



Cambridge
International
AS & A Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY**9389/22**

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 **24** printed pages.

1–12(a)	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
	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.	9–10
	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.	6–8
	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).	3–5
	Level 1: Describes the topic/issue Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation.	1–2
	Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content	0

1–12(b)	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
	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.	18–20
	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>	15–17
	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.	10–14
	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.	6–9
	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.	1–5
	Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Why did the Directory fall? <u>Indicative content</u> There are two broad reasons, the first being its inability to offer to the French people a solution to the contemporary political, social and economic problems of the time, and the second because of the effective seizure of power by Napoleon Bonaparte. While the Directory did offer some stability and managed some competent government, there was the constant background of war and possible counter revolutionary activity, as well as the various coups. They could provide no solution to the fundamental issue of 'how is France to be governed?' which pleased a wide enough range of the population. Bonaparte was an ambitious successful general with considerable appeal and his timing and the vital work of his brother made for a successful coup. He seemed to offer a viable alternative.	10
1(b)	'Internal divisions were the main reason why the counter-revolutionaries failed between 1789 and 1795.' How far do you agree? <u>Indicative content</u> The focus of the response should be on the relative importance of the reasons for the inability of those who opposed the revolution to restore the monarchy, or at least stem the revolutionary tide. Certainly internal divisions played a major part. There was no agreement on what their objectives should be, either to restore the Ancien Régime or to accept at least a move towards a constitutional monarchy of some type. The incompetence of the King's leadership did not help prior to his execution and furthered the appeal of republicanism. In many cases, those opposed to change were linked with Austria and Prussia which made them appear to be committing treason and went counter to the growing appeal of nationalism. Many who were monarchists at heart moved to neutrality over the issue of war. There was no leadership on the 'right' and no agreement on how to proceed after the death of the King. Hostility to the Ancien Régime ran deep for many reasons and significant sections of the French population were determined to avoid any return to the Ancien Régime. Given the huge social and economic problems prevalent at the time, a return to the past offered little chance of their solution. Strong nationalistic feelings present were on the side of the revolutionaries once Austria and Prussia had shown their hostility. While some of the ideas of the revolutionaries appalled, many had an appeal.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Why was the development of steam power so important to the Industrial Revolution? <u>Indicative content</u> There are two main reasons. Steam power revolutionised both production and transportation. Arguably there would have been no ‘revolution’ without steam power in the first place. Steam power’s impact on the production process really was the key to the factory and then mass production. This, of course, led to huge price drops and the creation of consumer demand in areas like textiles. While playing only a minor part in the building and operation of canals, steam power revolutionised transport with the railway engine. Not only did this stimulate the movement of raw materials and manufactured goods, but the railway was an enormous stimulant to the manufacture of steel and the demand for coal.	10
2(b)	Assess the economic effects of industrialisation by 1890. Refer to any <u>two</u> countries in your answer. <u>Indicative content</u> The key here is ‘assess’ and much more than a list is looked for. There should be reflection on the nature and extent of the effects and also some prioritisation together with reasons for that prioritisation. The term ‘economic’ can be interpreted quite broadly but should not include obviously ‘political’ effects. A range of factors can be considered. Economies had moved from the subsistence to the wholly capitalist, agriculture to manufacturing. Market forces tended to dominate societies and governments’ role tended towards the regulatory. There was a growing division of labour and the cycle of boom/bust was developing. Urbanisation and mass production became the order of the day and agriculture, while still important, increasingly became a minority industry in countries. Banking and stock markets dominated and the entrepreneur became a major figure in society. Size became a major factor and there were growing concerns about the influence of cartels and near monopolies. Labour became much more mobile. Governments became increasingly involved in the management of the economy and in its regulation. The extent to which governments tried to influence or control the economy varied – with France at the ‘regulatory’ extreme and with the UK at the other. Colonies became more important and were seen increasingly as economic assets to be controlled from the centre.