MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/43   Paper 4 (Depth 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Generic Levels of Response

Level 5	**25–30**	Responses show very good understanding of the question and contain a relevant, focused and balanced argument, fully supported by appropriate factual material and based on a consistently analytical approach.
		Towards the top of the level, responses might be expected to be analytical, focused and balanced throughout. The candidate will be in full control of the argument and will reach a supported judgement in response to the question.
		Towards the lower end of the level, responses might typically be analytical, consistent and balanced, but the argument might not be fully convincing.
Level 4	**19–24**	Responses show a good understanding of the question and contain a relevant argument based on a largely analytical approach.
		Towards the top of the level, responses are likely to be analytical, balanced and effectively supported. There may be some attempt to reach a judgement but this may be partial or unsupported.
		Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain detailed and accurate factual material with some focused analysis, but the argument is inconsistent or unbalanced.
Level 3	**13–18**	Responses show understanding of the question and contain appropriate factual material. The material may lack depth. Some analytical points may be made but these may not be highly developed or consistently supported.
		Towards the top of the level, responses contain detailed and accurate factual material. However, attempts to argue relevantly are implicit or confined to introductions and conclusions. Alternatively, responses may offer an analytical framework which contains some supporting material.
		Towards the lower end of the level, responses might offer narrative or description relating to the topic, but are less likely to address the terms of the question.
Level 2	**7–12**	Responses show some understanding of the demands of the question. They may be descriptive with few links to the question or may be analytical with limited relevant factual support.
		Towards the top of the level, responses might contain relevant commentaries which lack adequate factual support. The responses may contain some unsupported assertions.
		Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain some information which is relevant to the topic but may only offer partial coverage.
Level 1	**1–6**	Responses show limited understanding of the question. They may contain some description which is linked to the topic or only address part of the question.
		Towards the top of the level, responses show some awareness of relevant material but this may be presented as a list.
		Towards the lower end of the level, answers may provide a little relevant material but are likely to be characterised by irrelevance.
Level 0	**0**	No relevant, creditworthy content.

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

Indicative content

1   **'The incompetence of the Whites was the main reason for Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War.' How far do you agree?** [30]

The key issue here is the identification of the principal factors which led to Bolshevik victory in the Russian civil war. There needs to be a balanced argument, weighing up on the one hand the advantages possessed by and strengths of the Bolsheviks, counterbalanced by an analysis of the problems facing their opponents and arguing which was the most significant factor in the final outcome. The Bolshevik's opponents, both internal and external, were bitterly divided. The anarchists were unlikely to try and work with monarchists. Those who supported greater regional autonomy, the 'nationalists', were not going to work with Wrangel or the Czech Legion. The White Generals were neither willing nor able to work together. Foreign support added a treasonable and anti-nationalist element to their cause. They were unable to offer a viable alternative to socialism and there were too many bad memories of the Tsarist past to convince the people to wish for a return there. Communication between the peripheral regions of Russia was limited and coordination a nightmare. Famine and war exhaustion helped as well. Any opposition had an uphill start. Apathy by many and committed support by some was vital to the Bolsheviks. Lenin's leadership was important, ranging from his use of propaganda to his ideological flexibility over the switch from war communism to the NEP for example. There was ruthlessness there, as the early work of the CHEKA showed, as well as the ability to take horrendous decisions such as Brest Litovsk and Kronstadt. The work of Trotsky and the Red Army was vital and the commitment of hundreds and thousands of men and women who fought and produced munitions was vital as well. Geography helped, they were operating out of the 'centre' while the opposition was scattered. Perhaps they just seemed to offer a better way out of the appalling state that Russia was in in 1918.

2   **'Mussolini's corporate state failed' How far do you agree?** [30]

The key issue here is an analysis of the corporate state, what it set out to do and the extent to which it attained those objectives. An explanation of what it actually was is expected, with some details of the structure of corporatism set up by Rocco between 1926 and 1928. Several historians refer to them as a 'mirage' created to give the impression of activity but in reality being little more than an empty gesture towards planning, giving the impression of economic activity and providing solutions to Italy's endemic economic problems. The idea of separate corporations dealing with each major area of the economy looked different, as intended, to the socialist command economy, but in the end they were to do little but provide propaganda for the regime and rhetoric to impress foreign visitors with. They played no part in creating or managing the economy - that was largely down to Mussolini's whims. Major industrialists were deeply suspicious of them and were relieved when they did little more than assist in keeping wages down and employees subservient. Mussolini never actually seemed to understand what they were about, failed to give them any backing, and let them atrophy. The reason why Italy survived the depression as painlessly as it did was because of the fact that the corporate state did not involve itself in key areas. Arguably it failed to solve Italy's problems, but it gave the impression of activity without doing any harm.

