Venetia in 1866 and Rome in 1870, Mazzini remained critical, disliking the role of the House of Savoy and even agreeing to lead a Republican rebellion in Sicily as late as 1870.
- Some candidates may argue that Mazzini's ideology was of very limited significance. They may stress instead the importance of Cavour's domestic reforms in Piedmont to make it the leading liberal Italian state and his astute foreign policy, such as his actions during the Crimean War and the Plombières Agreement.
- Others may underline the role of Garibaldi's military campaigns in the south in 1860 and his willingness to hand his conquests to King Victor Emmanuel II.
- Some candidates may also, or alternatively, stress the role of foreign powers in achieving unification, especially France under Napoleon III.
- Finally, candidates could argue that Mazzini's ideas, while of limited practical importance, did play a significant role in inspiring others, especially Garibaldi and his followers. Perhaps the fear of a united Republican Italy also helped make a united monarchical Italy more acceptable.

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

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

4. Discuss the objectives of Bismarck's foreign policy between 1871 and 1890.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of what the key aims of Bismarck's foreign policy were following the unification of Germany.

Note: This is not a question on the wars of German unification.

Indicative content

- After the defeat of France (1870–1871), Bismarck's main objective was to keep France isolated. His fear was that France would ally with another European power and, ultimately, that Germany could face a two-front war.
- To achieve French isolation, Bismarck had to keep on good terms with both Austria-Hungary and Russia (hence the *Dreikaiserbund* of 1873).
- However, Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkans posed a serious threat to Bismarck's policy. He had to use diplomacy to prevent conflict between Austria-Hungary and Russia. After the Russian victory over the Ottoman Empire (1877–1878) and the Treaty of San Stefano 1878, Bismarck offered himself as “honest broker” and hosted the Congress of Berlin 1878.
- As Austro-Russian relations worsened in the later 1870s and 1880s, Bismarck concluded the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary in 1879 (enlarged in 1882 to include Italy) and the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia (1887). As long as these alliances remained, France would lack a major Continental European ally.
- With Britain, Bismarck also sought good relations and was generally unwilling to become involved in colonial disputes in Africa and Asia. Bismarck hosted the Berlin Conference (1884–1885), which settled a number of colonial disputes.
- Bismarck's foreign policy objectives could be argued to have a domestic dimension—the preservation of his supporters in power. In making this argument candidates could suggest that Bismarck's brief interest in the acquisition of colonies in 1884 and 1885 was a response to sections of German public opinion that, through the formation of the German Colonial League in 1882, vociferously demanded overseas territory. In this way Bismarck aimed to assist the popularity in the German elections of parties that supported him.
- Another area where domestic and foreign policy arguably overlap is the *Kulturkampf*. Internationally, this policy certainly alienated the Pope and Catholic opinion; however it was mainly focused on domestic policy and consolidation of the new German Empire.

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

*Examiners 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. Discuss the causes of the Greek War of Independence.

Candidates must offer a considered and balanced review of the various causes of the Greek War of Independence (1821–1832). These should include the origins of the rebellion and could also be extended to include the reasons why the rebellion was able to survive the Egyptian intervention by Ibrahim Pasha.

Indicative content

- The Greek War of Independence was a rebellion against the Ottoman Empire and led to the establishment of an independent Greek kingdom in 1832.
- The origins of the Greek rebellion can be traced to the *Philiki Etaireia*, whose leader Alexander Ypsilantis invaded Turkish Moldavia in March 1821. Although he was soon defeated, revolts broke out across Greece, especially in the Peloponnese, and an independent Greece was declared in January 1822.
- Internal division among the Greeks and the arrival of Egyptian forces under Ibrahim Pasha posed a severe challenge to the rebellion. However, the War of Independence continued to a successful conclusion, in part due to the role of foreign powers with the defeat of the Egypto-Ottoman forces at Navarino by Britain, France and Russia in October 1827.
- The longer-term causes of the rebellion could include the sense of Greek identity, fostered by the Greek Orthodox Church and the Greek language. The abuses suffered under Ottoman rule, for example the execution of Gregory V of Constantinople in 1821, aggravated the situation further as did the spread of French revolutionary ideas and the growing economic success of some Greek communities.
- Events in Serbia, where the Ottomans faced prolonged rebellions from 1804 onwards, may also have inspired the Greeks and underlined the relative weakness of Ottoman power.

