

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/23

Paper 23 (Outline Study), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

Generic levels of response

Part (a)

Level 4: Evaluates factors **[9–10]**

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

Level 3: Explains factors **[6–8]**

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

Level 2: Describes factors **[3–5]**

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

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

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

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content. **[0]**

Part (b)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

Level 1: Descriptive or partial responses [1–5]

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

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content. [0]

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789 – 1917

1 France, 1789 – 1804

(a) Why did the Directory face problems in France from 1795 to 1799? [10]

Candidates might discuss people's expectations of the government. It came to power after six years of instability when little seemed to have been achieved. The treasury was empty and the paper currency was worthless. The Directors came to power more because of the unpopularity of other political groups, culminating in the rule of the Jacobins. The Directory attempted policies to restore stability by means such as a forced loan on the wealthy, but they proved unpopular. Local administration fell apart. The Directory's main support came from the army but the war went badly until Napoleon's successes and these were to strengthen his position more than that of the Directors. The administration was accused of corruption but this was probably exaggerated. It failed when it attempted to introduce reforms to strengthen government. These were dismissed as authoritarian. Hence the coup of Brumaire in 1799 that brought it down, to be replaced by Napoleon's consulate.

(b) How far do you agree that war was the most important cause of the instability of French governments from 1789 to 1795? [20]

Answers might be organised in different chronological sections but the best should contain some overarching judgements. The government of Louis XVI was under pressure from 1789 particularly because of financial problems. The King was rapidly losing political control because of the failure of the Estates General. Violence spread and reference can be made to the attack on the Bastille and the Grand Peur (July-August 1789). Louis' position was weakened when disorder spread from Paris to the provinces. Successive institutions such as the Constituent Assembly meant that Louis XVI could no longer be regarded as the government. Instability was heightened by the presence of reactionaries in the provinces and the threat from foreign enemies. Inflation became worse. The payment of taxes dried up and loans were impossible to negotiate other than at the cost of very high interest rates. The foreign wars from 1792, especially with the Flight to Varennes (1791), destabilised France further. From that year, radical groups in Paris became stronger. Extremism alone seemed the answer to France's problems. The outcome was the inception in 1793 of the Jacobin regime led by Robespierre. Its use of terror seemed to bring some stability but with hindsight this seems deceptive. Further extremism followed, e.g. the Law of Prairial which undermined Rule by Law, to be replaced by the Law of Necessity. By 1795, the danger from foreign enemies seemed to have stabilised but other problems such as finance continued. Robespierre and his party were isolated and the most extreme government of France was brought down by a country that preferred the more moderate and cautious Directory in 1795. Even with changing governments, candidates might judge that many of the problems of 1789 were still apparent in 1795, for example the lack of a representative and popular government and finance.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800 – 1850

(a) Why did mechanisation affect the lower classes? [10]

The highest level of responses should be able to point to some benefits as well as disadvantages but it will not be necessary for answers to be evenly balanced. The balance will depend on the argument. But moderate answer might be vague about what is meant by mechanisation. The positive aspect might include the opportunities for employment, especially for unskilled labour. Workers did not have rights but employment became more certain. Mechanisation depended less on the vagaries of weather. Mechanisation through railways meant that supplies especially food, could be transported over wider distances. Periodic fear of shortages was lessened. More employment was available. The railways for example were a major source of employment in building or running them. On the other hand, mechanisation could cause hardship. Machines in rural areas put men out of work. Skilled labourers were worst hit. Machines did not need them. It is not reasonable to expect specific examples of villages and small towns that suffered but the best answers might have some references to areas / towns that benefited.

(b) How far did industrialisation result in changing patterns of trade in this period? Refer to any two countries in your answer. [20]

‘How far?’ invites candidates to consider continuity as well as change. They should note that the topic and the question end in 1850. Internally, industrialisation was an advantage to established trade centres but also benefited others that happened to be favourably placed. Railway lines put some places at an advantage, providing an outlet for trade from localities to large if more distant markets. The output of coal and steel increased greatly in Britain. The boom in Britain’s cotton trade depended largely on industrialisation, both because of the new machines and larger and faster ships. These were still mostly sail powered but steam ships were increasing rapidly. Lancashire depended on overseas markets for much of its wealth. The balance of British trade was overseas. Support for free trade grew, as in demands to end the Corn Laws and to support other aspects of free trade. The same pattern was to be seen in France and Germany but to a lesser extent. For example, the circle within which French farmers and producers sold their products widened. Lagging behind in industry by 1850, French and German trade was still mostly continental. Prussia developed the Zollverein in 1834 although similar innovations began from 1815. It encouraged industrialisation and German trade.

