



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/22

Paper 2 Outline Study

October/November 2023

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

<p>Published</p>

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 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **22** 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
Level 4	Connects factors to reach a reasoned conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 reach a supported conclusion. 	9–10
Level 3	Explains factor(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers include explained factor(s) supported by relevant information. 	6–8
Level 2	Describes factor(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	3–5
Level 1	Describes the topic/issue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation. 	1–2
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5	Responses which develop a sustained judgement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers are well focused and closely argued. (Answers show a maintained and complete understanding of the question.) Answers are supported by precisely selected evidence. Answers lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported. 	17–20
Level 4	Responses which develop a balanced argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. (At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.) 	13–16
Level 3	Responses which begin to develop assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	9–12
Level 2	Responses which show some understanding of the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	5–8

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 1	Descriptive or partial responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	1–4
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

Annotation symbols

ID	ID	Valid point identified
	EXP	Explanation (an explained valid point)
	Tick	Detail/evidence is used to support the point
	Plus	Balanced – Considers the other view
	?	Unclear
	AN	Analysis
	^	Unsupported assertion
	K	Knowledge
	EVAL	Evaluation
	NAR	Lengthy narrative that is not answering the question
	Extendable Wavy Line	Use with other annotations to show extended issues or narrative
N/A	Highlighter	Highlight a section of text
N/A	On-page comment	Allows comments to be entered in speech bubbles on the candidate response.

Using the annotations

- Annotate using the symbols above as you read through the script.
- At the end of each question write a short on-page comment:
 - be positive – say what the candidate has done, rather than what they have not
 - reference the attributes of the level descriptor you are awarding (i.e. make sure your comment matches the mark you have given)

