

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/21

Paper 2 (Outline Study), maximum raw mark 60

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

Generic levels of response

Part (a)

Level 4: Evaluates factors [9–10]

Answers are well focused and identify and explain a range of factors. Answers are supported by precise evidence and demonstrate clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers consider the relative significance of factors and reach a supported conclusion.

Level 3: Explains factors [6–8]

Answers demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations, supported by relevant and detailed information. Answers are clearly expressed. Candidates may attempt to reach a judgement about the significance of factors but this may not be effectively supported.

Level 2: Describes factors [3–5]

Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers are either entirely descriptive in approach with few explicit links to the question or they provide some explanation which is supported by information which is limited in range and depth.

Level 1: Describes the topic / issue [1–2]

Answers contain some relevant material but are descriptive in nature, making little reference to causation. Answers may be assertive or generalised. The response is limited in development.

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content [0]

Part (b)

Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement [18–20]

Answers are well focused and closely argued. Arguments are supported by precisely selected evidence. They will lead to a relevant conclusion / judgement which is developed and supported. They will be fluent and well organised.

Level 4: Responses which develop a balanced argument [15–17]

Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. They will begin to form a judgement in response to the question. At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.

Level 3: Responses which begin to develop assessment [10–14]

Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, supported by relevant and appropriately selected evidence. However, these answers are likely to lack depth and / or balance. Answers will be generally coherent and well organised.

Level 2: Responses which show some understanding of the question [6–9]

Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will be either entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support.

Level 1: Descriptive or partial responses [1–5]

Answers may contain descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question. They may only address part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment on the

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

question which lacks detailed factual support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. Answers may be fragmentary and disjointed.

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content

[0]

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

(a) Why did the Estates General fail to solve France’s problems? [10]

The syllabus begins in 1789 and candidates are not expected to show detailed knowledge of the *ancien regime* before that date. But they should be able to explain the general nature of the problems in France that led the King to convene the Estates General. A major problem was uncertainty about procedure. The previous meeting of the institution was 1614. It was agreed that the Estates General represented three groups: clergy, nobility and others. There were serious differences about voting, that is, how decisions should be made. Finance was an evident problem for France but the cahiers (lists of grievances sent to the Estates General) and early debates showed how contradictory were the solutions that were proposed. Louis XIV offered a procedure that he hoped would be sufficiently conciliatory but it was unacceptable to the Third Estate. The Third Estate challenged the King’s power when it voted to call itself the National Assembly and asserted that it had the right to decide on taxation. The combination of an increasingly adamant National Assembly and a King who was irresolute led to disorder (for example, the fall of the Bastille). Louis was suspected of planning to use soldiers to crush opposition. The National Assembly became the Constituent Assembly. The attempt to use the Estates General to solve problems had failed. This marks an appropriate point to end answers. There is no need to go beyond 1789.

(b) How far did Napoleon show himself to be ‘the son of the Revolution’ as First Consul from 1799 to 1804? [20]

The most successful answers can be expected to consider arguments for and against the claim and come to a considered conclusion. Judgements might well vary but the most successful responses will show an awareness of alternatives. Napoleon came to power in 1799 with two sets of credentials. He was a successful general and had the reputation of a reliable defender of the best revolutionary ideals. His early career was made when he defended the Revolution against its enemies. His restoration of order for the Directory did not destroy this reputation. His policies as First Consul did not openly contradict his claim that he was continuing the best features of the Revolution. He used plebiscites as a form of popular consent, although they were carefully managed. There were three consuls to share power: a difference from the monarchy and Robespierre’s dictatorship. In practice, he towered above the other consuls. In theory, there were institutions such as the Tribune and the Council of State. In reality, the members were chosen, directly or indirectly, by Napoleon.

