
HISTORY

9389/22

Paper 2 Outline Study

October/November 2018

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

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

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

1–12(a)	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
	<p>Level 4: Evaluates factors Answers are well focused and explain a range of factors supported by relevant information. Answers demonstrate a clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers consider the relative significance of factors and reach a supported conclusion.</p>	9–10
	<p>Level 3: Explains factor(s) Answers demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers include explained factor(s) supported by relevant information. Candidates may attempt to reach a judgement about the significance of factors but this may not be effectively supported.</p>	6–8
	<p>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).</p>	3–5
	<p>Level 1: Describes the topic/issue Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation.</p>	1–2
	<p>Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content</p>	0

1–12(b)	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
	<p>Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement Answers are well focused and closely argued. <i>(Answers show a maintained and complete understanding of the question.)</i> Answers are supported by precisely selected evidence. Answers lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported.</p>	18–20
	<p>Level 4: Responses which develop a balanced argument Answers show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. Answers develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. Answers may begin to form a judgement in response to the question. <i>(At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.)</i></p>	15–17
	<p>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.</p>	10–14
	<p>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.</p>	6–9
	<p>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.</p>	1–5
	<p>Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content</p>	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Why did the Directory survive for four years?</p> <p>Several factors could be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strong reaction to the excesses of the Terror/Jacobin. • Dislike of the De-Christianisation process – the more conservative appearance of the Directory had wide appeal. • It occupied the middle ground between the excesses of the Ancien Regime and those of the Terror. • Opposition (Jacobins, Royalists) was weak and divided. • Its foreign policy was successful and the war progressed well. • It had the support of the army. • It made semi-democratic institutions work. • It administered the state and the localities sensibly. 	10
1(b)	<p>To what extent was lower-class unrest the driving force of the Revolution from 1789 to 1794?</p> <p>Ideally, 'lower-class unrest' should not just be seen as the actions of the Paris mob and the <i>sans culottes</i>. Popular unrest in the regions could be very different from Parisian. There are plenty of examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The storming of the Bastille, the refusal to pay taxes. • The Great Fear and the September Massacres. • The reaction to the flight to Varennes as well as the several outbursts of severe rural unrest. • Conditions in the countryside in 1789 were dire and there was real hunger reported right across France in the first four months of the year. <p>However, there are other factors which could be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was middle-class unrest at the lack of representation. • Most of the radicals came from middle-class backgrounds and it is suggested that it was their ability to manipulate lower-class unrest that could be the 'driving force'. • The refusal of the monarchy to compromise in any realistic way increased the appeal of radical solutions. • There was the constant pressure of war after 1792. • The need to find a way of governing the country and solving its problems that could achieve popular support. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1166 282">Why did changes in agriculture encourage industrialisation?</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 772 349">Several factors can be considered:</p> <ul data-bbox="316 383 1310 864" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 383 1270 450">• Changes in agriculture, such as enclosure, released workers to seek jobs in towns.<li data-bbox="316 454 1275 555">• Greater mechanisation, greater knowledge and use of fertilisers and more selective breeding of livestock led to a considerable increase in both the quality and quantity of food available.<li data-bbox="316 560 1257 627">• Subsistence farming declined and there was surplus produce which enabled an urban proletariat to be fed.<li data-bbox="316 631 1302 732">• This also led to a decline in infant mortality and a general improvement in diet which led to a growth in population. This not only increased demand but also provided an industrial workforce.<li data-bbox="316 736 1214 804">• Increased agricultural production led to changes in transport and communication generally which assisted later industrial needs.<li data-bbox="316 808 1310 864">• Surplus capital was generated which was used for industrial investment as well.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p>Assess the impact of technological change in the iron and steel industries in bringing about industrialisation. Refer to any <u>two</u> countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.