



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY

9769/23

Paper 2 European History Outlines c.1715–2000

May/June 2023

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

Assessment Objectives

AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

Generic levels-based mark schemes

These level descriptions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1 and 2, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

Mark grid for all essay questions

Level	Description	Marks
5	<p>Contains consistent analysis and argument. Outlines valid criteria for assessing the question, and there is consistent focus on the demands of the question. Uses an appropriate range and depth of argument and supporting knowledge.</p> <p>Coherent and effective structure.</p> <p>Arguments and explanations are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Judgements are developed and well supported by accurate and relevant knowledge.</p>	17–20 marks
4	<p>Contains analysis and argument although there may be some descriptive material. There is overall focus on the demands of the question with attempts at establishing criteria for assessing the question. The range and depth of argument and supporting knowledge may be uneven.</p> <p>Recognisable and coherent structure.</p> <p>Arguments and explanations are generally clear, but unevenly developed.</p> <p>Judgements are adequately supported by some accurate and relevant knowledge.</p>	13–16 marks
3	<p>Contains some analysis and much descriptive material. Focus on the demands of the question is uneven and the range and depth of argument and supporting knowledge may be limited.</p> <p>Some structure and organisation.</p> <p>Arguments, explanations and judgements may be attempted. These are undeveloped and not adequately supported by accurate or relevant knowledge.</p>	9–12 marks
2	<p>Any analysis is brief and undeveloped, and the response is mainly descriptive. There is a very limited attempt to respond to the demands of the question.</p> <p>Limited structure and organisation and lacks coherence.</p> <p>Arguments may be attempted. Supporting knowledge has limited depth, accuracy and relevance and this does not go much beyond generalisations.</p> <p>Any judgements are unsubstantiated.</p>	5–8 marks
1	<p>Includes some information that is relevant to the topic. The information does not relate to the demands of the question and so there is no analysis.</p> <p>Very brief, fragmented or obviously unfinished. There is no structure or organisation.</p> <p>Arguments may be attempted, and some knowledge included, but these are not accurate or relevant.</p> <p>There are no meaningful judgements.</p>	1–4 marks

Level	Description	Marks
0	No creditable response.	0 marks

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p data-bbox="304 248 1278 315">How effectively did Catherine the Great deal with the problems facing Russia in the years 1762–1796?</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1326 517">The discussion could be how far the changes she made effectively met the need for modernisation in government and society in the light of reforms being made in European states generally and how far they were merely nods to enlightened thinking or failed to grasp underlying problems such as the debilitating effects of serfdom. Element to be considered might include:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 555 1321 1025" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 555 1278 719">• The reform of the law and the legal system; the Nakaz was drawn to a large extent from Beccaria and Montesquieu. However, contemporary opinion was that legal reform was largely window dressing and the Legislative Commission of 1767 could be seen as half-hearted and unsuccessful. <li data-bbox="304 725 1321 824">• Attempts were made to reform the administration; the college system and local government and some of Peter's centralising methods were abandoned largely for reasons of pragmatism. <li data-bbox="304 831 1289 891">• St Petersburg was enhanced and there was generous patronage of the arts. <li data-bbox="304 898 1246 958">• Catherine's social policies which confirmed noble privileges and left serfdom largely untouched. <li data-bbox="304 965 1299 1025">• What is clear is that Catherine's response to the French Revolution was one of severe repression in Russia. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Why were attempts at reform in France, c.1774–1788, not more successful?</p> <p>Answers may focus on the key element of financial reform and the discussion could weigh the relative importance of different factors. The opposition of the privileged classes; the weakness of the King in supporting his ministers; the pressure of war expenditure and the size of inherited debt; the limitations of the ministers. Some may point out that this was not a period without reform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic and fiscal reforms of Turgot met popular resistance and needed more time. Turgot’s relatively brief period in major office was met with opposition at court. • The structural problems of local and class privilege acted as a brake on reforms by Necker and Calonne. • The pressure of accumulated debt and the heavy costs of the War of American independence increased problems. • Radical solutions such as the opening up of the royal accounts to public scrutiny and the calling of the Assembly of Notables were risky and provoked opposition. • Fear of ministerial absolutism allowed the defence of fiscal privilege to acquire more support and legitimacy with essentially selfish defence of interest being supported by popular protest as in the Day of Tiles. • Irresolution by the King was a result of pressure from within the royal family to oppose change, but France unlike England and the Netherlands lacked a financial structure to allow deficits to be managed and absolute centralised power was not strong enough to impose radical solutions. • The calling of the Estates General was a solution which lacked preparation and clear aims and a plan of how to manage a major change. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>What best accounts for the fall of the French monarchy in 1792?</p> <p>Discussion may centre on the relative importance of factors such as the role of the King in his own demise, or the impact of threats of invasion and political radicalism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fragility of the constitutional monarchy with the king unhappy about limitations and radicals concerned about the veto. • The impact of the Flight to Varennes and the lack of trust between King and Assembly. • The growing radicalism and Republicanism and the vulnerability of the king living in the centre of Paris. • The decision for war and the initial setbacks and fears of invasion. • The power of popular action in the capital. • The accumulated political debate and desire for a radical rebirth of France and the steady erosion of royal power since 1789. • Fears of foreign invasion and restoration of absolutism. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Does Napoleon deserve to be seen as a ‘military genius’ in his campaigns before 1804?</p> <p>Much hinges on the interpretation of genius as opposed to mere military success. Arguments for genius might focus on a mixture of employing new methods, mastering logistics and having ‘an eye for the battlefield’ coupled with an outstanding ability to motivate troops. Arguments against might focus on a lack of originality and merely using the ideas and practices of others; reliance on weaker enemies; poor decisions and dependence on subordinates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Italian campaign demonstrated the inspiration given to a neglected force; brilliant movement; effective concentration of force and use of artillery, but also some weak opposition. • The Egyptian campaign saw mastery of the battlefield against superior forces but flawed overall strategy. • Marengo saw highly flexible and imaginative action in retrieving what seemed to be a lost battle but dependence on subordinates, especially Desaix. • Some ideas and practices such as rapid movement, division of forces, and concentration of artillery were inherited from theorists and practitioners of the eighteenth century rather than being original to Bonaparte. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Did Napoleon do more harm than good for Europe, 1804–1814?</p> <p>This is the period of the empire, and the discussion could look at the extension of some gains of the revolution into areas ruled by France but at the cost of taxation, conscription, and the physical ravages of war under an authoritarian regime which put French interests first. There could be a discussion of the extent to which Napoleon, as he later claimed, encouraged national consciousness and laid the basis for subsequent nation states in Italy and Germany.