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Explain why the slave trade was important to the growth of industry.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stimulated British manufacturing and industry through demands for goods, e.g. plantation utensils and clothing for slaves and estates.• British manufacturers benefited by supplying factory made goods in exchange for slaves in Africa.• Places like Manchester became an important textile centre as it made cloth from cheap slave picked cotton. This allowed it to export its goods throughout the world.• Profits made in the slave trade provided money for investment in British industry and fostered innovation and technological development.• Banking and insurance companies offered services to slave merchants to expand and made cities such as London very wealthy. The experience, and funds, gained from these services provided the means for investment in industry. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>‘The middle classes benefited the most from industrialisation.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments to show that the middle classes did benefit the most could be as follows. Industrialisation created employment opportunities in the form of industrialists, investors, bankers, merchants, lawyers, engineers, and factory managers. This led to an expansion in numbers and wealth. The greater wealth provided better food and living conditions. This led to fewer deaths and longer living. The increase in personal wealth and more prominent role in the creation of the nation’s wealth ensured that the previously unchallenged economic supremacy of the landed aristocracy came under threat. The nation’s economic policies came to reflect the preferences and priorities of the middle classes (repeal of the Corn Laws, 1846). This increased role in the economy led to demands, which were successful, for greater influence over government policy (Reform Act, 1832 and Municipal Corporations Act, 1835). Industrialisation led to the status of the middle classes being enhanced. Sir Robert Peel the son of a northern industrialist, was a dominant figure in national politics for over 20 years.</p> <p>This view can be challenged. Working people benefited from more secure employment and were not so prone to the seasonal or periodic unemployment as in an agrarian economy. Hence the migration from rural to urban areas, in 1760 16% lived in urban areas but by 1840 it was 54% and continued to rise. However, the working and living conditions in these urban centres were poor. When unemployment occurred, there was no social safety net. Attempts were made to improve working conditions, but they dealt much more with women and children rather than adult male workers. They often led to cuts in family income and longer hours for adult males. Unlike the middle classes, working people received no political recognition (e. g. failure of Chartism). It could be argued that the position of working people was not much better than in pre-industrial times. Despite the Reform Act of 1832 the aristocracy continued to dominate public life. In the following 30 years, except for Peel, most cabinet members and Prime Ministers were members of the aristocracy. Also, few industrialists entered parliament as they were too busy running their businesses, whilst landowners left the running of their estates to their agents and so had the leisure to enter public life.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Explain why the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819 were issued.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The decrees provided inspectors for universities, disbanded student societies, introduced press censorship and set up a commission to investigate, and clamp down on, so-called revolutionary movements.• The immediate cause was the murder of a reactionary writer and secret agent (Kotzebue) of the Russian Tsar by a member of a student society.• The murder seemed to confirm Metternich's belief that student societies (<i>Burschenschaften</i>) promoted liberalism and nationalism in Germany. These were products of the French Revolution and, as such, a threat to the aims of preserving monarchical rule and the social dominance of the aristocracy.• Liberalism and nationalism were an existential threat to the Austrian Empire, made up as it was of several nationalities (Hungarians/Czechs/Poles/Croats).• Austria was the dominant power in the German Confederation and a growth in liberalism and nationalism would threaten this dominance. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p>‘German nationalism caused the war fought by Denmark in 1864 against Prussia and Austria.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments to support this view might be as follows. The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein had been under Danish rule for 400 years, but Holstein’s population was German speaking whilst Schleswig had more Danish speakers. German nationalists wanted the duchies incorporated into Germany. This German nationalism created tensions which had led to a war, 1848–1851, between several German states and Denmark. The issue seemed to have been settled by the London Protocol of 1852. However, in November 1863 the new Danish king incorporated Schleswig into Denmark, a clear breach of the protocol which provided Prussia and Austria with a <i>casus belli</i> against Denmark.