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

*Examiners 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. Discuss the causes of the Balkan Wars of 1912 to 1913.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of the reasons why the Balkan Wars of 1912 to 1913 broke out. One approach could be to look at international and domestic causes of these conflicts. Candidates are likely to focus mainly on the causes of the First Balkan War.

Indicative content

- The First Balkan War of 1912 to 1913 saw the Ottoman Empire lose almost all of its remaining European territory after it was defeated by the Balkan League (Serbia, Greece, Montenegro and Bulgaria).
- The Second Balkan War of 1913 occurred when Bulgaria was in dispute with Romania, Greece and Serbia over conquests in Macedonia, with Bulgaria being defeated.
- For international causes of the First Balkan War, the defeat of the Ottoman Empire by Italy in 1911 to 1912 emboldened the Balkan states by underlining the relative weakness of the Ottoman Empire. Russia was also keen to advance its interests in the region and encouraged the formation of the Balkan League. Russia wished to recover its prestige in the region after its diplomatic setback over the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1908/1909).
- Domestically, Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia were all relatively new nation states that aimed at territorial expansion while the Ottoman Empire was weakened after its defeat by Italy and by its internal political problems.
- In addition, within the Ottoman Empire's remaining European provinces, there were a series of uprisings. For example, from March 1910, there was an uprising in Albania against tax collection and military recruitment. There was also an ongoing guerrilla campaign against the Ottomans in Macedonia. Again, this undermined Ottoman power and encouraged the countries of the Balkan League to take military action.
- For causes specific to the Second Balkan War, the rival territorial ambitions of the Balkan League countries plus Romania will probably be the main factor discussed.

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

*Examiners 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. Evaluate the impact of the Dreyfus affair in France.

Candidates are required to review the impact of the Dreyfus Affair on French politics and society. Candidates could argue that it changed France greatly or that it merely confirmed pre-existing conflicts within French society.

Indicative content

- The Dreyfus affair (1894–1906) involved a Jewish Army officer, Captain Albert Dreyfus, condemned in a closed military court martial for selling secrets to Germany.
- While Emile Zola took an active part in defending Dreyfus, French political parties, newspapers and public opinion were sharply divided. Broadly speaking, those on the Left argued that he had been unfairly treated, while those on the Right affirmed that such arguments were an attack on the honour of the French Army. Dreyfus was eventually cleared in a civilian appeal court in 1906.
- Politically, the immediate impact of the affair was to create a degree of unity among the pro-Republican parties that led to the Waldeck Rousseau “government of Republican defence” of June 1899 (against the anti-Dreyfusards who were perceived to be threatening the Republic). This government was the first time a French Socialist, Millerand, had held cabinet office in the Third Republic.
- In the longer term, the Dreyfus affair galvanized both anti-Semitism on the Right and anti-clericalism on the Left in France. In the latter case, this led to the expulsion of most religious orders from France, the closure of most religious schools and the separation of Church and State in 1905.
- It is arguable that the Dreyfus affair prevented the development of a moderate Catholic political party supportive of the Republic. Instead, a section of the Right developed into *Action Française*, a movement that emphasized the supremacy of the state and a national community based on “blood and soil” and which stood against French Revolutionary ideas.

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

*Examiners 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. Evaluate the successes and failures of Gladstone's domestic policies between 1868 and 1894.

Candidates must demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the question and appraise the successes and failures of Gladstone's domestic policies during his four ministries: 1868 to 1874, 1880 to 1885, 1886 and 1892 to 1894.

