
HISTORY

9389/21

Paper 2 Outline Study

October/November 2017

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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **23** printed pages.

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

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

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1(a) | <p>Why was Napoleon popular with the French people?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> There are a variety of reasons which could be considered. He brought stability after the years of turmoil, the execution of the King, the Terror and the coups of the Directory period. He was a highly successful general who brought glory and acquisitions to France. He was an excellent propagandist who managed opposition carefully. His domestic policy ensured that many of the popular gains of the revolution remained. His civil code was respected and the Concordat with the Papacy calmed the religious. Taxation fell equally and there were obvious gains in areas like education.</p> | 10 |
| 1(b) | <p>‘Social and economic factors provide the best explanation for government instability between 1789 and 1795.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> A debate comparing the economic causes of instability with the many other factors is looked for. There can be a fairly broad interpretation of both ‘social’ and ‘economic’ in this context.</p> <p>It was issues over the inequality of taxation and the national debt which could be seen as critical factors in setting off the whole revolutionary process, as could hunger and economic deprivation amongst the poor. A hungry mob was often an important causative factor in the events of the period. Resentment by the Third Estate of the abuse of privilege by the other two Estates dominates these years, and the determination of the monarchy and the privileged estates to hang on to their powers and influence was critical.</p> <p>Arguably poverty and economic aspiration fuelled the process in the period, rather than caused it, but there were a range of other factors to be considered. For example, the impact of the Revolutionary War, policies of the Jacobins (e.g. The Terror) and war in the Vendee. Also, French society had been rigidly hierarchical and those outside the chosen courtiers had rarely exercised any power. In many regions there was a deep loathing of both aristocracy and Church which fuelled disorder; the incompetence of the King and his duplicity over Varennes, for example. Louis made it apparent he was not to be trusted, which made any settlement unlikely. There was no consensus amongst the political elites about who should govern France and how. The social and economic divisions were too deep to be easily overcome.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2(a) | <p>Why did industrialisation have such an impact on the middle classes?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The focus of the response should be on the reasons for the major changes in the size and status of the middle classes. In addition to the huge scope now given to the entrepreneur to go from rags to riches, and there are plenty of examples of those, industrialisation produced a demand for what could be seen as essentially ‘white collar’ workers. Banking and the stock markets grew rapidly in size and importance and they were very much ‘middle class’ occupations. Managers were needed for canal companies, railroads and factories, as were accountants and lawyers. Surveyors and engineers were in high demand as were salesmen for developing both domestic and international markets. Rail expansion helped create the suburbs for them to live in and commute to. In many cases, it was industrialisation that created the middle class.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2(b) | <p>Assess the reasons why industrialisation had so great an impact on political structures by the end of the nineteenth century. Refer to any <u>two</u> countries in your answer.</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>The focus of the response should be on the overall impact industrialisation had on politics. Arguably it had limited impact in the short term, but a profound one in the longer term. It could vary from country to country as well.</p> <p>Germany: In Germany, the cautious Bismarck ensured that the established elite remained firmly in control by taking care to ensure that both middle and working class aspirations and interests were managed to avoid political confrontation. There was adaption and compromise in Germany. While Germany remained primarily an autocratic regime dominated by the Kaiser, there had to be major concessions to the middle class in terms of managing the Reichstag and to the working class in terms of creating the basis of a welfare state. Bismarck's problems with the Liberals over the military budget are well known.</p> <p>France: Particularly in the latter part of the period there was a major shift to the 'Left' with Socialist governments taking great care of the urban proletariat and politics largely dominated by a bourgeoisie which had grown with the rise of capitalism in France. However, the influence of the businessman on the political process could be limited. The free enterprise/laissez faire culture which was so important in the UK was not present in France.</p> <p>Great Britain: The decline of aristocratic power and the political impact of initially the middle classes in 1832 and the working class in 1867 and 1884 are better known. The link between the growth of Trade Unions and the various groups of the Left could also be examined. Now that the specification has been changed to end in c.1890, this offers real scope. In all three countries there had to be far greater awareness of the needs of both the industrialist and the urban worker by government. In some cases these groups were absorbed into the political process, in others there was real attention paid by the ruling elites to their respective needs.