



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/23**

Paper 2 Outline Study 23

May/June 2020**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 60

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **21** 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

Section A: European Option: Modern Europe, 1789–1917

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Why were political clubs, such as the Jacobins, set up during the Revolution? • There was a complete lack of leadership and effective policies by the King and his ministers, so something or someone had to fill the void. • There was considerable political inexperience amongst the membership of the Convention/Assembly. • There was an element of regionalism in it, with deputies from the Gironde, for example, forming the Girondins. • The Clubs provided policies, debate and a degree of leadership and co-ordination necessary for anything to happen in the Assembly. • They provided centres where, for example, the pro and anti-war factions could meet, or those supporting or opposing the execution of the King.	10
1(b)	‘Effective propaganda was the main reason why Napoleon remained in power for so long.’ How far do you agree? Arguments supporting the statement might consider how he sold himself successfully as the real heir to the revolution. He took great care to present himself and his regime in an impressive light: his portraits of the coronation ceremony are good examples of this. He also took great care to censor and control the press and there was endless emphasis on his military victories and the glory and gains that accrued to France as a result. He also managed to present his failures, such as Trafalgar, in a good light, or blamed someone else. Arguments challenging the statement might discuss how he provided good, stable, government and ensured that the most important, to the middle-class, gains of the revolution were maintained. There were also sensible, popular and lasting reforms such as the Concordat and the Civil Code which helped his longevity. Additionally, there was a lack of any alternative to his rule. Louis was hardly a threat. His military victories were also popular as were the territorial gains.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Why were the early technological innovations in textile manufacturing important in causing industrialisation? There are a variety of reasons why the early inventions, such as the spinning jenny and the flying shuttle, were so important to industrialisation. They include: • They helped not only to satisfy the huge demand for textiles, but because the price dropped so drastically, they created additional demand. • They led to further major changes in both technology and transport. • They led to increasing demand for labour and were an important part in the 'pull' factor in the move from rural to urban areas. • The massive profits made by manufacturers benefitting from this new technology led to further capital investment in areas such as transport. • The changes also led to the creation of the factory.	10
2(b)	To what extent did industrialisation lead to political change? Refer to any <u>two</u> countries from Britain, France and Germany in your answer. Arguments supporting the case for change might consider how there was a substantial reduction in the power and influence of the landed aristocracy. There was also a growth in the economic, social, as well as political influence of the middle classes, especially in both Britain and France. There was also a growth of working-class movements in all three countries, and after 1848 in all three countries there was a much greater awareness by the governing classes of the need to be much more aware of working-class issues Arguments challenging the idea of change might consider how the aristocracy still retained a large degree of power and influence. This was particularly seen with the Junker class in Germany and in the House of Lords in Britain. France, for example, remained a highly centralised with a very authoritarian system of government, even after the creation of the Republic. There was also very little working-class representation in Britain until the very end of the period, and even less in Germany.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Why did Anglo-French relations improve by 1904? • The Entente Cordiale improved relations between the two countries because it settled some controversial matters paving the way for their diplomatic cooperation against German pressures. • The Fashoda Incident in 1898. The French conceded defeat but it made them realise an alliance with Britain would be beneficial. • King Edward VII was in favour of the agreement as was the French President Loubet. • Delcassé, France's foreign minister believed that a Franco-British understanding would give France some security against any German system of alliances in Western Europe. • Britain was concerned about Germany's naval programme which could threaten Britain's clear dominance at sea. Agreement with France might help to keep Germany's power in check. • Britain ceded the Los Islands to France, defined the frontier of Nigeria in France's favour, and agreed to French control of the upper Gambia valley, while France renounced its right to fisheries off Newfoundland. • The Entente Cordiale also outlined French and British zones of influence in Siam (Thailand).	10
