IB History Paper 2 Past Questions and Markschemes

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war

1. Analyse the results of *either* the First World War *or* the Second World War. (May 2005)

Candidates should understand by results, the actual results of the war – which side won, the effects upon both sides and the wider effects.

For the First World War, the winning side consisted of Britain and the Commonwealth, France, Italy, the USA and their allies. Both winners and losers suffered financially, economically and socially, and the losers were subjected to the Treaty of Versailles and the other treaties. Candidates could outline main clauses, and analyse their effects. The Ottoman, Austrian and German empires all ceased to exist. No doubt many candidates will include the rise of Hitler, the Great Depression and the Second World War as results. For the Second World War, again the allies of Britain, USA, France, and this time the USSR,

and their allies won the war. Results again were devastation and economic problems throughout Europe and in the Pacific region. The main results to analyse could be: the defeat of Hitler and the Nazis; the Cold War; the rise of superpowers, the impetus to granting independence to European colonies; the changing nature of Europe, perhaps leading to the European Union.

Candidates should know much and high marks will depend on analysis and selection.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate general comments.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit analysis.
[11 to 13 marks] for suitable selection of material and explicit analysis.
[14 to 16 marks] for structured, analytical answers, focused on results.
[17+ marks] for balance, in-depth analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

2. Examine the impact of foreign intervention on *either* the Chinese Civil War *or* the Spanish Civil War. (May 2005)

Foreign intervention could be concerned with causes, course and results of the chosen civil war. As no dates are given, candidates can either use the long term civil war in China, or concentrate on the period 1946 to 1949. Mao and the CCP received some assistance from communist supporters, but their main strength was their own people, whereas the Kuomintang or KMT/GMD was aided by the USA (which had tried to mediate between the two sides), and lost support because of this foreign element.

Both sides in the Spanish Civil War received foreign help, but the German and Italian support for Franco and the Nationalists was more useful than the communist, socialist, anarchist *etc.* support given to the Republicans.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments on the chosen civil war with no mention of foreign involvement.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative which includes foreign intervention.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus on foreign intervention.
[14 to 16 marks] for essays focused on foreign intervention which analyse impact.
[17+ marks] for perceptive interpretation of impact of foreign intervention.

3. Assess the social and economic causes of *one* twentieth century war. (May 2005)

This will probably not be a popular question, but candidates could use either of the world wars, assessing the social implications of German (especially Nazi) social policies, such as Hitler's wish for "living space" and anti-semitic policies. Economic factors were present in causes of the First World War, with rivalry over colonies and financial implications of the arms' race. Appeasement before the Second World War was also the product to some extent of economic recession which prohibited rearming in Britain and France - and the Great Depression was a factor in the success of Hitler in obtaining power.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague general answers.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit assessment.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment.
[14 to 16 marks] for well structured and focused analytical answers.
[17+ marks] for balance or different interpretations.

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war

1. Evaluate the social and economic consequences of *two* twentieth century wars. (November 2004)

Emphasis should be on identifying and evaluating the types, nature, extent of changes produced as a result of war in social and economic areas – supported by specific examples to substantiate claims. The relative emphasis given to each area of change may alter depending on the conflicts selected, but responses should attempt to cover both areas as requested.

"Consequences" may be interpreted as occurring during the period of conflict or after such conflicts have ended. Social consequences could refer to issues of – demographic imbalance as a result of deaths, infringement or curtailment of civil liberties – freedoms of speech, press, assembly – changing roles/perceptions of females as a result of contributions made to a war effort, increased state control over the life of the individual – conscription, requisition, rationing *etc.*

Economic consequences could include – mobilization of work force behind war effort,

industrial boom/slump, dislocation of pre-war trading and production patterns, agricultural disruption, inflation, increased taxation, government borrowing, indemnities/reparations as a consequence of defeat, physical destruction/damage and post-war recovery needs. In some cases profits could be made by individuals and the economic status of certain states improved

immeasurably – for example the USA as a creditor nation after both World wars.
N.B. *If only one war is attempted mark out of maximum of* ***[12]****.*
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive responses of two wars which cover the changes implicitly – but little evidence of an attempt at evaluation or critical commentary. Likely to be an end-on account with insufficient focus.
[11 to 13 marks] will require a more explicit focus on the areas of change, providing specific examples – perhaps unbalanced in terms of the areas and/or the treatment of the two wars selected. Evaluation present but not fully developed.
[14 to 16 + marks] will be awarded for a structured (possibly thematic) approach as opposed to end-on account. Evaluation will be present and developed and evidence provided to support the arguments. Balanced in terms of the treatment of both areas and the two wars chosen. At the top end of the band a high level of analysis/critical commentary, a strong supporting base of relevant and accurate information concerning the types, extent, nature of changes will be present.

2. How valid is the claim that in 1914 states went to war due to fear rather than for motives of gain? (November 2004)
The question requires candidates to consider the motives of the various states in Europe (and their respective empires) for entry into the First World War. A popular question no doubt, which could produce an avalanche of pre-learned or pre-planned responses on the Origins of World War One: such responses are unlikely to score well. The question indicates two areas/issues for particular consideration *i.e.* "fear" and "gain" and both areas should be addressed. The "How valid" invitation permits candidates not just to consider the relative merits of "fear" and "gain" but allows for identification of other motives which they may feel to be significant. Stronger responses will no doubt produce such an approach. Belgium, for example, had little time to worry about either issue in 1914 and found itself at war for quite simple reasons. "Fear" could be linked to individual states – *e.g.* German fear of encirclement, Russian fear of diplomatic failure/humiliation, Vienna's fear of Pan-Slavism/Serb Nationalism and anxiety over imperial disintegration, British fears of naval/economic challenges. "Gain" could be linked to desires (overt or covert) of various states by 1914 which, it was believed, might be achievable through military means/war. Such gains might be territorial, economic, diplomatic, irredentist, *etc.*
N.B. *The First World War provides much opportunity for investigation and examination of other motives and the problem will not be a lack of detail in responses, but a plethora of indiscriminately selected and deployed material.*
[8 to 10 marks] for answers which are largely descriptive but which do touch upon the issues of "fear/gain" albeit in little convincing depth before moving on to other areas. Responses may in some cases give the impression of a learned response approach.
[11 to 13 marks] will consider the issues of "fear " and "gain" explicitly, though specific examples of each may be limited and/or unbalanced. The "How valid" element will be identified and tackled though the level of analysis and provision of alternative motives may not be well developed.
[14 to 16 marks] may be awarded for responses that deal effectively with both issues of "fear" and "gain", provide convincing, accurate, substantiation of each and address the issue of "How valid" effectively. Investigation of other possible motives of the powers involved (individually or collectively) may be apparent and once more, specific examples provided as evidence.
[17+ marks] as above but candidates will provide accurate detailed knowledge and reveal evidence of wide reading and/or different interpretations concerning motives/motivation of the warring states.