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social change brought about by the end of feudalism and the encouragement of greater social mobility. • Unified administration on the French model. • Greater secularisation, toleration, and a reduction of the power of religious restriction on liberal ideas. • Greater national unity which lasted after the fall of Napoleon e.g., in Germany. • Reforms undertaken by European states, for example, Prussia as a reaction to defeat by France. • The spread of legal reform. • On the other hand, there was violence and repression, and Napoleon brought the ravages of war to large areas of Europe. • In terms of economic development, manufactures in the Empire were subordinated to French interests. • Spread of reform was uneven and, in some areas, there was cooperation with local elites, not the introduction of Revolutionary ideas of equality. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p data-bbox="304 248 963 282">Why was the Congress System so short-lived?</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1283 584">The discussion could be whether changing circumstances put too much pressure on the rather fragile consensus of great powers or whether underlying differences were too great for any ‘system’ to last. Following the success of international cooperation in the defeat of Napoleon and the international agreements made at Vienna, there was the hope that the defence of peace and order or the status quo could be affected by international cooperation by the European monarchies. Why this was not sustained could be explained by various factors.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 622 1326 1503" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 622 1246 719">• The allied powers had their different aims and interests. Austria and Russia were more anxious to defend their multi-national empires by taking an active role against revolution. <li data-bbox="304 725 1310 920">• The interests of Britain did not lie in costly interventions or supporting absolutist monarchies. Neither Castlereagh nor Canning showed enthusiasm for supporting Metternich’s active interventionism in matters in which Britain’s direct interests were not involved. The alliance of European monarchies had been brought about by a common threat from France. <li data-bbox="304 927 1310 1023">• After 1818 when that was officially ended as Louis XVIII’s monarchy was reasonably stable and France re-joined the Concert of Europe, this was no longer a binding factor. <li data-bbox="304 1030 1326 1263">• The Congresses really represented the major powers of Europe and the interests of the opponents of liberalism and nationalism. This was under threat quite soon after the Congress of Vienna and interventionist plans could not command consensus. The Congress system even by 1823 was failing to come to terms with dynamic forces in Europe. Intervention raised the unwelcome prospect of extending the power of the monarchies which undertook it and creating opposition within the Concert of Europe. <li data-bbox="304 1270 1326 1366">• The Congress system did not develop strong military cooperation, staff talks, institutions or a common agenda. It was less a system than a series of conferences which became increasingly divided. <li data-bbox="304 1373 1326 1503">• A wider analysis is that it was not possible to ‘put the clock back’ after the French Revolution and Napoleon, and that the aims of Russia and Austria in particular were unrealistic. Also, national interests came before ideological aims. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p data-bbox="304 248 999 282">Assess the achievements of Nicholas I of Russia.</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1321 551">The discussion could centre on whether maintaining the status quo was ‘an achievement’ or whether there was a lack of vision in rejecting change which ultimately left Russia behind the progress made by other European countries. Nicholas I (1825–1855) faced a revolt on the day of his coronation which he suppressed and ruled as an autocrat, hoping by militarisation and discipline to defend his dynasty and protect Russian interests, probably seeing the two as inseparable.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 584 1326 1883" style="list-style-type: none"> • Police activities increased with the creation of the Third Department. The government closely controlled education and imposed strict censorship. • Dissent was met with punishment and Nicholas opposed nationalism and change in Europe – as ‘the gendarme of Europe’ he cooperated with Austria. • He limited Polish rights and, when unrest broke out, repressed the Poles, and ended Poland’s constitution and special status in the Empire, making it a province. He was active in opposing change (1848–9) and intervened in Hungary to suppress the rebellion there against the Habsburgs. • He supported the conservatism of the Holy Alliance, but not at the expense of Russia’s interest. He took advantage of the Greek revolt to fight Turkey in 1828 and 1829 and negotiated concessions at the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi in 1833. • Nicholas I was not a total reactionary and contemplated land reform and also expanded education, but he was seen as rigid in maintaining an autocracy based on military power, a militarized civil service and support for the Orthodox Church. • To avoid the excesses of the French Revolution, the disunity that nationalism would have brought to a diffuse empire, to build up the armed forces and to promote Russian influence over the Turkish Empire and attempt to secure an outlet to the Mediterranean would have seemed to be achievements. • In the perspective of the weaknesses shown by the Crimean War and the failure to compromise with Europe’s more dynamic forces, the reactionary policies can be seen to have weakened Russia. • The adherence to Austrian influence; the suppression of liberal criticism; the rigid censorship which made constructive criticism impossible and the over reliance on a large army which relied heavily on serf-soldiers and outdated technology suggest failings which, in the long-term, weakened Russia. • The failure to carry through plans to reform slavery and promote industrial modernization may be seen as failing to engage with Russia’s long-term interests in pursuit of the short-term interests of the dynasty in resisting change and modernisation. • However, he did not put political ideology before the strategic needs of Russia; he was not blindly reactionary, and his reign did see some agrarian and educational reform. • It also saw quite a cultural flowering with Gogol, Pushkin, and Glinka. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p>What best explains why Austria had lost its dominant position in Germany by 1867?</p> <p>The discussion might be between the weaknesses of Austria and the growing power of Prussia and the war that Bismarck exploited both.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relative weakness of Austrian economic growth compared to that of Prussia. • The loss of Italy and its impact on Austria. • The relative weakness of Austrian military force and leadership compared with Prussia. • The limited support given by Austria's German allies. • The diplomatic isolation of Austria. • The skill of Bismarck in isolating Austria and preventing French or Russian interference in a big change in the balance of power in central Europe. • The military reforms in Prussia supported by Bismarck but developed by Von Roon and the technology of the needle gun and railways. • The Prussian military victory at Sadowa and the swift outcome of the war which prevented possible outside intervention which might have resulted from a much more drawn-out struggle. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>How far had Italy been united by 1871?</p> <p>The key concept here is 'unity.' Though relatively few areas of Italian speaking majority were outside the kingdom after Venetia and Rome were added, the country suffered from considerable internal disunity and the Risorgimento could be seen as Piedmontisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from 'Italia irredenta' not gained until after the First World War, much more land had come into the Italian kingdom than envisaged by Cavour originally. Alliance with Prussia had brought Venetia despite lacklustre Italian military performance and the withdrawal of France gained Rome. • There was unified administration, internal trade and a common monarchy and parliament. • A cultural boom developed a distinct Italian culture. • However, the brutal so called 'Bandits war' of the 1860s had left scars and the Mezzogiorno was not well integrated into the new kingdom. • Regional loyalties and language still were a barrier to unity. • Political domination was by elites and politics was seen often as corrupt and unrepresentative of different regions and classes. • The domination by Piedmont of the monarchy and most institutions such as the army meant that many saw the Risorgimento period as exchanging one foreign ruler for another. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p data-bbox="304 248 1262 315">How well did the Second Empire serve the interests of the people of France?</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1310 483">Defenders might point to economic expansion and a move towards greater liberalisation, an increase in the standing of France and a flowering of the arts. Detractors might see prestige put above national interest, a vainglorious foreign policy which ended in disaster for France.