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3(a) | <p>Why was France hostile to Germany in the years before 1914?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> There were a variety of reasons which could be considered. France had not forgotten the humiliation of 1871 and the loss of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, both important economically. There had been reparations to pay to Germany as well. The Dreyfus affair had shown that Germany was spying on France and the French knew that Germany saw it as an enemy. The Entente kept the rivalry alive and the French were fully aware of the purpose of the Triple Alliance. The huge German army was just across the Rhine, and German ‘provocation’ in North Africa helped keep the tension high. The Kaiser’s various indiscreet statements did not help, and while the French may not have known about the Schlieffen Plan in detail, they were certainly well aware of the hostility and aims behind it. Events in North Africa did not help either.</p> | 10 |
| 3(b) | <p>To what extent were Great Power rivalries responsible for Balkan instability in the period from 1900 to 1914?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The focus of the response should be on the causative factors of Balkan instability in this period.</p> <p>Certainly Austria can take much of the blame. Her desire for expansion in that region and her attitude towards its inhabitants and their national aspirations were apparent. Its government was short sighted and incompetent and its motives for exploitation were entirely selfish. Russia too must take some of the blame. Her support for fellow Slavs/Orthodox believers was largely for propaganda and justification purposes. There was a real desire for influence and to hopefully to gain territory in the region. Italy also had aspirations there, but few seem to know that now. The Turks still had aspirations of restoring their days of glory in the region.</p> <p>However, there are other factors which merit consideration. The Ottomans had left a creaking legacy and there were bitter racial and religious divisions throughout the region. The Serbs could be tactless and aggressive and there was a centuries-old tradition of violence and localism in the region. Religion and a nascent nationalism were also significant factors. Socially it was a badly divided region and it was also economically very backward. The hatreds which dominate the region now were just as strong then.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 4(a) | <p>Why was the Provisional Government formed in 1917?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The focus should be on the reasons for the formation of the government and not on the broader causes of the Russian Revolution. The war had proved not only that the Tsar was an incompetent military leader and that his decision to go to war was a massive error, but also that his entire regime had failed the Russian army and its people. Hunger, shortages of everything and inflation were endemic. Millions had died unnecessarily. The hopes raised of change before 1914 had gone. Every support of the regime had gone, such as the army, the peasantry and much of the middle class. Even the aristocracy deserted the regime, realising that they might be tied to a sinking ship unless they abandoned the captain. It was an attempt to save as much as possible of the old regime.</p> | 10 |
| 4(b) | <p>‘A period of major reforms.’ Discuss this view of Russia in the period from 1900 to 1914.</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The better responses should reflect on the word ‘major’. The list of reforms is well known. What can be debated is how ‘major’ they were and what impact, if any, they had.</p> <p>It could be argued that much of both the political/constitutional changes, as well as the social/economic ones were both superficial and designed to prop up a failing regime rather than have any profound long term benefits for the Russian people. On the one hand, much of the October manifesto was later ignored by the Tsar and he continued to rule personally. The Basic Law achieved little and the Dumas were largely ignored when they were not dissolved. The franchise was limited. Repression was the order of the day in Russia. The best that can be said of Stolypin was that ‘he was a reforming conservative’, but he had little support at Court. Whether his agrarian reforms achieved much is debatable, the consensus is that he aroused hopes only to disappoint in this area. His ‘neckties’ and the growing efficiency of the Okhrana were perhaps his greatest legacies. The background of the Lena Mines affair, the Russification programme and the dreadful pogroms would indicate that the response should disagree.</p> <p>On the other hand, once the step towards constitutionalism was taken, it could not really be taken back. The Manifesto was the precursor of the Provisional Government of 1917. However, the implications of Stolypin’s work in the countryside were profound and they could be seen as ‘major’. The growth of investment by countries such as France could also be considered as a reform and there were major changes to the educational system which helped the Marxists recruit educated young men. They were more important in theory than in practice.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 5(a) | <p>Why did the USA advocate an ‘open door’ policy towards China in the later nineteenth century?