



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9389/21

Paper 2 Outline Study 21

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **20** printed pages.

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.

| 1–12(a) | Generic Levels of Response | Marks |
|---------|---|-------------|
| | <p>Level 4: Evaluates factors Answers are well focused and explain a range of factors supported by relevant information. Answers demonstrate a clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers consider the relative significance of factors and reach a supported conclusion.</p> | 9–10 |
| | <p>Level 3: Explains factor(s) Answers demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers include explained factor(s) supported by relevant information. Candidates may attempt to reach a judgement about the significance of factors but this may not be effectively supported.</p> | 6–8 |
| | <p>Level 2: Describes factor(s) Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. (They address causation.) Answers are may be entirely descriptive in approach with description of factor(s).</p> | 3–5 |
| | <p>Level 1: Describes the topic/issue Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation.</p> | 1–2 |
| | <p>Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content</p> | 0 |

| 1–12(b) | Generic Levels of Response | Marks |
|---------|--|--------------|
| | <p>Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement Answers are well focused and closely argued. <i>(Answers show a maintained and complete understanding of the question.)</i> Answers are supported by precisely selected evidence. Answers lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported.</p> | 18–20 |
| | <p>Level 4: Responses which develop a balanced argument Answers show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. Answers develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. Answers may begin to form a judgement in response to the question. <i>(At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.)</i></p> | 15–17 |
| | <p>Level 3: Responses which begin to develop assessment Answers show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. Answers provide some assessment, supported by relevant and appropriately selected evidence. However, these answers are likely to lack depth of evidence and/or balance.</p> | 10–14 |
| | <p>Level 2: Responses which show some understanding of the question Answers show some understanding of the focus of the question. They are either entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support.</p> | 6–9 |
| | <p>Level 1: Descriptive or partial responses Answers contain descriptive material about the topic which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment on the question which lacks support. Answers may be fragmentary and disjointed.</p> | 1–5 |
| | <p>Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content</p> | 0 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1(a) | <p>Why did Louis XVI oppose demands for reform in 1789?</p> <p>Reasons for his reluctance to reform might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louis had taken a solemn coronation oath promising to uphold the Ancien Regime. • He was a profound conservative and a believer in the Divine Right of Kings. • His influential wife was opposed to any change, as were many of the courtiers who surrounded him at Versailles. • Many amongst the clergy and nobility, the first and second Estates, were also opposed to any change. • The enormity of the many demands for change was also a factor as well as his unwillingness to take decisions. • He was too easily influenced by those who surrounded him and incapable of following through any serious programme of change. | 10 |
| 1(b) | <p>‘The counter-revolutionaries failed through poor leadership.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Arguments supporting the statement might consider how the leadership was consistently divided in their objectives. Some wanted a complete return to the Ancien Regime, and others were prepared to contemplate a constitutional monarchy. There was a real unwillingness to accept that there had to be real change by any in a senior position. Some were prepared to consider the abolition of privilege, others were not. There was never a good leader, the heir after the execution of the King was an infant, who died young. The eventual Louis XVIII seemed happier in safe retirement in England. Too many of the leaders were also overly concerned with arguing over trivia, such as whether someone was ‘noble’ enough to be accepted in their ranks.</p> <p>Arguments challenging the statement might consider how there was limited and often erratic foreign support, and often other countries such as the British had other motives to supporting a return to the Ancien Regime. Support in France, in the Vendee and Brittany for example, was inconsistent and had varying motives. Many potential supporters were often unwilling to leave their home regions. Most French people wanted to retain many of the gains of 1789-91. When there was foreign support, it was seen as treasonable by many to actual link up with it.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 2(a) | <p>Why was there an increase in agricultural output by 1800?</p> <p>Factors might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in population led to an increase in demand which had an effect on agricultural prices. • There were a variety of changes in agricultural techniques ranging from seed drills to much more careful breeding and use of fertilisers. • Enclosure enabled much more efficient farming, using less labour. Much more land became available for food production. • Increasing profits from food production led to greater investment in agriculture. • Improved transport enabled lower costs and wider markets. • Growth of scientific knowledge about farming. | 10 |