Indicative content

- One approach could be to emphasize the success of many of Gladstone's early domestic policies. For example, the Education Act of 1870 and the Elementary Education Act of 1880, the latter making education compulsory to age 10. The Ballot Act of 1872 introduced the secret ballot. There are many other possible examples of reforms from his first ministry, including the Judicature Act, Civil Service and Army reforms.
- A more debatable example could be the Third Reform Act of 1884 that gave the counties the same franchise that the boroughs had gained in 1867. In 1885, there followed the Redistribution of Seats Act, which made electoral districts more equal. It was a success in that a greater proportion of the population now elected MPs under a fairer system. However, the Liberal Party failed to prosper under the new system, suffering defeat in the elections of 1886, 1895 and 1900 and only achieving power in 1892 through an alliance with the Irish Parliamentary Party. Candidates may link these electoral defeats to the Reform Acts of 1884 to 1885.
- In terms of relations with the trade unions, Gladstone passed the Trade Union Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act, both in 1871. Although the first of these legally recognized trade unions, the second made picketing illegal. It could be argued that these laws did little to shore up Liberal support in urban working class areas and some may suggest that they eventually paved the way for a successful, separate Labour Party.
- There are many other aspects to Gladstone's domestic policies in this period, for example his wish to restrict government spending, including his opposition to proposed spending increases on the navy, which led to his resignation in 1894.
- Some candidates may also refer to Gladstone's Irish policy and this is acceptable.

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

*Examiners 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. Evaluate the economic and political impact of the domestic policies of Nicholas II between 1894 and 1914.

Candidates are required to appraise the impact of Nicholas II's policies on the Russian economy and on the political situation in Russia. Where appropriate, candidates may identify whether there was little or no impact. The end date makes it clear that policies during the First World War are not relevant to this question, although, some candidates may wish to consider the relative stability of the regime by 1914.

Indicative content

Political policies

- Nicholas's key political goal was to maintain autocracy. He resisted suggestions from the Congress of Zemstva presidents for a national assembly and banned the Congress in 1897. Between his accession and 1905 Nicholas made no changes to the political structure in Russia.
- Post-1905 policies could include the suppression of opposition during and after the 1905 revolution, crushing the Petrograd Soviet and, in the next couple of years, reasserting autocratic control (Stolypin's Necktie) throughout Russia.
- Other policies could include the issuing of the October Manifesto, the reiteration of the Fundamental Law, as well as the establishment of the Duma and subsequent adjustments to the franchise.

Economic policies

- Witte's drive for industrialization from 1893—the great spurt—contributed to the development of railways and heavy industry, which attracted foreign capital. Appraisal of the impact might infer that there was significant growth by 1914 with Russia being the fifth largest industrial power. As a consequence, however, there were poor living and working conditions and considerable unrest (Lena Gold Fields Strike, 1912).
- Agriculture was a key contributor to the Russian economy but had not modernized since Emancipation in 1861. Famines were frequent (1891 to 1892 and 1898) and land hunger was a major problem. Witte established a Land Bank in 1896 to encourage the growth of larger farms and the exploitation of "virgin lands", but this had limited impact since out of 97 million peasants, only 750,000 migrated to Siberia.
- Stolypin ended the control of the Mir over peasants, cancelled Redemption Dues and extended the Land Bank. By 1914 only about 10 per cent of agricultural land was owned by the "Kulaks" (independent peasant farmers).

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

*Examiners 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. “The political and military weaknesses of the Whites led to Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War.” Discuss.

Candidates must offer a considered and balanced review of the weaknesses of the Whites against the relative strengths of the Bolsheviks and consider how these contributed to the victory of the Bolsheviks by 1921. The focus should be on military strength and strategy and the political policies and unity of both sides.

Indicative content

Weakness of the Whites

- They had a divided military leadership (Yudenich, Deniken, Kolchak) and geographically separated armies. Also it was never quite clear which side some forces were fighting for, for example “the Czech Legion” and the Greens.
- They had divided political goals; some Whites were monarchists so they lacked a clear aim after Ekaterinburg and some, such as the moderate Social Revolutionaries, wanted a republic. There was no consistent political leadership (Siberia had 19 governments in 1918) and no unifying ideology.
- Lack of popular support was a weakness. The Bolsheviks were not very popular, but many peasants feared the loss of land gained during the revolution if the Whites were victorious. Also the White forces tended to “live off the land”.
- The Whites had limited support from other powers who, although hostile to communism, never organized a concerted invasion of Russia. Foreign intervention had largely ended by 1920.