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

(a) Why did Britain go to war with Germany in 1914? [10]

There might be general accounts of the causes of World War I but little on the specific issue in the question, such responses will deserve limited credit. A very successful answer might ignore events in the Balkans and be more narrowly focused on relations between Britain and Germany. The immediate cause of war was the invasion of Belgium but this revealed deeper and more complex issues, simplified when the war began. Britain, in common with other European countries, had recognised Belgian neutrality and the best responses will explain why this was important. It feared that German control of Belgium would result in German control of the North Sea, a threat to Britain’s security. Reference might well be made to the Naval Race and to German war planning. Why was Belgium vital to Germany? The issues combined honour and strategic interests (e.g. the Schlieffen Plan). The Triple Entente as an alliance was less vital because Britain did not make clear what its treaty commitments to France and especially Russia involved.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

(b) Assess the reasons why tensions in the Balkans were a concern to major European countries from 1900 to 1914. [20]

Basic answers might well be restricted to narrative of the Sarajevo crisis in 1914. Good answers will not require an even balance across the specified period but should reflect an understanding of the period as a whole. The region comprised small nations; including Bosnia, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Montenegro and Romania, that struggled to assert their independence after the decline of the Turkish empire. To Austria and Russia, the region was important strategically as promising an expansion of their national interests. Liberals in other countries were interested because they backed moves towards independence although this created instability. Austrian annexation of Bosnia – Herzegovina in 1908 was ostensibly to hold back Turkey but was really intended to limit Serbian influence in the Balkans. Candidates can explain the problem of Slav nationalism for Austria. Russia had conflicting interests in the region. It had long wished to secure safe routes to the Mediterranean and claimed cultural links through the orthodox religion. It was dissatisfied with the settlement of the Bosnian crisis of 1908–09 and was determined not to back down again in 1914. Germany became involved as the alliance partner of Austria. Britain had a general policy of avoiding instability whilst France had no direct interests in the region but wished to back Russia against the German-backed Austria. These feelings reached a climax in 1914 with the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, seen by Austria and Germany as evidence of Serbian/Slav aggression and by Russia and France as indicating Austrian opposition to valid Serbian nationalism and the rights of small countries.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905 – 1917

(a) Why was there widespread disorder in Russia in 1905? [10]

Candidates should avoid vague claims about the Revolution and concentrate on the widespread dissatisfaction in Russia. The peasants, comprising the largest group, were hit hard by rising taxes. These had been imposed to pay for Witte's industrialisation. The taxes aggravated long-standing grievances about land. Emancipation seemed not to have improved their situation because it meant redemption payments. Many peasants believed that emancipation was a poor deal. Urban poor complained about their living conditions. There were also harsh working conditions. Racial groups were alienated by the tsarist policies of Russification which imposed the superiority of the Russian language, orthodox religion, laws and customs. Individually, the racial groups were not large but taken together they comprised almost a half of the population. Bloody Sunday was explosive. A march in St. Petersburg led by Father Gapon was put down violently by the military. Although the march demanded reforms, it was not revolutionary in nature. Nicholas II was not in St. Petersburg but was blamed. Strikes and disorder spread throughout Russia. The movement spread from urban workers to rural peasantry and the middle classes. Some candidates might refer to the defeat in the war with Japan.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

(b) How important was Lenin in the Bolsheviks' seizure of power in October 1917? [20]

