



Cambridge
International
AS & A Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY**9389/23**

Paper 2 Outline Study 23

May/June 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 May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **29** 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
	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 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

PUBLISHED

Section A: European Option
Modern Europe, 1789–1917

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Why was the National Assembly formed? It was a result of the calling of the Estates-General to deal with France's various crises, especially economic ones. The Estates-General was called on 5 May 1789 to deal with France's financial crisis. The First and Second Estates, the clergy and the nobility, were unable to work with the Third Estate – the latter seeing itself as the most representative of all the three Estates. The Third Estate began meeting without the consultation of the other two and on 17 June declared itself the National Assembly of France. They were gradually joined by some of the nobles and the majority of the clergy. On 17 June 1789, the Third Estate, infuriated by the attitudes of the other two Estates, adopted the ideas of Sieyès that sovereignty lay with the majority of the people of France, and that they represented that majority. As a result, only they could decide on tax. The indecision of the King and the growing sense of a national crisis were also factors. With the King declaring their actions null and void, which appeared to add to their credibility, and being increasingly joined by many of the lower clergy and some of the nobility, there was a general acceptance that this 'National Assembly' spoke for France. On June 19, only two days after the National Assembly convened itself, Louis ordered the Estates to separate and the building in which the National Assembly met closed. However, the Assembly found another place to meet on an indoor tennis court and swore that they would not dissolve until France had a written constitution.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Assess the reasons why Napoleon was able to bring stability to France. What is looked for in this response is an identification of the principal reasons for the return to stability in France after 1799 and comment on the relative significance of the various factors with a degree of prioritisation. A variety of factors can be considered. After the collapse of the Ancien Regime, the chaos of the Terror and the concerns over the legitimacy and ability of the Directory, any regime which offered the mix of legitimacy and stability was bound to be supported, for a while at least. Napoleon was able to quickly give the impression that he was there to stay and convince the French, partly through the plebiscite, that he was 'legitimate'. He achieved a sensible balance between the long-established autocracy of the past with the clearly popular ideas of the early revolutionary period. He was a successful General who brought glory to France. Earlier wars had brought few clear gains; he brought territories and military victories. He was a successful propagandist and used censorship carefully. He dealt with major issues which affected the majority of the people. He established a sensible relationship with the Church. He invested in infrastructure and law and order returned to the regions. Care was taken to ensure food supply and prices. With 'careers open to talent' he gained support from formerly alienated classes. The Code restored faith in the judiciary and his changes in education gained much support from the middle class which had led much of the revolutionary process. He sensed what the public wanted and delivered it.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Why was there technical innovation in manufacturing in this period? The old saying that ‘necessity is the mother of invention’ is highly applicable. A shortage of wood led to early experiments with other energy sources to improve the quality and quantity of iron production. Improvements in spinning led to a demand for improvements in weaving. The development of steam power led to a demand for major changes in the quality and quantity of iron. The growth of the railways led to a demand for quality steel. Population growth led to a demand for more and better quality pots. There was a much greater willingness to invest and experiment as there were clearly huge profits to be made, as men like Wedgwood, Owen and Bessemer showed.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	‘Industrialisation had limited impact on the standard of living of all social classes.’ How far do you agree? Refer to any <u>two</u> countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer. It is easier to argue the case for limited impact before 1850 than it is after 1850. It is always easier to argue that conditions improved for the middle and upper classes throughout the period. Conditions for agricultural workers were invariably poor throughout the entire period in all three countries. Rural poverty was endemic. For some, the shift from subsistence/tenant farmer to wage labourer meant some improvement in quality of life, but it was not significant. The ending of many cottage industries, such as textiles with their handloom weavers, as factories produced better quality far more cheaply, furthered rural poverty and deprivation. For the urban dwelling factory worker, the first part of the 19th century tended to mean appalling living and working conditions, with serious exploitation of both female and child labour. The unrest in all three countries in the late 1840s was partly caused by the low quality of working class lives. Cholera epidemics in city slums further emphasised to the ruling classes the need for change. The Report of the Poor Law Commissioners in the UK in the 1830s and Bismarck’s own observations on the condition of agricultural workers and those employed in textile factories in the late 1840s give a picture of the appalling conditions many lived in and of starvation. It should also be noted that some early legislation restricting the working hours of women and children sometimes had an adverse