Under his centralised authority, local officials simply carried out his policies. These were also subject to his approval. The Code Napoleon was publicised as carrying out reforms that were in line with revolutionary ideals. The Concordat with the Pope was popular for restoring relations with the Catholic Church whilst ending its privileged position. The Jacobins’ hostility to Christianity was seen as an aberration. The revolution had improved the legal position of women but Napoleon’s policies were popular in restoring the traditional position. Overall, he buried his reputation as an associate of the Jacobins to continue seemingly the policies of the moderate reformers. The most impressive responses might point to some social and economic reforms that had begun from 1789 to 1793 and 1795 to 1799 but were incomplete until the Consulate. These included changes to the pattern of local administration and to the fiscal system.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Why did the Industrial Revolution change patterns of trade? [10]

Both internal and external trade were affected. Britain led the way because of the earlier Industrial Revolution, but France benefitted to some extent. They were countries with seaboards. Better roads, then canals and then especially railways meant that the conveyance of goods in larger quantities was easier and over longer distances was possible. In Britain, Liverpool, Bristol and especially London were major ports. In France, Nantes and Bordeaux grew. Cotton became an important trade as well as the traditional wool. There had long been some traditional trades over long distances, but most had communities which depended on local trades. The growth of large industrial conurbations gave opportunities to more tradesmen and merchants to sell more and at lower prices. Food was an important part of trade. Easier communications meant an end to periodic shortage, and even famine.

(b) Evaluate the reasons why industrialisation was later to develop in continental Europe than in Britain. Refer to at least one continental country in your answer. [20]

The direction to refer to at least one continental country is included to dissuade candidates from writing vague accounts. Britain had a number of advantages. It had plentiful supplies of iron and coal as raw materials. So did France and some regions in Germany, but Britain had more transport that could convey the supplies to where they were needed. The railways were to be crucial in this. Continental countries, on the other hand, depended on slower roads and rivers. As an island, Britain possessed varied ports that could handle trade within the country and also foreign trade. The ports were convenient for many regions. France had a large coastline but fewer convenient ports and internal trade suffered from customs levies. As soon as cotton became an important manufacture, Britain's natural advantages in handling cotton became evident, especially the conditions in Lancashire. Investment was important and money was more available in Britain. The middle class, which was ready to invest in industry, was larger than in France and other continental countries. On the continent, land was favoured more as a basis of investment, and there were fewer banks. From 1800 to 1850, the British economy was more stable than those in continental countries. Britain was less affected by political crises in spite of movements such as Chartism.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

3 The Origins of World War 1, c.1900–1914

(a) Why did Germany invade Belgium in 1914? [10]

The narrow answer is that it was a necessary part of the Schlieffen Plan, but answers at the highest level will put this in the context of wider German policy. Germany faced a world war with the prospect of being involved on two fronts: against Russia in the east and France with probably Britain in the west. Germany's only firm ally was Austria whose military effectiveness was of dubious value. Hence Germany believed that it was important to defeat France first. Russia had a large army but would be slower to mobilise. The uncertainty about British policy probably encouraged Germany to strike first. France's defences were such that a direct attack was dangerous. Belgium's limited defences reflected its reliance on the international recognition of its neutrality. Britain alleged that Germany was influenced by the possibility of gaining access to the North Sea for its fleet. This is possible but only as a lesser motive.

(b) Assess the consequences of the Alliance System for international stability from c.1900 to 1914. [20]

The key issue is the effect on international stability of the two major alliances: the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. The former, from 1882, was between Austria, Germany and Italy. The latter is more a term to describe a series of agreements between France and Russia (1894), the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale (1904) and the Anglo-Russian Entente (1907).

Whereas more limited responses might focus on narratives of developments during the relevant period, the more successful responses will consider events in terms of the alliances. The majority of answers can be expected to agree that the alliances were largely responsible for the outbreak of a general European war, but high credit can be given to those that take a more critical view of the claim (although this is not a pre-condition for the highest mark). The Triple Alliance was not one of equal partners. Italy had very different priorities from Austria and Germany and soon dropped out of the Triple Alliance when war was declared. The members of the Triple Entente differed in their concerns. Russia's priority was the Balkans. Britain wished to see a resolution in the Balkans but perhaps not to the extent of going to war. The Belgian crisis concerned Britain, France and Germany, not Austria and Italy and Russia only indirectly. Some candidates might point out that the alliances managed to resolve crises peacefully before 1914.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why did Tsar Nicholas II continue to face problems from 1906 to 1914? [10]