Candidates will be allowed to discuss other factors such as the war and the failures of the Provisional Government but the better answers will link these factors to Lenin to show how he took advantage of them. It will be difficult to make material on developments before 1917 very relevant. Answers might begin with the February Revolution but those that focus more narrowly on the later months should not be regarded as incomplete. The February Revolution took Lenin and other Bolsheviks by surprise and progress to power was not as easy as communist historians later claimed. The July Days were a serious setback. Lenin fled to Finland and the Bolsheviks went underground. However, Lenin's realism and ability to find popular programmes were the keys to his success. Slogans such as Peace, Land and Bread were easy to understand and responded to popular grievances. He offered a contrast to Kerensky. Lenin responded quickly to the Kornilov affair with an alliance between the Bolsheviks and the soviets that contrasted with the weakness and uncertainty of the Provisional Government. The call for 'All power to the Soviets' was more popular than 'All power to the Bolsheviks'. The Bolsheviks quickly moved from a minority to a mass movement. Lenin's role in October was crucial. He pressed for immediate action whereas other Bolshevik leaders were hesitant. A small proportion of the workers and soldiers in St. Petersburg were successful against a government that could not harness support.

Section B: American Option

The History of the USA, 1840–1941

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

(a) Why did US naval power grow in this period? [10]

The growth of the US navy occurred in a forty year period between 1880 and 1922. Most influential was the publication in 1890 of Alfred Mahan's *'The Influence of Sea Power upon History 1660–1783'*. At a time when the North American frontier was no more, Americans were looking overseas to sustain the manifest destiny they believed in, and Mahan's book justified the expansion of naval power. The 1898 war with Spain reinforced the importance of having a navy capable of fighting in two oceans, east and west. Theodore Roosevelt then persuaded Congress to fund a navy building programme which made the US navy second only to the British. In 1908 he sent the Great White Fleet around the world, emphasising the range of US naval power. The First World War led to further naval expansion though the Washington Naval Conference of 1922 resulted in naval cutbacks. Only in 1936 did naval building start again. There is a difference between the growth of the navy and the growth of naval power. The latter was based in part on the USA's ability to expand the navy when it was needed, which was based on America's industrial capacity. That capacity had to be ordered to build ships, however, and thus naval power grew because the American people willed it and no other power had the resources to challenge it.

(b) How far was the USA responsible for the outbreak of war with Spain in 1898? [20]

'Few events have been so encrusted in myth' as American involvement in war with Spain is how one historian puts it. The myth, the traditional version of events, is that the Yellow Press of Hearst and Pulitzer, outraged by the sinking of the USS Maine in Havana harbour, whipped up American public into a patriotic frenzy which then pushed weak politicians in Congress and the White House into war. In other words the USA was wholly responsible for the war. Revisionist histories give a different version of events. They argue that though the press was patriotic it did not influence the politicians all that much, that President McKinley

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

was less passive and more active than tradition has it. For instance, he secretly prepared for war in case negotiations failed – as they did. McKinley went to war because he saw the Cuban revolt as a threat to American interests on the island and in the region. After issuing an ultimatum to Spain on 27th March, McKinley sent a war message to Congress, which then took the lead to go to war. This is why McKinley’s leading role tends to be overlooked. At the same time, patriotism was on the rise in Spain, which declared war on the USA. Thus revisionist analysis would suggest that the USA was only partly responsible for the outbreak of war and the yellow press hardly at all.

6 The US Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 1877

(a) Why did the Reconstruction policies of President Johnson provoke hostility in the US Congress? [10]

Andrew Johnson, who became President on the death of Lincoln in 1865, was a Tennessee Democrat, a Southerner chosen as Vice President in order to attract Democratic voters. The Congress elected in 1864 was solidly Republican, the 1866 Congress even more so. There was a great deal of difference between President and Congress, Democrat and Republican, both in how best to treat the defeated Confederacy as well as which of the two should lead Reconstruction policies. 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. Johnson also focused Reconstruction on the whites, ignoring the position of ex-slaves. Thus Southern states passed Black Codes in 1865. Johnson assumed that with the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, Reconstruction was over. Congress had other ideas. 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. The policies of President Johnson strictly cover the period 1864–65 as he lost leadership to Congress thereafter. However, his response to Radical Reconstruction should also be included as part of policies.

