



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**HISTORY**

**9489/23**

Paper 2 Outline Study

**October/November 2022**

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 October/November 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **24** 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.

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Connects factors to reach a reasoned conclusion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers are well focused and explain a range of factors supported by relevant information.</li> <li>• Answers demonstrate a clear understanding of the connections between causes.</li> <li>• Answers reach a supported conclusion.</li> </ul>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Explains factor(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Answers include explained factor(s) supported by relevant information.</li> </ul>	<b>6–8</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Describes factor(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. (They address causation).</li> <li>• Answers are may be entirely descriptive in approach with description of factor(s).</li> </ul>	<b>3–5</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Describes the topic/issue</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	<b>No creditable content.</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Part (b)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Responses which develop a sustained judgement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers are well focused and closely argued. (Answers show a maintained and complete understanding of the question).</li> <li>Answers are supported by precisely selected evidence.</li> <li>Answers lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported.</li> </ul>	<b>17–20</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Responses which develop a balanced argument</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers show explicit understanding of the demands of the question.</li> <li>Answers develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence.</li> <li>Answers may begin to form a judgement in response to the question. (At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported).</li> </ul>	<b>13–16</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Responses which begin to develop assessment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers show a developed understanding of the demands of the question.</li> <li>Answers provide some assessment, supported by relevant and appropriately selected evidence. However, these answers are likely to lack depth of evidence and/or balance.</li> </ul>	<b>9–12</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Responses which show some understanding of the question</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers show some understanding of the focus of the question.</li> <li>They are either entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support.</li> </ul>	<b>5–8</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Descriptive or partial responses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Answers may be fragmentary and disjointed.</li> </ul>	<b>1–4</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	<b>No creditable content.</b>	<b>0</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Explain why Napoleon’s coup of 1799 against the Directory was successful.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Napoleon was a successful general who had considerable appeal amongst the army and the people of France. Therefore, the coup seemed to offer a viable alternative</li> <li>• Napoleon displayed excellent political skill. The timing of his return to France meant that the news of the less than glorious outcome of his Egyptian expedition did not precede his arrival. Thus, his reputation was not tarnished and his appeal to the French people remained</li> <li>• There was a lot of disillusionment with the Directory. For example, its manipulation of the voting system in 1797 and 1799 seemed to show its concern was maintaining power rather than governing France</li> <li>• His brother, Lucien, just prior to the coup was elected President of the Five Hundred and was able to persuade them to accept the coup</li> <li>• The coup was well prepared. In the weeks before the coup the conspirators bought the allegiance of the deputies. A large number of the Ancients seemed to have had advance warning of the coup and agreed to support it. No difficulties were raised about moving the Councils to St. Cloud, which enabled the coup to take place</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How far do you agree that the failure of the Estates General was caused by Louis XVI?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Louis XVI failed to give a clear lead to the Estates General. For example, the <i>cahiers</i>, a list of grievances sent to the Estates General to inform its discussions, had had no input from the royal government. This meant that, at times, the solutions they suggested were contradictory. Louis XVI's approach created disillusionment with the king, and, thereby, the whole procedure of the Estates General. The voting bias of the Estates General, which discriminated against the Third Estate, was not dealt with by Louis XVI. This created an impasse, as the Third Estate began to discuss separately the organisation of the legislature. The failure to reconcile the three Estates by the king led to the creation of the National Assembly. Louis XVI sought to restore the order of the Estates General by ordering the hall where the National Assembly met to be closed and guarded by royal troops. This reinforced the changes to the Estates General as the new National Assembly swore not to disband until they had settled the constitution of France (the Tennis Court Oath).