



MARKSCHEME

May 2014

HISTORY

Route 2

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 2

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

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

Paper 2 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 2 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 71–74. 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.

0:	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
1–3:	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There are no more than vague, unsupported assertions.
4–5:	There is little understanding of the question. Historical details are present but are mainly inaccurate and/or of marginal relevance. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there is minimal focus on the task.
6–7:	Answers indicate some understanding of the question but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Historical context may be present, as will understanding of historical processes, but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
8–9:	The demands of the question are generally understood. Historical knowledge is present but is not fully or accurately detailed. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. There has been 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.
10–12:	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 understanding of historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are present. There may be awareness of different approaches and interpretations but they are not based on relevant historical knowledge. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach.
13–15:	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Specific knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary are used appropriately to produce a specific argument. 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.
16–20:	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and, if appropriate, may challenge it. Detailed specific knowledge is used as evidence to support assertions and arguments. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively.

Following a review of marking practices it has been agreed that in order to add further clarity to the markschemes for Paper 2, all caveats with regard to the awarding of marks for questions that include more than one component (eg, compare and contrast; reasons and significance; methods and success) will be removed.

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.

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of wars

1. With reference to either the Central Powers in the First World War (1914–1918) or the Axis Powers in the Second World War (1939–1945), to what extent was their defeat the result of poor tactics and strategies?

Candidates are required to address the statement in their response even if they take another view than the one proposed in the question. This question deals with the defeat of the Central Powers or the Axis Powers in either the First World War or the Second World War. “Strategies” may be defined as long-term planning for military success in a campaign or a war. “Tactics” would be more precise use of technology/troops to address the challenges posed in specific battles or to achieve certain military targets. Do, however, accept any interpretations that would be reasonable.

With reference to the First World War, material in support of the statement may include: the inflexibility of the Schlieffen Plan, which forced Germany into a two-front war yet failed to produce a success; the decision to use unrestricted submarine warfare, which brought the United States into the war; failure of the German Navy to break the British blockade on Germany; Germany entering the war with a very weak ally in the form of Austria and an unreliable one in Italy.

Material that would challenge the statement would include: the effects of the British control of the seas which hampered the German economy; reduced access to food and raw materials; the failure of the submarines to impose a counter-blockade on Britain and weaken its economy; the superior manpower of the Allies especially after the entry of the United States; the economic power of the Allies which surpassed that of Germany; the ability of the Allies to bring men and resources from their colonies added to their strength; declining morale in Germany brought on by economic problems and revolutionary ideology undermined their war effort. The weakness of Austria and the defection of Italy also weakened the German effort.

With reference to the Second World War, material in support of the statement may include but not be limited to: Hitler’s decision to undertake a two-front-war in 1941; failure to defeat Britain before attacking Russia; failure to secure oil supplies in the Middle East; declaring war on the United States thus creating another powerful opponent, German mistreatment of conquered nations which led to resistance and support for the Allies; German failure to develop a strategic bombing force to attack enemy industry; the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor created a more powerful reaction in the United States than they expected, engaging the US in war when they were still involved in China; failure to protect their merchant shipping from attack, which led to economic collapse; entering a war against a more powerful and advanced industrial and economic power.

Material to challenge the statement may include: the superior economic and industrial power of the Allies especially after the entry of the United States made Axis victory unlikely; the superior manpower of the Allies; Allied control of the seas in the Atlantic and ultimately the Pacific was crucial to their strength and Axis weakness; the distance between Germany and Japan made their ability to support each other very limited in comparison to the Allies; the close co-operation and mutual support of the allies for each other was an advantage; Allied air superiority in strategic bombing as well as in tactical airpower was a major asset,

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 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. Assess the importance of economic causes in the origins of either the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) or the Iran–Iraq War (1980–1988).

For the **Spanish Civil War** economic causes could deal with the question of the inequitable distribution of land and the economic imbalance witnessed in Spain pre-1936, for example in the system of *latifundism* which existed in the south (especially Andalucía) and *minifundism* in the north (Galicia in particular). There could be a discussion of the plight of the *braceros*, or landless labourers, in the south and the radicalization of such communities due to poverty and the lack of social, economic and political equality. Specific details are required to illustrate the divisions, and the animosity fostered by those divisions and reflected in the programmes of different political parties or movements. Linked inextricably to the question of economic inequality was the issue of the Church, which played not only an important spiritual role in the state, but also a temporal role in terms of being a major land holder – and was identified by many as an upholder of an unjust status quo.

Candidates could also identify “other factors” that were important in fuelling the tensions leading to civil war, such as the issue of regional separatism; the anticlericalism of particular political parties, which provoked reaction from those who feared the move towards a “Godless Spain”; the fear of the growth of Communism/anarchism/socialism *etc*. But the focus should be on economic factors and an assessment of their importance. They should not simply be marginalized in a general “origins of the Spanish Civil War” learned/pre-prepared response.

For the **Iran–Iraq War** (1980–1988) candidates could examine causes related to economic factors, such as the long-standing dispute over mutual borders and control of waterways (Khuzestan and Shatt-el-Arab) which had been vexed issues even before the fall of Muhammad Reza Shah in 1979. The Shatt-el-Arab waterway acted as a vital outlet for both Baghdad and Tehran with regard to oil exports. Khuzestan was one of Iran’s most valuable oil-rich provinces and desired by Iraq, which also believed that the Arab majority population in that area would allow Saddam Hussein a relatively easy victory in the event of an invasion. The oil boom of 1979–1980 helped Iraq to fund military developments in preparation for a possible conflict, at a time when changing circumstances in Iran made success in war likely in Saddam Hussein’s opinion.

A major cause of war was Iraq’s desire to take advantage of Iran’s military weakness after the fall of the Shah.

Calls by Tehran for Iraq’s Shiite majority to rise against the Saddam Hussein’s secular regime also added to Saddam’s desire to teach Iran a lesson and establish regional hegemony, as well as gain oil resources.

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 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.

3. “Victory was the result of superior technological development.” With reference to *either* the Falklands/Malvinas War (1982) or the Gulf War (1991), to what extent do you agree with this statement?

The outcome (victory) of either conflict should be examined in relation to a variety of factors (hence the “to what extent?” command), though it is necessary to focus on the role played by technological development in either war and not merely dismiss it or accept it uncritically as a reason for the triumph of one particular side.

For the **Falklands/Malvinas War** (1982), candidates could consider the relative strengths of both protagonists in terms of military technology used in the conflict: the task force consisting of Royal Navy warships and aircraft carriers with Harrier jets as well as requisitioned merchant and passenger vessels dispatched by Britain to re-conquer the islands which were taken by Argentinian forces in early April 1982; the supply by the US of Sidewinder missiles to Britain, which proved crucial in aerial combat with the Argentinian air force; satellite intelligence provided by Washington to London, which aided in the identification of Argentinian troop and naval dispositions; the use of British submarines to sink enemy vessels and prevent the resupply of Argentinian troops on the islands; the provision of intelligence by Chile concerning Argentinian air force movements *etc.* Argentina’s Exocet missiles and French-built Mirage III fighter planes were unable to compete successfully with British air and naval power.