(b) ‘The Thirteenth Amendment was the greatest of the constitutional amendments passed between 1865 and 1970.’ How far do you agree? [20]

The Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery. It was approved by Congress in January 1865 and ratified by sufficient states by December 1865. The Fourteenth Amendment, a more complex statement of equal rights for all, was approved by Congress in June 1866 and approved by enough states in July 1868. The Fifteenth Amendment giving blacks the right to vote was approved by Congress in February 1869 and ratified by sufficient states in February 1870. Together they radically changed the US constitutional system, bringing about what some have called the Second American Revolution. Which of the three was the greatest? One feature of the Thirteenth Amendment which is often overlooked is that it stated ‘Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation’. This clause expanded the role of federal government [in its widest sense] which altered the balance between central government and the states. The clause was often repeated in future amendments, e.g. 14th, 15th, 23rd and 24th. The Thirteenth Amendment is important in that it is the first major change to the constitution in sixty years as well as illustrating formally the victory of the North, the defeat of the South. In terms of its impact on future policies and laws, the Fourteenth Amendment is easily the most significant, mainly for its reference in Article 1 to the right to ‘the due process of the law’ for all those deprived of life, liberty and property.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

The Fifteenth Amendment gave blacks the right to vote. Despite the Amendment giving Congress the right to enforce it, Congress failed to do so until the 1960s and only then in response to great political pressure.

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

(a) Why did the prohibition movement gain support between 1900 and 1920? [10]

Movements to prohibit the sale of alcohol had been around since the early nineteenth century, the most significant being the Prohibition Party from 1869 and the Women's Christian Temperance Union from 1873. While they had some success at the local and state level, they made no advance nationally. In 1895 the Anti-Saloon League was formed to ban the sale of alcohol in the saloons which proliferated in the industrial cities and to pressurise Congress to pass a prohibition amendment. Effectively led by Wayne Wheeler, the ASL gained support from a wide range of groups – from the Ku Klux Klan to the NAACP to a range of Protestant churches – from rural regions, especially in the South and mid-west and from sections in both political parties. Once the First World War broke out, the movement added a patriotic dimension to support the war effort against the Germans; the grain used to brew alcohol could be better used to help the war effort. The fact that most major brewers in the USA were German helped the ASL's cause. Thus Congress approved the Eighteenth Amendment in December 1917, enough states ratifying it by January 1919.

(b) How powerful were the party bosses who governed many US cities in the late nineteenth century? [20]

The one example always quoted on this topic is 'Boss' Tweed, who dominated the politics and government of New York from 1858 until 1871. During that time he controlled the Tammany Hall, the Democratic Party's political organisation, or political machine, as it is usually called. The power of this machine was based on its control of immigrants, mainly Irish. In return for voting for Tammany candidates in various elections, these immigrants were given some form of help and support when joining New York society. City officials were bribed to help ease the passage of immigrants into New York. The machine often found jobs for immigrants. On becoming head of Tammany Hall, Tweed took control of city government, using his power to raise money to bribe officials, ensuring jobs for immigrants as well as great wealth for himself and his cronies. He fell from power when he failed to halt an immigrant riot which killed more than 60 people. He went to jail. Tammany Hall political machine continued to dominate New York politics until the 1930s. Other industrial cities accused of having machine politics dominated by party bosses included Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia and St. Louis. One reason for the rise of the Progressive movement from the 1890s onwards was its attempts to limit the power of party bosses. The establishment of a professional civil service in the later nineteenth century also helped undermine the power of the party machine

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

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

(a) Why did many left-wing liberals oppose the New Deal? [10]

Left-wing liberals opposed the New Deal because it was insufficiently radical, accepting most existing inequalities, economic and social. They believed that FDR was making far too many concessions to the business classes. The best-known liberal critic was Huey Long, Democratic Senator for Louisiana. He wanted more federal government action to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor, as shown by his 'Share Our Wealth' plan. Dr Francis Townsend, a retired doctor, also opposed the New Deal for failing to support retired people. Communists do not really count as liberals; their opposition was far more fundamental than that of progressive liberals. These criticisms applied to the First New Deal 1933–35, which focused more on reversing the rapid decline in the US economy rather than providing social justice and a more equal society. Huey Long was assassinated in 1935, which meant his movement lost all momentum, while FDR did introduce social security for old people in the Second New Deal.