Topic 1 Causes, practices and effects of war
1. In what ways did the causes of the Second World War differ from the causes of the First World War? (May 2004)
The best way to approach this question is probably to explain the causes of the Second World War, showing how each one differed from causes in the First World War. Germany should be considered as a cause of both; for the Second World War it was Hitler's aggression, which was probably more important than the Kaiser's policies and ambitions in the First World War. Nationalism in the Second World War was mainly Hitler's desire for "living space", in the First World War it was mainly in the Balkans. Similarly Imperialism if present in the Second World War, was different from the desire for colonies in the First World War.
Appeasement has been considered as a cause of the Second World War, whereas the arms race was important for the First World War. The alliances and failure of diplomacy, could be discussed for both. It was Hitler's invasion of Poland that sparked the Second World War, whereas the assassination at Sarajevo began the events that led to the First World War. Versailles was a cause of the Second World War only. No doubt many candidates will attempt to give the causes of both wars end-on, and this will take too much time. Candidates should be selective and focus on differences.
[7 marks] and under if only one war is addressed.
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on accounts of both wars with implicit differences.
[11 to 13 marks] for a structure focused on differences or good linkage.
[14 to 16 marks] for focus on and analysis of differences.
[17+ marks] for different interpretations or perception of differences and similarities.

4. Analyse the results of *two* wars, each chosen from a different region. (May 2004)
The results of the wars will of course depend on the wars chosen, which could be global or limited, but should include the effects on and for both, winners and losers, or at least the main participants in major wars. Areas to consider are political, social and economic results at home, the ways in which the war has strengthened or weakened the country being analysed, its changes in status as a regional or world power, and where relevant, Cold War politics. Candidates are probably more likely to concentrate on wider results and issues, than detailed domestic circumstances and changes

(except perhaps after the First World War). Allow the Second World War as two wars, Europe and the Pacific, but candidates would probably be wiser to use conflicts involving fewer countries such as the Spanish Civil War or Korean War, where analysis can be in greater depth.
[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive or narrative accounts with implicit analysis.
[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit analysis.
[14 to 16+ marks] for focus on and specific analysis of, results.
N.B. *If only one war or one region is addressed, mark out of* ***[12]***.

1. Assess critically *three* causes of the First World War. (Nov 2003)
Probably candidates will choose from three of the following causes of the First World War; alliances; the Balkans; imperialism; the arms' race; naval rivalry between Germany and Britain; German militarism; the assassination at Sarajevo. Accept any other legitimate cause and different wording from those above. Candidates need to explain each of their chosen causes and assess their part in causing the war, for example how important they were relatively in causing the war.
Mark out of ***[7]*** for each cause approximately, or mark as a whole with:
[0 to 7 marks] for short or inaccurate attempts, or a brief general causes answer.
[8 to 10 marks] for basic accounts and at least implicit assessment of the chosen three causes.
[11 to 13 marks] for fuller accounts and explicit assessment.
[14 to 16 marks] for full analysis of the three causes.
[17+ marks] for a further dimension such as different interpretations of the selected causes.

2. Compare and contrast the causes of *two* wars (excluding the First World War) each chosen from a different region. (Nov 2003)
This is a comparative question requiring candidates to consider the similarities and differences of the causes of two wars. As the First World War is the subject of the previous question it has been excluded. Candidates may well choose the Second World War together with perhaps the Vietnam or Korean War, but of course allow any non European War, and as the Second World War developed outside Europe, candidates could elect to answer both parts on it, the European aspect, and the war in the Pacific. Causes should include long term and immediate.
[0 to 7 marks] for a vague inadequate attempt, or addressing only one war.
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on accounts with only implicit comparison.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison.
[14 to 16 marks] for acceptable details in a comparative structure.
[17+ marks] for excellent insight, or perhaps different interpretations.

Topic 1: Causes, practices and effects of war
1. What were the most frequent causes of twentieth century wars? Specific evidence from at least *three* wars should be used. (May 2003)
Candidates need to indicate the most frequent causes of twentieth century wars and give specific evidence from the wars in which each cause was involved. They should also analyse why the causes were so prevalent in the twentieth century. Some causes to include would be:

- nationalism, wars to use as examples could include both world wars, Balkan wars, wars of decolonization, Arab-Israeli wars; various suggestions for twentieth century nationalism could be suggested such as its use or misuse by rulers or would-be rulers, as a political tool, as a result of the decline of imperial powers, *etc.*aggression and the wish for conquest, *e.g.* Mussolini's invasion of Abyssinia, Japan's invasion of Manchuria, Hitler and the Second World War. The reasons for aggression by rulers and states need to be discussed.
- fear, this could account for some participation in both world wars, Arab-Israeli wars, Korea and Vietnam, and is often a factor in war and politics.
- religion, Arab-Israeli wars, an age old cause often used as a cover.
- East West rivalry or Cold War politics, *e.g.* Korea and Vietnam.

The above are some suggestions. No doubt others will also be used, and some candidates will tackle the question by selecting three wars and discussing the causes.
[8 to 10 marks] for a mainly narrative account of the causes of three wars.
[11 to 13 marks] for causes of three wars with assessment of their importance and frequency.
[14 to 16 marks] for answers structured around causes with specific examples and analysis.
[17+ marks] for answers with detail, insight and perceptive comments.

2. In what ways, and to what extent, was the Second World War "total war"? (May 2003)
Candidates need to give a definition of "total war", such as a war in which all the nation's resources economic, financial, human and ideological are mobilized in the war effort in order to win. This could be argued as true of Britain, Germany, Japan and USSR, but not USA. Specific details should be given of the areas listed, and an assessment made on "to what extent".In the past answers have tended to be too general with insufficient detail on vital areas such as conscription, direction of labour and resources, legislation curtailing freedom of action *etc.*
[7 marks] and below for unsubstantiated generalizations.
[8 to 10 marks] for descriptions of some of the above.
[11 to 13 marks] for better focus and detail.
[14 to 16+ marks] for specific coverage of most or all of the relevant elements.

3. How and why did technological developments play an important part in twentieth century wars? (May 2003)
The twentieth century probably saw the greatest changes in warfare in history, because of the century's technological revolution. "How" – would cover the changes in fighting methods, on land, sea, and in the air, with transport and weaponry developments, both offensive and defensive, which led to different tactics and strategies. "Why" – would cover the reasons for development and changes, research, resources, transference of peace time inventions to weapons of war, *etc.* There are many ways to tackle this open-ended question, but selection and focus, as well as detail and analysis are necessary for good marks. Of course the point could be made that in some areas, such as in guerrilla warfare, much remains the same.
[7 marks] and below for inadequate general answers.
[8 to 10 marks] for descriptions or narratives of key changes.
[11 to 13 marks] for focus on how and why with specific examples.
[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical answers which explain changes.
[17+ marks] for insight and perception.

4. Analyse the causes and results of *one* of the following: Chinese Civil War (1945–1949); Mexican Revolution (1910–1940); Spanish Civil War (1936–1939). (May 2003)
Candidates need to analyse the following types of causes, where applicable, in relation to the war of their choice: political, ideological, economic and social, religious, outside interference. Details of the war are not required, and the dates covering the actions are given. Results might include the winner, the regime that followed, the state of the country at the end of the conflict, the position of the losers and any wider issues, *e.g.* for the region or the world.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of the main causes and results with implicit analysis.
[11 to 13 marks] for better detail and some explicit analysis.
[14 to 16+ marks] for analytical answers, focused and structured on causes and results.