| 2(b) | <p>‘Governments were the most important obstacles to industrialisation.’ How far do you agree? Refer to any <u>two</u> countries from Britain, France and Germany in your answer.</p> <p>Arguments challenging the statement might consider the rigid social structure, such as existed in France and parts of Germany, which was hostile to trade and commerce, could be influential. There were shortages of capital for investment. The lack of entrepreneurship and a culture where it was not seen as a positive force were obstacles to industrialisation. Furthermore, a shortage of labour could be an important barrier. Poor agricultural techniques leading to a limited supply of food and the inability to feed an urban population. There was a hostility to technological change, amongst guilds or Luddism. War caused by other nations, such as the French invasion of much of Germany at the end of the 18th century acted as an obstacle to industrialisation.</p> <p>Support for the statement might involve a consideration of the willingness to go to war, as in the case of France after 1792. There was the creation of damaging tariffs and other barriers to commerce. Over-regulation by government, this was the case in France and parts of Germany acted as obstacles. Governments could show a lack of support for necessary changes. The example of enclosure acts and acts supporting canal and railroad building in Britain is a good example of where government support was vital. In addition, local government supporting regionalism as opposed to the national interest.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 3(a) | <p>Why did the Kaiser cause tension in Europe?</p> <p>A variety of reasons explain why the Kaiser caused tension in Europe.</p> <p>Reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His insistence on retaining the alliance system and the inclusion of Italy into it. • Fuelling the developing arms race, retaining conscription and embarking on the naval race. • Angering potential enemies such as the British over support for the Boers, and the French over Agadir. • Encouraging both a commercial and an imperial rivalry. • Being ruler of a nation, which produced the Schlieffen Plan. | 10 |
| 3(b) | <p>‘Serbian nationalism was the main cause of instability in the Balkans before 1914.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>The case for Serbian responsibility could be made by considering the development of a fanatical nationalism inspired by organisations such as the National Defence and the Black Hand. Also, the dominant role of an aggressive and nationalistic army leadership. There were successful aggressive campaigns against Macedonia and Bulgaria, success in the Balkan Wars. Serbia provided as much assistance as possible to other nationalistic movements in the Balkans, such as Young Bosnia.</p> <p>The case for other factors might be made by discussing the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. There was also Austrian aggression and expansionism in the Balkans. Austria was also determined to suppress any nationalistic movements in the region. Russian support and intervention added further to the region’s instability. Italian interference and ambitions can be considered. The role of Bulgaria in causing instability, such as the Second Balkan War.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 4(a) | <p>Why did the Tsar become increasingly unpopular after 1914?</p> <p>Several factors explain the Tsar's unpopularity after 1914.</p> <p>Factors could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rapidly deteriorating situation with high inflation and food shortages. • The Russian economy was simply incapable of dealing with the demands of the war. • There were constant military failures and defeats, starting with Tannenberg and the Masurian Lakes, which caused horrendous casualties which the Russian army could not cope with. There were serious shortages of all types of munitions. • Going to the front and taking personal responsibility for the war meant he was going to be blamed for defeats, and leaving his German born wife, with Rasputin as well, in seeming command of the home front also led to complaint. • The Tsar was simply incapable of leadership. | 10 |
| 4(b) | <p>'The poor state of the Russian economy was the main reason for Bolshevik success in October 1917.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Arguments in support of the statement might consider how the mismanaged economy was totally incapable of supporting a major war. This meant there were critical shortages of food and all types of munitions which led to a demoralised army and civilian population. Added to this there was high inflation which hit the middle classes very hard. Therefore, a better organised economy would not have led to the alienation of so many Russian people</p> <p>Arguments challenging the statement might consider how the Provisional Government's decision to remain in the war was vital, as was their mismanagement of the Kornilov affair. The background of an incompetent and autocratic Tsarist regime added further to support for the Bolsheviks. There was the appeal of Lenin, and his message of 'Peace, Bread and Land.' The brilliant organisation of Trotsky and the support of other left-wing groups. A further aid to success was the lack of any obvious alternative to the Bolsheviks.