ZIMBABWE SCHOOL EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL

General Certificate of Education Advanced Level

EUROPEAN HISTORY

1789 TO 1964

NOVEMBER 2016

HISTORY 9155/1

1 'It was the abuse of the French people by the ancient regime and not the ideas of the philosophers that caused the French Revolution of 1789.' Do you agree?

The key issue is a comparative analysis of the role played by the philosophers and the ancient system of government in causing the French Revolution of 1789.

The best answers, 21 – 25 marks, should be consistently analytical, comparative and balanced on the abuse of the ancient system of government and the role played by the philosophers. Top answers should show which of these factors played the more important role, 18 – 20 answers though explanatory and comparative, may miss some important lines of the argument. Sequential answers and those which are largely narrative with an attempt to explain merit between 16 and 17 marks.

The ancient system of government in France was characterised by an abusive political system. The king was absolute and despotic and ruled with the lettre de catchet. He had no constitution. He ruled by decree. The peasants and the bourgeoisie had their rights abused. The middle class

of France, though educated, could not be promoted to dignified positions of the state. Peasants were the only class which suffered from working in the unpaid public works and forced conscription into the army. The 3rd Estate suffered most in that they were heavily taxed and could not own land. Louis XVI's denial of reforms was very critical.

Ideas of the philosophers also caused the revolution. Rousseau, Voltaire, Montesquieu and Diderot criticized the existing system of government. They criticised religious intolerance and the unfair system of taxation. They also criticized the lack of a constitution. In addition to this, they criticised torture and the use of the letter de catchet. Rousseau's ideas of democracy were important in enlightening the bourgeoisie. 14 - 15 answers are for full narratives with implied analysis while 11 – 13 answers are weak narratives. Thin and fragmentary answers will not merit 10 marks.

2 To what extent did the 1791 constitution satisfy the demands of the revolutionaries in France?

The **key issue** is an assessment of effects of the 1791 constitution on the development of the French Revolution.

Top mark band answers, 21 – 25, are supposed to be consistently analytical and balanced on the groups which were satisfied and those which were not. These will discuss the terms of the constitution and examine the extent to which different groups in France accepted the constitution. These answers should be aware of the different political groups which drew up the 1791 constitution.

In 1791, the National Assembly was composed of people from all the three Estates of France. Each of the three estates, although it was in the National Assembly, had its own sectional interests. True revolutionaries were the peasants and the bourgeoisie of the 3rd Estate. By 1791, there were four main political parties in France; the Feuillants, the Girondins, the Jacobins and the Cordelliers. The 1791 constitution was a satisfactory package to the bourgeoisie because it fortified them against the threat from the king and the aristocracy above as well as that from the peasants below. By the constitution, the press was freed from censorship, the jury system was introduced, the letter de catchet was banned, capital punishment was banned except in crucial cases like murder. Furthermore, French people got the right to vote, but the franchise was narrow. The local government system was re-arranged. The king's authoritarian executive power was reduced by the separation of powers. These benefitted the bourgeoisie in that their civil and political rights were respected. On the contrary, peasants were disenfranchised. Although they were offended peasants enjoyed some of the liberties enshrined in this constitution like the ban on the letter de catchet. These answers also need to consider the Civil Constitution of the clergy and its effects in resolving the long standing dispute on land. Also, these candidates need to show how it divided by the priests and the peasants of France.

3 Examine the reasons for, and the extent of French success in the war between France and her European neighbours in the period from 1792 to 1795.

The key issue is an evaluation of the causes of the war and an assessment of the results.

Top band answers 21 – 25 will be consistently analytical giving a balance between the causes and the results for France. At least a 60:40 balance is acceptable 18 – 20 answers, while being analytical, may miss some important lines of the discussion. Several factors caused the war. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the Declaration of Rights of Man played a role. By these measures, the French monarchy felt insecure and appealed for help from her neighbours. The Declaration of Pillnitz was another factor. The king's attempted flight made him and the emigres to be considered traitors. For this reason, war with Austria and Prussia was considered a national duty to defend the fatherland. There was also the Edict of Fraternity whereby revolutionaries promised help to those people oppressed by monarchists abroad who wished to overthrow their kings. The Girondins wanted to discredit the king for supporting the enemies of the state. Feuillants on the other hand hoped that the king's position would be strengthened. The French were initially successful against the Prussian and Austrian forces in 1792 but faced setbacks along the way. Quarrels between Austria and Prussia over strategy worked to the advantage of France. At Jamappes, Dumouriez, the French general was successful. However, the desertion by Dumouriez weakened France leading to defeat by Austria. This led the revolutionaries to start the reign of Terror and by this France regained victory up to Baste. Carnot and Jourdan played a role in French victories. France was successful in Toulon, Savoy, Nice and Spain. France conquered Belgium and went into the Rhine. By 1795, France had established her natural frontiers.

The first constitution was dissolved and the treaty of baste was signed . 16 – 17 answers will be heavily descriptive with an attempt to analyse. 14 – 15 answers are for full descriptions with implied analysis while 11 – 13 are for basic narratives. Thin answers which are not focused cannot exceed 10 marks.