Other factors which could be considered in explaining victory are: the underestimation by the Galtieri regime of the likely British response, which may have encouraged the occupation of the islands in the first place; foreign aid and support provided to Britain by the US in particular; the effect of Argentinian morale after the sinking of the ARA General Belgrano by the Royal Navy; the discrediting of the military junta in Argentina as a result of lack of military success, leading to calls for its ending *etc.*

For the **Gulf War** (1991) candidates could consider the military strengths of the multinational force (most of whose equipment, financing and troops were provided by the US), which went to war to restore Kuwait’s independence after the Iraqi invasion and annexation in August 1990 and Saddam Hussein’s refusal to accept UN resolutions to withdraw. Airpower and strategic targeting of Iraqi military positions and economic infrastructure allowed the forces of the coalition to launch land attacks without serious resistance. The effectiveness of such airpower led to large casualty rates amongst Iraqi ground forces as well as retreats and mass surrender as morale collapsed. Civilian and military losses suffered by Iraq led to Baghdad’s acceptance of the aforementioned resolutions, as well as an agreement to pay compensation for damage inflicted by Iraq on Kuwait’s infrastructure. The Iraqi Scud missiles that were used against Israel and Saudi Arabia had little military impact on the outcome of the conflict.

Other factors which could be considered in explaining victory are: the unity of the UN in imposing collective security in the changed geopolitical circumstances of 1990–1991; Moscow did not veto UN action; the imposition of a UN-sponsored trade embargo on Iraq from 1990 onwards that prevented Baghdad from selling its oil, and the willingness of oil-consuming nations to cooperate in their own interests to prevent Saddam Hussein taking control of Kuwait’s oil supply. Lack of unity in the Arab world also prevented support for Iraq as states such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria supported the aims of the coalition, less out of sympathy for Kuwait than in their own future interests and security if Saddam Hussein’s ambitions were not curbed.

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 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 hindered the successful establishment of collective security in either the period 1920–1930 or the period 1945–1955.

Note that answers should not focus on events/issues outside the stated period. Responses dealing with events after 1930 or 1955 cannot be credited.

The League of Nations and the United Nations Organization (UNO) were set up after the world wars to prevent the outbreak of future conflict. Revulsion against the human and material cost of the world wars led to the desire to establish a mechanism that would provide a platform for dealing with potential conflict – and a vehicle for promoting functionalism through the provision of agencies or organizations to encourage international cooperation. Despite such sentiment in the immediate post-war period, however, collective security encountered significant obstacles to its success.

With reference to the period of 1920–1930, for factors which hindered the successful establishment of collective security, candidates could consider: the provisions of the League's Covenant; the non-universality of membership (for example, the failure of the US to join); revisionism and revanchism associated with the post-war peace settlement; the reluctance of Great Powers to sacrifice the pursuit of national self-interest *etc.* Such factors should be linked to specific cases to substantiate claims made – Åland Islands, Vilna and Corfu, for example.

Similarly, candidates could consider the other agreements or pacts intended to promote collective security in the period and explain to what extent collective security was hindered – and how and why. In the period 1920–1930, candidates could also consider the Washington (1921–1922) and London (1930) Conferences, the Locarno Pacts (1925), and the Kellogg–Briand Pact (1928), for example.

With reference to the period of (1945–1955), in the case of collective security arrangements, the likely focus of answers will be the work of the United Nations Organization.

For factors hindering the successful establishment of collective security in the period 1945–1955, candidates could include the emergence of Cold War tensions which prevented the UN in particular from acting in cases of aggression (with the notable exception of Korea, 1950–1953). The existence of the veto power in the Security Council led to paralysis of the organization for most of the period.

Some candidates could also deal with regional security pacts or agreements such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO, 1949), the Australia, New Zealand, United States Security Treaty (ANZUS treaty, 1951), South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO, 1954) and the Baghdad and Warsaw Pacts, which were established at the end of the period (1955). The willingness of states to resort to such regional collective security agreements illustrates the level to which the UN was relegated in status and power. The existence of atomic weapons added to already existing fears, and reinforced the desire to establish spheres of influence which prevented cooperation between major powers in the pursuit of genuine global collective security.

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 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.

5. Evaluate the contribution of external involvement to the outcome of *two* civil wars, each chosen from a different region.

The focus should be on identifying the nature and extent of external involvement, whether economic, military, diplomatic *etc*. Few, if any, 20th century civil wars have remained free from outside involvement, and the impact of such intervention needs to be evaluated – an approach could be an assessment of the extent to which such involvement aided one side to victory, or in fact proved counter-productive (for example in Russia's civil war). Extensive coverage of the **motives** for foreign intervention is **not** required.

Popular examples are likely to be: the Russian Civil War (1918–1921/22), the Chinese Civil War (1927–1949 or 1945/6–1949), the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), the Korean War (1950–1953), or the Vietnam War (approximately 1961–1975). Candidates could investigate the types of aid provided in terms of war material and/or military personnel, and how and why (**or not**, depending on the war selected) such aid could be considered decisive in determining the outcome. In some cases the military equipment, advisors and troops which were sent by outside powers could be seen as giving an advantage to one particular side – especially when the opposing side struggled to match such aid (for example, Spain) due to lack of domestic military capacity or equivalent outside support. In other cases, outside intervention, even though significant in terms of material or troops, did not produce victory for the recipient (for example, Vietnam or – to a lesser extent – Russia). Other factors may be considered alongside the issue of external involvement (economic factors favouring one side, political divisions hampering unity of a particular side *etc*) but candidates are required to consider the issue of external involvement and not gloss over the issue by producing a narrative overview of the causes and practice of civil wars.

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 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. “The poor military strategy of governments is the principal reason for the success of guerrilla movements.” With reference to *two* guerrilla wars of the 20th century, how valid is this statement?

The focus of the response should be a discussion of the importance of government military strategy in determining the success of guerrilla movements. Failure to do so would indicate a failure to answer the question. Candidates may state that government military strategies were of little importance but they must address their role in some form in their response.

The ways in which government military strategies may have played a role in their failure in guerrilla warfare may include: governments’ focus on military control of cities and failure to control the countryside; governments’ reliance on advanced technology to defeat the guerrillas instead of using weapons more suited to the environment and type of combat; governments’ failure to train troops in the nature of guerrilla warfare and how to succeed in it; large-scale government attacks such as aerial bombing may have caused extensive damage to civilian lives and property thus alienating the population. The use of foreign troops or agents by governments may alienate the population and further reduce support.

Factors which may challenge the statement may include: weaknesses or failures in government political and economic policies may have been more important in creating support for the guerrilla movements; governments may not have possessed a charismatic or popular leader who could attract support; governments’ failure to see guerrilla warfare as having a large political component and an attempt to win the war by military means alone. In addition candidates may suggest that the strength, popularity and strategy of the guerrilla movement were such that no government initiative would be successful.

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 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.

Topic 2 Democratic states – challenges and responses

7. Examine the obstacles to the success of democracy in Weimar Germany (1919–1933).

The question invites candidates to explore democracy rather than the rise of Hitler.

