



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/43**

Paper 4 Depth Study 43

May/June 2021**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 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **16** 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.

Question 1–12	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5:	Responses show a very good understanding of the question and contain a relevant, focused and balanced argument, fully supported by appropriate factual material and based on a consistently analytical approach. Towards the top of the level, responses may be expected to be analytical, focused and balanced throughout. The candidate will be in full control of the argument and will reach a supported judgement in response to the question. Towards the lower end of the level, responses might typically be analytical, consistent and balanced but the argument might not be fully convincing.	25–30
Level 4:	Responses show a good understanding of the question and contain a relevant argument based on a largely analytical approach. Towards the top of the level, responses are likely to be analytical, balanced and effectively supported. There may be some attempt to reach a judgement but this may be partial or unsupported. Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain detailed and accurate factual material with some focused analysis but the argument is inconsistent or unbalanced.	19–24
Level 3:	Responses show understanding of the question and contain appropriate factual material. The material may lack depth. Some analytical points may be made but these may not be highly developed or consistently supported. Towards the top of the level, responses contain detailed and accurate factual material. However, attempts to argue relevantly are implicit or confined to introductions or conclusions. Alternatively, responses may offer an analytical approach which contains some supporting material. Towards the lower end of the level, responses might offer narrative or description relating to the topic but are less likely to address the terms of the question.	13–18
Level 2:	Responses show some understanding of the demands of the question. They may be descriptive with few links to the question or may be analytical with limited factual relevant factual support. Towards the top of the level, responses might contain relevant commentaries which lack adequate factual support. The responses may contain some unsupported assertions. Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain some information which is relevant to the topic but may only offer partial coverage.	7–12

Question 1–12	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 1:	Responses show limited understanding of the question. They may contain some description which is linked to the topic or only address part of the question. Towards the top of the level, responses show some awareness of relevant material but this may be presented as a list. Towards the lower end of the level, answers may provide a little relevant material but are likely to be characterised by irrelevance.	1–6
Level 0:	No relevant creditworthy content.	0