3 **To what extent did Stalin create a totalitarian state in Russia?** **[30]**

The key issue here is the nature and extent of totalitarianism in Russia under Stalin. A definition is expected and reflection on the extent to which Stalin attained it. There is a case against the view that it was the pinnacle of autocracy. Much of what he did had been started by Lenin and much of that followed on from the autocracy of the Tsars. The NKVD had a clear descent from the Okhrana and the CHEKA, and as Solzhenitsyn pointed out the same jailors ran the same jails and camps from the late 1890s through to the 1930s. Banishing opponents or likely opponents to Siberia went way back into Russian history. Stolypin's neckties were just replaced by a bullet in the back of the neck in the Lubyanka. Stalin did not create it; he just killed a lot more. He had popular support for many of his objectives and without the enthusiasts who went out and collectivised or worked under appalling conditions in the Magnitogorsk works he would have achieved little. There was a tradition of authoritarianism already ingrained, which he just developed. On the other hand it could be argued that he changed the very nature of totalitarianism. The extent which his regime reached, be it in education or family life, agriculture and industry, showed the total subordination of all to the whim of one man. The fact that when Russia was nearly destroyed in 1941 it could be put down to the failings of him and him alone shows just how totalitarian it was, while the survival of Russia thereafter shows well how important the innate support for the regime was.

4 **'Hitler was able to establish himself in power by 1934 mainly because of a weak opposition.' How far do you agree?** **[30]**

The issue here is the extent to which actual and potential opponent's lack of any strength played a role in Hitler acquiring and retaining power. A range of factors, when it comes to acquiring power, needs to be examined. This could range from the division of opponents and potential opponents, such as the Communists and the Centre parties and the Socialists, to groups such as the churches and the Jewish community. The liberal elites in education and the law might be expected to oppose Hitler as well. Obviously the other factors like the depression and Hitler's skills and use of propaganda are factors which could be utilised against this view. Once in power there was again a failure of those who could, and perhaps ought to have opposed, to act together. The army elite, while possibly sympathising with some of Hitler's views, were unlikely to work with Communists and trade unionists. The legality of his acquisition of power was a major deterrent to opposition for many, and the Night of the Long Knives was a good deterrent to others. Hitler's ability to identify opponents and potential opponents and neutralise them by use of a mix of carrots and sticks was clever, as his dealings with the judiciary and the churches showed.

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

5 **'President Eisenhower was re-elected in 1956 mainly because of the booming economy.' How far do you agree?** **[30]**

The US economy was certainly booming in the mid-1950s. Sandwiched between two minor recessions of 1953–4 and 1957–8, the boom saw unemployment fall to just over 4.0%, a very low figure for the USA. Most people saw an increase in their living standards. Following the adage of Bill Clinton that 'It's the economy, stupid', US voters in 1956 voted to re-elect Eisenhower.

There were other factors, however. Eisenhower's experience was very important-he was a Second World War military leader whose expertise was still needed in the Cold War. His first administration was successful-he had ended the Korean War while the economic revived.

The Democratic candidate, Adlai Stevenson advocated more social welfare and rapprochement with the USSR. He was a cerebral politician, lacking Ike's special experience – as well as holding no public office. In October 1956, in the last month of the election campaign major international crises emerged - Hungary and Suez-, which meant it was no time to change the captain of the ship.

6 **How successful was affirmative action in improving the position of ethnic minorities in the 1960s and 1970s?** **[30]**

There is much evidence that affirmative action was successful. More minority students were going to college -when AA has been scrapped [Texas 1996, California 1998], then the proportion of minority students falls. Studies show AA led to improved wages or jobs for blacks. In the end this led to more highly visible senior black figures-individual examples might include e.g. Colin Powell, Clarence Thomas.

