

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/21**

Paper 2 Outline Study

**October/November 2019**

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **28** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question  
the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question  
the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate  
marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do  
marks are not deducted for errors  
marks are not deducted for omissions  
answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

1–12(a)	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
	<p><b>Level 4: Evaluates factors</b>            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>	<b>9–10</b>
	<p><b>Level 3: Explains factor(s)</b>            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>	<b>6–8</b>
	<p><b>Level 2: Describes factor(s)</b>            Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. (They address causation.)            Answers are may be entirely descriptive in approach with description of factor(s).</p>	<b>3–5</b>
	<p><b>Level 1: Describes the topic/issue</b>            Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation.</p>	<b>1–2</b>
	<p><b>Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content</b></p>	<b>0</b>

1–12(b)	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
	<p><b>Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement</b>            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>	<b>18–20</b>
	<p><b>Level 4: Responses which develop a balanced argument</b>            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>	<b>15–17</b>
	<p><b>Level 3: Responses which begin to develop assessment</b>            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>	<b>10–14</b>
	<p><b>Level 2: Responses which show some understanding of the question</b>            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>	<b>6–9</b>
	<p><b>Level 1: Descriptive or partial responses</b>            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>	<b>1–5</b>
	<p><b>Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content</b></p>	<b>0</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Why were so many reforms passed by the Legislative Assembly in 1791 and 1792?</b></p> <p>The Legislative Assembly first met on 1 October 1791. It implemented new reforms to help create a society of independent individuals with equal rights. These reforms included new legislation about divorce, government control over registration and inheritance rights for children. Thus, it had an agenda. The assembly believed that émigrés had betrayed France and passed legislation to deal with them. They had left France after the revolution had become violent. In their decree on 9 November 1791, the Legislative Assembly established a three-class hierarchy of émigrés as well as the punishments that would correspond with each class. The nation had to be protected.</p> <p>There were a number of issues which the National Constituent Assembly had left unresolved. For example, many Catholic clergy had objected to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790) as it took the power to appoint bishops and parish priests away from the king. The clergy who objected had been required to swear an oath of loyalty if they wanted to keep their positions in the Church. This was, also, not well received. Therefore, the Legislative Assembly decided to tackle the issue once and for all and decreed that every non-juring clergyman must take within eight days the civic oath, substantially the same as the oath previously administered, on pain of losing his pension and, if any troubles broke out, of being deported.</p> <p>The king was not to be trusted (e.g. flight to Varennes) and so more revolutionary measures were needed to protect the revolution's gains. War and invasion in the spring and summer of 1792 further added to this mood. This would lead to the provisional suspension of the king (August 1792) and the convocation of a new assembly, a National Convention voted by manhood suffrage to decide the king's fate.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>‘He was a successful and popular general.’ To what extent does this explain why Napoleon was able to retain power?’</b></p> <p>His military successes and the considerable degree of popular support that came with it were certainly important factors in both cases. His great victories in Italy (less so in Egypt) were vital for establishing himself as a national figure before 1799. The Directory had gained little popular support or affection in the years after 1795, and Napoleon seemed to promise a brighter future for the French people, tired of Terror and instability. Napoleon’s ability to continue to bring possessions and glory to France with the take-over of Spain, Italy and much of Germany as well as great military victories such as Austerlitz and Jena, also helped to keep him in power.</p> <p>However, there were many other reasons. Politically he was astute. He managed to retain the great gains of the Revolution while at the same time establishing a successful autocracy and avoiding the pitfalls of the ancient regime. His ability to downplay the failures, ranging from the Nile through to Trafalgar and the retreats from Moscow and Madrid, was also an important factor. He played the ‘patriotic’ card successfully and managed opposition intelligently. He understood that the growing bourgeoisie in France and a deeply conservative peasantry were major forces and ensured that the interests of both were intelligently catered for. His propaganda skills were impressive. With the Concordat, he dealt successfully with the religious issue. There were investments in infrastructure which were popular, and he took care to deal with the supply of bread. The Civil Code was a great success and his educational changes were also very popular. There was a degree of repression, but he was careful not to overdo it.</p>	<b>20</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Why was there a move towards freer trade in the nineteenth century?