</p> <p>The following could be considered (and both iron and steel should be covered):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initial work of the Darby family, in using coke and not charcoal, created a major industry where none had really existed. This linked mass production to any easily accessible source of energy. • The second ‘Darby’ made key changes in producing quality coke which led to a high quality iron. It was this iron that enabled machines to be built to high specifications and also the railway lines that crossed Europe. • The work of men like Boulton, Cort and Wilkinson was vital in fine tuning the mass production of iron for building the engines which were to drive the new textile industries and the engines which pulled railway carriages. • The work of Bessemer was critical in the development of steel. • It was the German Siemens whose use of gas in the steel manufacturing process led to a real increase in the quality of steel and also in the ability to mass produce it. <p>Candidates are likely to seek to establish a balanced analysis by comparing the impact of changes in iron and steel production with other factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in agriculture • Population growth • The availability of capital investment • Innovative ideas in other industries • Improvements in transport • The significance of political factors (e.g. the creation of the Zollverein and Unification of Germany) 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p>Why did Germany consider its alliance with Austria as so important?</p> <p>Several factors could be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France had been determined to gain revenge since its defeat in 1871. Bismarck had started the alliance process with the Austrians to minimise the risk of facing France alone. • Once the Franco-Russian Alliance grew stronger, then there was the additional fear of the ‘war on two fronts’ by Germany. • The attachment of Britain to France and Russia only strengthened Germany’s desire for a close ally in the East. • There was the fellow feeling by the Kaiser for another hereditary ruler as well. • In addition, it had always been Bismarck’s policy to work closely with Austria after its defeat in 1866. • German military thinking, as the Schlieffen Plan showed, assigned a key role to the Austrian army in withstanding any Russian advance from the South East. • Though Italy joined the dual alliance, Germany did not consider them a reliable ally. 	10
3(b)	<p>‘Austria must take the blame for causing the First World War.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>There is a strong case to be made for the hypothesis for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria was determined not only to hold on to the territories which it had gained in the Balkans from the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, but also to expand in the region. • It was determined to repress emergent liberal and nationalist movements in the Balkans for its own domestic reasons, as there were many ‘subject’ peoples within the Austrian Empire. • There was a lack of organisation surrounding the Archduke’s visit to Sarajevo; had care been taken, the outcome could have been avoided. • Reaction to the death led to assumptions about the role of the Serbs which were incorrect. While some Austrian ministers advised caution, the Emperor agreed an ultimatum which all knew would be unacceptable to the Serbs and would lead to war. • There was no serious consideration of what the implications might be of a declaration of war against Serbia. <p>On the other hand a variety of factors could be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘blank cheque’ gave them enormous confidence; it is possible that without it and the Kaiser’s guarantee, there would have been no attack on Serbia. • Russia’s decision to mobilise was unwise under the circumstances. • Once the German Schlieffen Plan started rolling into action, there was little that anyone could do. • Wider issues such as imperial rivalry, the arms race, public opinion and the various Alliances and Ententes might also be considered. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1166 282">Why did the Provisional Government become so unpopular?</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 1297 416">Several factors can be considered, some for which the Provisional Government must be held responsible, and others which were linked to the legacy left to them by the Tsar.</p> <ul data-bbox="316 450 1310 931" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 450 1286 517">• There was high inflation and a real shortage of resources, both for the army and the civilian population.<li data-bbox="316 517 1206 584">• There were poor working conditions for industrial workers which provided ample fuel for opponents on the Left.<li data-bbox="316 584 1254 651">• Law and order had largely broken down in the countryside and land seizures by the peasantry were widespread.<li data-bbox="316 651 1310 752">• The decision was taken to remain in the war. This imposed huge strains on the Russian people and morale within the armed services was exceptionally low.<li data-bbox="316 752 1238 819">• The management of the Kornilov affair showed incompetence and indecision.<li data-bbox="316 819 1302 931">• The government of Kerensky lacked legitimacy and proved increasingly incapable of solving the issues of 'Peace, Bread and Land' which Lenin identified so well.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p>‘Political incompetence, rather than poor social and economic conditions, led to the 1905 Revolution.