
HISTORY

9389/21

Paper 2 Outline Study 21

May/June 2016

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.



Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	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 lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported. They are fluent and well organised.

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

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

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

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.

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

Answers 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 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 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1814

(a) Why was Napoleon able to become First Consul? [10]

The French had become tired of 'rule by coup' and the attendant political instability. With the election of many royalist deputies in 1797 there was a genuine concern for the gains of the revolution and a growing disillusion with democracy. The confused results of the election of 1798 further aroused anxiety which Napoleon played on. His own military record looked useful, particularly as there had been military failings elsewhere. A free press encouraged radicalism which led again to a desire for stability and a more authoritarian system along the lines which had run France for centuries. His timing was excellent and he had good propaganda skills and an excellent grasp of the social, economic and political situation. With the astute constitutional work of Sieyes he had a great asset there as well.

(b) To what extent were Robespierre and the Jacobins responsible for the political instability in France between 1789 and 1795? [20]

Certainly they were an important factor. Their radicalism in so many areas alienated moderate opinion and gave ammunition to the counter-revolutionaries. The Terror brought chaos to both the centre and the regions, and the scope for any common ground from those in favour of reform was seriously diminished by their actions. However, there was a huge range of other causes which could be considered. The attitude and role of the King until his death were major factors and made the likelihood of any constitutional settlement almost impossible. There were active opponents of any change to the Ancien Régime and there was, of course, the attitude of Austria and Prussia. There was widespread hunger and social unrest. What Paris wanted and what the regions wanted could differ fundamentally. It could also be argued that, given the state of France in 1789 with the huge range of social, economic and political problems that it faced, the chance of any stability at all was unlikely.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1890

(a) Explain why the Industrial Revolution affected the standard of living. [10]

A variety of central factors could be considered. Real wages certainly rose and fell in different areas and for different reasons. Earlier agricultural changes had made a major impact on diet and population rose as a result. However, the decline in infant mortality led to larger families which in itself had an impact on the standard of living. In some cases housing improved, but the transition from a rural to an urban slum was often not a beneficial process. Diseases such as cholera thrived better in an urban environment. Regular factory wages could be an improvement on a subsistence existence, but economic recession could cause devastation to an area dependent on a single industry. The effect on a growing middle class could be dramatic and further up the social scale those aristocrats who did invest could reap huge benefits. For many there was a dramatic improvement, but not all the benefits flowed equally downwards.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

- (b) 'Without changes in transport there would have been no industrial revolution.' How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries in your answer. [20]

There is a good case to argue here as without the ability to move materials in bulk there might have been some industrial change, but never anything that amounted to a 'revolution'. Some consideration of what might, or might not, constitute a 'revolution' could be included. The key changes in transport do need to be reflected on and their impact on the whole process of industrial change. Canals made bulk transport possible, moving raw materials inland, finished products out and bringing in the necessary energy supplies such as coal. Canals were such massive enterprises that they led to the growth of the joint stock company and were also a great stimulus to banking and capitalism generally as well as huge employers. The railways provided even greater stimulus to the whole process and, of course, had an insatiable demand for iron, coal and steel. Roads and shipping could also be covered. The focus could well be on what transport changes made possible. Other factors which were of equal or possibly greater importance, such as agricultural change, the role of government and entrepreneurs and, of course, of technological advances, could be considered as well. Without a growing population and increasing markets and sources of raw materials, there possibly could have been no 'revolution' either.

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

- (a) Why did the Germans develop the Schlieffen Plan? [10]

The primary reason was to manage the threat of the 'war on two fronts'. Germany felt it could not deal with a joint attack by both Russia and France at the same time. Thinking that Russia would be slow to mobilise, the Plan envisaged a knockout blow against France first. Then using the efficient German rail system, they would transfer the troops to the east to defeat the Russians. It was to play a key role in committing Germany to an offensive strategy in 1914, and also was influential in creating the mind-set that there would be a war with both France and Russia. The draftees never really considered the political implications of going through Belgium, or the possibility of having a conflict in the East without one in the West. It also had to be done without a prior declaration of war, which again had major implications, and the absence of the means of actually stopping it once the button had been pushed was also to prove a serious issue. The whole problem of the 'war by timetable' had not been thought through and was a classic case of narrowly focused military strategists having a major and damaging effect on policy. The fact that it did not actually work could also be considered, although it needs to be made relevant to the key issue of why the Plan was developed.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

