GradeMax

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/21**

Paper 2 Outline study **May/June 2026**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme contains the instructions and marking guidance that our examiners used to mark candidate responses for this component.

Before they start marking, examiners complete a standardisation process. They review a range of candidate responses and discuss the mark scheme in detail to agree which answers can and cannot be accepted. Examiners award marks where it is clear that candidate responses have met the requirements of the mark scheme. These requirements may vary between different components or different versions of the same component, depending on the exact requirements of the question and the candidate responses seen during the standardisation process.

Sometimes, our mark schemes may allow marks to be awarded to responses which contain elements that are factually incorrect or for content not covered by the syllabus. We do this in response to the demands of a specific question to support candidates and make sure that our assessments are fair. However, these allowances should not be used as a guide for teaching and learning.

We cannot discuss the mark scheme with schools, and we recommend that schools read the mark scheme together with the assessment material and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

This document consists of **23** printed pages.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

[Turn over

GradeMax

General marking principles

All examiners must apply these marking principles when marking candidate responses.

1	Examiners must award marks for each response in line with: • the specific **content** defined in the mark scheme • the specific **skills** defined in the mark scheme or in the level descriptions • the **standard of response** required as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
2	Examiners must award **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).
3	Examiners must award marks **positively**. This means that: • marks are not deducted for errors or omissions • marks are awarded for correct/valid answers as defined in the mark scheme and also for **other valid answers** which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme referring to your team leader as appropriate • the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar are judged **only** when the mark scheme indicates that these features are **specifically assessed** in the question. However, the meaning of all responses must be unambiguous.
4	Examiners must **consistently** apply the requirements of the mark scheme and any rules for what to do when candidates have not followed instructions correctly.
5	Examiners must use the **full range of marks** defined in the mark scheme, unless limited by the quality of the candidate responses seen.
6	Examiners must award marks according to the mark scheme and **must not** award marks with grade thresholds or grade descriptions in mind.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Unsupported assertion
	Evaluation
	Knowledge
	Lengthy narrative that is not answering the question
	Explanation (an explained valid point)
	Assessment
	Examiner has looked at everything on the page
	Valid point identified
	Use with other annotations to show extended issues or narrative
	Balanced – considers the other view
	Unclear
	Level 0
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Level 4
	Level 5

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4	**Connects factors to reach a reasoned conclusion** • 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 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.	**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	**No creditable content.**	**0**

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5	**Responses which develop a sustained judgement** • Answers are well focused and closely argued. (Answers show a maintained and complete understanding of the question.) • Answers are supported by precisely selected evidence. • Answers lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported.	**17–20**
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. (At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.)	**13–16**
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.	**9–12**
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.	**5–8**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
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.	**1–4**
Level 0	**No creditable content.**	**0**