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>It could be argued that it was more political incompetence that led to the immediate outbreak, but the deeper causes were the poor social and economic conditions.</p> <p>‘Political’ factors might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision to fight the Japanese when the army was totally unprepared to fight a seriously underrated enemy. • The mismanagement of the protest by Father Gapon. • There was a total absence on the part of the regime to contemplate any change in how Russia was governed. • The Russification policy, which was the direct responsibility of the Tsar, led to areas like Poland, the Ukraine and Georgia joining in the Revolution. <p>However, there were a large number of other factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aristocratic control of the army and navy, with low morale, low pay and miserable conditions for the ordinary soldier and sailor, led to the mutinies. • The legacy of emancipation was still causing serious problems in the countryside. There was often real hunger caused by a basically subsistence rural economy. • Factory and urban living conditions were often appalling and were breeding grounds for social unrest and gave ample scope to left wing agitators. <p>Both factors are interconnected, and with more enlightened leadership and better treatment of the mass of the population, the outbreak could have been avoided.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p>Why did the USA sign the Washington naval treaties?</p> <p>The USA signed the Washington naval treaties for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political pressure for disarmament within the USA led by the Republicans such as Senator Borah, an isolationist from Idaho. • Desire to avoid another naval arms race, similar to that which occurred before the First World War. • Desire to break the UK-Japan cooperation in the Western Pacific. Japan and the UK were the USA's two main rivals in the region and had been allied since 1902. • Desire to limit Japanese militarism and thus provide some support for the newly-democratised China, which the USA favoured. 	10
5(b)	<p>How beneficial to the USA was the acquisition of Alaska in 1867?</p> <p>The USA paid Russia \$7.2 m in 1867 to acquire 'Russian America'. ['Alaska' is Inuit for 'great land'.] Russia initiated talks but the US government was also keen to buy, and most US newspapers welcomed the acquisition as well. 'Seward's Folly' is a misleading label.</p> <p>US expansionists of the time saw the acquisition as beneficial. Their arguments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It strengthened the US presence in both North America – linking with manifest destiny, containing the potential threat of British Canada – and the Pacific Ocean. • It would provide naval bases and refuelling stations on the way from 'mainland' USA to East Asia. [That expectation of 1867 was never fulfilled. Pearl Harbor in Hawaii had this role.] These facilities would help improve US trade across the Pacific. <p>Thus the benefits of Alaska were initially strategic rather than material. In the first census [1880], only 1.2% of the 33 000 people living in Alaska were white settlers, and only in 1899 was gold discovered in Alaska.</p> <p>Arguments that the acquisition of Alaska was not beneficial to the USA include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquiring Alaska made the USA an expansionist, imperialist state, which went against the best traditions of the USA. • Governing Alaska would be a drain on the US Treasury. [It was not a great expense in practice because so few people lived there, most of them Native Alaskans.] <p>In reality, the location of Alaska meant it was not at risk of other nineteenth century powers wishing to govern it. The benefits of owning Alaska became real only in the 20th century.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p>Why was Radical Reconstruction introduced?</p> <p>Radical Reconstruction was the set of policies associated with the Republican party in the US Congress and especially with Senator Charles Sumner. Thus it is sometimes called Congressional Reconstruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They wanted equal civil and voting rights for ex-slaves [male only] when moderate Republicans did not. Thus the 15th Amendment to the constitution. • They wanted harsher treatment of the former Confederate states. Thus the 1867 Reconstruction Act and the imposition of military rule on most Southern states. <p>These policies were introduced because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congress was in dispute with President Johnson, who was encouraging Southern states to resist reforms, e.g. by refusing to approve the 14th Amendment. • The 1866 Congressional elections were a defeat for Johnson’s attempt to win in the North via his ‘swing around the circle’, which was counter-productive. <p>The election increased Republican support in both houses of Congress, giving them the ability to override the presidential veto.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	<p>How far did the political aims of the North change during the course of the Civil War?</p> <p>The aims certainly changed. The crucial issues are how and how far. Responses are likely to focus on the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863.