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The open door policy aimed to ensure that all of China was open to commerce and trade with all nations. It became official US policy in 1898–99 with John Hay’s Open Door notes. The USA advocated such a policy because:</p> <p>A weakened China seemed on the verge of partition in what some called the scramble for China to follow the recent scramble for Africa.</p> <p>It wanted to distance itself from the European great powers’ policy of signing unequal treaties with China which established treaty ports with special rights – even if in 1844 it had signed a treaty which ‘hitchhiked’ on the back of the 1842 UK-China Treaty of Nanking. The USA still saw itself as against imperialism.</p> <p>It wanted/needed access to the large market that China offered for US goods.</p> <p>Its victory in the war against Spain in 1898 gave it the confidence for a more assertive policy in the Pacific. Also the USA gained the Philippines.</p> <p>It focused on international cooperation, which the US preferred, rather than the bilateral or multilateral treaties that were more common at the time, e.g. the Franco-Russian Dual Entente.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 5(b) | <p>How far, in the period 1897–1934, did US policy towards the states of the Caribbean and Central America remain consistent?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Arguments that it remained consistent:</p> <p>The US policy of political and, if need be, military intervention was sustained for almost the whole period. It is best summarised by Theodore Roosevelt’s ‘speak softly and carry a big stick’ approach and the 1901 Platt Amendment to the independence of Cuba. FDR’s Good Neighbour policy was more of a public relations move, a short-term fix while the USA concentrated on its more urgent domestic problems. The USA always needed to support its various commercial and business interests in the region, e.g. the United Fruit Company in Costa Rica and Guatemala. Woodrow Wilson adopted the policy of financial intervention backed up by gunboats which was developed by Roosevelt and Taft. This model was also applied by Republican presidents in the 1920s.</p> <p>Arguments that it did not remain consistent:</p> <p>FDR’s Good Neighbour policy. The shift from Theodore Roosevelt’s Big Stick approach to Taft’s Dollar Diplomacy. Woodrow Wilson’s 1913 attack on economic imperialism and gunboat diplomacy in the region; he wanted a less materialistic, more idealistic approach. The USA devised different patterns of government for different states, e.g. semi-colonial for Puerto Rico, Panama Canal Zone for the strip of land surrounding the canal, private companies providing many services, e.g. the United Fruit Company.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 6(a) | <p>Why did military rule of the South come to an end in 1877?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Formal military rule was introduced by the 1867 Reconstruction Act, which divided ten rebel states – Tennessee was excluded – into five military districts. The aim was to protect ex-slaves and to prepare the states for return to the USA, in part by giving freedmen the vote. Military rule was not continued in 1877 because of:</p> <p>The unclear result of the 1876 presidential election, which led to the ‘Compromise of 1877’. The Republicans kept the presidency while the Democrats were left to govern the South without military supervision.</p> <p>The changing attitude of the Republican Party. Northern Republicans were losing interest in Reconstruction; Southern Republicans were losing control of their states.</p> <p>The presidency of Ulysses Grant. By his second term, he was unwilling to impose military rule on the South.</p> <p>The achievement of Black suffrage via the 15th Amendment in 1870, which meant a major Reconstruction goal had been achieved.</p> <p>The impact of the economic recession which hit the USA in 1873. This affected both Northern industry and Southern agriculture, turning attention away from the political struggles of the South.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 6(b) | <p>Which side did more to limit civil liberties during the Civil War: North or South?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Civil liberties are the rights and freedoms of the individual, e.g. freedom of speech, freedom of association. In wartime, they are usually restricted. The main points of comparison are:</p> <p>Conscription [aka the draft] The South was first to compel men to serve in the army, in March 1862. The North's Enrolment Act came a year later. The difference was a result of the limited manpower available in the South: slaves were excluded. Though both sides allowed exemptions, the South was more vigorous in drafting men into its armies.</p> <p>Suspension of habeas corpus: individuals could be detained without charge Lincoln was quick to suspend habeas corpus in certain areas given local unrest. Congress and the courts said that Lincoln did not have this power. In 1863, Congress authorised the suspension of habeas corpus. In 1862, when John Merryman was granted a writ by a judge, Lincoln just ignored it. It is hard to gauge the extent of its use. The South was quick to suspend habeas corpus and to introduce martial law which it used it widely, especially in the Border States. According to one source, thousands of dissidents were held without trial.</p> <p>Martial law: military courts and laws to replace civilian courts and laws It is often difficult to separate martial law from the suspension of habeas corpus. Clement Vallandigham is the best-known case of a political figure being prosecuted under military law. His case caused much opposition. Lincoln eventually had him moved to the South. He returned and took part in the 1864 Democratic convention. Lincoln did nothing to prevent him. For the South, see details under suspension of habeas corpus.