effect on the poorest by reducing family income. The second part of the 19th century did see improvement, but how ‘real’ it was could be discussed. The franchise was extended in all three countries to some working class males, so there was greater focus on social issues which affected them. Regulations dealing with hours and wages and the employment of women and children came in. Education became available and then compulsory which gave great opportunity. Regulations were introduced about the provision of clear water and proper sewage disposal which radically improved living conditions and ended the scourge of cholera. Trade unions were legalised and began to exert great influence in both the workplace and in politics. Germany made the first steps towards developing a welfare state in the latter part of the 19th century, and the French followed suit. Bismarck realised that a healthy and educated workforce was not only more productive but also more manageable.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Why, in 1914, did Austria adopt such an aggressive approach towards Serbia? Several factors could be considered. The fact that it was the heir to the Austrian-Hungarian throne who was killed at Sarajevo naturally led to the feeling that there was a huge loss of prestige involved and a consequent need to retaliate in order to regain it. The Austrians were convinced that the Serbs were behind the assassination and this gave them an excuse to damage or destroy what they saw as a highly threatening force in the Balkan region. The Austrians, with their multi-national empire, felt strongly that Balkan nationalism had to be contained, and ending the Serbian threat was a critically important way of doing so. The Austrians had lost considerable prestige after Serbian expansion in the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913 and this would be a good way of restoring it. With strong German support, there was little threat from elsewhere (so they thought) and it would be a good opportunity to get revenge and reduce Serbia to a satellite state. At the same time, they did not wish to be branded as aggressors, hence the harsh ultimatum which was likely to be rejected but which thus transferred blame for the conflict onto the Serbs.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	Assess the reasons why the Great Powers expanded their armies and navies in this period. What is looked for in a response is the identification of a range of factors which had led to expansion of both armies and navies and then reflection and comment on which might be seen as the most important and why. Factors which could be considered range from the purely personal to wider national concerns. Judgements will need to be based on whether these factors apply to just one specific instance or whether they are more universally applicable. For example, fear of German expansionism might apply to more than one country, whilst concern about Serb nationalism might be seen as much more regionally significant. In Germany there was a strong military tradition at the highest levels of government. Prussia had gone from being a minor German state to a major European and world power, largely through the efforts of its army. The Kaiser was determined to ensure that the German army was the most powerful in Europe and capable of dealing with any threats. It had a protected budget and was a dominant force in German politics. It was the Kaiser's wish that the navy expanded in order to counteract the influence of the British and assist the expansion of the German empire. Germany also feared being faced with a war on two fronts. The British, concerned about a possible threat by Germany to its empire and commerce, saw a growing German navy as a threat, and embarked on its huge Dreadnought programme which, of course, led to Germany following suit. The Russians, humiliated by Mukden and Tsushima, worked hard to rebuild both army and navy and modify and modernise both, which naturally worried both the Germans and the Austrians and encouraged them to spend more on armaments. The French were determined to regain Alsace Lorraine and the prestige lost in 1871, so they reformed their army and increased spending and conscription. Their weak security led to Germany being well aware that French military strategy was based on a massive counter offensive in the event of a German attack (Plan 17), so naturally they took precautions such as the Schlieffen Plan. The French also feared further German aggression. Writers and thinkers such as Mahan stressed the need for naval expansion and there were popular movements (often funded by those who stood to make a lot of profit out of them) such as the Navy Leagues in Britain and Germany which fuelled the desire to expand. The popular press in France, Germany and Britain all encouraged militarist aspirations, and there are plenty of examples of politicians utilising popular fears to argue for increased spending on armaments and make political capital out of it.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	Why, between 1905 and 1914, was the Tsarist regime able to survive the opposition to it? Several factors explain this. One was the fact that even within opposition groups, such as the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, there were bitter divisions over policy and strategy. There was little agreement between groups who wished to make the Tsar modernise and move towards constitutional government, such as the Kadets, and those who wished to abolish the Tsarist system totally, such as the Bolsheviks. The Okhrana was efficient and created an effective system of law enforcement and informers. Many opponents were exiled, imprisoned or killed. The peasantry and the army by and large remained loyal, and the Church and the Aristocracy (who owned much of the land and wealth) were supportive. The concessions made after 1905 also helped, as did the work of the Duma, occasionally. There was at least an appearance, at times, that the Tsar might change for the better. The work of Stolypin also improved the situation and fairly good harvests and industrial investment also helped.