4 'The rise to power of Napoleon Bonaparte was inevitable.' How accurate is this view?

The key issue is an examination of the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte of France.

The best answers, 21 – 25, should be explanatory, covering a wide range of reasons which would be balanced between the strengths of Napoleon and the weaknesses of his enemies. Top candidates will be perceptive and say why the rise was unavoidable. 18 – 20 answers though analytical, may miss some lines of the argument.

Napoleon's popularity started with his victory at Toulon in 1793. The Italian campaign further enhanced his rise. Military victory in battles as well as diplomacy at Campo Formio helped him. The Egyptian campaign made him even more popular. His ability to silence internal uprisings in the face of the Directory's weaknesses, played to his advantage. Napoleon also used other people to his advantage e.g. Barras, Abe Sieyes and Ducos. The Coup of 18 Brummaire must be discussed. On the contrary, the Directory could have averted Napoleon's rise. The Directory failed to utilise opportunities as they came which Napoleon did. It failed to effectively use state machinery e.g. the army. The coup of Brummaire was easily avoidable. Lack of unity among the directors played into Napoleon's hands.

16 – 17 answers are descriptive with an attempt to analyse. 14 – 15 are descriptions with implied analysis, while 11 – 13 are for weak descriptions. Thin and fragmentary answers will not be awarded more than 10 marks.

5 Discuss the assertion that 1807 was a turning point in the political career of Napoleon I both at home and abroad.

Key issue is an analysis of the political career of Napoleon I.

Top mark band answers, 21 – 25, should be consistently analytical and be able to explore the political achievements of Napoleon before and after 1807. These answers should be able to explore the downfall of Napoleon from 1807 up to his defeat at Leipzig by the 4th coalition. Candidates will note that after 1807, Napoleon at home started to attack French people through press censorship, spies and the letter de catchet, while on the war front, he increasingly ignored advice from his generals to be sought to achieve glory and ignored caution. 18 – 20 answers, although being analytical may miss some important lines of discussion, 16 – 17 answers are largely descriptive with comments in places.

On the international scene, Napoleon used several methods to achieve success like the dynastic policy, treaty signing, military campaigns and marriage alliances. After signing the peace of Amiens in 1802, he turned to the domestic reorganisation of France where he signed the Concordat with the Pope and drafted the Code Napoleon. From 1805 onwards, he fought vital battles like Wagram, Jena, which culminated in the signing of the treaty Tilsit with the Tsar in 1807. By the time Tilsit was signed, Napoleon was virtually the emperor of Western Europe. Many parts of Europe were directly under him while others were indirectly controlled through treaties or marriage alliances. The empire started to crumble in 1807. The continental system began this. By it, European powers started to desert Napoleon e.g. Russia and Portugal. This resulted in the Penisular warfare against Spain, Portugal and Britain and then Moscow campaign against Russia. France's enemies were increasing in number. Even his trusted generals like Benardotte turned against him. By 1813, Napoleon was finished. The battle of Leipzig completed the process. 14 – 15 answers are for full narratives with implied analysis while 11 – 13 are weak narratives. Thin and fragmentary answers will not merit 10 marks.

6 How far did the differences between the Quadruple and Holy Alliance destroy the Congress System?

The key issue is an explanation of the role of the differences between the Quadruple and Holy alliance powers in causing the collapse of the Congress System.

Top mark band answers, 21 – 25, should be consistently analytical and balanced on the role of the Quadruple and Holy Alliances and other factors. 18 – 20 answers, although being analytical, may miss possible lines of the argument. Russia and Britain, authors of the Holy Alliance and the Quadruple Alliance respectively differed in their interpretation of the alliances. Castlereagh viewed the Quadruple Alliance in the spirit of meetings of the great powers to discuss problems as they arose, but not to interfere in liberal revolts. He also viewed it only as an alliance to curb the return of Napoleon to the French throne. On the contrary, the Tsar viewed the Holy Alliance as a tool to crush liberal and nationalist revolts in countries, sharing the same views with Metternich and Hindenburg. These sharp differences of opinion were costly to the Congress System. Castlereagh viewed the Holy alliance with suspicion, so was Hindenburg and Metternich. Britain refused to sign the Holy Alliance. The common enemy of the Great powers, Napoleon was gone. The powers also did not decide to have a central

meeting point and there were no specific time frames for discussions. The system had no secretariat. On the other hand, the death of Castlereagh and the coming of Canning destroyed European diplomacy. The system also died because of suspicion and self-interest, for example, the British were concerned only with their commerce. The USA's Monroe Doctrine and the Greek War of Independence can also be discussed. 16 – 17 answers are for descriptions with an attempt to analyse while 14 – 15 answers are full descriptions with implied analysis. 11 – 13 are weak descriptions while answers which are not focused will not merit 10 marks.

7 Examine the reasons for, and nature of the restored Bourbons' fall from power in 1830.

The key issue is an analysis of the reasons and the processes leading to the downfall of the Bourbons in the 1830 Revolution.