(b) How far was the First New Deal undermined by the judgements of the US Supreme Court? [20]

Key Supreme Court judgements which undermined major New Deal reforms included: *Schechter vs. United States*, 1935, which ruled the National Industrial Recovery Act unconstitutional; *US vs. Butler* 1936, which undermined the Agricultural Adjustment Act and *Morehead vs. New York*, 1936, which ruled New York state's minimum wage to be against the constitution. The first two in particular overturned key elements of the New Deal. However, the Supreme Court occasionally approved New Deal reforms, as it did in its judgement on *Ashwander vs. the Tennessee Valley Authority*, which said the TVA was constitutional. This was a rare judgement from a Supreme Court dominated by the 'Four Horsemen', conservative judges opposed to New Deal reforms which expanded the role of federal government on ideological grounds. Too often a fifth 'swing' judge supported their interpretation of the constitution. Hence in 1937 FDR's court packing plan. Though the Supreme Court did overturn some New Deal legislation, the First New Deal involved so many reforms and initiatives that the Supreme Court could not stop it totally. The reforms were popular. The Supreme Court did not have the powers to initiate actions against the New Deal; it had to choose from cases put before it. And when it came to the Second New Deal, the Supreme Court was less obstructionist, sometimes even overturning judgements it had made a few months before, e.g. with regards to Social Security.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871 – 1945

9 International Relations, 1871 – 1918

- (a) **Why did the USA move away from its traditional policy of non-intervention overseas between 1871 and 1900?** [10]

The USA experienced major and rapid economic growth during this period. As the economic downturn of 1893 clearly showed, there was a danger in being over-reliant on domestic markets and many industrialists/businessmen argued for greater overseas trade. The heated political debate between isolationists and expansionists was effectively settled when a US battleship was destroyed in 1898, leading the USA to declare war on Spain. Victory left the USA in control of former Spanish colonies (e.g. Guam, the Philippines and Puerto Rico). President Theodore Roosevelt extended American interests abroad (e.g. gaining control of the Panama Canal, the Platt Amendment to give the USA effective control over Cuba, the Roosevelt Corollary to give the USA control over the Caribbean). The desire to gain trading rights in China and the Far East required the development of a strong navy and naval base in the Pacific. Roosevelt justified these policies by stating that they were to protect American economic interests and to prevent European intervention in the Americas.

- (b) **To what extent was Austria-Hungary responsible for the outbreak of the First World War?** [20]

In support of Austria-Hungary's culpability, it could be argued that it was its determination to maintain the Habsburg Empire which was the primary factor in leading to WWI. An unlikely mix of different and rival nationalities, the Empire had long been threatening to break up. Serbian nationalism posed its biggest threat. Giving in to demands for a Greater Serbia would have led to nationalism elsewhere within the Empire. Austria-Hungary therefore had a vested interest in ending this threat by going to war with Serbia. Fearful that a war between Austria-Hungary and Serbia would lead to Russian intervention (in order to protect its warm water access from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles), Germany urged Austria-Hungary not to go to war with Serbia in 1913. The murder of the heir to its throne in Sarajevo (June 1914) finally led Austria-Hungary to declare war on Serbia.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that there were other causal factors for which Austria-Hungary alone was not responsible. For example, the existence of rival alliances which had heightened tension within Europe and led to an escalation in military preparations in all of the major countries. These tensions had been increased by Germany's adoption of a more aggressive foreign policy following the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890. Indeed, Austria-Hungary attacked Serbia in the certain knowledge that it would be fully supported by Germany. Russia was the first major power to mobilise following its declaration of war on Austria-Hungary. It could be argued that war was inevitable at some point; indeed, it had been widely anticipated and prepared for in all major European countries.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

10 International Relations, 1919 – 1933

- (a) Why did relations between France and Germany remain poor during the period from 1919 to 1933?** [10]