</b></p> <p>In some cases, such as Britain in the late 18th century and for much of the 19th century, the Free Trade ideas of Adam Smith were adopted and put into practice as far as possible. Britain had huge advantages of being the first to industrialise on a large scale and therefore its manufactured products found little competition and naturally British manufacturers disliked any barrier to their sales.</p> <p>Britain also wished to be able to access all markets freely and also access the raw materials they needed. The freer commerce was, the more money the British government raised on import and export duties and the wealth of the empire grew. Tariff wars simply led to retaliation and that could lead to conflict as the history of the 18th had shown.</p> <p>The argument was that if duties on imported goods were abolished raw materials would be cheaper and so the exports of manufactured goods would be cheaper. This in turn would encourage other countries to buy more from Britain.</p> <p>In 1846 the Corn laws were repealed. This reflected a growing belief that cheap imports were the key to prosperity because they would benefit the consumer as well as reduce business costs and help to maintain industrial supremacy. In the 45 years following the end of the Napoleonic Wars Britain was responsible for 60% of the world's trade and she was producing 50% of the world's trade in coal, cotton and iron.</p> <p>The French, under Napoleon III in the 1850s, started to realise that the considerable internal barriers between Departments as well as the high tariffs on imported good, were a massive obstacle to economic success, and when the Cobden/Chevalier Treaty was negotiated with Britain in 1860, which led to a real economic boom, they became convinced supporters of free trade and saw that it was vital for the development of commerce in Western Europe.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How significant were agricultural changes as a cause of the Industrial Revolution? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.</b></p> <p>It varied from country to country. In Britain, it could be argued that there was the greatest link. Agricultural innovation in the middle decades to the 18th century, enclosure, new methods such as selective breeding, crop rotation and a more 'scientific' approach led to a substantial increase in food production. This played a large part in the considerable population increase in the latter part of the 18th century with much lower infant mortality. Not only did this enable the growth of an urban working class, but it also provided the food sustain a growing urban working class. Enclosure also meant that there was a surplus of workers in rural areas, who in many cases left the countryside to provide a workforce for the new factories. The changes in agriculture also stimulated developments in transport and banking. As profits rose for efficient landowners, they were looking for other areas to invest in, and the growing number of textile mills, coal mines and canals provided more opportunities to make money. It is arguable how much of an industrial 'revolution' there would have been without the initial stimulus of quite fundamental agricultural change.</p> <p>However, a combination of factors spurred on the industrial revolution after its initial impetus including the entrepreneurs, inventors, raw materials and transport system enabling goods to be distributed both at home and overseas.</p> <p>In Germany, there is less of a clear-cut connection. Much of the early industrial development in the 1840–1860 period, such as in the growth of heavy industry in the Ruhr and the development of a sophisticated rail network, preceded what agricultural change there was. There was no really significant change in the size of rural units, but much greater efficiency after 1860 led to considerably increased productivity which helped feed an industrial workforce and cut imports of food. Consensus is that agricultural change lately followed industrial change.</p> <p>France, with its deeply conservative rural population which had been enfranchised after 1848, had significantly less agricultural change. Rural voters did not want it, and they were a powerful political force. While productivity did increase by the late 1860s, mainly as a result of more technology and scientific knowledge, there was little impact. There was some exodus from the countryside to the factories, but serious underemployment and overcrowding in rural areas remained an issue until the 20th century.</p>	<b>20</b>



Question	Indicative Content	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Why was the German ‘Blank Cheque’ to Austria an important cause of the First World War?</b></p> <p>Following the assassination in Sarajevo, there were divisions within the Austro-Hungarian Cabinet over whether to issue an ultimatum to Serbia. It was expected to be rejected, which would lead to conflict in the Balkans with Russian intervention on behalf of the Serbs. Therefore, the ‘blank cheque’ was vital in giving the Austrians the confidence to issue their ultimatum to Serbia, knowing that Germany would provide the back up to any course of action Austria took.</p> <p>The Serbs did reject the ultimatum, as expected, and with the Austrian declaration of war, the Russians proceeded to mobilise, which of course led then to the triggering of the Schlieffen Plan which brought France and Britain into the conflict. The German guarantee was a vital link in the chain of events that led from the assassination to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.</p> <p>The ‘blank cheque’ was based on faulty assumptions. Germany believed that Austria-Hungary would take swift action against Serbia while the Sarajevo murders were still fresh, delivering a <i>fait accompli</i> to the Triple Entente and thus (maybe) decreasing the chance of a wider war. Also, it was assumed that Russia was not militarily ready to risk a general European war. Therefore, it was designed to secure a triumph, either political or military, for the Central Powers in the Balkans. However, the Austrians prevaricated, Russia was prepared and so events were set in train which led to a general European war.</p> <p>Bethmann-Hollweg, the German Chancellor, had built into his calculations the risk of a general European war if Germany supported Austria-Hungary. He believed that were a European war to happen, it would be better it happened in 1914 than several years later. However, this scenario was not considered a possibility when the ‘blank cheque’ was issued on July 5th 1914. When that prospect became a probability in late July Bethmann-Hollweg and the Kaiser sought to amend the cheque but failed. The ‘blank cheque’, therefore, led to a chain of events resulting in Russia, France and Britain, as a result of the Schlieffen Plan, all going to war against Germany and Austria-Hungary.</p>	10

