



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9389/21

Paper 2 Outline Study

May/June 2021

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 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and 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
	Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content	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
	Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content	0

Section A: European Option: Modern Europe, 1789–1917

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Why was the Estates General divided in 1789?</p> <p>Several factors can be considered, they include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diversity of issues raised in the cahiers requiring changes • The divisions within the clergy, the higher/aristocratic members and the lower clergy. Many of the latter sympathised with the more radical demands of the Third Estate. There was a rich v poor division. There were also thinkers like Sieyés. • There were many divisions within the aristocracy, again between the rich and the poor, those strongly opposed to any change in their status and privileges and the more radical like Lafayette. There were some who felt there had to be change in order to survive. • There were huge division within the Third Estate, ranging from quite conservative constitutional monarchists to much more radical anti-monarchs who were demanding real social, economic and political change. • There were the major divisions between the Estates, over voting for example. • There were further divisions between, for example, from those who came from urban as opposed to rural areas. 	10
1(b)	<p>'The Directory governed France well.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>There is a sound case 'for' which could include the suggestion that it introduced a period of comparative calm after the Terror and that the Revolution had been largely a destructive force before 1795 and as such the Directory genuinely tried to be constructive. It also managed a largely successful war against major enemies, including Britain and Austria, and tried to tackle issues left behind such as the currency, the Church, local government, with a degree of success. It also tried to find a 'middle' constitutional way between the extremes of the monarchists who wanted a return to the Ancien Régime, and those who wished to pursue social revolution.</p> <p>In contrast it might be suggested that to many it never appeared as the legitimate government. Nor was it able to manage the complexity of both the religious and constitutional issues facing France at the time. It also looked too much like a group of middle-class men managing France in their own interests and these did not grasp fully the extent of the social and economic problems facing France at the time. They also failed to realise the implications of allowing Bonaparte to control so much of the Italian campaign and its aftermath, let alone the expedition to Egypt. Britain was also not a sensible enemy to have in the 1790s.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Why was there a growth in the influence of the middle class in this period?</p> <p>Several factors explain why the middle class grew in size and influence in this period. They could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial agricultural changes led to increased profits and growth of units. Those capable of managing this change were elevated in status. • The growth of industrialisation led to a whole new class of owners, entrepreneurs, managers, bankers, surveyors, engineers, lawyers etc. • The rise of a 'salarariat' – doctors- public health officials – local government officers- railways managers – teachers etc. • Political changes resulted in economic power leading to political power and the extension of the franchise to the middle class, seen strongly in both Britain and France, which led to major constitutional changes. 	10
2(b)	<p>'Governments were the driving force for industrialisation.' How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.</p> <p>There are plenty of examples where governments were directly or indirectly responsible for industrialisation such as direct legislative support including over patents, railway building, canal building, banking regulation, company regulation with limited liability and developing a central banking system for raising capital. Arguments might also consider how there was no regulation of hours and wages and a general endorsement of laissez-faire policies. There was also the enclosing of colonies and the acquisition of overseas markets together with defending colonies and trade routes. Free trade and protection policies also might be featured.</p> <p>However, there are areas where governments damaged industrialisation prospects and these might include maintaining social barriers, where those involved in 'trade' lacked status and influence, especially over legislation. France is an example here. Going to war was also a stimulus in some cases, but clearly was a damaging factor in both France and Germany. Also identified might be the rigid central control of all aspects of economic life by government, several German states are a good example of this as well as France, and the extensive internal trade barriers which damaged free flow of goods and services. Germany a good example of this until Zollverein ideas spread. Bad use of tariffs which discouraged trade might also be used.