France had been disappointed by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, believing that they had left Germany strong enough to recover and to become a threat to French security again in the future. Unlike Britain, which believed that a resurgent Germany was essential for its own economic well-being, France was determined to keep Germany as weak as possible for as long as possible. In particular, France insisted that Germany pay reparations in full. When Germany defaulted, France occupied the Ruhr, one of Germany's most important industrial regions; a clear threat to peace. Tensions were only reduced by the Dawes Plan (1924), as a result of which France withdrew from the Ruhr. Franco-German relations did seem to improve as a result of the Locarno Treaties (1925), aided by the good working relationship which developed between Briand and Stresemann (Foreign Ministers of France and Germany). Indeed, France's new willingness to compromise on the reparations issue was revealed by its acceptance of the Young Plan (1929). However, France remained deeply concerned about its security and continued to develop alliances against any future German attack (e.g. with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia). As the German economy began to revive, France became increasingly alarmed and adopted a tougher attitude towards its relations with Germany in the early 1930s. The World Disarmament Conference (1932–3) clearly revealed these tensions, with Germany complaining that it alone had disarmed in line with the requirements of the Paris peace settlement.

- (b) How far do you agree that the Paris peace settlement of 1919–20 was a 'bad peace'?** [20]

It could be argued that the Paris peacemakers faced very difficult circumstances. Satisfying the competing demands of the victorious nations was a virtually impossible task. Wilson's desire to create a lenient, fair and lasting peace was undermined by French desire for revenge and heavy reparations to ensure that Germany could never again threaten France. Wilson, no longer in control of the Senate, lacked the authority to speak on behalf of the American people. Indeed, the USA did not ratify the treaties which emerged from Paris. The Treaties were heavily resented by Germany, but also by France, Russia and Italy. France believed that the Treaty of Versailles left Germany strong enough to rebuild for the future and again threaten France. Russia, not even invited to the peace talks, had lost its former possessions to the newly created nation states. Italy felt frustrated and humiliated, its claim to territory along the Adriatic coast, the guarantee of which had led to Italy's entry into the First World War on the side of the Allied Powers, having been ignored. Maintaining a commitment to self-determination was not as simple as Wilson envisaged, leading to the creation of successor states which were all to suffer from similar problems. In redrawing the map of Eastern Europe, the peacemakers had left some 30 million people living in minority groups under foreign rule, making border disputes inevitable. However, the peacemakers had little option but to recognise situations which had already emerged following the disintegration of the Habsburg, Turkish and Russian empires. In fact, far less people were living under foreign rule in 1920 than had been the case in 1914.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

11 International Relations, 1933 – 1939

(a) What were the causes of Spain's political instability in the period from 1933 to 1936? [10]

Spain had experienced little industrial growth. Its economy remained largely agricultural, with most land owned and inefficiently managed by a small number of wealthy landowners. There was a large class of landless labourers, with no guarantee of employment and no political rights, posing a major threat to civil order. Spain was divided socially and geographically, with separatist movements demanding independence. Spain's constitutional monarchy was an inefficient system, and came under increasing threat from political divisions between monarchists, liberals, socialists, republicans, communists, separatists and anarchists. Primo de Rivera's military dictatorship had provided some stability after 1923, but he was forced to resign in 1931 when he lost control of the army. With the Republicans gaining control of the large cities in local elections, the king abdicated and Spain became a Republic in 1931. The reforms proposed by the Republican government of Manuel Azana upset the church, the army, landowners, businessmen and industrialists; a new right-wing group, the CEDA, was formed to represent their interests. Extreme left-wing groups also opposed the government's reforms for not going far enough, leading to riots and social unrest. Azana resigned and right-wing groups gained overall control in 1933. Riots and social unrest increased. Spain's political system was unable to cope with this situation. Right-wing groups came to the conclusion that the only solution was a military dictatorship.

(b) To what extent had Hitler achieved his foreign policy aims by the end of 1938? [20]

It is firstly necessary to outline what Hitler's foreign policy aims actually were. He had been making these clear in speeches since the early 1920s. Germany was to be restored to her rightful position as a major European power. This was to be achieved by:

- Ending Germany's commitment to the Treaty of Versailles
- Recovering all lost territory, such as the Polish Corridor and the Saar coalfields
- Developing the German army, navy and air force
- Anschluss – forming a union between Germany and Austria
- Reuniting all German-speaking people under the government of Germany
- Lebensraum – expanding Germany eastwards.