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	How far were the military setbacks suffered by Russia between 1914 and 1916 responsible for the downfall of the Tsar? It was certainly a major factor. The vast Russian army, already humiliated by the defeat by Japan in 1905 (and the navy was destroyed there as well), suffered catastrophic casualties and consistent defeat at the front throughout this period. All knew that disasters like Tannenberg and the Masurian Lakes were caused primarily by military incompetence. When the Tsar then assumed personal command of his armies and moved nearer to the front, then he could no longer blame generals and the blame fell on him personally. High command simply highlighted the many personal failings, and while many in the army had been loyal to him personally, now his obvious incompetence led to a growing total disillusionment with his regime. It was to play a major part in driving ‘constitutional’ opposition towards the conclusion that the Tsar had to go. There were many other factors. The war had placed a huge strain on a weak economy. Famine and inflation undermined support. The rumours about the Tsarina’s loyalty and ‘command’ at home undermined the regime. The role of Rasputin further undermined the regime. With the collapse of morale at the front, high food prices at the rear as well as inflation, industrial workers went on strike on a large scale, which meant an even greater shortage of vital munitions. Neither the individual nor his system could cope with the strain, and when it was clear that every section of society was prepared to reject Tsarism, he abdicated. It might be argued (with suitable support from events in the period 1905–14) that by 1914 Tsarism was already a failing system and the war simply accelerated this process.	20

Section B: American Option
The History of the USA, 1840–1941

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	Why did the USA go to war with the Philippines in 1899? The reasons why the USA went to war with the Philippines in 1899 was a desire to keep control of the Philippines for the following reasons. Strategic reasons: the Philippines occupied an important place in the western Pacific. Controlling it would strengthen the presence of the USA in the region. It was also to stop other powers with ambitions in the region from gaining control, e.g. Germany. Cultural [i.e. racial] reasons: many Americans believed they had a duty to the people of the Philippines to introduce them to the benefits of American civilisation. Filipinos were not yet ready to govern themselves. President McKinley offered them the benefits of 'Benevolent Association'. Economic reasons: the Philippines would provide both markets and raw materials for the US economy. Political reasons: the Filipinos had challenged American authority; this rebellion had to be defeated. Defeating guerrilla warfare waged by the Filipinos took three years.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	How far did the USA follow the policy of dollar diplomacy in the Caribbean and Central America in the early twentieth century? Arguments that the USA did follow the policy of dollar diplomacy focus on US attempts to implement a model of dealing with problems of unstable states in the region which neither neglected those problems nor tried to use force to solve them. These efforts were tried in the Dominican Republic under Roosevelt and then in Guatemala, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras under Taft. Taft recognised that by 1909 the United States was producing more goods than Americans could consume and therefore had to increase exports. The developing areas of Latin America and East Asia seemed particularly important. A concentration on economic opportunities in Latin America and East Asia, especially China, would have many benefits. When the administration talked about dollar diplomacy in Latin America, it was almost always referring to the Caribbean, which had strategic implications because of the soon-to-be-completed Panama Canal. Concerned over the general instability of the Central American governments, Taft and Knox set a goal of stable governments and prevention of financial collapse. Fiscal intervention would make military intervention unnecessary. Arguments that the USA did not follow the policy of dollar diplomacy focus on the regional policies of the USA which did not fit the model of dollar diplomacy. These policies used more traditional power politics to further American interests, as in Cuba and in creating the new state of Panama. Even in the [usually smaller] states to which dollar diplomacy was applied there was considerable resistance to being so obviously under American control. Such resistance was often met with US military power, even under Taft, as in Nicaragua. Under the name of Dollar Diplomacy, the Taft administration supported the overthrow of José Santos Zelaya and set up Adolfo Díaz in his place; it established a collector of customs; and it guaranteed loans to the Nicaraguan government. The resentment of the Nicaraguan people, however, eventually resulted in US military intervention as well. Taft and Knox also attempted Dollar Diplomacy in China, where it was even less successful, both in terms of US ability to supply loans and in terms of world reaction. The dismal failure of Dollar Diplomacy caused the Taft administration to finally abandon the policy in 1912. Taft and Knox were not unwilling to use military power in the Caribbean. They did use it. They thought that fiscal control would lessen the need for intervention. When Taft ordered two thousand troops to the Mexican border to stand ready to intervene in revolutionary-torn Mexico to protect US investments, Congress opposed him. Taft then backed off leaving the situation in Mexico for his successor to handle. The defence of the Panama Canal, which was under construction throughout Taft's term, guided US policy in the Caribbean.