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941

Question	Indicative content	Marks
1	‘Russia experienced fundamental change between 1918 and 1924.’ How far do you agree? Arguments challenging the statement might discuss how one autocracy was arguably replaced by another and how control remained firmly in the centre and government still focussed on the wishes of one individual. The Tsar made the decision to go to war, Lenin decided to accept the terms of Brest Litovsk. Additionally, the economy remained locally based, with a strong degree of state control. Former Tsarist army officers returned as did many industrial managers and there was little change in rural areas. What changes there were after War Communism and the famine of the Civil War, were very much a continuation of what Stolypin had done. Judicious use of a secret police remained and there was little impact on the ‘other’ parts of the old Russian Empire. In support of the statement arguments might consider how the Tsarist systems was destroyed and the role and influence of the Church largely eliminated. Considerable changes also came in which affected the position of women in society. A central planning system was set up using <i>Sovnarkom</i> and <i>Gosplan</i> and the Decree on Land was a significant departure. The whole direction of the economy shifted and the basic ideology underlying the regime changed.	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
2	‘Communism was feared more than fascism.’ How far does this explain Mussolini’s rise to power by 1925? Arguments supporting the statement may consider how communism was a major factor influencing the Roman Catholic Church. The anti- religious ideas (and actions in Russia) were the cause of serious concern within the Curia. The influential Roman Catholic press was supportive of Mussolini after 1921 and of course the Concordat was important in giving Mussolini increased legitimacy after 1922. It was also of real importance in influencing the decision of Victor Emmanuel in 1922 as well as the manufacturers in the North. The large number of communist-inspired strikes between 1919 and 1922 had made a significant dent in their profits. The shift from a wartime to a peace time economy was also causing real problems and the owners did not want to worsen the situation. The idea of state ownership of land also appalled the landlord class in the South. Arguments challenging the statement might discuss the incompetence of the Liberal governments and how their inability to provide even a semblance of political stability played into Mussolini’s hands. The failures of the army during the war and the perceived humiliation at Versailles also benefited Mussolini. Equally, his ideological flexibility was a great asset. He could appeal to whoever he was speaking to. His awareness of the appeal of D’Annunzio and the foreign policies he promised and adopted consequently. Furthermore, his sense of timing in 1922, the sheer boldness of the gamble of the ‘March on Rome’, and his clever use of the Acerbo Law and reaction to the Aventine secession also helped Mussolini to power. The work of the <i>ras</i> and <i>Squadristi</i> and his ability to distance himself from them when necessary, together with the use of effective propaganda were also influential.	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
3	To what extent was Stalin's rule based on popular support? Arguments supporting the idea of popular support might consider how there was genuine enthusiasm for many of his communist policies – Collectivisation was fully endorsed at central party levels and imposed by large numbers of youthful enthusiasts. Similarly, the Five-Year Plans were popular and well supported and there was also widespread support for the whole idea of equality of opportunity and many of the changes which helped women. Furthermore, Stalin's anti-Nazi ideas and aggressive nationalism were popular and in accord with deep rooted patriotic ideas while the improvements to health provision and education were equally popular. Arguments discussing other factors for Stalin's rule might consider his use of terror and extensive propaganda – particularly the development of the cult of personality and his claim to be the 'heir' of Lenin. There was also a lack of any tradition of a 'loyal' opposition and of any apparent alternative. The way in which he eliminated all opposition and potential opposition, demonstrating the sheer skill and ruthlessness of Stalin is also notable.	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
4	Evaluate the reasons why democracy came to an end in Germany by 1934. A variety of factors could be considered when evaluating the reasons why democracy came to an end in Germany between 1933 and 1934. They could include the lack of any deep-rooted democratic traditions within Germany. Weimar was discredited almost from the start. Germany had always been a largely autocratic country with the Kaiser, for example, making all major decisions such as war and peace. There were also huge political divisions within Germany and a lack of any clear consensus. The Right and Left had substantial support, yet there were serious divisions within those groupings which precluded any serious opposition to the other. Additionally, there was a real lack of commitment from Hindenburg and the Army for supporting the democratic process. From the very earliest the Army made it clear they only tolerated Weimar (and made sure it got the blame for their own failings in 1918). The apparent failure of Weimar to deal with major issues such as Versailles, inflation, deflation and mass unemployment was also a significant factor in the decline of democracy, as was Germany's dependence on US loans. Nazi methods and Nazi electoral skills, including the effective use of propaganda, and the work of the SA were equally instrumental. The ability of the Nazis to remain 'legitimate', gain power, and then destroy democracy from the inside is also of note.	30