Strengths of the Bolsheviks

- The Bolsheviks and their allies, Left Socialist Revolutionaries for example, had a clear aim to defend the gains of the revolution. They also claimed they were protecting Russia from foreign interference.
- Trotsky was an effective and ruthless military leader. He restored discipline and used former tsarist officers to lead the Red Army, which numbered 5 million by 1921.
- The Bolsheviks retained control of the heartland of Russia, including Moscow and Petrograd, and the key means of communication.
- There was effective political leadership from Lenin who extended party control throughout Bolshevik areas. The policy of War Communism ensured that the Red Army was adequately supplied. Key industrial areas remained under Bolshevik control.
- There was support from the peasants who feared loss of land. The Bolsheviks “promised” payment for requisitioned supplies.
- The Reds were able to pose as patriotic because the Whites were supported by foreign powers.

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

*Examiners 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 Alliance System contribute to the outbreak of the First World War?

Candidates are expected to consider how far the Alliance system was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Other factors may also be considered as causes of the war, be they of less, equal or more significance; however, the main focus of responses will be on the role of the Alliance System.

Indicative content

- The Alliance System should be well known to candidates: the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy of 1882, the Franco-Russian alliance of 1891 to 1894, the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale of 1904 and the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907.
- For balance, candidates could challenge the claim of the question and instead they could stress that there were other factors that were more important in the outbreak of war.
- Some candidates could argue for the importance of events in July 1914; some historians claim that this was a crisis that slipped out of control after the murder of Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo. Candidates could point to the successful resolution of other crises, for example, Morocco in 1905 to 1906 and 1911, Bosnia in 1908 to 1909, the Balkan Wars of 1912 to 1913, which all took place after the onset of the arms race and with the alliance system already largely in place. So, perhaps it was miscalculations in July 1914 that led to war rather than the alliance system.
- Another possible line of argument would be to underline the importance of events in the Balkans; the weakening of Ottoman power, especially the Ottoman's defeat in the First Balkan War of 1912 that led to an unstable region with competing local nationalisms.
- Candidates may also argue that it was the aggressive nature of individual countries' foreign policies, especially those of Germany, which caused the war.
- Candidates may claim that colonial rivalries increased tension among European powers and this contributed to the outbreak of war. Consideration could also be given to the contribution of the arms race, with reference to Anglo-German Naval rivalry and the land based arms race between European powers such as Germany and Russia.
- Some candidates could, perhaps, argue that it was the interplay of different factors that led to the outbreak of war. Perhaps the Alliance System sharpened and amplified the implications of crises in the Balkans.

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

*Examiners 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. “Economic factors determined the outcome of the First World War.” Discuss.

Candidates must give a considered and balanced review of the argument that it was economic factors that determined the outcome of the First World War. Other factors in determining the outcome of the war, including military and diplomatic issues, could also be discussed.

Indicative content

- Economic factors may include a range of issues: governments’ creation of state agencies to control and organize the production of key raw materials and armaments, as well as the organization of labour and transport. Governments also created special taxes/war bonds or took out loans from abroad.
- In support of the statement, candidates could argue that as the war dragged on, the greater economic resources of Britain and France and their empires were bound to wear down their enemies. With the entry of the US into the war in April 1917 this disparity in economic resources grew.
- Some might argue that the economic organization of the Home Front was more successful in Britain than in Germany. For Germany, candidates could point to economic problems: growing inflation and the limited success of the War Raw Materials Office under Rathenau. Ultimately, the Hindenburg Programme was introduced in 1916; but its diversion of yet more resources into war production led to catastrophic food shortages that in turn led to growing domestic discontent by early 1917 (the Turnip Winter).
- As a balancing argument one could highlight the economic failures of Britain in the war, for example, the Shell Crisis of 1915. Nevertheless, Britain was one of the victorious powers.
- In addition, candidates could argue that it was other factors that determined the outcome of the war: Germany’s weak allies; the successful naval blockade of Germany and Austria-Hungary; Allied military victories in 1918; and German diplomatic blunders, such as the sinking of US ships and the Zimmermann Telegram.
- Candidates may argue that some factors are both economic and military in nature, for example, the naval blockades and the German U-boat campaign.