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Why did the assassination of Franz Ferdinand have such serious results? <u>Indicative content</u> A variety of factors can be considered. Naturally the Austrians were furious that a key member of their royal family and his wife had been killed in such a way, but it was the chain reaction that it was to set off that was critical. The reaction of the Kaiser was vital as it is unlikely that the Austrians would have reacted in the way they did over the Serbian ultimatum without the ‘blank cheque’ and the nature of the Triple Alliance. Inevitably the Russians would get drawn in and as a result the French would come in to support, which, of course, would lead to a growing likelihood of British involvement. It proved to be a key factor in pulling the ‘trigger’ of the Schlieffen Plan. The lack of perception by so many leaders of what might be the implications of their actions was frightening. However, there was also a consciousness about what might happen as well.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	‘Decisions to go to war in 1914 were taken for defensive reasons.’ How far do you agree? <u>Indicative content</u> The focus of the response should be on analysing the principal reasons behind the involvement of the major powers in the war in 1914. There is a good case to be made arguing both for and against the hypothesis, and arguably defensive factors were a much greater influence on some powers than others. With Austria-Hungary, they were concerned to defend their status and empire and stop the growth of nationalist movements within their empire. On the other hand, there was the desire to expand their empire South and East. Her adherence to the Triple Alliance was probably motivated as much by a desire for aggrandisement as to gain an ally. Her thinking in 1914 itself was fundamentally aggressive and they were well aware of the implications of the Serb ultimatum. Germany was concerned about being attacked on two fronts, and this was triggered by the Russian mobilisation and the Entente. They were also well aware of the French desire for revenge. However, Germany issuing the blank cheque was hardly defensive, and its record elsewhere, such as in North Africa, showed its aggressive side. It is suggested that the Kaiser was unaware of the possible implications of his decisions in the summer of 1914. While the Schlieffen Plan was based on the idea that the best method of defence was attack, it is still difficult to argue that Germany’s motivation was not defensive. The French had been attacked, and were threatened through Belgium, so it could be argued they were motivated by defensive reasons, but they were determined to avenge 1871 and their whole military strategy was based on the offensive. It is possible to argue either way here, but France had done a great deal to build up the tension in Europe by the summer of 1914. The Russians were not really threatened and perhaps were the most culpable in this respect. The support for the Serbs was hardly defensive, while the mobilisation was done without really thinking through the implications. Much seemed to depend on the Tsar’s ideas of ‘honour’ and saving face. The British were not directly attacked, but did feel threatened with the invasion of Belgium, although the strategic thinking behind it was very much out of date. They were worried by German imperial aspirations and commercial rivalry. Arguably it was defensive, but there was also the commitment to an ally and an old Treaty. Much of the UK’s defence was ‘defensive’ but there are stronger counter agreements which could be made.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	Why was the Tsarist regime disliked so much by 1905? <u>Indicative content</u> There are several reasons which could be considered. There was the humiliation caused by the losses in the war with Japan. There had been major naval and military defeats by a nation seen as inferior in every way. Real wages were dropping and there was considerable hunger. The abolition of serfdom still left major issues in the countryside such as debt and ownership. A subsistence rural economy did not service a growing industrialisation process. The increase in industry led to an influx into the towns with often appalling living and working conditions, the ideal atmosphere for socialism to develop in. Anti-Jewish pogroms fuelled tension in many areas, and often brutal conditions inside the armed forces led to mutinies there as well. Russification policies created discontent amongst the minority populations who made up nearly half of the population of Russia. Increasing education highlighted failings and more had travelled overseas to see how things could be done better elsewhere. With such an autocratic regime, there was no outlet for dissent and redress of grievances. As the question specifies ‘by 1905’ (not ‘before’), events in 1905 can be credited, notably Bloody Sunday.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	‘A great revolutionary leader.’ Assess this view of Lenin. <u>Indicative content</u> Responses can look at his career as a whole or confine it more to the 1914–17 period. The better responses will reflect on what might be the criteria for a ‘great’ revolutionary leader and then argue a case each way as to whether Lenin met those criteria. There is ample evidence for indicating his ‘greatness’, ranging from his early days as a revolutionary and writer to his management of the various factions before 1914. He had a great ability to inspire and communicate. He never lost the common touch and could inspire great loyalty. He was a gifted writer and polemicist as well. His role in October 1917, of course, was vital and his message of ‘Peace, Bread and Land’ was critical to success. His regime lasted and, it could be argued, his decision-taking in 1917 with the Decree on Land and his use of Dzerzhinsky being good examples. He had the Left Social Revolutionaries as allies by the end of the year. He was able to adapt Marx to the situation in Russia at the time. He was, as Service says, ‘an irrepresible leader’ who grew in confidence as the situation grew more critical. Lenin was highly dependent on many other able men (and women). Trotsky was critical in many cases and arguably there would have been no revolution without him. If the Germans had not let Lenin through in 1917, it may well have been a different story. He made poor decisions over the management of the elections leading to the Constituent Assembly. It could well be argued that given the situation in Russia in 1916–17, ending the Provisional Government was no real achievement and the Tsarist system had collapsed easily. He was in exile for much of the critical period before the events of 1917 and if the Germans had not realised his potential and sent him off in his sealed train, he could well have only been a footnote in history.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	Why did the USA play a leading role in European powers agreeing to the Dawes Plan in 1924? <u>Indicative content</u> This USA needed to take a leading role, thereby departing from isolationism, because it needed a stable and prosperous Europe. The international trade system depended on the flow of capital between nations to maintain at least a semblance of equitable trade relations between nations. European nations, which owed the United States some \$13 billion, relied on US investments and the sale of goods to raise the capital for repayment of these loans. In addition, the reparation payments from Germany served as a critical source of capital for loan repayments. By 1922–23, Germany defaulted on its payments. As reparations further eroded the German economy, other European nations were left without the necessary infusion of capital to meet their loan repayments to the United States. As a result, Great Britain began calling upon the United States to cancel the debts that they owed the American government and private banks. Great Britain argued that the United States should write off these loans and consider them part of their contribution to the Allied victory over Germany. The post-war crisis in Europe resulted in the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 and German hyperinflation, thus ensuring a very unstable Europe. The USA accepted that in economics if not in politics it had to take a leading role as a consequence of becoming a creditor nation as a result of the war. The allies, Britain and France, had to accept the leading role of the US because they owed the USA \$13 billion in war debts.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	How far does the Mexican–American War of 1846–48 deserve to be known as ‘Mr Polk’s War’? <u>Indicative content</u> Going to war against Mexico was very much a personal initiative of the US president of 1845–49. Polk was a Democrat from Tennessee. He won the party’s nomination in 1844 as a dark horse candidate instead of the favourite, van Buren, who opposed the annexation of Texas. Arguments that the war was Polk’s personal initiative and responsibility include: His hard-line stance towards Mexico over Texas and California. Polk wanted to buy California from Mexico and believed that Mexico would eventually back down. His sending of US troops to the Rio Grande when Mexico regarded the Nueces River as the proper border. When Mexican troops attacked US forces in the disputed region, Polk had a justification for going to war. His usurping of the war-making powers which properly belonged to Congress. Arguments that US involvement in the war was more than Polk’s personal enterprise could take either of two routes: That it was a sectional war. The South, especially Democrats, did support the war because they saw it as leading to the gaining of territories which could become slave states. The Democrats had a majority in Congress. That it was a national war. The country could be united behind the concept of Manifest Destiny, supporting the expansion of the USA to the Pacific. This was not the case, however. Northern Whigs, e.g. Lincoln, opposed the war. Abolitionists opposed a war which might see the expansion of slave-owning states.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	Why did the slave states divide in 1861? <u>Indicative content</u> Of the fifteen slave states, eleven seceded and four did not. Those four were Delaware, Maryland, Tennessee and Missouri. Part of one of the seceding states, Virginia, split to form West Virginia. The South divided because opinion across the states was split between those who wanted to leave the USA and others who did not. The four states which stayed with the Union – and West Virginia – were all border states, adjoining the North. They looked North as much as they looked South. The seceding states had economies which were more reliant on slave-labour, e.g. cotton and tobacco. The question could also be taken to mean why did each Southern state experience internal divisions, as they did. Reasons include the importance of the issue: union or disunion, and the social structure of Southern states, which were not just slave power dominated. Most also had small yeoman farmers who did not identify with plantation owners.	10