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 517 1318 1906" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 517 1318 685">• Napoleon III was Emperor from 2 Dec 1852 to 4 September 1870. The first phase of the Empire was politically authoritarian with opponents arrested and power centred on the Emperor and his government. A Liberal Empire developed after concessions made 1860–1 culminating in a Liberal ministry in 1869. <li data-bbox="304 689 1318 824">• The Empire saw greater industrialization, the expansion of banking and credit, more railways, and the rebuilding of Paris. Napoleon pursued free trade policies, encouraged enterprise, and invested in infrastructure even at the cost of budget deficits. <li data-bbox="304 828 1318 996">• At a time of general price rise and economic optimism, there was a boom in the establishment of companies and railways increased from 3000 to 16 000 km in the 1850s. There was the development of larger transport companies and the growth of shipping. A French engineer built the Suez Canal. <li data-bbox="304 1001 1318 1191">• An important element of the reign was the rebuilding of Paris. Napoleon III's desire to modernise Paris was based on what he had seen of the modernisations of London during his exile in the 1840s. There was a lot of preservation work done on mediaeval buildings in France and France's railways were considerably developed. This helped the growth of coal and steel. <li data-bbox="304 1196 1318 1296">• Major Banks were founded, and the Bourse expanded. Napoleon was interested in economic development and offered reforms which recognised the interests of industry and industrial workers. <li data-bbox="304 1301 1318 1435">• The Cobden-Chevalier treaty marked a new departure and recognition of the importance of trade. In the end an over-ambitious foreign policy and the large-scale resources devoted to military spending undermined progress. <li data-bbox="304 1440 1318 1641">• France's international prestige was boosted by the Crimean War 1854–6. France also defeated Austria in 1859, increasing her prestige as a supporter of nationalism, while gaining Nice and Savoy. However, Catholics in France objected to the loss of an independent papal regime in central Italy in 1861. Catholic opinion was alienated further by secularising education policies. <li data-bbox="304 1646 1318 1906">• Internal reforms were made in Algeria; the acquisition of French indo-China in 1862 confirmed French overseas influence as a civilizing mission. Together with the joint expedition to China, the sending of a military mission to Japan in 1867 opened up French influence in Asia. There was less success in Latin America with the failure of the bid to put a client ruler on the throne of Mexico. Plans for recognition of and influence over an independent Confederate republic floundered on Britain's opposition. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10	The rise of Prussia with the successful war against Austria left France with reduced European influence and Napoleon failed to gain compensation. The Liberal reforms in France never had a chance to embed themselves as Napoleon III unwisely was drawn into a war against Prussia in 1870.	

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>Did the reforms of Alexander II strengthen or weaken the Tsarist regime?</p> <p>The discussion could focus on how far reforms reduced threats to the regime and allowed it to modernise in the wake of the weaknesses shown in the Crimean War and to strengthen its popularity and bonds with key elements. The more critical view is that reforms which did not go far enough, alienated key supporters without satisfying those who saw the need for greater modernism and encouraged opposition and unrest which ultimately resulted in the Tsar's death.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Emancipation of the Serfs which responded to growing unrest and allowed more economic development but whose provisions were disappointing and did not prevent ongoing rural unrest. • The Zemstva which allowed wider participation in local affairs but fell short of demands for a national parliament and might have whetted appetites for greater power. • The reduction of censorship and educational reforms which might have encouraged greater dissent. • The military reforms which might have done more to strengthen the regime given the weaknesses shown in the Crimean War. • Economic reforms did promote transport and industrialisation. • The limitations and inconsistency of change may have encouraged hopes for greater change while not fulfilling them, but it was clear that some reform was needed and the unproductive retreat into repression by his predecessor and successor might suggest that Alexander should not be judged too harshly. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p data-bbox="304 248 1121 282">How effective was Bismarck’s domestic policy after 1871?</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1318 719">Admirers might point to the development of national institutions, the management of the Reichstag, the modern measures of welfare taken in the 1880s to undercut socialism, the maintenance of some liberal elements while maintaining the authority of the Kaiser, his own power, and the conservative order in which he believed. Detractors might point to policies which lurched between relying on Liberal and then conservative support, to failed and obnoxious policies of repression of Catholics then reconciliation, to a repression of socialism accompanied by a clumsy attempt to win over the masses by social insurance, to suppression of minorities. Much depends on a definition of effective – but despite all his efforts he did not maintain power and it is possible to see his domestic policy as short-term, immoral and in the long run ineffective in promoting the best interests of Germany as a whole.</p> <p data-bbox="304 752 823 786">Answer might consider these elements:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 819 1102 1102" style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of the constitution. • The progress to unification. • The Kulturkampf. • The relations with the SPD – repression and conciliation. • Political skills and the change after 1880. • Economic policy and tariffs. • Relations with Wilhelm I and Wilhelm II. • Fall from power. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
13	<p>Who served the Tsarist regime better: Witte or Stolypin?</p> <p>Both had a willingness to change and a vision of an improved Russia and a stronger regime and their relative success/limitation should be considered, and a judgement made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Witte might win the contest given the policies which encouraged industrial growth, and some land reform so vital for the regime’s great power status and defence. • Witte was sensible enough to oppose the war against Japan, he was also influential in reducing the unrest in 1905 by the October manifesto – so moderniser, reformer, the encourager of fiscal stability. • Stolypin might win out because he tackled the challenges of revolution by trying to establish a stable peasant proprietor class which would support the regime, bringing in reforms which modernised the countryside, ending the restrictions of the MIR, promoting investment and settlement of new lands and like the British in Ireland making ‘a wager on the strong’ which might have been effective in the longer term had not war intervened. • Stolypin also restored order in the countryside by brutal repression and ensured that the Dumas were managed. <p>The downsides of both might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Witte’s industrialisation created problems in accumulating workers in large scale enterprises in poor conditions, receptive to socialist ideas and ready to revolt. • Also, the October Manifesto was not likely to be sustained by a Tsar unwilling to abandon a divinely ordained role so led to greater expectations than could be realistically delivered. • Though Lenin saw Stolypin as a threat, the actual creation of a new loyal prosperous peasantry had not been achieved with limited numbers and many went back to some form of communalism rather than embracing rural capitalism. • The repression left scars and it could be that the failure to allow the Duma to develop was a key failure of the regime and left the way open for more extreme opposition. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
14	<p>How effective were the overseas policies followed by Italian governments in the period 1871–1914?</p> <p>The issue is whether Italy did establish itself as a major power and part of the alliance system and establish its credentials as a colonial power or whether it pursued over ambitious policies and began a colonisation policy which brought few advantages and involved a major defeat and costly military actions.</p> <p>Issues which might be discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Italy's diplomatic relations with other European powers in the Mediterranean agreements. • Italy joining the Triple Alliance and the problems this brought. • Italy's relations with France. • The colonial policies in Africa – the expansion in the Horn of Africa and the humiliation of Adowa. • The war in Tripoli. • The decision in 1914 to remain neutral. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