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	Why was the federal government ultimately unable to defeat the opposition of White Southerners to Reconstruction? The US federal government was ultimately unable to defeat the opposition of White Southerners to Reconstruction because: The federal government in Washington increasingly lacked the support of the Southern states, as shown in the US Congress. In the later 1860s, the Republicans had super-majorities in both Houses. By the later 1870s, they had 50% support in the Senate, 48% in the House. The federal government lacked the power to impose upon the Southern states. The US constitution gave the US Presidency and Congress limited power over individual states. Once Southern states had made changes to their constitution to restore their membership of the US Congress, there was not a great deal the federal government could do in the face of Southern opposition. The federal government lacked the means to impose on the Southern states. To reconstruct the South as the North wanted, it required federal institutions within the Southern states, the obvious example being the Freedmen's Bureau. The Bureau was too understaffed and underresourced to be able to achieve its goals. White Southerners continued to resist federal intervention. Even if Black Codes were overturned and the Ku Klux Klan contained, the White South continued to resist attempts to rebuild its way of life. Thus, finally, Northern Republicans lost the will to defeat White Southerners, especially following the economic recession of 1873 which diverted their attention. Rutherford B Hayes, president in 1877, withdrew federal troops from the South.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	‘Living conditions in the South during the Civil War became harsh only in 1864–65.’ How far do you agree? Evidence that living conditions in the South became harsh only in 1864–65: The scorched earth policies of Sherman and his armies, as they marched through Georgia and South Carolina. Avoiding set piece battles, Sherman destroyed the infrastructure that helped support the CSA’s war effort, e.g. railroad tracks and much property, as his troops lived off the land instead of relying on supply trains. At the same time, Grant subjected Richmond and Petersburg in Virginia to the harsh tactics of siege warfare. By 1864–65, the North’s campaigns were as much against the people of the South as against their armies. This made living conditions much harsher. The effects of the naval blockade (the Anaconda Plan) were slow to become fully effective until Union control of the Mississippi closed off the major opportunity for blockade runners to bring in supplies. After Grant’s victories in the west, this route was closed. Evidence that living conditions in the South became harsher before 1864–65: Living conditions became difficult from the outset. When men left to go to war, women took up their duties on top of their own. Supplies were short, inflation was much more rampant than in the North. When the Union blockade kept cotton from being sold, it also prevented goods and supplies from coming in. Prices of everything rose sharply. The Confederacy printed its own money, but merchants began to refuse it. They wanted to be paid in gold or silver coins. Clothing and shoes were impossible to buy, so people did the best they could. Some made shoes out of animal skins and used fabric from old clothes to make new ones. Only about 10% of the population of the South lived in cities and the cities were smaller than those in the North. As the war continued, many cities and towns in the South saw fighting firsthand. Atlanta, Savannah, Vicksburg, Petersburg, Richmond and others all came under the guns of the Union. In April 1863, many Southern cities experienced bread riots and especially in Richmond, the capital. Their occurrence in the spring of 1863 must mean that life had been harsher for some months. Organised by women, many calling themselves soldiers’ wives, the rioters complained about the price of foodstuffs, the high price of which they blamed on speculators. The position and attitude of slaves was another source of insecurity on the plantations, especially as CSA conscription, introduced in 1862, unusually included married men as well as bachelors.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	Why, in 1908, did Theodore Roosevelt decide not to run for a third term as US President? There is one main reason why Theodore Roosevelt did not run for president in 1908: in 1904, on the night of his landslide election victory, Roosevelt announced to a small group of journalists in the White House that ‘under no circumstances will I be a candidate for or accept another nomination’. A supplementary reason TR used to explain his decision was the custom that US Presidents were elected for two terms only. Another reason given by TR, both in 1904 and 1908, was that seven years in office avoided the danger of becoming out of touch with the changing times. In 1908, TR argued that to go back on his word given four years earlier would undermine public trust in politicians. By 1908, TR was also committed to supporting the Republican candidacy of William Taft, his colleague and friend.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	How far did the federal governments of the later nineteenth century help American farmers deal with the problems they faced? Evidence that the federal governments of the later nineteenth century helped American farmers is limited in time, if not in scope. The most substantial federal attempts to help farmers came in a brief period at the end of the 1880s. In 1887, two Acts were passed. Firstly, the Hatch Act established experimental agricultural stations in each state, aimed at educating farmers in the latest farming techniques – which was not much help. Secondly, the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 imposed some controls on the pricing policies of railroads which operated across the state lines by means of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the first federal agency to monitor private companies – which was more of a help. In 1890, three more Acts were passed. Firstly, the Morrill Act required land-grant colleges in Southern states not to be based on racial segregation – again, limited help. Next was the Sherman Silver Purchase Act, which required the federal government to buy specified quantities of silver, thereby expanding the money supply and reflation the economy. Finally, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act enabled the federal government to take action against big business