PapaCambridge papacambridge.com

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Explain why the dismissal of Necker in 1789 was important in causing the revolution.** Indicative content • Necker during his first tenure in office as Director-General of the Treasury between 1777–1781 had gained a reputation as a reformer and an administrator capable of solving the many financial problems facing the French Crown in the later eighteenth century. He had given the impression that not only could he solve those problems, but he also painted an over-optimistic picture of the actual state of France's financial condition. He had become nationally popular through charitable work, and by donating a large part of his wealth to pay off France's national debt. • He returned to high office in 1788 as Controller-General of Finances, the first non-noble to hold the office. France's financial condition had deteriorated rapidly after 1781, and there was widespread awareness throughout France that there was a crisis, and that Necker was the man capable of solving it. He became a symbol of a desire to reform by the Court and great expectations were placed on the appointment. Necker was viewed as the 'people's champion,' a Protestant, Swiss-born financier considered the most capable of solving France's financial crisis. • He gained popularity amongst the public by supporting not only the summoning of the Estates-General, but also in increasing the size of the Third Estate and showing himself in favour of financial and other reforms, but largely moderate ones. There were very high, and conflicting, expectations placed on his ability to deal with France's problems by the Court, the Third Estate and the increasingly hungry and angry Paris mob. His removal was interpreted as the beginning of an armed crackdown by the King and conservative nobility against the Third Estate. This generated enormous public anger across France and amongst all classes. • His dismissal was one factor which led to the storming of the Bastille. News of his dismissal on July 12, 1789, led to massive protests, inciting speakers like Camille Desmoulins to urge the public to arm themselves. This direct action resulted in the storming of the Bastille prison two days later. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	'**The purpose of Napoleon's domestic policies was to keep him in power.' How far do you agree?** Indicative content Napoleon's domestic policies were a hybrid of authoritarian consolidation and revolutionary reform. While he did modernize France, most reforms were meticulously structured to centralize authority in his hands, eliminate political dissent, and build loyalty among the populace to ensure his rule remained unchallenged. Arguments to support this view might be as follows. The speed with which he got rid of Sieyes and demanded to be 'First' Consul and moved into the Tuileries give a clear indication of where he was hoping to get from the outset. His decision to become Emperor, with obvious Papal endorsement, also supports the idea of Napoleon wanting to stay in power. So too was his divorce from the childless Josephine in order to marry an Austrian princess so he could establish a dynasty. Napoleon dismantled local autonomy, replacing elected officials with centrally appointed prefects. This created a highly efficient, top-down structure of control that reported directly to him. Napoleon also used popular votes (plebiscites) to legitimize his acts, such as making himself First Consul for Life or Emperor. These were rarely fair competitions, but tools to present his power grab as a popular mandate. Propaganda was also effectively used – his image was carefully cultivated, and censorship was the order of the day. Freedom of speech and press was strictly curtailed. Newspapers were suppressed, critical thinkers (like Germaine de Staël) were sent into exile, and a police state was used to eliminate the opposition. Arguably his major domestic policies were inspired by a political need to continue the most essential elements of the revolution, such as equality before the law and a fairer taxation system, while at the same time ending the chaos of the years between 1789 and 1799, both of which could ensure his position. Whilst the Napoleonic Code (Civil Code) enshrined equality before the law, the code was deeply authoritarian. There were genuine signs of liberalism in Napoleon in the early years. His analysis of how to end chaos and restore order with a mix of authoritarianism and good popular government was a good pragmatic solution to the problems facing France, and there was popular support for what he did. Many of his reforms were genuinely effective and beneficial to France, outlasting his reign. This includes stabilizing the economy, creating the Banque de France (1800), and improving education through *lycées* (high schools). He showed a real concern for education which was not necessary for the retention of power, and his monitoring of bread prices shows compassion as well. The Code Napoleon, although a little 'state orientated', emphasised that no one was above the law. The Concordat reconciled the state with the Catholic Church. He created a meritocracy, allowing talented individuals to rise in administration and the military based on merit rather than birth. There was a genuine desire there to retain and embed the main gains of the Revolution. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Explain why the development of roads was important to the early Industrial Revolution.** Indicative content • Transportation of goods. Better roads made many of the later developments possible. Improved, all-weather roads (turnpikes) enabled the increased produce from enclosure to get to urban areas more quickly to feed a growing urban population. • It also allowed businesses to move products like pottery and cloth to inland markets and ports much faster than the old, potholed roads. • Better roads enabled easier movement of people. • The improved road infrastructure and Turnpike Trusts lowered the price of transporting raw materials and goods, which allowed manufacturers to reduce prices and increase demand. • Between 1750 and 1770, very much the critical early period of industrialisation, over 500 Turnpike Trusts were created which led to over 24 000 kms of roads being built or upgraded – which proved a key stimulus for the later development of the bulk carriers – the canals. • The Turnpike Trusts, groups of businessmen investing together for a major capital project, proved popular and often high profitable to those investors. This stimulated other capital investments in transport such as canals and railroads, as well as factories, harbours and docks. • New, engineered roads (by figures such as John Macadam and Thomas Telford) linked regional industries with expanding national markets, supporting urbanisation.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