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 5(a) | <p>Why did the United States prevent Filipino attempts to establish independence after 1898?</p> <p>The USA opposed the nationalists because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USA saw the nationalists as a rebellion against its authority, which it had gained from Spain surrendering the Philippines to the USA and not the nationalists. • The USA paid \$20 million to Spain in return for Spain ceding the Philippines. • The USA regarded the Filipinos as unable to govern themselves democratically; they needed to benefit from American experience and guidance. • Some in the USA saw the Philippines as an important strategic base in the western Pacific, especially given US interest in China and concern about the rise of Japan. A nationalist government in the Philippines might well be anti-American. | 10 |
| 5(b) | <p>‘Total dominance.’ How accurately does this describe US relations with the states of Central America in the period from 1865 to 1917?</p> <p>There are a number of arguments as to why, between 1865 and 1917, the USA did totally dominate the states of Central America. These could include the existence of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, which established American predominance over the whole of Central and South America, at least in theory. This was added to by the Roosevelt Corollary of 1904. This stated that the US would intervene in conflicts between European countries and countries in the region. The US would do this to enforce legitimate claims of the European powers, rather than have the European powers press their claims directly. From the 1870s, the economic and financial power of the US over Central America grew as governments in the region got into debt and economies depended increasingly on access to the US market, e.g. for bananas. Once the USA gained California in 1848, Central America gained in strategic importance as a short cut avoiding the need to sail round Cape Horn. American strategic desire to build a canal across Central America meant that in 1903 it backed the break-away of Panama from Colombia. Then it established the Panama Canal Zone within the new state. The canal was opened in 1914. Finally, from the 1890s, the USA established the Pan-American Union for the Americas, North and South, which Central American states were expected to join.</p> <p>Arguments that the USA did not totally dominate Central America include the obstacles it faced in achieving its strategic goals in the region, e.g. building the Panama Canal. In addition, other great powers, such as Britain, had major economic interests in the region, which the USA could not ignore. Finally, the states of the region often resisted American attempts to marshal them into an economic union, as shown by opposition to the idea of a customs union in 1890.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 6(a) | <p>Why was Grant appointed General-in-Chief of the Union Army in March 1864 and not before?</p> <p>Reasons why this appointment occurred in March 1864 and not before include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant fought in the western theatre of the war, far away from Washington DC, and in a less senior role than his immediate predecessor and commander, Henry Halleck. • His superior, Halleck, was jealous of his achievements and sought to portray him as insubordinate. • Grant's military victories in the West had little national impact until 1863, e.g. taking of Vicksburg in July 1863. Only then did he have direct [written] contact with Lincoln. And even then Grant persuaded Lincoln that he should remain in the western theatre. [He did not meet Lincoln until after being appointed General-in-Chief.] • There were persistent rumours that Grant's consumption of alcohol was so great as to impair his ability to lead large armies. [He did drink a lot but usually avoided doing so in the middle of campaigns and battles.] | 10 |
| 6(b) | <p>'The position of ex-slaves changed little between 1865 and 1877.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Evidence that the position of these ex-slaves changed little between 1865 and 1877 includes the passage of Black Codes in 1865-66 in many Southern states. These replaced the previous Slave Codes, thereby ensuring that African Americans were still treated as inferiors. Also, most ex-slaves continued to work on the plantations which had employed them as slave labour in a system of working called share-cropping. It was only marginally better than slave labour. Slaves were given no property of their own to farm. Finally, ex-slaves continued to suffer violence and intimidation from groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, which emerged in this era.</p> <p>Conversely, it can be argued that the position of ex-slaves changed greatly during the Reconstruction era because, first, via the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments they gained equality before the law and the right to vote. These enabled them to participate in the politics and government of Southern states and the USA, which they did. Secondly, the federal government passed laws to help ex-slaves, either by protecting them against hostile groups such as the KKK, via three Enforcement Acts in the early 1870s, or by helping them, especially via the Freedmen's Bureau of the era. Legal and constitutional advances depended heavily on federal government support, which was significant in these twelve years but not thereafter.