3(b)	To what extent was the Kaiser responsible for the outbreak of war in 1914? Arguments supporting the claim that the Kaiser was responsible might consider how he played a central role in the development of tension in the years before. This ranged from the Agadir and Moroccan crises, to the Kruger Telegram in 1896. He was also responsible, ultimately, for the Schlieffen Plan and the failure to halt it. The Kaiser had also gone out of his way to antagonise the British – notably with the Kruger telegram, and had also issued the Blank Cheque to Austria which encouraged it to invade Serbia. His response to Russian mobilisation also encouraged the likelihood of conflict. Arguments challenging the suggestion might discuss how there were others responsible for the tension who were in the Alliance and Entente. They might also consider how the Serbian/Sarajevo incident was not his responsibility and how Austria was very much the troublemaker in the Balkans. France was also determined on revenge for defeat in the Franco-Prussian war in 1871. The Russians, like France, were also determined to overcome the humiliation of defeat to Japan in 1905, and were unwise to mobilise.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	Why was the Provisional Government unable to solve Russia's problems in 1917? There are several reasons why the Provisional government was unable to solve Russia's problems in 1917. They include: • They had inherited a disastrous war against Germany and Austria-Hungary which Russia was losing. • There were major economic and social problems ranging from high inflation to acute food shortages. • The army was close to mutiny. • The regime lacked legitimacy in the eyes of many people. • The Tsar had left a weak government riven with corruption and nepotism. • The regime was not accepted by either Left or Right, or the masses. • It lacked experience, unity and skills.	10
4(b)	'The strengths of Romanov rule outweighed the weaknesses between 1906 and 1914.' How far do you agree? Arguments supporting the suggestion of more strengths might discuss the traditional support that Nicholas II enjoyed, the divided opposition and lack of tradition concerning a 'loyal' opposition. He had the support of the elites, the Church, Army and aristocracy. The largest section of the population – the peasantry, was usually deeply conservative and supported the Tsar. There was also an apparent willingness to reform and change elements of the regime, e.g. the Duma. Nicholas II could also rely on some competent ministers, such as Stolypin. The regime also had an efficient police system while there was also some evidence of economic improvement. Arguments supporting the idea of more weaknesses might discuss the personality of the Tsar and his unwillingness to offer any meaningful change. For example, the Fundamental Law of 1906 undermined the Dumas. The quality of his administration was also very limited and even with some competent ministers such as Stolypin, who was killed in 1911. Arguments might also consider how there remained an overdependence on nobility and the hereditary principle.	20

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

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	Why did the Indian Wars break out so often in the later nineteenth century? Reasons why the Indian Wars broke out so often in the later nineteenth century include: • The great area across which many different tribes resisted white settlements and military repression, e.g. most of the lands west of the Mississippi from Canada to Mexico in and around the Rockies. • The mixed strategies of the US government towards Native American tribes. Negotiated settlements with various tribes were then replaced by more aggressive action, depending on local circumstances. • The continuing Native American resistance to white settlement of their lands and disruption of their lives, using a form of guerrilla warfare to do so, e.g. Apache in Arizona to the South, Ute in Utah and Sioux in the Dakotas. The later saw Custer's Last Stand in 1876.	10
5(b)	How successfully did the United States respond to the rise of Japan in the period from 1898 to 1922? Arguments that the USA responded successfully to the rise of Japan between 1898 and 1922 rest upon the effectiveness of American diplomacy. Under Theodore Roosevelt in the 1900s, the success of Japan in the war against Russia was mediated by the Treaty of Portsmouth in 1905. The issue of Japanese immigration into California was addressed by the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907. The main point of friction between the two powers was Japanese demands on China, e.g. its 21 Demands in 1915. The Lansing-Ishii Note of 1917 saw the USA and Japan agreeing to an 'Open Door' policy in China. The limits of this Agreement meant it was replaced by the Nine-Power treaty at the Washington Naval Conference in 1922. A major benefit of the 1922 