9489/21 Mark Scheme ne 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**To what extent was mechanisation the main cause of popular protest?** Indicative content 'Luddism' was the protest by the former skilled workers, such as the handloom weavers, put out of a job and 'deskilled' by the mass-produced factory products replacing their own products in the market. Machine-breaking was a targeted tactic, demonstrating a clear reaction against technological disruption that threatened traditional livelihoods. Factories tended to dominate a community, with millowners providing accommodation for their workers, so in a time of slump, then the whole community would be out of work and suffer. In the Swing Riots, agricultural labourers, particularly in southern England, destroyed steam-powered threshing machines, which were perceived as a direct threat to winter employment, reducing their ability to earn a living wage. The working conditions in the new mechanised factories could often be appalling. 72-hour weeks were often the norm and that included women and children. Breaks were brief and infrequent. Pay was subsistence level for men and less than that for women and children whose pay just supplemented the family income. Accidents were frequent with children made to clean moving machinery. There was usually little or no compensation for injuries or deaths caused during working hours. There was little serious attempt to regulate working hours and conditions or improve the quality of life for the majority of the population. Other factors also led to protest. Large numbers of workers could form Unions, which could harness their grievances, while at the same time leading to protest when legislation like the Combination Acts was passed or the way in which the men of Tolpuddle were prosecuted became known. Urbanisation led to often appalling living conditions and greater poverty. The lack of any effective system of welfare to replace the old Poor Law – such as the much-hated New Poor Law with its workhouses - inevitably engendered protest. Protesters often sought to address wider political and social reforms, with some movements blending into campaigns for democratic representation, such as the Chartists. Some riots such as the Luddites were set against a background of economic distress, with the Napoleonic Wars causing trade disruption, inflation, and the mass unemployment that occurred after 1815 with thousands of soldiers and sailors coming onto the job market. A doubling of the population between 1750 and 1840 led to an oversupply of labour and unemployment, increasing competition and lowering wages, exacerbating the impact of technology. The revolution in France and the ideas of men like Tom Paine and Cobbett spread with a reasonably free and often radical press. The Swing Riots and the Peterloo incident showed a huge range of grievances, from hunger to new threshing machines and a desire for the vote. Some of the most violent protests came in the run up to the 1832 Reform Bill, demanding political change, but there had been bad harvests and heavy unemployment in the preceding years as well. Heavy-handed government repression often fuelled protest: the Six Acts and the Combination Acts, let alone the New Poor Law, did not ease protest. The Corn Laws impacted the price of bread, the basic food for many. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

9489/21 Mark Scheme June 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Explain why the Zollverein was important to the development of nationalism in Germany.** Indicative content • The Zollverein created a customs union, which allowed free trade with no barriers, with 25 of Germany's independent states joining in. A common currency and uniform weights and measures followed. While states preserved their political independence, there was a growing sense of economic unity with Prussia as the driving force. • The Zollverein provided a considerable boost to trade, manufacturing and commerce in Germany. Tariffs were down and co-operation between states proved to be beneficial to all. This economic success encouraged rapid improvements in transportation, such as railway construction, which improved connectivity and fostered a sense of shared national identity. • The union, initially organised by Prussia to unify its own fragmented territories, led other smaller states to align with Prussian economic policies. • Also important was the fact that Austria, Prussia's rival when it came to seeking to dominate Germany, remained firmly out of the Zollverein. This meant that the focus of German economic expansion lay in the North and in the Baltic regions. By systematically excluding Austria, the Zollverein ensured that the movement toward unification was directed towards a 'Kleindeutschland' (Small Germany) under Prussian leadership, rather than a 'Großdeutschland' (Greater Germany) that included Austrian territory. • The economic boom caused by the Zollverein supported the growth of the middle class, which favoured political unification to support commercial interests. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