trusts, of which railroad trusts were the best known. Evidence that the federal governments of the time did little to help American farmers address the problems they faced is plentiful. This argument focuses on the time it took for federal government to respond to farmers' discontents, which stretched back to the 1870s, when The Grange movement was formed. In the 1880s came the Farmers' Alliance, leading to the People's Party of the 1890s. Even when, in the years 1887–90, some federal help did arrive, it was often limited. The Silver Purchase Act was overturned just three years later. The Anti-Trust Act was something of a disappointment. More importantly, the troubles of American farmers in the late nineteenth century were beyond the authority of federal government in that they were in part caused by global forces, as agricultural expansion in other regions, such as South America and Canada, affected the US market, resulting in falling prices.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Why was investing in the stock market so popular in the 1920s? Investing in the stock market became so popular in the 1920s for the following reasons: On the evidence of the stock market, investors became richer. The stock market rose especially rapidly in 1924–25 and 1927–28. ‘On margin’ funding lowered the financial barrier against investing. Only 10–20% of the share price had to be raised, the remaining 90–80% being a loan, unusually from share brokers. The desire to ‘get rich quick’. On margin share buying was seen as an easy way of making money. In fact, the number of small investors was quite small. Most investment funds came from brokers, banks and even companies themselves, all with cash to spare. A [misplaced] sense of optimism caused by the end of the First World War, the USA’s role as a world power and the emergence of a new world based on new consumer goods industries.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	‘A well-meaning dictatorship.’ How far do you agree with this judgement on Franklin Roosevelt’s presidency? Arguments that FDR’s presidency was a well-meaning dictatorship: Both parts of the phrase need to be considered. FDR was well meaning in that he had good intentions to help improve the wellbeing and welfare of the American people at a time when many were experiencing very hard times. The best evidence of FDR’s desire to assist can be almost any of the many New Deal reforms of the 1930s. Evidence of his dictatorial behaviour come from two main events and one trend of government. The first event was the bypassing of the Supreme Court’s 1935 judgment that the National Industrial Recovery Act was unconstitutional. FDR quickly issued two Executive Orders to ensure the National Recovery Administration continued to function, if in a different form. The second was FDR’s court-packing plans of 1937, when he proposed expanding the number of Supreme Court judges. The trend in government was the greater use of Executive Orders, which enabled the presidency to act without previous Congressional approval. FDR issued 2800 EOs in 1933–40, an annual average of 351, which far outstripped the number issued by any previous President. FDR made the presidency powerful as never before. Arguments that FDR’s presidency was not a well-meaning dictatorship focus on the nature of FDR’s rule, which was not autocratic. He accepted the rule of law. He did not limit civil liberties to any noticeable degree. Elections were held according to the constitution. He abandoned the court-packing plan following the widespread opposition and criticism it provoked. He won all three presidential elections with a clear majority in an open election. He took greater powers to himself and to federal government, which some, especially on the right, saw as undermining the traditional American values of individualism. As a peacetime President, he had more power than any of his predecessors, but in a time when Europe experienced actual dictatorships, Roosevelt’s Presidency remained democratic. [FDR’s wartime administration, by comparison, was less impressive as it moved closer to dictatorship on the democrat-dictatorship spectrum.]	20

Section C: International Option
International Relations, 1871–1945

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Why were Austria-Hungary and Russia in conflict over the Balkans in the years leading up to the First World War? The disintegration of the Turkish Empire created a chaotic situation in the Balkans, essentially a power vacuum which both Austria-Hungary and Russia were keen to exploit. Having lost influence in central Europe due to unification of Germany under Bismarck, Austria-Hungary was determined to maintain its prestige and power by expanding into the Balkans. Having been defeated in both the Crimean War (1853–56) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05), Russia's status as a major European power was also under threat, and the Balkans offered an opportunity to restore its pride and status. Russia was also keen to enhance its influence towards the Mediterranean, especially ensuring its vital warm-water access through the Dardanelles. While the chaotic situation in the Balkans seemed to provide an opportunity for both Austria-Hungary and Russia to expand, it also posed a significant threat. Both were multi-national empires, and the development of nationalism within the Balkans was a very real threat. Austria-Hungary felt that intervention in the Balkans was essential in order to prevent the spread of disruptive movements which might threaten the integrity of the Habsburg Empire. While Russia had religious links with fellow adherents of the Orthodox Church within the Balkans, it appreciated that it would not be easy to control the increasingly nationalistic groups which were emerging. Both Austria-Hungary and Russia were therefore deeply concerned by the succession of Balkan wars in which they were not directly involved. At the same time, it was clear that the expansion of either Austria-Hungary or Russia within the Balkans would pose a significant threat to the regional vested interests of the other.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	‘The development of the Schlieffen Plan clearly demonstrated Germany’s warlike intentions.’ How far do you agree? Agree: The Schlieffen Plan was an offensive strategy, originally developed as early as 1904. It meant that, in the event of any war, regardless of its initial causes, Germany was prepared to go to war with France, Russia and, if necessary, Britain. It also meant that Germany was prepared to break international agreements regarding the neutrality of Belgium. The Plan involved attacking France through Belgium in order to avoid the heavy defences which France had developed along its border with Germany. It was this affront on Belgian neutrality, rather than any vague commitments as part of the Triple Entente, which led to Britain’s entry into WWI. The Plan was implanted in 1914. The Plan therefore reflected the aggressive nature of German foreign policy under Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Germany’s willingness to go to war against other European powers. Disagree: Germany was not alone in developing such a plan. France, Russia and Austria-Hungary had all developed their own strategies to be implemented if and when war broke out. Given the rising tensions in Europe during the pre-war period, enhanced by the existence of two rival sets of alliances, such precautionary measures seemed sensible in order to ensure national security. The Schlieffen Plan was a defensive strategy designed to prevent Germany simultaneously facing war on two fronts. Bismarck’s diplomatic strategies, which led to the formation of the Triple Alliance and the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia, had been designed to prevent such a situation. Kaiser Wilhelm II perceived the formation of the Triple Entente as a direct threat to German security. In the event of war, Germany would almost certainly be confronted by France to the west and Russia to the east. The Schlieffen Plan was designed to avoid Germany having to fight both at the same time. The threat from France could be dealt with quickly, with the added bonus that this would make Britain’s involvement more difficult and less likely. German forces could then deal with the more complex threat of Russia, its vast size making confrontation with it more difficult and time consuming. The Schlieffen Plan was, therefore, a defensive strategy only to be used in the event of threats to German security.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	Why, despite the USA's isolationist policy, did Americans help to resolve the issue of German reparations in the 1920s? While essentially following an isolationist policy, the USA was prepared to become involved in international affairs when its own vested interests were at stake. For example, the USA did not become involved in the Genoa or Locarno Conferences because it believed that they related to issues which were entirely European. While the American government was not directly involved in issues relating to German reparations, it condoned the involvement of Americans because the USA's own interests were at stake. The USA had insisted on the full repayment of war loans given to the Allied powers during the First World War. Britain and France were heavily reliant on German reparation payments in order to meet their own financial commitments to the USA. Germany's failure to meet its reparation payments, therefore, had major repercussions. The French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923, essentially an act of war, made the situation even worse, while also increasing existing tensions between European nations. It was, therefore, in the USA's best interests to seek a solution to the problem. The Dawes Plan of 1924, masterminded by an American lawyer/financier, eased tensions and ensured the ending of the French occupation. American loans made it more likely that Germany would maintain its reparations payments. The USA realised that, once it had made its reparations payments, Germany would not be able to repay the loans it had received from the USA. The Young Plan of 1929, masterminded by an American banker, therefore negotiated reduced reparation demands on Germany.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	How far do you agree with the view that international relations were more stable in 1930 than they had been in 1919? Agree – The main issues which had caused international tension in the immediate post-war period had been addressed by 1930. The French desire for revenge against Germany, for a guarantee of security against future German aggression and reparations, had been met in 1919. Germany's failure to make payments had led to the French occupation of the Ruhr, an act of war which caused great tension between nations. This problem had been solved by the Dawes Plan (1924). Relations between Germany and France were greatly improved by the agreements reached at Locarno in 1925 and by the cordial working relationship which developed between Briand and Stresemann. Locarno had enabled Germany to become a member of the League of Nations. France's new willingness to compromise was evidenced by its acceptance of reduced reparations as agreed in the Young Plan of 1929. Western fears of the growing power of Japan and the threat which this posed to their interests in the Far East had been allayed by the agreements reached at the Washington Naval Conference (1921–22). Soviet Russia's outspoken attempts to encourage world-wide revolution had been watered down, and other European countries had re-established formal diplomatic relations with it. While the USA remained aloof from the League of Nations, it, together with 64 other nations, signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928, renouncing war. Disagree – Pre-existing tensions remained by 1930. France remained highly sceptical of German intentions. French acceptance of the Dawes and Young Plans was largely due to their isolation following international condemnation of the French occupation of the Ruhr. The solution to the German reparation issue was dependent on American loans, which were no longer forthcoming following the Wall Street Crash. No-one had honoured the Treaty of Versailles commitment to disarmament. Germany resented the fact that it had disarmed in line with the Treaty but no other country had done so. Locarno did not cover eastern borders, such as that between Germany and Poland. Serious weaknesses of the League had already been exposed (e.g. Mussolini's refusal to accept the League's jurisdiction over Corfu). Economic problems continued to affect all European countries, and these were to get significantly worse in the wake of the Wall Street Crash. Tensions between the USSR and the rest of Europe remained high. Stalin had been unable to secure effective alliances with either Britain or France, leaving the USSR isolated and exposed. The rising threat of extremism. Nazis gained 107 seats in the 1930 elections and successor states had become increasingly dominated by dictatorships.