Topic 3 The rise and rule of single-party states
11. Analyse the methods used and the conditions which helped in the rise to power of *one* ruler of a single-party state. (May 2005)
This question requires candidates to select one single-party state, and first state and analyse the methods used by the aspiring leader to obtain power. Methods could include: choice and use of an ideology; how support both inside the country, and from foreign sources, was obtained; the appeal of the leader; propaganda; whether legal or violent methods were used. Candidates must also consider how the conditions in the chosen country were ripe for a new regime, for example a lost war, poor economy, weak government *etc.*
[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate/general material.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit methods and conditions.
[11 to 13 marks] for more exact focus and explicit assessment of methods and conditions.
[14 to 16 marks] for structure, focus on methods and conditions, and analysis.
[17+ marks] for an extra quality such as different interpretations.

12. Evaluate the successes and failures of *one* ruler of a single-party state. (May 2005)
Candidates should be well prepared and well informed for this question. They need to state their ruler and analyse all aspects of his rule, giving judgment on which policies, actions etc. were successful and which were failures. Expect accurate chronology and some wider assessment for the top bands. Domestic and foreign policies should be considered. Better candidates might point out the difference between success for the country as a whole, and success for the ruler. No doubt the most popular choices will be Castro, Hitler, Lenin, Mao,
Mussolini and Stalin.
[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated general comments.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit success and failure.
[11 to 13 marks] for focus and explicit assessment.
[14 to 16 marks] for structured analytical answers.
[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis and balance.

13. Assess the methods used by *either* Lenin *or* Perón to maintain his regime. (May 2005) (Also November 2003)
Candidates might begin with how the chosen leader established his regime - that is the immediate circumstances of the end of the previous regime - and constitutional and other measures taken to establish his own regime. They should then assess methods, policies, actions, alliances etc. by which the regime was maintained.
Lenin established his rule by overthrowing the Provisional Government in the second 1917 Russian Revolution and overturning the Constituent Assembly in January 1918. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the murder of the Romanovs followed. He introduced War Communism, won the Civil War, changed to NEP and controlled the Party and country with terror. Candidates could note that Lenin was not always in control after his first stroke, and died in 1924. Perón took part in the 1943 coup, established his power base in the ensuing government as
Minister of Labour and Social Security, survived an attempt to oust him in October 1945, and was elected president in February 1946. He maintained his regime with populist policies, expanding government expenditure in the wake of an export boom, the help of his popular wife, Eva, and the support of the urban working (and middle) classes. He was deposed and exiled in 1955 after antagonizing the Church and many former supporters. He returned as
president in 1973, but died in 1974.
[0 to 7 marks] for inaccurate or very general answers.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit assessment of methods.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit focus and assessment of methods.

[14 to 16 marks] for focused structured analysis of the institution and maintenance of the chosen regime.
[17+ marks] for balance and/or different interpretations.

14. Compare and contrast the influence outside their own countries of Hitler and Mao. (May 2005)
Mao took power in China in 1949 after waging a guerrilla campaign and winning a Civil War against Chiang Kai-shek. Hitler came to power in 1933, when he was made Chancellor. He committed suicide in 1945, when the Russians captured Berlin. The question is limited to material outside the two leaders' own countries.
For comparison, both had some influence outside their countries before they came to power, Mao as an exponent of Communism and Hitler in Europe with his Nazi party. Both were well known leaders for their chosen ideology, communism and fascism, and both were involved in conflicts - Korea, Vietnam and the Second World War. Both won support overseas by propaganda.
For contrast, Mao sent aid and advisers to many African and Asian countries whereas Hitler "took over" European countries. Hitler fought the Second World War on his own behalf, and as its main figure and instigator. Mao's involvement in Korea and Vietnam was less clear cut.
[0 to 7 marks] for very general comments, or if only one ruler is addressed.
[8 to 10 marks] for sequential accounts of both with implicit linkage.
[11 to 13 marks] for good detail and explicit linkage.
[14 to 16 marks] for a comparative structure with relevant evidence for both.
[17+ marks] for analytical balanced comparison.

To what extent was the rise to power of *one* Left wing and *one* Right wing single party ruler, the result of previous political problems? (November 2004)
The question mentions both left and right wing rulers and responses need to provide examples of both. Thematic, rather than end-on narratives are likely to produce more effective responses. The popular examples are likely to be taken from Germany, Italy, USSR, China, Cuba. Whichever is selected there needs to be identification and examination of specific political distress or situation(s) and a judgment as to how these may have aided the coming to power of the chosen rulers/regimes. Other factors may also be considered in addition to those
indicated in the question – in keeping with the invitation to evaluate. In this case such factors and relative contribution will depend on the example selected. Anti-imperialism/nationalism, revanchism, ideological appeal, economic problems, charismatic leadership, fear/insecurity are all possible areas for development and investigation.
[7 marks] and below for unfocused, narrative/descriptive responses.
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on narratives of two examples. Implicit evaluation.
[11 to 13 marks] for identification of suitable left and right wing examples. Response covers issue of political distress/conditions and provides supporting details. May be unbalanced in treatment of examples. Evaluation element present but limited.
[14 to 16 marks] for reasons which identify two examples, provide evidence of political circumstances surrounding the rise of each extreme. May recognize other factors as well but fails to develop and evaluate effectively.
[17+ marks] as above but shows an accurate and detailed base of support concerning political factors. Candidate is able to recognize and comment on the importance of other factors and makes an attempt to evaluate or make judgment on the relative importance or contribution of the various factors.

Assess the role of terror and force in maintaining the ruler in power in *two* totalitarian states each chosen from a different region. (November 2004)
If only one example is tackled or both examples are taken from the same region mark out of ***[12]*** maximum.
Maintenance is the focus, not rise to power. The issue of "terror" and "force" – depending on the examples chosen – can be dealt with through examination of the mechanism of a (secret) police state, the use of violence/intimidation, detention/labour camps, forcible "re-education", purges and arbitrary punishment of individuals/groups. Popular areas of focus will probably be Lenin, Stalin and purges, Mao and campaigns (*e.g.* 100 Flowers, Cultural Revolution), Hitler, Franco. Whichever is selected there should be detailed knowledge of the nature and operation of "terror" and "force" in the totalitarian system. In a few cases there may be a challenge to the assertion. "Assess" also permits candidates to identify and comment critically on other features/factors which may be relevant to maintenance of power: economic policies, successful foreign policies, lack of effective alternatives, propaganda/media control, education *etc.*
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on narratives or descriptive accounts. Knowledge base requires development. Assessment is implicit.
[11 to 13 marks] for answers clearly identifying the nature of "terror" and "force" within the regimes chosen, how it operated, effectiveness – and identification of other areas – though not well developed. May be an imbalance in treatment of the two states chosen. Assessment explicit but not fully developed.
[14 to 16+ marks] for accurate detailed knowledge of the mechanisms and nature of "terror" and "force" as applied by the regimes selected. Comments on the effectiveness of such methods/mechanisms and identifies other factors linked to the issue of maintenance of power. Responses make judgment as to the relative contributions of the factors.

11. Analyse the methods used by one single-party state ruler in his successful bid for power. (May 2004)
Candidates should explain the methods used by their chosen ruler, say why these methods were chosen, then analyse them by indicating how and why they were successful in propelling the aspiring ruler into power. Actual details will depend on the person chosen, but the type of methods used, legal or violent, political or in armed rebellion, the type of support sought and obtained, ideology, the nature of the regime that is overthrown, the regional or world situation, should all be analysed. The answer need only go as far as when power is obtained. No doubt Hitler and Castro will be popular choices.