The focus of the task should be the identification of obstacles throughout the period. While the rise of extremist political movements occurred during Weimar's existence – and especially after 1929/30 – there were indeed threats to democracy from the outset from extremists: Spartacus League; Kapp Putsch; November Putsch. Areas for consideration could include: the circumstances in which democracy was introduced (was it welcomed by the population, or foisted upon them in an attempt to mitigate punishment in the post-war settlement?); the constitutional structure and provisions; the association with defeat and the influence of the Versailles “diktat”; the economic crises of 1923 and 1929–1930 onwards; the willingness of political leaders to abandon democratic government by March 1930 (Hindenburg's invocation of Article 48); the failure of institutions (judicial, military, civil service) to commit to the new system; the actions of particular parties which were willing to abandon democracy in favour of their own interests (for example, the Centre Party (Zentrum) or the Nationalists (DNVP) by 1933).

The story of Weimar was not only a tale of constant failure or disaster – there was a Golden (arguably a “gilded”) Era under Stresemann from 1924–1929, which did seem to indicate that democracy was taking root as the economic and political situation stabilized. The fragility of the system in this period, however, does provide an opportunity for candidates to comment upon the underlying problems which the Republic faced and had insufficient time to deal with.

*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 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. For what reasons, and by what methods, did political and economic change occur in Japan between 1945 and 1952?

The occupation period offered the opportunity for the victorious Allies to demilitarize, organize war crimes trials and dismantle the *zaibatsu* (industrial combines). It also resulted in a significant reorganization of Japan's political and economic structure: SCAP (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers), under Generals MacArthur and Ridgeway, sought to establish democratic rights and institutions to prevent a revival of militarism.

Reasons for the original implementation of political programmes by SCAP and the subsequent changes, especially in the economic development of Japan by 1947–1948, could be explained and linked to the growing international tensions that generated anxiety in Washington and encouraged a reassessment of Japan's economic, political (and even military) future in a Cold War world (Maritime Safety Force established 1948; Self Defence Force, 1952). The outbreak of the Korean War – a proxy war amongst other things – and its significance for Japan could be considered.

Candidates, in relation to **political changes (developments)**, could refer to the post-war Japanese constitution (1947), in which the role of the emperor as symbol of the state (deriving his position from the will of the people) was clearly stated, along with the establishment of a bicameral diet elected by universal suffrage. Some candidates may explain the respective importance of the House of Representatives and House of Councillors. A supreme court was to decide on whether laws infringed constitutional provisions/rights, and courts were independent of control by the Ministry of Justice. Reference could be made to the guarantees of human rights, freedom of speech, religion, association and the improvement in the position of women in terms of suffrage and rights within marriage.

Economic changes (developments) could include consideration of: legislation to improve the rights of workers (Trade Union Law, 1945; Labour Standards Law, 1947); land reform (which by 1950 was responsible for redistribution of the holdings of absentee landlords to tenants); and developments after 1947–1948, as earlier changes were altered and emphasis was placed on encouraging an industrial revival of Japan. The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) was established under US guidance to deal with economic recovery, and a series of policies introduced to stimulate economic growth: an end to previous policies to abolish the *zaibatsu*; fixing of the dollar/yen exchange rate to promote currency stability.

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 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.

9. With reference to **one** democratic state in the first half of the 20th century, examine how it coped with threats from either internal or external sources.

Candidates are required to select one democratic state from the first half of the 20th century. References to threats to democratic states after 1950 are not acceptable and will be considered as not having answered the question.

Candidates are required to identify either internal or external threats to a democratic state and then determine how effectively these threats were dealt with.

Internal threats may include: economic collapse; political division and extremism; new ideologies, racial and ethnic tensions; religious divisions; constitutional disputes; armed insurrection and/or civil war.

Popular choices of countries subject to internal threat may include: Weimar Germany; Spain; France; United States; Argentina.

External threats may include: invasions; trade or economic sanctions/boycotts; involvement in wars.

Popular choices may include: France; Britain; Czechoslovakia.

Candidates must not simply describe the course of a crisis but explain clearly the nature and severity of the threat and what specific steps were taken to deal with it and how successful or unsuccessful they were in dealing with the 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 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. Examine the methods used, and level of success achieved, in the struggle to gain gender equality in *one* 20th century democratic state.

Candidates should identify the extent of the gender imbalance in the selected state, for example in relation to issues such as: suffrage; legal rights, such as property/inheritance; opportunities in education and employment; marriage/divorce etc. The focus should be on identifying the policies adopted by democratic governments to address such inequality, and an assessment made of their effectiveness or success achieved. Candidates are required to create an effective argument supported by reference to specific historical knowledge of the methods used.

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 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.

11. To what extent was Canada successful in dealing with the political and economic challenges it faced in the period 1968–1984?

Candidates must identify a number of challenges that existed at this time and then determine how successfully they were addressed.

Political challenges: These may include: growing nationalist movement in Quebec which threatened to divide the country; increasing alienation of the Western provinces which led to new political initiatives to increase their power; demands for the patriation of the Canadian constitution including an enshrined Charter of Rights and a formula for constitutional amendments.

Candidates may argue that the government had limited success in dealing with these issues. The Quebec nationalist movement was defeated in the referendum of 1980 but it did not disappear and continued to expand its popularity; the alienation of the western provinces increased, leading to the formation of a Western political party and even discussion of separation; the patriation of the constitution was achieved along with the Charter of Rights but Quebec refused to sign the accord and no amending formula was agreed upon. This led to further challenges in later years.

Economic challenges may include: stagflation of the 1970s; rising government deficit and debt; recession.

Economic challenges: The government intervened in the economy in order to address problems with a variety of measures such as wage and price controls that attempted to address inflation (some success was achieved but broader issues of stagflation were not easily resolved); governments attempted to address recession issues with increased spending which provided some temporary relief but which increased debt and deficit leading to problems in the later years. It could be argued that governments had limited ability to address economic issues as they were worldwide and because of the influence of the US economy

These are only examples of problems and all reasonable responses should be credited.

*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 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. “Coalition government proved unworkable and unable to promote stability.” With reference to two 20th century democratic states, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

A working definition or understanding of what is meant by coalition government would be an appropriate starting point for candidates. The question invites candidates to examine the functioning of coalition governments in the selected states in relation to a variety of areas (economic, political, and social) and comment on whether the coalitions were able to address the issues facing the democratic state effectively. In some cases it could be argued that coalition governments, because of the fragile nature of their composition, were unequal to the task of acting quickly to deal with pressing problems. On the other hand, it could be argued that coalition governments allowed for different political groups to work together in the national interest to promote a stable administration, with effective policies acceptable to the majority of the population.

Whichever states are chosen (likely examples could be Weimar Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Italy etc) the candidate is required to comment on the extent to which such a system of government was unable to function due to divisions amongst its members, and whether the attempt to promote stability (economic or political, for example) was impossible due to other factors or circumstances outside the control of any democratic form of government.

Specific knowledge is necessary to substantiate the argument presented.

There is no regional requirement.

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 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.