The best answers, 21 – 25 should be consistently analytical and balanced on the reasons for the revolution and the pattern of the 1830 Revolution. 18 – 20 answers, although analytical, may miss some important lines of the argument. Such answers may concentrate on the reasons and show how the revolution was accomplished.

16 – 17 answers are for descriptions with an attempt to analyse

The 1830 Revolution was caused by the Bourbon's alliance with the church. This was mainly characterised by Charles X's coronation at Rheims, control of education by the church and the sacrilege law. The choice of repressive ministers like Villelle and Polignac was also a factor. The Bourbons also censored the press which annoyed people like Lafayette. Louis XVIII persecuted Napoleon's supporters e.g. he put them on half pay and denied some of them their passions. Charles X also persecuted critics like Beranger, Courier and Guizot who were either imprisoned or exiled. Charles X also compensated the emigres for the law of their land during the 1789 Revolution and restored the inheritance law of primogeniture. Finally he passed the Ordinances of St. Cloud. However, candidates should mention that Charles X was the one mainly responsible for the fall. His policies were reactionary and retrogressive.
Louis XVIII followed a middle-of-the road policy which was more conciliatory. He was a moderate royalist who avoided extremist policies, hence there was no revolution during his reign. He avoided the excesses which his younger brother went on to implement leading to the revolution.

The 1830 revolution was organised by Republicans like Lafayette, Socialists under Louis Blanc and Liberals under Thiers. The revolutionaries established burricades in Paris. They captured the hotel de Ville and Notre Dame. Charles X offered to dismiss Polignac and restore the Charter. Government forces mutinied. The king offered the throne to Philippe. 14 – 15 answers are for full descriptions with implied analysis while 11 – 13 are for weak narratives. Thin and fragmentary answers will have a ceiling of 10 marks.

8 To what extent can Nicholas I's rule in Russia be described as a success?

Key issue is an assessment of Nicholas I's rule in Russia

Top mark band answers, 21 – 25 are supposed to analytical and thorough. These must give a balance between the successes and the failures and they should show that there was repression.

18 – 20 answers will have gaps in factual knowledge and they may dwell largely on the negatives of Nicholas' rule.

Nicholas I succeeded Alexander I, at a time when Russia was largely feudal and agrarian. He came to power after the Decemberist Revolt which strongly challenged the authority of the Tsar. In general, Nicholas' rule was driven by his narrow-mindedness which promoted repressive autocracy and detested change, making Russia's problems worse. On the positive side the Tsar had fixed principles and did not deliberately cause misery. Some of the faults blamed on him were not entirely his. Up to 1833, he worked to discourage liberalism and Westernism, establishing order.

The press was muzzled and education was controlled. Poles challenged Nicholas' minister of education, Uvarov's policies of Orthodox, Autocracy and Nationality. Nicholas considered reforms like those related to serfdom and the law. However, between 1834 and 1848, there was very slow development in education, literature and the economy. There were revolts against Nicholas, but repression followed. Russia was technologically behind the western powers. Railways were not enough and Russia was no match for other powers of Europe in industrial terms. The press was further muzzled and movement was restricted. Opposition existed in Austria, but achieved very little. His rule ended with the disasters of the Crimean War.

16 – 17 answers are largely descriptive with some analysis in places 14 – 15 answers are full narratives while 11 – 13 are weak narratives. Thin and fragmentary answers will not exceed 10 marks.

9 Assess the relative importance of the Turkish, French and Russian contribution to the outbreak of the Crimean War.

The key issue is a comparative assessment of the contribution of Russia, France and Turkey in causing the Crimean War.

The best answers, 21 – 25 will be consistently analytical, comparative and balanced in the contributions of the three powers in causing the Crimean War, and should show which power contributed most.

The Sultan of Turkey had a problem with his subjects. The subjects wanted independence following the Greek War of Independence in the 1820s. The Sultan was not prepared to see the empire disintegrate. The subjects in the Ottoman empire also wanted the Sultan to give political and democratic reforms, but the Sultan was resistant to this. Russia on contrary, due to imperialist and religious as well as economic motives, was keen to have the empire crumble. She wanted an outlet to the Mediterranean, hence she annexed Moldavia and Wallachia which was provocative. She also wanted to be a protector of Orthodox Christians, but Turkey as a Moslem country, could not accept that. France on the other hand was for prestige. This was one of Napoleon III's campaign slogans before coming to power.

France also went into the war to protect Catholic christians and it was Napoleon III's desire to maintain the balance of power. 18 – 20 answers, although being analytical and comparative, may miss some important lines of the argument. Sequential answers will merit a ceiling of 17 marks while narratives with analysis in some parts will be awarded 16 – 17 marks. 14 – 15 are

for full descriptions while 11 – 13 are for weak descriptions. Thin and fragmentary answers will not merit 10 marks.

10 'A despotic and Liberal Regime.' How accurate is this description of Napoleon III's rule?