</p> <p>Evidence that the political aims of the North changed radically during the Civil War include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1861–62, few in the North wanted the abolition of slavery. In 1865, the US Congress passed the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery. [Enough states did so by the end of 1865.] This was a radical shift in political aims. • In 1861–62, most in the North simply wanted to end the rebellion of the CSA and to restore the unity of the USA. In 1865, many Northerners wanted the South to change its way of life by recognising the end of slavery. • In broad terms, the North was still prepared for some kind of compromise settlement at the start of the war; by the end, it was determined to impose a harsher settlement. <p>Evidence that the political aims of the North did not change radically during the Civil War include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main aim remained that of defeating the rebellion of the South. • The ending of slavery was simply a means of defeating that rebellion, which was proving more stubborn and more successful than had been expected. • The Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 was a cautious, war-focused initiative, e.g. it exempted the four Border States, all slave-owning, to stop those states changing side. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p>Why was the Prohibition Amendment to the Constitution passed in 1919?</p> <p>Reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US involvement in the First World War: firstly, prohibition would divert grain from brewing to war production. • US involvement in the First World War: secondly, the brewing industry was dominated by Germans. • The influence of pro-prohibition groups, both Christian and single-interest. • The campaign against saloons, a key feature of Northern industrial towns. Many were centres for new immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe, many of them Catholics. Thus there was a nativist element to the prohibition movement. • The role of women, receiving the vote around that time, was especially important: defending the family and the home against alcohol. <p>Thus there was a mixture of long-term and short-term factors.</p>	10
7(b)	<p>How important to the industrialisation of the USA in the later nineteenth century were the contributions of ‘robber barons’?</p> <p>‘Robber barons’ was a term of criticism and abuse of leading industrialists and financiers including Andrew Carnegie [steel], Jay Gould [railroads], J P Morgan [steel], J D Rockefeller [kerosene oil] and Cornelius Vanderbilt [railroads and shipping].</p> <p>Evidence that these business leaders were important to the industrialisation process includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They developed US-wide companies which benefited from the single and growing market that was the USA. • They developed new models of business organisation, e.g. trusts, integration – vertical or horizontal – to provide economies of scale and thus greater productivity. • They provided financial support for federal government at times of financial crisis, e.g. J P Morgan and the crises of 1893 and 1907. [Note: there was no Federal Reserve until 1913.] <p>Evidence that these business leaders were not important to the industrialisation process includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They were more concerned with dominating and controlling key parts of the economy in their own interests rather than benefiting American industry. They discouraged competition rather than encouraging it. • Other factors were more important, whether technological innovation or the growth of the industrial workforce. <p>The term itself was a term of abuse used by the progressive left to gain popular support. Whilst robber barons benefited themselves, they could at the same time aid industrialisation.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p>Why was there a Great Crash in October 1929?</p> <p>Key reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic growth of the 1920s created a growth in stock prices which exceeded the basic value of the products and profits of relevant companies. This was a financial bubble. • Much of the growth in stock market prices was based on ‘buying on margin’, i.e. borrowing most of the finance needed to buy the shares. • The Federal Reserve, along with other central banks, cut interest rates in 1927, making it cheaper to borrow. Just at this time economic growth was slowing down. Money was invested in the stock market rather than encouraging economic growth. • Mass psychology. More people – and companies and banks – followed the markets as stock prices rose in the late 1920s in the belief that stock prices would continue to rise. Once the bubble burst, investors who were greatly dependent upon borrowed funds for their investments had to sell shares as soon as possible to repay debts and minimise losses. <p>The Great Crash was predominantly the inevitable working of the business cycle, but was made worse by the over-optimism of the 1920s.</p>	10