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 7(a) | <p>Why was the development of the US economy in the late nineteenth century characterised by a cycle of ‘boom and bust’?</p> <p>The reasons why the US economy of the time went through this cycle included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The over-reliance on loans, i.e. debt, to fund investments in key growth industries, especially railroads. Debt rose excessively, often to invest in increasingly uneconomic companies and projects. When a well-known company collapsed, people panicked and withdrew their money from banks, leading to ‘a run on the banks’. • The nature of the US banking system, which was decentralised and undercapitalised. The USA had no national reserve bank which might help minimise the boom-bust cycle, until 1913. Each panic featured the collapse of many state-based banks. • The issue of bimetallism, i.e. a currency backed by two precious metals, gold and silver. In 1873, the USA switched to a currency based just on gold, which encouraged deflation. To offset the resulting depression, many demanded the return of silver. This partly occurred in 1890, which helped cause the Panic of 1893. • The booms occurred once the recession had reduced the costs of supply, while demand revived for a range of reasons: new technologies, immigration, increased gold supply. | 10 |
| 7(b) | <p>‘President Wilson was not a Progressive.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p> <p>The argument that Wilson was indeed a Progressive is based on the considerable amount of domestic reform passed during his presidency. These reforms included a Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, the Underwood Tariff [the first reduction in tariffs since the civil war], federal income tax [a more progressive form of taxation, though not Wilson’s as it took the form of a constitutional amendment], the Clayton Anti-Trust Act and the Federal Farm Loan Act. These were all passed during Wilson’s first term, before he took the USA into the first World War. The number and significance of these reforms all fitting the Progressive label, are strong evidence that Wilson was a Progressive.</p> <p>The argument that Wilson was not a Progressive is based mainly on his attitude towards racial minorities and especially African Americans. Wilson was a Southern Democrat and as such he had the racist attitudes of the time. Wilson allowed some federal agencies, such as the Post Office, to practice racial segregation, as a result of which some African Americans lost their jobs. He allowed the pro-Ku Klux Klan film, ‘<i>Birth of a Nation</i>’ to be shown in the White House and several of the inter-titles were taken from passages in his book, ‘<i>A History of the American People</i>’. He resisted political pressure from the newly-formed NAACP to change his government’s ways. In addition, until he saw the contribution of women to the war effort in 1917-18, Wilson opposed votes for women at the federal level. He also opposed prohibition, on practical grounds.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 8(a) | <p>Why was the impact of the Great Crash so severe?</p> <p>Reasons for the severe impact of the Great Crash of October 1929 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of debts, both individual and institutional, which had accumulated in the boom of the 1920s. The development of hire purchase had aided that process. • The deflationary government policies of 1929-33, e.g. staying on the gold standard, raising discount [interest] rates and trying to balance the federal budget. • The disorganised nature of the US banking system, which was only partly under the control of the Federal Reserve Board, causing greater instability. • The crisis of 1929-33 had an international dimension, especially the issue of reparations and inter-allied war debts, not forgetting the raising of tariff barriers. | 10 |
| 8(b) | <p>‘Franklin Roosevelt’s main achievement was to reinforce American democracy.’ How valid is this judgement?</p> <p>FDR is seen as one of the great American presidents with many achievements to his name, in both peacetime and wartime. His peacetime policies of the 1930s focused largely on the economy rather than on democracy. Arguments that FDR’s main achievement was to reinforce American democracy could include the limited headway made by undemocratic populists such as Father Coughlin and Huey Long. Most people still voted for the traditional two parties, Democrat and Republican. Both populists and politicians accepted the framework of US government. FDR accepted Supreme Court decisions which ruled some of his policies were unconstitutional. He abandoned his court-packing plan in the face of political opposition.</p> <p>Arguments that FDR’s main achievement was not to reinforce American democracy can take one of two routes. First, FDR often acted in ways which did not reinforce democracy, e.g. his court-packing plan and his expansion of Presidential power at the expense of other branches of government. Secondly, his main achievement was some other aspect of his presidency. The choice includes: political - giving the American people hope for the future - or governmental – introducing a range of policy initiatives to address the USA’s economic problems.