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>To what extent did the Great Powers have different reasons for joining alliances and ententes before the First World War?</b></p> <p>The initial intention behind the Triple Alliance was probably defensive, certainly in the thinking of both the Germans and the Austrians. The Germans were concerned, inevitably, about the determination of the French to gain revenge for 1871 and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. They were well aware of the offensive intentions of France and its army and its increasing spending on the military and the expansion of conscription there. There was also the fear in Germany of the 'War on Two Fronts' if attacked by France and its ally Russia. However, from the German perspective, the Alliance could be seen as giving it a degree of security in Europe to support its expansion, both commercially and in terms of colonies, in North Africa, East Africa and the Far East. The Austrians had mixed motives as well. They wished to defend their possessions and status as a great power, but at the same time they wished to expand their holdings in the Balkans. It is unlikely that they would have embarked on the takeover of Bosnia, for example, without the security that they felt the Alliance gave them. Italian membership was not defence-minded but designed purely to enhance their chances of territorial expansion in the Balkans, North Africa, or in East Africa to get revenge for their humiliation at Adowa (Adwa).</p> <p>There were mixed motives with the Entente. The French were determined to get revenge for the disasters of 1871 and naturally were looking for allies against Germany, or at least neutrality in the event of conflict. France's aggressive attitude towards Germany was a major reason why it was prepared to alter its critical approach to Britain which had come to a head over the Fashoda incident. It was partly a desire to attack Germany as well as a real fear of a German threat to the French empire in North Africa that influenced its approach to the Entente. The British were perhaps, more defensively inclined. They saw the growing German navy, expanding empire and increasing commercial dominance as a threat to its very existence and status as a world power. Arguably British motives were primarily defensive in intention, but naturally with the Military Conversations and the North Sea/Mediterranean deal between the British and the French, it could be seen by a potential enemy as an offensive act. The Russians were determined to restore their status after the humiliations suffered in their war against Japan. While the Austrians arguably might be seen to have aggressive intentions against the Russians, the Germans did not, so there is little evidence that the Russians were in their alliances for purely defensive purposes. The mix of defensive and offensive thinking was common to both 'sides'.</p>	20

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
4(a)	<p><b>Why did the decision to continue fighting the First World War damage the Provisional Government?</b></p> <p>Russia had been doing poorly in the war under the Tsar and was a reason why he was forced to abdicate. The country faced high inflation because of the war and famine. The most likely solution to these problems would be to stop fighting in the war. Most Russians wanted this to happen but by continuing the war the Provisional Government lost the vital support of the public.</p> <p>The public became angered at the continued fighting and did not have any faith in the Provisional Government's ability to rule the country effectively. The Bolsheviks were opposed to the continuation of the war. This appealed to many and meant more support towards the Bolsheviks, which led to more discontent at the rule of the Provisional Government.</p> <p>The continuation of the fighting meant that the Provisional Government could not deal with other problems the country faced (e.g. food supply and land reforms). This meant it could not consolidate its position as it showed how out of touch it was with those suffering the hardships of war: the ordinary soldiers, industrial workers and the peasantry.</p> <p>It led many to question the need for it to remain as the government. The failure of the Kerensky Offensive in June 1917 showed the Provisional Government was no more effective at fighting the war than the Tsar's government had been. If this was the case why should it remain in power as, like the Tsar, its policies were not working, and a new government should take over with different policies more in tune with the people's wishes.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
4(b)	<p><b>How successfully did the Tsarist regime deal with opposition between 1900 and 1914?</b></p> <p>The fact that there was no successful revolution or coup before 1914 would suggest that there was considerable success. The regime had built up a successful and efficient police system and secret service with the Okrahna. There were many informers and a ruthless judicial system subordinate to the state. Concessions had been made with the creation of the Duma and the October Manifesto. The Tsar had complete control over the Duma and dissolved the first one after just 72 days. Eventually in 1907, the electoral law was changed to create a Duma which was much more middle class in its membership. Even though the Duma had little power, it did placate some liberals and it gave hope that reform was on its way, thereby lessening opposition. There was no real focus to the opposition. Liberals were wary of the working-class and feared anarchy; therefore, they did not support the strike movement which developed after 1912. Thus, the Tsar was faced with no real challenge even though it would appear that few, if any, lessons had been learned from events in 1905. The army and the church remained loyal, and sufficient care was taken to eliminate some of the abuses that had led to the naval mutinies. The fact that there was no more war to demonstrate the failings of the regime also helped. There were unusually good harvests which helped, and Stolypin's economic changes helped as much as did his 'neckties'. Therefore, there would seem to be a strong case for arguing that the regime was capable of survival in 1914 and beyond.