15	<p>How important was poor leadership in bringing about the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire?</p> <p>This factor could be set against the reverses from 1859–1867, the relative economic decline, the effects of the Ausgleich, the growing problem of nationalism, the efforts to meet the demands for change internally, the domination of military advice and disastrous decision to embark on war as a solution to problems and the effects of the First World War. Some elements which might be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor leadership might look at how Austrian leaders dealt with the rising problems of nationalism within the Empire. • The losses of 1859 and 1866 might be considered in terms of unwise diplomatic and military decisions. • The over dominance of Hungarian influence and the diplomatic decision to tie Austria to Germany in 1879. • The failure to deal with the South Slav problems and the reliance on inflated hopes for a military solution by Hotzendorf. • The reckless decisions of 1914. • Military leadership in the costly campaigns of the war. • Longer term problems of popular nationalism. • The economic problems and divisions in the Empire. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
16	<p data-bbox="304 241 948 280">Why was it <u>not</u> possible to avoid war in 1914?</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1302 577">Though crises in the Balkans had been settled in 1908 and 1912–13 and though there was the possibility of compromise over tensions (such as naval rivalry and the fate of the Portuguese colonies) and personal contacts as in the Willi-Nikki letters and hesitations in Berlin, none of the restraining factors were enough to prevent war in August 1914. The discussion might be between the relative importance of short-term factors and the weight of long-term fears and ambitions which drove nations to seek a sort of final military solution.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 622 1326 1574" style="list-style-type: none"> • Taylor’s ‘War by Timetable’ may be referred to here – the key idea is that the massive military build-up before 1914 and the detailed plans such as the Schlieffen Plan involved the mobilisation stage and once this had begun it was difficult for the powers to wind down in 1914. • It could be argued that when a major crisis came the planning offered the prospects of a short-war and victory, even though any study of campaigns such as the US Civil War might have indicated the opposite. The Schlieffen Plan offered a rapid campaign against France similar to that of 1870 and used Russia’s sheer size and anticipated slowness of response to argue that a war on two fronts could be avoided. French concepts of high morale and rapid advance being able to overcome the effect of rapid firing weapons and heavy artillery offered a tempting vision. British belief in its naval superiority and the sheer size of the armies of Russia and France encouraged a view of a short campaign without large scale land fighting. • Few military leaders set out what were to be the realities of a long war of attrition for the politicians. • The wider view is that the plans made war seem a viable option to fulfil longer-term ambitions or remove long-standing anxieties. Countries went to war with the view that there was a good chance that they could win. • However, there were of course long-term rivalries – the French resentment about Alsace Lorraine and the defeat of 1870; • the Russian concern for the Balkans and the dangers of a German-supported Austria. • The Austrian fears for the long-term security of the Empire. Germany and Austria’s fears about Russian economic and military growth. • Britain’s economic, colonial, and naval rivalry with Germany. • Germany’s fear of encirclement. <p data-bbox="304 1615 1278 1709">The issue is whether these longer-term rivalries would have by themselves led to a war had not statesmen had the confidence of military advice promising victory.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
17	<p>‘Germany agreed to an armistice in November 1918 because of the collapse of its allies.’ Did it?</p> <p>The rapid collapse of allies – Turkey in the middle east and Austria on the Italian front left Germany alone in a rapidly deteriorating situation. The entry of the US, the effects of the blockade, the failure of the 1918 offensive and the rapid advances of a united allied command utilising a combined arms strategy are other elements to be weighed against the issue in the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany’s allies had needed to be bolstered – for example the Austrians in Italy. Turkey was a distraction for the Entente powers, but not strong enough to withstand better, campaigns in 1917. • German plans were postulated on the rapid defeat of France, which failed in 1914 and a war of attrition was not to its advantage, particularly with British naval superiority and blockade. • The heavy casualties were a factor, but it was the entry of America in 1917 which has been seen as decisive. • The failure of the 1918 offensive to gain a decisive victory before the arrival of the US forces in significant numbers is a major factor. Linked to this is the over stretch of German resources in a two-front war – even after the Russian collapse, large number of troops had to remain in Eastern Europe. • The U boats mounted an effective challenge to Britain but could not end the blockade and were a factor in bringing about US intervention. They were overcome by better British naval tactics. • The supplies of war material and credit by the USA offered the entente a major advantage. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
18	<p>‘The best that circumstances allowed.’ Discuss this view of the Paris Peace Settlement.</p> <p>Circumstances could be the rapidly developing situation in Eastern Europe with the breakup of the Austrian Empire; the Russian Revolution which seemed to be a threat which needed the creation of a cordon sanitaire; the huge pressure in France for revenge and a permanent weakening of Germany; the position of Wilson in being the peacemaker who had tried to bring the war to end on an idealistic basis. However, the discussion could point to the obvious flaws which were seen at the time despite the problems and the way that national interests were put before the achievement of a lasting peace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main weaknesses of Versailles have been seen as inconsistency in applying the principle of national self-determination; a punitive and unrealistic reparations policy; creating problems of minorities in new states; leaving Germany with lost lands which she would be bound to want to recover; making the settlement a diktat; trying to ensure that a major power had ineffective defences for an undetermined period; causing major economic problems; being over-motivated by French desires for revenge without taking the actions against Germany far enough to ensure that this was not countered by a German nationalist revival; lacking the means to enforce the decisions in the long term. • The disposal of the lands taken by Germany from Russia alienated Russia and made the settlement unsustainable in the long run. • The counter view is that much was successful – there was little opposition to Alsace-Lorraine being given back; there were plebiscites in some areas like N.Schleswig; the Germans themselves had been punitive at Brest-Litovsk and there was the need to take some action about areas of mixed nationality. It has been argued that the problems of reparations have been exaggerated and that they were not the main cause of Germany’s economic ills as so little was actually paid. • The demilitarisation of Germany was undertaken amid hopes that general disarmament would take place. • The emergence of rabid nationalism was not primarily the result of Versailles and indeed had the trends of the 1920s continued then the treaty would have been modified and a Franco-German rapprochement might have been successful. The Rhineland was evacuated by occupying allied forces earlier than expected and Locarno offered prospects of renegotiation. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. • The new states in eastern Europe were not easy always viable and the problems of minorities that dogged pre-war Austria-Hungary were reproduced, but the peacemakers often faced a fait accompli. • The grab for colonies in the barely misguided forms of mandates may be less easy to defend. • There was huge unhappiness as a result – Italy, Germany, Russia, Japan were all likely at some point to want to revise the treaty. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