Topic 3 Origins and development of authoritarian and single-party states

13. “Widespread support for the ideology of authoritarian or single-party leaders was the most important factor in their rise to power.” With reference to *two* leaders, each chosen from a different region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates could, at the outset, provide a working definition of the term “ideology”; for example in order to identify the main beliefs (social, economic, political) of the chosen leaders. The task is to comment on the extent to which such ideology was welcomed by the population on a large scale (*ie* “widespread support”) and why – or whether – other factors were **as important**, or **more important**, in explaining the rise to power. **Answers that focus on the leaders in power are not relevant.**

Some candidates – if Stalin is chosen as an example – may comment on the fact that support for Stalin was “widespread” in the Party rather than the population (though the reason for the popularity may have had as much to do with patronage than ideology *per se*). This is a legitimate approach, since at the time of the succession dispute the USSR was a single-party state and the rise of a leader was dependent on support within the party, rather than popularity within the populace.

Having commented upon the significance/importance of ideology, candidates could consider a variety of other factors which explain the accession to power of the chosen leaders. These could include: lack of faith in discredited existing regimes that proved unable to deal with economic and political crises; the failure of opponents to organize resistance to the rise of the leader and his movement; collaboration and/or cooperation of individuals or vested interests who underestimated the aspiring leader and believed he could be controlled; fear of alternative radical movements and leaders; the use of force and propaganda *etc.*

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 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. Assess the importance of the use of force *and* economic policies in the maintenance of power of *one* authoritarian or single-party ruler.

Note the focus of the question is rule, not rise, and answers which dwell on the period of rise do not meet the requirements of the task.

For **force**, candidates could consider: the use of physical intimidation by means of internal security forces and/or paramilitary groups used to suppress opposition and enforce the party/leader's will; the establishment of camps to punish and/or “re-educate” dissidents; the use of the purge against sectors of the population and, in some cases, the party or movement itself; the application of arbitrary arrest and terror to atomize society and prevent the organization of opposition movements; show trials manufactured to scapegoat perceived opponents and intimidate the population *etc.*

For **economic policies**, examination could be made of specific policies implemented by the single-party leader to address economic issues and provide solutions to problems such as unemployment, inflation, maldistribution of economic resources within the state *etc.* In some cases economic policies could be seen to be successful in addressing economic distress, though in other cases the adoption of economic programmes in the areas of industrialization and agrarian reform, for example, did little to tackle general distress – and indeed contributed to new and higher levels of distress for many.

The emphasis is on force and economic policies, though the term “assess” does allow candidates to comment on “other factors” which could be considered significant in the maintenance of power. These “other factors”, however, should not be a replacement for the main focus of the task, and responses that show little evidence of knowledge of the stated factors of force and economic policies cannot access the higher markbands.

*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 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.

15. “The domestic policies of Stalin were beneficial to the Soviet Union up to 1939.” How valid is this statement?

The domestic policies of Stalin may include: economic development both industrial and agricultural; a move from an agricultural to an urban society; the elimination of opposition to himself and the Party and complete political control.

Stalin's domestic policies for economic development involved a series of 5 year plans. These plans may be seen as successful in developing certain aspects of the Soviet economy such as iron and steel, and large engineering machinery as well as infrastructure such as canals and hydroelectric projects. They were much less successful in providing consumer goods and improving the standard of living. Basic necessities such as food and housing were often in short supply. The emphasis on heavy industry meant that Soviet citizens saw little improvement in their lives and faced increased hardships as few goods were made available.

Agricultural policy which involved forced collectivization of land proved less successful and led to widespread famine in which millions died as well as a permanent weakness in the Soviet economy as food production never reached the necessary levels. It did achieve political goals of eliminating potential opponents of the regime but was not a sound economic policy.

The transformation from an agricultural society to a more urban one was achieved through policies of forced collectivization of land and the transfer of millions of people to new industrial cities. These new industrial cities were centres for increased industrial production which allowed Russia to develop armament and other industries necessary for defence against invasion. This was a key goal of Stalin. This industrial policy was successful in achieving the goals of the government but involved considerable cost in human lives, family dislocations and other hardships.

The elimination of opposition and political control were achieved through purges, mass arrests, labour camps and deportations as well as extensive propaganda. These were successful in removing all internal dissent and challenges to the authority of the government. They could be seen as less successful in terms of the numbers of casualties, the loss of talented individuals and the enormous resources devoted to internal security. In addition an atmosphere of terror and fear was created. The need to diminish the influence of various ethnic groups as part of national unity and elimination of rival groups led to the Ukrainian famine in the 1930s in which millions died as well as the relocation and internal deportation of many ethnic groups – all of which led to considerable hardship.

Candidates may argue that Stalin was successful in transforming the Soviet Union to satisfy his priorities.

This transformation, it might be argued, came at a great cost both in terms of human suffering and an enormous waste of resources as a result of trying to achieve political goals rather than economic efficiency.

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 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. With reference to *one* of the following leaders: Castro; Perón; Nyerere, assess the extent to which his economic policies were successful.

Candidates must produce a critical analysis of the success of the economic policies of the chosen leader. Narrative accounts will not score well. In each case the leader's key economic policies should be identified and their success assessed. All, of these leaders experienced varying degrees of difficulty in implementing their economic plans. Candidates should be able to explain the causes of these difficulties as well as noting any success that they may have had.

Castro's economic policies were designed to diversify the Cuban economy from its dependence on sugar as an export and to increase food production and industry. This would make Cuba better able to export and improve standards of living. He also wished to free Cuba from dependence on the US. This led him to open close relations with the USSR and other communist bloc countries in search of export markets and capital.

His internal economic policies were based on a Soviet model of state control and ownership of all the means of production. These policies were generally a failure as production declined, rationing was introduced and Cuba still relied on sugar as its main export. The same problems that caused poor economic performance in other communist states such as the USSR or the Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe occurred in Cuba. In addition, the emigration of many skilled workers and managers who were unhappy with the socialist model hampered development. The Cuban economy became dependent on Soviet subsidies to survive, and thus Cuba went from being a US satellite to a Soviet satellite.

The Cuban economy was directed and controlled by the USSR from 1970 onwards and made some progress in expansion of industry but sugar remained the key export and the vast majority of trade was with the Soviet Union which meant that the Cuban economy had not achieved the ability to compete in world markets. The Cuban economy was entirely dependent on a large Soviet subsidy to survive. This was made clear when the withdrawal of Soviet support after 1991 caused the collapse of the Cuban economy. This resulted in unemployment, food shortages and a much lower standard of living.

After 1994, the recovery of Cuba was made possible by the abandonment of previous economic policies in order to attract foreign investment, allow foreign ownership of industry and encourage tourism. This was a complete reversal of the earlier policies of Castro and marked a return to reliance on market forces to improve the Cuban economy.

Perón's economic policies were designed to eliminate foreign influence in the Argentinian economy, expand and diversify the Argentinian industrial sector and to increase incomes and living standards. These policies were initially successful as the result of the use of profits from exports during the Second World War were used by the government to purchase a number of foreign owned companies and reduce Argentina's dependence on foreign loans. In addition foreign enterprises in Argentina were not allowed to export their profits and were required to invest them in Argentina. This led to a significant expansion of Argentinian industry and the creation of new industrial sectors such as aviation, and shipbuilding as well as expansion in other sectors such as iron and steel.