</p> <p>Alternative challenging arguments might be put forward for being a driving force for industrialisation such as individuals being inventors and business entrepreneurs in e.g. developments in steam power and railway construction. Also capital investments in industrialisation from wealthy individuals or families.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p>Why was Austria hostile towards Serbia in the years before 1914?</p> <p>Several factors explain Austrian hostility towards Serbia in the years before 1914. They could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria was anxious to expand its empire into the Balkans and saw Serbia and what it represented as a barrier to these expansionist aspirations. • It saw Serbia as a force encouraging nationalism in the Balkans, and this threatened Austrian imperialism. • It feared that such Serbian nationalistic ideas would spread into its own territories, where nationalistic ideas were growing. • It saw Serbia and its activities as a threat to its status within Europe and the wide world. • Groups such as the Black Hand and Narodna Odbrana (National Defence), which were formed between 1901 and 1908, and by 1911 overlapped in membership, had stated aims to liberate Serbs under Austrian control. Actions included anti-Austrian propaganda, the organisation of spies and saboteurs to operate within occupied territories. 	10
3(b)	<p>'Its members had different reasons for joining.' How far do you agree with this view of the Triple Entente?</p> <p>Britain's motives included deep concern over the preservation of its empire, which it saw as being threatened. Britain also saw the Entente as a solution to its problems with France in Africa, especially over Egypt following the Fashoda crisis (1898). Britain also wished to preserve Belgian neutrality, the 'opposite coastline' issue, and sought to resolve issues with Russia, over India, Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet. There was also concern over the balance of power in Europe and Asia, particularly over the growth of the German navy and the rise of German commerce. There had been issues such as the Kruger telegram and issues over territory in East Africa where Germany was a growing threat.</p> <p>In a similar way, the French were also concerned about the balance of power and particularly feared German militarism, expansion in Europe, and the Austrian alliance with Germany. They also had specific issues, e.g. revenge for the Franco-Prussian war and wanted to protect their interests in SE Asia and Africa. France also wanted, like Britain, to get agreement over spheres of influence in imperial matters. France wanted to work with the British army and above all the British navy, a major power in both the Mediterranean and the North Sea/Channel as well as the Far East.</p> <p>Like the other powers, Russia was also concerned with the balance of power in Europe and was anxious to do a deal with Britain over its expansion in the South East as well as South West. Additionally, Russia sought to ensure its unfettered expansion in the Far East and pursue its Russification policies within its empire. The Russian state also wanted to maintain and develop the French financial support and investment, and particularly restore its international status, which had been severely damaged after the 1905 Revolution and the humiliation of the war with Japan.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p>Why did the Revolution of 1905 fail to overthrow the Tsar?</p> <p>Several factors explain the failure of the Revolution to overthrow the Tsar. They could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diverse range of opponents and critics meant there was a lack of any co-ordination amongst those taking part. • The many different, and often conflicting, reasons for participation. It was largely spontaneous, resulting in a lack of any planning. • The deep conservatism of the peasantry, the mass of the population of Russia, as well as their illiteracy and poor communication. • The degree of support for the Tsar from the bulk of the aristocracy and public officials alongside that of an influential church. • The loyalty of some, key, troops to the regime. 	10
4(b)	<p>How far do you agree that popular discontent was the main reason for the Tsar's abdication?</p> <p>Arguably it could be seen as the key factor because the Tsar had alienated most of his aristocratic supporters through poor leadership and the actions of Rasputin and his wife. He also alienated most middle-class support by his poor decisions during the war and his policies towards the Duma. The peasantry was alienated using conscription, demanding so many men to leave their homes, and the mismanagement of the rural economy. The urban working class was totally alienated by poor wages and working conditions, above all in the munition's factories. The morale of the army was destroyed by incompetence and particularly losses at Tannenberg in August 1914. Subsequent defeats encouraged further discontent back in Russia.</p> <p>However, there were other factors such as hyperinflation. The Tsar's personal direction of the war also undermined his position as it meant he was blamed for the defeats. His lack of any serious reform since the 1905 revolution led to the growing realisation that he was just an incompetent autocrat. There was also a backlash against the Russification policies of the years before 1914, and the pogroms, which fuelled nationalism and radicalism in the further parts of the Russian Empire. Economic mismanagement was also an influential factor in the Tsar's decision to abdicate.</p>	20