treaty was that it ended the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, first agreed in 1902. As well as using diplomacy to counter Japanese expansionism, the USA also developed its presence in the Western Pacific with the acquisition of Hawaii in 1898 and its continued presence in the Philippines after the war with Spain in the same year. Arguments that the US response to the rise of Japan in 1898-1922 was unsuccessful are the USA being unable to stop the growing power of Japan in the western Pacific, e.g. its acquisition of Korea in 1910. Also, its diplomatic successes of this period were short-term only, e.g. the 1917 Lansing-Ishii Note. Even the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 did little to stop the rise of Japan, as shown by the invasion of Manchuria in 1931.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	Why was Andrew Johnson's presidency controversial? <i>Johnson was not formally a Democrat in 1864-68, he was a member of the National Union party, formed to help widen support for Lincoln in the 1864 election. [Lincoln also was a National Union candidate.]</i> Andrew Johnson's presidency was controversial because: • He was a Southerner – from the border state of Tennessee – and a Democrat. He was president only because Lincoln was assassinated. [He had been chosen as Lincoln's VP in order to balance the ticket.] Northern Republicans, initially supportive, soon turned against both the style and policies of the President. • His policies towards ex-slaves were less sympathetic than Northern Republicans wanted, e.g. his veto of Congress's 1866 Civil Rights bill. • His Reconstruction strategies differed from those of the US Congress, leading to constitutional conflict. • His style of government was provocative, e.g. his dismissal of cabinet ministers. Hence his impeachment in 1868, which he survived.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	‘The Confederacy lost the Civil War because its member states believed more in states’ rights than in a united war effort.’ How far do you agree? Evidence which supports the assertion includes the unwillingness of some states to provide men for Confederate forces. Georgia and North Carolina were especially reluctant to send men away from defending their home states. The Confederacy thus found it [increasingly] hard to coordinate effective forces against Unionist armies. In addition, states often resisted Confederate restrictions on civil liberties, e.g. conscription. This provoked internal divisions, which further weakened the Confederate’s war effort. Also, the state-based nature of politics meant that there was no effective opposition to the leadership of Jefferson Davis at the Confederate level. While this absence might reduce divisions, it also meant that government policies were little scrutinised and thus little improved. Evidence which challenges the assertion includes Jefferson Davis’s failure of leadership away from the battlefield. Davis failed to offset the power of states’ rights by developing the sense of Confederate national unity and identity which was so important to the breakaway state. Another Confederate failure was the failure of its diplomacy. It was unable to gain support of another country, especially Britain in the first year of the War. A third limitation of the Confederate war effort was the Confederate States of America’s (CSA) inability to properly fund the war, resulting in rapid inflation and lower living standards. Finally, a fundamental weakness of the Confederate State’s war effort was its slave-based society. As US forces entered the CSA, increasing number of slaves fled to Union lines or failed to support the CSA’s war effort. From 1863, CSA states were given the power to recruit slaves into the army, but only to non-combat duties. In 1864-65, when facing defeat, the CSA did consider given slaves combat roles in return for post-war freedom. Such a radical reform was too late, and too fundamental a challenge to the very values of the CSA.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	Why did the industrial working class experience bad living conditions in the late nineteenth century? Reasons why the industrial working class experienced such bad living conditions in the late nineteenth century include: • The rapid growth of the towns and cities in which the working class lived and worked. Between 1850 and 1900 the population of New York grew seven-fold from 0.5 million to 3.5m. In 1850 15% of US people lived in cities. By 1900 40% did so. This growth was too rapid to enable the provision of adequate living and working conditions. • The government of the industrial cities was in the hand of the middle class, which neglected the interests of the working class. • The industrial working class was often first or second-generation immigrants and thus open to exploitation by bosses, both industrial and political. • The political bosses especially, based on the example of Boss Tweed in New York in the 1860s, exploited the needs of the working class in return for votes. Until the emergence of the Progressive Movement at the turn of the century, there was little effective action taken to improve bad living conditions in working class areas of the industrial cities.	10
