

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/22

Paper 2 (Outline Study), maximum raw mark 60

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

Generic levels of response

Part (a)

Level 4: Evaluates factors [9–10]

Answers are well focused and identify and explain a range of factors. Answers are supported by precise evidence and demonstrate clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers consider the relative significance of factors and reach a supported conclusion.

Level 3: Explains factors [6–8]

Answers demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations, supported by relevant and detailed information. Answers are clearly expressed. Candidates may attempt to reach a judgement about the significance of factors but this may not be effectively supported.

Level 2: Describes factors [3–5]

Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers are either entirely descriptive in approach with few explicit links to the question or they provide some explanation which is supported by information which is limited in range and depth.

Level 1: Describes the topic/issue [1–2]

Answers contain some relevant material but are descriptive in nature, making little reference to causation. Answers may be assertive or generalised. The response is limited in development.

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content [0]

Part (b)

Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement [18–20]

Answers are well focused and closely argued. Arguments are supported by precisely selected evidence. They will lead to a relevant conclusion / judgement which is developed and supported. They will be fluent and well organised.

Level 4: Responses which develop a balanced argument [15–17]

Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. They will begin to form a judgement in response to the question. At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.

Level 3: Responses which begin to develop assessment [10–14]

Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, supported by relevant and appropriately selected evidence. However, these answers are likely to lack depth and / or balance. Answers will be generally coherent and well organised.

Level 2: Responses which show some understanding of the question [6–9]

Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will be either entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support.

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

Level 1: Descriptive or partial responses

[1–5]

Answers may contain descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question. They may only address part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment on the question which lacks detailed factual support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. Answers may be fragmentary and disjointed.

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content

[0]

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

- (a) **Why were there dangers to the French Revolution from the counter-revolutionaries from 1789 to 1795?** [10]

The simplest answer is that the counter-revolutionaries opposed the Revolution, but this must be expanded and varied to gain credit. Virtually everybody in 1789 recognised that something had to be done to address France's problems, but different solutions were advocated. The aims of the two highest estates that became the bedrock of the counter-revolutionaries, the Church and the nobility, can be explained. Although most of these estates opposed the revolution from its inception, some aristocrats and some churchmen became more extreme and violent. For example, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790) was a turning point for most clergy and many lay people. There was resistance in the provinces whose populations opposed the Revolution as dominated by Parisians crushing provincial freedoms. They were willing to use violence against the Revolution. The émigrés will be very relevant. 'Counter-revolutionary' became synonymous with monarchism. With the advent of Robespierre's Jacobins, people who did not express positive support for the revolution became regarded as a counter-revolutionary. Note that the term 'counter-revolutionary' is not often used for Louis XVI himself in secondary sources. A discussion of the King will be relevant but should not be regarded as a gap if omitted.

- (b) **Analyse the ways by which Napoleon was able to increase his authority over France as First Consul from 1799 to 1804.** [20]

Napoleon's authority was established by the Constitution of 1799. He became First Consul, outstripping the other two consuls. He also had the power to appoint ministers and lesser officials. There were representative assemblies in the Tribune and Legislature but they were tightly controlled by Napoleon. His prefects controlled the provinces. There was a façade of democracy in plebiscites, but they were carefully controlled by Napoleon. Candidates can explain his role in drawing up the Code. He drew up the agenda, attended regularly the sessions that approved it and made his views clear. Less formal but still important methods can be explained. Censorship and a police system enhanced his authority. Propaganda, including the supervision of the media and the encouragement of suitable public works, can be referred to. In addition, the policies pursued by Napoleon were mostly popular and won him support. The popularity and authority of his rule were contrasts to the instability since 1789. There might be unconnected – but not irrelevant – description of Napoleon's policies that might deserve a mark in the middle levels. These might indicate good answers but they should not be undervalued.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Why did changes in roads and canals encourage the Industrial Revolution in Britain? [10]