Section B: American Option: The History of the USA, 1840–1941

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p>Why did the Mexican-American War lead to territorial gains for the United States?</p> <p>This relatively short and one-sided conflict was important to US expansion in North America because it resulted in a clear victory for the USA and the gaining of a huge slice of territory known as the Mexico Cession.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The war arose from a territorial dispute between the USA and Mexico concerning Texas joining the Union and whether the border lay further north at the Neuces river (Mexico's view) or further to the south at the Rio Grande (USA's view). A skirmish near the Rio Grande between the respective forces led to the USA declaring war in May 1846. Therefore, the USA sought territorial gain from the outset. • American forces were successful, gaining victories at Monterrey, Buena Vista, Vera Cruz and captured Mexico City in 1847. This resulted in the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (February 1848) – USA gained some 500 000 square miles and included lands which later formed three states – California, Utah and Nevada – most of Arizona, half of New Mexico as well as parts of two more – Colorado and Wyoming. • The idea of Manifest Destiny was popular amongst many Americans at this time – it was the nation's destiny to control all the land from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific coast. Therefore, territorial expansion was justified. • More particularly, gold was discovered in California just as it was being handed over to the USA, which caused the westward migration from the eastern USA and eventually growing links between the two halves of the USA. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	<p>How far did the US acquisition of the Philippines signal a change in US policy towards Asia and the Pacific?</p> <p>In 1898 the USA annexed the Philippines from Spain – rather than making it a US Protectorate or Territory. This gave the USA a large state of about seven million people at the far side of the Pacific Ocean. This action was a departure from the ‘anti-imperialist’ foreign policy which the United States had been following. It was justified on the grounds that control of the Philippines would serve America’s commercial and strategic interests in the Far East. The latter would seem to be proved by the dispatch of 6300 US soldiers from the Philippines in 1900 as the US contingent of an international force sent to crush the anti-foreigner Boxer Rising. In fact, the troops were in the Philippines to defeat a rebellion against American rule by Filipinos fighting for their independence since 1896. The war ended in 1903, when some kind of joint rule, albeit with American dominance, was agreed. Full independence would come much later. The US also had some interest in China and in 1899 and 1900, the US Secretary of State, John Hay, published two Open Door Notes, asking all great powers to agree to open access for all states to China. Most states grudgingly agreed to what was no more than a form of words. In 1905, Russia and Japan went to war in part because of claims to Chinese territory. The US intervened only to facilitate peace talks, but it did show that the USA was now a great power and had concerns beyond her own borders.</p> <p>The US presence in the affairs of the Western Pacific clearly grew in the decade following its acquisition of the Philippines. Whether this acquisition caused the increased intervention is hard to say. The reverse could be equally valid: because the future of China was looking increasingly problematic, because Japan was emerging as a force to be reckoned with, both evident before 1898, the USA decided it needed more of a presence in the Far East and thus decided to acquire the Philippines. Therefore, other factors caused the USA to be more interventionist on the world stage. After all, the great powers’ attention was focused on events much further north, on the mainland of Asia, in regions such as Korea and Manchuria, rather than on a country consisting of 7000 islands, even if taken over by the USA.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p>Why did Presidential Reconstruction prove to be controversial?</p> <p>The term is applied to the initial stages of Reconstruction under Lincoln and his successor Andrew Johnson, who became President after the death of Lincoln in 1865.