7(b)	How far did the Progressive Movement achieve its goals? The argument that the Progressive Movement achieved its goals rests on the large number of reforms passed in the thirty years from 1890 to 1920. To restrict the powers of big business monopolies the Sherman Anti-Trust Act was passed and enforced. To improve the conditions of the working class, the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act was passed. To limit political corruption and improve democracy, states began to use party primaries while the US constitution was amended to allow direct elections of US senators. Finally, a federal income tax was introduced which was mildly progressive, enabling the reduction of tariffs, which hit the working class the hardest. The argument that the Progressive Movement did not achieve its goals is based mainly on two main aspects. Firstly, there were some gaps in the reform programme. The position of women, especially working-class women, changed little. Though women got the federal vote in 1920, this was mainly because of their contribution to the First World War, not because of the Progressive Movement. The position of African Americans changed little, those in the South not at all. The position of organised labour unions saw little recognition and improvement; only with the 1914 Clayton Anti-Trust Act did these unions gain exemption from anti-trust legislation. Secondly, political and economic power still rested with the middle classes. This enabled them to limit reforms or their application in their own interests, e.g. federal income tax thresholds. Indeed, the Progressive Movement itself was largely middle class.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	Why did business groups oppose the New Deal? The main business group which opposed the New Deal was the American Liberty League [ALL], formed in 1934 and having its greatest impact in 1934-36. It claimed to be bipartisan but many argued it was led by Republican politicians. Reasons for the opposition of business groups include: • Opposition to the expanded role of federal government, as can be illustrated by almost any New Deal reform. • Opposition to specific New Deal reforms for specific reasons, e.g. the 1935 Wagner Act increasing the power of labour unions, the minimum wage raising labour costs, the NRA introducing too many regulations [‘red tape’] also increasing business costs. • They believed that the New Deal reforms, by altering the balance between public [control] and private [enterprise] in favour of the former, were undermining traditional American values upon which American economic success had been built. • In the context of the 1930s, some business leaders saw the New Deal as authoritarian. The ALL described the Agricultural Adjustment Act [AAA] as showing elements of fascist control while some portrayed the Social Security Act as anti-democratic.	10
8(b)	‘Politicians were more responsible than bankers for failing to prevent the Great Crash turning into the Great Depression.’ How far do you agree? Arguments that politicians were more responsible than bankers for failing to prevent the Great Crash turning into the Great Depression has several elements. Firstly, the politicians failed to counter the deflationary effects of the Great Crash. In fact, the passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930 made things worse by raising tariffs, provoking a trade ‘war’ and reduced demand for US goods. Secondly, President Hoover assumed that the Great Crash was the traditional business cycle in action and did little to counter its effects until 1932. Even then he still increased taxes, thereby reducing demand, in order to balance the federal budget. Thirdly Hoover kept the USA on the gold standard, which made the dollar uncompetitive as other countries started to leave the gold standard, e.g. the UK in 1931 [FDR abandoned the gold standard in 1933]. Finally, the USA failed to support international efforts to halt the growth of protectionism. It was a case of ‘America First’. Arguments that bankers were more responsible than politicians for failing to prevent the Great Crash into the Great Depression also have several elements. Firstly, the US banking system was fragmented and relatively uncoordinated. Many banks had not joined the Federal Reserve System of 1913 and thus did not have the benefits of Federal Reserve support. This made the banking crisis nationwide. Secondly, many banks had insufficient capital reserves to prevent a run on those reserves; one-third of US banks went bankrupt in 1930-31, causing credit to dry up and the economy to contract. Thirdly, the Federal Reserve increased its discount [interest] rate in late 1931, raising the cost of borrowing still further, thereby deflating the economy.