</p> <p>However, the fact that there was a substantial array of bitter opponents, albeit they were seriously divided in almost every way, might suggest that there was in fact limited success. Also, there were still many series of strikes, and the failure to address the appalling living and working conditions suffered by many industrial workers was likely to lead to real problems in the future. There was a complete failure on the part of the regime to realise quite what a depth of feeling was being built up amongst all classes, and it was a frail system dependent on opponents' divisions and not on innate strength. Arguably the degree of success was quite limited, as the system collapsed once the pressure of war arrived, and the regime's strength was much more apparent than real.</p>	20

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
5(a)	<p><b>Why did the USA support the independence of Cuba in the later 1890s?</b></p> <p>It was the policy of the Republican party candidate, William McKinley, in the 1896 presidential election. McKinley won the election and became president. Americans supported Cubans in their struggle for independence from Spain, an imperialist European power using brutal methods to defeat Cuban nationalists. This resonated with their own view of their colonial struggle with the British in the 18th century.</p> <p>The USA could more easily dominate an independent and, preferably, peaceful Cuba than an unstable Cuba divided between Cubans and Spanish.</p> <p>The US had great economic interests in Cuba, which an independent Cuba under the influence of the USA, the dominant regional power, would more readily protect.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
5(b)	<p><b>‘US participation in the First World War was a turning point in its relations with Europe.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>The argument that US participation in the First World War was a turning point in its relations with Europe is based on that very participation in the war. First, on the military front, the USA sent 2 million soldiers in 1917–1918, over 116 000 of whom died and 204 000 were wounded. This was the first time that the USA had involved itself directly in a war in Europe. Secondly, the USA helped fund the war, lending money in large quantities to the Allied powers, mainly Britain and France: some \$7 billion during the war, another \$3 billion after. Those commitments meant that the USA became involved in making the post-war peace treaties. President Wilson became the first sitting President to visit Europe, receiving a rapturous reception in the process. The USA played a significant part in European affairs of the 1920s, in particular with regard to the financing of German reparations and the settlement of inter-allied war debts.</p> <p>The argument that US participation in the First World War did not mark a turning point in its relations with Europe are based on the continuity of isolationism. The short-lived intervention in the Great War and its immediate consequences in 1917–1920 was not sustained. The US senate vetoed the proposal that the USA join the League of Nations. This withdrew formal US cooperation from an international body in which European great powers played a major role. US policy towards Europe became even more isolationist in the 1930s, when faced with the rise of Nazi Germany. Only with the bombing of Pearl Harbour by an Asiatic power in 1941 did the USA become fully involved in European affairs.</p>	<b>20</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
6(a)	<p><b>Why did Reconstruction plans change so frequently in the period 1863–1877?</b></p> <p>Abraham Lincoln took a moderate position designed to bring the South back into the Union as quickly as possible. Andrew Johnson, as a Southerner, followed a lenient policy toward ex-Confederates and opposed enfranchising all freedmen. Radical Republicans in Congress sought stronger measures to improve the rights of African Americans while curtailing the rights of former Confederates.</p> <p>The 1866 election gave Republicans a majority in Congress, enabling them to pass the 14th Amendment, take control of Reconstruction policy, remove former Confederates from power, and enfranchise the freedmen.</p> <p>Reconstructing the South was an extremely complex task involving both the readmission of Southern states and policies towards the ex-slaves.</p> <p>By the mid-1870s, Northern interest in and commitment to reconstructing the South was on the wane, especially following the 1873 financial crisis.</p> <p>Public support for Reconstruction policies, requiring continued supervision of the South, faded in the North after the Democrats, who strongly opposed Reconstruction, regained control of the House of Representatives in 1874.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
6(b)	<p><b>‘The US navy made a vital contribution to the military victory of the North.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Evidence that the US navy made a vital contribution to the military victory of the North is based mainly on the blockade of CSA ports for the duration of the war. The blockade became more effective as the war went on, restricting CSA trade, especially with Europe. This limited cotton exports and thus valuable supplies of currency as well as imports of war material. The former helped undermine the CSA’s currency, which caused greater inflation and more public discontent. The latter affected the CSA’s war effort. In addition, the blockade ensured that the CSA received no diplomatic recognition, e.g. from Britain, and thus remained isolated. The one occasion when naval operations directly affect the course of the war came in April 1862, when a US fleet took the lead in a combined operations campaign against New Orleans, helping to ensure its fall in May 1862.</p> <p>Evidence that the US navy made little contribution to the military victory of the North rests on two points. The first is that the blockade was not very effective. Blockade runners, several thousand in number, usually evaded capture. In addition, commerce-raiders inflicted damage on US trade with Europe. The main argument, however, must be that the naval conflict was something of a sideshow. The American civil war was essentially a soldier’s war, not a sailor’s. It was also fought in the USA, which had plentiful supplies of men and resources. The CSA’s war effort was certainly limited by the blockade to some degree. However, more important to the outcome of the war was the sheer superiority of the North with regard to the resources of war. Therefore, it was the North’s superiority on land and its plentiful resources combined with the demoralisation in the south and its major economic problems that resulted in the defeat of the South.</p>	<b>20</b>