19	<p>To what extent did Lenin ‘sacrifice principles for power’ in the years 1917–1924?</p> <p>It could be argued that Lenin put power above everything in even launching the revolution when Marxist theory and principles demanded a more developed bourgeois phase and a more numerous proletariat.</p> <p>It has been argued that concessions to the peasants were a result of pragmatic necessity not Marxist principle and that the reliance on violence and repression were not in the spirit of Marx who assumed an almost automatic shift to power when conditions made it inevitable.</p> <p>Then the concessions of NEP could be seen as undermining Marxism by permitting a degree of capitalism largely to stay in power.</p> <p>On the other hand, Lenin did make a persuasive case that he was acting in accordance with Marxist theory and there is the view that to put his principles into practice he had to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the situation in October 1917.</p> <p>The violence was not incompatible with the overall Marxist principle of the Dictatorship of the proletariat – a precursor to true Communism.</p> <p>Lenin did not see a contradiction between NEP and Marxist principles and it could be said that the measures taken in Russia did put into practice some key ideas – the control of key areas of the means of production, greater equality, a soviet system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 1917 and 1924 the Bolshevik regime had struggled for survival. A minority who had come to power by a coup at a time of exceptional unrest, they relied more and more on terror during the Civil War. • The initial ideological changes could not be enforced and there were painful compromises, such as NEP, necessary to safeguard power and the possibility of greater socialism. In Marxist theory there was a ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ as a transition from revolution to the true Marxist state and the Bolshevik terror could be seen as part of that. However, the unrest among the industrial workers cast doubt on whether this was a dictatorship of the proletariat or desperate attempts by a minority of ideologues to maintain power. • Many of the measures did attempt to introduce socialism and there is an argument that Lenin was more than ‘a Red Tsar’ but the Land Decree and the NEP had limited justification in pure Marxist terms. • The nationalisation of banking and larger enterprises, the moves towards social equality, the mobilisation of mass support against counter-revolution, theoretical respect for minorities and greater sexual equality could be seen as genuinely progressive. • The repression and terror could be seen as a proletarian dictatorship; but there were few indications of the power of Party and State withering away and the increasing dictatorship of the leaders might seem to be a counter-indication that Russia had much genuine Marxism by 1924. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
20	<p data-bbox="304 248 1315 315">How far did Hitler’s rise to power by 1934 depend on the weaknesses of his opponents?</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1315 517">What lies behind the question is the view that Hitler had advantages not of his own making, and his rise heavily depended on mistakes and misjudgements by other. This can be countered by his own skill in exploiting these and by considering very favourable circumstances which affected both Hitler and his opponents.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 555 1315 831" style="list-style-type: none"> • He was lucky not to have been ruined by 1923 and allowed to become a national figure by sympathetic elements in the judiciary. • He was lucky that, when he had reached the furthest point in electoral success in 1932 without gaining office, that splits in Weimar's ruling elite allowed him to negotiate his way into power. • He was lucky that the radical wing of his party did not press their opposition to compromise. • He was lucky that the army was willing to do a deal in 1934. <p data-bbox="304 864 1315 898">The counter argument is that Hitler exploited circumstances and weaknesses.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 931 1315 1341" style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision to switch to a policy of legality, for instance. • The organization of the party to be in a position to exploit the economic crash. • The studiedly effective ‘message’ and the brilliance of its delivery were not matters of luck. • The way that Hitler kept his nerve and did not give in to demands for radical action in 1932. • The way that he saw that entrance to government could be the way to power and how he outmanoeuvred Von Papen and the <i>Reaktion</i>; the <i>Realpolitik</i> in abandoning the SA and compromising with the army, knowing that he could in the long run control them as well all amount to high level political skill. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
21	<p>Was there ever a Fascist dictatorship in Italy?</p> <p>The issue here is whether Mussolini established a dictatorship dependent on ongoing support from elites or whether the dictatorship reflected the ideas of fascism and managed to effect a transformation of Italian society.</p> <p>In arguing for a limited dictatorship:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the reliance on the support of king, church, and army. • the alliance with economic elites. • in the 1920s orthodox financial policies and negotiations with other European powers as a responsible statesman. • the Lateran treaties and the relationship with the Church. <p>The counter view might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme nationalism and propaganda to recreate the Roman Empire. • Attempts at indoctrination with youth movements. • The Corporate State. • Racial policies in the 1930s. • Ideology in some elements of foreign policy such as Italian participation in Spain and the war in Russia. • Increasing links with Nazi Germany. <p>There is some doubt about the penetration of fascist ideology into Italian life and the rapid demise of the regime might suggest, unlike the fervid resistance to the allied advances in Nazi Germany that support was largely for a nationalist regime which brought some elements of prosperity, unity, and prestige to Italy. However, it could be argued that the regime became more overtly fascist in the 1930s.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
22	<p>What best explains the rise to power of Stalin by 1928?</p> <p>The debate is likely to be between elements which show Stalin’s own skills and elements which offered favourable circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stalin had seen the possibilities of his roles as Commissar of Nationalities and Party Secretary in building up patronage networks. • He used divisions among his possible opponents effectively. • His policy of opposing rapid industrialisation and pursuing the prosperity of NEP in the 1920s seemed realistic and gained him support in the party. • He marginalised opponents and excluded them effectively. • He used his grasp of ideology to defend changes to policy in 1928 once his opponents had been defeated and turned-on erstwhile allies. <p>On the other hand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trotsky did not exploit the concerns Lenin had expressed in his Testament and allowed Stalin to appear to be the heir of Lenin. • Stalin’s enemies did not cultivate the support base in the party and the central committee. • Trotsky was already distrusted as a former Menshevik and suffered from memories of pre-revolutionary divisions. • The policies put forward for rapid industrial growth seemed unrealistic and were opposed by Bukharin. • Trotsky did not exploit his previous links with the army and went off into exile without much resistance. • Stalin benefited from the sort of strict party discipline and suppression of debate that had emerged under Lenin and the feeling that in face of international hostility the party needed to avoid division. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
23	<p data-bbox="304 248 1270 315">Was Spain weaker or stronger as a nation in 1975 than it had been in 1931?</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1217 416">The discussion here might weigh the divisions and weaknesses of the Republic in 1931 with the costs of civil war and dictatorship.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 454 1326 1480" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 454 1307 555">• In 1931 Spain emerged from a period of dictatorship with deep divisions, between left and right, between the church and the traditional elite and opponents on the left, and between regions. <li data-bbox="304 562 1233 663">• There was industrial unrest for example in the Asturias region, and tension in the countryside stirred by poverty, under investment and resentment against latifundia. <li data-bbox="304 669 1307 770">• Spain had a tradition of internal political and social conflicts exacerbated by the admiration of some on the right for Fascism and some on the left for Communism <li data-bbox="304 777 1241 878">• Even on the left there were divisions so that the chances of political stability were low. Regionalism especially in Catalonia threatened national unity. <li data-bbox="304 884 1326 965">• However, the opportunities existed in 1931 for progressive reform within a democratic framework. <li data-bbox="304 972 1294 1075">• By 1975 Franco's repression – now known to be remarkably brutal and extensive – did secure the regime. Regional aspirations were suppressed, and Castilian language promoted. Traditional moral values and the role of the church were maintained. <li data-bbox="304 1081 1321 1162">• Isolation internationally was ended by the establishment of good relations with the USA after 1953 <li data-bbox="304 1169 1313 1249">• By utilising economic experts and dismantling controls Spain was able to enjoy some economic growth after 1959. <li data-bbox="304 1256 1294 1337">• Helped by foreign investment, cheap labour and the absence of strikes and effective unionism, the economy grew, bolstering the regime. <li data-bbox="304 1344 1273 1424">• Franco kept a balance between maintaining his personal power and respecting the traditional monarchy by seeing himself as a regent and then designating, in 1969, Juan Carlos as his successor. <li data-bbox="304 1431 1294 1512">• However, the Civil War and the considerable repression which followed had left deep scars and divisions. <li data-bbox="304 1518 1074 1599">• Regionalism had been suppressed, but not eliminated. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