</p> <p>This argument can be challenged. The last calling of the Estates General had been in 1614. This meant that there was no clear notion of how the newly convened Estates General should proceed. This lack of clarity was seen in the issue of voting – by Estate or by head? The <i>cahiers</i> seemed to promise a way to deal with the issues facing the kingdom. Undoubtedly, this raised expectations which the Estates General could never meet. The problem faced by France in 1789 required a complete overhaul of the <i>Ancien Régime</i>. Therefore, it is questionable just how effective such a seemingly disregarded institution of the <i>Ancien Régime</i> could be in restoring the system.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1262 313"><b>Explain why the Industrial Revolution led to the development of the middle classes.</b></p> <p data-bbox="316 349 549 383">Indicative content</p> <ul data-bbox="316 421 1302 999" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 421 1302 555">• Employment opportunities led to an expansion in numbers and wealth, as the Industrial Revolution created the growing need for industrialists, investors, bankers, merchants, lawyers, engineers, and factory managers</li><li data-bbox="316 555 1302 656">• Greater wealth meant the middle classes had better food and living conditions. This led to fewer deaths and longer living. This meant the population of the middle classes grew</li><li data-bbox="316 656 1302 790">• Increased wealth meant that they could afford greater educational opportunities for their children – private education and attendance at university. This further cemented their place in the professions, business, and politics</li><li data-bbox="316 790 1302 902">• The Industrial Revolution enhanced the status of the middle classes. Thus, Sir Robert Peel the son of a factory owner was a dominant figure in national politics for over twenty years</li><li data-bbox="316 902 1302 999">• Increasing wealth led to pressure for political representation and the result was The Great Reform Act of 1832 which gave much more political influence to the Middle Class</li></ul> <p data-bbox="316 1032 759 1066">Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How far were governments opposed to the demands for change that were caused by industrialisation?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>A consequence of growing industrialisation was that workers began to combine in an attempt to protect their interests. The Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800 made such combinations (unions) illegal and forbade collective bargaining. Although repealed in 1824, governments still took a firm stance against worker seeking to improve their conditions. In 1825, following the outbreak of a series of strikes, a Combination Act was introduced which imposed limits on workers' right to strike. In March 1834, the Tolpuddle Martyrs were transported for making an illegal oath when joining a trade union. This was prompted by the government's alarm at the creation of the Grand National Consolidated Trade Union (GNCTU). The government was determined to prevent the growth of trade unionism. It was seen as a hindrance to the operation of free trade and could lead to demands for political change by the lower classes. The demands of the Chartists were opposed in Parliament, with heavy votes against the two petitions presented in 1839 and 1842. In 1848, Parliament simply refused to receive a third Chartist petition. Also, troops and the newly developing police forces were employed to intimidate the Chartists.</p> <p>However, the extent of opposition can be questioned. Governments were more willing to accede to demands for change from the middle classes. Thus, some political influence was granted to the middle classes through the Reform Act of 1832 and the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835. It was felt that this would detach the middle classes from the lower classes, and they would not combine to present a more potent threat to the existing system. The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 was a further reform which helped to attach the middle classes to the existing order, as it reflected their preferences and priorities. Governments were willing to act, albeit in a limited way, on the working conditions of the lower classes, influenced by Humanitarian and Utilitarian ideas. This led to Factory Acts in 1819, 1833, and 1844, and the Mines Act of 1842. There was, also, a gradual recognition that health issues needed to be addressed, as in the Public Health Act of 1848.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<b>20</b>



Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1230 315"><b>Explain why Austria was opposed to the development of German nationalism.</b></p> <p data-bbox="316 349 549 383">Indicative content</p> <ul data-bbox="316 421 1310 965" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 421 1310 555">• Nationalistic ideas which had accompanied Napoleon into Germany were seen as an existential threat to the Austrian monarchy and its empire. Thus, the Vienna settlement of 1815 restored Germany to a series of independent and sovereign states</li><li data-bbox="316 555 1310 689">• The Austrian Chancellor, Metternich, had played an important role in Napoleon’s defeat. He was a strong ideological conservative who was determined that Austria should dominate the German states and repress nationalist ideas</li><li data-bbox="316 689 1310 790">• The development of German nationalism might lead to the creation of a unified German state, which would be stronger and more of a threat to Austria than a collection of independent states</li><li data-bbox="316 790 1310 869">• German nationalism might lead to the end of the Austrian Empire – German subjects of the Austrian Empire might seek to break away</li><li data-bbox="316 869 1310 965">• German nationalism could act as an inspiration to other national groups – Hungarians, Italians, Czechs, Croats, and Serbs – and lead to their demands for independence</li></ul> <p data-bbox="316 999 759 1032">Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>To what extent did liberals in the Prussian Landtag present a challenge to Bismarck in the period 1862–66?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>When Bismarck was made Minister President of Prussia in 1862, liberals in the Landtag saw this as a direct challenge to them. He was regarded as a conservative reactionary who was likely to overturn the Landtag and was opposed to their aims. Therefore, liberal antagonism towards Bismarck was present from the start. This challenge was significant as liberals presented a formidable grouping in the Landtag. By 1862 they controlled 65% of the seats, whilst the king's supporters had only 11 deputies. In 1863 this liberal control rose to 70% of seats. There had been a constitutional crisis since 1860 over the approval of the army budget because liberals feared the budget and the accompanying army reforms would be used, as in 1848–49, against the Prussian people and not any external threat. Bismarck was made Minister President to end this crisis. He did this by saying parliamentary support for the bill was unnecessary and collected taxes and disbursed funds without any recourse to parliamentary authorisation. In May 1863, seeking to undo Bismarck's policy towards the Polish rebellion against Russia, a motion was passed in the Landtag which demanded, effectively, the dismissal of Bismarck. Whilst the war of 1864 against Denmark had the potential to end conflict with liberals in the Landtag, through its support of German nationalism, it did present Bismarck with the challenge of avoiding placing himself at the mercy of a national-liberal movement. There was undoubted bitterness in Bismarck's relations with liberals. In June 1865 he challenged a leading liberal politician, Virchow, to a duel.</p> <p>The extent of the challenge can be questioned. Bismarck was able to collect taxes and reform the army as if the liberal challenge in the Landtag did not exist. Over four years and two wars Bismarck directed Prussian affairs without constitutionally approved budgets. He had judged, correctly, that his opponents would not present the ultimate challenge – an appeal to force. This was because they had no military force. The victories of 1864 and 1866 appealed to the nationalistic element amongst liberals. In September 1866 an Indemnity Bill, introduced by Bismarck to draw a line under the long-running constitutional conflict, was passed with only seven votes against. There were other challenges which faced Bismarck. He had to threaten resignation in 1863 in order to prevent the king, William I, from meeting the German princes at Frankfurt, following an overture from the Austrian emperor who was seeking to assert Austrian influence by increasing the power of the German Confederation. Had the king gone, Bismarck would have had to resign and a second Olmütz would have occurred. Bismarck, also, could present challenges to himself. His first major speech as Minister President, 'blood and iron' (originally 'iron and blood') was regarded as misjudged and threatening and led to the royal family questioning Bismarck's fitness to act as Minister President. Under the terms of the constitution of Prussia the Minister President was responsible to the monarch not the Landtag. Therefore, it could be argued that the royal relationship was more significant for Bismarck.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p><b>Explain why Kansas became a focus of sectional divisions in the mid-1850s.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>What became known as ‘bleeding Kansas’ was a series of ongoing skirmishes (that some described as a mini-Civil War) that occurred in the Kansas territories after the passing of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Kansas-Nebraska Act allowed people living in the territory to decide for themselves on the issue of slavery – through what was known as popular sovereignty. This law overturned the Missouri Compromise under which Kansas was a ‘free’ state and so some slavers hoped that they would be able to overturn that tradition</li> <li>• Kansas becoming a slave state would have had a political impact as it would have tied the votes in the Senate between slave and free states. This issue was becoming increasingly important in the middle of the 1850s and so Kansas was seen almost as deciding the fate of legislation</li> <li>• Violence quickly became an issue in the territory as settlers from both sides rushed there to establish communities which supported or opposed slavery. As a result, two state capitals and two state legislatures were established. One which supported slavery in Lecompton and one which argued for a free state in Kansas City</li> <li>• On 21 May 1856, 800 pro-slavery fighters attacked the settlement of Lawrence where the free-soil governor lived. People fled as they burned homes and businesses. But the violence was not one-sided – in October 1856 John Brown and his men attacked slave owning families in Pottawatomie Creek. Attacks like these brought the issue to national attention</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p><b>‘The Lincoln–Douglas debates were the main reason for Lincoln’s victory in the 1860 presidential election’.