</p> <p>Other aspects of laws and war The South, which was in more desperate circumstances, took more powers to order manpower, e.g. some key occupations were exempt from the draft. The taking of power in the name of war by both federal-level governments caused criticism but more so in the South, which was committed to the idea of states' rights.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 7(a) | <p>Why did Theodore Roosevelt fail to win the 1912 presidential election?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Theodore Roosevelt, President from 1901 to 1910, was not re-elected in 1912 because:</p> <p>He was the third party candidate. The Electoral College system favoured two parties, especially the traditional two parties. The existing President, Taft, was the Republican Party candidate. Taft and Roosevelt split the Progressive vote, allowing the Democratic Party candidate, Woodrow Wilson, to be elected. His candidature was last-minute. In February 1912, he announced he would run for the Republican Party nomination. When he lost that, he accepted the nomination of a breakaway party.</p> | 10 |
| 7(b) | <p>Assess the impact of the USA's high tariff policy on the economy in the late nineteenth century.</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The USA's high tariff policy benefitted the US economy in that it:</p> <p>Protected the USA's 'infant' manufacturing industries from foreign competition, especially from the low-price, low-wage European economies. The resulting higher prices resulted in higher profits and thus more investment capital. Higher prices also allowed employers to pay higher wages, thus increasing consumer demand.</p> <p>The high tariff policy harmed the US economy in that it:</p> <p>Protected US companies against competition from more efficient foreign competitors, thus ensuring the survival of inefficient practices. Raised prices of imported goods, thereby adding to the consumers' cost of living and reducing purchasing power. Provided federal government with its main source of income, thus delaying the introduction of federal income tax, which was a more progressive form of taxation. As a form of regressive taxation, it stimulated inequalities of income.</p> <p>Some of these points on either side of the argument contradict each other. Which argument prevailed varies with time and industry.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 8(a) | <p>Why are the 1920s often referred to as the Jazz Age?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Reasons include:</p> <p>Jazz was the new popular music style of the era. Performers such as Louis Armstrong and bandleaders such as Paul Whiteman and Duke Ellington became popular.</p> <p>The focus on popular music was a focus on enjoyment and entertainment rather than on serious hard work and self-improvement. The popularity of Hollywood films was further evidence of a desire to be entertained.</p> <p>This focus was reinforced by authors of the time, e.g. Scott Fitzgerald and his <i>Tales from the Jazz Age</i>, 1922.</p> <p>The emphasis of the era on enjoyment was further reinforced by popular dances such as the Charleston and the rise of independent young women, known as flappers.</p> <p>Prohibition might seem to run contrary to this spirit of enjoyment, but the growth of speakeasies simply made much entertainment more enjoyable.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 8(b) | <p>‘The most stupendous invasion of the spirit of liberty’ (Herbert Hoover, 1936). How justified is Hoover’s criticism of the New Deal?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The criticism is justified because:</p> <p>The New Deal involved a major expansion of federal government powers – and especially the powers of the Presidency, e.g. Executive Order April 1933 ordering the handing over of all gold above a value of \$100. Many other examples could be quoted.</p> <p>Critics of the New Deal would argue that it interfered with the working of the free market which was the basis of economic liberty. Thus the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) 1933 raised farm prices and limited farm production.</p> <p>The formation of the American Liberty League in 1934. It called the AAA ‘a trend towards fascist control of agriculture’.</p> <p>The criticism is unjustified because:</p> <p>The New Deal regulated the American economy, it did not control it.</p> <p>The New Deal aimed to help individuals gain the means and thus the freedom to live their lives as they chose.</p> <p>The New Deal had widespread popular support, as shown by election results. Voters had been free to reject the New Deal. They had not done so. By contrast, Hoover had been firmly rejected by the voters in 1932.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 9(a) | <p>Why, after 1890, did Britain become increasingly concerned about Germany's intentions?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Peace in continental Europe after 1871 had enabled Britain to avoid involvement in European affairs, concentrating instead on developing its overseas possessions. With undisputed naval supremacy, Britain was able to follow a policy of 'splendid isolation'. Following the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890, however, Kaiser Wilhelm II's Germany embarked on a more aggressive foreign policy which, increasingly, caused concern to Britain. Germany began to seek more overseas possessions and this posed a threat to British possessions, especially in Africa. The Kaiser's 1896 telegram to Kruger, the Boer leader, was interpreted in Britain as an indication that Germany would actively support the Boers in any future conflict with Britain. In common with much of continental Europe, Germany was heavily critical of the British actions in the Boer Wars, especially its 'scorched earth' strategy and use of concentration camps.