6(b)	How successful were President Johnson's plans for reconstructing the South? <u>Indicative content</u> Johnson's plans, as expressed in 1865, were for a restoration of states' rights to Southern states based on rule by white males. He wanted punishment for those who had committed treason, mainly the wealthy who had led the Confederate war effort, mainly from the plantocracy. He was also against giving any rights to blacks, whom he saw as inferior. Evidence that his plans were successful included: Southern state elections in 1865 on the pre-war franchise. Black Codes, 1865–66: these laws were decided by Southern state assemblies and limited black rights in the labour market. Evidence that his plans were unsuccessful: His granting of amnesties to Southern leaders, which was more generous than first proposed. This was for personal electoral reasons, as he needed Southern support in the 1868 elections. Opposition to the Black Codes, both within some Southern states and in the US Congress. Thus in 1866 he used the veto against the Freedmen's Bureau Act and the Civil Rights Act, overturning the Black Codes. The passage of the 14th Amendment by Congress, and later by the states, which granted equality before the law. The breakdown of his relations with Congress, resulting in his impeachment in 1868.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	Why was state regulation of private corporations introduced in the 1890s and early 1900s? <u>Indicative content</u> During the 1890s, many Americans were struggling. Large corporation owners were making large amounts of money, whilst their workers were being paid very low wages. This was also a time when thousands of immigrants were flooding into the country from Europe. Many of these immigrants remained in the eastern industrial cities working for low wages in dirty and dangerous jobs. During the 1890s, the United States had one of the highest industrial accident rates in the world. Yet workers who were severely injured or crippled could rarely collect any compensation. Times were tough for rural Americans, too. Farmers constantly complained that their lives were ruled by eastern bankers and railroad men. Farmers had to contend with high interest rates for loans in order to buy land, seed and farm equipment. All these economic problems increased in 1893 when a severe economic depression struck. The period from 1890 to 1917 was a time of intense reform activity in the United States. Many different reform movements existed at this time, ranging from farmers who wanted to regulate railroad freight rates, to women fighting for the right to vote, to city social workers trying to improve the health of immigrant children. They wanted government to take a more active role in regulating big business. There was a popular perception that private corporations, often called trusts, had too much power, e.g. railroads and that greed, corruption and outright bribery were common among many politicians. The gradual organisation of those opposed to the power of trusts, e.g. the Progressive movement, led to a greater response by the government to put more controls in place. The ability of Progressives to gain the support of both parties in Congress was also very significant, thus the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, 1890.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	‘Open to immigration for all.’ How valid is this assertion about late nineteenth-century America? <u>Indicative content</u> Evidence against the assertion includes: Chinese Exclusion Act 1882, renewed in 1892, made permanent in 1902, repealed in 1943, excluded all Chinese workers – including, from 1884, those not from China. In the 1870s, 123 000 Chinese immigrants had entered the USA, joining the 105 000 already there. Immigration Act 1882 banned from all other countries ‘criminals, lunatics, idiots’ and those ‘likely to become a public charge’, i.e. those who could not look after themselves. The categories of undesirables were further extended in 1891. Evidence for the assertion includes: Within the wider group of Asian immigrants, only Chinese immigrants were excluded. Japanese immigrants continued to arrive in considerable numbers, especially in Hawaii but also on the mainland. The exclusions introduced in 1882 and 1891 excluded only a relatively small number of immigrants – though exact figures of exclusions are hard to find. Decennial figures for total immigration are as follows: – 1860s 2.3m – 1870s 2.8m – 1880s 5.2m – 1890s 3.7m Thus there was mass immigration. Immigrants came from Europe in particular, initially from Ireland and Germany, but later from Italy and southeast Europe.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Why was President Hoover unable to control the economic impact of the Great Crash? <u>Indicative content</u> Hoover did not cause the depression. The conditions had been in place before he took office, but many Americans blamed Hoover for their suffering. They believed he permitted the economic crisis to continue – and even deepen – during his time in office. Initially, President Hoover did not think he should try to control the economic impact, seeing the Great Crash as the necessary – and desirable – working of the capitalist business cycle. In other words, it was the economic orthodoxy of classical economics. For too long he clung to a <i>laissez-faire</i> belief that the economy would eventually right itself of its own accord. This generally ‘hands off’ approach failed to address the dramatic loss of confidence throughout the economy. In addition, in a mistaken attempt to balance the Federal Budget, Hoover signed into law the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which led to a dramatic decline in international trade, as well as agreeing to tax increases on estates, businesses and checks. The scale of the financial and economic crisis of 1929–30 was unprecedented in both depth and duration, and there was no path to follow. President Hoover worked hard to fix the problems. He tried many approaches: creating government agencies, urging private and public groups to cooperate, and working to balance the federal budget. But Hoover did not want to use federal money to provide direct aid to Americans. Nor did he want to use the federal government to try to control the economy. Government intervention, he said, would lead to socialism, and eventually destroy the country’s founding beliefs. When Hoover and Congress did act, they either followed policies which made the crisis worse, e.g. Smoot-Hawley tariffs, or were examples of ‘too little, too late’.