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

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

War and change in the Middle East 1914–1949

13. Evaluate the factors that led to the creation of the State of Israel.

Candidates may choose to consider both long- and medium-term factors as well as those arising in the post-Second World War period. Others may concentrate on the years 1945 to 1948. Reasons for Israeli victory in the 1948/1949 conflict are not relevant here.

Indicative content

- Long-term factors could include the growth of Zionism in the 19th century and/or the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which seemed to encourage increased Jewish immigration to Palestine after the First World War with the promise of a homeland for Jewish people.
- Medium-term factors could include the increasing violence between Jews and Arabs in the 1920s and 1930s, which led to the consideration of the partition of Palestine and thus raised the notion of a separate Jewish state. Candidates may discuss the various White Papers, although by 1939 Britain appeared to be against partition.
- Short-term factors could include Jewish determination to establish a Jewish state after events in Europe before and during the Second World War; an aim for which there was significant international sympathy. Truman, for example, announced his support for the Biltmore Program.
- Violence between Jews and Arabs in the post-war years meant that some sort of partition was almost inevitable. The attack on the King David Hotel and international criticism after events such as the Exodus affair influenced Britain's decision to withdraw from the Mandate, which meant that an alternative state structure had to be established by 1948. The UN Resolution of November 1947 supported the establishment of a separate Jewish state.

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

*Examiners 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. Evaluate the nature of Reza Shah's regime (1925–1941).

The key word in the question is “nature” and answers should appraise the aims and the extent of change in the social, economic and political areas of Reza Shah's regime.

Indicative content

- Politically the regime was highly authoritarian as Reza Shah relied heavily on the army for the maintenance of power.
- Elections were carefully managed and parliament had no effective powers. Trade unions and the Communist Party were banned and the press censored. Political opponents were arrested and often executed. Centralized control was imposed on the nomadic tribes who were forced to settle.
- Attempts were made to westernize society, and to that effect secular education and law codes were introduced. Western clothes were worn and women were not allowed to wear the veil. Attempts were made to reduce the influence of the *ulama*, but this was only partially successful (notably in the cities where the new elite, bureaucrats and army officers dominated).
- Reza Shah attempted to modernize the economy by developing the infrastructure, roads and railways and establishing a National Bank. However, the oil industry remained under foreign control (Anglo-Persian Oil Company) and profits went abroad. Other industries were limited in scale and often inefficient. Agriculture was the main economic activity but it continued to be backward and unproductive.

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

*Examiners 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 social and economic impact on Italy of Mussolini's domestic policies.

Candidates are required to consider the relationship between Mussolini's domestic policies and the social and economic changes that affected Italy during this period. The main focus is whether or not Mussolini's policies changed Italian society and economy. Did he fascistize Italy and to what extent did the Fascist state direct the economy in order to achieve autarky?

Indicative content

Social policies

- Education policies were designed to indoctrinate the younger generation. Teachers had to swear an oath of loyalty to the party as did all children every morning. Textbooks were rewritten and by 1937 there was only one official history textbook. However many children left school at eleven years of age and, for those who stayed in secondary education, the Church remained very influential in implementing a traditional curriculum.
- Youth groups such as the *Opera Nazionale Balilla* (ONB) were also a means of indoctrination and preparation for military service. Membership was made compulsory in 1937 but, despite this, 40 per cent of 4 to 18 year olds managed to avoid membership.
- The *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* (OND) was an after-work organization that was also designed to indoctrinate people; 40 per cent of industrial workers were members. The OND controlled a range of leisure activities from football to libraries and concerts. Organizers accepted financial support from the state although there was little real concentration on ideology.
- In the so-called "Battle for Births", there were rewards for large families, such as a gold medal for women who had 12 children. Despite lower taxation and incentives to marry, the birthrate declined and women remained one third of the workforce.
- The long-standing tensions between Church and state were resolved by the 1929 Lateran Accords. Roman Catholicism became the state religion and remained an independent and potential rival for Fascist ideology.