- (b) ‘The naval race was an important cause of the First World War.’ How far do you agree? [20]**

It could well be argued that it was to play a key role. It certainly raised a great deal of tension between Germany and Britain and had a serious impact on politicians, the mass media and the public generally. The growth of the patriotic ginger groups like the Navy Leagues were to play a part in raising tension and helping to generate the idea that Germany/Britain was the ‘enemy’. The growth of an arms industry followed with the usual military/industrial complex issues arising. It was to lead to the Anglo-French military conversations and played a major role in reducing the tension between Britain and France which Fashoda showed to be really latent. With the agreement that the French would focus on the Mediterranean in fleet strength, with the British looking after the North Sea, it was to play a major role in pulling the two nations together which was to have major implications in British and French thinking in the crisis days of 1914. Obviously there is a huge range of other factors which could be considered and contrasted with, and there should be some focus on them as part of the answer in order to ensure balance.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1894–1917

- (a) Why did World War I damage the Tsar’s position? [10]**

It was very much the Tsar’s decision to take Russia into the war. He was determined to recover from the humiliation of the Japanese war. It was a military disaster from the very early stages as Tannenburg and the Masurian Lakes showed. Later offensives failed as well. The failure of the supply system crippled the army; there were acute shortages of nearly every essential for campaigning. Soldiers starved and lacked rifles. Grain piled up in depots which could not be transported. Taking personal command from the front led to his taking personal blame for failure and not his Generals. The loyalty of the army to the regime ended and inflation and shortages eroded what support he had on the home front. His supporters became isolated and eventually moderate opinion felt that there was no alternative to abdication. The war demonstrated all too clearly he was not up to the job.

- (b) ‘The 1905 Revolution had little impact.’ How far do you agree with this view? [20]**

There is definitely a case to be argued here. The fact that the Tsar felt he could get away with only very limited concessions, and then renege on them, was to be significant. Much of the political elite failed to notice quite how profound the unrest was and what was needed to settle it, and that again was to be significant. However, in other ways it was important. The Dumas and the other freedoms were seen as a step forward. The work of Witte and Stolypin was to follow, some of which could be seen to have been as ways in which potential revolution could be avoided. It was to have an influence on both those who desired constitutional change and on the more radical left who moved towards more extreme solutions to Russian political problems. It could be seen as having limited impact in areas such as the social structure and the economy, and as a result was to push Russia more emphatically down the path to revolution.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	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) Explain why the European great powers did not formally take sides in the American Civil War. [10]

The two great powers most likely to intervene in the Civil War in 1861–65 were Britain and France, though Russia was involved as well. There was pressure on the great powers to intervene in terms of self-interest – UK cotton trade, especially given the North's naval blockade, France cotton and Mexico – and for humanitarian reasons, especially as the war dragged on and became bloodier. There was some European sympathy for the South; in October 1862 Gladstone, a UK government minister, said that the South was developing into a nation. UK relations with the North were strained by the *Trent* affair in November 1861 but the US backed down. There was never any question of military or naval intervention, however; you might have thought the latter was possible, given the UK's need for raw cotton, but this was never considered. Britain quickly declared both sides to be belligerents and thus subject to the laws of war, such as they were. As the war continued, Britain and France began to think of mediation, which is another reason why they avoided taking sides. The summer of 1862 was the time when Britain and France came closest to intervening as cotton supplies were hit and the war became more of a stalemate, but the Emancipation Proclamation of September 1862 caused the UK to be more sympathetic to the North. Britain and France, though usually united, never really considered taking sides. Britain in particular wanted to be able to trade with both North and South.

- (b) 'The Washington Naval Treaties were a great triumph for US diplomacy.' How far do you agree? [20]

The Washington Naval Treaties were a set of three treaties concerning international relations in the Pacific: Four Power, Five Power and Nine Power. Strictly, only the Five Power Treaty addressed naval issues. The UK, USA, Japan, France and Italy agreed to fix the size of their battleship fleets in the ratio 5 – 5 – 3 – 1.75 – 1.75 respectively. To do so involved scrapping some existing ships and agreeing to a ten-year holiday on building new warships. This meant there was no danger of the pre-war naval race occurring for the time being.