Many of these aims had been achieved by the end of 1938. Germany had withdrawn from the World Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations, beginning a programme of re-armament. Careful, if devious, strategies enabled Hitler to isolate 'targets' and exploit the weakness of potential opposition (e.g. appeasement). For example, he had removed Mussolini's opposition to Anschluss, making this a reality in 1938. In five years under Hitler's leadership, Germany had totally destroyed the Treaty of Versailles, regained land in the Saar and the Rhineland, taken possession of Austria and developed large, well-equipped armed forces with actual experience of modern warfare. German pride and prestige had been restored, and the country had unquestionably regained its status as one of the world's most powerful nations. He had achieved all this without embroiling Germany in a major war. However, not all of his stated aims had yet been achieved. There remained many German-speaking people living under foreign rule, for example in Czechoslovakia and Poland. The Polish Corridor remained. The issue of Lebensraum had not yet been addressed. It was in 1939 that Hitler, convinced that Britain and France would do nothing to stop him, began to address these issues.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	23

12 China and Japan, 1919 – 1945

(a) Why did Japan's move towards democracy come to an end in the early 1930s? [10]

The constitution which created an elected Diet had only been adopted in 1889, prior to which the Emperor had supreme power in Japan. The idea of democracy was, therefore, still relatively new to the Japanese people. Moreover, the Emperor retained considerable power and had the authority to dissolve the Diet at any time. As disputes raged both between and within political parties, military leaders became increasingly powerful. Secret military groups, such as the Sakurakai (Cherry Blossom Society) established in 1930, were organised. Their aim was to end party politics and restore the Emperor as head of state in a military dictatorship. Popular opinion in Japan, concerned that politicians were dividing rather than uniting the country, increasingly had sympathy with the aims of such groups. This increased when it became clear that many Japanese politicians were corrupt and open to bribery. Most Japanese citizens were heavily nationalistic and resented the agreements which Japan's government made at the Washington Conference. Army and navy leaders felt that Japan was being too soft on China, believing that Japan should be exploiting China's weakness. The economic boom which Japan had experienced during WWI had ended by 1921, causing unemployment and social unrest. Economic problems worsened following the Wall Street Crash. As unemployment and poverty spread, most Japanese blamed the government. In 1931, the Kwantung Army began taking control of Manchuria. This action was taken without the permission of the Japanese government. Indeed, when Prime Minister Inukai Tsuyoshi criticised the action, he was assassinated by a group of army officers (1932). Emperor Hirohito deplored the attack on Manchuria, but, afraid that he would be ignored, steadfastly refused to order the Kwantung Army to withdraw. This effectively ended Japan's flirtation with democracy.

(b) Should the Long March be seen as a victory or a defeat for the Chinese Communist Party? [20]

In terms of 'victory', it could be argued that the Long March provided a significant propaganda boost for the CCP and left Mao as its undisputed leader. Despite the hardships of the March, the CCP had ensured its survival and overcome all of the KMT's attempts to destroy it. It enabled Mao to develop a safe base and gave him the time to rebuild his depleted army. The determination and dedication of the marchers had won the respect of China's rural population. Mao was quickly able to establish control over Shensi and Kansu provinces. As the KMT government continued to lose popularity, so communism began to attract more support. Mao's land policy, for example, could hardly have been more different from that of Chiang. Seizing the large estates of wealthy landowners, Mao's communists redistributed the land amongst the peasants. This guaranteed the support of the largest sector of Chinese society. Mao was able to use the Long March as a propaganda tool, arguing that it had 'announced to some 200 million people in eleven provinces that the road of the Red Army is their only road to liberation'.

In terms of 'defeat', it could be argued that Mao posed a threat to the KMT's control of China. Chiang carried out a series of 'extermination campaigns' against the CCP between 1930 and 1934. It was clear that the CCP's base in Kiangsi was under threat. The Long March was, therefore, a retreat – an attempt to escape from the KMT's forces. It involved a difficult journey across hazardous terrain, constantly besieged by KMT forces, the armies of warlords and Tibetan tribesmen. Of the 100 000 who embarked on the March, only 20 000 reached the safety of Yen'an on Shensi Province. Although able to establish control over the region, the CCP remained isolated and lacking in power.