Well organised answers should indicate some order of importance but the question does not need essentially this assessment. It will be enough for any level to explain the nature of the problems. It can be argued that the Tsar faced problems because of his aversion to change. He opposed any signs that might indicate concessions. 1905 was the year of a major revolution, caused partly by the defeat in the war against Japan but more by internal grievances. Strikes in towns spread to the rural areas. The Potemkin incident revealed trouble in the navy. The October Manifesto of 1906 seemed to indicate an acceptance of the need to reform the political system, but the true nature of the regime was shown in the Fundamental Laws and the way in which the Duma was denied influence. The extreme opposition was put down by a loyal army. Extreme radicals were not a serious problem at that stage. The Bolsheviks, for example, were weakened by the police with their leaders in internal or external exile. Stolypin's career as prime minister from 1906 to 1911 shows that some in Russia were aware of problems. He tried to use the kulaks to build support for the regime. However, his policies were mostly unsuccessful. Strikes continued. The economy showed some improvement but the problems were too serious to be solved in the short period that he was in power.

(b) 'The Bolshevik seizure of power came as a surprise.' How far do you agree with this claim? [20]

A case can be made to support or deny the claim. Answers at the highest level can be expected to consider the alternatives whilst coming to a clear judgement. To agree with the quotation, the Provisional Government had lost its authority by October 1917. The Kornilov affair in August showed the weakness of Kerensky's government. He had to rely on the Bolsheviks to put it down. Whilst the Provisional Government took power easily in February when Nicholas II's abdication left a political vacuum, it was unable to create an acceptable group of supporters. In fact, it lost support when it decided to continue with the war. Enormous losses in manpower and land continued. The situation was too unstable to introduce political reforms with elections and policies to improve the economy. Lenin put his finger on the main popular demands: land, bread and peace. However, to Kerensky there seemed to be no alternative. The Soviets sprang up but were not regarded except by themselves as a viable form of national government. The Bolsheviks, the most intransigent group, seemed to have ruined their chances in the July Days. Lenin was determined not to join a government of national consensus. It seemed as if the impasse would continue. Lenin was one of a small group even among the Bolsheviks who called for action in October. The revolution was carried through quickly and by a comparatively small number. With hindsight it is possible to agree that the revolution was not unexpected. In 1917, the most probable future was one of continued instability.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

Section B: American Option

The History of the USA, 1840–1941

5 The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

- (a) **Why, in 1904, did President Roosevelt introduce what became known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine?** [10]

The Monroe Doctrine was the statement of President Monroe in 1823 that European great powers should not intervene in the internal affairs of the states of North, Central and South America. For much of the rest of the century, the USA could do little to enforce this doctrine – not that it really needed to. By the 1890s, however, European great powers were showing greater interest in the Americas, which threatened the accepted predominance of the USA. The UK and Venezuela argued over disputed borders. Venezuela appealed for US support. In 1895, it became so anxious about the UK intervention, which ignored the Monroe Doctrine, that it threatened war. The UK backed down. In 1902–3, the British and German navies blockaded Venezuela in an attempt to uphold the claims of investors against Venezuelan debtors. The USA was once more alarmed. Thus the new president, Theodore Roosevelt, restless and ambitious, reinterpreted the Monroe Doctrine in what became dubbed the Roosevelt Corollary. For the first time, the USA explicitly reserved the right to intervene in the affairs of states of Central and South America in order to uphold civilised behaviour. On the one hand, governments might be too brutal; on the other, they might be too weak. Either case would justify US intervention. Unlike the 1820s, the USA now had the physical power to intervene. It soon began doing so, as in the Dominican Republic in 1904.

- (b) **How consistently did the USA support an Open Door policy towards China in the years from 1899 to 1931?** [20]

Open Door summarised US policy at the start of this period. When other powers were signing 'unequal treaties' with China and 'slicing the Chinese melon' to reserve a part for themselves, the USA was anxious that China should remain a single sovereign state which was open to trade with whoever it wanted. American goals in China were twofold: to ensure access to a single Chinese market and to protect the many US missionaries trying to civilise the Chinese in western ways. After a series of unequal treaties involving European great powers in the 1890s, in 1899 and 1900 the US government issued Open Door notes in an attempt to prevent what appeared to be an imminent partition of China. In practice, however, US policy in the Western Pacific in the early twentieth century was greatly influenced by the rise of Japan and the expansion of Russia.