</b></p> <p><b>How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Possible discussions around the Lincoln Douglas debates:</p> <p>The Lincoln–Douglas debates took place from August 21st to October 15th across the state of Illinois. Lincoln and Douglas were both candidates for election to the Senate seat which was to be decided that autumn. Lincoln had challenged Douglas to a ‘war of ideas’ and Douglas was happy to oblige. They held seven debates in the period which caught the attention of the public across the nation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the debates Douglas strongly advocated the policy of popular sovereignty but Lincoln reminded him that this went against the recent Dred Scott judgement that had stated that slavery continued in free territories. In what became known as the Freeport Doctrine Douglas replied that no law could overcome the opinion of citizens on slavery. This was seen as a betrayal by many Southern Democrats</li> <li>• Lincoln constantly returned to the idea that ‘A House Divided Could Not Stand’ and argued that black Americans should be entitled to rights under the Constitution. Although Lincoln did not win the Senate seat (it was decided by a state electoral college) the debates set him up as the focus of abolitionist thinking and action within the Northern United States. By the time of the 1860 election the Republicans desperately needed to win Illinois and other states in the region so Lincoln emerged as the man who would symbolise the hard-working, self-made man of the frontier in these states</li> </ul> <p>Possible discussion of other factors in Lincoln’s electoral victory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anti-slavery – The growth in abolitionist feeling in the Northern states was clearly important to the political situation of the late 1850s. Many had been radicalised by the horrors of Bleeding Kansas earlier in the decade and supported extreme abolitionist positions. After John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry there were those in the North that celebrated him as a martyr although many also condemned his actions. Although abolitionists didn’t always agree with Lincoln most voted for him</li> <li>• Splits within the Democrat party – the Democrats met Charleston in April 1860 to choose their candidate for the election in tumultuous mood. Northern Democrats wanted to nominate Stephen Douglas because they felt he had the best chance of beating Republicans in the North. Douglas though was an enemy of many Southern Democrats because of his championing of popular sovereignty in new territories. Southern Democrats left the convention and later nominated the then vice-president John C. Breckenridge. This split would prove fatal to Democratic electoral hopes</li> </ul>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Smaller parties – Another group of again politicians wanted slavery to not be the central issue of the election and so formed the Constitutional Unionist Party and nominated John Bell as their candidates. This further split the vote in some areas and helped hand victory to Lincoln</li></ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p><b>Explain why some leading businessmen of the late nineteenth century were known as robber barons.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Well known industrialists of the era who were called robber barons included Andrew Carnegie [steel], Jay Gould [railroads], J P Morgan [finance], J D Rockefeller [oil] and Cornelius Vanderbilt [railroads], though there were others. They were commonly known as robber barons because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a belief that they had gained their great wealth and power by using methods which were illegal or immoral, e.g. bribery, share dealings and manipulation, and were unjust</li> <li>• The belief that these men and their methods were a major cause of the growing inequalities of the Gilded Age, as they exploited the efforts of the workers i.e. they were akin to the feudal overlords of the past in the way that they treated and controlled ordinary workers</li> <li>• The power of the image of robber barons was used by those keen to criticise the very wealthy few, e.g. by liberal journalists and progressive reformers</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	<p><b>How successful were attempts to limit the power of party bosses in this period?