PapaCambridge papacambridge.com

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**'Prussia was able to defeat Austria because Bismarck ensured Austria had few allies.' How far do you agree?** Indicative content Bismarck had learned how to isolate a country prior to the Danish War, and used the same techniques with Austria. All the major European powers who might have supported Austria were carefully neutralised. The meeting with Napoleon at Biarritz in 1865 was seen as diplomatic success for Bismarck and ensured that France would stay out of the war. Bismarck secured an alliance with Italy, forcing Austria to split its forces to fight a two-front war, drastically reducing its strength against Prussia. Russia agreed to remain neutral, having improved relations with Prussia following Russia's isolation after the Crimean War and Bismarck's hints about what Russia might do with the collapsing Turkish empire. Whilst some smaller German states supported Austria, Bismarck ensured the major European powers remained neutral, preventing the war from escalating. In the case of the Austrian war Bismarck took great care to ensure that Austria was seen as the aggressor which lost it support. Britain, always sympathetic towards Italian unity and liberty, guaranteed neutrality as long as Austria was driven out. Austria, with potentially a larger army, was facing a war on two fronts (the second being in Italy) when Prussia could focus all its forces in one place. Moltke as a general far outclassed his rival Benedek - the Prussian army was faster and better organized, utilising rapid deployment and superior planning. The Austrian army was large but poorly led and equipped whereas the Prussian infantry used the breech-loading 'needle gun,' which was far more efficient than the muzzle-loading rifles used by Austria. Moltke made use of the telegraph to manage his forces which was also very effective. Finally, Prussia's superior railway network allowed them to mobilize and concentrate forces faster, crucial for the swift victory, culminating at the Battle of Königgrätz. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	**Explain why the Slave States wanted to maintain the constitutional balance of sectional interests.** Indicative content • Slave states were aware of increasing abolitionism so expected challenges to slavery. Maintaining the balance of sectional interests in Congress meant that any move to abolish slavery would be unsuccessful as representatives of the Southern States would reject it. • Slave states saw slavery as essential to the Southern way of life. The Southern economy had long depended on slave labour. Slaves worked in the fields producing cash crops such as cotton and tobacco. They worked as domestic servants and in factories. Without slave labour, plantations would not be profitable. The Southern culture was based on values that reflected the acceptance of and reliance on slavery. • The Slave States saw themselves as defending native-born interests in contrast to the North where there were more immigrants. They saw themselves as upholding traditional values. • Under the Three-Fifths Clause, the Constitution provided slave states with disproportionate political power, allowing them to count 60 per cent of their enslaved population for representation in Congress. Maintaining the overall balance ensured this advantage wasn't eroded by an influx of new, free states. • More new immigrants settled in the North than in the South, so, based on population size, there were gains in the House of Representatives for the free states. With the House of Representatives dominated by the more populous North, the Senate was the primary constitutional safeguard for the South. Maintaining an equal number of slave and free states meant the South could block any abolitionist legislation. • If an imbalance in favour of the free states developed, they were afraid of challenges to the constitution or law which would undermine the traditions of the South. Accept any other valid responses	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	**How far do you agree that the secession of the seven Deep South States was the reason for civil war starting in April 1861?** Indicative content Supporting arguments could include the following points. If the Southern States had not seceded, then there would have been no need for a war whose aim, on the part of the Union, was to maintain the integrity of the Union. The secession of South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas created the Confederate States of America, a separate government that claimed sovereignty. Without this act, there would have been no 'Confederate' army to engage federal forces. President Lincoln considered secession 'the essence of anarchy' and refused to recognise the legitimacy of the Confederacy, viewing it as a rebellion that needed to be suppressed. Seceding states did not just leave; they actively seized Federal forts, arsenals, and custom houses. This forced a confrontation over federal authority, culminating in the battle over Fort Sumter. On the other hand, the seven seceding states did not intend a war. They simply wanted to avoid interference from a hostile president. They seceded individually, not as a bloc. This suggests that they did not envisage joining together