24	<p data-bbox="304 248 1315 315">How important was ideology in bringing about the Second World War in Europe?</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1315 517">The issue is whether the war brought about immediately, by the invasion of Poland culminating in Germany expanding into eastern Europe, and then extended by the invasion of the USSR and the declaration of war on the US was the result of ideology or of the pursuit of national strategic and economic interest.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 555 1315 1368" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 555 1315 656">• Hitler had aims which might have been pursued by most German statesmen e.g., of reversing the restrictions of Versailles, regaining lost lands, and restoring Germany’s pre-war great power status. <li data-bbox="304 656 1315 757">• These were linked to economic and strategic interests and were concerned with defence of very vulnerable and extended borders. They involved building up allies and ensuring supplies of vital materials. <li data-bbox="304 757 1315 958">• On the other hand, there were aims which were deeply connected with ideology – overthrowing the Marxist Russian state, allowing racially pure Aryans to settle in territories of their racial inferiors and to establish a racial thousand-year Reich which would dominate Europe at the expense of states with ideologies which went counter to those of Nazi Germany – the corrupt democracies and the threatening ‘Judeo Bolshevism’ <li data-bbox="304 958 1315 1059">• The invasion of Poland was initially to recover the lands lost in 1939 but the way it was undertaken, and the subsequent treatment suggest that ideology dominated. <li data-bbox="304 1059 1315 1160">• The war against France and Britain was not sought, if not actually avoided. The rapid conquest of France was not foreseen so it was a consequence of the Polish war. <li data-bbox="304 1160 1315 1238">• The alliance with Stalin might be seen as ideological pragmatism to achieve more limited goals of revision of the Treaty of Versailles. <li data-bbox="304 1238 1315 1368">• The invasion of Russia, the aims and the conduct of war suggest geopolitical ambitions more than the pursuit of national interests as by 1941 Hitler dominated Western Europe and had a reliable alliance with Stalin who was not planning for war and did not expect invasion. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
25	<p data-bbox="304 248 1078 282">Why did the Second World War in Europe last so long?</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1315 450">A discussion could weigh the failure of Hitler to win an outright victory in 1940 and to continue to face Britain with factors which made it hard for the allies to achieve a decisive victory even when a powerful coalition of Britain, the USA and the USSR had greater resources.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 488 1326 1473" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 488 1326 555">• This needs some reflection in broad trends which could include the failure of Germany to avoid war on two fronts after 1941. <li data-bbox="304 555 1326 723">• The continuation of British resistance, protected by the RAF and Navy meant that German resources were stretched by a world conflict at sea and having to garrison Western Europe (30 divisions in Norway alone) against a possible counterattack. Britain on the other had could not invade and defeat Germany, so a prolonged standoff ensued. <li data-bbox="304 723 1326 824">• Allied dispersionist strategy of waging war in peripheral areas – North Africa and Italy prolonged the war by delaying invasion of Northern Europe until 1944. <li data-bbox="304 824 1326 958">• The ideological nature of the war against Russia meant that a separate peace was not possible, and the nature of the regimes and their carelessness of life meant that immense casualties were acceptable and the war was prolonged to the bitter end in the East. <li data-bbox="304 958 1326 1059">• Germany had considerable resources from its 1939–41 conquests. Its war crimes and extermination policies meant that its leaders could not compromise. <li data-bbox="304 1059 1326 1160">• The allied position of unconditional surrender was based on two countries not fighting on home soil and the third being committed to post-war expansion at all costs. <li data-bbox="304 1160 1326 1238">• Generally public opinion in all countries accepted a non-surrender policy which extended the war. <li data-bbox="304 1238 1326 1473">• The links between separate conflicts – Japan’s war against China; the war of the Fear East colonial powers to recover assets taken by Japan; the ideological war in Russia; the war by Germany to recover lands lost in 1919 and the desire of Britain and USA for a stable and democratic Europe and the struggle of the Nazi state for a new world order meant that it was hard to end any of these conflicts even when there was not the slightest hope that the original aims could be achieved. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
26	<p data-bbox="304 248 975 282">How effectively did Khrushchev rule the USSR?</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1326 517">Modernisation in economic terms and the break with the political past may seem to indicate that Khrushchev ruled Russia well; but the limitations of change and the misjudgement of key economic policies, together with the continuing repression of discontent and the failure to address some key economic problems and to keep up the consumer technology of the West may be discussed.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 555 1321 1160" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 555 1321 719">• After Stalin's death in 1953 Khrushchev emerged as leader, outmanoeuvring his rivals. The Secret Speech of 1956 changed the political atmosphere, but though the Stalin regime was renounced and there were attempts at decentralisation, Khrushchev remained wedded to large-scale state projects, such as the Virgin land scheme. <li data-bbox="304 725 1321 853">• The commanding heights of the economy remained in state hands and despite the admittance of the large-scale crimes of Stalin and the willingness to accept this, there was limited political liberty and dissidents were prosecuted. <li data-bbox="304 860 1321 1093">• Though there were impressive technological feats such as Sputnik and the development of new Soviet planes, the countryside remained neglected and protests about shortages and poor living standards were repressed severely. However, the image of rapid progress – the first man and then the first women in space, the impressive displays of military strength made many in the West think that Russia was a massive superpower. <li data-bbox="304 1099 1321 1160">• Khrushchev may have believed in his own propaganda and a dangerous strategy over Cuba weakened his domestic position. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
27	<p data-bbox="304 248 1110 282">Why did the Fourth Republic, 1946–1958, not last longer?</p> <p data-bbox="304 315 1326 450">The Fourth Republic faced problems with the recovery of France from occupation, war and inflation. It needed to establish stable government without too much presidential power and also to recover France’s international position and deal with unrest in the empire.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 488 1270 696" style="list-style-type: none"> • The Republic has been criticised for a weak executive with unstable coalitions. • Criticised for engaging in a futile war in Vietnam which was lost. • Criticised for Suez. • Criticised for allowing the Algerian situation to escalate by repression. • Criticised for having to hand over power to de Gaulle. <p data-bbox="304 730 491 763">In its defence:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 797 1321 1137" style="list-style-type: none"> • A parliamentary regime was established which was responsive to the electorate. • Against that, despite problems with inflation, France gained from the European Coal and Steel Community, from planning measures and from modernisation in agriculture. • Despite the deep divisions of the Vichy period, parliamentary government was maintained and some of France’s colonies passed peacefully to independence. • However, the Algerian Crisis subsumed these more positive aspects and revealed unresolved tensions. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