Focussing on reasons, candidates might explain the links between improvements in communications and industrial developments. Candidates might point out that railways resulted in greater changes, but this is appropriate only for an introduction or conclusion and should not be part of the main argument. Before the Industrial Revolution, transport depended on roads and rivers. Both fitted the needs of pre-industrial conditions but not industrial change. The turnpikes and more especially the canals in Britain provided for carriage of greater bulk and created links between more distant places. Canals were less expensive than roads and could be linked to seaports. They were the first step towards national systems of transport and communications. On the continent, rivers were more important but their usefulness depended on natural conditions. For example, in Germany some of the largest rivers pointed in the 'wrong' direction: south-north rather than east-west. France relied mostly on rivers rather than canals and there was little improvement in rivers. By contrast, canals became a major feature in Britain. By c.1800 canals had contributed to the development of many industrial areas in the north-west, north-east and midlands. They provided links with London.

(b) Assess the claim that the middle classes benefited most from the Industrial Revolution by 1850. Refer to any two countries in your answer. [20]

There is a comparative element in the question: benefited most? Well argued alternatives will be accepted, especially the working classes. A strong case can be made in favour of the middle classes. From being a small group, they expanded in numbers and wealth as employment opportunities increased. They included industrialists, investors, bankers, ship-owners and merchants as well as lawyers. Whilst all of these groups benefited from the Industrial Revolution, some did particularly well, such as the bankers and large merchants. These resembled the aristocracy in their life-styles. They benefited in other ways. In Britain and France they achieved some political influence by the middle of the century: less so in Germany. Their children had more educational opportunities. In discussing the working classes, candidates might note the benefits of employment. Most were not so prone to seasonal or periodic unemployment as in agrarian economies. Housing was a problem: not its availability but its quality. Some might point to the disadvantages of employment for women and children, but some answers might consider whether conditions for these groups were much worse than in pre-industrial economies. In social terms, the nobility retained its importance but the gap was diminishing between the nobility and the upper middle class.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

3 The Origins of World War I, c.1900–1914

(a) Why was there instability in the Balkans from c.1900 to 1914? [10]

Answers should focus on the reasons for the instability in the Balkans. Three major reasons might be identified: the decline in the Ottoman Empire, the growth of newly independent countries and the concerns of Austria and Russia as well as the consequent concerns of Germany and France. Of these, candidates are not expected to have knowledge of Ottoman decline but should appreciate its effects in creating a power vacuum. New states such as Bulgaria, Montenegro and Serbia wished to preserve their independence and even to enlarge their influence. Austrian and Russian interests in the Balkans can be explained, as well as the reasons why other major European countries became concerned. Attention can be given to the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and the Balkan Wars (1908–09). Some answers might be limited to accounts of the 1914 Sarajevo Crisis. It might be difficult for such answers to be awarded the highest mark but they should not be undervalued if the issues at stake are explained clearly.

(b) ‘France was most responsible for the outbreak of World War I.’ How far do you agree with this judgement? [20]

The question asks which country was most responsible for World War I, and answers which focus on judgement rather than descriptive narratives will attract high marks. Candidates can suggest alternatives but should show an awareness of the case for or against French responsibility when preferring an alternative. The case for France’s primary responsibility depends on France’s wish for revenge against Germany for the defeat in 1870–71. France’s strengthening of its army persuaded Germany that it would soon present a greater danger. Diplomatically, France was linked to powerful countries in Russia and Britain and did nothing to curb these countries in the crises that led to a general European war.

A contrary view might argue that the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine was no longer a priority for France. It is possible to argue that France feared another German attack. It will be relevant to discuss the responsibilities of other countries, but again with an emphasis on explanation and judgement. Germany’s war plans revolved around co-ordinated attacks on France in the west and Russia in the east. This would result in a general European war. Other countries, including the other members of the Triple Entente, were uncertain about Britain’s intentions. Some have argued that Germany misjudged British policies, whilst it might also be argued that Britain could have done more to head off the crisis. Austrian policies can be assessed as well as those of Serbia, although it is difficult to argue that Serbia wished to spark off a European-wide crisis.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why was World War I an important reason for two revolutions in Russia in 1917? [10]