The Four Power Treaty was an agreement between the UK, USA, Japan and France to accept the status quo in the Pacific and to refer any disputes to collective diplomacy. The main significance of this treaty was that it meant the end of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902. This had been a major concern of the USA which saw Japan as an aggressive force in the Far East; an alliance with Britain risked isolating the USA in times of crisis. The Nine Power Treaty concerned China. Nine countries, including China and Japan, agreed to maintain an Open Door policy towards China, thereby curbing the possibility of Japanese expansionism, for example, in Manchuria.

The treaties were a great triumph for the USA in terms of process. The Conference of 1921–22 was the first international conference held in Washington DC. The USA gave a strong lead to negotiations by establishing at the start, in a meeting open to the public, detailed proposals for naval disarmament. The treaties raised questions about the extent to which the USA was isolationist. There were limits to the success of US diplomacy. The naval treaty covered battleships only. Germany and the USSR were absent. Collective agreements on paper were not always obeyed in practice and none of the treaties contained any mechanism for enforcing their terms. Signed in the early 1920s at a time of strong opposition to militarism

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

following the First World War, the treaties were not strong enough to survive in the more troubled times of the 1930s.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why were Congress and the Presidency so deeply divided over the Reconstruction of the South so soon after winning the Civil War? [10]

The short answer to this question is because Congress was composed of Northern Republicans while the President, Andrew Johnson, was a [War] Democrat from Tennessee; though from 1864 to 1868 he labelled himself a National Unionist, as had Lincoln for the 1864 election. The two Congresses at the time of the Johnson presidency were the 39th and 40th. The Republicans had a supermajority in both Houses in both Congresses. Many Congressmen and Senators called themselves Radical Republicans, opposed to Slave Power in all its forms. Even before the end of the war, even with Lincoln as President, there was conflict between Congress and the President as Lincoln vetoed the Wade-Davis Bill on Reconstruction. Andrew Johnson vetoed no less than 21 bills he received from Congress. Congress in turn overrode that veto for 15 of the 21 bills. Johnson wanted to impose limited change on the South after the war; Congress wanted to impose much harsher demands, for example, punishment of Southern war leaders. The conflict became so bitter that Congress found an excuse to impeach Johnson, the first-ever use of this form of political trial in US history. Once Johnson had been replaced by Ulysses Grant in 1869, the conflict ended.

(b) How far do you agree that, during the Civil War, the military and political leadership of the South was always inferior to that of the North? [20]

Key names for political leadership include Lincoln and Johnson vs. Davis. Military leadership involved Scott/McClellan/Halleck and Grant as Generals-in-Chief vs Lee and Jackson – though candidates are likely to concentrate on the better known names. At the start, the Southern leadership was stronger in that Jefferson Davis had considerable military experience, having fought in the war against Mexico in 1846–48 and being Secretary of War in 1853–57, while Lincoln had almost none. In addition, the South had Robert E Lee as the leader of its army in Northern Virginia, where many of the early battles were fought. Lincoln's military commanders tended to be cautious and ineffectual, which caused him frustration and Northern leadership additional problems. By 1864, however, he found his man, Ulysses Grant, who provided the dynamic, aggressive campaigning Lincoln believed necessary.

Lincoln grew into his role as President, as evidenced by the Emancipation Proclamation and the Gettysburg Address, while Davis proved less effective as the leader of the South. As a leader of his cabinet, he was much less effective than Lincoln and his leadership of a 'team of rivals'. And Davis, as an ex-military man, was prone to interfere too much in the making of strategy. Though Robert E Lee remained the key military leader of the Confederacy, he was not appointed as General-in-Chief until January 1865, by which time the war had been lost. Andrew Johnson became the new President a few months later, but his leadership made little difference at this late stage – even if it did have a great effect on post-war Reconstruction. The key word in the question is 'always'. In the last year of the war, the statement is undoubtedly true. In the first three years, the superiority of Northern leadership was much less obvious.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

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

(a) Explain why the prohibition movement gained increased support in the early twentieth century. [10]

The prohibition movement gained its immediate goal with the passage of the 18th Amendment in 1917–19 banning the manufacture, distribution, sale and importation of intoxicating liquors. Attempts to ban the sale of alcohol had been around for most of the nineteenth century, gaining support in the 1880s and 1890s. The Anti-Saloon League, formed in 1895, became the main organisation calling for prohibition. The title of this group is significant. Saloons were almost as much the focus of the campaign as was alcohol. Saloons were centres of corrupt and often violent activities, especially in the rapidly-expanding cities of the North. They were seen as being linked to the power of party bosses and the dominance of machine politics. Thus the campaign for prohibition gained most support from the rural West, from women, who were also campaigning for the vote at the time, from nativists against new immigrant communities, from Protestant churches especially.