[8 to 10 marks] for a narrative "rise to power" essay with implicit analysis.
[11 to 13 marks] for some explicit analysis of methods used, *e.g.* why they succeeded.
[14 to 16 marks] for a structured analysis of methods.
[17+ marks] for balance and perhaps different interpretations.

12. Evaluate the importance of ideology in the policies of *two* of the following rulers of single-party states: Castro; Hitler; Lenin; Nyerere. (May 2004)
Candidates need to select two from the list of four, and discuss the role of ideology – as a positive or negative force in the policies they implemented during their rule. It should be determined if the ideology associated with the rulers chosen was one already in existence or one which originated with the ruler. Did the ruler believe in it or was he just using it? How precisely did he follow it? The two selected rulers can be linked together in one essay or treated separately . Castro was originally a revolutionary socialist, then a Communist. Hitler
can be called a fascist and/or a Nazi. Lenin was a Marxist or Marxist Leninist. Nyerere was an African nationalist and a socialist.
[7 marks] and under if there is no attention to ideology.
[8 to 10 marks] for a narrative or descriptive essay with implicit importance.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit evaluation of importance.
[14 to 16 marks] for balance and focus on importance.
[17+ marks] for different interpretations and understanding of the different ideologies.
N.B. *If only one ruler is addressed mark out of* ***[12]****.*

13. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of *two* rulers of single-party states, each chosen from a different region. (May 2004)
Foreign policy is not usually a popular area in this topic. This is a straightforward compare and contrast question, but the selected rulers must be from different regions. Points to consider could include, offensive or defensive: aggressive to hide domestic problems, or passive to allow for concentration on domestic issues; successful or a failure; solitary or acting in alliance; personal or influenced by outside events; driven by economic or political motives.
Candidates will probably find it easier to address rulers with an active foreign policy thus Castro could be considered with either Hitler or Mussolini.
[7 marks] and under if only one ruler or one region is used.
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on narratives with little linkage.
[11 to 13 marks] for good linkage or a perhaps unbalanced comparative structure.
[14 to 16+ marks] for a satisfactory comparative structure with adequate detail.

14. In what ways, and to what extent, did *either* Nasser *or* Perón improve social and economic conditions? (May 2004)
Nasser was minister of the interior after the 1952 coup, then President of Egypt, 1954–70. His policies included land reform, and he advocated socialist measures to try to eliminate poverty. He opposed extremist Muslims, and was a modernizer. He instigated the building of the Aswan Dam which controlled irrigation but resulted in coastal erosion and diminution of fishing. Perón was President of Argentina 1946–55 and briefly 1973–74. Helped by his wife Eva, he introduced schemes and policies to help the poor and improve the lives of women, such as social welfare, education and health care. He supported industry at the expense of agriculture, trade unions, and public works. Argentina amassed a large foreign surplus in the Second World War, but financial problems and poverty remained.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative accounts with implicit assessment.
[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit assessment.
[14 to 16+ marks] for focus, structure and analysis of improvement, and attention to, to what extent.

15. Examine the global impact of *one* ruler of a single-party state. (May 2004)
This question gives thoughtful candidates the opportunity to write an original and analytical essay on how and why one ruler of a single-party state affected other states. Some suggestions are: Hitler's destructive global impact culminating in the Second World War; Lenin as the first ruler to adopt Marxism: then his own version of Communism, Marxist Leninism, was adopted widely – Lenin's writings were also influential; Castro, who as the ruler of a very small state had an impact that was beyond his importance, partly because of Cuba's geographical position, close to America.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit impact.
[11 to 13 marks] for better focus on, and explanation of, global impact.
[14 to 16 marks] for an analytical essay.
[17+ marks] for original thought and analysis.

Topic 4 Peace and cooperation: international organizations and multiparty states
16. Why, in spite of early successes, did the League of Nations fail to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War? (May 2005)
There are three elements to this question: the nature and organization of the League of Nations, and how it permitted early successes; its inherent weaknesses, which did not allow it to solve the more difficult problems and crises it faced in the 1930s and an examination of the perpetrators of aggression in the 1930s, with judgment of whether any organization could have prevented a determined dictator such as Hitler from turning demands and aggression into war. Some candidates will probably also consider appeasement, and perhaps the Wall Street Crash, in the equation.
[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate or inaccurate material.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of the League, 1919 to 1939, with implicit judgment.

[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the key areas of the question.
[14 to 16 marks] for focused analysis of the League's failure to prevent war.
[17+ marks] for balance, analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

14. Examine critically the successes and failures of *either* Castro *or* Mussolini, as a leader of a single-party state.
Candidates need to state the main policies of their chosen ruler and assess them in order to explain how and why they were successes or failures. Castro became prime minister of Cuba after he had seized power in 1959, president in 1976 and still ruled the country at the end of the twentieth century. Candidates should be able to assess his economic and social policies, the nature of his regime, and relations with USA, USSR and other Communist countries. There will probably be many shades of opinion as to his successes and failures. Mussolini formed a government in Italy in October 1922 and assumed dictatorial powers by 1924. Policies to be assessed could include the nature of his totalitarian state, social, economic and religious policies, his fierce nationalism with overt expansionism from the mid 1930s, alliance with Hitler and part played in the Second World War. Accept the rise to power – as a success – for both, but answers that contain little else will not score well.
[0 to 7 marks] for short or irrelevant answers.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit analysis.
[11 to 13 marks] for fuller details with explicit assessment.
[14 to 16 marks] for an analytical approach and focus on successes and failures.
[17 + marks] for balance and/or different interpretations.

15. How and why was propaganda used in *two* single-party states, each chosen from a different region? (May 2003)
How and why requires both the actual methods used: posters, films, the press, radio, television, control, censorship of the arts and rallies; and the aims: purpose, organization and direction of the methods. Use of propaganda could cover success in indoctrination, in obtaining and keeping support for the regime, establishing a cult of personality, stifling freedom of expression, and punishment for transgressions. Candidates usually know about the use of propaganda in Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Note that the examples must be from two different regions. Probably Castro or Mao will join a European example.
[0 to 7 marks] for lack of specificity.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers which lack focus on ways and results.
[11 to 13 marks] for attention to both parts and specific examples.
[14 to 16+ marks] for focus, structure and analysis. If only one state or one region is addressed mark out of ***[12]***.

11. "In order to achieve and retain power a leader of a single party-state needed to be ruthless, blind to human suffering and yet charismatic." To what extent do you agree with this assertion? (May 2003)
The question is phrased in the singular, so accept a thorough analysis of one single-party state ruler, or answers which draw on several to illustrate the named attributes. These attributes, ruthless, blind to human suffering and charismatic, are meant to provide a framework for a focused answer. Of course candidates need not agree with them all, or indeed any of them – as long as they do discuss them. This should be a popular question as it includes "rise", and many will no doubt see Hitler, with his ruthlessness *e.g.* against the Jews, in the Night of the Long Knives, and aggressive foreign policy, blindness to suffering in terror, and concentration camps, and charisma, with his speeches and rallies, as an ideal choice for their answer to this question. If only rise or only rule is addressed mark out of ***[12]***.
[7 marks] and under for vague general answers.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of the rise and rule of one ruler with implicit attention to the quotation.
[11 to 13 marks] for answers focused on the quotation.
[14 to 16+ marks] for focused analytical essays which also implicitly or at the top explicitly, address "to what extent?"