Initially pro-Japanese, after 1905 the USA became wary of Japanese expansionism and opposed the most extreme of the 21 Demands Japan made of China in 1915 as they breached America's Open Door policy. By then China, which in 1912 became a republic, had entered the era of the warlords and was divided within itself rather than threatened with division by outside powers. Japan remained ambitious for Chinese territory. Thus in 1922 the USA led the signing of a Nine-Power treaty at Washington which accepted the territorial sovereignty of China. Thereafter, as the USA entered its isolationist phase and as Chinese domestic politics became more divided and more complex, American intervention in Chinese affairs was minimal. It took no effective action against anti-US riots in Nanking in 1927, and when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, the USA was too preoccupied with its own problems. Thus its support for an Open Door policy was greatly diminished towards the end of this period.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why was the Compromise of 1877 agreed?

[10]

The Compromise was an informal deal in February 1877 between the Republican Party and Southern Democrats. In return for the Republicans (a) aiding various infrastructure projects and (b) withdrawing federal troops from the South, those Democrats would accept the Republican, Rutherford Hayes, as President. The Democratic candidate, Samuel Tilden, had not only clearly won the popular vote but more narrowly led the Electoral College vote. Twenty Electoral College votes were disputed, however, in Florida, Louisiana and South Carolina. An electoral commission was appointed to rule on these results. Divided on party lines, it awarded all twenty votes to Hayes who, as a result, won the Electoral College by a single vote. Thus reasons for the Compromise were both party political and constitutional. Some historians maintain that no such Compromise was ever agreed, that the phrase was coined by the historian C. Vann Woodward in 1951. Even if there was no formal meeting and agreement, there was some kind of informal political bargain between the Republicans and Southern Democrats.

(b) How far, by 1877, did the position of the ex-slaves change because of Reconstruction?

[20]

The 1865 Thirteenth Amendment meant all slaves were freed. It took the Fourteenth Amendment of 1867 to make them citizens, equal in status with whites, and the Fifteenth Amendment of 1869 to give them the right to vote. Overturning the limits imposed in some states by Black Codes in 1865–66, these amendments did much to improve the legal and political position of ex-slaves. They went further than anyone but the most radical abolitionists would have predicted in 1861. Some 2000 ex-slaves were elected to official posts within Southern states. Judgements of the Supreme Court in 1873 (the *Slaughter-House* cases) and 1875 (*US vs Cruickshank*) limited the advances made, however. And in social and economic matters, the situation was much less positive. Though the Freedmen's Bureau did much useful work in the late 1860s, especially in establishing schools and colleges, it was scrapped in the early 1870s when, to make a lasting difference, its contributions were needed for many more years.

To make a living, ex-slaves turned to sharecropping, a system of farming which maintained the predominance of the white landowners. In order to help ex-slaves, the Radical Republicans in Congress passed three Reconstruction Acts in 1867, the main consequence of which was to impose military rule. The army was used to try and ensure that the rights of ex-slaves were respected and to limit the power of returning Confederates. This rule allowed an alliance of scalawags (Southern Unionists), carpetbaggers (Northern activists) and freedmen to try to reform Southern society along Northern lines. They made some limited progress. Before long, more conservative Southern whites gained office in the South while at the same time the federal government of Grant lost the strong will needed to impose social change on the South. The Compromise of 1877, by which the Republicans handed control of the South back to Democrats in return for keeping the presidency, was more a consequence of the changing reality of Southern politics than a cause. By 1877 the position of ex-slaves had certainly changed and broadly for the better. They had some opportunities, which benefited some. For many, however, the change was more in the letter of the law than the reality of their lives.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

7 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

(a) Account for the rise of the Progressive Movement in the late nineteenth century. [10]