However, some would argue that affirmative action was unsuccessful – or did little to help. There was a lot of reverse discrimination. Some did argue that recruiting minority students on favourable terms excluded more able members of the majority [i.e. white] candidates, which led to **mismatch** of students and courses. The limitations imposed by the US Supreme Court is an important moment- in the *Bakke case 1978* the Court decided against quotas for minorities but accepted ethnic background could be a factor in recruiting students. It may also be said that any improvement in minorities' position is the result of other factors, e.g. the state of the economy, the quality of the education they received.

7   **Assess the reasons why, in the 1980s, the USA experienced 'twin deficits' on the federal budget and on overseas trade.** **[30]**

In 1970s annual average deficit was $50bn, in the 1980s $200bn. Cuts in taxes on individuals and companies, especially in the 1981 budget had a major effect. Increased expenditure, especially on defence with the Second Cold War of the early 1980s was also important.

Thus the budget deficit could be explained by the policies and popularity of President Reagan. The US Congress did little to oppose the administration's economic strategy.

Meanwhile, increased imports of manufactured goods from Japan and Europe, e.g. cars, were helped by the protectionism policies of new competitors. A rise in the dollar in the first half of the 1980s by 40% made imports cheaper and exports more expensive. The rise in the dollar was needed to pay high interest rates to investors who provided the loans which helped offset the budget deficit. Thus the two deficits were related.

8   **How consistent were President Reagan's policies towards the USSR?** **[30]**

The more usual perception of Reagan's policies towards the USSR is that they were inconsistent, moving from hard-line to dove-like. Thus the 'Evil Empire' speech vs. Reykjavík summit is a key contrast. In 1981, at the height of the second cold war, Reagan spoke of the USSR as an evil empire, thus condemning it in very strong, moralistic terms and exacerbating cold war tensions. In 1986 he met the new Soviet leader, Gorbachev, to whom he proposed the scrapping of all nuclear weapons. There is a strong contrast between the build-up of nuclear weapons in 1981–3, including the placing of intermediate nuclear weapons in Europe, and the INF Treaty of 1987.

On the other hand, Reagan's policies can be seen as consistent in some sense.   Continuity of tactics may be demonstrated in some ways. Reagan both expanded forces and sought arms control agreements throughout his two terms, e.g. his commitment to SDI and the continuity of arms talks in Geneva and elsewhere. In Afghanistan, following the 1979 Soviet invasion of, Reagan supported the mujahedeen opposed to Soviet forces, eventually forcing the withdrawal of Soviet troops and a major defeat for the USSR.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 **To what extent did the nuclear arms race make the world safer in the period from 1950 to 1975?** **[30]**

It could be argued that the arms race created a balance of power in which neither superpower dare use nuclear weapons for fear of its own destruction (MAD). A compromise was reached in the Cuban missile crisis precisely because neither superpower was willing to risk nuclear war. Superpowers were keen to avoid direct confrontation. The arms race helped to create periods of détente, during which attempts were made to improve relations and impose limits on the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons – eg the Test Ban Treaty, NNPT, SALT. It led the superpowers to create alternative defence strategies (e.g. flexible response.)

Conversely, it could be argued that the arms race greatly increased tension between the superpowers. It led to the stockpiling of ever-increasing numbers of weapons and technological innovations as both the USA and the USSR sought to tip the balance of power in their favour by developing ever-more sophisticated missiles and launch systems. It greatly added to the mutual fear and distrust between the USA and the USSR. The Cuban missile crisis brought the world close to destruction. It involved other countries – e.g. deployment of American missiles in Europe. Proliferation meant that other countries gained possession of nuclear weapons, greatly adding to international tensions (e.g. India and Pakistan, already in dispute over Kashmir). Potential use by countries or terrorist groups which would not be constrained by balance of power issues added to the risk.

10 **'The growth of nationalism in Eastern Europe was the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union.' How far do you agree?** **[30]**

In support of the view, it could be argued that the growth and success of nationalism in Eastern Europe put tremendous pressure on the limited resources of the USSR, and encouraged nationalist uprisings within the Soviet Union itself. The collapse of the Eastern Bloc undermined the prestige and influence of the USSR and, indeed, communism as a political ideology. Conversely, it could be argued that the growth of nationalism in Eastern Europe was a symptom rather than a cause of the wider problems facing the USSR: for example, long-term economic stagnation and political atrophy; Reagan's heavily anti-communist policies, including the stepping up of the arms race (Star Wars). Gorbachev's decision to reduce expenditure on the arms race, which necessitated improved relations with the west, which itself required him to provide evidence of the USSR's willingness to reform. Gorbachev's reforms (e.g. perestroika and glasnost) were designed to improve the Soviet economy and provide greater political and social freedoms. Gorbachev's decision to end the Brezhnev Doctrine meant that the USSR was no longer able to resist rebellions in Eastern Europe.