Answers might be expected to recognise common and different factors affecting the February and October revolutions. A common reason is that the war went badly. Defeat bred disenchantment with government. Conduct of the war exposed the inadequacies of the leadership of both Nicholas II and Kerensky. Better answers will see some differences. Nicholas II took personal charge of the war in 1915. Loyal soldiers became unreliable. After the February Revolution there were widespread demands for an end to the war. The Provisional government took the unpopular decision to continue the war, probably to support allies since perhaps withdrawal might mean that its allies would halt more loans and investments in Russia. The war effort continued unsuccessfully, but the army now had stronger political feelings that Lenin and the Bolsheviks exploited. Peace would be the key to domestic reforms in land and food supplies. The war broke down domestic communications and government efficiency, making room for the rise of the Soviets. Lenin's ability to forge an alliance between the Bolsheviks, Soviets and the army was to be crucial in October. Candidates can consider other factors but should make them relevant to the key issue by linking them to the issue of the war.

(b) 'Nicholas II was popular with most Russians during the period up to 1914.' How far do you agree with this claim? [20]

It is important that candidates recognise 1914 as the end point. 1914–17, if given any attention, should be limited to brief comments in an introduction or conclusion. The assessment of support means that candidates can deal with problems for the Tsar but the priority should be the support that he enjoyed. During the relevant period, few challenged his authority. The political classes were either conservative – even reactionary – or liberal but basically loyal. The Tsar's unwillingness to accept reform, as in his dealings with the Duma, did not result in widespread opposition by 1914. He could rely on the army and police to keep control, although strikes and other evidence of civil unrest continued. The Tsar was personally cold and distant towards the general population but, within the relevant period, this probably added to his mystique and did little to curb his popularity.

The Russian Orthodox Church was a powerful ally, especially because of its influence with the peasantry. Russians were not in a majority but they generally supported the policy of Russification. The economy showed some signs of improvement. Stolypin made enemies and lacked support from Nicholas II, but there were some who welcomed the minister's policies for land reform, religious toleration and greater self-government for national minorities. In pointing out the limits of popularity or support for the Tsar, candidates can explain the radicals such as the Bolsheviks. But Lenin did not foresee an early revolution. Overall, tsarism seemed the natural way of government in Russia where few were aware of alternatives. Most candidates will see the alternatives as popular or unpopular, and this can merit any mark. But high credit might be given to answers that offer other alternatives, for example, respected, revered.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

Section B: American Option

The History of the USA, 1840–1941

5 The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

(a) Why, in 1846, did the USA declare war on Mexico? [10]

The war with Mexico was known as ‘Mr Polk’s war’. President Polk declared war on Mexico – or rather the US Congress did – because he wanted to gain lands from Mexico. Exactly which lands became clearer only as the war progressed. The specific dispute which sparked war in May 1846 was the 100–150 mile strip between two rivers, the Nueces and the Rio Grande. Nueces was the existing border between Mexico and Texas, a state which had joined the USA in 1845 after breaking away from Mexico in 1836. In May 1846, Polk ordered US troops to advance from the Nueces to the north bank of the Rio Grande. Mexican forces then crossed to the north bank. There was a clash of forces. Polk could claim ‘American blood has been shed on American soil’ and asked Congress to support further military action against Mexico. There was no Mexican threat to American interests or territory. Polk had provoked war.

An important dimension of this conflict was the issue of slavery in the USA. Keeping the balance between slave and free states was proving harder as the Missouri Compromise line of 36° 30’ enabled more free states than slave states to be created. After absorbing Texas as a slave state, taking Mexican lands below the Compromise line would enable more slave states to be formed. This is why many in the North opposed the war. President Polk was from Tennessee, a slave state; his parents had been slave-owners.