12. Account for the rise to power of *one* of the following: Castro; Mussolini; Nasser.
Which ever ruler is chosen candidates need to examine the circumstances and weaknesses of the previous regime, assess the character, leadership qualities, policies and actions of the would-be ruler, and show how and why he gained support. The answer need go no further than the date when the ruler achieves power, although some may continue until his position is considered secure. Suggested years to cover fully are: Castro 1953 to 1959; Mussolini 1918 to 1922; Nasser 1948 to 1954. As well as these years some introductory material on the previous regime will be required.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of the rise with implicit assessment.
[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit accounting and assessment.
[14 to 16 marks] for focused, analytical and structured answers which clearly account for the rise to power.
[17+ marks] for insight and perhaps different interpretations for the ruler's success.

13. Compare and contrast the economic and social policies of Mao and Stalin. (May 2003)
For comparison of economic policies, both recognized that their countries were economically backward and introduced 5 Year Plans, Stalin in 1928 and Mao in 1952. The emphasis of both was on state directed growth of heavy industry. Both were concerned with increasing the output of coal, steel and petro-chemicals. Both undertook projects to impress, *e.g.* Stalin the new town with factory complexes at Magnitogorsk and Mao a vast road and rail bridge across the Yangzi. Both followed policies designed to increase the industrial workforce. In agriculture both implemented collectivization as a means of introducing new methods and machinery, and both policies produced famines. In contrast, Stalin introduced and continued with 5 Year Plans, which were developed in time to include some consumer goods. Mao followed the Soviet model at first then – partly because promised Soviet aid turned out to be loans and exploitation – went his own way such as the Great Leap Forward. Mao was more concerned with the peasant

population, and agriculture, *e.g.* his 8 point agricultural constitution of 1958.
For both, social policies included compelling acceptance of their form of Communism and their personal rule and direction, with the use of propaganda and terror. Education and training was encouraged, but for the benefit of the regime not the individual. Youth in both USSR and China was used to sustain the regimes *e.g.* Stalin's Communist youth movement and Mao's Red Guards. In contrast Stalin's policies were more consistent with his control of the media, arts and culture. Mao used his own "philosophy", expressed in his "Red Book", and tried to control the social life of China with campaigns and revolutions, *e.g.* the Hundred Flowers Campaign and the Cultural Revolution.
[7 marks] and under if only Stalin or only Mao is addressed.
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on accounts with implicit comparison.
[11 to 13 marks] for more specific details and explicit comparison and contrast.
[14 to 16+ marks] for comparative structures with appropriate details and comments.

16. Why were the attempts of the League of Nations to ensure collective security more successful before rather than after 1929? (November 2004)
No doubt many will produce standard pre-learned responses on "The failure of the League" but the question does require students to identify and critically examine the collective security attempts both pre and post 1929.
Reference may be made to conditions pre-1929 when arguably the "climate" for successful attempts at "collective security" was more propitious *e.g.* Locarno, rapprochement between France and Germany, post-war economic prosperity generally in the 1920s. There were indeed challenges to "collective security" (Vilna, Corfu) but also successes (Aaland, Iraq).
Political extremism though present (Italy) not yet seen as a major threat to international peace. Post-1929 – Great Depression – radicalization of politics and the search for solutions to economic and political problems by aggressive/predatory states – Japan, Italy, Germany. Domestic concerns due to economic crisis led to an unwillingness to commit resources by democratic states (Britain, France). Nations guided in the period post-1929 by increased emphasis on national self-interest – whether it be expansionism for material and prestige gains or a retreat to insularity to preserve resources and concentrate upon solving internal problems. Examples – Manchuria, Abyssinia, Appeasement policies of the 1930s – all of which reveal the ignoring and subsequent abandonment of the principle of "collective security".
[8 to 10 marks] for generalized narratives on the failure of the League which may implicitly address the question's demands.
[11 to 13 marks] understands and addresses the demands of the question though not all aspects are covered.
[14 to 16+ marks] a well-balanced treatment of the demands of the question in a structured and focused manner. Reveals a good grasp of the climate pre-and post-1929 in which the League operated and makes critical comment, with substantiation, of the ways in which the application of the principle of "collective security" was made more difficult in the changed circumstances caused by economic depression, right-wing totalitarianism/militarism and appeasement/apathy/isolationism practised by certain powers.

16. Why in spite of the worthy intentions of its founders, did the League of Nations only last for two decades? (May 2004)
Candidates should first consider the founders' "good intentions", that is, their aims, to preserve peace and work for a better world, and assess if this was possible or too idealistic. Criticisms of failures in the League such as its structure and association with Versailles could also be examined here, or in the second part which is to explain its short life. Candidates should do this by pointing out the problems it faced because of its inherent weaknesses, and the difficult world situation with countries refusing to join, or obey, or cooperate, as well as
aggressive dictators and governments, including Mussolini, Hitler and Japan.
[8 to 10 marks] for a chronological narrative of failure with implicit reasoning.
[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the set question and some explicit arguments.
[14 to 16 marks] for exact focus on and analysis of both parts of the question.
[17+ marks] for reasoned analysis in a balanced interpretation.

Topic 5 The Cold War
21. Assess the part played by differing ideologies in the origin of the Cold War. (May 2005)
Candidates should be well prepared to explain and discuss the differences between communism and democracy, and a directed and planned economy versus a free market economy. They will probably explain opposition to Bolshevik revolution and rule, and state that cooperation of the two ideologies was only possible with a common enemy. Other causes of the Cold War such as fear and mutual suspicion and/or power politics could then be considered. A frequent weakness in answers to questions on the origin of the Cold War, is that candidates do not know where to stop. Some recount the whole course of the Cold War, but up to 1950 is sufficient.
[0 to 7 marks] for a general account of some Cold War episodes.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of perhaps 1917 to 1950, with implicit assessment.
[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the part played by differing ideologies.
[14 to 16 marks] for analytical responses which also briefly consider other causes.
[17+ marks] for balance, in depth analysis and perhaps different interpretations.
N.B. *This does not mean rote learning of the different theories of the origin of the Cold War.*

22. In what ways, and with what results, was Germany the key focus of the early stages of the Cold War? (May 2005)
The demands of this question are: Yalta and Potsdam, the division of Germany and Berlin into four, the problem of

reparations, disagreements between East and West, the Berlin Blockade and Airlift, division into two countries - the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. This division could equally be structured as a result. Other results could include the different political and economic situation in each part, exodus from east to west, Marshall Plan, NATO, Warsaw Pact, entrenchment of the Cold War and perhaps the
Berlin Wall – but no further.
[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate , irrelevant or inaccurate material.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit focus on ways and results.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit ways and results.
[14 to 16 marks] for structured analysis of ways and results.
[17+ marks] for another dimension and balanced coverage.

23. Analyse the part played by Cuba in the development of the Cold War. (May 2005)
The main areas to cover are: Castro's embracing of the USSR and communism, and rejection of the USA; Bay of Pigs; Missile Crisis and its aftermath; other ways in which Castro gave aid to support communism, revolutionaries, and hopeful converts in Third World countries. Analysis should be made to ascertain how important the above were in developing the Cold War; did they almost lead to a third world war or to détente and an improvement in relations between East and West?
[0 to 7 marks] for a brief answer confined to the missile crisis.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of some of the above with implicit analysis.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit analysis.
[14 to 16 marks] for structured analysis of the part played by Cuba in the Cold War.
[17+ marks] for specific detailed evidence and depth of analysis.