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	Why was there a lack of unity on the Republican side during the Spanish Civil War? The Republican side was constantly fragmented and lacking unity. This was because the Republican side consisted of various left wing groups, each with their own, often contradictory, aims. The Liberals were the most moderate, seeking to create a modern democracy in which the power enjoyed by the King and the Church was greatly reduced. While clearly opposed to the type of military dictatorship threatened by Franco, the Liberals did not agree with the Socialists, whose aim was to remove the monarchy altogether and form a Spanish Republic. Even more radical than the Socialists were the Communists, who advocated a revolution and a form of government similar to that of Soviet Russia. More radical still were the Anarchists, who wanted no government at all. In addition, many of those who supported the Republican cause in the Spanish Civil War were separatists, demanding independence for their own particular regions of Spain, regions which had developed their own cultures, customs and languages. Lacking the formal organisation, leadership and equipment of the Spanish army, whose support Franco could depend upon, the Republicans lacked the ability to develop an effective resistance. The Republicans gained no foreign assistance except for the International Brigades. The motives of volunteers for these Brigades were equally varied – some were driven by the desire to halt the progress of fascism, some by the determination to spread communism, some simply in search of adventure.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	‘Hitler’s foreign policy was based on his willingness to take major risks.’ How far do you agree? Agree Hitler’s decision to withdraw Germany from both the World Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations in 1933 carried the risk of making Germany isolated and, therefore, vulnerable. His attempt at Anschluss in 1934 was thwarted when Mussolini sent Italian troops to the Austrian border and could have alerted the rest of Europe to his aggressive intentions and, in particular, his determination to destroy the Treaty of Versailles. His decision to rearm Germany after 1935 was a gamble; it led to the formation of the Stresa Front (Britain, France and Italy) which might have taken practical action against Germany. In 1936, he gambled by sending German troops into the demilitarised Rhineland, fully aware that his army was not yet ready for a full-scale war – his troops were under strict orders to retreat if they should meet resistance. In 1938, he gambled by achieving Anschluss with Austria, in clear defiance of the Treaty of Versailles. He gambled by lying his way through the Munich Conference in 1938 and subsequently breaking his promises by occupying the whole of Czechoslovakia. The riskiest gamble was his invasion of Poland in 1939. This time the gamble backfired, his conviction that Britain and France would do nothing to defend Poland proving inaccurate. Disagree Some would argue that his plans were clearly signalled in his book <i>‘Mein Kampf’</i>. Each of Hitler’s moves was based on a careful assessment of the circumstances and devious manipulation of potential adversaries. Germany’s withdrawal from the World Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations was justified by French refusal to compromise. Germany, he argued, was the only country which had complied with the Paris Peace Settlement’s aim of disarmament, and the failure of other nations to carry out their commitments exposed Germany to insecurity. He quickly appreciated the weaknesses inherent in the Stresa Front and set about exploiting them. The Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935 both condoned Germany’s rearmament and undermined the integrity of the Stresa Front. While the occupation of the Rhineland was a gamble, he had established a contingency plan and justified the action by arguing that the Treaty of Versailles had been grossly unfair – an argument which had much sympathy in Britain, if not in France. Hitler removed Mussolini as a potential threat to his plans for Anschluss by signing the Rome-Berlin Axis (1936) and by keeping Mussolini occupied in the Spanish Civil War. He was well aware of Britain’s appeasement policy, appreciating the opportunity which this provided for further German transgression of the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno agreements. Hitler easily convinced the British government, determined to avoid war at all costs, that he had peaceful intentions and was merely seeking the right the wrongs of the unjust Treaty of Versailles.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	He was well aware that the French were in no position to take action against him (politically, economically or militarily) unless they had the guarantee of British support, which was not forthcoming. The weakness of the British Prime Minister (Chamberlain) was fully exposed during the Munich Conference in 1938, and endorsed by the fact that the German takeover of the whole of Czechoslovakia went unopposed. Convinced that Britain and France would do no more to defend Poland than they had to protect Czechoslovakia, he removed what he saw as the only obstacle to his plans by signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact – another example of his ability to isolate potential targets by devious diplomacy. Rather than gambles, therefore, Hitler's actions were calculated and well-prepared attempts to take advantage of circumstances.	