</p> <p>The view can be challenged. It was the product of a clash of nationalisms, Danish and German. Danish nationalists wanted to maintain its language and culture in Schleswig. It was Danish nationalism in 1863 which breached the London Protocol and caused the war to happen. The war of 1864 can be seen, also, as the result of an old-fashioned dynastic dispute caused by the death of a king, Frederick VII of Denmark, without male heir. In Denmark royal succession could pass down the female line but the two duchies followed the Salic Law which favoured the male line. When Christian IX became king in 1863 the government of Holstein refused to swear allegiance and the son of the Prince of Augustenburg, a German claimant, claimed the duchies. In addition, there was an economic aspect to the war as there was a grievance at the tolls the Danes charged through the Danish Straits between the Baltic and North Sea. To avoid this Austria and Prussia intended to build the Kiel canal, but it could not be done whilst Denmark ruled Holstein. It can be argued that a change in the international situation led Bismarck to see an opportunity ripe for exploitation. By 1863 there was a decline in support for Denmark’s position over the duchies – the Crimean War had crippled Russia’s power and France was prepared to renounce Danish interests in exchange for compensation to herself elsewhere. Some argue it was the product of Bismarck’s long-term aim to increase Prussia’s power by annexing land and cementing Prussian pre-eminence in Germany by the defeat of Austria and France in future wars. This would create a unified Germany under Prussian leadership.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p>Explain why ‘Bloody Sunday’ weakened the Tsarist regime in 1905.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The killing of unarmed men, women and children was seen by many as a deliberate act and questioned the Tsar’s image as the ‘Little Father.’ • There was an Empire wide outbreak of disorder in response to the killings and this disorder increased as the year went on. In places (e. g. Poland and Georgia) the Tsarist government almost broke down. • Strikes occurred in all major cities and towns. In the initial stages it seems that there was employer support for the strikers. This suggests that the killings had created serious disillusionment with the regime amongst the middle classes. • The anger created by ‘Bloody Sunday’ became associated with other concerns – defeat by Japan led to mutinies in the army and navy – peasants feared the loss of property for not paying off mortgages taken post emancipation, and so began to seize the gentry’s land in the countryside – workers in several cities, notably St. Petersburg and Moscow, formed soviets to demand better conditions, and became the base for political agitation amongst revolutionaries such as Trotsky. • ‘Bloody Sunday’ was the spark which led to a widespread explosion of opposition to the Tsar’s rule. The October Manifesto was produced in response to this opposition and seemed to signal the end of Tsarist autocracy. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p>To what extent was Bolshevik success in October 1917 caused by the errors of the Provisional Government?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments to support the central role the Provisional Government's (PG) errors played in Bolshevik success in October 1917 could be as follows. The PG failure to remove Russia from the First World War lost it a great deal of support. The problems of food shortages and military losses remained. The preoccupation with the war meant that the land issue was not adequately addressed and caused widespread discontent in the countryside. Demand for war production remained high but the problems of pay and working conditions still faced the industrial workers. The situation seemed no different from that experienced under the Tsar. This led to the PG being unpopular and provided ammunition for the Bolsheviks ('Peace, Land and Bread'). The Kornilov Affair was mishandled by the PG and led to a reinvigorating of the Bolsheviks after the July Days, and by September 1917 they controlled the Petrograd Soviet (PS).</p> <p>However, this view can be questioned. The PG was weak from the outset. It had to share power with the PS which meant it could never establish its authority fully, and so left it vulnerable to a determined opponent like the Bolsheviks. Lenin proved to be an inspired leader. He saw the weakness of the PG and was, therefore, opposed to any cooperation with it. This presented the Bolsheviks as a viable alternative, untainted by avoiding association with the PG. This was enhanced by the policies he advocated after his return to Russia in April 1917. The Bolsheviks favoured 'All power to the Soviets' which raised their support within the soviets, and by September 1917 Trotsky was chairman of the Petrograd Soviet. Bolshevik appeal was broadened through the slogan 'Peace, Land and Bread' – the people wanted an end to the war – Bolshevik support lay in the cities but offering land to the peasants, the bulk of the population, meant they would be neutral when the Bolsheviks made their bid for power – food shortages would be ended. Trotsky was vital to Bolshevik success in October 1917. His position in the PS allowed him to set up the Red Guard, a Bolshevik militia made up of armed factory workers, soldiers, and sailors. On October 23, he persuaded the garrison of the Peter and Paul fortress to come over to the Bolsheviks. Lenin gave the order for the uprising to begin but it was Trotsky who directed the Red Guard in their seizure of key installations and vantage points in Petrograd.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p>Explain why implementing the Compromise of 1850 caused problems.