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>By 1890 virtually every sizable city had a political boss or was in the process of developing one. The most notorious political boss of the age was Boss Tweed of New York's Tammany Hall. For twelve years, Tweed ruled New York. He gave generously to the poor and authorised the handouts of Christmas turkeys and winter coal to prospective supporters. In the process he fleeced the public out of millions of taxpayers' money, which went into the coffers of Tweed and his associates. They were difficult to deal with as they retained the support of the poor people who vastly outnumbered the rest.</p> <p>Possible discussion around limiting the power of Party Bosses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Party bosses were not completely unaccountable as was seen with Tweed above who went to jail for his actions and the foundation of a professional civil service in the late 19th century went some way to improving corruption in some cities. One example of progressive reform was the rise of the city manager system, in which paid, professional engineers ran the day-to-day affairs of city governments under guidelines established by elected city councils</li> <li>• Progressives repeatedly warned that illegal voting was corrupting the political system. It especially identified big-city bosses, working with saloon keepers and precinct workers, as the culprits in stuffing the ballot box. The solution to purifying the vote included prohibition, voter registration requirements and literacy tests</li> <li>• Progressive journalists and politicians often started their careers by campaigning against party bosses and this did go some way to limiting their power. In the North, Progressives argued that the average citizen should have more control over his government. The Oregon System of 'Initiative, Referendum, and Recall' was exported to many states</li> </ul> <p>Possible discussion around lack of success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was difficult to unpick the system – To the urban poor the boss ran a kind of welfare state. For example, he helped the unemployed find jobs and he provided free coal and baskets of food to tide a widow over an emergency. Bosses often began as saloonkeepers, because the saloon was a natural meeting place in poorer neighbourhoods in the days before Prohibition. To maintain power, a boss had to keep his constituents happy. Most political bosses appealed to the newest, most desperate part of the growing population, the immigrants. Individuals who were leaders in local neighbourhoods were sometimes rewarded city jobs in return for the loyalty of their constituents</li> </ul>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is clear that the model of machine politics survived in many cities into the twentieth century, despite efforts, local and national, to limit the negative aspects of the spoils system, i.e. 'jobs – and contracts – for the boys'. Specifically, Tammany Hall remained a power in the life of New York City way beyond the years of Boss Tweed's dominance. This shows that it was difficult for reformers to make any real change</li></ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p><b>Explain why Roosevelt faced legal challenges to the New Deal.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Legal challenges to the New Deal often came through right wing opposition who believed that the New Deal pushed beyond the limits of the Constitution and what the state should (or could) do. In challenging the New Deal, the Supreme Court could start its own grievances but had to choose from the cases put before it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The key cases include Schechter Poultry Corporation vs. United States [1935], in which a unanimous Supreme Court made a judgement which undermined the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, a crucial New Deal reform, and US vs. Butler [1936], which negated the Agricultural Adjustment Act.</li> <li>• These judgements were made by a Supreme Court which contained a group of 'Four Horsemen' [of the Apocalypse], all conservative, which a swing judge would often support to ensure a majority in a court of nine judges. The three liberal judges were known as the Three Musketeers. During the Second New Deal opposition from legal challenges was much less effective.</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	<p><b>'Unemployment was the most significant consequence of the Great Depression.' To what extent do you agree?</b></p> <p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Possible discussion of unemployment as the most significant consequence of the Great Depression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the effects of the Depression cascaded across the US economy, millions of people lost their jobs. By 1930 there were 4.3 million unemployed; by 1931, 8 million; and in 1932 the number had risen to 12 million. By early 1933, almost 13 million were out of work and the unemployment rate stood at an astonishing 25 percent. Those who managed to retain their jobs often took pay cuts of a third or more</li> </ul> <p>Possible discussion of the other significant consequences of the Depression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the Depression, a third of the nation's banks failed. By 1933, 4000 banks had failed. As a result, depositors lost \$140 billion. The stock market lost 90% of its value between 1929 and 1932. It didn't recover for 25 years. People lost all confidence in Wall Street markets. Businesses, banks, and individual investors were wiped out. Even people who hadn't invested lost money. Their banks invested the money from their savings