8(b)	<p>How far do you agree that Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal undermined the traditional values of the USA?</p> <p>Evidence that FDR’s New Deal undermined the traditional values of the USA includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The greater reliance on the federal state to address the USA’s economic and social problems, e.g. the various alphabet agencies, the Social Security Act, the minimum wage. • The support provided for labour unions, e.g. the Wagner Act, put collectivism before individualism. • The unconstitutional nature of some New Deal agencies, e.g. NIRA. • The New Deal economy was an over-regulated state which discouraged individual enterprise and undermined laissez faire and the free market economy. <p>Arguments that the New Deal did not undermine traditional US values include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key value of constitutional government was maintained: FDR worked within the limits of law. • The New Deal aimed to help local communities, especially rural, which were at the heart of American values, e.g. rural electrification. • The New Deal aimed to repair the weaknesses revealed in the traditional laissez faire economy in previous decades, e.g. capitalism working for the few, not the many. <p>Thus the New Deal was evolutionary rather than revolutionary, aiming to reform the US economy and society rather than replace them.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 979 282">Why did Germany develop the Schlieffen Plan?</p> <p data-bbox="316 315 1291 416">Following its unification in 1871, Germany was concerned about facing the prospect of war on more than one front. Bismarck's elaborate system of alliances had been designed to prevent this.</p> <ul data-bbox="316 454 1302 965" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 454 1302 555">• After Bismarck's dismissal in 1890, Kaiser Wilhelm II embarked on a more aggressive foreign policy, allowing the Reinsurance Treaty to lapse. The threat of war on two fronts was, therefore, renewed.<li data-bbox="316 555 1302 622">• The Schlieffen Plan was designed to enable Germany to cope with any future war in which it was threatened by both France and Russia.<li data-bbox="316 622 1302 723">• The plan assumed that France could be defeated relatively quickly, leaving Germany free to concentrate on the eastern front against Russia.<li data-bbox="316 723 1302 790">• Also that Russia, being such a large country, would take longer to mobilise its forces and take longer to defeat than France.<li data-bbox="316 790 1302 891">• In the event of any future war, therefore, Germany would launch a pre-emptive strike against France through Belgium, defeat it quickly and then deal with the threat of Russia.<li data-bbox="316 891 1302 965">• The Plan was, therefore, initially defensive – to protect Germany in the event of any future war.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1142 315">To what extent was the ‘Scramble for Africa’ caused by the development of nationalism in Europe?</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1150 383">The late nineteenth century was a period of intense nationalism.</p> <ul data-bbox="316 421 1302 999" style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments believed that the development of large overseas empires was essential to enhancing their countries’ wealth, power, pride and international prestige. • Gaining African possessions became a matter of national pride. This was clearly demonstrated when Britain and France almost went to war over the Fashoda incident. • Similarly, when Germany joined the race for African territory later than the other main European nations, it gained territories which were of no practical use; indeed, they cost Germany considerably more than they were worth. • With no possibility of expanding in Europe itself, Africa offered the perfect opportunity for European nations to play out their international rivalry. • Imperialist adventurers, such as Cecil Rhodes, provided the inspiration for the scramble for Africa. • European governments were determined to protect their countries’ rights and interests and public opinion demanded that they did so. <p data-bbox="316 1037 1254 1104">Other factors might also be considered as significant in the scramble for Africa:</p> <ul data-bbox="316 1137 1310 1749" style="list-style-type: none"> • The rapid increase in the production of manufactured goods associated with the European Industrial Revolution created a need for more raw materials, new markets and greater investment opportunities. Africa offered the potential for all three. • Medical advances had made it possible for explorers to open up access to the African interior. • The local people could not defend themselves against European forces equipped with modern weaponry. • Railways and steamships made transport to and from the African interior effective enough to exploit Africa’s raw materials. • Control of African territory was also of strategic value. For example, control over southern Africa provided Britain with a key port on its trading route to India, while control over Egypt enabled it to shorten the route by the development of the Suez Canal. • Bismarck, determined to avoid conflict with other European nations, had initially kept Germany out of the race for African land. He only relented under pressure from German businessmen determined to exploit the potential wealth of Africa. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1286 282">Why, in 1932–33, did the World Disarmament Conference take place?</p> <ul data-bbox="316 320 1313 931" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 320 1313 421">• Under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the other treaties which emerged from the Paris Peace Conference, all of Europe’s leading powers had committed themselves to arms reduction.<li data-bbox="316 421 1313 488">• This commitment was re-affirmed when they agreed to the Covenant of the League of Nations.<li data-bbox="316 488 1313 555">• By 1932, no country, with the enforced exception of Germany, had honoured this commitment.<li data-bbox="316 555 1313 656">• The World Disarmament Conference was intended to address this issue, in the hope of avoiding the type of arms race that had characterised the build-up to World War I.<li data-bbox="316 656 1313 723">• The Conference was called by member states of the League of Nations, together with the USA.