</p> <p>The major concern, however, was the rapid expansion of German naval capabilities under Tirpitz. While the British navy was widely dispersed across the world to protect its overseas possessions, the German navy was concentrated in the North Sea, thus posing a significant threat to Britain itself. As a result, Britain embarked on its own naval expansion, leading to the naval arms race between the two countries. Also, the Kiel canal was extended during the period 1907–1914 in order to meet the demands of the German navy for the passage of its wider ships. This meant the German navy could travel now from the Baltic to the North Sea without going around Denmark. Fearing isolation, Britain also began seeking alliances, beginning with the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902, followed by agreements with France (1904) and Russia (1907).</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 9(b) | <p>To what extent was it imperial rivalry in Africa that created the threat to peace in Europe?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>European nations saw the acquisition of land in Africa as a way of enhancing their economic power and international prestige. The Scramble for Africa may have begun for logical strategic and economic reasons, but rapidly descended in a mad dash for territory, regardless of its potential value, simply to prevent it falling into the hands of their rivals. It helped to fuel a growing spirit of nationalism, which was to have profound effects on relations between the major European nations. While the Treaty of Berlin (1885) was designed to prevent rivalry in Africa leading to war, it did not prevent major incidents, for example, when British and French forces confronted each other at Fashoda in 1898.</p> <p>When Germany entered the race for African land after 1881, this posed a potential threat to areas already controlled by Britain and France. Not only did this further weaken relations between Germany and France, but it also highlighted the growing rivalry between Germany and Britain. This was increased when Kaiser Wilhelm sent his supportive telegram to Kruger, which Britain interpreted as a direct challenge to its control over the Boers in southern Africa. Similarly, the Kaiser's ambition to expand the German Empire led to the Moroccan Crisis (1905–06) and the Agadir Crisis (1911). The Scramble for Africa therefore instigated intense nationalism and an arms race as countries enhanced their military capabilities in order to defend their empires.</p> <p>The events of 1871 had effectively settled European borders in such a way that they could only be changed by full-scale war, something which the major nations wished to avoid. France, still reeling from its embarrassing defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, was in no position to go to war; Germany, under Bismarck, was more concerned with developing itself as a newly-unified state and ensuring its security; Britain was still pursuing its policy of 'splendid isolation', determined to keep out of the affairs of continental Europe. Many historians see the Scramble for Africa as a safety valve – a way for European nations to play out their game of power politics without the risk of a major war. The Treaty of Berlin (1885) is clear evidence that European nations were determined to ensure that rivalry for African land did not lead to major disputes between them. The Fashoda Incident confirms that, even when their interests directly clashed, neither Britain nor France was prepared to go to war over African territory.</p> <p>Increasing tensions between European nations in the early 20th century were not the result of rivalry in Africa, but of growing concerns regarding the more aggressive foreign policy adopted by Kaiser Wilhelm. This enhanced British and French (and Russian) fears of the intentions behind the formation of the Triple Alliance, and posed a serious threat to Britain's naval supremacy which, in turn, led to the arms race. Peace in Europe was also threatened by the decay of the great empires, leading to problems such as crises in the Balkans. The system of alliances and ententes, also seen as a cause of WWI, was not the result of imperial rivalry in Africa.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 10(a) | <p>Why did France agree to the terms of the Dawes Plan?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> France had been insistent that harsh terms should be imposed on Germany in the Treaty of Versailles, in particular insisting that reparations be paid in full and on time. In accordance with this, France had occupied the Ruhr industrial region in order to gain compensation for Germany's failure to pay reparations. Yet, by 1924, France was willing to accept the Dawes Plan, which provided Germany with greater flexibility in terms of meeting its reparations requirements. This can best be explained by France's increasing sense of isolation and vulnerability. The USA, with its return to isolationism, offered France no protection in the event of any future attack by Germany. Similarly, Britain, with a vested interest in re-establishing trade with a resurgent German economy, did not share the French desire to keep Germany weak. The hard-line approach exemplified by the occupation of the Ruhr had backfired – it merely enhanced Germany's economic problems and capacity to pay reparations, while it also worsened relations between Britain and France. The French therefore felt compelled to seek a more overtly compromising approach in its relations with Germany, as exemplified by its acceptance of the Dawes Plan and subsequent agreements at Locarno.