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	How far did the New Deal bring about a major shift in power towards the US presidency? <u>Indicative content</u> Arguments that it did bring about a major shift in power include: The creation of many federal government executive agencies. The great increase in the number of executive orders, i.e. presidential decrees which were based on Congressional authority or the constitutional powers of the presidency; the average was 386 per annum, more than during FDR's wartime years. The 100 Days and its various actions, though approved by Congress, were led by FDR. FDR's unprecedented decision to stand for a third term in 1940, and his subsequent re-election. Arguments against the New Deal bringing about a major shift in power towards the US presidency include: The checks and balances of the US constitution continued to work, e.g. Supreme Court judgements against New Deal legislation. The failure of FDR's court-packing plans. The electoral limits on presidential power. States' powers were not completely eroded. The growth of political opposition.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Why did Britain experience difficulty in defeating the Boers in the period from 1880 to 1902? <u>Indicative content</u> During the Boer Wars, the power of the British Empire was severely challenged by a relatively small number of farmers, revealing fundamental weaknesses in the British army. The First Boer War was little more than a series of skirmishes. British forces, inadequate in number and ill-prepared, were easily defeated, leading to the Pretoria Convention (1881), by which the Transvaal and Orange Free State were given self-governing status. Further discoveries of gold and British expansionist ambitions led to the failed Jameson Raid (1895). Britain was widely condemned across Europe for invading what was effectively an independent nation, Kaiser Wilhelm's telegram to the Boer leader (Kruger) being the most obvious example. With better knowledge of the land and by adopting guerrilla tactics (such as surprise raids on British railways and supply lines), the Boers were able to gain victories in the early part of the Second Boer War. With its army widely dispersed across the world to protect its Empire, Britain had too few soldiers in the area and too little experience of this type of warfare to cope. Britain's eventual victory was only possible due to the dramatic increase in the number of troops it deployed, the use of scorched earth strategies and the establishment of concentration camps in which to imprison the wives and children of Boer fighters. At huge expense to the British tax payer and at a cost of 22 000 deaths of soldiers from the British Empire, Britain was able to defeat the Boers.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	‘The Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 benefitted Japan more than Britain.’ How far do you agree? <u>Indicative content</u> The Alliance meant that Japan was accepted as an equal by one of the major European powers, clear recognition of its emergence as a global power in its own right. Britain recognised Japan’s rights in Korea, rights which were heavily contested by Russia. The Alliance was one of the factors which enabled Japan to feel strong enough to seek a settlement with Russia, offering to accept Russian rights in Manchuria in exchange for Japanese rights in Korea. When the Russians refused to negotiate, Japan declared war. Japan’s victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) was assisted by Britain’s refusal to allow the Russian Baltic Fleet access to the Suez Canal, which seriously delayed its arrival at the Straits of Tsushima. It was in line with the Alliance that Japan entered WWI, during which it gained enormous economic advantages while the major Western powers were absent from the Far East. Concerned by adverse European reaction to its Boer War campaigns, by Germany’s adoption of a more assertive foreign policy under Kaiser Wilhelm and by the threat posed to British interests in the Far East by Russian expansion, Britain moved away from its previous policy of ‘splendid isolation’. The Alliance with Japan marked the start of Britain’s attempts to end its diplomatic isolation. The British fleet was widely dispersed across the world in order to protect British colonial and economic interests. Under the terms of the Alliance, Japan agreed to use its fleet to help protect British interests in the Far East, thereby reducing some of the strain on widespread British forces. During WWI, Japan’s role was to secure the sea lanes of the South Pacific and Indian Ocean against the German navy, a role which was vital to prospects of an Allied victory.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	Why did France feel isolated and vulnerable in the period from 1919 to 1924? <u>Indicative content</u> France was disappointed with the outcome of the Paris Peace Settlement, believing that it left Germany with the potential, yet again, to threaten French security. The USA's decision not to ratify the peace settlement added to French insecurity – France now had no guarantee of American support in the event of an attack by a resurgent Germany. Moreover, Britain was clearly seeking to withdraw from European affairs, again giving France no guarantee of support. It was evident that Britain wanted Germany, a key trading partner, to recover economically as quickly as possible. As a result, France felt increasingly isolated and vulnerable. Therefore, France was even more determined to do everything it could to prevent Germany's post-war recovery. When, at the instigation of the British Prime Minister Lloyd George, the Genoa Conference was held in 1922 with the aim of improving relations between France and Germany, the French steadfastly refused to compromise. When Germany failed to meet its reparations obligations in 1923, France occupied the industrial region of the Ruhr. This was essentially an act of war and was strongly opposed by Britain. This French action had effectively backfired, making France even more isolated and vulnerable. It was only then that the French became more willing to compromise, as indicated by France's acceptance of the Dawes Plan in 1924.