Question	Indicative Content	Marks
7(a)	<p><b>Why did the US economy grow so rapidly in the 1870s and 1880s?</b></p> <p>New technologies, e.g. Bessemer process in steel making, electrical generation. These helped to raise production and cut costs.</p> <p>Large-scale immigration, especially from central Europe and China. Immigrants provided cheap labour as well as an expanding market for basic consumer goods.</p> <p>Development of a single internal market, following the growth of intercontinental railroads. The West provided agricultural produce and raw materials needed by the heavy industry of the North, especially in the Great Lakes region.</p> <p>High tariff policy of federal government protected US industry from foreign competition, especially UK and Germany.</p> <p>Capital investment from Britain, the world's banker, looking to benefit from the growing US economy.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
7(b)	<p><b>How significant a feature of the Progressive Movement was the demand for Prohibition?</b></p> <p>Arguments that the demand for Prohibition was a significant feature of the Progressive Movement include the benefits which prohibition would bring, viz. less alcoholism and less family violence. These fitted well with the Progressives' aim of improving the lives and prospects of American people. It was also significant in that it attracted a wide range of support from groups both left and right, business and labour. The Anti-Saloon League gained a lot of publicity, even in Northern cities where it was not as successful as in the South. The Prohibition Party won the occasional Congressional seat. Additionally, helped by the war, the 18th Amendment was passed.</p> <p>Arguments that the demand for Prohibition was not a significant feature of the Progressive Movement rest on the perception that it was something of a fringe issue, less central to Progressivism than political or social reforms. Prohibition did not feature prominently on party platforms, if at all, Neither Theodore Roosevelt, nor Taft, nor Wilson made Prohibition part of their campaigns. All three focused on other aspects of Progressivism. Wilson vetoed the Volstead Act. It was the effective work of the Anti-Saloon League on Congressional candidates and the unusual context of the First World War which brought a rather marginal issue to the centre of US politics and government.</p>	<b>20</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
8(a)	<p><b>Why did the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) cause so much opposition?</b></p> <p>It imposed codes of good practice on most US industries, i.e. too much red tape.</p> <p>It meant too much federal intervention, and this was seen as going against the very foundation of the American system. Minimal government and free enterprise.</p> <p>It gave too much power to the president. This seemed to be undermining the balance of power in the American system and was felt to be unconstitutional. Some in America regarded it as undemocratic and foreign as it was seen as following the example of Mussolini's corporate state, i.e. elements of fascism.</p> <p>Business interests and some on the right opposed it because it encouraged the development of cartels as anti-trust laws were relaxed and seemed to give too many collective bargaining rights to labour unions.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
8(b)	<p><b>‘Franklin Roosevelt achieved his goal of putting the American people back to work.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Arguments that FDR did achieve his main goal of putting the American people back to work are based on some broad comparisons of employment data. Unemployment did fall from 25% when FDR came to power in 1933 to 15% in 1940, the last clear peacetime year. The actual numbers in work rose from 39 million in 1933 to 47 million in 1940. While he obviously did not put all Americans back to work, such a goal was unrealistic. The broad trend of the 1930s was falling unemployment rising employment. Even if other factors were more important in causing the trend, FDR must deserve credit for undertaking various initiatives which helped increase employment. Roosevelt did make improvements and instilled confidence into the American people. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) enrolled jobless young men in work camps across the country and about 2 million young men took part in this program during the 1930s. The Civil Works Administration was a work relief programme that gave jobs to many unemployed people even though it only lasted a few months. The Works Progress Administration also provided jobs to over 3 million people during the Second New Deal; it was an attempt to provide work rather than welfare. Under the WPA, buildings, roads, airports and schools were constructed. In addition, the National Youth Administration gave part-time employment to students.</p> <p>Arguments that FDR did not achieve his main goal of putting the American people back to work are based on several elements. First, the 1930s never saw full employment – unlike the 1920s and the 1940 and 50s. Secondly, during the 1930s there was what became known as the Roosevelt recession of 1937–1938, when unemployment rose from 15% to 20%, a rise of one-third. Thirdly, a considerable minority were employed on work-relief schemes, provided until the economy recovered. For example, in 1938, 3.3 million worked on WPA (Works Progress Administration) schemes. Furthermore, Social Security taxes and minimum-wage laws often triggered unemployment; in fact, they pushed many cash-strapped businesses into bankruptcy or near bankruptcy. The Agricultural Adjustment Act (1933), which paid farmers not to produce, raised food prices and kicked thousands of tenant farmers, particularly African-Americans, off the land and into unemployment lines in the cities.</p>	<b>20</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