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 10(b) | <p>To what extent did the Treaty of Versailles satisfy France?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>The terms imposed on Germany in the Treaty of Versailles were harsh, considerably more so than Wilson had originally proposed. Clemenceau's hard-line strategies at the Paris conference had been largely successful in overcoming Wilson's desire for a more lenient settlement. France had regained Alsace and Lorraine, thus extracting some revenge for its humiliating defeat in 1871. Germany's ability to threaten French security in the future had been severely restricted by strict limitations on Germany's armed forces and the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. Moreover, Germany's ability to recover its economic strength was restricted by the imposition of very high reparations and the loss of coal from the Saar Valley for at least 15 years. As a justification for reparations, Germany had been forced to agree to the War Guilt Clause, accepting full blame for the social and economic misery which resulted from WWI.</p> <p>Severe though the terms imposed on Germany were, they were not severe enough to meet all of Clemenceau's demands. To some extent, these demands had been tempered by a combination of Wilson's idealism and Britain's economic self-interest. France, fired by a desire for both revenge and guarantees of future security, had hoped to gain more at Germany's expense. France argued that Germany's territorial losses as a result of the Treaty were restricted to those areas it had gained as a result of previous wars, and that Germany retained the potential to become the strongest economic power in Europe. French insecurity was increased when the USA refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles – France now had no guarantee of US support in the event of an attack by a resurgent Germany. Moreover, it was clear that Britain was seeking to withdraw from European affairs, whilst retaining a vested economic interest in a resurgence of the German economy. France therefore felt isolated and vulnerable; it continued to adopt a hard-line strategy in its dealings with Germany, especially through its insistence that the Germans meet their reparations requirements in full (which led to the French invasion of the Ruhr in 1923).</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 11(a) | <p>Why did Spain lack political stability in the period from 1933 to 1936?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Spain's constitutional monarchy had collapsed with the abdication of King Alfonso XIII in 1931. With its economy still largely based on agriculture, Spain was a relatively poor country, split geographically, socially and politically. Monarchists, Liberals, Socialists, Communists, Republicans, Separatists and Anarchists all competed for control of Spain. Azana's predominantly Socialist government after 1931 attempted radical reform, which posed a threat to conservative interests (e.g. Church, landowners, army), which formed the CEDA to defend their rights. Meanwhile, the more extreme left-wing groups (anarchists, communists) argued that Azana's reforms did not go far enough.</p> <p>In the elections of November 1933, the CEDA (led by Jose Maria Gil-Robles) became the main party, and it set about cancelling Azana's reforms. This had the effect of drawing the left-wing groups together, and they formed the Popular Front. This organised a General Strike for 1934 and was also responsible for organising riots and acts of violence (e.g. derailing trains). Fearing revolution, the government used the army to crush opposition. In common with the rest of the world, Spain was also facing massive economic problems, and lacked the strong and consistent government needed to address them. In the elections of February 1936, the Popular Front emerged as the strongest party. Like its predecessors, this government seemed incapable of addressing the key problems facing Spain and maintaining law and order. When a leading right-wing politician (Calvo Sotelo) was killed by police in July 1936, right-wing groups became convinced that a military dictatorship was the only way to deal with the escalating violence in Spain.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 11(b) | <p>‘Hitler’s foreign policy was based on the desire to gain revenge for Germany’s defeat in the First World War.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>Hitler’s political power was dependent upon extreme nationalism, and his stated aim was to restore German pride, power and prestige. Germany, he argued, had been ‘stabbed in the back’ by the weak politicians who had meekly signed the Treaty of Versailles; it was this which was responsible for Germany’s weakness and massive economic problems. These issues could be resolved by first overturning the Treaty of Versailles and then expanding German territory eastwards to provide more living space (lebensraum). Hitler had consistently espoused these aims (e.g. in his book ‘Mein Kampf’, 1925, and in the Hossbach Memorandum, 1937). Hitler intended to establish a Germany greater than had ever existed before; this could only be achieved by avenging the defeat in WWI and fighting a war of conquest, primarily at the expense of Soviet Russia. Hitler’s foreign policy, therefore, was based on a calculated step-by-step plan to achieve these aims. At each stage, he would carefully isolate his target by ensuring that the risk of opposition was minimized (e.g. signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact before embarking on his invasion of Poland).