(b) How far were the motives for waging war against Native Americans in the period from 1840 to 1890 economic? [20]

Economic motives mean the acquisition of resources needed to produce goods and services, to increase the wealth of the new Americans. The main economic resource provided by Native Americans was neither men nor finance; it was land and the minerals which many of those lands contained, gold and silver being the most obvious. While Native Americans were initially involved in prospecting for gold in 1848, they were soon pushed aside by Americans arriving from the East. The Mariposa War of 1850–1 resulted in Indian tribes being confined to reservations. By 1860, though there were no more wars, the number of Californian Indians was around one-quarter of what it had been 15–20 years before. Other examples of gold discoveries leading to wars with Native Americans include Colorado in 1858 and the Black Hills of Dakota in 1874. Even reservations were not safe from Americans wanting these metals. Thus there are clear economic motives for many of the Indian wars.

If not for precious minerals, wars were often fought either to control the lands needed for agriculture, whether cattle or arable, or to develop the new railroads. Both were essentially economic. There were, however, other motives, best described as political, which in essence is the desire to assert power, to enforce the superiority of the new Americans. This especially applies to wars concerning previously-negotiated treaties, which either needed enforcing or to be changed to suit American interests. Almost all wars after 1865 had these motives, at least in part.

Finally, cultural motives were also a factor behind the wars. New Americans, believing in their manifest destiny to control America, could justify wars as being necessary to break Native American Indian resistance to white rule and thus enable them to become more civilised.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why was the South unable to capitalise on its early successes in the Civil War? [10]

The successes included the two battles at Bull Run in 1861 and 1862. The battle of Antietam in September 1862 was more a Northern success, but Fredericksburg in December 1862 still saw Northern forces heavily defeated. After eighteen months of war, the South, the smaller of the two forces, was far from being defeated. Within six months it had lost that advantage. In the West, the North had gained control of Vicksburg, ensuring that the South lost control of the Mississippi, while in the East the battle of Gettysburg was a major setback. Thereafter, the North always had the upper hand. The reasons why the South failed to press home the advantages of 1861–2 have been the subject of much historical debate. Options which cover the South include: Lee's poor military leadership, his offensive-defensive strategy resulting in too many casualties; Davis's poor political leadership (especially when compared with Lincoln's); inability to mobilise fully, for example, by using slaves; the confederate nature of the Confederacy, meaning a lack of unity and will to win; the failure to gain the support of Britain and France. These weaknesses need placing alongside the North's growing strength of manpower and *materiel*.

(b) How far do you agree that Lincoln's leadership was a major reason why the North achieved such limited success in the first two years of the Civil War? [20]

Until Gettysburg and Vicksburg in July 1863, the Civil War did not go well for the Unionists. The South invaded Northern territory in both 1862 and 1863 – albeit briefly. The North had more states, more men and more resources. Why then did it do so poorly? One reason might be Lincoln. The presidency meant that he was both political and military leader of the North. He lacked any great experience of Washington politics and had only the most minimal experience of military affairs. The latter is usually highlighted by the several Generals-in-Chief he appointed in those first two years – Winfield Scott, McClellan and Halleck – before sticking with Halleck until Grant took over in March 1864.

Lincoln's relations with McClellan were especially difficult. He interfered with the conduct of some his campaigns, which was bound to lead to confusion. Certainly Scott and McClellan were cautious strategists, unlikely to achieve any dramatic battlefield success, and unable to match the military leadership of Lee and Jackson for the Confederates. Appointing Grant earlier was not really possible, especially given his reputation among other generals. Lincoln often appointed what were called 'political generals', those who represented particular groups in Northern society rather than those with military expertise, which did little to ensure military success – though they did ensure a more representative force. The limited Northern success was mainly a result of the combination of two elements: an over-cautious military strategy necessitated by the balance of political forces in Washington DC plus the skilled and more aggressive military leadership of the South. Lincoln was intelligent enough to learn the lessons of these years and apply them in the second half of the Civil War.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Why was prohibition introduced?