H W Brands, in his book *The Reckless Decade*, 1995, p.341, describes the Progressive Movement as 'to some extent ... a house-broken version of Populism'. The Populists were mainly small farmers from the West and the South who suffered from economic recessions and the power of the railroad companies in the 1870s and 1880s. They wanted to return to a bimetallic currency, gold and silver, to limit the power of the railroad barons. In 1892, they formed the People's Party, winning some elections in the West. In 1896, rather than split the anti-business vote, they chose the Democratic Party's candidate, William Bryan Jennings, as their candidate. They still lost. Their policies, however, carried on. The urban middle class came to accept them – except for bimetallism – as did Theodore Roosevelt, unexpectedly President in 1901, despite being a Republican. Putting populist/progressive policies into practice was a feature of the 1900s. The movement itself was never coherent or organised. It was more a broad political force of the many who turned against the excesses and inequalities of the gilded age and wanted limits placed on the economic and political power of the elites which governed the USA.

(b) How far did the Progressive reforms make the USA more democratic? [20]

The main changes in the American political system introduced by Progressives in the early twentieth century were: party primaries; direct democracy via initiatives, referendums and recall elections; popular elections of US Senators; women's suffrage. (N.B. federal income tax and the Federal Reserve Board, both Progressive reforms, are not relevant to the political process.) The first two were developed at the state level, especially in the West. The other two required constitutional amendments, the 17th in 1913 for directly elected Senators and the 19th in 1920 for women's suffrage. Thus only two applied to the whole of the USA. These certainly did much to make the USA more democratic in form. Before 1913 US Senators had been chosen by state legislatures, which were often one-party institutions. At least after 1913 the people chose US Senators, which caused Senators to focus more on the people's wishes rather than respond to state legislators who often had sectional interests at heart. The amendment gave the US Senate greater legitimacy and thus did the same for US federal government.

Giving women the vote did not have a great effect in subsequent elections. Admittedly, Congress passed the first federal social reform in 1921, which just happened to provide federal funding for maternity and child care, but the Act was allowed to lapse in 1929. Female turnout was lower than male until the 1980s. Female issues did not come to the fore as they did in the second wave of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s.

The other, state-based, reforms and especially referendums and initiatives had some impact in states which adopted them. Party primaries did help undermine the power of party bosses. However, the USA did not really become much more democratic in practice as a result of these reforms. The wealthy still provided the political rulers of the USA. Money remained a key factor in the winning of elections. If anything, 'men of the people' were less prominent after 1920 than they had been before. Neither of the two main parties chose as a presidential candidate anyone to equal William Jennings Bryan – or Abraham Lincoln.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929–1941

(a) Why was political opposition to the New Deal ineffective? [10]

The political opponent of the New Deal which would have the greatest effect on FDR's reforms was the Republican Party in Congress. Not only were the numbers against the Republicans being effective but the party itself was divided between Eastern conservatives and Western progressives. They took quite different attitudes towards New Deal reforms. In addition, the Republicans were the minority party for the first time in a long time – the First World War excepted – which took much getting used to. Finally, they were seen as the party in charge when the Great Depression occurred.

The Republican approach seemed no answer to a depression of unprecedented depth. Thus studies of the period usually focus on opposition outside Congress. The two best known are Huey Long and Charles Coughlin. Huey Long was a Democratic Senator, Charles Coughlin a Roman Catholic priest. Both, after initially supporting the New Deal, turned against it for being too cautious and ineffective. Both used the new medium of the radio to gain support. Before his assassination, Huey Long became more left-wing. Father Coughlin's views moved more towards the right. Both gained a great public response but it never turned into organised and effective electoral opposition to a President and a party which gained more support in 1936. Thus the disarray, intellectual and organisational, of the opposition allied with the more energetic efforts of the Roosevelt administration meant that the political opposition had little impact. Judicial opposition was another matter.

(b) How radical were the reforms of the First and Second New Deals? [20]

First New Deal reforms which candidates can be expected to cover include: the Emergency Banking Act 1933; the Banking Act 1933, which covers both the Federal Deposit Insurance Co-operation and the Glass-Steagall Act, which separated commercial and investment banking; the Agricultural Adjustment Act 1933; the Federal Emergency Relief Administration; the National Recovery Administration; leaving the gold standard; the Securities Act 1933.