</p> <p>Rather than working towards a long-term plan, Hitler was an opportunist, taking advantage of circumstances as they arose. The idea of lebensraum was merely a propaganda tool to gain him political support. Like most Germans, he believed that the Treaty of Versailles had been too severe. He argued that his attempts to overturn the Treaty were not due to the desire for revenge, but simply an attempt to right the wrongs done to Germany by the Paris Peace Settlement. That many British politicians agreed with him is clear from the fact that Britain followed a policy of appeasement.</p> <p>Hitler could not have predicted what response might have come from other countries to his attempts to destroy the Treaty of Versailles. For example, his decision to enter the demilitarized area of the Rhineland in 1936 was a gamble – his troops were under strict orders to withdraw if they met any resistance. His attempt to secure Anschluss in 1934 had, after all, failed due to Mussolini’s military opposition. It was only the weak response of Britain and France to his strategy of ‘returning’ German-speaking people to the ‘motherland’, most notably at the Munich meeting, which made him believe that he could get away with more aggressive acts, such as the acquisition of the whole of Czechoslovakia. If Britain and France had done nothing to protect Czechoslovakia, why would they protect Poland when it was clear that Hitler’s intention was to attack Soviet Russia, a country whose communist government was perceived as a dangerous threat by both? Therefore, Hitler did not have a long-term plan to gain revenge for Germany’s defeat in WWI. His aim was to restore German pride by ending the Treaty of Versailles, taking advantage of circumstances as they arose.</p> | 20 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 12(a) | <p>Why was the Kuomintang able to gain control over most of China by 1928?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Beginning in July 1926, the KMT's Northern March (Northern Expedition) had, by 1928, enabled Chiang Kai-shek to take Peking and become the political and military leader of China. A key factor in this success was the effectiveness of the KMT's armed forces, the National Revolutionary Army. Well organised and equipped with modern weapons from the USSR and Germany, the NRA was able to defeat the disjointed forces of the warlords. Ordinary Chinese people (peasants, factory workers, shopkeepers, businessmen, merchants, etc.) welcomed and supported the KMT forces, which offered an end to the violent and chaotic dominance of the warlords. Many joined the KMT army, which grew from 100 000 to 250 000 between July and December 1926. A key element in the KMT success was its liaison with the CCP – this gave the KMT access to Soviet advisers (Chiang himself had received military training in Moscow), while communist promises of land redistribution and industrial cooperatives were attractive to the working-class Chinese. Realising the threat which the CCP posed to the KMT's control of China, Chiang began the Purification Movement in 1927. This ended the KMT's liaison with the CCP and purged communist leaders who posed a threat to Chiang's power over China.</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 12(b) | <p>To what extent did Sun Yat-sen share the views of the Chinese Communist Party?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Sun's background as the son of a peasant gave him an understanding of the problems facing the large majority of the Chinese people and, in particular, the need for social, political and economic reform. As a result, Sun had a close affinity with the CCP, especially in terms of Chinese nationalism – Sun's KMT and the CCP shared the desire that China should become a strong and unified country, respected abroad and free from foreign interference. It was Sun's willingness to work in close liaison with the CCP that enabled the KMT to benefit from assistance and advice from Soviet Russia. Russian advisors helped to create a more efficient structure for the KMT across southern China, and were important in developing the KMT's army – the KMT's military academy at Whampoa was led by Chiang Kai-shek, who had received his own military training in Moscow. Like the CCP, Sun believed that there was a need for land redistribution and wanted to end the power of dynasties and warlords so that the Chinese people could have a far greater involvement in the government of their country.</p> <p>Sun was willing to work in collaboration with the CCP because he saw the benefits which the KMT could derive from it – assistance, for example, from Soviet Russia and wider publicity for the KMT cause. However, while sharing the CCP's belief in Chinese nationalism, Sun was not a communist. Sun had spent much of his life exposed to Western methods of education and political ideologies, and his aim was to introduce these into China. He wanted China to adopt a democratic form of government in which the people could elect their own leaders. This form of constitutional democracy was very different from the one-party state advocated by the CCP. Sun believed that China needed to adopt more efficient agricultural practices and realised that this would involve some element of land redistribution to the peasants; however, his views on this were not as extreme as those of the CCP and he was opposed to the confiscation of land from wealthy landowners. Sun's willingness to work in close collaboration with the CCP was, therefore, a reflection of their joint desire for Chinese nationalism rather than an indication that he shared its views on how China should develop.</p> | 20 |