[10]

Prohibition was introduced in 1919 when the eighteenth Amendment was finally approved. Its passage resulted from a range of factors, political, social and cultural. The political was a very effective campaign carried out by the Anti-Saloon League (ASL) with Wayne Wheeler as its most effective leader. The ASL, a grass-roots organisation, used the new mass media such as advertisements and the yellow press to lobby politicians into supporting the 'dry' campaign. The ASL and other organisations, for example, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, gained support from certain sections of US society. Evangelical Protestants were very keen on prohibition as was the rural South. These groups tended to identify alcohol production and consumption with immigrant communities such as the Germans and the Irish. The Germans produced most of the beer, the Irish drank it. In the early twentieth century, two other arguments became important. One was 'national efficiency', the loss of production resulting from the alcohol-induced excesses of factory workers. The other was an anti-German feeling that developed during the First World War. Making beer became unpatriotic. These various forces lasted long enough after the end of the war for federal and state politicians to agree to the eighteenth Amendment.

(b) How far did the USA benefit from the mass immigration of the late nineteenth century?

[20]

Between 1865 and 1900, some 13 million people emigrated to America, mostly from Europe. By 1900, one third of Americans were immigrants or children of immigrants. In some major cities the figures reached 70%. The peak was reached in the 1880s, a decade when the economy boomed. Migrants from Europe were encouraged. However, in 1882 the US Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, banning all Chinese labourers from entering the USA. Passed in response to political pressure from California, this act showed that some Americans believed that some immigration brought no benefits to the USA. Rather they thought that mass immigration resulted in lower wages for working men.

Immigration from Europe provoked less opposition, especially in boom times. Most immigrants went to the industrial cities of the North and Mid-West, where they provided the work force for manufacturing industries such as steel. There can be little doubt that this immigrant workforce greatly helped the industrialisation of the USA in the later nineteenth century. Their contribution to American society is more problematic. They lived in ghettos of overcrowded tenement blocks, exploited by private landlords, sometimes resorting to organised crime such as the Italian Black Hand in the 1880s. In addition, these immigrant communities could become beholden to party bosses, such as Boss Tweed in New York in the 1860s. The impact on US culture of 'hyphenated Americans' was to become considerable, though more in the twentieth century than the late nineteenth.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929–1941

(a) Why did the US economy return to recession in 1937? [10]

Also known as the Roosevelt recession, the economic downturn of 1937 was, in the context of the Great Depression, what would now be called a 'double-dip recession'. Profits fell, investment fell and unemployment rose again. Four years of growth came to an end. Why? There are broadly three explanations, one political, one economic, the third a combination of the two. The political explanation, believed by Roosevelt, was that the recession was a conspiracy by a 'modern industrial oligarchy' against the New Deal. Key businesses had cut investment and profits and laid off workers in protest against the New Deal in an attempt to undermine it. The economic explanation was that the recession was simply the workings of the business cycle: after four years of economic growth, some contraction was unavoidable. The combined explanation was that the deflationary policies of the federal government caused the recession. Monetary policy was tightened by the Federal Reserve and fiscal policy was tightened by the administration. The latter involved both cutting expenditure, especially by the WPA and the PWA, and increasing taxes, in the form of payments for the new Social Security, first payable in January 1937.

(b) How justified is the view that, of all the groups opposing the New Deal, opposition from left-wing liberals was the most effective? [20]

Labelling the different opposition groups in terms of political ideologies is hard, especially given that the US two-party system does not neatly fit the left-right spectrum anyway. Most of the criticism of the New Deal in the mid-1930s came from new organisations usually built around a charismatic figure. The best known national movements were the National Union for Social Justice, built on the leadership of Father Coughlin, the radio priest, and Share Our Wealth, established by Huey Long, a Democratic Senator. They were populist mass movements which usually wanted social reform to benefit the people. Speaking in 1935, Roosevelt himself said, 'I am fighting Communism, Huey Longism, Coughlinism and Townsendism'.