24. Evaluate the role of *one* super power in the Cold War after 1970. (May 2005)
The term super power applies to either USSR or USA, but allow China in the unlikely event of it being chosen. Candidates probably will not like a question that deals with events from 1970 to the end of the Cold War. The main developments which concern both or one of the super powers are: Vietnam War; Soviet invasion of Afghanistan: US relations with China normalized; space race: US intervention in Latin America; test ban treaties: other arms limitation treaties; anti-communist demonstrations/parties formed in Soviet satellite states; fall of the Berlin Wall; end of Communism. Candidates need to assess and evaluate the role of their chosen super power, in relevant points above to judge each issue and its relation to prolonging or bringing to an end the Cold War.
[0 to 7 marks] for general assertions.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative with implicit evaluation.
[11 to 13 marks] for explicit evaluation of the chosen super power's role.
[14 to 16 marks] for structured analysis focused on the role of the super power.
[17+ marks] for balanced judgment or different interpretations.

To what extent did economic problems in the Communist bloc bring about the end of the Cold War? (May 2005) This question covers all the eastern bloc including the USSR. The demands of the question are that candidates explain the troubled economic situation in this area and decide how far this was responsible for bringing to an end the Cold War. As it asks "to what extent" other factors need to be assessed, that is political events and motives, and even foreign events such as support for rebels, and perhaps the impact of disillusionment with the communist ideology. Economic problems could include poverty, unemployment, lack of necessities or luxury goods, strikes *etc.*
[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalizations.
[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive answers with implicit assessment.
[11 to 13 marks] for specific examples and assessment of economic problems in the communist bloc.
[14 to 16 marks] for analysis of the economic problem and their impact.
[17+ marks] for thoughtful attention to what extent.

21. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the relationship between the wartime Allies deteriorate between 1945 and 1949? (November 2004)
Examination of the nature and purpose of the wartime Grand Alliance is an obvious starting point here – raising questions as to inherent stability/possibility of longevity at the outset. Consideration of the nature of a "marriage of convenience" may be present. "For what reasons" could include mutual fear, desire for security, pursuit of ideological goals, the loss of the Axis "glue" holding the different components together after May and August 1945, desire for economic gain *etc.* In what ways – could bring in the Yalta/Potsdam deliberations and issues/cooling of relations, the physical division of the continent into spheres of influence, Truman/Marshall and Soviet equivalents. Specific areas of competition/"conflict" – Greece, Turkey, Berlin, atomic weapons, NATO *etc.* End date is 1949, some candidates may include reference to Asian
developments. A "How" and "Why" question approach which will probably attract many responses. No doubt a standard historiographical approach will be adopted by many *i.e.* the "There are three schools of thought… orthodox/revisionist/post-revisionist …" Such responses are usually less focused on the specific question/task. Learned responses tend to be light on actual historical knowledge of the events of the period under investigation. Emphasis should be on the provision and deployment of relevant historical knowledge by the candidate in an attempt to reach the candidate's own conclusion rather than parroting historiography devoid of historical context.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive overviews of the period which deal with how and why implicitly.
[11 to 13 marks] for answers which deal explicitly with both parts of the question though possibly an imbalance in treatment. Level of knowledge is sound. Analysis is present, but requires development.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers which deal explicitly with both parts of the question, provide a good and accurate knowledge base to support arguments in both sections producing a balanced response.
[17+ marks] as above and in addition may show evidence of wide reading, knowledge of historiography to supplement and not replace candidate's argumentation/case. Detailed and accurate knowledge base from which points are drawn for effective substantiation.

23. Why, and with what success, did the USA adopt a policy of containment in the period 1947-1962? (November 2004)
Likely to prove a popular question with many candidates. The question has two parts and does invite an assessment of the success (or not) of the policy by 1962. Narratives of the origins of the Cold War with a heavy emphasis on "orthodox, revisionist, counter-revisionist" schools being identified and explained at length are a common approach by some candidates but the emphasis should be on the candidate using historical information to justify their answer, not to produce a summary of historiography – as often occurs. The period under discussion should be well known. Candidates should identify/define Containment and its constituent parts (Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan) and explain the motives which lay behind the adoption of such a policy. Fear of Soviet expansionism, desire for economic dominance over Europe, mutual misunderstanding of East and West, change of personalities at post war conferences, could be generally investigated. Specific examples to illustrate could include arguments over Poland, Germany, fears over Iran, Greece and Turkey *etc.* Much is available to tackle the "why" section. "Success" (or not) – up to 1962 – could consider the impact of Western European economic recovery as planned by Marshall for humanitarian/political motives, "victory" in the Greek Civil War, Berlin Blockade, NATO, Korean war, SEATO all as possible "successes" – but Czechoslovakia 1948, "loss" of China 1949, Indo-Chinese problems 1945/6 onwards, Cuban revolution and developments 1959-62 *etc.* might cast doubt on the level of "success" attained. Do not expect all of the above – but circumstances of adoption, "containment" and the assessment task all need to be addressed for an effective response.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of the origins and development of the Cold War until 1962 with implicit coverage of the issue of "success".
[11 to 13 marks] the demands of the question are understood but response requires more detail and more explicit commentary on the question of "success".
[14 to 16 marks] for a structured response which deals with the demands of the question, providing convincing substantiation of the claims made in relation to circumstances and degree of success achieved by 1962.
[17+ marks] for clear and focused structure, the provision of accurate and relevant substantiation and insight regarding both circumstances of adoption and level or extent of "success". May show evidence of wide reading and/or awareness of different interpretations.

24. In what ways, and to what extent, did relations between East and West change in the period 1960-1970? (November 2004)
By 1960 the period of "thaw" was beginning to come to an end with renewed arguments over Germany and the U2 affair which led to the collapse of the Paris Summit. A "hotting up" of East-West tensions could be witnessed in events such as the Cuban revolution and challenges to America's western hemispheric position, the construction of the Berlin Wall, Bay of Pigs, Missile crisis, a renewed nuclear arms race from 1962 onwards, increased US involvement in Vietnam under Kennedy and then Johnson. Inside the supposedly "monolithic" Eastern or
Communist bloc tensions between the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China led to the Sino-Soviet split which transformed the East-West situation as the previously bipolar world became tripolar. By the late 1960s detente - a relaxation of tensions between the USSR and USA began. SALT began 1969 as both Soviets and Americans became aware of the potentially crippling economic burdens imposed by their rivalry and the knowledge neither side could win a nuclear confrontation. China's position also encouraged both the USA and
USSR (for different reasons) to consider a rapprochement of sorts. There is much information which could be used – do not expect all, but effective esponses
will identify key events in the decade noted and attempt to examine the extent to which relations changed:- superficially – or fundamentally – in this period and why.
[7 marks] and below for generalized descriptions of a few events with no awareness of the demands of the question concerning "to what extent".
[8 to 10 marks] for answers showing some awareness of the demands of the question but the knowledge base is limited and consideration of the question as to the nature and extent of change is largely implicit.
[11 to 13 marks] the demands of the question are understood but not all aspects are considered in a balanced and well-supported fashion. The response requires better substantiation in terms of details of "in what ways" and development of the nature and "extent" of change.
[14 to 16+ marks] for effective focused response covering developments in the decade under consideration and a convincing attempt to assess the nature and extent of the change in East-West relations in the period. At the top end evidence of wide reading or insight or historical interpretations and/or a high level of analysis will be present.