The movement gained more support from 1902 after Wayne Wheeler became the leader of the Anti-Saloon League. Under his leadership, the ASL worked within the two-party system, encouraging people to vote across party lines for the 'dry' candidate. And when in April 1917 the USA joined the First World War, prohibitionists used patriotism to gain more support. Grain used to brew alcohol could be better used in the war effort. Most leading brewers were German-Americans. By the end of 1917, Congress had passed the 18th Amendment. It took another thirteen months to gain the approval of enough states. One year later, prohibition came into effect.

(b) How far was the industrialisation of the USA in the later nineteenth century founded on laissez-faire beliefs and policies? [20]

Laissez faire means limited government intervention in the economy, leaving the private sector, individual enterprise and the profit motive to ensure supplies of goods and services. Developed from Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*, this belief became the conventional wisdom of public policy in Britain and the USA in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Governments lacked the knowledge and expertise to run the economy. However, there was one area of the economy which the private sector developed only with the help of the public sector, namely the transcontinental railroads which were so important to making the USA a single market. The Pacific Railroad Act of 1864 granted the companies constructing the first transcontinental lines 20 square miles of land for every mile of completed rail track. In total some 130 million acres were given to railroad companies. This was a massive subsidy without which the railroads could not have been built. New railroads required more iron and steel, which stimulated these industries as well as coal mining.

There was another area of economic life which relied on government assistance and that was international trade. The new industrial companies required protection from more established foreign competitors such as those in the UK. Thus Republican governments imposed high tariffs on industrial imports throughout the period. Finally, the currency policy of the government affected industrialisation. Late 19th century governments listened more to financial interests of the East in following a sound money policy, which helped enable imports of foreign capital, especially British, to build the factories which were the essence of industrialisation. Without pro-business government policies, business would have taken longer to develop manufacturing industries.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941

- (a) Explain the reasons for the economic boom experienced by most Americans in the 1920s. [10]

The combination of lower taxes following the war and new ways of raising money, such as the development of hire-purchase, led to a steady growth in demand by the American consumer. Consumers had money. There was a plentiful supply of new goods and services which the consumer was persuaded to buy. Henry Ford's assembly production methods became widely copied. Electricity became more widespread as the main source of light and power. As well as cars, radios and refrigerators became very popular while silent films provided a new form of mass entertainment. Some of their income consumers invested in the stock-market, buying on the margin, gaining a greater sense of prosperity – at least until the Great Crash arrived. External factors also helped. By the mid-1920s, the economies of Europe were more prosperous and the citizens of Europe looked to America to provide the latest goods and services. Thus there was a range of relevant factors, on both the supply and the demand side of the economy.

- (b) 'The right-wing opposition to Roosevelt's New Deal was more effective than left-wing opposition.' How far do you agree? [20]

The leading left-wing opponents – Father Coughlin, Francis Townsend and Huey Long – are better remembered than the American Liberty League and the 'Old Right' Conservative Coalition of the later 1930s. Coughlin established a National Union for Social Justice in 1934 and a third party to contest the 1936 presidential elections. Francis Townsend gained national publicity for his proposal to introduce Social Security for the old. Long set up his Share Our Wealth movement in 1934, arguing for progressive taxation and great redistribution of wealth.

As well as personalities such as Coughlin, Townsend and Long, institutions such as labour unions should also be included. There was more labour unrest in the 1930s than is often remembered. This left-wing pressure, even though uncoordinated, was at its height during the First New Deal. There would seem to be a close connection between that left-wing pressure and the more radical Second New Deal of 1935–36, which did include Social Security reform and the Wagner Act. Only Townsend remained to influence New Deal legislation in FDR's second term, helping to persuade Congress to extend Social Security to include dependents of retired workers. Long had been assassinated in 1935 and Coughlin became more concerned with opposing communism.