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lincoln's proposed '10% Plan' (December 1863) did cause controversy as Congress favoured more stringent measure (e.g. Wade-Davis Bill's 'Ironclad Oath', 1864). • In 1865 Johnson took a softer line towards Southern war leaders than Congress wanted: only one was executed and Jefferson Davis was imprisoned for two years. Many in Congress were angered as they felt a generation of southern political leaders was irremediably tainted. • Johnson also focused Reconstruction on the whites, ignoring the position of ex-slaves, and Southern states passed Black Codes in 1865. Johnson assumed that with the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment by the required number of states (December 1865) Reconstruction was over. • Congress disagreed and in 1866 it passed a Civil Rights Act protecting the rights of freedmen; it passed the Reconstruction Acts which imposed military rule on the South. Johnson vetoed both only for Congress to override his vetoes. • Congress also passed the Fourteenth Amendment giving equal rights to all, only to find Johnson encouraging states to refuse to approve it. The Amendment was eventually passed while Congress introduced the Fifteenth Amendment giving ex-slaves the vote. • Relations between President and Congress were so bad that, in March 1868, Congress impeached Johnson. He escaped punishment by one vote. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	<p>'Poor military leadership was the main reason that the Civil War lasted for four years.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Many of the country's best military schools were based in the South which meant that many of the most qualified generals fought for the South i.e. General Lee led the Confederate army because his home state sided with the South. Davis, as an ex-military man, was prone to interfere too much in the making of strategy. Though Robert E Lee remained the key military leader of the Confederacy, he was not appointed as General-in-Chief until January 1865, by which time the war had been lost. Additionally, General James Longstreet tried in vain to convince Lee not to attack at Gettysburg on the third day, arguing, correctly, that it was a suicide mission. On the side of the North, President Lincoln had to replace some of his generals because they weren't effective. For example, General McClellan hesitated to move his army at times. At Antietam in September 1862, he failed to pursue the retreating General Lee, possibly costing the Union a chance to end the Civil War at that time. Lincoln also had very little experience of military affairs - 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.</p> <p>Other possible lines of discussion might include idea such as the nature of the war which meant that the North had to fully 'conquer' the South in order to be seen as successful whereas the South had only to continue to fight a defensive war. This meant that the nature of victory was often unclear. There also was some opposition to the Civil War in the North. The Peace Democrats wanted President Lincoln to negotiate a settlement with the Confederacy. Thus, not everybody in the North fully supported the Union's war efforts. More decisive episodes of leadership shown by people like Ulysses Grant may also be identified. The Anaconda plan of Scott needed the USA to gain naval control over the CSA's coast line, and this took time. The production of arms and the training of raw recruits could not be achieved overnight. Thus, the USA's advantages in wealth and numbers took time to be harnessed effectively. The fall of Vicksburg in 1863 meant the Confederacy was now split as the USA controlled the Mississippi – victory for the USA over the CSA was assured.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p>Why were there concerns about rapid urbanisation in the late nineteenth century?</p> <p>Mass immigration to cities in the last third of the nineteenth century put a lot of pressure on the infrastructure in cities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cities such as New York and Chicago grew rapidly. In the thirty years from 1870 to 1900, Chicago grew from 300 000 to 1.7 million. Growth on this scale put immense pressure on conditions in the city. • Workers crowded into tenements close to their workplace, which lacked running water and thus were insanitary. • Drunken and disorderly conduct counted for half of the 60 000 arrests in New York in 1889. • Disease was widespread, in part because its causes were not properly understood, and little effective action was taken. Streets were often left full of rubbish and dead animals. • By the 1890s Progressives and ‘muckraking’ journalists were highlighting these conditions - How the Other Half Lives by Jacob Riis, published in 1890 complete with photographs, showed how bad the conditions still were, how much had still to be done. According to Riis, over 80% of the 1.5 million people in New York in 1890 lived in tenements. • Linking in with the corruption and exploitation of city mayors such as Boss Tweed. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p>'Theodore Roosevelt was the most Progressive President.