25. Why was Soviet control over East European satellite states successful in the period 1945-1968 and why did it collapse between 1988 and 1991? (November 2004)
Post-war political, military and economic weakness of East European states due to Nazi occupation/exploitation allowed Red Army "liberation" to occur with relative ease – indeed in some cases Soviet forces were welcomed as liberators by some (Czechoslovakia for example). Even if not welcomed, there was no way to eject superior military forces of Soviet Union. Installation of "friendly" governments and political systems with the aid/presence of Red Army. Military strength of Soviet occupying forces and (reluctant) acceptance of Soviet
"sphere of influence" by Western powers as Cold War tensions emerged meant no effective resistance was possible in

East European satellites which were effectively Sovietised by 1948. Purges of non-communists and even of those communists within Eastern European satellites with "deviationist" tendencies (Hungary's Rajk, Bulgaria's Koslov, Czechoslovakia's Slansky for example) ensured Stalinist conformity.Examples of attempts to challenge Soviet influence (post-Stalin) within the satellites themselves – Germany 1953, Hungary 1956, Czechoslovakia 1968. All were crushed by military force. In no case was any effective aid offered by West. Brezhnev's Doctrine (1968) seemed to lay down the limits of Eastern European satellites ability to experiment with different roads to Socialism/Communism. By the late 1980s, early 1990s Soviet control over satellites weakened due to economic failure/frustrations of the populations of the satellite states, the decision in the USSR itself (Gorbachev) to "rescue" communism by introducing perestroika and glasnost policies which
accelerated the reform process not only in the USSR but also encouraged changes within the satellites when it became obvious Soviet military force would not be deployed as in the past. Examples of the process of dissolution of Communist domination in satellites – Poland and Solidarity, Hungary and free elections 1990, East Germany and the collapse of Honecker's regime 1989, Czechoslovakia and the Velvet Revolution *etc.* Much is available – do not expect all, but balanced coverage of the two periods and the reasons for the change in response of the USSR need to be addressed for an effective answer.
[7 marks] and below for a brief narration of a few events pre- and post-1968. Demands of the question are not understood.
[8 to 10 marks] the demands of the question are generally understood but there is a limited knowledge base of the period and implicit explanation of the rapidity of collapse by 1990-1.
[11 to 13 marks] the demands of the question are understood but there is a need for greater detail concerning events pre-and post – 1968 and more explicit explanation of reasons for change in attitude in both the satellite states and the USSR by the end date.
[14 to 16+ marks] for effective, structured and balanced treatment of developments in the two periods and convincing examination of the factors which altered over the period in relation to circumstances within Eastern European satellites and the changing attitude of the Soviet leadership and how these produced the collapse of Sovietised Eastern Europe.
[17+ marks] answers show signs of insight, or awareness of historical interpretations or a high level of analysis supported by accurate and well deployed historical information.

21. To what extent did events in the final year of the Second World War turn wartime allies into Cold War enemies? (May 2004)
Candidates need to name events in the final year of the Second World War – 1945, analyse them to ascertain if, how and why, they turned the USSR from an ally into an enemy of the western powers, then assess previous events that might also have contributed to this change. Key events in 1945 could include: Yalta, Potsdam, Soviet invasion of, and success in, eastern Europe (including Berlin), USA and the atomic bomb. Candidates should discuss how important they were in turning the wartime allies into enemies. To address "to what extent", they could mention other pre 1945 events that caused friction. Others might argue that the
Cold War did not become really embittered until 1947, although the term "Cold War", was used in 1946.
[8 to 10 marks] for a narrative of events in 1945, with implicit judgment.
[11 to 13 marks] for exact focus and assessment.
[14 to 16+ marks] for analysis of the part played by 1945 events.
[17+ marks] for perceptive comments or different interpretations as well as addressing "to what extent".

Assess the impact of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan on the development of the Cold War between 1947 and 1961. (May 2004)
Candidates should explain briefly the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan then explain how both affected relations between east and west, and contributed to the spread and escalation of the Cold War.
The Truman Doctrine was enunciated in Truman's speech to Congress, 14 March 1947, requesting support for "free peoples", resisting subjugation. Congress voted money for economic and military aid to those thought to be under communist threat. The Marshall Plan was the European Recovery Programme, passed by Congress in 1948, offering aid to help Europe's post war recovery. The USSR pressured its satellites to refuse. Results/impact might include: OEEC; European economic upturn, especially in west Germany; fear of this by USSR; Berlin Blockade and airlift; NATO; Warsaw Pact; and perhaps with the given end date, the Berlin Wall. Candidates must analyse the two US measures, determine US motives, and how far the USSR genuinely feared their effects, in order to decide to what extent they were instrumental in causing bitterness and hardening Cold War attitudes.
[8 to 10 marks] for an account of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan.
[11 to 13 marks] for a clear definition and assessment of their impact.
[14 to 16 marks] for focus and analysis of their effects on Cold War development.
[17+ marks] for balance, in-depth analysis or different interpretations.

24. In what ways, and to what extent, did the Cold War become less confrontational after 1970? (May 2004)
This question requires candidates to explain the nature of Cold War developments in this period, assess danger, then, including a brief reference to earlier periods and events, make a judgment on the question. The most dangerous events between 1960 and 1970 were probably the Cuban Missile Crisis, Vietnam, the nuclear arms race and the suppression of the Prague Spring. But during this decade Nixon had begun troop withdrawal from Vietnam, Khrushchev was talking "peaceful coexistence", and SALT talks began in 1969. Arms limitation and control continued and détente gained ground, as did the growth of opposition to the regime in communist countries, *e.g.* the Solidarity movement. In 1972 Nixon visited Moscow and SALT 1 was signed. The Helsinki agreement was issued in 1975, but unrest in eastern Europe continued, and in 1979 USSR invaded Afghanistan.

[7 marks] and under for unsubstantiated assertions.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of some events, with implicit judgment on "less confrontational".
[11 to 13 marks] for focus on the changes in Cold War tension.
[14 to 16+ marks] for focus on, and analytical treatment of, the variation of tension and confrontation.

21. In what ways, and to what extent, did mutual distrust and suspicion cause the Cold War?
Candidates should be well prepared for this question: mutual distrust will no doubt be regarded as another way of asking about "fear" as a cause of the Cold War. Both sides regarded the other with suspicion because of fear of attack. USSR feared another attack from the west therefore sought a "cordon sanitaire" or buffer zone to protect her western boundary. The proposed help from the USA was suspect and seen as "Dollar Imperialism". The USA regarded any move which might have been prompted by defensive motives as aggression. Candidates should be able to provide specific examples as evidence to support these views, *e.g.* USSR's East European policies, events in Germany and Berlin, Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. They can also discuss different ideologies and old fashioned power politics to explain the mutual distrust and suspicion. This will be a popular question: demand specific details which are relevant for causes of the Cold War (1950 would be quite far enough to go) as well as analysis for the top bands.
[0 to 7 marks] for a brief/inaccurate account of the Cold War.
[8 to 10 marks] for a general causes essay with implicit reference to distrust and suspicion.
[11 to 13 marks] for better attention to the set question and specific evidence.
[14 to 16 marks] for an analytical answer focused on mutual distrust and suspicion.
[17+ marks] for an extra dimension such as different interpretations.