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990

Question	Indicative content	Marks
5	Assess the impact of the Warren Court on the lives of African Americans in the 1950s Discussion might consider <i>Brown vs. Board of Education</i>. This was a landmark decision that declared state laws establishing separate public schools for black and white students unconstitutional. The Supreme Court heard the case for the first time in 1952 but was planning to rehear it in October 1953 giving special attention as to whether the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection clause prohibited segregated public schools. The death of the Chief Justice and his replacement with Earl Warren delayed the proceedings. <i>Brown v. Board</i> was reargued over 3 days on 7-9 December. Warren stated that 'in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal'. In 1955, the Supreme Court ordered Kansas and other states with segregated schools to do away with their dual school systems. The condition of Southern Black schools was particularly appalling. In one elementary school, there was not a single desk. White children had bus transportation if they needed it, but Black children had no transportation to their schools, which were often located in isolated and underdeveloped areas. At first, many Southerners appeared ready to comply. President Dwight Eisenhower made it clear he was not happy with the Court's decision. In <i>Brown II</i> (1955), the Court made what many came to consider a wrong turn: it permitted the local school boards to desegregate gradually, under federal court supervision. Ten years later, only 2.14% of Southern Black children attended desegregated schools. Nevertheless, during those years, segregation was outlawed in all municipal facilities – parks and recreation areas, transportation, libraries and courtrooms, as well as in hotels, restaurants, and other public accommodation	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
6	‘The US economy was transformed in the 1970s by developments in the Cold War.’ How far do you agree? Discussion points in relation to the Cold War and the US economy might include the impact of Vietnam. The Vietnam War placed great pressure on the economy; it was paid for by borrowing rather than taxation, putting the government budget into deficit and further weakening the dollar. Additionally, oil crises were influential. In 1973, following the Yom Kippur war, OPEC placed an embargo on western buyers resulting in the price of oil rising four-fold. Stagflation began with a huge rise in oil prices, but then continued as central banks used monetary policy to counteract the resulting recession, causing a runaway wage-price spiral. This coincided with the ending of direct US military involvement in Vietnam followed by its ultimate defeat in 1975. The shock of the oil price rise combined with a stock market shock badly affected the lives of the Americans who realised how dependent their economy was on the Middle East. Gas stations ran dry, oil consumption dropped by 20%, the speed limit was reduced to 55 mph on highways. Nixon ordered the department of defence to create a stockpile of oil in case the country needed the military to carry it through a time of chaos. Thus, the USA faced rising international competition and soaring energy prices alongside increasing inflation which was 10% in 1974 and unemployment which rose to 8% in 1975. There was a further oil crisis in 1979 at the time of the Iranian Revolution which sparked further price rises and caused panic among consumers. Further discussion on the weakening economy might consider the trade deficit on manufacturing goods, a major contrast with the predominance of the United States in the world economy some twenty years before. This deficit was partly caused by the revival of manufacturing industries in Japan and West Germany. Japan especially produced cars which were more reliable than those of American competitors and were much more economical, the latter being important as petrol prices rose rapidly during the 1970s. America had failed to invest in the latest manufacturing methods, companies preferring to leave the traditional industrial heartlands of the north east to the air-conditioned factories and cheaper, nonunionised labour of the south and west, moving from rust belt to sun belt. Governments did little to address these structural economic and social problems, especially in the first half of the decade, when the US politicians concentrated more on foreign policy and the constitutional crisis known as Watergate.	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
7	Affirmative action policies in the 1980s improved the lives of minorities.’ How far do you agree? Discussion about the success of Affirmative Action might consider the changes in employment. By the 1990s 30% percent of black men and nearly 60% of black women held white-collar jobs. The percentage of physicians increased from 2.2% to 4.5%. The number of black college and university professors more than doubled between 1970 and 1990; the number of engineers almost quadrupled; and the number of attorneys increased more than six-fold. Positive Supreme Court cases might also be considered. In 1980, the Supreme Court ruled in <i>Fullilove v. Klutznick</i> that modest quotas were reasonable, upholding a federal law that 15% of public works funds be set-aside for qualified minority contractors. In <i>Connecticut v. Teal</i> in 1982 it was held that an employer is liable for race discrimination where any part of its selection process has a disparate impact on black applicants or employees, even if the ‘bottom line’ result of the employer’s hiring or promotional practice is racially balanced. This decision made clear that the fair employment laws protect the individual and therefore fair treatment of a group is no defence to an individual claim of discrimination. <i>Price Waterhouse v. Watkins</i> in 1989 held that if a plaintiff shows that discrimination played a ‘motivating part’ in an employment decision, the employer can avoid liability only by proving by a preponderance of the evidence that it would not have made the same decision in the absence of the discriminatory motive. Challenges to the idea that Affirmative Action was successful might consider how by the end of the 1970s there had begun to be widespread challenge to the idea and policies of affirmative action. Reagan campaigned vigorously against affirmative action in 1980, promising voters he would overturn policies that advocated quotas requiring sex, race and ethnicity to be the principal factor in hiring or education. Once in office, Reagan’s Justice Department backed cases that challenged affirmative action programmes hoping to eradicate them completely. President Reagan believed that the government promoted reverse discrimination and stated that it should relax its efforts to reach employment equality on behalf of minority groups. Reagan also cut funding for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the civil rights division of the Justice Department. He also believed that compensating African Americans and other minority groups for past discrimination with hiring quotas, numerical goals, and timetables, ought to be eliminated. As a result, the EEOC filed 60 percent fewer cases by 1984 than it had at the beginning of the Reagan administration. On May 19, 1986, the Supreme Court in <i>Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education</i> invalidated an existing affirmative action programme. A school board policy stipulated that when layoffs were necessary, white teachers should be laid off before non-whites regardless of their seniority. The Court held that the policy’s benefits to minorities could not justify the injury it caused to whites	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
8	Assess the impact of US policies on Latin America in the period 1950 to 1963. Discussion might consider individual countries such as Cuba. In 1959, the right-wing Batista dictatorship of Cuba was replaced by the left-wing party dictatorship of Castro. Two years later, Eisenhower was replaced by Kennedy as US President. The USA had always had a special relationship with Cuba, just 90 miles off the Florida coast, and often seen as being America's backyard. Fear of a Communist Cuba and its effect on the region led to plans to topple Castro, as shown by the CIA-organised Bay of Pigs attack in April 1961. The CIA continued to plan to overthrow Castro, even after the Cuban missile crisis. Additionally, in Guatemala in 1954 a CIA coup brought down the democratically elected government of Guatemala which had been in power since the overthrow of the US backed dictatorship. The US had prospered from the 'banana republic' status of Guatemala. Under the Guatemalan dictator Jorge Ubico, the United Fruit Company gained control of 42% of Guatemala's land, and was exempted from paying taxes and import duties. Seventy-seven percent of all Guatemalan exports went to the United States; and 65% of imports to the country came from the United States. After 1944 the democratically elected government had begun to undo this monopoly and change the political system e.g. Communists had been allowed within the country and President Arbenz proposed 'Decree 900', to redistribute undeveloped lands held by large property owners to landless farmers, which constituted 90% of the population. From the late 1930s to the 1970s Nicaragua was under the control of the dictatorial Somoza family. Responses may discuss how US policies allowed for engagement with this family in the interest of commercialism, for example the US-owned Nicaraguan Long Leaf Pine Company (NIPCO) paid the Somoza's millions of dollars in exchange for not having to re-forest areas where they had been cutting. In addition to this type of practice, the Somoza family were generally predisposed to supporting US interests and accepted many US exports – including pesticides which were banned in the US such as DDT – 40% of US pesticide exports went to Central America in the 1950s and 1960s. Furthermore, the expansion of cotton plantations in the 1950s and cattle ranches in the next decade also forced peasant families from the areas they had farmed for decades. Some were forced by the National Guard to relocate into colonisation projects in the rainforest while others moved eastward into the hills.	30