The government also imposed high tariffs on imports to protect new Argentinian industry and encourage investment in new industrial ventures. Government resources were also shifted away from the traditional agricultural focus to support these new industries. These policies resulted not only in increased industrial investment and production but a significant expansion of real wages and employment opportunities for many Argentinians. This improvement in living standards was also

aided by heavy government investment in the social infrastructure such as education and health care.

The success of these policies could not be sustained as Argentina still required foreign loans and investment to realize the new policies. Perón's nationalization of foreign industry and his hostility to foreign investment caused significant decline in the availability of foreign capital which began to put limits on his expansion plans. In particular American investment and willingness to trade with Argentina were greatly reduced as there were fears that Perón was setting up a type of socialist or anti-capitalist state. Perón's decision not to join General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was short-sighted as it limited Argentina's opportunities to export. This weakness in exports caused by the GATT decision and American attitudes was further compounded by the fact that by 1950, European industries had recovered from the ravages of the Second World War and were recovering their export markets at the expense of the Argentinians. The new Argentinian industries were not able to compete against the Europeans and others who were returning to world markets which led to a sharp decline in export income. This decline in income limited Perón's ability to continue his 5-year plans and expand government revenues and economic opportunities.

Despite this decline in income, Perón continued to spend large amounts on infrastructure and other social projects. This high level of spending caused increased government debts, severe inflation, stagnation and limited growth. Inflation rates of 20 per cent and higher were quite common and did much to undermine economic development, discouraged investment and lowered the standard of living. A new 5 year plan in 1953 attempted to shift the focus to agriculture but this was not successful and the pattern of high inflation, large government deficits, low exports and large amounts of government regulation continued to put severe limits on growth and prosperity.

Nyerere's economic policies were expressed in the Arusha Declaration of 1967. This was the document that proposed that the economy be based on a socialist model similar in a number of ways to those practised in Maoist China. The basics were compulsory collectivization of agricultural land and the elimination of virtually all forms of private enterprise. The state was, as a result, the largest employer.

These policies were essentially a failure as the production of goods especially food collapsed. The problems of collectivized agriculture had been seen previously in the USSR and the People's Republic of China and the Tanzanian experience was very similar. The collective farms which represented the vast majority of the arable land produced only a tiny fraction of the food required and much less than before collectivization.

The result of this failure was widespread starvation which was only alleviated by foreign aid. It was argued that production of certain goods such as tobacco and tea did increase but this was of limited importance to the populace as the proceeds went to the state to finance its programs. The supply of basic essentials continued to decline as resources were devoted to state priorities.

The economy was essentially in a state of collapse with declining living standards which were made worse by high levels of government corruption which diverted the resources available to the benefit of a few.

In addition to these problems, the government was not able to attract foreign investment or industry as means to increase development. The anti-capitalist political ideology and hostility to private enterprise discouraged interest from foreign businesses. This meant that Tanzania's significant natural resources were not developed.

The situation became so severe that Tanzania came to rely extensively on foreign aid simply to survive.

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 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.

17. Analyse the successes and failures of either Mao or Nasser as leader of a single-party state.

Whichever leader is chosen, candidates could identify, at the outset, the range of issues/policies which are to be examined – for example the aims and efforts of the leader in relation to: **economic policies** relating to: employment, currency stabilization, agrarian reform, the nationalization of foreign and/or privately owned and controlled businesses, programmes to promote industrialization, attempts to achieve a more equitable distribution of wealth amongst the population *etc*); **political measures** relating to: methods adopted to consolidate the leader's authority (use of force, purges/re-education programmes, propaganda, the cult of personality, censorship *etc*); **social policies** designed to: improve the status of previously disadvantaged classes/groups through universal education and programmes to increase literacy, the provision of employment opportunities, health care, gender equality, the treatment of religious groups *etc*.

Candidates could examine the nature and extent of opposition to specific policies and how effectively the regime was able to deal with such resistance – or not.

While foreign policy is not included as an area of study for explicit examination in the guide for topic 3, some candidates may legitimately point out that the various economic reforms undertaken by a leader were designed to eliminate external control over the economy and such reforms did have repercussions for the leader (for example, the financing of the Aswan Dam in Egypt) in the longer term. Similarly, involvement in conflicts (Arab–Israeli dispute, Korean War) did prevent valuable resources being used to promote development.

Successes, it should be noted, can be taken to mean successes not only for the state and its people, but for the leader himself. The Cultural Revolution, for example, could be interpreted by candidates as a failure in terms of promoting social and economic stability, yet it did re-establish Mao as leader after the failure of the Second Five Year Plan (Great Leap Forward).

Critical comment should be made as to why – and how – such policies could be considered successful (or not).

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 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. Examine the status of women or the role of education in two single-party or authoritarian states, each chosen from a different region.

Candidates should consider the policies implemented that affected the roles and status of women in the society chosen.

Areas for examination of the “**status of women**” could include: suffrage rights; the provision of, or restrictions placed upon educational and employment opportunities; attitudes to traditional roles of the woman within the family structure; policies to promote or restrict births; legal rights such as marriage/divorce, property and inheritance, the presence of women in leading political or economic roles; the portrayal of women in media and propaganda.

For the “**role of education**” candidates could consider the ways in which the chosen regimes sought to control the system of education in schools (and state-sponsored youth movements) and, in a wider sense, amongst the general population through opportunities for adult literacy, for example. Political indoctrination and the need to ensure the continuation of the regime for the future (*ie* after the generation of the leader and his supporters) by fostering acceptance and support for the ideals of the leader were crucial for single-party or authoritarian leaders. Education was also used to instil the social norms supported by the regime, emphasize specific values important to the regime and assist in the development of a disciplined and compliant society.

Education was not only a vehicle for the promotion of ideology, however, and in some cases, the desire of the leader to build a modern industrial state required the provision of educational opportunities for a developing work force – in some cases leading to the inclusion of sections of society which had been previously ignored.

In both cases – women or education – specific knowledge is necessary to support the claims made.

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 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.

Topic 4 Nationalist and independence movements in Africa and Asia and post-1945 Central and Eastern European states

- 19. With reference to *one* African or Asian nationalist movement, assess the reasons for its success in achieving independence from colonial rule.**

Depending on the selected state, areas for consideration could include: the impact of the world wars in weakening the capacity (economic, military) and/or the willpower of the metropolitan power to wage a campaign to retain control of the colonial territory; the growth of mass movements led by a charismatic leader, able to mobilize the people behind an appealing programme of reforms designed to deal with popular grievances (economic, religious, racial *etc*); the use of force or non-violent methods to put pressure on the metropolitan power; the involvement of outside powers or organizations (for example the superpowers and/or the UN) which advocated and provided support (political, military) for the process of decolonization *etc*.

Please note that China is not a valid example for this question, since it was not formally under colonial rule.