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Factors supporting this claim might include railroad regulation, meat inspections and the Pure Food and Drug Act although an uncooperative Congress meant little radical legislation could be passed. Roosevelt's use of the Presidency to act progressively might also be considered. He ordered the prosecution of the Northern Securities Company, a railroad trust and became known as the 'trust buster'. He intervened in the anthracite coal miners' strike of 1902 not by sending in troops to break the strike, as had been the norm before, but to urge the two sides to talk to each other. Roosevelt also called himself a Progressive, especially in the 1912 presidential election. His conservation initiatives, setting up national parks for the benefit of all, can also be seen as Progressive. The main limitation of his Progressivism concerns civil rights, especially of Blacks facing Jim Crow laws in the South, but there the Democratic Party was too strong.</p> <p>Other presidents such as William Taft and Woodrow Wilson might be considered more progressive. Taft filed twice the number of antitrust suits as Roosevelt, and the Supreme Court upheld the breakup of Standard Oil under the Sherman Antitrust Act (1911) during his administration. Through the Mann-Elkins Act (1910), the authority of the ICC was again expanded to cover regulation of telephone, telegraph, and cable companies. Taft also actively supported both the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Amendments and established new agencies, such as the Bureau of Mines, which set standards of mine safety, and the Federal Children's Bureau. Woodrow Wilson's 'New Freedom' initiative of 1912 was directed against 'the Triple Wall of Privilege': tariffs, which protected big business; banks, which harmed small businesses; trusts, which were anti-competitive and anti-consumer. Thus, in 1913, Wilson manipulated public opinion to make Congress pass the Underwood-Simmons bill, which cut tariffs to levels not seen since the 1850s, he introduced the Federal Reserve banking system and the Federal Trade Commission and he supported the Clayton Anti-Trust Act of 1914. Wilson even continued Roosevelt's conservation policies, establishing more national parks. In his second term he also supported votes for women.</p> <p>Candidates might offer a definition of 'Progressive' and organise their response around this and credit should be given to this approach.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p>Why was Roosevelt successful during his first ‘100 days’?</p> <p>By the end of the 100 days:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unprecedented – Congress had passed fifteen major bills to address urgent social and economic problems, a degree of legislative activity never matched before or since. • His use of ‘fireside chats’ helped to calm the nation and explain what he had done – particularly having already closed banks. • As well as objective external factors which required urgent action, there were also political reasons for acting so quickly. His election gave Roosevelt a store of popularity which he could use to overcome the obstacles to effective government presented by the US constitution and especially the separation of powers. • In his first few weeks in office, he was strong enough to take the drastic action which he believed the dire situation of the USA required. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	<p>'The actions of President Roosevelt during the 1930s resulted in a positive change to the US economy.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>In supporting the statement the following positive arguments might be used:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Banking reforms such as the Emergency Banking Act granting the federal government greater control of the banks, interest rates and the money supply. Roosevelt also ensured Federal Insurance of bank deposits which further improved confidence in the banking system for the American people. • Various government schemes to provide employment such as CCC, PWA and CWA. • Providing relief for the unemployed through FERA; the first time federal government had ever intervened in this area of the economy. • Social Security Act providing unemployment insurance for workers who were laid off. • Coming off the Gold Standard, which meant the dollar dropped in value compared with other countries, helping to improve international trade and US exports moving again. • New Deal reforms saved US capitalism from complete collapse and prevented its possible replacement by a socialist economy or a Nazi-style dictatorship. <p>In challenging the statement the following arguments might be used:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roosevelt failed to resolve the Great Depression – unemployment remained high until 1941 with the impact of WW2 enabling a resolution of the problem. • Federal intervention in the economy undermined the free-market economy that was supported by business interests and the Republican politicians. • Left-wing opponents such as Huey Long and Charles Coughlin who believed Roosevelt's actions were not radical enough, suggesting heavy taxation of the rich, more public works to create employment and nationalisation of the major industries. <p>Other valid arguments in responses would be acceptable.</p>	20

Section C: International Option: International Relations, 1871–1945