28	<p data-bbox="304 248 1289 315">Assess the contribution of Adenauer to the achievement of stability in West Germany.</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1326 719">Some may feel that he made a more significant contribution to building a stable West Germany in the period of the late 40s and mid 1950s when people still looked back at Weimar and its problems, than when he had become by 1963 when it was clear that new Western leaders lacked the commitment to roll back the Soviet threat and that a new approach set out in Brandt's 'Ostpolitik' was emerging. However, many may feel that Adenauer's main significance was getting the balance between democracy and order – showing that proportional representation and a federal system need not mean the instability, especially in the context of prosperity that had been the case earlier. He was not a cabinet man – the role of the Chancellor became crucial; but his democratic credentials were sound.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 757 1326 1939" style="list-style-type: none"> • Adenauer was a conservative politician who had clear anti-Nazi credentials and who helped to found the very influential CDU in 1946, combining the old Centre Party with moderate liberals. It was clearly anti-Communist and a credible alternative to the SPD with whom the allies could deal. He was chairman of the constituent council and helped to establish the West German Basic Law. • The CDU and their Bavarian allies the CSU emerged as the largest parliamentary group in the 1949 elections and Adenauer set the pattern of coalition politics in post war Germany by his agreement with the FDP – showing that it could work better than Weimar politics and offering dignified leadership. He worked with the allies, and the FDR government, which he headed as Chancellor, got the right to conduct foreign relations in 1951. The aim was to rehabilitate Germany – and to make a fresh start. • He worked with France on the Coal and Steel Community, accepted the Saar being separated and offered restitution to the Jews. He also made a defence contribution and by 1955 West Germany had its own armed forces – a measure of the trust the allies had in the new regime and how Adenauer stood as a democratic opponent to the east. The Saar was returned in 1957 and West Germany was a leading member of the EEC. • Stability came not only through allied help but also through the economic prosperity promoted by Adenauer's governments and his economics minister Erhard. The state helped groups who had fled from the east and integrated former Nazis into the new state. Bourgeois stability – never a strong feature of Weimar – ensured electoral success in 1953 and 1957. • In place of the pre-war instability the ruling party achieved an overall majority. The reliance on the West and the lack of interest in unification reassured Germany's defenders, but the building of the Wall shook confidence. Adenauer condemned this as he had condemned the crushing of the Berlin risings of 1953 but relations with the USA declined, and Adenauer became closer to de Gaulle in 1963. • The Der Spiegel affair in 1962 seemed to reveal authoritarian tendencies and Adenauer was criticized for making West Germany a 'chancellor democracy', and for not doing enough to promote unification – he rejected the Stalin Note of 1952 and aimed to integrate West Germany into Western Europe in defence and economic terms. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
29	<p data-bbox="304 248 1305 315">How effectively did Spanish governments deal with domestic problems in the period 1975–2000?</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1321 517">The problems might be seen as healing the divisions of a long period of dictatorship, restoring a credible democracy, and reintegrating with Europe as well as dealing with economic problems and changes in society. There were also issues regarding regional demands and autonomy. The discussion might draw a distinction between the political and economic problems.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 555 1326 1536" style="list-style-type: none"> • After Franco’s death there was a transitional period which paved the way first for a new constitution and national elections and then devolution of power to the regions without fragmenting the state. Despite an attempted military coup in 1981 the transition to democracy was effective and general political stability despite challenges from dissidents to right and left has been maintained without the sort of national disintegration seen in Yugoslavia. • There are many explanations. Some stress the willingness of political groups to be moderate and to avoid polarising politics, especially in the late 70s and 80s when a new generation had to adjust to democratic politics with very little previous tradition. • Economic explanations point to the economic expansion and prosperity of the late Franco era and the avoidance of large-scale inflation in the transitional period. After an economic crisis in the late 1950s the Franco regime allowed expert elites to affect a modernisation programme which improved Spain’s infrastructure and laid the foundations for greater prosperity. • Spain’s links with Nato and the European community were helpful in the transition in providing effective role models; the left was less inclined to offer an uncompromising opposition to democracy when neither China nor the USSR were seen as outstanding successes – this was in contrast to the 1930s. The repression of the Franco regime had weakened left-wing extremism, but the exiled leftist parties gave Spain one model of political organisation. • The monarchy was helpful in leading conservative Spain to accept democracy and defusing the right. The new Spain had the advantage of good leadership with a clear aim of settling national issues before bringing about regional devolution and being able to manage moderate change, underpinned by economic prosperity loyal to the monarchy 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
30	<p>How well did the states of Eastern Europe respond to the challenges of the post-Soviet era in the 1990s?</p> <p>Answers should consider what those challenges were and draw their examples from a range of Eastern European states rather than attempting mini histories. Against the violence and war of Yugoslavia, there were examples where transitions were affected, and challenges met.</p> <p>Challenges might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjusting to multi- party systems after a long period of one-party rule. • Dealing with minorities and regional and ethnic differences without the unifying element of pro-Soviet police state. • Adjusting to ending economic controls, state planning and responding to the free market. • Adjusting to greater freedoms of expression and parliamentary systems. • Forging new relationships with western Europe. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
31	<p>‘Symphonic and operatic music were greater in the nineteenth century than in the first half of the twentieth century.’ Discuss.</p> <p>Much depends on how greatness is defined and assessed and what criteria were used. There could be a distinction between opera and symphonic music, but a judgement is called for.</p> <p>A possible case for the nineteenth century being greater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of symphonic emotional expression e.g., Beethoven’s Ninth, Brahms’ 4th, Bruckner 8th. • The development of more varied symphonic forms and lengthier development Schubert 9th. • The richness of orchestration by the late century. • In opera the use of opera to convey weighty ethical messages – Fidelio, Wagner’s Ring, Verdi’s Don Carlos. • The brilliance of Italian vocal writing – Bellini. Donizetti, Rossini. <p>The case for the first half of the twentieth century:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The massive emotional journeys of Mahler’s very large-scale symphonies, embracing far more varied elements than anything in the previous century. • The highly sophisticated concision of form seen in Sibelius. • The ability to sum up the atmosphere, aspirations, and anxieties of his age in Elgar’s 1st and 2nd symphonies. • The dazzling orchestration of Puccini, Strauss and Janacek. • The greater range of subjects showing an insight into the human condition and challenging orthodoxy - Shostakovich, Berg, Hindemith. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