</p> <p>The Compromise of 1850 contained the following provisions: (1) California was admitted to the Union as a free state; (2) the remainder of the Mexican cession was divided into the two territories of New Mexico and Utah and organized without mention of slavery; (3) the claim of Texas to a portion of New Mexico was satisfied by a payment of \$10 million; (4) new legislation (the Fugitive Slave Act) was passed to apprehend runaway slaves and return them to their masters; and (5) the buying and selling of slaves (but not slavery) was abolished in the District of Columbia. As a result of this compromise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North seemed to have gained from the admittance of California and the subsequent lack of balance in the Senate between slave and non-slave states. Southerners were also concerned about the issue of slavery not being mentioned in relation to the new territories. • Undoubtedly though the South ‘won’ with the passing of the Fugitive Slave Act. Northerners saw the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 as imposition of federal control in Northern states. The changes with the previous law, which had been passed in 1793, meant that any adult male could be called upon to take part in a posse to capture a slave. This was seen as an affront to the abolitionist feeling of many in the North. • Under the previous law it had been difficult to find judges to rule on cases but provided for federal circuit courts to designate commissioners specifically to hear rendition proceedings. The commissioners who heard rendition cases earned a fee of \$10 if they found in favour of the slave-owner but only \$5 if they found that the alleged slave had been misidentified. This was seen as unfair. • Many states and Free Soil members of Congress tried to argue that the new law was unconstitutional. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p>‘By April 1861 both the North and the South wanted war.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Extremists (sometimes known as Fire-eaters) in the South had been calling for secession and conflict for many years. In the decade prior to the outbreak of war they had constantly highlighted what they saw as threats to slavery and claimed that any attempt at compromise was an attempt to undermine ‘King Cotton’. Thus, the South saw the election of Lincoln as an attack on the institution of slavery and a break in the compact of the Union. They believed it was their right to secede. Economic issues were also clear – Georgia accused the federal government of exploiting the South and the North of dominating the federal government. Similarly, Texas officials expressed dissatisfaction with federal military protection. Many states continued to use the call of States’ Rights to explain their secession even mentioning the lack of implementation of the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act as a grievance. There is also a lot of legitimate discussion about how far Lincoln wanted war. Many historians have accused him of not pursuing a positive war (i.e. a crusade against slavery) but equally there is evidence that by the time of Fort Sumter he was clear that continuing to hold it would likely result in war. However, Lincoln saw maintaining slavery as a legitimate trade-off to avoid war and save the union. This can be seen by his support for the Corwin Amendment which attempted to protect slavery where it existed. The amendment was passed by Congress in early 1861 but was never ratified. On 12th April 1861 Confederate shore batteries under General P.G.T. Beauregard opened fire on Union-held Fort Sumter in South Carolina’s Charleston Bay. During the next 34 hours, 50 Confederate guns and mortars launched more than 4000 rounds at the poorly supplied fort. On April 13, US Major Robert Anderson surrendered the fort. Two days later, US President Abraham Lincoln issued a proclamation calling for 75 000 volunteer soldiers to quell the Southern ‘insurrection’.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p>Explain why the 14th Amendment was passed.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The fourteenth amendment was passed on 9 July 1868 to give citizenship to former slaves and states that every person born or naturalised in America is a citizen of the country as well as their state of residence.• The amendment was passed in response to the 'Black Codes' which many Southern States had created in order to undermine the rights of former enslaved people. The fourteenth amendment placed a limit of states' rights as well as protecting the civil rights of black Americans.• The fourteenth amendment also focused on the issue of rebellion and the readmission of states into the Union. States could not be officially readmitted to the Union without ratifying the 14th amendment. It also stated that no one could be elected to public office after engaging in rebellion or treason. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	<p>To what extent was poor military leadership the reason the Civil War lasted for four years?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may frame their discussion in terms of North/South or through the lens of individual leaders. Possible discussions of military leaders may include the leadership of Scott/McClellan/Halleck and Grant as Generals-in-Chief vs Lee and Jackson – though candidates are likely to concentrate on the better-known names. At the start, the Southern leadership was stronger in that Jefferson Davis had considerable military experience, having fought in the war against Mexico in 1846–48 and being Secretary of War in 1853–57. In addition, the South had Robert E Lee as the leader of its army in Northern Virginia, where many of the early battles were fought. Lincoln’s military commanders tended to be cautious and ineffectual, which caused him frustration and the Northern leadership additional problems. By 1864, however, he found his man, Ulysses Grant, who provided the dynamic, aggressive campaigning Lincoln believed necessary. 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.</p> <p>Possible discussions of other factors prolonging the war might include 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 coastline, and this took time. The production of arms and the training of raw recruits could not be achieved overnight. Thus, the North’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 North controlled the Mississippi.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p>Explain why Roosevelt established the Alphabet Agencies.