to fight the North. Although they recognised that the only way to survive was as a confederacy, war was not the purpose of secession. Rather, the Southern States expected that secession would be followed by compromise – this was certainly the view of the border states. Alternatively, it could be argued that other factors caused the outbreak of war. with the root cause being the debate over slavery. The states seceded after the election of Lincoln who was anti-slavery. The South realised that they would be ruled over by an anti-slavery president with no sympathy for their concerns. Although Lincoln did not have the power to abolish slavery in the Southern States, the Fire-Eaters used his election to stir up fear and push for secession. Ultimately this must lead to Civil War. Another line of argument is that it was Buchanan's failure to address the issues associated with secession that allowed the situation to deteriorate. The war began on April 12, 1861, not merely because the states had left, but because Confederate forces bombarded Fort Sumter in South Carolina. This act forced a military response from the Lincoln administration. Finally, the initial secession of the seven states did not automatically cause war in April. It was the call for 75 000 troops by Lincoln to 'suppress' the rebellion *after* Fort Sumter that prompted four more states (Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas) to join the Confederacy, making the war far more severe. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	**Explain why tariffs were kept high during the Gilded Age.** Indicative content • High tariffs protected domestic producers—particularly in steel, woollens, and linens—from cheaper foreign imports, allowing American firms to dominate the home market. • High tariffs were a cornerstone of the Republican Party platform, supported by industrial interests who argued that protective duties saved American jobs and kept wages high. These industries actively lobbied for favourable rates, and the GOP cultivated a pro-tariff electorate in industrial states. • Those who opposed tariffs found it difficult to organise, partly because they were too disparate. Farmers Alliances and Populists were unsuccessful (in the long term) in uniting to oppose tariffs. Farmers were among the main exporters who suffered as a result of retaliatory tariffs, while consumers suffered because of the high prices of American-produced goods. • Tariff income was a large source of federal government revenue (prior to federal income tax). This meant federal government was reluctant to support tariff reduction. • Government followed a protectionist policy on the basis it was better to have jobs in America, even if it made prices high for consumers and made the export of some goods difficult. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	**To what extent do you agree that Taft achieved little for Progressivism?** Indicative content Arguments supporting the statement may include howTaft appeared not to achieve much because he was not very dynamic or enthusiastic compared with Roosevelt. He was known for being hesitant. His presidency has been described as 'an unmitigated disaster.' Whilst Although Taft promoted conservation projects, they were undermined because he allowed federal land to be used for business interests which were detrimental to conservation. Taft's attempts at tariff reform (he called for a special session of Congress to reform Tariff law) were largely unsuccessful as Congress added 847 amendments to his bill, meaning it made little difference. By 1911 Taft began to back away from his antitrust efforts, after criticism from his friends who were conservative business supporters. He became uncertain about the long-term effect of trust-busting on the national economy. On the other hand, Taft initiated more anti-trust legislation than Roosevelt, for example, the Mann-Elkins Act of 1910, empowering the Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend railroad rate hikes and to set rates. He used the ant-trust laws in 'trust-busting'. For example, he employed the Sherman Antitrust Act against both the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and the American Tobacco Company (both of which cases were begun under Roosevelt). More trust prosecutions (99 in all) occurred under Taft than under Roosevelt, who was known as the 'Great Trust-Buster.' He also won a lawsuit against the American Sugar Refining Company to break up the 'sugar trust' that rigged prices. The sixteenth and seventeenth amendments were added to the Constitution. Income tax was a Progressive measure, being seen as a fairer way to collect tax because previous reliance on tariffs to fund federal government over-penalised the poor. The sixteenth amendment (income tax) effectively overruled the Supreme Court's attempts to undermine the federal government's ability to tax individuals. In addition, this measure paved the way for Prohibition. Taft was a supporter of this measure. Taft was less enthusiastic about the direct election of Senators (seen as a means of achieving a more democratic government.) Nevertheless, this Progressive amendment was approved during his term. Taft was also a dedicated conservationist who added significantly to the national forest system. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	**Explain why opposition to the New Deal from the Supreme Court created a crisis.** Indicative content • The Supreme Court had the potential to undermine all alphabet agencies on the grounds that in passing the legislation that established the various agencies, Congress had exceeded its powers. The Alphabet Agencies arguably infringed on the powers of state governments. They therefore declared the AAA unconstitutional. • The opposition showed that the president lacked the power to take action to deal with a nationwide problem at national level as the power to address the type of problems seen during the Great Depression was delegated to the states. • The elections of 1932 had produced a Democrat Presidency and Democrat majority in both Houses. Despite this, the Supreme Court was able to challenge the measures these institutions introduced and did so despite the clear need for federal action. • The Court unanimously declared the National Industrial Recovery Act (NRA) unconstitutional in *A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States*, arguing that Congress had improperly delegated legislative power to the executive branch and that the regulations exceeded federal authority over interstate commerce. • The opposition of the Supreme Court also led to a crisis because of FDR's proposed solution. His court-packing plan which would remove justices aged over 70 and appoint new Democrat-leaning justices to replace them was very controversial. This plan was unacceptable because it would challenge the checks and balances that were a core feature of the Constitution. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	**'Structural weaknesses in the US economy were the main cause of the Great Crash.' To what extent do you agree?** Indicative content The collapse of share prices in the autumn of 1929 was caused by many factors; among these were structural weaknesses in the economy such as the uneven distribution of wealth, stagnation and decline of some older industries such as coal mining and cotton woollen cloth production. The banking industry was under-regulated and insecure, consisting of thousands of small, rural banks that lacked the capital to handle mass withdrawals. Many banks had also invested directly in the stock market or used customer deposits for speculative loans. Economic growth had been too reliant on easy credit with many people purchasing shares 'on the margin'. This created a bubble – a massive overvaluation of stocks relative to the actual, weakened economy. This credit was borrowed with inadequate collateral from institutions that had few reserves. The market for consumer goods was limited by significant levels of poverty and by retaliatory tariffs that made it difficult to export manufactured goods resulting in over-production. Additionally, the agricultural sector never recovered from the post-First World War decline, with overproduction keeping prices low throughout the 1920s. This limited the buying power of a significant portion of the population. Counterarguments might consider that there were other weaknesses in the economy. These included weak understanding of the economy in an age of mass markets and mass demand sustained by heavy levels of borrowing. The widening of share ownership, with many inexperienced investors who assumed that the Stock Market would continue to rise was a contributory factor in share price inflation. Demand for shares meant that the value of shares in many companies exceeded the value of the company by a considerable margin. The panic in share selling began when investors realised that they could face significant losses and fall into debt as the Stock Market began to adjust. Government did not intervene sufficiently to regulate banks and the Federal Reserve banks did not have sufficient understanding of the impact of their actions. Tariffs were seen as a way of protecting American manufacturers with the wider impact on farmers, manufacturers and consumers not considered sufficiently. Protective tariffs, such as the Fordney-McCumber Act, led to retaliatory tariffs from European countries, slowing trade. Government failed to support farmers who were caught in a cycle of debt and poverty. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	**Explain why the USA did not join the world war until 1917.** Indicative content • The US population contained a significant proportion of immigrant communities from both sides of the conflict. Joining the war could create internal problems. • Many immigrants had come to the US to escape persecution and poverty – they had no interest in the affairs of their home countries. • Americans believed the war was a result of bad management by European leaders and did not want to be involved. • Many Americans simply thought it was not their problem. America was following a policy of isolationism • President Wilson did not support joining the war – indeed in the 1916 election campaign he strongly opposed intervention. • US economic interests were not being threatened initially by the war. They were benefitting by taking over British and German markets. Also, they were making money from loans to countries involved in the war. • German aggression gradually changed public opinion – Sinking of the Lusitania, all-out submarine warfare, Zimmerman telegram.