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 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. “Challenges to Soviet control of Central and Eastern European and Balkan states (1945–1968) were both rare and unsuccessful.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

After the Second World War many of the states of Central and Eastern Europe that had been occupied by the Nazis and liberated by the Soviet Union (or, in the case of Yugoslavia, by an indigenous Communist movement led by Tito) found themselves the victims of sovietization. Moscow, for ideological and/or security reasons, established regimes in these nations that were intended to remain subservient to the interests of the Soviet Union and to aid in its reconstruction after the war.

The presence of Red Army troops in such states acted as a deterrent to those who sought to challenge their incorporation into a Soviet sphere of influence. Despite pro-Moscow regimes, an army of occupation, and internal security forces established to eliminate anti-Communist resistance, in the period 1945–1968 there were attempts to escape Soviet control.

The schism between Tito and Stalin, beginning in 1948, provided an example where a Communist government in the Balkans was able to defy Moscow over matters of economic and foreign policy and follow the “Yugoslav road to socialism”. Expulsion of Tito from the Cominform did not bring Belgrade to heel, and indeed Tito became the recipient of US aid of \$2.7 billion from 1951–1960: a case of a successful challenge.

Other relevant examples where Soviet control was challenged in the period could include: in 1949–1952, Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, where Moscow (or, more specifically, Stalin) perceived “Titoist” resistance in the administration of these states, leading to purges and executions in the attempt to restore Moscow’s control; the East German rising of 1953; Poland in 1956; Hungary in 1956; and Czechoslovakia in 1968.

In most cases the successful re-imposition of Moscow’s power over the satellite state was achieved; through the use of force in the majority of cases, as well as a mixture of force and concessions, for example, in the case of Poland (and Gomulka) in 1956. The lack of success and the forceful nature of the Soviet response to challenges varied according to the geopolitical status of the state where challenges occurred. “Front line” states such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the German Democratic Republic were treated especially harshly for any sign of deviation from the Moscow line.

Whether the challenges were indeed rare depends very much on how the candidate interprets the term and how much awareness there is of the events in this period.

Since the question states “challenges”, candidates need to refer to more than one example to support their answer. Answers which deal with only one example cannot score well.

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 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.

21. Compare and contrast the methods used in the struggle for independence *and* the reasons why independence was finally granted to Algeria and the Belgian Congo.

Methods used in the struggle for independence

The most obvious contrast was the fact that Algeria's struggle for independence was accompanied by a bitter war of liberation (1954–1962) waged by the FLN (National Liberation Front) against the *colon* (European settler) population and the French army. A (conservative) estimate puts the death toll of this conflict at 300,000, with more victims in the post-war period as those Muslims who had stayed loyal to France were attacked. Guerrilla warfare tactics were used by the FLN in urban and rural areas, and the frequent use of terror/torture (by both sides) was common. In the Congo, the methods involved a decision by the colonial government to grant independence. This decision was not influenced by war or rebellion and there was little violence prior to the grant of independence.

For comparison, one might suggest that while there was violence in the Algerian situation, there might have been a fear of violence in the Congo which influenced the independence decision.

Reasons why independence was granted

For contrasts, with regard to Algeria, candidates could examine, the impact militarily, economically and politically on France *eg* the open revolt of *colons* and General Salan against the government of the Fourth Republic, which was believed to be insufficiently committed to holding on to Algeria, led to a crisis on the mainland. De Gaulle was the main beneficiary of this lack of confidence in the Fourth Republic. By 1960 a referendum on independence for Algeria returned an affirmative vote in France and Algeria. By 1962 and the Evian Agreement, the war was over. With regard to reasons for Belgium granting independence to the Belgian Congo, candidates may mention that neither military conflict nor occupation costs were involved. In addition, unlike France, there was no political unrest or instability in Belgium. Mindful of the decolonization movement in Africa (Ghana 1957, the bloody war in Algeria, the moves towards independence for Nigeria) Brussels very quickly – without any preparation of the indigenous population for the task of government – granted freedom. It has been claimed the rapidity of decolonization was quite deliberate: the ensuing chaos would lead to appeals by the ill-prepared leaders of the new states for help from Brussels. A new form of neo-colonial control would thus replace the formal one. This proved illusory.

For comparison, candidates might mention that in both cases, the colonial power sought to rid themselves of territories which they no longer could or desired to possess. In both cases changing world attitudes to imperialism and rising support for national independence movements and racial equality were undermining their ability to maintain an 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 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. In what ways, and with what success, did Mugabe deal with the challenges faced by the newly independent state of Zimbabwe?

Robert Mugabe became prime minister of Zimbabwe in 1980 after a long, brutal war of liberation against the Rhodesian Front government of Ian Smith. He later became president (1987–present).

Candidates could consider the **challenges** faced by the new leader in terms of the need to: achieve reconciliation with the White settlers who had fought against Black majority rule in the conflict; allay the fears of many that Mugabe, as an avowed Marxist, would seize private property and embark upon a programme of nationalization; reach a rapprochement with his rival Joshua Nkomo and his political movement, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU); redress the racially discriminatory policies that had obtained in Rhodesia with regard to employment, education, land ownership, health provision *etc*, as well as ensure (for economic reasons) that relations with the Apartheid regime in South Africa were non-confrontational.

Candidates need to explain what specific measures were adopted by Mugabe to tackle these challenges and how effectively he achieved his aims. This could include: consideration of his treatment of Nkomo, who survived only two years in the first coalition government; the ending of safeguards for Whites (as previously agreed upon) in terms of reserved seats in parliament; the compulsory purchase of land by 1992; the problem of inflation/hyperinflation; foreign debt accumulation; the fall in living and educational standards of much of the population along with unemployment *etc*.

Note that “success” could also be taken to mean success for Mugabe personally in maintaining his rule, as well as for the state and its people.

*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 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.

23. How successful were the methods used to deal with the political challenges faced by *one* Central and Eastern European *or* Balkan state after it achieved independence?

The achievement of independence by these states marked not only a period of political freedom from domination but the need for each new nation to deal with a variety of political problems in order to ensure the stability of the nation.

The political challenges that new nations faced may include: the existence of disaffected religious or ethnic minorities in the state; difficulties of establishing new political structures and systems acceptable to the population; the influence of members of the previous regime; difficult or hostile relations with neighbouring states; lack of experience by the leaders and the populace in administering an independent state; developing a sense of nationalism and loyalty to the new state amongst the populace.

Candidates must assess how well the new state was able to deal with the problems that it experienced.

Some of the ways that their success may be measured may include: their ability (or otherwise) to maintain internal unity, establish an effective government, develop a national consciousness and defend themselves against external pressures. In addition the success of their methods in suppressing the influence of the previous regime or groups associated with it should be assessed. The methods used may involve: propaganda and education to explain and promote the working of the new state and its government; armed force; the return of previously ousted leaders to provide experience, inspiration and knowledge; establishment of laws to prohibit the activities of the previous regime or other disruptive groups; seeking assistance of other friendly states to provide assistance in transforming the 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 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. Assess the importance of the leadership of either Ho Chi Minh in the organization of resistance to colonial control or Havel in the organization of resistance to Soviet control.