The most organised and most public right-wing opposition to the New Deal was the American Liberty League, set up in 1934. It combined conservatives Democrats and some leading industrialists and some popular support for private enterprise, which these groups felt was being eroded by the New Deal. Once FDR was re-elected in 1936, the American Liberty League lost support and soon disbanded. However, in Congress at least, conservative Democrats started to work across the aisle with some Republicans. In December 1937, they published a Conservative Manifesto praising private enterprise. The right-wing opposition in the Senate blocked an anti-lynching bill approved by the House, to FDR's embarrassment. FDR pushed through Congress the Fair Labour Standards Act, which introduced a minimum wage, against conservative opposition. Relations between FDR and Southern Democrats deteriorated. The right-wing opposition in the Senate blocked further New Deal reforms. Thus there is a clear contrast between opposition to the New Deal in the two presidential terms. Some candidates will include Supreme Court opposition to many New Deal reforms, but the Supreme Court is a judicial not a political institution and so cannot be seen as either left wing or right wing.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, c.1871–1918

(a) Why were the Boers in conflict with Britain between 1880 and 1902? [10]

British rule was resented by the Boers who had settled in Orange Free State and the Transvaal, especially after Britain claimed possession of the gold and diamond-rich Transvaal in 1877. In 1880, once the threat posed by the Zulus had been removed, the Boers rebelled – the First Boer War (1880–81). The ill-prepared British troops were defeated; Transvaal and Orange Free State were given self-governing status under British oversight. New settlers were denied political rights by the Boers. Britain encouraged the new settlers to rebel as a pretext for a British invasion; although the planned rebellion did not occur, British troops invaded anyway (the Jameson Raid, 1895), an action which was heavily criticised by other European nations. In 1890, Kruger, the Boer leader, demanded the withdrawal of British troops and full independence for the Transvaal. When Britain refused, Kruger declared war (the Second Boer War, 1899–1902). Britain's eventual victory was confirmed by the Treaty of Vereeniging (1902), which placed Orange Free State and Transvaal firmly under British control.

(b) 'By 1914, the USA had abandoned its policy of isolationism.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the USA's rapid industrial growth in the period after 1875 led to the need to seek out new markets, especially in the Far East. This required a strong navy and overseas bases to protect merchant shipping. Victory in the war against Spain (1898) left the USA in possession of former Spanish territories, such as the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam. Public opinion clearly favoured this expansionist foreign policy, as evidenced by McKinley's victory over the isolationist Bryan in the presidential elections of 1900. Roosevelt continued the expansionist policy, taking control of the Panama Canal and ensuring American dominance in the Caribbean through the Platt Amendment to the Cuban constitution and the corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. By 1914, therefore, the USA had developed a growing influence over world financial markets and a commitment to its own form of imperial expansion.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that the USA remained fundamentally isolationist in 1914. The war against Spain over events in Cuba was essentially in line with the Monroe Doctrine, under the terms of which the USA had long held significant influence and power over the Caribbean region. The USA's main aim remained to protect its own interests by keeping European imperialists out of the Americas. Economic growth had encouraged the USA to seek new markets in the Far East, and this required a larger navy with overseas bases to protect merchant shipping – however, this was to protect the USA's economic interests rather than for imperialistic expansionism. The USA remained determined to keep out of European affairs. In the USA, the outbreak of WWI was perceived as the result of selfish and expansionist acts by the main European powers and, as such, nothing to do with the USA. It was only when the USA's own interests were threatened by German U-boats and rumours of German attempts to incite Mexico and Japan to declare war against the USA that President Wilson brought his country into WWI.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

10 International Relations, c.1919–1933

(a) Why did the Washington Naval Conference (1921–22) relieve international tension? [10]

In common with some of the major European countries, the USA was deeply concerned by the rapid growth of the Japanese navy and the threat which this posed to American interests in the Far East. For a time, it looked as though there would be a naval arms race between Japan and the USA. The Washington Naval Conference took place to address this issue. The Conference led to a series of treaties which, at the time, seemed to ensure peace in the Far East. Japan agreed to limit the size of its navy to three-fifths the size of the US and British fleets. A Four Power Treaty was signed by Britain, the USA, France and Japan, by which each country agreed to respect the others' rights in the Pacific and Far East. A Nine Power Treaty guaranteed protection for China against invasion and all signatories agreed to uphold the 'open-door' policy. Although it did not take long for these agreements to be broken, at the time they were perceived as a major breakthrough and certainly led to a reduction in international tension.