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 9(a) | <p data-bbox="316 248 986 282">Why did the Boxer Rebellion break out in 1899?</p> <ul data-bbox="379 320 1310 927" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="379 320 1310 584">• In the 1890s Germans seized control of Shandong province and there was tension between foreigners and peasants there. The British took Weihaiwei and in the south extracted a 99-year lease on the Kowloon Peninsula, north of Hong Kong. The French, also, seized territory in the south. The Qing government seemed unable to defend Chinese sovereignty. The Boxers wanted revenge against foreign imperialists in China and promised to ‘drive out the foreign devils.’<li data-bbox="379 589 1310 757">• Violence against foreigners spread throughout Shandong in late 1898 and 1899. The suppression of the Hundred Days’ Reforms by Dowager Empress Cixi may have given some encouragement to the rising Boxer Rebellion, which had attributed China’s weakness to the Guangxu Emperor.<li data-bbox="379 761 1310 927">• The Boxers received support from Cixi through the legalising of the formation of civilian militias, providing a green light to Boxer recruiting. Money was filtered to Boxer leaders, to support the training of new members. The Boxers reciprocated by using the catchphrase “Revive the Qing! Destroy the foreigner!” <p data-bbox="316 960 1294 1028">The Boxer movement expanded which encouraged it to invade Beijing and lay siege to foreign legations.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 9(b) | <p>‘The Berlin Conference of 1884-85 was successful in preventing imperial conflicts in Africa.’ How far do the events between 1885 and 1914 support this claim?</p> <p>Support arguments could discuss how there was settlement of immediate difficulties over the Congo basin. An agreement was reached that free passage should be given to all ships on the Niger and Congo rivers. Areas of influence were defined and whilst tensions did sometimes occur (e.g. Fashoda in 1898) they were resolved peacefully. France renounced all rights to the Nile basin and the Sudan in return for a guarantee of its position in West Africa. The Berlin Conference did set out terms under which territory could be claimed. This meant that diplomacy, not war, was established as the means to deal with territorial issues in Africa. For example, the Second Moroccan Crisis saw France giving Germany part of the French Congo in exchange for part of German Togoland.</p> <p>Challenges to the argument could consider how while Prussia was busy expanding its territory in Europe to become Germany, England and France acquired or strengthened their formal and informal empires in Africa and Asia. This discrepancy in imperial power and prestige heightened tensions with Germany. Kaiser Wilhelm adopted Weltpolitik and had ambitions to gain colonies for Germany. The Berlin Conference speeded up the Scramble for Africa and, thus, increased the risk of conflict. Colonies could make rivals more economically powerful by giving them access to markets, labour, and resources. Imperial rivalries, also, increased the number places of potential conflict in the world. There was near conflict in 1898 between the French and British over Sudan (Fashoda). The Conference did not prevent the Kaiser in 1896 from trying to interfere in British concerns in South Africa with The Kruger Telegram. This offended the British public and their leaders. The rivalry in Africa made the countries more suspicious of each other at home and further strengthened the alliance system.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 10(a) | <p data-bbox="316 248 1190 282">Why was Corfu at the centre of an international crisis in 1923?</p> <ul data-bbox="379 320 1315 1261" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="379 320 1315 651">• In 1923, a border dispute between Greece and Albania was referred to the League of Nations, which established a commission to determine where the boundary should be. The commission was led by an Italian, Enrico Tellini. Greece was unwilling to co-operate with the commission and Mussolini was convinced that Greece was responsible when Tellini and three of his assistants were killed. Mussolini sent an ultimatum to Greece, demanding financial compensation and the execution of those responsible. Greece ignored the ultimatum and in August 1923 Mussolini bombarded the Greek island of Corfu. <li data-bbox="379 658 1315 857">• Greece appealed to the League of Nations; the Council of the League met and told Mussolini to leave Corfu. Mussolini refused to co-operate with the League and demanded that the Conference of Ambassadors should deal with the matter. Italy stated that it would leave the League rather than allow the League to interfere. The League appeared to be under threat of collapse. <li data-bbox="379 864 1315 1025">• A division emerged between Britain and France over the Corfu incident. Britain favoured referring the matter to the League of Nations, but France opposed such a course of action. France feared that it would provide a precedent for the League to become involved in the French occupation of the Ruhr. <li data-bbox="379 1032 1315 1128">• The Conference of Ambassadors announced that Greece was to apologise and pay the full amount of compensation Italy demanded in exchange for the withdrawal of Italian troops from Corfu. <li data-bbox="379 1135 1315 1261">• Greece paid the compensation and Italian troops withdrew from Corfu. This showed the weakness of the League of Nations very early in its history as Mussolini had refused to agree to the League's demands. | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 10(b) | <p>'International relations in Europe during the 1920s were dominated by economic issues.' How far do you agree with this claim?