11 How successful was Deng Xiaoping's policy of 'market socialism'? **[30]**

In terms of success, it could be argued that the policy reversed the worse effects of the Cultural Revolution. Modernisation was possible in industry, agriculture, science and technology, based on monies borrowed from abroad and the IMF. 'Capitalist' incentives were used to increase efficiency and output – e.g. grain output reached record levels by 1979. Whereas Gorbachev reformed both economically and politically, Deng confined his reforms to the economy – he insisted on maintaining a one-party state. This allowed the CCP to survive the crisis of communism.

Conversely, it could be argued that the policy had significant side-effects: for example, the increasing demand for political reform, leading to the Tiananmen Square crisis. The policy also caused economic problems; prices now fluctuated on the open market, causing occasional slumps. While exports increased, so too did imports, creating a trade deficit. Inflation also rose. These economic problems were another causal factor of the calls for greater democracy. China's hard-line against the demonstrations led to international criticism.

12 To what extent did the Iran-Iraq War (1980–88) destabilise international relations? **[30]**

Examples of the ways in which the war destabilised international relations might include:

Splits between the Arab states: Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Kuwait gave cautious support to Iraq, but Syria, Libya, South Yemen and the PLO were critical of Iraq for starting a war at a time when they believed all Arab states should be united against Israel. Many Arab states were also concerned by the threat posed by Iran's Shia fundamentalism.
Iraqi attacks on Iran's oil exports threatened the energy supplies of the west. This led to the presence of US, Soviet, British and French warships in the area, adding to the international tension. Iraq used weapons supplied by the USSR, Britain and the USA. Iraq's weaponry came from China and North Korea (and, secretly, from the USA). This added to the international tension.

Conversely, it could be argued that the war was primarily a local affair, directly involving only Iran and Iraq. While it caused additional confusion to the Middle East, it drew attention away from the Arab-Israeli issue. The USA, concerned about the fundamentalist Iranian regime which had overthrown the Shah, an American ally), saw Saddam Hussein as a stabilising influence, both in Iraq and in the Middle East. Many other Arab states were equally concerned about the threat posed by the kind of religious fundamentalism fostered by the Iranian government. There was, therefore, no international attempt to resist Saddam's attack against Iran. It was only towards the end of 1987, when both sides began to bombard each other's capitals, that the international community took action. The UN engineered a ceasefire in 1988.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

13 How significant were outside factors in securing African independence? **[30]**

The focus here is an analysis of the role of outside factors such as World War II, the attitude of the USA to colonialism, the independence of India, the Bandung Conference, the Cold War, in the achieving of independence; comparison of the importance of these factors with internal factors such as leadership and mass political parties to evaluate significance. Discussion might cover the independence movements in at least two African countries showing specific detail of the impact of external factors. The reluctance of France to offer independence to French West African colonies could be effectively developed and contrasted with, for example, British circumstances and greater willingness to support independence movements after World War II. Events outside the colony should include any of the following: World War II, the Atlantic Charter and American attitude towards colonies, the independence of India, the Bandung Conference, the Cold War, as they impacted upon Africans.

Comparison with pressures within the colony is needed for assessment and could be focused on the growth of mass political parties, political leadership, the media and general dissatisfaction with colonial rule.

Conclusions should be based on evaluation of the comparative significance of factors, either choosing one factor as most significant, or setting external against internal factors.

14 How far have African countries been able to establish stable political systems since independence? **[30]**

There were multiple problems since independence: fragmentation of aims, the trend from multi-party to one-party states to solve problems or retain leadership of a majority party; incompetence, corruption, changes of government, military coups. The question asks for an evaluation of countries' success in dealing with these challenges to stability.

This will involve identification and explanation of political problems faced by newly-independent African countries e.g. rivalries between political parties or personalities, lack of experienced leadership, weak economy, poor infrastructure or undeveloped education system, all of which had political implications. Different ways of dealing with these problems included changes in government, such as from democracy to one party state, military rule, civil war or dictatorship. Some attempt should be made to identify and prioritise factors in successful management of new states and containment of problems.