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Roosevelt and his advisors known as the ‘brains trust’ set up a number of agencies designed to tackle the major problems of the Depression. They became known as Alphabet Agencies as they were often referred to by their initials. Candidates may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies designed to help farmers – The Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) paid farmers to produce fewer crops. This aimed to end overproduction and drive food prices back up. The Farm Credit Administration improved mortgages for about 20% of farms, meaning farmers could pay more easily and avoid repossession. • Agencies designed to get people back to work – The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) was set up to give outdoor conservation work to half a million 17 to 23-year-olds. They lived in camps and were paid \$30 a month, most of which was sent home to their families. The Public Works Administration involved \$3.3 billion of federal money for public works schemes and for hiring skilled workers. • Agencies designed to help industry – The NRA set up a scheme where business owners could pledge to follow guidelines on wages, working hours, workplace conditions and prices. The NRA also gave workers the legal right to join a union and campaign for better working conditions. Union membership rose from 3.1 million to 3.9 million in 1939. • Improvement in technology – The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was set up to solve the problems of poverty, underdevelopment, and soil erosion in states along the Tennessee River. Federal control allowed it to achieve more than state governments could. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	<p>‘The Great Crash was caused by speculation on the stock market.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Possible discussions concerning speculation on the stock market might induce the government’s selling of war bonds during World War One meant ordinary people became attracted to investments. Their interest continued in the 1920s, especially when they saw wealthy people making huge profits from buying and selling shares. Many Americans, who could ill-afford to lose money, became caught up in this disastrous type of speculation. Some people even bought shares ‘on the margin’, i.e. they borrowed money to buy shares and then held on to them until they were worth more than the debt. Then they sold the shares, paid off the original debt and made a profit. However, it was difficult for this kind of market to continue over a long period of time.</p> <p>Possible discussions of other factors might include overproduction in the agricultural sector. As farming techniques improved, farmers started producing more food. However, the demand for grain fell in America because of Prohibition and changes in tastes in food. There was also less demand from Europeans for food from America because they were growing their own crops and there was a tariff war. The laissez-faire policies of the Republican presidents of the 1920s also meant that there was little regulation in the economy. Banks were unregulated and even before the crash many went out of business leaving customers with no way of getting their money back. Many banks were small and local rather than national which meant they had no way of dealing with a shock like the Wall Street Crash. Overproduction of consumer goods might also be considered. By the end of the 1920s, there were too many consumer goods unsold in the USA. Mass production methods led to supply outstripping demand. People who could afford items, such as cars and household gadgets, had already purchased them. Also, people in agriculture and the traditional industries, who were on low wages, could not afford consumer goods. This led to workers being laid off, which reduced demand for goods even further.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p>Explain why the USA did not join the League of Nations in 1920.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was the brainchild of democratic President Wilson but was strongly opposed by Republicans and others within the US.• Republicans controlled Congress and voted against acceptance of the Versailles Peace Treaties, which was seen as too punitive and because of concern about this causing internal conflict between different groups of European immigrants.• The establishment of the League was an integral part of the Treaties so rejecting them also meant rejecting the League of Nations.• Americans were afraid that it would allow foreign powers to interfere in US internal affairs.• There was concern about what it would cost the US. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p>To what extent did the Ruhr crisis lead to a change in relations between France and Germany?</p> <p>Arguments supporting the statement may consider how, in the aftermath of the war, France sought to control any future development of Germany by enforcing the punitive clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. Germany's search for support can be seen in the signing of the Rapallo Pact with Russia and France's in the creation of the Little Entente (1921). This policy culminated in the occupation of the Ruhr. The universal condemnation of this action led to a change of policy to seeking collective security in international agreements. The first step towards this was the Dawes Plan to help resolve the issue of payment of reparations. Following this the Locarno Treaties provided a reconciliation of border issues with Germany as well as international support in the event of any challenge to this agreement. As a result of this Stresemann and Briand were awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1926. The positive relationship between these two formed the basis of a period of improved relationship between the two countries and it was followed by the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 which confirmed international commitment to disarmament, providing further reassurance to France and confirming a more positive relationship.