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

Question	Indicative content	Marks
9	How effective was arms control in the 1960s and 1970s? Discussion might consider a range of agreements that encouraged the control of arms. In particular, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, Salt 1 in 1972 may each be identified. These all may be discussed as being effective measures for the control of arms, establishing a potential foundation for long term peace. Additionally, the Helsinki Accords and the failure to ratify SALT 2 may be considered. As examples of how the measures put in place were not totally effective. The Soviet Union's support for the Helsinki Accords was varied and the failure to extend the gains of SALT 1 with agreement at SALT 2 evidences limited success. Ideological motivations and mutual distrust may be identified as influencing factors, as might the unwillingness of both sides to really allow effective enforcement and monitoring of the nuclear arsenals. The rise of additional nuclear powers such as Britain, France and China might also be considered.	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Indicative content	Marks
10	How far was the USA's ideological determination to defeat the USSR the main cause of the Second Cold War? The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979 and this ended the Carter Doctrine and the policy of détente and led to a ramping up of tensions. Carter ordered the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games and reduced trade. However, even before Afghanistan the Soviet Union had been consciously expanding its influence in Africa Asia and Latin America and many felt the USA was being weak in foreign policy. On the other hand, the election of Reagan in 1980 led to an Administration that was determined to win the Cold War and followed a policy of increased defence spending, introduced SDI (Star Wars) and then responded in a hawkish manner to Soviet actions such as the shooting down of Korean Airlines Flight 007 and both sides inadvertently followed brinkmanship in Operation Able Archer in 1983 and the boycott of the Los Angeles Olympic Games. The Neoconservatives had been planning on defeating the Soviet Empire and Reagan calling it the 'Evil Empire' and then urging Gorbachev to tear down the Berlin Wall was all part of this rhetoric.	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
11	Assess the reasons for the communist victory in 1949. The strategies adopted by the leadership of the CCP played a major role in securing victory. Mao Zedong, who had become Chairman of the CCP in 1945, understood how the leaders could win the support of the peasants and the importance of having a strong army led by loyal generals. The leadership of the CCP under Mao Zedong lived on the ground throughout the period of the communist revolution and were able to win ‘the struggle for the hearts of the people’ by sympathising with the Chinese peasants. However, His grip on control also allowed him to adopt an offensive strategy in the war which resulted in victory in 1949. In the areas that the communists liberated, the peasants were usually encouraged to take charge of their own affairs. His cadres ensured that whenever the communists secured an area, they organised village meetings where wealthy landlords were forced to confess their bad treatment of peasants and labourers. The cadres then cancelled all of the debts owed to the landlords and redistributed the land or imposed rent restrictions. As more peasants and labourers acquired land, they had a vested interest in the success of the Communist Party. If the communists lost, they would lose everything and, consequently, they supported Mao’s army with food, labour and recruits for the army. The PLA was also an important factor in securing victory for the Communists; it was unified under a tightly controlled central command. Mao appointed loyal generals including Lin Biao and Zhu De. These generals, dedicated to the communist cause, were superior military leaders. Civil war had erupted again in 1946 and the PLA was unified under a tightly controlled central command; the ordinary soldiers were treated with respect. Chiang Kai-shek’s army was poorly led and lacked a central command to co-ordinate it; many deserted and joined the communists. In 1945 the CCP controlled about a quarter of the country’s territory; the Soviet Union turned over its captured Japanese weapons to the CPP and China also received Manchuria from the Soviets. In June 1947 the PLA defeated the KMT New First Army; they now had tanks and heavy artillery at their disposal. In 1948 they launched an attack south of the Great Wall that cut off nationalist troops from their supply bases in Xi’an. They then secured the South East Central section of China and by the end of January 1949 most of China was in the hands of the communists. The shortcomings of Chiang’s government also contributed to the communist victory. It was filled with incompetent and corrupt officials. He lost support in the cities because of heavy taxes, inflation, unemployment and food shortages. Economic discontent led to strikes and there were protests demanding an end to the civil war and the creation of a government that included the communists. The Nationalists responded with repression including censorship, mass arrests and assassinations. The nationalists supported business and the landlords; they ignored the suffering of the peasants. Chiang’s decision to go to war against the communists in 1946 meant that the economic reconstruction of China had to be postponed. Even though Chiang held dictatorial powers, his orders were often ignored.	30