In evaluating success in dealing with instability, answers might focus on whether problems are endemic or due to specific and temporary factors, the part played by the quality of political leadership or outside influences, the nature, aim and purpose of new governments.

15 **Assess the attitudes of African governments to religious and cultural diversity within their state.** **[30]**

New African governments responded to diversity in a variety of ways-either embracing or repressing minority views. Some included minority groups and minority political parties in government and some excluded them. It might also be considered whether and how the triple religious heritage of indigenous culture, Islamic influences and western Christian traditions had an impact on independent states and how far there was an attempt to revive or create a national identity.

Ways in which governments have dealt with such diversity should be identified e.g. with tolerance or by suppression, and such methods compared and contrasted. Contrasting colonial legacies could be used as a way of explaining attitudes, or competing internal factors after independence such as tribal groupings, urban/rural divide, how powerful such factors as the educated elite, the military, left-wing groups, the media or other pressure groups turned out to be.
Discussion of the diversity of religion could be based on the significance of Christianity, Islam, traditional religions or African independent churches within the new state. There was also diversity of culture, based on tribal differences, languages, traditional government, and colonial heritage. Some may draw upon knowledge and understanding of literature, music, art and legend in explaining cultural diversity. Contrasting attitudes could be developed showing how this has been used both positively and negatively.

16 **How effective was the United Nations as a peace-keeper in Africa?** **[30]**

The involvement of the United Nations was important in a number of flashpoint situations, some of which need to be considered and the effectiveness of the intervention weighed up to reach an assessment of effectiveness.

The Congo will probably be the main focus, but other areas could be Togo, Cameroon, Eritrea or Biafra/Nigeria. Assessment of the UN's role could be related to the UN Charter and a definition of when the UN is allowed to intervene. Assessment of the role of the UN could be based on the success of involvement, short or longer term peace-keeping, advantages and disadvantages for the countries concerned.

Other factors to be considered include the background to conflicts, the strength of forces within countries, other agencies working as mediators, economic considerations, and the quality of leadership on both sides of a conflict.

Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–1990s

17 **Why did the nature of resistance to Japanese rule in Southeast Asia vary so much?** **[30]**

Given the sudden end of western rule and the propaganda of the Japanese about a wider Asian nationalism, the people of Southeast Asia and their leaders had to make an assessment of the gains and losses of accepting their new rulers. Also, the degree of repression and exploitation by Japan varied as did their attitude to different peoples in the region. Variation often depended on previous experience of empire and the policy of the Japanese. It also tended to change as the war went on and the prospects of long term Japanese possession receded. Thus when there was some attempt by Japan to make political cooperation, possible, as in Indonesia, some nationalists cooperated, like Sukhano, while others like Hatta maintained links with resistance movements. Similar splits were to be seen in Burma. In Malaysia the leader of the Communists varied between following a line of a united front against the Japanese and working with them. There were attempts by Japan to gain support by using Southeast Asians in administration, to develop public works and to promote agrarian development. Resistance was often determined by a common dislike of both Japanese and western imperialism, for example in Kuomintang cells and Communist movements. Ethnic repression by the Japanese was a major contributory factor. In Vietnam, even though the Vietminh was a broad-based resistance movement, communist leaders like Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Gap were its principal leaders, so ideology was important in determining resistance. Resistance to the Japanese could be determined by a desire to use the occupation and war as a means of social change as in the Hukbalahap of the Philippines. The deteriorating position of Japan and the availability of allied military support for resistance led some to change their stance – for example Aung San in Burma ceased to cooperate and formed an anti-fascist movement in 1944, losing any faith that an increasingly pressured Japan would offer nationalist concessions and looking to a post-war world of allied victory. Answers may deal with the 'so much' part of the question by considering the degree of variation.