The key is a comparative assessment of Napoleon III's domestic policies. Up to 1859, Napoleon ruled France as a shrewd dictator. He nominated all state officials and prepared new legislation. He controlled the army. He reduced the franchise. Political opponents were arrested and punished either by exile or imprisonment. Key civil servants were given incentives to make them loyal to him. Those responsible for administering elections and army officers had their salaries doubled. The press was heavily gagged. Those accused of press offenses were tried without a jury. The Council of State was revived. Napoleon used plebiscites to endorse his decisions. From 1859 to 70, Napoleon's leadership style in France changed to that of a liberal. The press was relaxed. Strikes and trade unions were legalised. Political opponents were given an amnesty. The Senate and Legislative chambers were given the right to debate and reply to the government proposals. After this, these two arms of government were given the right to question government ministers. Although the amnesty was granted, other enemies of the state were either in exile or imprisoned. Even in connection with the press, journalists wanted more freedom. During this time, liberalism encouraged the growth of business and the economy.

Excellent answers, 21 – 25, are supposed to be consistently analytical, giving a balance between the autocratic and the liberal empire. 18 – 20 answers, though analytical, may miss some important lines of the argument. Sequential answers get a ceiling of 17 marks. 14 – 15 are descriptions with implied analysis. 11 – 13 are for weak descriptions while thin and fragmentary answers will not merit 10 marks.

Section C

11 Discuss the reasons for, and means by which the French established a Republican government by 1875.

The key issue is an assessment of the methods and explanation of the reasons for the setting up of the Republican government in France.

From 1871 to 1875, France had to deal with defeat, civil war and a search for political settlement. There was a struggle for power as supporters of the empire 'were blamed for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. In 1871, monarchists had a strong position, but by 1875 they had lost out to the Republicans. The Radicals in Paris under the Commune were not accepted by the people who were tired of war. The Republicans benefited from the good leadership of Thiers who subdued threats from Paris and the failure of the monarchists who under the leadership of Mac-Mahon seized the opportunity to power. Plans for compromise failed as Comte de Chambord refused to accept the tri-colour flag. Division in the Royalist camp worked to the advantage of the Republicans. The Republicans benefitted from the leadership of Gambette who carried out massive campaigns for the republic. Evacuation of German soldiers was

credited to him. After the drawing of the constituency, the Republic was seen as the institution that least divided the French. Moderate politicians, republicans and monarchists had accepted to put national interests ahead of party interests.

The best answers, 21 – 25 should examine the strengths of the Republicans and the blunders of their opponents. These should show a variety of methods like campaigns, diplomacy, constitutional methods and hard work in government. 18 – 20 answers, though analytical, may miss possible lines of discussion. 16 – 17 answers will be descriptions of the 1871 – 1875 period with attempts to analyse in places. 14 – 15 answers will be for thorough descriptions while 11 – 13 answers are for weak descriptions. Thin and fragmentary answers will not be awarded marks above 10.

12 How far did Bismarck's foreign policy after 1871 fulfil his aims?

The key issue is an assessment of Bismarck's foreign policy after 1871. Candidates need to explore the aims and implementation of Bismarck's foreign policy in detail giving a judgement on whether he was successful or not.

Among Bismarck's aims were the need to preserve peace in Europe after the defeat of France and to isolate France. This was done through the alliance system. Bismarck was generally successful as Europe did not go to war during Bismarck's time and France only came out of isolation after the fall of Bismarck. He succeeded in solving crises as they came. This was done through signing the following alliances the Dreikaizerbunds, the Dual Alliance, the Triple Alliance and the Reinsurance Treaty. However, the foreign policy had cracks from the beginning. By 1890, Kaiser William II dismissed him and adopted a new policy. During his tenure as Chancellor, Bismarck was mainly preoccupied with France. He did not seek permanent solutions to the problems that existed in 1871, with regards to the Eastern Question. The Congress of Berlin,1878,was only a temporary measure. The Dual Alliance which followed the Berlin Congress, showed that Bismarck's foreign policy was fragile. The Russians were hurt by the Congress of Berlin, that even the Reinsurance Treaty was not enough to the heal wounds.

To show that Bismarck was also a failure, Russia and France became allies in 1892.

Excellent answers, 21 – 25 marks should be sound in judgement, having explored in detail the successes and failures. These answers must be well illustrated. 18 – 20 answers are supposed to be analytical, but with gaps in some places. 16 – 17 answers are full narratives with analysis in some places. 14 – 15 are for full descriptions merit 11 – 13 marks. 10 marks or less are given to answers that are not focused and to unsupported assertions.

13 To what extent did industrialization lead to European imperialism in the late 19th century?

The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for European imperialism in the late 19th century.

During the second half of the 19th century, many European countries were becoming industrialised. Industrial development required more new raw materials. The raw materials were scarce in Europe, but abundant in Africa and Asia. Besides this, there was also the need

for ready markets. This is because industrialisation brought with it mass production. With mass production, there were no immediate buyers in Europe. Industrialisation meant the existence of a 'glut of capital' which was to be invested somewhere. Industrialisation was therefore to be sustained by imperialism in Africa and Asia. Other factors can also be discussed. Political factors like strategic factors and prestige need to be explored. The influence of public opinion needs to be analysed, social factors like the three Cs and Darwinism need to be examined.