In 1936, these three movements came together to form the Union Party to contest the presidential election. It gained less than one million votes. It is argued, however, that the threat posed by these groups to Roosevelt was such that he adapted his policies to address some of their demands, the clearest example being his plans for a Wealth Tax. Those plans did not come to much after the election, however. Some commentators go further, arguing that most of the Second New Deal was a response to these mass movements, for example, Social Security was first proposed by Francis Townsend. Whether these groups can be described as left wing is another matter. Huey Long probably was. Father Coughlin, however, was anti-communist and thus more right wing. Clearly on the right was the American Liberty League, formed in 1934 by conservative Democrats and leading businessmen. Of all the opposition groups, the Liberty League was perhaps the most effective, if only because it turned to the US Supreme Court to declare much New Deal legislation unconstitutional. The Supreme Court itself does not count as an opposition group.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 12 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did Britain and Japan form an alliance in 1902? [10]

Although potential rivals as a result of their interests in the Far East, both Britain and Japan had clear motives for forming this unlikely alliance, which guaranteed both countries' neutrality if either were to be involved in war.

Japan's motives – Japan's expansionist ambitions in the Far East were being thwarted by the major European powers, especially Russia. For example, Japan was forced to give Port Arthur (gained in the Shimonoseki Treaty of 1895) to Russia following the Triple Intervention of Russia, France and Germany. Russia's interest in the area caused both alarm and resentment in Japan, especially when, in 1902, Russia occupied the whole of Manchuria. The alliance with Britain was the first time that Japan had been recognised as an equal by a major European power. It clearly established Japan's emergence as a global power, and gave it the strength to tackle Russia through negotiations and, subsequently, war.

British motives – In the late 19th century, Britain had followed a policy of 'splendid isolation', concentrating on the development of its own empire. This policy ended in the early 20th century, when Britain began to feel isolated and vulnerable. Russian expansionism in the Far East posed a threat to British interests there. German naval expansion was also a threat to Britain. While the German navy was largely based in the North Sea, the British fleet was widely dispersed across the globe. As a result of the alliance, Japan agreed to use its fleet to help protect British interests in the Far East. It marked the end of Britain's isolationist policy, leading to subsequent ententes with France (1904) and Russia (1907).

(b) To what extent was rivalry between France and Germany the biggest threat to international peace in the period from 1871 to 1914? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that France greatly resented its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. It feared Germany would be likely to seek revenge. Fully aware of this and conscious of the vulnerability of Germany's geographical location, Bismarck's foreign policy was based on the desire to ensure German security and, in particular, to isolate France. It was for this reason that Bismarck negotiated a series of defensive alliances – the Dreikaiserbund (1873), the Dual Alliance (1879), the Triple Alliance (1882) and the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia (1887). Fear of isolation and the threat posed by Germany led France to seek alliances with Russia (Dual Entente 1894) and Britain (Entente Cordiale 1904). Rivalry between France and Germany was, therefore, the main reason why the rival alliance systems came into existence, and it was those systems which led to the outbreak of WWI.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that other factors were more significant as threats to peace during the period from 1871 to 1914. For example:

- The rise of nationalism and the threat which this posed to the Habsburg Empire
- Rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans. Russian determination to maintain its warm water access from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles came into conflict with Austria-Hungary's desire to maintain the integrity of its empire

| | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 13 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

- Germany's more aggressive foreign policy after Bismarck's dismissal in 1890, which caused alarm in other major European nations. Britain, for example, ended its policy of 'splendid isolation' and forged alliances with Japan (1902), France (1904) and Russia (1907)
- The growth of Japanese power in the Far East, which was seen as a threat to European and American interests in the region, as evidenced by the Russo-Japanese War
- The increasing military preparations carried out by all major European countries
- Imperial rivalry.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 14 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did the USA refuse to ratify the Paris Peace Settlement? [10]

US President Wilson had played a leading role in the negotiations which took place at the Paris Peace Settlement. It is ironic, therefore, that the USA refused to ratify the settlement. Involvement in WWI had become increasingly unpopular in the USA. The Republican Party, the political opponents of Wilson's Democratic Party, was heavily against American involvement in the Paris peace talks, believing that these were essentially a European matter. By the time Wilson arrived in Paris, the Republican Party held a majority in the Senate. As Theodore Roosevelt, his political opponent, pointed out '*Our allies and our enemies and Mr Wilson himself should all understand that Mr Wilson has no authority to speak for the American people at this time*'. Tired of war and determined not to become involved in another, most Americans were convinced that the USA should return to its traditional isolationist policy, in particular avoiding all involvement in European affairs. The Republicans were convinced that the peace treaty negotiated in Paris would not bring about lasting peace and that rivalry between the major European powers would re-emerge. By ratifying the treaty, the USA would effectively be committing itself to upholding its terms, which, most Americans believed, would sooner or later result in the USA becoming involved in another war.