32	<p data-bbox="304 248 1259 313">Assess the impacts of changes in transport on Europe in the period c.1750-c.1850.</p> <p data-bbox="304 349 1297 517">Changes in canal transport and shipping and in roads were probably less dramatic than the impact of railways. Canals had a big economic impact but did not transport large numbers of people nor did they lead to urban growth and national integration. Road development was patchier in Europe as a whole and the traffic carried was still horse drawn.</p> <ul data-bbox="304 555 1326 1400" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="304 555 1326 723">• Railway construction can be seen as the main engine of economic growth in the 1840s and into the 1850s, stimulating growth in coal mining, iron, machinery making and civil engineering. Railways made trade and industry more profitable, while bringing farms closer to growing urban markets and thus much more profitable. <li data-bbox="304 723 1326 857">• New managerial and engineering skills spread from railways to other industries. Railways stimulated urban growth and urban markets grew as a result, stimulating economies. The profits from railways were fed back into the economy. <li data-bbox="304 857 1326 1160">• In France, railways helped to modernise backward regions. The central government department brought in British engineers and workers, handled much of the construction work, provided engineering expertise and planning, land acquisition, and construction of permanent infrastructure such as the track bed, bridges, and tunnels. Much of the equipment was imported from Britain and therefore did not stimulate machinery makers. The system did help modernise the parts of rural France it reached, but it did not always help create local industrial centres. <li data-bbox="304 1160 1326 1261">• They helped to promote a national market for raw materials, wines, cheeses, and imported manufactured products. The major effects of the railway system were probably political and military rather than economic. <li data-bbox="304 1261 1326 1400">• Other infrastructure needs in rural areas in France and other European countries, such as better roads and canals, were neglected because of the expense of the railways, so there is a view that there were net negative effects in areas not served by the railway networks. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
33	<p>Which is more remarkable: the speed of colonisation after 1870 or the speed of decolonisation after 1945?</p> <p>The speed and scale of the new imperialism after c.1870 might be seen as remarkable because the imperial powers were so willing to take on responsibility for ruling considerable areas of the world for reasons which were not all directly linked with the economic self-interest that had driven colonial ventures.</p> <p>What was remarkable was the popular enthusiasm for colonisation and the domestic and strategic considerations which drove expensive expeditions, costly administration and development and dangerous confrontations. What was also remarkable was the speed of decolonisation was that the abandonment of what had become so quickly entrenched as vital for the mother countries came about with relatively little public debate. Entrenched attitudes to entitlement and racial superiority gave way to more realistic assessments of the cost and impracticability in maintaining colonies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Imperialism was predominately centred on Africa and Asia and involved European powers in greater formal control. It was made possible by better technology – the Suez Canal and steamships. • The new telegraph system made better links with the home country and new medical knowledge lessened the risk from tropical disease. As the new ‘scramble’ for colonies lacked effective regulation, it created conflicts which in turn encouraged imperial expansion for protection of borders. • Some areas were developed and defended for reasons of trade and economic gain. Others like British Egypt because it dominated a key communications route – the Suez Canal. The Belgian Congo was developed predominantly for economic profit. Countries valued fuelling bases on strategic routes. In some cases, colonisation was a result of powerful pressure groups. • Domestic considerations such as with Bismarck’s colonial acquisitions could be important; Disraeli’s Imperialism was seen as popular, but also dominated by ‘the men on the spot’ who forced their government’s hand. • The desire for international prestige – such as French and Italian colonisation. • Remarkable was a sense of civilizing mission, often linked to religion.; the need for capital investment outlets; the impact of the 1873 downturn in the European economy; enthusiastic local imperialists; mass communications informing a nationalist public of colonial adventures and opportunities. • Greater weaponry such as the machine gun facilitated victories. This remarkable imbalance between European military resources and those of the inhabitants of the targeted areas added imperial growth. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
33	<p>Features of rapid decolonisation might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing global contexts (The Cold War, attitudes of USSR and especially USA). • The costs of empires – military, policing, administrative, investment opportunities – can be assessed. • The emergence of anti-colonial superpowers and the UN. • The rise of effective organised opposition (e.g., in Indochina, Indonesia), the growth of militant nationalism. • Domestic issues (e.g., post-war socialism, right wing reappraisal, anti-imperial, moral pressures), unrest and violence (e.g., Algeria, Central Africa). <p>It could be argued that the rapid change in the international context was more remarkable after 1945 as there had been a residual interest in imperialism before 1870 so the change to more formal and larger scale acquisition was not as rapid as the change brought about by the emergence of superpowers opposed to colonisation after 1945.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
34	<p>Was democracy as a political theory more challenged in the nineteenth century or the twentieth century?</p> <p>In the nineteenth century democracy was challenged both by traditional conservatism and liberalism and leading theorists like Marx offered a different kind of social democracy. But the way that Marxism was developed by Lenin and the emergence of fascist ideologies may have presented a greater challenge because they had populist elements while undermining parliamentary democracy. On the other hand, it might be argued that the elitist challenges of the nineteenth century were more profound as the role of the people whether the proletariat or the racial majority was more downplayed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the earlier nineteenth century, the association of democracy as a theory was linked to the French Revolution and this provided a considerable challenge. • Liberalism then saw democracy as associated with counter revolution in the form of plebiscites. • More democratic theory had become acceptable by the later nineteenth century but opposition to women's rights and ongoing association with taxation as being necessary for representation challenged democratic idealism. • However, democracy had come to be seen as a more positive form of government by the early twentieth century but in its manifestation as parliamentary democracy it came under serious challenge from Communist and Fascist theory. • Both centuries offered a deeper challenge than the reactionary anti-Revolutionary ideas of the previous century because dictatorship was justified by either class or racial theories. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
35	<p>‘Urbanisation since 1750 has brought more problems than benefits for Europeans.’ Discuss</p> <p>Discussion could take account of different phases of urban growth – the expansion in the 1750–1850 period brought public health problems, overcrowding and crime but also opened up more employment and a richer cultural life and public architecture and facilities. After 1850 with more provision for sanitation, and in many cities a grand public architecture and galleries and concert halls developed, so the balance might swing towards benefits, with diverse employment and suburban development mitigating inner city overcrowding. In the twentieth century, urbanisation brought problems of pollution and inner-city deprivation and low-quality high-rise housing, but also varied cultural life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of benefits candidates could discuss the economic effects of urban growth – the need for labour and resources for building, the pull of urban markets on the surrounding countryside. • The employment possibilities in towns as well as the concentration of urban labour and the dangers of recession might be considered. • In social terms, the diversity of urban centres, the opportunity for social development and cultural opportunities could be discussed. • Europe’s eighteenth-century cities saw fine classical architecture and public buildings – St Petersburg for example or Georgian Bath. The cities saw opera houses and theatres and pleasure gardens and parks. However, they also saw overcrowded tenements and ‘stews’. • There was a development of high culture. The link between urbanisation and the greater book production, for instance in eighteenth century Paris. • The stimulus for improved transport might be identified. • Against that, the problems of coping with large development and influx of population in terms of public health and infrastructure could be considered. • The political dangers of oversized capitals with areas of transient population subject to food distribution problems and cyclical unemployment – the Faubourgs of Paris, for example, and the diffusion of radical ideas and literature could be seen as a disadvantage for rulers. • The rise of the urban mob as a phenomenon and the growth of crime and prostitution in overcrowded urban areas; as well as the increased dangers of plague and fire. • Suburban growth and the neglect of inner cities might be considered. 	