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	Why, up to 1927, was Chiang Kai-shek prepared to collaborate with the Chinese Communist Party? The son of a wealthy landowner, Chiang was steeped in Chinese traditions and culture, believing that their preservation was vital for the resurgence of China. He was, therefore, totally opposed to the political philosophy of the CCP, which strongly advocated policies such as social reform and the redistribution of land. He realised, however, that if his KMT were to defeat the warlords and gain control of China, he needed to maintain the close cooperation with the CCP which had begun under Sun Yat-sen's leadership of the KMT. Liaison with the CCP enabled the KMT to gain military assistance, in the form of advisors and weaponry, from the USSR. Chiang's own military training had taken place in Moscow, and the USSR had played a significant role in helping to establish and maintain the KMT military academy at Whampoa. This had enabled the KMT to develop an organised and efficient army (NRA) capable of taking on the power of the warlords. Liaison with the CCP also enabled the KMT to widen its support base within China. Weary of the violence incited by the warlords, a wide variety of people supported and welcomed KMT forces – peasants, factory workers, shopkeepers, merchants, businessmen could all see the benefits of a KMT victory. The vast majority of the Chinese people were peasants or factory workers. They were attracted by the CCP's promise of land redistribution and industrial cooperatives. While Chiang did not support such views, he was prepared to exploit them in the interests of gaining power for the KMT. In particular, Chiang required the support which liaison with the CCP brought to the KMT during its Northern Expedition. Many ordinary Chinese people joined the KMT forces as they marched northwards through China, its army growing from 100 000 to 250 000 between July and December 1926. Once it was clear that the Northern Expedition would be successful in gaining control of Peking and much of China, Chiang ended his collaboration with the CCP, instituting the Purification Movement from 1927.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
12(b)	To what extent was the need for economic self-sufficiency the reason for Japanese aggression during the 1930s? Yes – Many Japanese military leaders believed that, as a small, resource-poor island nation dependent on trade, Japan was vulnerable. In the event of war, Japan could easily be blockaded into submission. They argued that, in order to avoid this threat, Japan needed to become economically self-sufficient, and this could only be achieved by acquiring new territory. This would provide new sources of vital raw materials and also increase the market for Japanese products. The Kwantung Army's decision to take over Manchuria in 1931 owed much to the fact that the area was rich in iron ore and coal deposits. These would be of great benefit to a Japanese economy suffering enormously as a result of the Great Depression. Similarly, military leaders argued that the outbreak of WWII offered an opportunity similar to that which Japan had successfully exploited during WWI. An aggressive foreign policy, they argued, would provide Japan with new sources of raw materials and wider markets. For example, success against Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Malaya and the Dutch East Indies would make available new supplies of tin, oil and rubber. Once the German invasion of the Soviet Union (1941) freed Japan from the risk of a Russian attack, the new government of Hideki Tojo began further expansion, taking possession of French Indochina. The American imposition of economic sanctions merely added to Japan's need to seek new supplies of vital commodities such as oil. Rather than discouraging Japanese aggression, it made it even more essential. No – Japanese aggression during the 1930s owed more to the development of extreme nationalistic views and the emergence of military dictatorship. The introduction of a democratic form of government proved highly unpopular, not least because it very quickly became clear that politicians were both corrupt and open to bribery. The elected government's willingness to negotiate and compromise with the Western powers was highly unpopular (e.g. Japan's willingness to compromise at the Washington Naval Conference, 1921–22). Moreover, the government was deemed responsible for the economic problems which Japan faced following the ending of WWI and, especially, as a result of the Great Depression. The takeover of Manchuria occurred because the Chinese were seeking to restrict Japanese influence in the region and, at the time, China was weak due to the civil war between the KMT and the CCP and catastrophic floods. The weak international response to the Manchurian issue led Japan to resign from the League of Nations, reject disarmament, repudiate the Washington Conference agreements and, by 1936, join Germany in the Anti-Comintern Pact. By 1937, Japan was at war with China. Further acquisitions were only prevented because some military leaders, including the Prime Minister (Prince Konoye), believed that it was more important to secure Japan from a possible attack by the USSR. Once this threat was ended by the German invasion of the USSR in 1941, Japan resumed its attempts to acquire new territory in the Far East.	20