<li data-bbox="316 723 1313 824">• Germany had insisted that either other countries comply with their commitment to disarm or else Germany should be allowed to re-arm in order to guarantee its own security.<li data-bbox="316 824 1313 931">• A Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference was established in 1925, with the aim of gaining some agreement before the Conference actually met.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	<p>'The problems which confronted the 'successor states' during the 1930s were caused by economic rather than political factors.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Economic factors might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With most of its industrially productive areas given to Poland and Czechoslovakia by the Treaty of Saint-Germain, Austria experienced enormous economic difficulties. It became increasingly reliant on foreign loans, and inflation ran high throughout the 1920s, leading to political instability. • Similarly, Hungary had lost around two thirds of its population and much of its industrially productive land to Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia, making it largely economically unviable. • Infrastructure which had worked within empires was now fragmented by national boundaries and did not work effectively for the new states. • While Poland and Yugoslavia were created with the potential to be economically viable, they lacked the political stability to fully exploit it. • The only successor state which managed to maintain a democratic form of government was Czechoslovakia; this was because it was blessed with raw materials, rich agricultural land and productive industries, and it remained relatively prosperous throughout the 1920s. <p>On the other hand, political issues might arise because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problems faced by Austria and Hungary came largely as a result of the political decision taken at the Paris Peace Conference to treat them as defeated nations; it was for this reason that they lost so much of their land and populations, which, in turn, led to economic fragility. • The newly created successor states suffered problems because Wilson's commitment to self-determination was not as straightforward as he had envisaged. His belief that nationality could be gauged by language was too simplistic for the complicated situation in Eastern Europe, where there was a multitude of ethnic groupings, all with conflicting ambitions. Yugoslavia, for example, became home to Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Magyars, Germans, Albanians, Romanians and Macedonians, making religious and ethnic disputes inevitable and democracy untenable. • Of Poland's population of 27 million, only 18 million were Poles. With fourteen political parties, democracy failed and the country became a military dictatorship in 1926. • Suffering from economic problems, most Austrians believed that their only hope was union with Germany, which had been expressly forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles. • Attempts at democracy failed in both Austria and Hungary. • All of the successor states were involved in border disputes; these were inevitable given the multi-ethnic composition of their populations and their need to secure political and economic stability. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	<p>Why, by 1936, did many Spanish generals believe that military dictatorship was the only solution to Spain's problems?</p> <p>In the 1920s, Spain was very divided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were many separatist movements seeking independence for their regions. Weak governments had resulted from these divisions. • Spain faced massive economic problems following the Wall Street Crash. • The elections of 1931 left the Republicans in charge. The Socialist government of Azana embarked on a series of reforms, which infuriated the army, the Church, wealthy landowners and industrialists but upset many left-wing groups who felt that the reforms did not go far enough. • The effects of the Great Depression made it difficult for any government to work effectively. • In the elections of 1933, right-wing groups gained an overall majority and the CEDA became the main party. It cancelled Azana's reforms, which unified left-wing opposition, forming the Popular Front. • In elections of 1936, the Popular Front became the strongest party. It also proved incapable of maintaining order in Spain. • When, in July 1936, a leading right-wing politician (Calvo Sotelo) was killed by police, army leaders decided that Spain needed a military dictatorship to deal with the escalating violence and disruption in Spain. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	<p>To what extent was Mussolini’s foreign policy based on fear of Italy being isolated and vulnerable?</p> <p>As the only fascist state in Europe, Italy was in real danger of being isolated and, therefore, vulnerable. Realising this, Mussolini adopted a diplomatic approach to foreign policy in the period before 1934:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He established friendly relations with Greece, Hungary and Albania. • He ensured good relations with Britain and France; in particular, he played a key role at the Locarno Conference in 1925. • Mussolini sent troops to the Austrian border to prevent Hitler’s ambitions of securing Anschluss in 1934. This gained the admiration of other European nations, especially France. • After 1934, Mussolini adopted a more aggressive foreign policy, but with the same objective when it became clear from their reactions to Hitler that Britain and France would do little to oppose him. Mussolini now saw an alliance with Hitler’s Germany as offering greater security to Italy while also enabling him to achieve a much needed propaganda boost. • The alliance with Germany, formally expressed in the Rome-Berlin Axis of 1936, provided Italy with security, but also the opportunity to carry out his long-promised nationalistic ambitions. <p>Alternatively, the proclaimed aim of Mussolini’s foreign policy was to make Italy ‘great, feared and respected’ (while also ensuring that he remained in power).