The best answers, 21 – 25 marks are supposed to be consistently analytical and balanced, giving examples from both Africa and Asia. Such answers should show that Britain was the most industrialized country than other countries like France and Germany followed. These answers will also realize that the late 19th century was important because of the unification of Germany and Italy. 18 – 20 answers, although being analytical, may miss some important lines of discussion. 16 – 17 are largely descriptive with some analysis in some places. Full descriptions with implied analysis merit 14 – 15 while 11 – 13 is for weak descriptions. Answers which focus on industrial factors alone will be in band 2 while those that consider Britain alone as the European example will not exceed 11 marks.

14 Compare the domestic policy of Alexander II with that of Alexander III.

The key issue is the comparative analysis of the domestic policies of Alexander II and Alexander III.

Excellent answers, 21 – 25, will be consistently comparative. The answers will see strengths and weaknesses of both rulers. 18 – 20 answers will be explanatory and comparative but will lack the thoroughness of the top mark band. Alexander II was a great reformer. His greatest reform was the Edict of Emancipation of 1861. The Russians were not totally satisfied. There was opposition with the growth of Nihilism and Populism. The result was that Alexander II became a reactionary and he became very repressive. His successor, Alexander III was negatively affected by his father's assassination with the result that he became ultra-reactionary. He was a reactionary and conservative monarch who considered that Alexander II had been too liberal. He embarked on counter-reforms. The principles of autocracy, orthodoxy and nationality which were very popular during Nicholas I's reign were adopted. Serf emancipation could not be reversed, yet western type reform could not be entertained, so Russia lagged behind in technological and industrial development. There was no full-scale industrialization until 1890 when Witte started some development programmes. Russian autocracy had a fear of the proletariat and so industrialization and serfdom could not go hand in hand.

Sequential answers will have a ceiling of 17 marks. Answers which attempt to argue, but are largely descriptive will be awarded 16 – 17 marks. 14 – 15 are for one-sided answers which are fully descriptive with implied analysis while 11 – 13 are for weak descriptions. Thin and fragmentary answers will not exceed 10 marks..

15 Which contributed more to the outbreak of World War One: the Kaiser's provocative policies or Serbia's desire to promote Pan-Slavism?

The key issue is a comparative assessment of the role played by the Kaiser's provocative policies and Serbia's desire to promote Pan-Slavism.

Top mark band answers, 21 – 25 will be explanatory and comparative. These answers should strike a balance between the role of the Kaiser's provocation and Serbia bigheadedness. 18 – 20 answers, though comparative, may miss some lines of discussion. Sequential answers cannot be credited more than 17 marks. Those answers which are fully descriptive, with attempts to analyse can be awarded 16 – 17 marks. 14 – 15 marks are for answers which are fully descriptive with implied analysis while 11 – 13 marks are for weaker narratives. Fragmented answers will not be credited above 10 marks.

As the 19th century was coming to an end, Germany was involved in a heavy industrial, military and commercial drive. This was a direct challenge to Britain, who was already leader in these areas. The Kaiser's approach to international politics created tension and confusion in Europe. The Kaiser congratulated Paul Kruger, following his victory against Britain in the Anglo-Boer war. This made Britain feel insecure. Since Britain felt insecure, she moved out of isolation, culminating in the Anglo-French alliance. The Kaiser's utterances on Morocco, made France her long-time rival feel more insecure. This culminated in the Triple Entente of 1907.The Kaiser's approach to naval building looked like he was challenging Britain, and this caused war. The Kaiser's black cheque to Austria was provocative to Russia.

On balance, Serbia's Pan-Slavism begins with the Balkan wars of 1875 against Turkey and her gaining independence. The acquisition of her independence, made her feel that she would lead other Balkan states to independence. She was not happy with the results of the Berlin Congress of 1878, especially that Austria was given power over Bosnia – Herzegovina. Serbia protested the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary in 1908 since she wanted to form a south Slav state of Yugoslavia and also wanted access to the sea. Pan-Slavism was also shown in the formation of the Balkan League in 1911. Her victory against Turkey in the second Balkan war made her to feel that she could even defeat other European giants like Austria. The formation of the Black Hand further illustrates this. It was the Black Hand which sponsored Princip with a gun which killed Ferdinand and his wife leading to war in 1914.

16 How, and to what extent did European countries benefit from the First World War?

The key issue is an assessment of the effects of the First World War on Europe.