22. For what reasons, and with what results, was Germany a centre of Cold War tension between 1945 and 1961?
This covers another well known area. Reasons could include Germany's geographical situation, her twentieth century pre-Cold War history, Second World War settlement of Germany with division and reparations and the subsequent disagreements between East and West. Results should include at least some of the following: Allied Control Council; four sectors; Berlin Blockade and airlift; Marshall Plan; split into Federal Republic of Germany and German Democratic Republic; West joins NATO; Refugees from East to West; Berlin Wall. The overall result of tension over Germany was increasing bitterness and suspicion between
the two sides in the Cold War.
[0 to 7 marks] for brief unconnected statements about the Cold War in general.
[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of some of the above events with implicit reasons and results.
[11 to 13 marks] for a detailed factual account with some explicit focused assessment.
[14 to 16 marks] for specific evidence and analysis to support reasons and results.
[17+ marks] for excellent coverage, interpretation and balanced judgment.

23. Compare and contrast the part played by Korea and Cuba in the Cold War. (May 2003)
This should also be a popular question as both these areas are frequently studied. The test will be selection and comparison; there will not be time to write all that is known. Castro seized power in Cuba in 1959, and later declared himself a Communist. Main events were; Bay of Pigs, 1961; Missile Crisis, 1962; support for communism and revolutions world wide; anti USA. Korea: the country was divided at the 38th parallel and war began when the North invaded the
South and ended in 1953 with the territorial position unchanged. Points for comparison might be: both used by superpowers to attempt to weaken the other,
both Cuba and North Korea promoted aggressive Communist policies; both were anti USA, subjected to US attacks and increased Cold War tension. Points for contrast: Cuba was near the USA, Korea far; US deployed US troops under the UN in Korea but not in Cuba, although the US supported the Bay of Pigs, which was undertaken by Cuban exiles; time scale and extent of activity; fighting varied; missile crisis nearly led to a major confrontation and fear of a third world war (therefore settled quickly?); Korea was the first "hot" war (although Soviet troops were not engaged officially) Other conclusions and analysis could be drawn from both.
[0 to 7 marks] if only Cuba or Korea is addressed, or short inaccurate answers.
[8 to 10 marks] for end-on accounts with implicit comparison.
[11 to 13 marks] for either a full account with explicit linkage or a rather unbalanced comparative structure.
[14 to 16 marks] for a knowledgeable and appropriate comparative structure.
[17+ marks] for concise and perceptive comparison and contrast.

25. Assess the importance of détente *and* internal opposition to Communist rule in Communist countries, in ending the Cold War. (May 2003)
There are two distinct parts to this answer which can be treated together or separately. Some candidates may offer an opinion as to which was more important for ending the Cold War, but the question does not demand this.
The term détente is usually applied to improved relations, beginning November 1969, when the SALT talks began. These ended in agreement on arms reductions in May 1973. Further talks began in 1974, and another agreement was reached in 1978. However tension then increased with the build-up of Soviet arms and their invasion of Afghanistan. Tension decreased significantly with Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika. Internal opposition took three forms, actual revolts as in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland, opposition movements, partly ideological and partly economic, such as Solidarity (formed 1980) in Poland, and general discontent with Communist rule because of the

lower standard of living, poverty, dearth of consumer goods *etc.*, compared with the West. USSR could be included, especially in this third section.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of some of the above, with implicit assessment.
[11 to 13 marks] for better details and explicit assessment.
[14 to 16+ marks] for focus on détente and opposition with specific evidence, assessment, and balance between the two parts.

21. How and to what extent did the conferences at Yalta and Potsdam (1945), contribute to the origin of the Cold War? (May 2003)
This question has three demands, actual disagreements at the conferences, problems that arose out of decisions taken there, and a judgment on "to what extent". In the latter part, candidates could also record briefly other causes of the Cold War. Yalta, attended by Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin took place 4 to 11 February 1945. It was both the high watermark of the wartime coalition and the beginning of serious disagreements, over the composition of the United Nations, the shape and government of Poland, the division of Germany, and reparations. The cracks were largely papered over, but disagreements re-emerged later.
Potsdam took place 16 July to 2 August 1945. Stalin and Truman attended throughout, but Churchill withdrew and Attlee (who was there) took his place. The US possession of the atom bomb was announced, and unsatisfactory decisions on Germany – boundaries and reparations, Polish frontiers, and Soviet participation against Japan were concluded. Again they caused disagreements later.
[7 marks] and under for short general causes essays, or for those who deny the importance of the conferences without discussing them.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of Yalta and Potsdam with implicit assessment of their part in the origin of the Cold War.
[11 to 13 marks] for answers that consider how the conferences caused disagreements between the powers, then and later.
[14 to 16 marks] for focus on the conferences' part in the origin of the Cold War.
[17+ marks] for understanding of the conferences' importance in the origin of the Cold War, and a verdict on "to what extent".

22. "Although it began in Europe the spread of the Cold War to other regions was a much more dangerous development." To what extent do you agree with this judgment? (May 2003)
This question is designed for those students who like to consider/analyse a broad sweep of history. There is of course no right or wrong answer, and those who produce thoughtful and perhaps original essays, backed by specific details, should score well. Some areas that might be considered are: the nature of the early Cold War in Europe, and how dangerous it was; when and why it spread: US policy in Europe – perhaps as the beginning of the spread to other regions; the danger of the US containment policy; the nature of USSR involvement in Korea and Vietnam; the danger of Chinese involvement; the meaning and
danger of the Cuban Missile crisis. The above are some suggestions. Do not expect all of them; an answer that tries to incorporate the whole area will lack depth and not score well.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of some Cold War events with implicit focus on the quotation.
[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit focus on the quotation.
[14 to 16 marks] for planned thoughtful answers which explain their views.
[17+ marks] for in-depth analysis and balanced judgment.

23. How and why did the policies of *either* the USA *or* the USSR affect superpower rivalry between 1950 and 1970? (May 2003)
The period 1950 to 1970 includes the following: Korean War (1950–1953); expansion of NATO; Warsaw Pact: Geneva Conference 1955; Hungary and Suez 1956; Berlin Wall 1961; Cuban missile crisis 1962; Partial Test Ban Treaty 1963; Vietnam War (began 1965 continued to 1973); Prague Spring 1968; Brezhnev Doctrine 1968; non-proliferation Treaty 1968; rioting in Poland 1970.
Candidates need to explain how and why some of the above fitted into or were affected by, either US or Soviet policy. The question ends with the Vietnam War still continuing. Candidates could refer to its end or to SALT1, on which talks began in November 1970, in their conclusions.
[8 to 10 marks] for narratives of some of the above with implicit attention to policies of their chosen superpower.
[11 to 13 marks] for answers which address both policies and their impact on Cold War developments and rivalry.
[14 to 16 marks] for exact focus on and analysis of policies and their effect on the Cold War.
[17+ marks] for perceptive insight and perhaps different interpretations.