18 **How important were economic factors in bringing about the formation of the Federation of Malaysia in 1963?** **[30]**

The Federation was mooted in 1961 and established by Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, and Sabah. Brunei stayed out. The background was the establishment of the Alliance in 1952, a coalition of the Malayan UMNO party, representing the interests of the ethnic Malays, the Chinese MCA and the MIC – the Malayan Indian party. This achieved independence in 1957; Islam was the national religion and Malay the official language, but despite 'positive discrimination' for the poorer Malay population, there was a serious economic imbalance between them and the richer Chinese and Indian groups. The Federation was a matter of ethnic balance with the Borneo states boosting the Malays and the Chinese in Singapore adding to the Chinese. The idea of a greater Malaysia had been discussed as a way of strengthening the security of the area against Communism and outside interference. It has been suggested that its origins lay with British suggestions. Singapore had been given internal self- government in 1958 but the agreement was due to expire in 1963 and there was a danger that an independent Singapore would be open to influence by Chinese Communism and threaten Malaya. There were also arguments for economic integration to link trade and financial interests. Excessive influence by the Singapore Chinese could be balanced by the inclusion of the Borneo areas. The negotiations by Lee Kwan Yew gained for Singapore vital economic concessions that would not tie it to the Malayan tariff policy and Malaya gained the concession that Singapore's representation in parliament would be less than its population size suggested to prevent any domination. Federation was attractive to Borneo because of the common currency and the likely economic investment. British influence here was strongly asserted for a federation. Though a currency union, access to markets, economic cooperation and trade were important, many will see political concerns as more so – the Malay fears of an independent Singapore; the desire for the leaders

for a common front against Communism and greater regional influence and specific political gains for the leaders in terms of prestige and undermining left wing threats.

19 **Why was opposition to military rule in Thailand not more successful in the period from 1945 to the 1990s?** **[30]**

US aid allowed infrastructure development in Thailand which created jobs and financed social welfare. The dominance of the military was well established from before the war and inhibited democratic traditions and experience. Phibun Sokhran was a well-established authoritarian military figure, having taken power in 1932. The Cold war atmosphere and the rise of Communist China allowed anti-Communism to flourish and be exploited by the military after the coup of November 1947. Sarit Thanart (1958–63) justified military rule by appealing to Thai traditions and gained support by economic and social modernizations. He also used King Rama IX as a front. High economic growth rates were seen as justification for military rule under his successors and the Vietnam War not only brought more US aid but saw Thailand used as a barrier against Communism. A civilian interlude between 1973 and 1976 saw economic problems and unstable coalition government. Corruption and inefficiency were ostensibly the reasons why even managed democracy gave way again to military rule after 1991. Explanations might include the strong links between the military and rural Thailand where they were seen as supporters of the people and where politicians were seen as corrupt. The politicised army had a long tradition of interference in government and high expectations of office and careers beyond the purely military. The ongoing fears of Communism and high average growth rates were not helpful to opposition, neither was the extent of US support in the Cold War context.

20 **How important were economic considerations in bringing about the formation of ASEAN?** **[30]**

The proposals to revive earlier regional organizations, such as that formed in 1961 which had failed because of disagreements, came about in the context of fears of outside interference, for instance by Britain, and of the spread of Communism. It was formed in the wake of the Konfrontasi – the clash between Indonesia and Malaysia, and the escalation of the war in Vietnam, so regional peace was a major aim. Personal enthusiasm by, for instance, the Thai foreign minister and his Indonesian counterpart were important, but it would not have been easy to have a military alliance, and strategic alliance between a diverse range of countries would have been difficult. Therefore the unifying factor was economic cooperation and a general agreement for cooperation between sovereign states with the emphasis on general good will, regular meetings and respect for sovereignty. ASEAN from 1967 was characterised more by loose cooperation and expressions of mutual respect than by more specific commitments either to peace keeping or to free trade. There was awareness of the levels of economic growth produced by trade associations in Europe like the EEC but answers should balance the economic motives with the political. Hostile observers saw ASEAN initially as politically conservative elites protecting the status quo and ASEAN stated objectives saw regional peace and security as the objectives. Economic progress may be hard to separate from both of these. Raising the standard of living would erode the popularity of Communism. However there were specific state interests: Suharto hoped that ASEAN would enhance his leadership role and convince the region of the legitimacy of his accession to power. Singapore as a newly independent power wanted to ensure friendly neighbours by economic cooperation and joining membership of an association with idealistic aims for peace. It also needed access to markets and natural resources. Thailand and Malaysia were conscious of the threat of Communism and aware that the US approved of ASEAN. The Philippines wanted to strengthen regional economic links to counterbalance dependence on the USA and to be seen as part of Southeast Asia.