Some of the issues to be considered are that at the end of the war, Europe was weakened politically and economically. On the political side, power shifted from Europe to North America as the USA became the superpower. Economically many economies in Europe were weakened and there was high inflation e.g. in Germany and Italy. Extreme parties emerged in Europe and these abused human rights e.g. the Fascists in Italy and Germany. Japan and USA emerged economic giants as they sold weapons to both sides of the warring parties. There was huge unemployment in Europe and European states had to pay war debts. Europe became generally poor. Communism, although it was a new ideology, was an extreme form of dictatorship as evidenced by Bolshevism. On balance, the war was equally progressive for Europe. The League of Nations which was formed was a sound organisation. The war led to the advancement of women. In Britain, they were given the right to vote. The war also brought the idea of self-determination as new boundaries and new nation-states were formed. The

collapse of the huge empires benefitted other nationals who became independent at the collapse of the empires.

There were also technological changes e.g. the radar, radio, telephone, aeroplane, refrigerator etc.

Best answers, 21 – 25, should be explanatory and balanced. 18 – 20 answers, although being analytical, may miss possible lines of discussion. 16 – 17 are for descriptions with attempt to analyse. 14 – 15 are for full descriptions with implied analysis 11 – 13 are for weak narratives while thin and fragmentary answers will not merit 10 marks.

17 'A strategic retreat.' How justified is this view of Lenin's adoption of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921?

The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for and the results of the adoption of the New economic Policy (NEP).

Issues to be considered are that by 1921 the situation in the USSR was appalling following the Bolshevik Revolution, the treaty of Brest Litovsk at the end of the World War I and the Civil War which followed. It was during the Civil War, that War Communism was introduced and the secret police was used to requisition grain from the peasants. There was a huge famine in Russia which, despite foreign relief from USA, led to the death of millions of people. This created opposition to Lenin from people like Trotsky, so he adopted NEP. NEP was considered a reversal of War Communism. Under it, Lenin wanted to win back the support of the people. Under NEP, a grain tax substituted grain requisition. Peasants sold their produce in a free market. Small-scale businesses were allowed to function so that profits could be made but the main industries were controlled by the Soviets. The old channels of trade between town and country were reopened. Forced labour was abolished. This showed a retreat from socialism back to capitalism. Lenin said this was necessary to create capital which was to be used for socialism to survive. Industry grew as agriculture and infrastructure were revived. The Kulak re-emerged. On the other hand, NEP created divisions within the Bolshevik party. People like Trotsky opposed it while others who thought like Lenin pushed it through.

Excellent answers are supposed to be analytical and balanced on the reasons for adopting NEP, its main ideas and achievements or failures. 18 – 20 answers are analytical but may miss some important lines of the argument. 16 – 17 are for answers that attempt to analyse but are largely descriptive. Descriptive answers with implied analysis fall into 14 – 15 mark band. Weak descriptions can be awarded 11 – 13, while thin and fragmentary answers will get up to 10 marks.

18 How far can Mussolini's domestic policies be described as fruitful?

The key issue is an assessment of Mussolini's domestic polices.

Excellent answers, 21 – 25 marks should be balanced on the achievements and failures of Mussolini. These answers need to show that the policies ensured his continued rule in Italy while at the same time brought great advantages to the Italians. 18 – 20 answers are those which are analytical, but may miss possible lines of the argument, 16 – 17 are narratives with vital analytical comments in some places while 14 – 15 are heavy descriptions with implied

analysis. Thin and fragmentary answers merit 10 marks while weak narratives merit 11 – 13 marks.

Mussolini's authoritarian state was marked by the passing of the Acerbo laws, banning of political parties and trade unions, use of the OVRA. All these measures created order in Italy. These dictatorial policies improved the Italian economy. Of immense benefit was the Concordat and the Lateran Treaty which created peace between the church and the state. Under Mussolini, the Lira was re-valued. This Battle for Wheat and the reclamation of waste land boosted agriculture and Italy became a self-sufficient state. Electrification projects were embarked on and industry boosted. People got employed. People's standards of living improved. Although Italians benefited, this was done at the expense of their liberty. People died while some were exiled. The press and education were tightly controlled since Mussolini hated a thinking nation.

19 Examine the reasons for, and effects of the British policy of appeasement on Europe by 1939.

The key issue is an explanation of the reasons for the adoption of appeasement and the results of this policy for Europe.

The best answers, 21 – 25 will be explanatory and illustrative. These need to be balanced between the reasons and the effects of the policy. 18 – 20 answers, though analytical, may miss some important lines of the argument.

Britain justified appeasement as a correction of the wrongs suffered by Germany from the treaty of Versailles. Germany had a right to be treated more fairly and to be accepted as a great power. Appeasement guaranteed peace in Europe. Germany's aggression meant war, so Britain and France had to avoid war at all costs. The spread of communism was another aspect used to justify appeasement. By 1935, the policy was evident with the Anglo-German Naval agreement and the occupation of the Rhineland. Appeasement was displayed at the Munich Conference after which Hitler went to get Czechoslovakia before attacking Poland. The attack on Poland caused the Second World War, so appeasement is unjustifiable. Britain and France had judged Hitler wrongly. He was ambitious and unscrupulous. Hitler interpreted any concessions as a sign of weakness. With appeasement, the League of Nations was weakened. Appeasement created camps. Russians felt that appeasement was not enough to protect them, so they signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact which made the Germans confident to attack Poland. 16-17 answers are descriptive with an attempt to argue. Heavy descriptions of the policy of appeasement can merit 14-15 marks while 11-13 are for weak descriptions. Thin and fragmentary answers will not exceed 10 marks.