</p> <p>Support arguments might consider the need to deal with economic issues, such as German reparations, which was an important element in international relations in this period. For example, in 1922 the Genoa Conference was set up to resolve the issue by seeking to develop a strategy to rebuild a defeated Germany. Also, it aimed to provide an economic plan to rebuild Central and Eastern European states. The conference also aimed to negotiate a relationship between European capitalist economies and that of the new Bolshevik regime in Russia. In January 1923, the French invaded the Ruhr as Germany had defaulted on its reparation payments. The German workers went on strike and Germany was faced with hyper-inflation. The US was itself owed large sums by Paris and London. The repayment of these loans hinged on the French and British taking receipt of German reparations. The Dawes Plan of 1924 provided some easing of the issue as massive loans were made to Germany, half of them provided by US bankers and a more affordable schedule was made for reparation payments. The Reichsbank was reorganised and the gold standard was introduced to stabilise the currency. France agreed to withdraw its troops from the Ruhr. The American loans meant that once again reparation payments could be made. However, The USA knew that, despite the Dawes Plan once Germany had to meet its full annual payments it would no longer be able to afford its interest payments on US loans. The Young Plan of 1929 reduced the final sum of German reparations from £6.6 billion to £2 billion.</p> <p>Challenges to the argument might consider the success of the Bolsheviks in the Russian Civil War which led to a fear of the spreading of communism throughout Europe. War broke out between Poland and Bolshevik Russia, ending with the peace of Riga in 1921. This fear continued beyond the 1920s. There were tensions amongst the new successor states. For example, Poland contained a population that was 35% non-Polish whilst Czechoslovakia contained more ethnic Germans than Slovaks and three million Hungarians lived in Romania. The Locarno Treaties of 1925 did provide some settlement concerning Germany's western borders with France and Belgium. This political rehabilitation of Germany seemed to be confirmed by her admittance into the League of Nations in 1926. In 1928 the Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed agreeing to outlaw war. On August 27, 1928, fifteen nations signed the pact at Paris. Later, an additional forty-seven nations followed suit, so the pact was eventually signed by most of the established nations in the world.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 11(a) | <p data-bbox="316 248 1315 315">Why did the Nazi-Soviet Pact lead to the outbreak of the Second World War?</p> <ul data-bbox="379 353 1315 987" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="379 353 1315 555">• Once Hitler had taken over Czechoslovakia, he set his sights on Poland. However, he feared Russia intervening and the possibility of facing a war on two fronts with France in the west and Russia in the east. Once the Nazi-Soviet Pact was agreed it freed Hitler from immediate risk of Soviet attack and he could launch an invasion of Poland which would inevitably lead to a wider war.<li data-bbox="379 562 1315 757">• The Munich Agreement of 1938 and the seizing of the whole of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 had led the public in Britain and France to feel that further German aggression had to be stopped. Therefore, German action taken against Poland after the Nazi-Soviet Pact was agreed forced Britain and France to honour military commitments to the Poles.<li data-bbox="379 763 1315 824">• In Britain there was an ever-growing pro-war group in Parliament which was opposed to further appeasement of Germany.<li data-bbox="379 831 1315 987">• The fact that the Nazis and Soviets were ideologically opposed, yet signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact showed what Hitler was prepared to do to achieve his goals. Therefore, further appeasement was not an option and on 3 September 1939 Britain and France declared war on Germany. | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 11(b) | <p>'Mussolini was more interested in pursuing his own objectives than in ensuring a Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.' How far do you agree with this judgement?</p> <p>In support of the statement, arguments might discuss how since 1922 Mussolini had pursued in foreign affairs a 'great and powerful' policy. Mussolini was seeking glory and confirmation of his ability to lead Italy back to its former greatness as a major power, with a leading role to play in European affairs. His support of the Nationalists in Spain was based on the pursuit of this foreign policy objective. The troops Mussolini sent to Spain were not what Franco had expected. Instead of volunteers to join his own regiments, he received an entire organised force of Italian army units. The Italians were there to win a few spectacular victories, giving Mussolini a political boost at home and abroad, not to be part of Franco's own plans. Also, Italian interests were to the fore as it signed a secret treaty with the Spanish. In return for military aid, the Nationalists agreed to allow Italy to establish bases in Spain if there was a war with France. On 21 October 1936, Germany and Italy signed a formal alliance which came to be known as the Rome-Berlin Axis. Italy's invasion of Abyssinia had already soured Italy's relations with Britain and France and Mussolini was convinced that Germany was the power he should ally with. He thought this would help him to become more powerful in Europe. Thus, he fought alongside Hitler in Spain.