accounts</li> <li>• Homelessness – In 1932 alone, 273 000 families were evicted from their homes; many of these people went on to live in shanty towns that became known as 'Hoovervilles'. One of the biggest of these was in Central Park in New York. By the winter of 1932 it was estimated that 1.2 million Americans were homeless</li> <li>• Health – Peoples' health suffered as a result of poverty and illnesses such as rickets and skin diseases became more common. The suicide rate increased considerably rising to 18.9 per 100 000 people in 1929</li> <li>• Unrest – Demonstrations by the poor demanding increased relief often resulted in fights with the police. In places like Harlem, the 'sit-down strike' became part of the strategy during these relief demonstrations. A Pittsburgh priest named Father James R. Cox attracted 60 000 people to a protest rally; 12 000 of these followers later joined Cox in Washington to protest in front of President Herbert Hoover. When 5000 war veterans demonstrated in Washington in the spring of 1932, Hoover sent none other than General Douglas MacArthur and Major Dwight Eisenhower to break up the rally</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p><b>Explain why economic pressures led to changes in US foreign policy in the late nineteenth century.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>'Economic pressures' covers the general growth of the economy and the pressures it created and might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rapid expansion of the economy during the Gilded Age – search for new markets.</li><li>• Closing of the frontier. With no further internal territorial expansion possible the opportunity for developing internal trade and resources were reduced.</li><li>• The Panics of 1893 and 1896.</li><li>• Involvement in Cuba was largely a response to US economic interests.</li><li>• Acquisition of remnants of the Spanish Empire in Central America and The Pacific provided opportunities for economic expansion into new fields.</li></ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p><b>To what extent had Japan been transformed into a world power by 1905?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>This offers the possibility of alternative interpretations of the international achievements of Japan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries from which a balanced judgement should be possible. Answers may identify a significant difference between potential and acceptance.</p> <p>In support of the argument:</p> <p>It might be suggested that as a result of the Meiji Restoration the country had undergone a rapid industrial and military transformation that brought its economy and armed forces up to the standard of the Western powers. This was demonstrated in its gains from the First Sino-Japanese War (Treaty of Shimonoseki) which also confirmed Japan as a more significant regional power than China. In 1902 it signed its first major international treaty with a western power – the Anglo-Japanese Treaty and it was also successful in the Russo-Japanese War culminating in an international conference and the Treaty of Portsmouth in which it made significant gains. The way they were treated by western powers convinced the military elite in Japan that rather than seeking economic advantage they should develop a more imperialistic policy.</p> <p>Against the argument:</p> <p>The three western powers (Britain, France and Russia) were unhappy with some of the provisions of the Treaty of Shimonoseki and staged the ‘triple intervention’ in which they forced Japan to return the Liaodong peninsula to China. Their treatment did not even rate Japan as a regional power. The Treaty with Britain was a purely regional arrangement to help the British deal with the threat of other powers, especially Russia, to their Asian empire – it did not really constitute recognition of Japan as an equal power. Finally, the defeat of Russia was seen largely as a sign of Russian weakness and disorganisation rather than a success that placed Japan on equal terms with the western powers.</p> <p>Note: the question is about Japan in 1905 – comparison with Japan in 1918 is NOT a valid response.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p><b>Explain why the United States was involved in European affairs in the 1920s.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Following the failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles it seemed that the US had returned to a strict isolationist policy under its Republican presidents of the 1920s. The core argument of successful answers is likely to be based around economic issues and self-interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washington Conference – 1921–22 US sought to place limitations on European naval development in order to reduce risk of future naval race and threat of war.</li> <li>• The collapses of the German economy, as a result of the hyper-inflation in 1923, threatened the whole economy of Europe and trade with the US.</li> <li>• The French occupation of the Ruhr because of no payment of reparations threatened the international security of Europe.</li> <li>• In a joint US/British initiative, banker Charles Dawes chaired an international committee that drew up the Dawes Plan for US loans to fund German Repayments. This satisfied the French who got their payments and encouraged international growth which benefitted the US economy.