9(a)	<p><b>Why did German foreign policy change after 1890?</b></p> <p>Following Bismarck's removal from office in 1890, Kaiser Wilhelm II took control of foreign policy. Boastful and impulsive, the Kaiser adopted a far less cautious approach than Bismarck.</p> <p>His concept of <i>Weltpolitik</i> involved an increase in Germany's power, and his aggressive actions were designed to ensure that Germany gained its 'place in the sun'.</p> <p>The Kaiser actively sought overseas possessions, whereas it was only because of pressure from German businessmen that prompted Bismarck, towards the end of his time in power, to allow Germany to seek African possessions.</p> <p>Wilhelm also sought to rival Britain's navy; he was jealous of Britain's success and wanted to achieve the same for Germany. Bismarck had not sought to rival Britain's navy.</p> <p>The Kaiser allowed the Reinsurance Treaty to lapse, which led to the formation of the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894 – an agreement between two unlikely allies, which had little in common except mutual fear of Germany. This exposed Germany to the threat of war on two fronts, the very thing which Bismarck had been so careful to avoid. Germany's vulnerability became even more pronounced with the signing of the Entente Cordiale in 1904 and the Anglo-Russian Alliance of 1907. Bismarck's carefully laid plans to ensure Germany's security was, therefore, destroyed as a result of the Kaiser's more aggressive foreign policy.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
9(b)	<p><b>‘Imperial rivalry in Africa posed a significant threat to peace in Europe.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>Arguments made to support the statement could be as follows. The major European powers were rivals in Africa, competing for raw materials, markets, trade and territory. More than this, they were competing for national pride and prestige at a time of intense nationalism. Inevitably, therefore, conflict arose as a result of their common interest in Africa. For example, the Fashoda Incident led to widespread outrage in both Britain and France, with each country accusing the other of unjustified aggression. Both countries began the process of mobilising their fleets in preparation for war before a compromise was finally reached. Tensions between European nations intensified when Germany entered the race for African acquisitions. Britain, in particular, saw German acquisitions in Africa as a threat to its own strategic and commercial interests. This threat was highlighted with Kaiser Wilhelm’s interference in Britain’s struggle with the Boers, his telegram to Kruger seeming to imply that the Boers could rely on German support in any future conflict with Britain. The Kaiser’s equally ill-judged involvement in Morocco added to the growing fears relating to Germany’s intentions. In many ways, the ‘scramble for Africa’ instigated the arms race between European nations, as they began to enhance their military capabilities in order to defend their overseas possessions.</p> <p>However, it can be argued that the rush to acquire territory in Africa opening up the risk of direct conflict between competing nations was appreciated very quickly. In 1884–1885, thirteen European nations met at the Berlin Conference precisely to prevent such an occurrence. The Treaty of Berlin, which emerged from the Conference was designed to regulate European colonisation and trade in Africa, so that each European nation had the right to pursue ownership of African territory without interference. That agreement was reached in Berlin is testament to the fact that European nations were not prepared to go to war over African possessions. Africa had become something of a safety valve, allowing European nations to play out their game of nationalistic power politics without the risk of war. Even when conflicts arose, such as the Fashoda Incident, the countries involved found ways to compromise with the express intent of avoiding war. Diplomacy triumphed in the Moroccan Crisis of 1911. The Germans dropped their demands for a port in Morocco but secured equal trading rights. France gave Germany part of the French Congo in exchange for a part of German Togoland. In the main, European nations were developing their own specific areas of Africa (e.g. Britain in the East and South, France in the West, Belgium in the Congo, Portugal in Angola and Mozambique). Only rarely did their particular interests clash. Moreover, Germany did not enter the scramble for Africa until 1881, by which time most of the valuable African land had already been taken.</p>	20

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
10(a)	<p><b>Why did the signing of the Locarno Treaties bring reassurance to the French people?</b></p> <p>The Locarno Treaties appeared to provide France with the security which it lacked since the end of World War I. Germany, France and Belgium agreed to respect their joint frontiers, thereby confirming the borders which had been established in the Treaty of Versailles.</p> <p>The Treaty of Mutual Guarantee meant that Britain and Italy would come to the assistance of any country that fell victim to an act of aggression in violation of the Locarno agreements.</p> <p>While there were some limitations to this guarantee, Britain appeared to be committing itself to supporting France in the event of any future German aggression.</p> <p>Britain, Italy, Belgium, Germany and France foreswore war with each other. Germany was admitted into the League of Nations in 1926 and violations of this pact and future arbitration procedures would then be referred to the League Council. France no longer felt isolated and had gained the security it had long desired.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