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p>Why was there conflict between European nations over Africa in the late nineteenth century?</p> <p>Essentially this is about the reason for the ‘Scramble for Africa’ so a range of factors might be considered, and these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic – The search for new markets/resources. • Political – The closing of borders in Europe and the resulting wish to avoid direct conflict. • Ideological - The desire to take European culture/religion to the populations of Africa. • The strategic importance of controlling areas like the Southern Cape and later the Suez Canal and the major rivers that gave access to the interior. • New technology created better weapons and medical advances made it easier to infiltrate the ‘dark continent’. 	10
9(b)	<p>How far did the direction of US foreign policy change between 1890 and 1914?</p> <p>Responses might consider the influence of ideas such as Mahan’s books (1890–1905) on the role of sea-power and Turner’s frontier thesis (1893) and how this might lead to a new direction in international policies regarding the expansion of influence overseas. This might be considered alongside the politically isolated position the US had taken throughout the 19th and early 20th century. In 1914 USA did not enter the conflict but remained isolated. Additionally, the impact of the Spanish-American War which might have offered the opportunity to continue this expansion may be identified. Economic opportunism which had driven the expansion west still continued to influence policy.</p> <p>Other factors might include the application of the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary which stated that the US’s ‘international police power’ to end the ongoing unrest in the Western Hemisphere was justified under the Monroe Doctrine, set out in 1823. The role of expansionist Presidents might also be considered, especially McKinley and Roosevelt, the latter of whom pursued an expansionist policy by taking control of the Panama Canal and sending the ‘Great White Fleet’ – the US Navy, on an around the globe voyage between 1907 and 1909. In addition to the actions of Roosevelt, there was also a desire to be recognised as a great power and the challenge to European control of developments in the Far East, especially China may be discussed.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	<p>Why was Bolshevik Russia isolated internationally between 1918 and 1921?</p> <p>Factors will revolve around the effects of the Bolshevik revolution and might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bolsheviks signing a separate Treaty with Germany at Brest Litovsk which alienated allies. The Bolshevik refusal to take responsibility for the repayment of loans taken out under the Tsar further angered the Allies, especially France. • Allied forces supported White armies in the Civil War. • The Soviet Union was excluded from the Versailles Peace discussions having signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. • Communism was considered a threat to international order because of the Communist International's aim to spread 'World Revolution'. • The Bolshevik Russia was totally involved in Civil War and then the Russo-Polish war. 	10
10(b)	<p>'Efforts in the 1920s to solve the problems created by the Versailles Settlement were a failure.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indications of failure might include Reparations. A figure was finally established by the League of Nations in 1921 but this remained a problem requiring further adjustment in the Dawes and Young Plans but the Wall Street Crash and quickly following Great Depression then destroyed any hopes of these succeeding so the problem remained at the end of the 1920s. Disarmament was also forced on Germany and included as an aim of the League in the terms of the Treaty but little had been done towards reaching this goal. Furthermore, German resentment at the war guilt clause and heavy reparations that were linked to this were made worse by the Ruhr Crisis (1923). This resentment was never fully removed and resurfaced once economic hardship returned to Germany at the end of the 1920s. Successor states also faced several problems, social economic and political, few of which were resolved by the end of the 1920s. Thus, whilst the Locarno treaties eased concerns over Germany's border with France and Belgium there was no mention of her borders in the East.</p> <p>Challenges to this claim might consider the creation of the Dawes and Young Plans to alleviate the effects of the reparations on the German economy. Additionally, any of the achievements of the League in dealing with post war issues like the Aaland islands, the Silesian Coalfield issue etc might be identified alongside the Locarno treaties and resulting improvement in Franco-German relations. The Kellogg-Briand Pact might also be considered.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	<p>Why did Spain become a republic in 1931?