20 'The USSR contributed most to Allied victory during World War Two.' How far do you agree?

The key issue is a comparative assessment of the role played by the allies during the World War II.

Candidates must be consistently comparative and analytical. They may agree or disagree and give extensive evidence either way. Issues for discussion include the fall of France which weakened resistance on the Western Front, the Russian exploits in Eastern Europe and the Far

East. In 1944, the Soviet onslaught re-occupied Winsky in white Russia, drove Poland and the Baltic territories, capturing 30 German divisions in the process. In the latter half of the year, southern offensives cleared Soviet soil of German troops, causing the surrender of Germany's Romanian and Bulgarian allies. March 1945 saw the Soviet forces crossing the river Odev, driving beyond Berlin to ensure that it was their forces and not those of the allies that occupied the German Capital, thereby leaving much of Eastern Europe in the hands of the Soviet Union.

Alternative explanations to Allied victory need to be explored. They should discuss the role of the United States in reviving the Allied onslaught on the Western Front. The defeat of the Luftwaffe in the battle of Britain should also be mentioned. America's contribution since 1942 needs to be explored.

Candidates should also be aware of D' day landings and the recapture of Western Europe leading to the occupation of West Germany by the Allies.

Excellent answers, 21 – 25 will compare, explain and balance the role of the USSR versus that of the other allies. These candidates will clearly show in their answers whether it was the USSR or another country which played the most significant role. 18 – 20 answers will be analytical and comparative but with gaps. 14 – 15 are for full descriptions with implied analysis. Sequential answers will not merit 17 marks. Thin and fragmenting answers will not exceed 10 marks.

21 Why, and with what results to 1949, did the Allied Powers fail to achieve an amicable settlement in post-war conferences?

The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for failure and the results of the post war conferences.

The different political systems and a history of mistrust between the USA and Russia led to the failure to reach a satisfactory agreement. At Yalta, the main area of dispute was Poland and at Postdam, the focus was Germany. Stalin wanted to keep the parts of Poland which he obtained through the Nazi pact of 1939. He also wanted Poland extended westwards by giving it parts of Germany. Stalin had a pro-Soviet government in Poland, where he already had a government in exile the Lublin Poles and was ready to take over Poland. On the other hand, Roosevelt and Churchill supported another group, the strongly anti-communist London Poles. Roosevelt and Churchill did not want Stalin to have a free-hand in Poland. The result was a division of the great powers. At Postdam, dispute arose over the future of Germany. There was disagreement on reparations which the Soviet Union opposed and also a dispute on whether to leave Germany. There was disagreement on reparations with the Soviet Union and also a dispute on whether to leave Germany intact or not. As a result of the deliberations at Yalta and Post dam, the Cold War developed in earnest, moreso, America now led by Truman who was not as cautious, as Roosevelt. There was a clear division between the Western allies of Britain, France and USA on one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. Suspicion based on ideological differences increased and manifested in Churchill's iron curtain speech. The division of Germany and Berlin resulted in the Berlin Blockade. The tension between the East and the West came to a peak with the formation of NATO. Suspicion from Yalta and Postdam can also be understood in the releasing of the atomic bombs by the USA without the USSR's knowledge.

Best answers, 21 – 25 will be consistently analytical and coherently structured. These will be balanced between the reasons and the results. 18 – 20 answers will be balanced with gaps in some places. Answers dealing with results alone or reasons alone get to a ceiling of 17 marks. 16 – 17 answers describe reasons and results with little attempt to analyse. 14 – 15 will be full descriptions with implied analysis while 11 – 13 are weak descriptions. Fragmented answers, ceiling 10 marks.

22 How convincing is the view that the fear of invasion by the West was the major cause of Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe after 1945?

The key issue is an assessment of the reasons for Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe.

The best candidates, 21 – 25 will discuss this view and proceed to balance it with an alternative view. They will argue that the USSR had suffered more than any other country during the Second World War. The USSR was convinced that the West was being aggressive through many events such as the Greek Civil War, implementation of the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Aid and the formation of NATO. In addition the Soviet Union still haboured Western aggression from the Bolshevik Revolution, so felt insecure. Again the use of the atomic bomb by the USA in 1945 and the outcomes of the Yalta and Post-dam conferences, made the Soviet Union feel insecure. The only way the Soviet Union could feel safe was by building a defensive zone of friendly countries along its western boarder. These were the satellite states. The alternative view will see the Soviet actions as expansionist. The USSR wanted to extend communism world-wide, but first in Eastern Europe. In 1939, the Soviet Union had invaded Poland and the Baltic states. In 1945, the Soviet army was in most European countries and wished to spread communism further. Top candidates will realise that expansion in the west by the Soviet Union was driven by economic means as resources were needed to rebuild the Soviet Union after the war. 18 – 20 answers will be analytical, but may miss possible lines of the argument. 16 – 17 answers will be descriptive with analytical comments in places while 14 – 15 are for narratives. 11 – 13 are weak narratives while 0 – 10 are fragmentary answers.