10(b)	<p><b>‘A peace with no trace of justice.’ How far do you agree with this assessment of the Treaty of Versailles?</b></p> <p>Arguments in support of the statement could take the following form. Germany had every reason to resent the harsh terms imposed by the Treaty of Versailles. German representatives were not allowed to attend the Paris Peace Conference and had little choice but to accept the harsh terms imposed on them. These terms were not based on Wilson’s Fourteen Points as Germany had been led to expect and which had influenced her decision to sign an armistice in 1918. The restrictions imposed on Germany’s armed forces might leave it vulnerable to attack, as it soon became clear than none of the victorious countries intended to disarm, Also, it made it more difficult to ensure law and order in Germany itself at a time of intense social, economic and political instability. Although classed as mandates, Germany’s former African colonies were effectively taken over by Britain, France and South Africa. Millions of people who were ‘German’ in terms of language and culture would now be living under foreign rule (e.g. in Poland and Czechoslovakia). East Prussia was split from the rest of Germany by the Polish Corridor. The War Guilt Clause seemed harsh and unfair given the complicated events which led to the First World War. The amount settled for reparations seemed unreasonably high and beyond Germany’s capacity to pay. The treaty gave Germany no opportunity to recover from the war which in the end resulted in a determination to seek revenge when Hitler rose to power.</p> <p>However, it could be argued that, having ignored Wilson’s Fourteen Points when imposing extremely harsh terms on Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Germany had little right to expect them to form the basis of the Treaty of Versailles. Germany had escalated events in 1914 with its blank cheque to Austria. It did not attempt to contain the war and decided to put the Schlieffen Plan into operation. Germany was having to pay for all the suffering and misery that was caused. Germany’s territorial losses in Europe were restricted to those areas which it had gained as a result of previous wars, while its African possessions had been of little value, either economically or strategically (a reflection of Germany’s late entry into the ‘scramble for Africa’). The terms of the Treaty of Versailles were not as severe as Clemenceau had wished. French desire for revenge and a guarantee of future security against possible German aggression had been tempered by Wilson’s desire to ensure a fair and lasting peace, together with Britain’s desire for the German economy (which provided a significant market for British exports) to revive. The Treaty of Versailles was part of a wider series of treaties emerging from the Paris Peace Conference. These had to take account of the chaotic situation in Eastern Europe following the collapse of the great empires, the development of nationalism and Wilson’s desire for ‘self-determination’.</p>	20



Question	Indicative Content	Marks
11(a)	<p><b>Why, in 1939, did Hitler go against the advice of his generals by ordering the invasion of Poland?</b></p> <p>Hitler had long argued in favour of <i>lebensraum</i>, more living space for the German population. This concept required German expansion to the east. Even Stalin, despite agreeing to the Nazi-Soviet Pact, believed that Hitler's long-term intention was to invade the USSR and that Hitler's designs on Poland were merely a precursor to such an invasion.</p> <p>Hitler's strategy had always been careful to isolate his potential targets and he believed that Poland had been successfully isolated. The signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact had ensured that the USSR would not interfere with Germany's invasion of Poland.</p> <p>Hitler did not believe that Britain and France would go to war over Poland – after all, they had done nothing to prevent his takeover of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 and had been easily duped at the Munich Conference in 1938. He was convinced that their fear of war would prevent them from defending Poland, especially when he could claim that he was merely protecting a German-speaking minority from discrimination by the Polish authorities.</p> <p>Just as he had many times before, Hitler was prepared to gamble. He believed that once Poland was taken there would be nothing to prevent him attacking the USSR. Britain and France, worried about the threat of revolution as a result of the social and economic problems associated with the Great Depression, would not oppose a German invasion of the USSR – indeed, they might welcome it.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
11(b)	<p><b>How far do you agree with the view that the causes of the Spanish Civil War were economic rather than political?</b></p> <p>Arguments to support the statement could take the following form. Spain was a largely agricultural country, most of its farmland divided up into very large estates and inefficiently managed by a small number of very wealthy landowners. Some 2–5 million Spaniards were landless labourers, relying on seasonal employment and living in poverty with no rights and no guarantee of finding work. This large and discontented group posed a significant threat to civil order in Spain. Spain's lack of industrialisation also meant that its infrastructure, such as transport and communication, was poor. As a result, different parts of the country retained their own cultures, customs and languages. Many Basques, Catalans, Andalusians, Aragonese and Castilians believed that their regional identity was more important than showing allegiance to Spain as a country. Several separatist groups formed, demanding independence for their regions. Following King Alfonso's abdication and the creation of the new Republic of Spain in 1931, it was economic problems which undermined the position of various elected governments. Azana's socialist-dominated government faced opposition from the more extreme left-wing groups which felt that Azana's attempted reforms did not go far enough to address Spain's ever-increasing economic crisis, with its associated unemployment, reduced wages and falling standards of living. The government was undermined by a series of strikes, riots and assassinations. The right-wing government of Gil-Robles, which proposed to overturn Azana's reforms, faced a general strike, riots and increasing acts of violence. It was growing economic problems and government's inability to address them which finally convinced army officers that Spain's form of democracy could not provide the kind of stability required to maintain law and order.