Economic Policies

- The Corporate State was designed to reduce industrial conflict and increase production. Its main impact was to control working conditions and wages (Rocco's Labour Law 1926) led to a decline in living standards for workers both in towns and rural areas where wages fell by 30 per cent. Big business remained independent and could influence government via the *Confederazione generale dell'industria italiana* (CONFINDUSTRIA, General Confederation of Italian Industry).
- Candidates may mention the Battle for Grain and the Battle for the Lire and in each case there should be consideration of whether these battles achieved their aims and also whether they were economically sound.
- Some may argue that despite increases in industrial production of around 9 per cent, Mussolini never achieved autarky as was demonstrated when war broke out in 1939.

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

*Examiners 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. “By 1929, the Weimar Republic had overcome the problems of the immediate post-war years.” Discuss.

Responses will offer a considered and balanced review of the problems facing the Weimar Republic in the years from 1919 to 1923 and the extent to which these problems had been resolved by 1929. Problems identified will likely be political, economic and possibly diplomatic isolation. Political problems could include threats to the Republic, for example Spartacus, Kapp and Munich, the frequent changes of government and the levels of political violence (assassination of Rathenau and other politicians). Economic problems were inflation, hyperinflation and Reparations. Internationally Germany was a defeated occupied power.

Indicative content

- The main focus of responses should be the “Golden Years”. Stresemann was the dominant politician during this period and governments were coalitions of pro-Weimar parties. There were no attempted coups and Hindenburg’s election as President in 1925 reconciled the Nationalists to the Republic. The Nazis had a declining share of the vote at just over 2 per cent in 1928, so arguably politics had reached a level of stability with voters mostly supporting pro-Weimar parties. Some may argue that the Nazis and Nationalists were still a political force as indicated during the referendum on the Young Plan. It could also be argued that the collapse of Müller’s Coalition showed the weakness of politics.
- Economically, Germany had recovered from hyperinflation because of the introduction of the Rentenmark, followed by a new currency, the Reichsmark. The Dawes and Young Plans seemingly reduced the problems caused by Reparations. Foreign investment contributed to some industrial growth and German exports had grown. However, there were budget deficits because of welfare spending and there was a balance of trade deficit. Foreign investment was short term and insecure agriculture faced a recession from 1926.
- Internationally, Germany was once more involved in international affairs, and reference may be made to Locarno, membership of the League of Nations, signing the Kellogg-Briand pact and Stresemann’s leadership.
- It could be argued that despite the apparent prosperity of these years the economy was essentially unstable. Alternatively, it may be argued that Germany was relatively politically stable and it was the Depression that destroyed that stability and caused politics to become polarized.

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

*Examiners 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. Discuss the impact of the purges in the Soviet Union.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of the consequences of the purges. They may address impact on society or on society and institutions for example. There is no prescribed response; however, while there may be some limited discussion of aims in order to frame the argument, the bulk of the response must be focused on impact.

Indicative content

- Candidates could comment on the Kirov Affair, 1934, and the purge of the “Congress of Victors”, whose members appeared to favour a change of leadership. The three great show trials of the 1930s removed potential rivals within the party such as Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin as well as Yezhov (head of the People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs, NKVD), who Stalin blamed for the excesses of the purges. They could argue that the main impact was the total domination of politics and the Party by Stalin.
- Detail on the armed forces could include the purge of the army high command and key leaders such as Tukachevsky. The purge of between a third and a half of the officer corps is also a key area for discussion. The impact was that the Russian military was weakened and unprepared for the German invasion in 1941.
- Detail of the impact on society of the Yezhovschina or Great Purge could include the scale of arbitrary arrests by the secret police (the NKVD) and the expansion of the Gulag system. Estimates of prisoner numbers in the Gulags vary from 8 to 15 million but there is little debate that the NKVD were set targets for arrest and some warrants contained thousands of names. The impact was the creation of a climate of fear with a population that was unwilling and/or unable to question Stalin’s policies for fear of the consequences.

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

*Examiners 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. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

The main focus here is change and continuity in the Soviet Union's relations with other states under the two leaders. Some candidates may argue that overall there was continuity in that the overall goal of both leaders was to maintain the prestige of the Soviet Union. Differences tended to be how they approached that goal.