Whichever leader is selected, the invitation to “assess” requires candidates to identify the **nature and extent** of the contribution of the leader in the struggle against colonial/Soviet control and comment upon its significance (importance) in relation to other factors.

A founding member of the French Communist Party (PCF) Ho Chi Minh, as a member of the Comintern, was also founder of the Indo-Chinese Communist party. Ho’s involvement in anti-imperialist activities thus pre-dated the First and Second Indo-Chinese wars (1945/46–1975). His organization of the Vietminh in 1941 was originally intended to combat the Japanese occupation, and by the end of the war the Vietminh were in control of much of northern Vietnam. The Viet Minh unified the Vietnamese in their anti-colonial struggles before and after the Second World War. Ho created a rainbow party which incorporated all political views during the struggle against France. He has a key role therefore in the anti-colonial struggle in Vietnam and was clearly the inspirational figure for the movement.

His declaration of independence of Vietnam after the Japanese surrender was unacceptable to the French, and the result was a war of liberation against the French that ended in 1954 with victory at Dien Bien Phu. He was a popular hero for Vietnamese nationalists of all political views and created the environment which led to the defeat of the French.

Vaclav Havel, by profession a playwright, produced work highly critical of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. After the crushing of the Prague Spring of 1968 Havel’s plays were banned in Czechoslovakia, though he was able to have work published abroad. His most notable contribution to the organization of resistance to Soviet control was to the drawing up of Charter 77, which earned him periods of imprisonment, house arrest and hard labour over the next six years for his “anti-state activity”. Charter 77 was a condemnation of the Czech regime’s failure to honour its commitments to the Helsinki Final Act (1975), by which the signatories had agreed to respect “civil, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms”. Charter 77 dissidents were relatively few in number, but their influence was felt in other Eastern Bloc states as well. Released from imprisonment in 1983, Havel continued to organize opposition groups in Civic Forum, resulting in a further period of imprisonment in 1989.

The unfolding of events in other Eastern European states – for example, the fall of the Berlin Wall – helped catalyse events in Czechoslovakia, and a relatively peaceful transition occurred as the Czech Communist government disintegrated.

Popular admiration for Havel meant that the Velvet Revolution of 1989, which marked the fall of Communism in Czechoslovakia, also resulted in his election as president of the nation. Havel, as an intellectual, was much respected at home and abroad before and after the fall of Communism, but whether his work and that of other Chartists who were jailed was of major significance – or whether Czechoslovakia was caught up in a “domino effect” of regime changes as a result of a loosening of Moscow’s control under Gorbachev (1985 onwards) – is a point candidates could consider.

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 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.

Topic 5 The Cold War**25. Evaluate the reasons for the change in East–West relations from the Yalta conference to the end of the Potsdam conference.**

Candidates have an opportunity here to demonstrate detailed knowledge of the issues discussed at both conferences. They should not simply provide a general “origins of the Cold War” or a “description of Cold War historiography” response.

At **Yalta** (February 1945), with the defeat of Germany imminent, Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill reached agreement on: the establishment of the United Nations Organization; the temporary division of a defeated Germany (and Austria) into zones of occupation, with similar arrangements for sectors in Berlin and Vienna, the intention being to demilitarize, denazify, disarm and democratize defeated Germany; reparation arrangements that would entitle the Soviet Union to half of a sum set at \$20 billion dollars; the Declaration on Liberated Europe, which was intended to provide for free elections in the states of Central and Eastern Europe that had been freed from Nazi occupation; the formation of a Polish government, which would consist of “London” and “Lublin” Poles; and the entry of the USSR into the war against Japan after Germany’s surrender, in exchange for the South Sakhalin and Kurile Islands.

At **Potsdam** (July–August, 1945) circumstances had changed. The death of Roosevelt (April) and his replacement by Truman, Germany’s defeat (May), the defeat of Churchill in a general election in Britain and his replacement by Attlee, and the news of a successful atomic bomb test formed the background for a less harmonious meeting.

Issues arising (and producing grounds for potential conflict) at Potsdam included further discussion and disagreement over details concerning reparations to be extracted from Germany (including the agreement that the USSR would receive 25 per cent of the reparations from the western zones in exchange for providing food supplies to these zones), Western reluctance to permanently impoverish and weaken Germany was a source of disagreement with the Soviets, Western disquiet over Soviet policies in Poland (border changes and the failure to carry out democratic elections), the increasing sovietization of Central and Eastern European states, which was felt by Truman to be a breach of the Declaration on Liberated Europe agreement made at Yalta, the revelation that atomic tests had been successful and the dropping of two bombs on Japan in August increased Soviet suspicions of Western intentions. Truman’s decision to take a harder line with the Soviets than Roosevelt had, changed the atmosphere at the Potsdam Conference.

*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 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.

26. To what extent did the US policy of containment prove effective in limiting Soviet expansion between 1947 and 1962?

Candidates could begin by defining containment and explaining the circumstances in which it was adopted by the Truman administration in 1947. The “two halves of the walnut” (the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan) formed the basis for the containment of perceived Soviet expansion in Europe. Examination of events in Greece and Turkey, the Czechoslovakian coup of February 1948 which acted as an additional stimulus to the expansion of the policy, the Berlin Crisis of 1948–1949 and the formation of NATO (1949) could be considered in the European sphere, before moving on to consider the application of the policy outside Europe with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 and the outbreak of the war in Korea (1950). Attempts to bolster anti-Communist regimes in East and Southeast Asia, militarily and economically, as well as the establishment of regional pacts in the Middle East and Australasia, could also be noted. The end date of 1962 provides the opportunity for candidates to deal with events in Cuba, culminating in the missile crisis of that year following tense relations with Cuba since Castro’s accession to power in 1959.

More developed responses may also identify the instruments of containment and make an assessment of whether the original intentions of containment – essentially, to hold in place what was considered a spreading tide of Communism – were realized, or not, and why and how.

*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 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.

27. Examine the social and cultural impact of the Cold War on *two* states (excluding the US and the USSR), each chosen from a different region.

Responses will vary in detail depending on the countries chosen, but note that candidates are required to focus specifically on two countries.

For **social impact** candidates could consider areas such as: increased tensions or divisions in society based on ideology, ethnic origin or political views which may be seen as hostile by the populace or government; education curricula may be changed to support a particular view of world events, history or ideology; various aspects of lifestyle may be forbidden or discouraged as showing support for unacceptable ideas.

For **cultural impact** candidates could examine: effects on the media; censorship; influences on art and/or films produced in the country. In addition the impact on written materials produced by governments or individuals may be considered. Music may also be limited or directed in support of a political or ideological position. Religion and education are further areas which may demonstrate some impact. Restrictions on free expression may be increased to limit the circulation of images or ideas deemed inappropriate by government or other groups in society.

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 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.

28. Assess the significance of events in either Germany (1945–1961) or the Congo (1960–1964) to the development of the Cold War.