The main terms of each reform should be measured against some yardstick of radicalism. This in turn means candidates need to assess just how major a change in the particular area of policy – monetary, economic and social, for example – each reform was. The question asks about the reforms of the New Deal, not the New Deal as a whole. (Candidates who do write about the New Deals in general and who end up comparing the two New Deals are not strictly addressing the question.) Having considered several individual reforms, however, candidates might then go on to assess how radical was the package of reforms they have considered, especially in relation to the role of federal government, which both New Deals increased.

Second New Deal reforms to be assessed and evaluated include: the National Labour Relations Act (aka the Wagner Act); the Works Progress Administration; the Social Security Act; the fair Labour Standards Act; the US Housing Authority. Again, candidates should focus on the Acts and relevant areas of policy.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did Britain and France agree the Entente Cordiale in 1904? [10]

An alliance between traditional enemies, Britain and France, seemed highly unlikely, especially to the Germans. However, both France and Britain had clear reasons for agreeing to settle their differences and reaching a defensive alliance.

French motives – France had become increasingly alarmed by the more aggressive foreign policy which Germany had adopted since the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890. Fearing Germany and its Triple Alliance partners, France was determined to avoid becoming diplomatically isolated and vulnerable to German attack. Despite their political differences, France had formed a defensive alliance with Russia in 1894. The Entente Cordiale offered France additional security.

British motives – Britain's policy for the last quarter of the 19th century had been 'splendid isolation', remaining out of European affairs and concentrating on the development of its empire. However, the massive development of the German navy under Kaiser Wilhelm caused alarm in Britain. Already concerned by the adverse reaction of European countries to its involvement in the Boer Wars, Britain now felt threatened by the growth of the German navy. While the British navy was widely dispersed across the globe, the German navy was heavily localised in the North Sea, posing a significant threat to British naval supremacy and security. Britain, therefore, abandoned its isolationist policy. Initially, this led to the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902. The Entente Cordiale was a continuation of this new policy, which was subsequently extended with the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907.

(b) To what extent was the Scramble for Africa the result of economic rivalry between the major powers? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that imperial expansion was a means whereby countries could enhance their wealth, power, prestige and influence. Industrial revolutions enhanced the major powers' need for new sources of raw materials and markets. Britain had taken control of Cape Colony in order to protect its shipping / trade routes to India. Similarly, Britain took Egypt, an event which arguably began the scramble, in order to secure passage through the Suez Canal to enable speedier trade. All of the major powers realised that Africa offered major economic advantages.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that political rivalry was the key factor. After 1871, expansion within Europe itself was no longer possible without going to war, something which all of the major powers were keen to avoid. Africa offered the possibility of expansion without the threat of a major war, thereby becoming the focus of political rivalry. Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal and, belatedly, Germany all became involved in the scramble for Africa, each convinced that the possession of a large overseas empire gave it greater power and prestige.

Other factors were also significant. Exploration, medical advances and improved shipping / means of transport opened up Africa, enabling European nations to exploit its natural resources and establish new markets. There were social factors – convinced of their racial superiority, Europeans saw it as their mission to civilize the people of Africa. The fact that European countries were determined to avoid coming into conflict over Africa (as evidenced by the Treaty of Berlin 1885) suggests that political rivalry was not the main motive.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why was France unhappy with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles? [10]

Clemenceau had been determined to ensure that the Treaty ruined Germany both militarily and economically. This was to gain revenge for the devastation which France had suffered during WWI and to ensure that Germany could never again threaten France. At Clemenceau's insistence, the Treaty of Versailles had severely restricted the size of the German army and the number of weapons it could have. The demilitarisation of the Rhineland meant that Germany would not be able to attack France through that border region. The Treaty had given France use of the Saar, denying Germany its valuable coal deposits, for a period of fifteen years.