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	To what extent did the Treaty of Versailles reflect President Wilson's desire to create a 'peace without victory'? <u>Indicative content</u> Wilson believed that it was the greed and selfishness of European nations which had led to the outbreak of WWI. He saw himself as the mediator between the conflicting demands of the victorious nations and aimed to create a fair peace which would lead to lasting peace. He played a vital role in constraining the excessive demands made by Clemenceau on behalf of France. His success in this is confirmed by the fact that France was unhappy with the finally agreed terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Harsh though the terms imposed on Germany were, they were considerably less harsh than France had demanded. Germany's territorial losses were restricted to those areas it had gained in previous wars. Moreover, Germany retained the potential to become the strongest economic power in Europe. While Germany's armaments were heavily restricted, it was intended that other countries would soon undertake similar levels of disarmament. Wilson's belief in nationalistic self-determination meant that far fewer people were living under foreign governments in 1920 than had been the case in 1914. Wilson's insistence on the League of Nations being included in each of the treaties reflected his desire for an end to secret diplomacy and the idea of disputes being settled by negotiation. The outcome of the Paris peace talks was not based on Wilson's Fourteen Points as the Germans had anticipated. The treaties were imposed on defeated nations, which were not allowed representation in Paris. At French insistence, Russia too had been unable to attend. Resentment was therefore inevitable. Wilson's concept of nationalism was simplistically based on language, leaving some 30 million people living in minority groups under foreign rule. The War Guilt Clause, imposed on Germany as a justification for reparations, was clearly unreasonable, while the level of reparations eventually established was unrealistic. Germany was right in its belief that other countries would refuse to disarm in line with the expectations imposed on it. Wilson was an idealist, with little understanding of the complex situation facing Europe. Moreover, he had lost control of the Senate and it was increasingly clear that the USA would not ratify either the treaties or the League of Nations. In the final analysis, the Paris Peace Settlement was the result of a series of compromises which satisfied no-one.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	Why did Spanish army generals begin a revolt in July 1936? <u>Indicative content</u> By July 1936, Spain had descended into chaos. With its economy still largely agricultural, Spain was a relatively poor country which suffered greatly during the world-wide depression of the 1930s. It was also divided socially, geographically and politically. Its weak form of constitutional monarchy had collapsed with the abdication of King Alfonso XIII in 1931. Azana's predominantly socialist government, elected in 1931, had attempted radical reform. This had united the right-wing groups (Church, army, monarchists), who formed the CEDA. It had also angered the more extreme left-wing groups (communists, anarchists), who accused it of not going far enough. In the elections of November 1933, the CEDA became the predominant party and set about ending Azana's reforms. This united the left-wing groups, which formed the Popular Front and organised national strikes. Violence increased as the more radical left-wing groups adopted terrorist tactics. Spain's inability to maintain a strong and consistent government was confirmed in the elections of February 1936, when the Popular Front emerged as the strongest party. The new government seemed just as incapable of restoring law and order as its predecessor. In July 1936, a senior right-wing politician (Calvo Sotelo) was killed by police. This convinced right-wing groups that a military dictatorship was the only solution to Spain's escalating violence.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	‘Hitler thinks he has outsmarted me, but actually it is I who have tricked him.’ How far do you agree with Stalin’s opinion regarding the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact? <u>Indicative content</u> As Stalin told one of his senior officials, ‘of course, it’s all a game to see who can fool whom. I know what Hitler is up to’. Stalin had long been convinced that Hitler’s ultimate aim was the achievement of lebensraum, and that the achievement of this aim would require a German invasion of the USSR. He was well aware that Hitler signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact in order to ensure that there was no Soviet resistance to a German attack on Poland – an attack which was likely to be the precursor to a German invasion of the USSR. Stalin was equally well aware that the USSR was in no position to defend itself against such a German invasion. He had tried, unsuccessfully, to gain alliances with Britain and France as a