23 Examine the factors that led to the rapid recovery and economic prosperity of Western Europe after 1945.

The key issue is an assessment of reasons for the rapid economic recovery and prosperity of Western Europe.

Answers will indicate the devastated state of Europe after the Second World War and the role of the United States assistance e.g. the Bretton Woods Conference, Gatt, IMF, United States Loans to Britain and the 1947 Marshall Aid programme. Answers will also assess the impact of the United States aid to Europe. This shows that the rapid economic recovery was due to US assistance. Candidates need to explore the role of either factors. The prevailing factors in these Countries need to be shown. In West Germany, Professor Erhard steered the economy to recovery. He also used migrant labour and there was cooperation between the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats under Willy Brandt. In France, work was done by De Gaulle who was determined to make France powerful again. In France again, work was steered by Monet and Schuman. In Britain, candidates may discuss the policy of austerity as well as the attitude of the people and the leadership towards recovery. European countries also

cooperated economically, leading to the formation of the Coal and Steel Community, the Euratom and the idea of free enterprise and the common market. Prosperity was also aided by the development of an overseas market through the emphasis on the production of consumer goods. Employment was created for a diverse workforce. The role of the new currency needs exploration.

Top mark band answers, 21 – 25 will be explanatory, and explore a variety of factors leading to a sound judgement. Such answers will balance between external factors and internal factors. 18 – 20 answers, though analytical, may miss some lines of the discussion. 16 – 17 answers will be descriptive with analytical comments in places while 14 – 15 are full descriptions with implied analysis. Weak descriptions can merit 11 – 13 while incomplete answers deserve not more than 10 marks.

24 To what extent was the development of the Cold War a threat to European peace and stability by 1964?

The key issue is an assessment of the effects of the development of the Cold War.

Coming out of World War II, Europe found herself in an uneasy peace, characterised by suspicion based on ideological differences between the capitalist West and the socialist East. The wartime alliance between the USA, USSR, Britain and France ceased to exist as their common enemy, Germany had been defeated. Relations deteriorated and the USA adopted the position of the protector of democracy through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Aid. Action and counteraction made the situation dangerous demonstrated by the Berlin Blockade, the formalisation of the division of Germany and the establishment of the military camps. NATO stood on the side and the Warsaw pact on the other. In the period to 1955, the Soviet conquest of Eastern Europe was effected while the development of the Iron curtain culminated in the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961. Though relations between the powers were dangerous, the situation was under control. No major war erupted. Tension was somewhat reduced through the Geneva summit of 1955 and the abolition of Cominform in 1956. The attempts at improving relations were made through Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence. The best answers, 21 – 25 will be explanatory and they will offer a balanced argument. Candidates in this band will see conflict which was contained as war did not erupt between the powers. They will also see attempts by the Soviet Union to climb down. 18 – 20 answers, though analytical, may miss possible lines of the discussion. 16 – 17 answers, though with analysis in some places, are for largely descriptive answers. 14 – 15 are for full narratives while 11 – 13 are for weak narratives. Thin and fragmentary answers will not merit 10 weeks.

25 How far, and why, had European countries decolonize by 1964?

The key issue is on the reasons for and the extent to which decolonisation had been achieved by 1964.

Decolonisation took place both in Africa and Asia. In Africa, only five states were independent in 1965 and by 1975, only three were to gain independence. Post-war demands by Africans who were more conscious of their rights led to Europe giving up colonies. This was true in the case of France in Algeria. Criticism at home over colonial policy also had an impact. Some

countries got independence through revolution and guerrilla warfare. Others achieved it peacefully, without conflict. The methods used determine why decolonisation was fast or slow. In the far East, decolonisation took place in India, Pakistan, French Indo-China, Malaysia and Singapore. The process was sometimes difficult that the UN had to be called in. This was the case in Indonesia. In Africa there were cases of reluctance to decolonisation. This happened in the Congo where the Belgians reluctantly relinquished power thereby creating chaos. In Rhodesia where there was a big settler economy, the British found it difficult to move out. Instead, by 1965, the white Rhodesians had declared U.D.I. In South Africa, decolonisation became a racial issue. France was reluctant to give up Morocco and Algeria which they considered as provinces of France. The unstable government of France also made decisions on decolonisation difficult. The return of de Gaulle was important in Algeria's attainment of independence.

21 – 25 answers should be analytical and thorough. Candidates should be illustrative 18 – 20 answers are supposed to be analytical, but may be one-sided by giving examples from Asia and Africa alone. 16 – 17 will be more descriptive and less explanatory while 14 – 15 are full descriptions with implied analysis. 11 – 13 are for weak narratives while thin and fragmentary answers will not deserve 10 marks.