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	Why did Bismarck want to isolate France in the years after 1871? • Concern about French <i>Revanche</i>. The Franco–Prussian War of 1870–71 enabled Bismarck to complete his plans to unify Germany, but it forced France to pay a vast sum of money in war compensation and left France both resentful and determined to seek revenge. • French claims on Alsace Lorraine – By the terms of the Treaty of Frankfurt (1871), Germany took the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and France was determined to recover them • Danger of war on two fronts. Bismarck knew that Germany was open to attack from three sides: from France to the west, from Russia to the east and from Austria-Hungary to the south. His main concern was to isolate potential enemies, especially France. • Need to consolidate unification of Germany. The defeat of France enabled the completion of the German unification. This needed to be consolidated so Bismarck wanted to avoid conflict and built a system of alliances to support Germany and isolate France e.g. Three Emperors' League (Dreikaiserbund) 1873, the Dual Alliance 1879, the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1887.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	To what extent was Kaiser Wilhelm responsible for the decline in Anglo-German relations before 1914? <i>NB</i> the question specifies ‘before 1914’ so any drift into the reasons for the outbreak of war or references to events in 1914 are not relevant to the question. Arguments in support of the claim might consider the dismissal of Bismarck. The Kaiser set out to take direct control of the government. He pursued ‘Weltpolitik’, to fulfil his ambitions of building an overseas colonial empire and a naval power capable of competing with Britain. As part of this Wilhelm sought to antagonise Britain, which can be seen with the Kruger Telegram. Colonial policies officially became a matter of national prestige and the idea of ‘a Place in the Sun’. This encouraged investment in strengthening its colonies in Africa and the Pacific, although few became profitable. Additionally, Admiral von Tirpitz, who was to head the Imperial Naval Office championed five successive naval laws (1898-1912). He openly claimed that Germany’s ‘future lies on the sea’ – an obvious and increasing threat to Britain’s naval power which paved the way for the naval arms race. The Moroccan Crisis was also encouraged by ‘Weltpolitik’. Germany made attempts at breaking apart the Triple Entente. This was principally attempted by engineering crises in Morocco in 1905 and 1911. Germany’s aim was to test the strength of the relationship between France and Britain, and to exploit the weakness for their own gain. However, these efforts resulted in the strengthening of the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale which angered Germany. Alternative arguments might include how British weaknesses were exposed by the Boer War. This demonstrated to the world its weakness and inability to control portions of its African empire even though Britain ultimately achieved victory. The British need to maintain the ‘two power standard’ might also be considered. British naval policy was always to maintain a fleet as big as the next two in size combined. When the Germans began to expand their navy the British were compelled to respond. Improved Anglo-French relations following settlement of the Fashoda incident might equally be discussed. Rivalry in the ‘Scramble for Africa’ culminated in Anglo-French confrontation at Fashoda in 1898. After this they agreed to settle mutual differences (including Egypt and Morocco) by negotiation. This ultimately led to the Anglo-French Entente which dismayed the Germans. The importance of the ‘Dreadnought’ also encouraged decline. The building of the <i>HMS Dreadnought</i> by the British created a whole new class of battleship that made other vessels virtually redundant. The race began to build more ships like <i>Dreadnought</i> was a particular feature of the Anglo-German naval race.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	Why did Germans consider the Treaty of Versailles to be unfair? • The War Guilt Clause – Germany had to accept the blame for the war when they believed that Russia should have been blamed for starting the war. Accepting this clause gave the Allies the right to punish Germany and seemed to justify the harsh terms of the treaty. • Lack of German representation at the negotiations. The Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles because they had not been allowed to take part in the peace conference and they regarded the treaty as a ‘Diktat’. They thought the treaty was unfair as it was imposed upon them. The Germans were treated like a defeated country, but they did not think they had been defeated. • Reparations was unfair – it was too high at £6,600,000,000 and would destroy Germany’s economy. There would be no chance to recover in order to pay the reparations. • Forced disarmament when no other states were disarming. Germany felt that the disarmament clauses of the treaty were unfair, especially as other countries did not have to disarm even though the 14 points included universal disarmament.