way of guaranteeing the USSR’s security against a possible German attack. Isolated and vulnerable, therefore, Stalin agreed to the Nazi-Soviet Pact in order to buy time in which he could build up the USSR’s armed forces. Stalin also hoped that a German invasion of Poland would lead to the involvement of Britain and France, embroiling Germany in a long and costly war. The terms of the Pact meant that the USSR might also regain territory which formerly belonged to pre-revolutionary Russia, although Stalin realised that Hitler would not willingly keep his promises. Hitler’s strategy had always been to isolate his intended targets, usually by making agreements which he had no intention of keeping. In signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact, Hitler aimed to isolate Poland; believing that Britain and France would do no more to protect Poland than they had to defend Czechoslovakia, he needed to ensure the non-intervention of the USSR. In return, he promised that the USSR would receive eastern parts of Poland, Finland, Estonia and Latvia – promises which he had no intention of keeping. He was well aware of the fact that Britain and France feared Soviet communism and that they would not resist (and might even welcome) a German attack on the USSR. He fully understood Stalin’s motives for agreeing to the Pact, but assumed that Germany would be able to take Poland quickly and invade the USSR before it had time to bolster its armed forces and defences. Therefore, both Hitler and Stalin had their own motives for agreeing to the Pact, and both were fully aware of each other’s reasons. Essentially, neither outsmarted the other!	20

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	Why, in the period from 1931 to 1937, did Japanese leaders disagree about how to respond to the weakness of China? <u>Indicative content</u> While there is no doubt that the disintegration of China provided Japan with the opportunity to expand, it is equally true that it posed a significant threat to Japanese security. The Western Powers were continuing to exploit China's weakness. There was a real possibility that the Western Powers, particularly Russia, might try to take advantage of China's plight by gaining political as well as economic control over East Asia. As a small country with limited resources, Japan needed to maintain and extend its interests in the Far East, particularly China, and the Western Powers would clearly resent and resist this. It was this mixture of fear and ambition which had led Japan into wars with China (1894–1905) and Russia (1904–05). The same motives had inspired Japan's conquests of Taiwan (1894), South Manchuria (1905) and Korea (1910). Many historians argue that the reason for Japan's acceptance of the agreements reached at the Washington Naval Conference (1921–22) was that they provided Japan with security from possible attack by a Western Power, especially Russia. Following the military-inspired invasion of Manchuria in 1931, many Japanese leaders argued in favour of further expansion at the expense of a weak China. Conversely, others argued that the priority should not be further expansion in China but to develop Japanese forces in preparation for a possible attack by the USSR.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
12(b)	How far do you agree with the view that Chiang Kai-shek was more concerned about maintaining his own power than about the well-being of China? <u>Indicative content</u> Chiang was initially more than happy to exploit the KMT's liaison with the CCP. In addition to providing popular support from peasants and industrial workers, this liaison also brought Soviet military advice and equipment; Chiang himself had received military training in Moscow and the KMT military academy at Whampoa, of which he was head, was established with Soviet assistance. Once it was clear that the Northern Expedition would soon achieve its objective, Chiang ended this liaison by embarking on the Purification Movement. Chiang viewed CCP leaders as a threat to his own power. Once in control of China, Chiang's KMT failed to carry out the social and economic reform which the people had expected. Instead, the KMT protected the interests of businessmen, bankers, factory owners and wealthy landowners; they were the ones who could provide Chiang with the financial resources on which the KMT depended to maintain its army and control over China. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, Chiang initially adopted a policy of non-resistance. He was more concerned with protecting the KMT government from the threats posed by warlords and the CCP than in defending China from Japanese aggression. This policy was widely unpopular, and Chiang was arrested by some of his own KMT troops; it was only because of this that he was forced to renew the liaison with the CCP to provide a common front against the Japanese. Chiang was a Chinese nationalist and his priority throughout was to restore China's unity and end the chaos caused by the excessive power of the warlords. He was strongly opposed to the CCP's proposals for land redistribution and industrial cooperatives, believing that these were divisive, and it was for this reason that he ended the liaison with the CCP, whom he had come to regard as embarrassing allies. His decision to adopt a policy of non-resistance to Japanese aggression in 1931 was perfectly logical. The KMT's control over China was far from complete and he needed to focus his resources on overcoming the continuing destructive power of the warlords. With China still weak, divided and lacking a large navy to protect its long coastline, Chiang realised that China could not hope to win a war against Japan. His priority, therefore, was to continue working towards uniting the country in the interests of Chinese nationalism.	20