Indicative content

Comparisons

- Both sought better relations with the West, peaceful coexistence and detente. Both were willing to consider nuclear arms negotiations (Test Ban Treaty, 1963 and the SALT talks, 1970).
- Both were willing to use force to maintain Soviet security and used the Warsaw Pact to do this (Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968).
- Both leaders had poor relations with China.
- Both had meetings with Western leaders.
- Both sought to extend influence in developing and Non-Aligned states.

Contrasts

- Their attitude to Germany and Berlin differed significantly. Khrushchev often raised Cold War tensions in this area, for example the 1958 Ultimatum and the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. Brezhnev, on the other hand, resolved tensions by signing the 1970 Moscow Treaty and the 1972 Basic Treaty.
- Khrushchev's actions in Cuba almost led to nuclear conflict, while the invasion of Afghanistan (1979) under Brezhnev led to worsening relations but did not escalate tension to the level of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

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

*Examiners 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. “While there was limited political change, there was significant economic development in Spain in the period from 1939 to 1975.” Discuss.

The main focus of the question is the political and economic developments in Spain during the Franco regime. Candidates must offer a considered and balanced review of the nature of politics throughout the period and some may argue that the regime became less repressive by the 1970s but was still essentially authoritarian and undemocratic. However, the economy developed significantly from a limited industrial base in the 1940s and 1950s to a major industrial economy by the late 1960s.

Indicative content

Politics

- The state was authoritarian and repressive in the post-Civil War period as opposition groups were either imprisoned or executed on a significant scale. Franco was the dominant political figure, acting as Head of State for life (1947 Law of Succession).
- The *Falange Española Tradicionalista*, FET (Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx) was the only political grouping allowed to function. Trade unions were banned and many opposition political leaders were exiled. Franco relied on the support of the Church, the Army and armed police (Guardia Civil) to maintain control. In 1969, Prince Juan Carlos was designated Franco’s heir.
- By the late 1960s there was some relaxation of censorship and some unionization but little in the way of real political debate. By the early 1970s, Franco was less directly involved in government and some opposition political activity began. Significant political change only came with the 1976 Law of Political Reform following Franco’s death.

Economic development

- There was slow recovery from the Civil War and the economy stagnated.
- From the mid-1950s, Spain began to receive some American funding and the country began to trade internationally again.
- From 1959 onwards there was a series of economic reforms that encouraged industrial development and tourism all of which contributed to the Spanish Miracle and stronger economic growth.

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

*Examiners 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 **one** Western European state (excluding Germany and Spain), discuss the main aspects of domestic policy in the years from 1945 to 2000.

This is an opportunity for candidates to consider their national history in the period following the Second World War (former Eastern Bloc states are not relevant here). Details will vary according to the chosen example but identification of key trends should be supported with specific detailed evidence.

Indicative content

- Political, economic and social policies may be considered and key trends could include the development of welfare provision, an extension of the franchise where appropriate or constitutional change as in, for example, France.
- Changing levels of state intervention and the move towards a market economy or, in many cases, more integration within the European Union are also valid areas for debate.

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

*Examiners 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. Compare and contrast the domestic policies of Nasser and Sadat.

The focus here is on the similarities and differences in key domestic policy areas such as political power, the economy and social policy. Candidates may well argue that both Nasser and Sadat led largely authoritarian presidential regimes but had significantly different attitudes to the economy; Nasser being perceived as a “socialist” and Sadat, to some extent, an advocate of capitalism and a free market.

Indicative content

Comparisons

- Both were dominant political leaders as president and ultimately controlled policy direction.
- Both relied on the support of the military as a power-base although Sadat did not allow the army so much political influence.
- Both relied on repression and a secret intelligence service to deal with potential opposition (the Mukhaberat under Nasser and the Central Security Police under Sadat).
- Both had powerful parties that dominated politics. Nasser led the Arab Socialist Union and Sadat the National Democratic Party, although Sadat allowed small opposition parties to operate.

Contrasts

- Nasser pursued “Arab Socialism” via Land Reform Acts, reform of Labour Laws and State control of the economy; State Capitalism was implemented in the First Five Year Plan (1960). He also reduced foreign involvement in the economy via actions such as the nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956.
- Sadat encouraged the development of the private sector in Egypt and also encouraged foreign investment. In agriculture his policies favoured the richer landowners. In general, under Sadat there was a declining standard of living for workers and peasants.
- Socially, Nasser appeared to favour change, allowing some progress in the legal status of women whereas Sadat favoured a much more traditional role for women.
- Nasser refused to allow the Muslim Brotherhood to function openly, whereas Sadat relaxed tight controls as long as the Brotherhood focused on religion.