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	‘The United States wanted no involvement in European affairs in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree? Responses should examine the role of the US in European affairs highlighting what they did or didn’t involve themselves in. Arguments in support of the claim might refer to the failure to sign peace treaties. Though Wilson was one of the main architects and toured the US to promote the treaty, Congress, which had a Republican majority, refused to ratify it. Additionally, Americans elected three Republican presidents in a row: Harding, Coolidge and Hoover. These were ‘conservatives’ and were generally more interested in economic growth at home than in relations with other countries. There was also the failure to join the League of Nations. President Harding’s victory speech called for ‘a return to normalcy’ and declared the issue of America’s involvement in the League of Nations ‘deceased’. Most Americans wanted to be kept out of any future involvement in European politics. There was also fear of political extremism. Americans believed that radical political movements and ideologies such as socialism, communism, and anarchism were European in origin and threatened political stability in the United States. The events during the Red Scare of 1917–1920 had fostered the fear and suspicion of foreigners. Americans did not trust Europeans after the Treaty of Versailles. Counter arguments might include the United States’ involvement in international treaties like the Washington Naval Treaties. The United States arranged the Washington Conference between November 1921 and February 1922 to discuss disarmament. The Washington Conference resulted in three agreements to prevent future wars. Also, the US role in Dawes and Young Plans might be considered. As a result of the Ruhr crisis and German hyper-inflation, an international group intervened and negotiated a settlement to the crisis. The group provided a system to save Germany’s currency and protect international debts led by the American diplomat and banker Charles G. Dawes in 1924. American bankers agreed to lend money to Germany to pay its war debts to the Allies. His plan was to give Germany longer to pay its heavy war reparations and agreed to an American loan. This was superseded by the Young Plan in 1929 which reduced the total amount of reparations and adjusted the payment period. The US economic role including negative effects of Wall Street Crash may also be identified. The United States had become a world power. It was tied to other countries by trade, politics and shared interests. American foreign investments continued to increase greatly during the 1920s and America’s economic strength influenced its policies toward Europe. In fact, one of the most important issues of this period was the economic aid the United States had provided European nations during the war. The Wall Street Crash destroyed European economic stability and created global recession.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	Why were foreign powers involved in the Spanish Civil War? • Support for right or left-wing factions by sympathetic states. While neither Mussolini nor Hitler were interested in Spain, they both saw the potential value of a third fascist state in Europe. Both countries supplied Franco with military equipment and troops. Stalin was concerned about the emergence of a third Fascist state. • German interest in developing its own armed forces and trying out new air war tactics e.g. bombing of Guernica. German forces were 'allowed to volunteer' to fight in Spain – e.g. the Condor Legion. • Mussolini personal aims - he wanted to seek glory and to show that he could lead Italy back to its former greatness as a major power. • Soviet concern about the rise of Fascism. He was willing to provide some aid to the Communists. However, he did not approve of the other members of the Popular Front and kept a tight control on his resources, which weakened the Republican's war effort. • May mention non-intervention policies of Britain and France – they were instrumental in forming the non-intervention committee, but were the only ones who followed its principles of non-intervention. As a result, only volunteers were able to offer support to the legitimate Republican government via the International Brigades.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	‘Chamberlain’s decisions at the Munich Conference were justifiable.’ How far do you agree? In support, responses might consider the lack of preparation for war and the weakness of the British armed forces. The poorly equipped military had to provide a global defence for all of Britain's territories, especially in India. The Wall Street Crash had prevented any substantial re-armament. The attitude of public opinion might also be discussed. Losses suffered in 1914-18 had created widespread pacifism and after the example of Guernica, there were fears of air attacks. The Oxford Union ‘King and Country debate (1933)’ might also be identified. There were also practical difficulties of intervening on behalf of Czechoslovakia – a land locked country distant from the UK in which most British people had no interest. This was also enhanced by the reluctance of France to take any action. France expected Britain to take the lead and thought they were safe