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His actions in Fiume and Corfu as early as 1923 demonstrated the aggressive nature of his foreign policy, and his determination to restore Italy’s prestige following its humiliating treatment in the Paris Peace Settlement. • Also, Corfu was strategically placed to challenge Britain’s naval control of the Mediterranean – a sea which he described as ‘Mare Nostrum’. • An aggressive foreign policy was essential in order to satisfy the nationalistic fervour which his own propaganda had fostered within Italy. • The take-over of Abyssinia, which was of little value to Italy, provided him with a vital propaganda boost. • Similarly, he was able to boast of Italy’s military power as a result of its involvement in the Spanish Civil War, involvement which helped to over-stretch the Italian economy. • The ‘invasion’ of Albania in 1939 was another propaganda exercise; it achieved nothing, since Albania had long been effectively under Italian control. • To Mussolini, an alliance with Hitler’s Germany seemed the perfect way to enhance Italy’s power and prestige, while simultaneously enhancing his own domestic popularity. 	20

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1294 315">Why did Japan attempt to increase its power and influence in eastern Asia in the period from 1931 to 1941?</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1310 450">With economic problems increasing following the Wall Street Crash in 1929, the people of Japan, facing severe economic hardship and lacking faith in constitutional government, became increasingly nationalistic.</p> <ul data-bbox="316 488 1310 1025" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 488 1310 589">• Japan was a small, resource-poor nation. It needed new territory in order to secure vital resources. Manchuria, for example, was rich in iron ore and coal deposits.<li data-bbox="316 589 1310 723">• With the collapse of democratic government, Japan had effectively become a military dictatorship. Many army leaders called for further action against China, exploiting its weakness to the benefit of the Japanese economy.<li data-bbox="316 723 1310 857">• When World War II broke out in 1939, many of Japan’s military leaders believed that this provided Japan with similar opportunities to those which had greatly benefitted the Japanese economy during World War I.<li data-bbox="316 857 1310 925">• German invasion of the USSR removed fears of opposition from that country.<li data-bbox="316 925 1310 1025">• With European nations heavily involved in the war and the USA still following an isolationist policy, there seemed to be nothing to stop Japan expanding further.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
12(b)	<p>'By 1935, the Kuomintang had achieved complete control over China.' How far do you agree?</p> <p>Beginning in 1926, the KMT's Northern Expedition aimed to destroy the power of the regional warlords and create a unified China under a KMT government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the end of 1926, the KMT had defeated two warlord armies and gained control of all land in China south of the Yangtze River. • KMT forces continued northwards, taking control of Hankow, Shanghai and Nanking during 1927. • Peking fell to KMT troops in 1928. By the end of 1928, Chiang Kai-shek was the political and military leader of a re-unified China. • The threat posed by the CCP to the KMT's control was effectively removed by the Purification Movement, which began in 1927. • Although Mao Zedong was elected Chairman of the Soviet Republic of China in 1931, he controlled only a small area and faced opposition to his leadership from within the CCP. • The KMT carried out five 'extermination campaigns' against Mao's communists between 1930 and 1934. By 1934, therefore, the CCP posed no real threat. Indeed, in 1934 Mao was forced to retreat, commencing the Long March. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all of the warlords had been defeated during the Northern Expedition. • The KMT government proved a disappointment to the majority of the Chinese population. It soon became clear that the KMT government was both inefficient and corrupt and it was clearly protecting the interests of businessmen, bankers, and wealthy factory/land owners. • The promise of social reform and land redistribution came to nothing. • By 1934, therefore, the KMT was unpopular with the majority of the Chinese people and Mao was eventually able to capitalise on the KMT's growing unpopularity. • Despite early successes, the KMT was unable to prevent the Long March reaching Shensi Province and developing large-scale support in the process. • When Japanese troops established control over Manchuria in 1931, Chiang's KMT adopted a policy of non-resistance which proved unpopular with the Chinese people. <p>Increasingly unpopular and threatened by the continuing power of warlords, the CCP and foreign invaders, the KMT's control over China was far from complete by 1934.</p>	20