</p> <p>In challenging the statement arguments might consider how Franco appealed to both Hitler and Mussolini for assistance. Franco claimed that he was fighting to prevent a communist revolution in Spain. Mussolini, could see the value of having a third fascist state in Europe. Spain had become an international battleground for the rival ideologies of fascism and communism. Italy was keen to prevent the spread of communism, so Mussolini's fascist leanings led him to support Franco and the Nationalists. Indeed, in 1934, Mussolini had met with a group of Spanish politicians and generals in Rome who were opposed to the Republican government.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 12(a) | <p>Why did democracy fail in Japan in the 1930s?</p> <p>Responses could refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was a lack of historical background regarding democracy. The elected Diet had only been in existence since 1889. When Hirohito was enthroned in 1927 there were calls for a "Showa Restoration" and a revival of Shinto. It glorified the emperor and traditional Japanese virtues to the exclusion of Western influences, such as democracy.• The 1930s were a decade of fear in Japan, characterised by the resurgence of right-wing patriotism, domestic terrorist violence, increased military aggression abroad, all leading to the weakening of democratic forces.• In the wake of the Wall Street Crash of 1929 there was a decline in Japanese exports and a rise in unemployment. Democratic politicians were blamed for these outcomes.• These politicians undermined their own position further through their stupidity. This led many in Japan to lose respect for democratic institutions.• The Mukden Incident of September 1931 set the stage for the eventual military takeover of the Japanese government. It was used as an excuse by the Kwantung Army to seize Manchuria. This was done without the approval of the civilian government in Tokyo. There was popular support for the army's action and in 1932 Prime Minister Inukai was assassinated and his successors were military men. | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 12(b) | <p>To what extent did Chiang Kai-shek maintain the policies and principles of Sun Yat-sen as leader of the Kuomintang?</p> <p>In support of continuity, Sun Yat-sen was a nationalist revolutionary who believed that the only way for China to move forward in the early 1900s was for the country to become a republic and adopt western ways such as in industry and agriculture. The Chinese Revolution in 1911 overthrew the Manchu dynasty. A keen supporter of Sun and his 'Three Principles', Chiang returned to the newly created republic of China in 1911. Chiang Kai-shek was personally selected by Sun to train KMT military officers at Whampoa military academy. This suggests that Sun Yat-sen believed Chiang Kai-shek would instil his principles and policies amongst the officer corps. The aim was to ensure the KMT was able to take on the warlords who controlled large parts of the country. Chiang Kai-shek carried out this aim by embarking on the successful Northern Expedition against the warlords in 1926. Therefore, one of his first actions after succeeding Sun Yat-sen in 1925 was to instigate the 'nationalism' aspect of Sun Yat-sen's 'Three Principles.' Chiang also established the New Life Movement. This stressed traditional Confucian morality and the Methodist notion of self-cultivation as the solution to the perceived degeneration of the Chinese people. It was considered by the Kuomintang to be key element of Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People.</p> <p>Continuity might be challenged as between 1922 and 1924, Sun adapted the beliefs of the Kuomintang so that they appeared more acceptable to the Chinese Communist Party that had been founded in 1921. However, Chiang Kai-shek went against this policy, as in April 1927 KMT forces attacked members of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in Shanghai. Hundreds of communists were rounded up, arrested and tortured; most were executed or assassinated. While he had achieved the unification of China that Sun had yearned for, he ended up with a country that was divided and lost much support as Mao Zedong won the hearts and minds of the peasants. Chiang did not follow Sun's principle of 'democracy'. Not only was Chiang the party's chairman and commander-in-chief of the army, in September 1928 the Organic Law gave Chiang what amounted to dictatorial powers over China. Critics within the KMT felt Chiang was more concerned with maintaining control within the party and in areas he had power over rather than co-ordinate a campaign against the Japanese aggressors. This raises questions about his commitment to Sun's principle of 'nationalism.' In addition, despite a professed focus on reform, Chiang's government concentrated on battling Communism within China.</p> | 20 |