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	**How strong was popular support in European countries for imperial expansion?** Indicative content Britain already possessed a far larger overseas empire than any other nation and there was a sense of pride in this and in their status as the leading imperial nation. As education developed after 1870 lessons encouraged national pride with maps of empire and adventure stories or exotic lands. Growing literacy encouraged printing of books and newspapers reflected a jingoistic enthusiasm for imperial expansion such as novels like *Kim* by Rudyard Kipling. All of these encouraged a positive image of imperialism and ignored the human suffering it caused. The idea of ending slavery in Africa was also a moral reason for intervention. In France state education was similarly used to foster patriotic enthusiasm for imperialism. Many Europeans viewed imperialism as a moral duty to Christianize and 'civilize' foreign populations, a belief reinforced by Social Darwinism and ideas of racial superiority. In Germany it was pressure from businessmen that drove imperial ambitions, but it was also seen as a way of uniting people from the different states of pre-unification Germany in a common cause. Again, the growth of education and the development of newspapers helped to raise public awareness of and support for imperialist policies. Although not all colonial projects were profitable, there was a widespread belief that colonies would bring wealth and resources. For countries such as Germany and Italy obtaining 'a place in the sun' was popular as it was seen as a way to prove their status as major powers. Some historians, however, argue that despite this public interest remained relatively low because this was so distant from their everyday lives. And there was still significant opposition to imperialism. Some writers and religious leaders strongly opposed it as being morally wrong to take land from indigenous populations (e.g. Joseph Conrad in *Heart of Darkness* is highly critical of imperialism). The 1902 book *Imperialism: a Study* by John Hobson concluded that imperialism harmed Britain economically politically and socially. Some businessmen argued that the cost of imperialism outweighed its benefits and this was certainly a valid argument for much of the land seized in Africa. Others argued that it increased international tensions. In Germany Bismarck had initially strongly opposed imperial ambitions arguing it was more important to concentrate on internal growth and consolidation of unification and it was only the accession of Willhelm II that drove the main period of imperial growth Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	**Explain why the League of Nations was successful in solving the Silesian Coalfields dispute.** Indicative content The Silesian coalfields were an important economic resource to whichever country owned them. They straddled the border between Germany and the newly re-created state of Poland. The main issue was that parts of Poland had, since the late eighteenth century, been part of Germany and the area was populated by both Poles and Germans. • The Treaty of Versailles specified that the granting of control should be decided by a plebiscite, and this was held in March 1921. • The vote was 60/40 in favour of Germany with over 90 per cent voting. However, Poland objected to this result because Germans who had moved out of the area were allowed to vote. Also, some districts had majorities in favour of joining Poland. • Fighting broke out in May and British and French troops were sent in to restore order and the matter was referred directly to the League. • The Executive committee of the League awarded Poland around half the population and one third of the land. • The League acted decisively over Silesia • Both sides initially objected but the League negotiated trade in resources between the two halves and both agreed to this. • The treaty included provisions to protect German minorities in Poland and vice-versa, which helped reduce tensions. • The dispute involved smaller nations which accepted the League's decisions. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	**How important was the role of the USA in the improvement in relations between European powers in the 1920s?** Indicative content Though USA had effectively stepped back into a pre-war position of isolation after the end of the War, the USA still involved itself in European affairs when their own interests were at stake so whilst the European powers themselves worked to improve relations the US did play some part in this especially where economic matters were concerned. The US played a significant role in overcoming the German economic crisis caused by the hyperinflation by taking a key role in the creation of the Dawes Plan. It provided Germany with US loans to pay its reparations but was only a temporary solution and did not involve any reduction in the total sum payable. This also improved relations between France and Germany. Subsequently the Young Plan in 1929 was designed to provide a longer-term economic solution but was quickly overtaken by the Great Crash which led to the collapse of the European economy and rapid decline in relations between European