Question	Indicative content	Marks
12	‘Britain’s withdrawal from Palestine caused the Arab-Israeli War in 1948.’ Assess this view. Britain’s decision to withdraw from the Palestine Mandate and to hand over the problems of the area to the UN resulted in partition and the war that followed. Palestine had been under the control of the British since 1917. In 1939 Britain issued a White Paper stating that it wanted an independent Palestine within 10 years; it would be a state in which Jews and Arabs shared responsibility for governing the country. It also stated that Jewish immigration would be restricted. At the end of the Second World War in 1945, the British confirmed that there would be no increase in immigration and no separate Jewish state. The Zionists, however, were convinced that they had international public opinion on their side and decided on a policy of active opposition to British rule in Palestine. After the war they made use of propaganda and lobbied members of the US government and Congress. In 1946, Truman requested that the British government allow 100,000 Jews to Palestine. The British government referred the problem to the United Nations in 1947 and announced it would withdraw from Palestine in May 1948. This decision to withdraw enabled the UN decision on partition. Britain objected to the partition plan; it wanted to avoid damaging its relations with the Arab states that had overwhelmingly rejected the plan. It also made no attempt to induce the Palestinian Arabs to accept it and refused to help implement it, rejecting the requests to allow UN observers to prepare for partition. Despite escalating violence, Britain still withdrew its troops in 1948. However, it was the UN that developed the plan for partition. An 11-member Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) was formed in April 1947 to devise a plan; unlike the Jewish community, the Arabs boycotted the committee. The committee recommended that Palestine be partitioned into an Arab state and a Jewish state, with a special international status for the city of Jerusalem under the administrative authority of the United Nations. Arabs rejected the plan arguing that it violated the principles of self-determination. Knowing the extent of Arab opposition to the resolution, the UN held a vote on the partition of Palestine and a two-thirds majority was obtained. Furthermore, it was the determination of the United States for the resolution to be passed that led to pressure being put on UN members. In the autumn of 1947 Truman decided to support partition; the Democratic Party feared that failure to support Jews in Palestine would lose them support. A telegram signed by 26 US senators with influence on foreign aid bills was sent to wavering countries, seeking their support for the partition plan; many nations reported pressure directed specifically at them. Partition was opposed by the Arabs and this sparked civil war in Palestine, leading to an Arab invasion when Israel declared itself an independent state in May 1948.	30