Conversely, Wilson had wanted a more lenient treaty, believing that this was the best way in which to guarantee future peace. It had also been in Britain's interests to ensure that Germany (a major consumer of British exports) could revive economically. While the Treaty of Versailles had been harsh in many ways, the French believed that it left Germany strong enough to rebuild for the future and again threaten French security. In particular, the Treaty led to strained relations between Britain and France, a situation which made the French feel isolated and insecure. As a result, France adopted a tough stance towards Germany during much of the 1920s, in particular demanding full payment of reparations.

(b) To what extent was the USSR successful in its attempts to establish improved relations with the rest of Europe in the period from 1919 to 1933? [20]

The Bolsheviks' rise to power in Russia (November 1917) had caused alarm across Europe. This was particularly true in France and Britain, which had lost a vital ally when the new Russian government withdrew from the First World War by signing the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with Germany. It soon became clear that Lenin's intention was to spread revolution as far as possible (e.g. Third International or Comintern). Given the political and economic turmoil which faced Europe at this time, widespread revolution did indeed seem a genuine possibility. Some countries (including Britain, France, the USA and Japan) actively supported the Bolsheviks' opponents in the Russian civil war. Moreover, Russia was not invited to the peace conference at Versailles in 1919. By 1921, however, tensions had eased. Although the Bolsheviks were clearly established in Russia, their hopes of a world-wide communist revolution under Russian leadership had not materialised. Lenin now accepted that Russia's future depended on peaceful coexistence and economic cooperation with other countries.

In terms of success, it could be argued that the USSR enjoyed good relations with Germany, perhaps because both countries felt isolated. Following a trade treaty in 1921, full diplomatic relations were resumed with the Treaty of Rapallo in 1922, renewed by the Treaty of Berlin in 1926. The USSR established formal diplomatic relations with France in 1924. Britain became one of the first countries to recognise the Bolshevik government when it signed a trade treaty in 1921. Another trade agreement was signed between Britain and the USSR in 1929.

However, while Soviet friendship with Germany remained until the rise of Hitler caused alarm in the USSR, relations with France and Britain were less secure, both countries being alarmed by the Treaty of Rapallo which linked Germany and the USSR. It was at French insistence that the USSR was not represented at the Paris peace talks, and France made little effort to get too friendly with the USSR until the rise of German Nazism forced it to do so in the 1930s. To France, fearful of revolution, the USSR seemed to pose a threat. Britain continued to see Russia's communist government with suspicion. Fears that the USSR was encouraging independence movements in British-owned India led Britain to break off diplomatic relations with the USSR in 1927. In 1932, the newly elected British government

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

ended the 1929 trading agreement between Britain and the USSR, which responded by arresting four Moscow-based British engineers on charges of spying.

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Italy, Germany and the USSR become involved in the Spanish Civil War?

[10]

Despite the Non-Intervention Committee (joined, but ignored, by both Germany and Italy) which was supposed to stop foreign interference in the Spanish Civil War, Italy, Germany and the USSR all became involved. Each had its own motives for doing so.

Italy – Like Hitler, Mussolini could see the value of having a third fascist state in Europe, especially one which bordered France. Mussolini also saw Spain as offering the opportunity to enhance his own position in Italy – seeking glory as confirmation of his ability to lead Italy back to its former greatness as one of the major powers with a leading role to play in European affairs.

Germany – In addition to Spain's location on the border of France, Hitler saw the war as an opportunity to test Germany's developing military strength. He was also keen to ensure that Mussolini was occupied in Spain so that he was unable to interfere with Germany's designs on Austria. Therefore, Hitler had a vested interest in making the civil war last as long as possible, so while Germany supplied Franco's Nationalists with men and equipment, German firms were allowed to sell arms to Spain's Republicans.

USSR – Just as Hitler had a vested interest in prolonging the Spanish Civil War, so too did Stalin. Sensing that the fascist governments of Germany and Italy posed the biggest threat to the security of the Soviet Union, Stalin had worked hard to maintain good relations with both Britain and France. While he most certainly did not want Franco to take control of Spain, posing yet another fascist threat to the Soviet Union, he was only too well aware that neither Britain nor France would tolerate a communist government in Spain. He was prepared, therefore, to send just enough aid to ensure that the Republicans could maintain their resistance, but not enough to enable them to gain outright victory.