</p> <p>On the other hand, Spain's form of constitutional monarchy had never been a particularly effective or efficient system, and it came under increasing threat as a result of political divisions within the country. Monarchists, Liberals, Socialists, Communists, Separatists and Anarchists all had different aims, the large number of political parties making it impossible for one party to gain outright control of the Cortez (Parliament), leading to weak government. This lack of effective leadership led to the military dictatorship of Primo de Rivera (1923–1931), but even he was unable to retain power once he lost the support of the army. His resignation in 1931 plunged Spain into chaos, and the threat of bloodshed led to the abdication of the King. The newly proclaimed Republic proved even less capable of sustaining strong government, overall control of the Cortes fluctuating between left and right-wing groups. It was the inability of democratically elected governments to maintain law and order which convinced army officers that military dictatorship was the only solution to Spain's problems.</p>	<b>20</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
12(a)	<p><b>Why, in 1926, did the Kuomintang embark upon the Northern Expedition?</b></p> <p>By the time Sun Yat-sen died in 1925, much of China still remained firmly in the control of regional warlords, whose constant feuds brought chaos, disunity and disorder. Although well established in the south, the KMT had no authority in the rest of the country. Chiang Kai-shek, who emerged as the new leader of the KMT after an internal power struggle, realised that the warlords would have to be defeated if China was to become unified in line with Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles.</p> <p>The KMT army (the National Revolutionary Army) had developed, by 1926, in both size and efficiency. Chiang had received military training in Moscow and headed a military academy at Whampoa, where KMT officers were trained.</p> <p>It was well-equipped with modern weaponry from the USSR and Germany, assisted by Soviet military advisers and enlarged as a result of the KMT's liaison with the CCP. Therefore, the NRA seemed ready to confront the warlords.</p> <p>The initial aim of the First United Front (formed between the KMT and the CCP) was to help defeat the warlord threat. Chiang Kai-shek saw the Northern Expedition as a means to control the CCP from the inside and so undermine a political rival.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
12(b)	<p><b>Assess the reasons for Japan’s involvement in the Second World War.</b></p> <p>While some of Japan’s military leaders favoured a cautious approach because of the fear of an attack from the USSR, the vast majority had always supported a more aggressive foreign policy. They argued that, as a small island nation dependent on trade, Japan was vulnerable in the event of war because it could easily be blockaded into submission. They believed that Japan needed to ensure its own economic self-sufficiency, and this could only be achieved by gaining more territory, providing more raw materials and markets. Therefore, Japan should continue its aggressive foreign policy, seizing Dutch, British and French possessions in the Far East. Success against Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Malaya and the Dutch East Indies would provide Japan with new sources of vital raw materials, such as tin, oil and rubber. This view had widespread public support in Japan, where extreme nationalism had grown during the adverse effects of the Great Depression. There was considerable public support for the Japanese takeover of Manchuria in 1931, for example. Moreover, the weak response by the League of Nations (and the USA) to such aggression in defiance of international agreements, greatly encouraged those who argued for further territorial acquisitions. By 1933, Japan had withdrawn from the League of Nations, rejected arms control and over-turned the agreements made at the Washington Naval Conference (1921–1922) and in 1936 Japan had signed the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany (subsequently joined by Italy in 1937). In defiance of international agreements, Japan had declared war on China in 1937. Therefore, Japanese economic concerns combined with an aggressive nationalism led to Japan’s involvement in World War II.</p> <p>However, Japan’s involvement in World War II was not just the product of its policies. There were some in the Japanese government who argued for a more cautious approach. They were concerned about the possibility of attack by the USSR and felt that it was more important to safeguard against this than to embark on further military commitments. This more cautious approach was favoured by the Prime Minister, Prince Konoé (in office 1937–1939 and 1940–1941). This dilemma was only ended when Germany invaded the USSR, which took Japan completely by surprise. This now meant that a Soviet attack on Japan was no longer a possibility. There now seemed to be nothing preventing Japan from taking more territory. Thus, the actions of others influenced Japanese policy. This was further seen in the late summer of 1941 with the USA’s imposition of a freeze on Japanese assets in the USA and an embargo on oil and gasoline exports to and from Japan following Japan’s occupation of all of French Indochina. It could be argued that these actions by the USA were a miscalculation as they left the Japanese with no alternative but war. Over 80% of Japan’s need was being met through American imports. The Japanese navy informed the Emperor that this meant Japan’s oil stockpiles would be completely depleted in two years. The navy chief of staff argued, therefore, if war with USA now seemed inevitable, it should start straightaway. The result was the attack on Pearl Harbor and the USA’s declaration of war against Japan.</p>	<b>20</b>