(b) To what extent did the Paris Peace Settlement make a future war more rather than less likely? [20]

In terms of more likely, it could be argued that the settlement was a series of compromises which satisfied no-one. Germany was angered by its harsh terms, Soviet Russia felt resentful and isolated since it was never invited, France felt it was too lenient on Germany and feared its resurgence, Italy felt betrayed by it and the USA disowned it entirely. The settlement left some 30 million people living under foreign rule and created a number of 'new' states which were both vulnerable and economically weak. Setting German reparations at such a high figure was bound to cause problems (for example, French occupation of the Ruhr) and increase tensions. Border disputes began almost immediately and continued throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Hitler was able to exploit the weaknesses of the settlement during the 1930s. The League of Nations, which was established by the settlement, proved to be weak and ineffective.

In terms of less likely, it could be argued that the settlement was the best that could be agreed at the end of WWI. The peacemakers had little option but to recognise situations which had already occurred due to the disintegration of the Habsburg, Turkish and Russian empires. Although tensions remained, these were gradually overcome during the 1920s – for example, Dawes and Young Plans to ease the problems caused by reparations, Locarno Treaties, improved relations between France and Germany, early successes of the League of Nations in dealing with border disputes. Despite its inevitable weaknesses, the settlement provided a framework within which the major European nations could work to overcome disputes and reduce tensions. The main threat to future peace came not from the terms of the settlement, but from the economic problems which beset the world in the 1920s and 1930s – problems which bred ultra-nationalism and fascism.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 15 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Mussolini sign the Pact of Steel with Germany in 1939? [10]

Between 1923 and 1934, Mussolini had adopted a diplomatic approach to foreign policy and had become widely respected abroad. Initially fearful of Germany's revival under Hitler, Mussolini had sent Italian troops to prevent a German invasion of Austria in 1934. However, by 1934 he had made little progress towards achieving the ambitious aims he had established when he came to power (restoration of Italy's greatness etc.). With Italy suffering from a severe depression and Mussolini's popularity amongst Italians faltering, there was a clear need for some spectacular success overseas – a propaganda boost. Therefore, in 1935, he ordered the invasion of Abyssinia. The League of Nations did little except impose minor sanctions. Ineffective though these were, they annoyed Mussolini. He withdrew Italy from the League and reversed his former policy towards Hitler. In 1936, Mussolini formed the Rome-Berlin Axis with Hitler and, the following year, joined the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany and Japan. Mussolini was now determined to be seen as a conquering hero, leading Italy back to its former glories, as evidenced by the invasion of Albania (1939). Italy's close links with Hitler's Germany were formalised by the signing of the Pact of Steel in May 1939, by which Italy was now committed to providing Germany with full military support in the event of war. Many Italian politicians opposed this, but Mussolini was now determined to pursue a glorious and aggressive foreign policy.

(b) To what extent was Hitler responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War? [20]

Arguments suggesting Hitler's personal culpability might include:

- His determination to 'right the wrongs' of the Treaty of Versailles and to restore Germany to its former greatness
- His devious and calculated foreign policy, based on a combination of threats and conciliatory statements
- His carefully planned isolation of potential targets. For example, the non-aggression treaty with Poland in 1934, which guaranteed Polish neutrality if Germany decided to attack Austria or Czechoslovakia and provided Britain with evidence of his peaceful intentions. He reassured France following return of the Saar to Germany as a result of the 1935 plebiscite that this ended all grievances between Germany and France. The Anglo-German naval agreement in 1935 with the aim of further weakening the Stresa Front against Germany. His bluff over the occupation of the Rhineland in 1936. Forming the Rome-Berlin Axis in 1936 to ensure that Mussolini would not interfere with his plans for Austria. The false promises which he made to Chamberlain at Munich in 1938. Signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 to ensure that Stalin would not interfere with his plans for Poland
- His long-term aim to achieve lebensraum.