</li> <li>• Kellogg-Briand Pact this idea was developed by US Secretary of State Frank Kellogg partly as a response to the huge popularity of the ‘outlawry of war’ movement in the US. Sought to avoid war in Europe.</li> <li>• Young Plan was meant to complete what had been started by the Dawes Plan in settling a reduced figure for reparations payments and a phased plan for their continuing payment.</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	<p><b>To what extent was German dissatisfaction with the Treaty of Versailles resolved by international negotiations in the 1920s?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The question provides an opportunity to consider the basis of German dissatisfaction and the extent to which this was eased by the international agreements made in the decade following the war.</p> <p>Dissatisfaction stemmed from four basic issues: the war guilt clause, demilitarisation, loss of territory and reparations. Germany also faced international isolation.</p> <p>Negotiations which addressed some of these might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genoa Conference and Rapallo; the conference was organised by Britain to try and resolve issues between France and Germany particularly over reparations but collapsed without achieving anything though it did result in Germany and Russia signing the Rapallo Pact which ended Germany's post war isolation.</li> <li>• Dawes Plan was a result of the German hyperinflation and Franco Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. It provided loans to Germany so that they could make reparations payments, reform their currency and rebuild the economy, but it did not resolve the underlying problems.</li> <li>• Locarno Pact improved relations with France and led to German admission to the League of Nations in 1926 so ended international isolation.</li> <li>• Kellogg-Briand Pact was a general renunciation of war and theoretically committed its signatories to eventual disarmament which might have resolved the issue of German disarmament but in fact this never happened so no solution.</li> <li>• Young Plan was designed to complete the reform initiated by Dawes by reducing the reparations sum and arranging a manageable repayments system, but it never got off the ground because of the Wall Street Crash and start of the Great Depression.</li> <li>• So overall some progress but many issues remained unresolved and played a major part in the rise of Nazism.</li> </ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p><b>Explain why German remilitarisation of the Rhineland was not resisted by Britain and France.</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Hitler's forces were limited and a strong response could have stopped this as the French had clearly superior forces at this stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Remilitarisation would require full mobilisation of the French army and France was not psychologically prepared for that.</li><li>• France suffered a severe economic crisis in 1935–36 and was not in a position to respond.</li><li>• In Britain, many did not see it as a problem; '...just Germany walking into its own backyard'.</li><li>• There were no protests against the move in Britain and several 'peace rallies' demanding the issue be resolved without military force.</li><li>• Britain had only just begun its rearmament programme and was in no position to act.</li><li>• Britain could not, in any case, act without France.</li></ul> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	<p><b>‘The main reason for the eventual failure of the League was its members’ unwillingness to take decisive action against Japanese aggression’. How far do you agree with this claim?</b></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>This essay provides an opportunity to compare the specific effects of the failure in the Manchurian Crisis and later Sino-Japanese War, with the importance of the long-term weaknesses of the League and to reach a reasoned assessment of relative importance.</p> <p>The Manchurian Crisis:</p> <p>The Japanese used the Mukden railway incident as an excuse to seize Manchuria and set up their own puppet government there. The League responded by sending a commission to look into Japan’s actions and in March 1933 ordered Japan to leave the area. The Japanese ignored them. This showed that the League was unable to act against a determined aggressor when that was one of the Great Powers. This encouraged Hitler to leave the League in late 1933 on the pretext of the failure of the World Disarmament Conference and begin his own aggressive re-armament and expansion. Japan’s success encouraged Italy to follow suit with the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 when the League again failed and Italy left the League in 1937. By the late 1930s no one was taking much notice of the League and when the Japanese invaded China in 1937 there was little response.</p> <p>Other factors:</p> <p>On the other hand, the progressive failure of the League could simply be attributed to its own systemic weaknesses which were simply highlighted by the Japanese aggression. These include lack of support from the USA, lack of any armed forces, the voting system that required consensus for any decisions to be made and the fact the even when decisions were made e.g. for economic sanctions, member states were prepared to ignore them if they were not in their own national interest.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20