states. Following the Locarno agreements in the 'spirit of Locarno' a major step towards reducing tensions was the Kellog-Briand Pact, negotiated by French foreign minister Aristide Briand and the US Secretary of State Frank Kellogg. It was effectively a promise to avoid war as a solution to international conflict but there were no measures for enforcement. The US organized the Washington Naval Conference to prevent a naval arms race, promoting disarmament among major European powers such as Britain and France. The failure of the US Congress to ratify the Treaty of Versailles had a serious impact on European relations as it meant that one of the main creators of the terms and conditions had no role in enforcing the Treaty. It also meant that the League of Nations was missing one of the strongest powers, thus limiting its authority in resolving issues, many of which were the result of the terms of the Treaty. Many of the post war issues stemming from the creation of new boundaries and the realignment of power in eastern Europe were referred to the League of Nations which was successful in dealing with issues like the Aaland Islands dispute the Silesia coalfield and Teschen disputes, etc. Attempts to improve international relations were largely initiated by Europe like the Little Entente, the Geneva Conference and the Rapallo Pact. Even where the US was involved the initiative was largely European like the Locarno Treaties for which Briand and Stresemann won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1926. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	**Explain why Chamberlain thought the Munich Conference of September 1938 was a success.** Indicative content When Chamberlain returned to London from Munich, he waved a piece of paper at the crowds and declared that he had brought back, '…peace for our time'. This was because: • The issue of the Sudetenland had been settled peacefully, averting an immediate outbreak of war, though Czechoslovakia was given no choice in the decisions • Chamberlain had convinced Hitler to sign a separate statement pledging that the two nations would never go to war with each other again and would use consultation for future disputes. Chamberlain regarded this 'piece of paper' as a significant, lasting agreement. • The agreement with Germany was supported by the French and by Mussolini. • Although his public focus was on peace, Chamberlain was also aware that Britain's military was not fully prepared for a major war. The agreement provided valuable time to accelerate British rearmament. • The majority of British people were strongly against going to war over such a distant and unimportant issue, so he was met by cheering crowds Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	**'The Non-intervention Agreement of 1936 was ineffective in preventing foreign involvement in the Spanish Civil War.' How far do you agree?** Indicative content The non-intervention Agreement was an initiative by the British and French in August 1936 following the outbreak of conflict. It was signed by Britian, France, Italy, Germany, the Soviet Union and 22 other nations. The USA did not sign it. Germany was involved form the beginning supplying transport planes for Franco to transfer his troops from Morocco to mainland Spain in order to begin his seizure of power. He signed the non-intervention agreement in October but continued to support Franco. Goods from German companies were channelled through other countries like Greece. He allowed pilots in the Luftwaffe to 'volunteer' for service in the specially formed 'Condor Legion'. They were equipped with the latest technology which they were able to test in campaigns like the bombing of Guernica. Hitler also saw this as an opportunity to distract Mussolini from his other objectives like the Anschluss with Austria. Mussolini on the other hand saw this as an opportunity to increase Italian influence around the Mediterranean and supplied both troops on the ground and naval support. The USSR did not want Franco in power as this posed a further fascist threat but equally, he was reluctant to establish a new communist state that was not under his direct control. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union later sent significant weapons, aircraft, and advisors to aid the Republican side. The Republican government appealed to Britain and France for help when the army generals led by Franco staged their military coup in July 1936. However, in both countries public opinion was divided between those who feared another Fascist dictatorship and those concerned about the spread of communist power to a new area of Europe. In Britan there was also a strong antiwar sentiment as expressed in the Oxford debate on 'King and Country' and in the National Peace Survey. The British and French perspective led to limitation of aid, though individuals were still allowed to volunteer and go to fight in Spain in the specially formed International Brigades. Soviet aid was limited as Stalin was, at this stage anxious not to antagonise the western powers as he saw Germany as the biggest threat to Soviet security. Stalin therefore signed the pact and stuck to it to some extent in order not to antagonise the western powers too much. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026