</p> <p>Arguments challenging the statement may consider how French policy immediately after the war was determined by the French desire for revenge and punishment and their need for assurances that Germany would never again be a threat to French security. In a sense this remained the underlying driving force behind French policy towards Germany. All the actions and agreements of the 1920s, whilst they improved the immediate nature of relationship between them, did not change the nature of the underlying relationship which was one of distrust and potential conflict. This was the basis of agreements like the Little Entente, the Locarno Treaties and even the Kellogg-Briand Pact, all of which gave France further guarantees of support in the event of future conflict with Germany. The Wall Street Crash and the death of Stresemann in 1929 revealed just how fragile the better relationship actually was.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p>Explain why the League failed to stop Italian aggression against Abyssinia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Britain and France were unwilling to fight for a small insignificant African country and would only agree to limited economic sanctions which did not include oil or other vital war materials• The League did not want to cause conflict with Italy because of the growing threat of Hitler in Germany.• By 1936 what Britain and France thought determined what the League did.• US continued to trade with Italy which further undermined the attempted sanctions.• After its failure to act in Manchuria the League had lost all credibility. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	<p>‘Ideology was the reason for the differing international responses to the Spanish Civil War.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Discussion of the importance of ideology may consider how the Spanish Fascist party (the Falangists) were only one part of a right-wing coalition that backed Franco’s Nationalist agenda, but Hitler and Mussolini saw intervention as an opportunity to establish another sympathetic power with a similar ideology. Stalin was willing to send support to the Spanish Communists but did not like the diversity of the Republican group and so limited his support. He also worried that supporting communism in Spain too overtly would antagonise the Western democracies and strengthen their mistrust of, and opposition to, Communism so in a sense ideology limited his support. The International Brigades were built on the democratic idealism of the individual members that came from other countries to fight for the Republic.</p> <p>Discussion of other factors may consider how Hitler wanted to test the strength of his newly developed military forces – especially his air force, members of which could ‘volunteer’ to join the Condor Legion. Mussolini also arguably had other motives and wanted to pursue his personal ambition of building a new Roman empire around the Mediterranean and saw intervention as a way to shore up his flagging support at home. Britain and France were militarily unprepared and did not want to risk starting a more widespread European war. The USA was still pursuing a policy of isolationism in relation to the European conflicts.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p>Explain why democratic government failed in Japan in the 1930s.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited experience of democratic rule• Failure to deal effectively with the effects of the Great Depression which undermined support for democratic government.• There were accusations of significant corruption in the governments of the early 1930s.• Rise of extreme nationalist groups like the Cherry Blossom Society.• Role of the army especially in the seizure of Manchuria which was done without any consultation with the government and simply accepted as a fait accompli. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	<p>How important was the Rectification Campaign in establishing Mao Zedong's control over the Chinese Communist Party?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates may consider Mao's position in 1941. Mao established himself as a significant leader by successfully managing the Long March and leading the setting up of the Ya'nan Soviet. The collaboration with Chiang consolidated his position as it increased his prestige amongst the peasant masses who he was now mobilising for the struggle against Japan. However, there was strong Soviet faction within the leadership hierarchy centred around Mao's most powerful rival, Wang Ming. A popular and respected Politburo member, Wang differed from Mao on questions of tactics and ideology. Along with the other '28 Bolsheviks', Wang Ming advocated a Soviet-style proletarian revolution, driven by the urban working class. He criticised Mao's theory of peasant-driven revolution as deviationist. This group had the backing of Stalin and the Soviet leadership.</p> <p>Discussion of the effects of the Rectification Campaign may include how, on the surface, the purpose of rectification was to educate the masses and purify CCP ideology. It began as a series of reflective study sessions, where individual party members studied the writings of Mao Zedong and engaged in reflection and criticism of their own attitudes. In reality, Rectification was a campaign to identify, marginalise, intimidate, and remove party members opposed to Mao's leadership and policies. Through this process, Mao was able to establish himself as the undisputed leader and figurehead of the CCP. Rectification cemented the party's ideological direction for years to come. Mao's own theories became the official ideology of the CCP. Though on the surface a political and intellectual movement, Rectification utilised terror tactics and produced violent outcomes. Though estimates vary, the purges carried out during Rectification caused as many as 10 000 deaths. Understanding Rectification is pivotal to understanding the development of the CCP and the leadership of Mao Zedong. It also provides a counterbalance to communist propaganda about the Yan'an Soviet, which is depicted as a period of optimism, cooperation, and unity.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20