Conversely, it could be argued that other factors were more responsible for leading to WWII. For example:

- The Treaty of Versailles left Germany resentful of its harsh terms, yet with the potential to recover and seek revenge
- The Paris Peace Settlement left millions of people living under foreign rule and created new, vulnerable and unsustainable nation states
- Weaknesses in the League of Nations which prevented it from dealing with issues effectively
- The USA's post-WWI return to isolationism
- Fear of another major war, leading to appeasement and a willingness to justify Hitler's actions

| | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 16 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

- Self-interest of other countries – for example, Italy (Mussolini seeking glory); USSR (Stalin condemning Poland by signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact to buy time to prepare for the German invasion he expected); Britain (with a vested interest in the resurgence of a strong German economy)
- World economic problems following the Wall Street Crash, leading to ultra-nationalism.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 17 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014 | 9389 | 22 |

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why did the popularity of the Kuomintang in China decline during the 1930s? [10]

The KMT's popularity had been founded on Sun Yat-sen's three principles (nationalism, democracy and land reform), as a result of which it had gained the support of the CCP. Much of the KMT's support had come from peasants and factory workers, attracted by the promises of land redistribution and industrial cooperatives. The KMT's leader, Chiang Kai-shek, though a staunch nationalist, was opposed to such measures. In 1927, he began a 'purification movement', ending the KMT's alliance with the CCP. This undermined the support which the KMT had received from those attracted by the CCP's socialist policies.

Once in power, the KMT proved a disappointment to the vast majority of Chinese. It quickly became clear that the KMT's priority was to protect the interests of rich businessmen, bankers, industrialists and landowners. Making little attempt to organise mass support, the KMT government proved both inefficient and corrupt. Conditions in factories remained poor; those laws which were passed to protect workers were rarely enforced and factory inspectors were easily bribed. There was no redistribution of land; droughts and bad harvests in the 1930s caused considerable distress to peasants, while rich landowners and merchants profited by stockpiling wheat and rice. Although some progress was made in the building of roads and schools, the vast majority of Chinese people gained little under the KMT government.

(b) To what extent was the Japanese takeover of Manchuria in 1931 due to economic factors? [20]

In support of the view that the invasion was due to economic factors, it could be argued that, as a small resource-poor country with a rapidly growing population, Japan needed to find new sources of raw materials and new markets for its industrial output. Manchuria offered both, particularly its abundant supplies of coal and iron ore. Japan realised that it needed to become economically self-sufficient – this would be essential in the event of a future war in order to ensure that Japan could not be blockaded into submission. The economic boom which Japan had enjoyed during WWI had ended by 1921, leading to unemployment and social upheaval. In addition, the Chinese were trying to reduce Japanese influence over trade and business in Manchuria. To many Japanese, the invasion of Manchuria provided the opportunity to solve Japan's economic problems.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the invasion owed more to political factors. There was growing resentment directed towards Japan's politicians and government. Japan's flirtation with democracy had, it was widely believed, led to weak, corrupt and ineffective government. Powerful military leaders were angry with the government's decision to agree to limit Japan's military strength at the Washington Conference, and appalled by its determination to press ahead with cuts to the army and navy. Popular opinion in Japan was becoming increasingly ultra-nationalistic, and people resented the government's willingness to make agreements with the USA and European nations. Attempts by factory workers and farmers to form political organisations were systematically suppressed by the government. To Japan's military leadership, 1931 seemed the ideal opportunity to expand Japanese influence in the region. China was distracted by terrible floods, while Europe and the USA were busy dealing with their own economic problems. Manchuria was, therefore, seen as an easy target, while the campaign was seen as a way of undermining an unpopular government.