</p> <p>Answers will need to identify a range of reasons for the ending of the monarchy and its replacement with a Republican constitution which might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects of the Great Depression which ended an economic boom in Spain. By 1929 the peseta began to fall in value despite desperate measures to prop it up • The resignation of Primo de Rivera following his loss of both royal and military support. The army turned against him as he intended to abolish the privileges of the artillery and engineering corps. The king feared that growing student protest, discontent in Catalonia and growing conspiracies amongst politicians were endangering his dynasty. • The incompetence of Alfonso XIII as his earlier support of the dictatorship tarnished him in the eyes of politicians and public. • The incompetence of the governments after Primo de Rivera led to the growth of Republicanism, even amongst some on the right who saw a republic as better than a tarnished monarchy which might provoke a Russian-style revolution, and the Pact of San Sebastian which united many of the republican groups in Spain. • Results of municipal elections of 1931 - the monarchists won victories in the rural areas but were defeated in most towns and cities. Rather than face civil war and street demonstrations in Madrid the king abdicated and left Spain. The Second Republic was declared 	10
11(b)	<p>How far does the strength of anti-war feeling amongst the British people explain why Chamberlain persisted with the policy of appeasement?</p> <p>Arguments in favour of the assertion might include the idea that the loss of a generation of young men in the First World War created a strong aversion to any future conflict that might have the same effect. This might be supported by the outcome of the Oxford 'King and Country' debate in 1933, and the Peace Ballot in 1934–5 where 11 million people were surveyed and 90% voted against trade in arms. It was a commonly held view that 'the bomber will always get through' (Baldwin in a 1932 speech, he was Prime Minister when the invasion of Abyssinia, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the start of the Spanish Civil War all occurred) and so any future war would be catastrophic. The film 'Things to Come' (1936) epitomised this mood.</p> <p>Arguments that other factors were equally or more important might revolve around the unfairness of the Treaty of Versailles and how Hitler's demands, at first, seemed reasonable adjustments to the Treaty designed to resolve significant issues. The isolation of Britain might be considered as without support from France and with the withdrawal of the US from involvement in Europe, Britain was in no position to take stronger measures against Hitler's aggression. Britain's imperial considerations meant that peace in Europe was essential in maintaining control over her far-flung colonies. The country also did not have sufficiently strong forces to challenge Hitler directly as the navy had been reduced in size and little had been done to develop the potential for air warfare. No attempt at re-armament was made until the later 1930s.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	<p>Why did Kuomintang attempts to destroy the Chinese Communist Party between 1927 and 1936 fail?</p> <p>Answers may recognise the importance of the events leading up to the encirclement campaign in cementing support for the CCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break-up of the First United Front in 1927 led to the CCP establishing semi-autonomous ‘Soviet base areas’, which they called the Chinese Soviet Republic (1927–1937). • The first four encirclement campaigns by the KMT against the CCP all failed due to determined communist resistance. • The fifth campaign succeeded and this led to the Long March which provided space for the CCP to regroup. It also led to growing support amongst the peasantry who liked the idea of re-distributing the land of wealthy landowners. CCP troops treated the peasantry, on the whole, far better than KMT troops • The determined leadership of Mao ensured that he remained in firm control and gave the CCP a clear ideology. 	10
12(b)	<p>To what extent was Yuan Shih-kai responsible for the collapse of the Chinese Republic established in 1912?</p> <p>Arguments supporting the claim might include the fact that he was suggested as president by both the outgoing emperor and the acting President Sun Yat-sen but soon adopted dictatorial ways, replacing ministers who disagreed with him and ignoring the constitution. He also used bribery and murder to sustain his government – and was suspected of ordering the assassination of KMT chairman Sung Chiao-jen in 1913. Furthermore, in declaring himself Emperor in November 1915, he alienated many of his own supporters and this led to rebellion throughout China, while his death in June 1916 left China leaderless.</p> <p>Arguments challenging the statement might consider the lack of any democratic tradition in China so democratic government was always going to be difficult to achieve. Also, although democratic ideas were popular amongst liberal intellectuals, most of the peasant population had no understanding of liberal politics and concepts of government. Additionally, the selfishness of local gentry military produced the growth of the warlords; regional interests often meant more than national ones to these local leaders. Many Chinese were also more interested in Nationalism than democracy and would support strong leaders rather than democratic institutions.</p>	20