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

*Examiners 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. “The issue of the Occupied Territories was the major obstacle to peace in the period up to 2000.” Discuss.

Responses are expected to identify the main factors that have, at various stages, been a hindrance to peace between Israel and its neighbours. Apart from the Occupied Territories (Gaza and the West Bank) these could include issues such as recognition of Israel’s right to exist, the Palestinian refugee problem, terrorist activities, the “right of return” and the problem of Israeli settlement.

Indicative content

- The initial stages of the peace process were the Camp David Agreements (1978) and the Washington Treaty (1979). At this point the Occupied Territories were not a key issue in negotiations.
- The Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) kept the issue of Palestinian refugees alive throughout the 1970s. However as early as 1974 Arafat indicated that he would accept a Palestinian state in Gaza. The 1988 Intifada brought the issue of the Occupied Territories to the fore. Israel rejected the suggestion of a two-state solution, maintaining that the Occupied Territories preserved its security.
- After the end of the Cold War, the US was willing to put more pressure on Israel and the PLO to make peace. The Oslo Accords of 1993 and 1995 agreed moves towards a measure of self-government and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Gaza and parts of the West Bank. However, there were still significant problems that remained unresolved; the continued presence of Israeli troops in parts of the West Bank, the question of whether Israel would recognize a Palestinian state, the settler issue, the status of Jerusalem and the “right of return”.
- The emergence of groups such as Hamas, terrorist attacks, the death of Rabin, the election of Netanyahu in 1996 and the Israeli military clampdown in 1997 were also factors that hindered attempts to reach a peace agreement in the years up to 2000.

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

*Examiners 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. With reference to **one** country of the region evaluate the reasons for its changing social structure over a period of approximately fifty years.

Candidates are required to make an appraisal of the reasons for a country's changing social structure. Candidates will attempt to cover a c50-year time period as set out in the question, rather than focusing on much longer or shorter periods of time. This is an opportunity for candidates to write about their own national history; so any country in the region is permissible.

Indicative content

- Popular choices may be the United Kingdom, Russia/Soviet Union or Germany. Reasons evaluated will depend on the country chosen.
- In some cases, for example, Russia/Soviet Union, radical political change altered social structure with the Collectivization of agriculture and rapid industrialization in the 1930s.
- In other cases, it was arguably economic change that prompted changes in the social structure. For example in the British case, the gradual rise of the middle classes and the growth of an industrial working class in the 19th and/or 20th centuries can be traced to the nature of the British Industrial Revolution.
- In Germany, one could argue that there was a mix of economic and political factors that led to changes in the social structure; German industrialization after 1871 certainly led to the growth of an industrial working class. However, political changes after 1918 also arguably created significant changes in social structure, with, for example, the decline of the Junker aristocracy in Prussia.

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

*Examiners 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. With reference to **one** country of the region, discuss the causes of urbanization during a period of approximately fifty years.

Candidates are required to offer a considered and balanced review of the causes of urbanization in any one country. Candidates will attempt to cover a c50-year time period as set out in the question, rather than focusing on much longer or shorter periods of time. This is an opportunity for candidates to write about their own national history; so any country in the region is permissible.

Indicative content

- The causes of urbanization will vary according to the country and period that is chosen.
- In many cases, industrialization attracted people to cities. On the other hand, changes in agriculture, for example mechanization and the growth in the size of farms, led to rural underemployment and unemployment, pushing people away from the land (as was the case in the United Kingdom during the 19th century). Improvements in transport also made cities more accessible.
- Other factors that led people to move to cities could include famine/food shortage, for example in Germany in the 1840s.
- In the 20th century, one could argue that in some cases, the growth of education and the increased spread of media, such as radio, television, newspapers, made people more aware of the economic and/or cultural opportunities available in cities, and that this was another factor that prompted urbanization, for example in post-1945 France or Italy.

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

*Examiners 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**.*