behind their new defensive lines. The role of Mussolini in supporting Hitler may also be considered. Mussolini had been linked to Britain and France in the Stresa Pact. However, after Abyssinia Mussolini became increasingly drawn into Hitler’s sphere and acted as his intermediary at Munich. Hitler said it as his last territorial demand in Europe and Chamberlain believed him. Challenging arguments might discuss the extent of concessions already made to Hitler. Appeasement made Hitler think that Britain was weak. A show of force by Britain and France may have stopped him from carrying out his plans. He was counting on them appeasing him. The Anglo-French commitment to the defence of Czechoslovakia might be considered also. They had committed themselves to the defence of Czechoslovakia, but the Czechs were not even present at Munich and were forced to accept the agreement. The capacity of Germany to take action if Chamberlain had not agreed to Hitler’s demands might also be outlined. German forces were far from ready for full-scale war and a firm challenge could have made him back down.	20

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	Why did large-scale protest break out in China on 4 May 1919? - Students protest the Treaty of Versailles and lack of consultation with Chinese – In 1917, China declared war on Germany and assisted the Allied side in the conflict on the condition that Shandong itself would return to Chinese control if the Allies won. As the birthplace of Confucius, the province had importance for China. However, at Versailles Chinese representatives were forced to agree to Japan's demands for control, which was a humiliation, - Response to transfer of German concessions in Shandong/Shantung province to Japan – The Chinese public, as a whole, was both upset and angry by the transfer of rights over the Shandong Peninsula to Japan. The Versailles conference itself received a bad name in China as a result. The treaty was a twofold betrayal – first as a symbol of Japanese brutality and aggression, and second as a betrayal by the Western powers. - Part of wider anti-imperialist movement – The Treaty of Versailles was seen as a marker that the Western powers were uninterested in Chinese feelings as they carved up the map of Asia between them. - Promotion of nationalism and against traditional Chinese culture – it was a political, cultural, and anti-imperialist movement with its roots in Beijing. It began with a series of demonstrations by students The May Fourth Movement gave a boost to nationalism in China, as well as favouring populist causes.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
12(b)	‘Military ambitions rather than economic difficulties were responsible for Japan’s decision to take over Manchuria in 1931.’ How far do you agree with this statement? In explaining what happened in Manchuria in 1931 candidates might consider important factors such as the rise of militarism and weakness of democratic government. Military leaders became convinced that only through domination of China could they solve their country's problems. The 1929 Depression hit Japan hard and the civilian government found that it had no solutions and were perceived as weak. The Mukden railway incident led the Kwantung army to take unilateral action to seize control of Manchuria without government approval. The creation of the puppet state of Manchukuo also increased popular support. Also popular was a secret society founded by army officers seeking to establish a military dictatorship, the Sakurakai, who plotted to attack the Diet and political party headquarters, assassinate the prime minister, and declare martial law under a ‘Showa Restoration’. Additionally, the weakness of China and the strategic importance of Manchuria as a base for further action against China might be considered as influential factors. The weakness of League of Nations might also be identified. It condemned Japan after investigation by Lord Lytton but took no further action – seen as justifying military takeover and Japan simply withdrew from the League when Lytton’s report condemned their action. Opposed to this, responses might set out economic factors such as the economic effects on Japan of the Great Depression. Factories closed and unemployment and social unrest followed. The democratic government was unable to respond so people turned to the military for solutions. Additionally, the decline of international trade might be considered. Many of Japan’s exports were luxury goods for which there was no longer a market after the worldwide economic collapse. This led to unemployment and political unrest at home – seen as a failure of democracy. The lack of natural resources in Japan were also important. Manchuria offered nearly 200,000 square kilometres which, as part of a Japanese empire, would easily accommodate any over-spilling population. At the same time Japanese industry could take advantage of the coal and iron ore deposits and create new markets. Existing economic interests in Manchuria including extensive Japanese rail network which it had controlled since the Treaty of Portsmouth might also be considered.	20