Between 1945 and 1961 **Germany** played a key role in East–West relations. Agreements reached at Yalta and Potsdam on the future of the state illustrated the differing views and geopolitical priorities of both sides in the Cold War. The “temporary” division of Germany (and Berlin) into Allied zones and sectors respectively assumed a more permanent basis as mutual suspicion and the fears of both superpowers became more evident in this period. Western anxiety about Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe generally, and Soviet policies relating to reparations and the establishment of a sovietised eastern German zone in particular, led to Washington’s attempt to rebuild the western zones as an economic unit and ultimately, by 1949, a political unit – the Federal Republic. Similarly, Soviet perceptions of a resurrected anti-Communist and capitalist western Germany produced the basis for clashes, such as the crisis over Berlin (1948/49) following the currency reform in the zones of the US, Britain and France. Containment of the USSR (enunciated in 1947) led to massive American commitment to preventing the loss of West Berlin. US perceptions of Soviet aggression led to the establishment of NATO and the Federal Republic in 1949 and the eventual incorporation of West Germany into the NATO alliance. Soviet belief that the rebuilding of western Germany and its inclusion in NATO was a threat to Moscow’s security led to the formation of the German Democratic Republic (1949) and the Warsaw Pact (1955). For Moscow, Berlin was “the fishbone that stuck in the throat of Communism”, and even after the “rescue” of West Berlin by airlift in 1948/49 the Soviets resented the existence of this Western outpost – in 1961, the Berlin Wall was erected to isolate this “capitalist island”.

Events in Germany reflected both the mutual hostility and suspicions of the superpowers and exacerbated the development of tensions and the adoption of policies which were eventually expanded to other parts of the globe (containment, confrontation, regional defence pacts *etc*).

The **Belgian Congo** achieved independence in 1960. The rapidity with which Brussels decolonized was arguably based on the belief that the newly-independent state would still need to rely upon Belgium for support, given the lack of experience of Congolese politicians and administrators. The desired neocolonial relationship based on dependency did not happen as Brussels hoped. Congolese political parties/movements based on regional and ethnic support emerged (Kasavubu’s Abako party, Tshombe’s Conakat, Lumumba’s MNC (Congolese National Movement)) and the resulting coalition government failed to promote stability. Military mutinies and the secession of the mineral-rich province of Katanga under Tshombe supported by the Belgian mining corporation, Union Minière, led to appeals by Kasavubu (president) and Lumumba (prime minister) for UN intervention to prevent the total collapse of the new state. UN Secretary General Hammarskjöld agreed to provide a UN force (United Nations Operation in the Congo; ONUC) to help resolve the crisis.

Superpower involvement took the form of Soviet claims that the UNO was working under US influence, and that the UN itself was guilty of being an agent of Western imperialism due to its reluctance to act against the secessionist government of Tshombe. For Moscow, the Congo crisis offered an opportunity to attack what it perceived as a UNO that it believed was a tool of Washington. When Lumumba, angered that the UN would not countenance action to end Katanga’s secession (since it was an internal matter and therefore beyond the mandate of the UN), appealed for Soviet aid, Kasavubu sacked him. The United States, worried by Lumumba’s socialist leanings, supported the move. In September 1960, a military takeover led by Mobutu Sese Seko occurred – backed by Washington. Soviet personnel were expelled from the Congo and Lumumba arrested and assassinated by Tshombe, with the alleged help of the CIA. The problems of the Congo continued until late 1964/65, when Mobutu declared himself president.

The events in the Congo allowed Moscow to portray the UNO as a partisan organization, and to appeal to the newly emerging decolonized states as the friend and defender of such states against Western imperialism – to establish its revolutionary credentials in the “Third World”. For the US, the Congo represented an attempt to halt the possible spread of socialism (via Lumumba and Soviet involvement) as well as to safeguard the valuable resources of the Congo for the West.

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 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.

29. Evaluate the causes of the change in US-Chinese relations after 1969.

Candidates should address the reasons from both the US and Chinese perspectives and produce an assessment of the reasons for change that occurred in each country. The emphasis is on understanding the reasons not in providing a narrative or catalogue of events. Candidates should demonstrate some awareness of the historical context from 1969 onwards and how this contributed to the desire of both states to seek a change in their relationship.

The reasons for the US to seek a change in relations with China may include: the war with Vietnam had weakened the American economy and both its ability and desire to continue its containment policy against Communism; it sought to enter a new relationship with China to reduce tensions in Asia; it sought a new Chinese relationship as a means to pressure the USSR into agreeing to détente through which the arms race and Cold War competition could be reduced with resulting declines in tension and economic expenditure. The influence of Henry Kissinger, a practitioner of realpolitik, was also important as he helped to move the United States away from its ideological hostility to Communist states. The ongoing hostility of China towards the USSR could be used by the Americans as a counter to Russian attempts to gain greater influence in the Third World. In subsequent years the United States sought to further improve its relations with China as a means of increasing opportunities for US industry and investment. This economic relationship expanded dramatically after the death of Mao and the adoption of new economic policies in China.

The reasons for China to seek a new relationship with the US may include: China’s relationship with the USSR which had continued to deteriorate since 1960. China was increasingly concerned about the USSR: armed conflict had broken out in 1969 between the two and there was a fear of further Russian aggression (possibly nuclear). In addition China was on bad terms with other neighbouring states such as North Korea. China needed to establish the possibility of a relationship with the US in order to diminish the possibility of Soviet aggression. In addition the Chinese economy was in a poor condition after the Cultural Revolution and would benefit from the ability to develop trade and technology links with the US. The withdrawal of the US from Vietnam reduced the possibility of conflict between the US and China in Asia and opened the door for better relations. After the death of Mao, a more pragmatic administration sought to expand the Chinese economy through a better relationship with the United States.

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 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.

30. “The break-up of the Soviet Union was the unintended result of policies introduced by Gorbachev.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Note the focus is the break-up of the USSR, not the reasons for the end of the Cold War. Candidates who produce rehearsed responses on “the reasons for the end of the Cold War” cannot score well.

Candidates need to identify the aims Gorbachev set for the Soviet Union. A **key point** is the term **“unintended”**. More developed responses may consider whether the intention of Gorbachev’s regime was to revive an ailing political and economic system, whether the changes were meant to go beyond basic reform and whether changes, once inaugurated, proved impossible to control.

Policies/programmes associated with the Soviet leadership from 1985 include those of perestroika and glasnost. Candidates could investigate the stated purpose for such policies and assess the extent to which the regime’s goals were met, or whether the forces unleashed were beyond the government’s expectations – and means of control.

The “to what extent” command invites candidates to consider other factors that may be linked to the break-up of the Soviet state. Candidates may refer to: longer standing problems that produced a general economic malaise; the significance of the forces of minority nationalism inside the USSR (particularly evident later in the Baltic states, Armenia and Azerbaijan for example); the impact of a foreign policy requiring major expenditure and which proved taxing for the USSR; the weakening of control over the satellite states of Eastern and Central Europe (acting as both a symptom and a cause of Moscow’s declining power). The attempted coup of August 1991, by those seeking to turn back the clock and restore Soviet power after a period of liberalization, was a failure, but marked the dissolution of the Soviet state as the individual republics of the (former) Soviet Union broke free.

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 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.