(b) How far do you agree that Britain's appeasement of Hitler during the 1930s was a misjudgement?

[20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that, by the end of 1938, appeasement had allowed Hitler to totally destroy the Treaty of Versailles, regain land in the Saar and the Rhineland, take possession of Austria and develop large, well equipped armed forces with actual experience of modern warfare. German pride and prestige had been restored, and the country had unquestionably regained its status as one of the world's most powerful nations. In Munich (September 1938), appeasement effectively ensured that Germany would subsequently invade Czechoslovakia without opposition. Hitler had been able to exploit the weakness of Britain and France. Had Hitler been confronted earlier, it would have been easy to stop German aggression, since it was not yet powerful enough to fight a major war. By 1939, Hitler's Germany was in a position to not only fight a major war, but win it.

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

In challenging the view, it could be argued that it is easy to be critical in hindsight. At the time, there seemed logical reasons for adopting a policy of appeasement. For example:

- Public opinion in Britain and France was heavily anti-war
- Both Britain and France were suffering from the world economic crisis and neither could afford the expense of preparing for war
- British businessmen had a vested interest in the resurgence of the German economy
- Many British politicians believed that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh on Germany and that Hitler was merely trying to address genuine grievances
- Communism was still seen as the major threat facing Western Europe. A strong Germany was seen as a vital buffer against the USSR
- Hitler was adept at isolating potential enemies. For example, the Anglo-German naval agreement of 1935 made France feel that Britain was an unreliable ally. France was not willing to act alone against Hitler
- Many of Hitler's statements seemed plausible and even justifiable.

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why did Japan attack Pearl Harbor in 1941? [10]

The USA saw Japan's expansion, and especially its war against China, as a threat to its own economic interests in the Far East. Japan was heavily reliant on trade with the USA, particularly for supplies of oil. The USA imposed a trade embargo with the aim of forcing Japan to end its expansionist foreign policy. While negotiations were continuing between the two countries, Japan was seeking alternative supplies for its oil and other vital materials. This would involve further expansion into areas such as Malaya and the East Indies. The USA would obviously have opposed this and, with major expansion of the American naval fleet, Japan would have found it difficult to compete. Therefore, the Japanese planned to cripple the US Pacific fleet long enough to buy time for Japan to find new sources of raw materials and develop its own naval power within the region.

(b) To what extent was the Kuomintang's rise to power by 1928 dependent on support from the Chinese Communist Party? [20]

It could be argued that Sun Yat-sen was fully aware of the benefits which liaison with the CCP brought to the KMT. In particular, it brought valuable assistance, both financial and organisational, from Soviet Russia. Russian advisors helped to create a more efficient structure for the KMT across Southern China, and were important in developing the KMT's army into a more efficient fighting force. The KMT's Military Academy at Whampoa was established with Soviet help, and its leader, Chiang Kai-shek, had himself received training in Moscow. The Northern March, which began in 1926, proved that the KMT's army, equipped with modern Soviet weaponry, was far more efficient than the armies of warlords. Much of the success of the March was due to the fact that its numbers were swelled by large numbers of factory workers and peasants, attracted by the CCP's promise of industrial cooperatives and land redistribution.

In contrast, it could be argued that the KMT's own policies, as outlined in the Three Principles, gave it a broad base of popular support in China. Factory workers, peasants, businessmen, industrialists and landowners alike saw that they had much to gain from the KMT – the destruction of the warlords, the restoration of China's unity, the removal of unwanted foreign interference / control, the emergence of democracy, an effective education system and land reform. Even without liaison with the CCP, it is likely that the KMT would have gained initial support from the USSR, which had a vested interest in extending its own

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9389	21

involvement in China. At the time, the CCP was relatively small and disorganised, seemingly offering little real hope to the people of China. Chiang Kai-shek, who did not share some of Sun's more socialist policies, clearly saw the CCP as a threat to the KMT's and his own power in China and, from 1927, began the 'purification movement'. Despite this split with the CCP, the KMT's march through Northern China continued to be successful, Peking itself falling to KMT forces in 1928. Chiang had become the political and military leader of China without the CCP.