(b) 'The Great War ended in 1918. The Great Peace did not begin until 1925.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the significance of the Locarno Treaties? [20]

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the Paris peace settlement was a compromise which satisfied no one. As a result, tensions remained, heightened by the USA's refusal to ratify the settlement and France's on-going fear of German revival. Germany's apparent inability to meet its reparations requirements also added to the tension, leading in particular to the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. The Locarno Treaties of 1925 did much to relieve the tension and were greeted with relief and optimism throughout Europe. They seemed to symbolise a new period of reconciliation and cooperation between the main European powers. Germany, France and Belgium promised to respect their joint frontiers, guaranteed by both Britain and Italy. The Treaty of Mutual Guarantee meant that Britain and Italy would come to the assistance of any country which fell victim to aggression in violation of the Locarno Treaties – this finally gave France the security which it had been lacking. France and Germany appeared to have settled their differences, symbolised by the effective working relationship between Briand and Stresemann.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that tensions between France and Germany had already been reduced by the Dawes Plan (1924), which led to the French withdrawal from the Ruhr. In reality, Britain's commitment to uphold the Locarno Treaties was limited by the provision that nations threatened with aggression should first appeal to the League of Nations. Britain was, therefore, not fully committed to military action in support of France. The Locarno Treaties did not give any guarantees regarding the new borders created by the Paris peace settlement. For example, they gave no guarantees regarding Germany's borders with Poland and Czechoslovakia. It is clear that France was less than sincere in forging better relations with Germany, remaining deeply concerned about the possibility of a resurgence of German power. For France, agreeing to the Locarno Treaties was a diplomatic convenience – the French occupation of the Ruhr had been heavily criticised by Britain and it was vital for France to regain British support by appearing to accept better relations with Germany.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

11 International Relations, c.1933–1939

(a) Why was Spain's left-wing government defeated in the elections of 1933? [10]

With the resignation of Miguel Primo de Rivera (1930) and the abdication of King Alfonso in 1931, Spain's political turmoil led to the declaration of a Republic (1931). Left-wing groups held a majority in the Cortes (parliament), the Socialists being the largest single party. However, the government of Manuel Azana faced an ever-deepening economic crisis – high unemployment, wages being cut, falling standards of living. It embarked on a programme of reform (reducing the power of the Church, reducing the number of senior army officers, allowing some element of self-government to Catalonia, nationalising large agricultural estates, increasing wages). These measures both angered and united right-wing groups (Church, army, wealthy landowners, industrialists), the CEDA being formed to defend their rights. At the same time, the government was criticised by the more extreme left-wing groups (anarchists, communists) for not going far enough with its reforms. They organised a series of strikes, riots and assassinations. The government took strong action against these threats to law and order, which lost it the support of the working classes. Azana resigned and the 1933 elections led to a CEDA victory.

(b) 'Propaganda and little else.' How far do you agree with this assessment of Mussolini's foreign policy? [20]

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that Mussolini's stated foreign policy aims were clearly propaganda, intended to gain the support of the Italian people by appealing to the nationalistic sentiments which had been heightened by the fact that Italy gained little from the Paris peace settlement. Mussolini spoke of re-establishing Italy's credibility as a major European power, making it 'great, respected and feared'. His early 'successes' – Fiume and Corfu (1923) – were of little real significance beyond their usefulness as propaganda. For all his outward bluster, Mussolini was well aware that Italy was in no position to carry out an aggressive foreign policy in the 1920s – as the only fascist nation, Italy was isolated and vulnerable. He was, therefore, forced to adopt a more diplomatic approach, as evidenced by his involvement in the Locarno Treaties, by his use of Italian troops to prevent the German take-over of Austria in 1934, and by his determination to maintain good relations with Britain and France. By 1934, Mussolini was widely respected abroad, but was losing domestic support at a time of economic depression. The invasion of Abyssinia (1935) was a propaganda exercise to increase support for Mussolini, who succeeded in Africa where others had failed. Similarly, the invasion of Albania (1939) was a propaganda exercise, since Albania had long been under Italian control anyway. Mussolini now saw alliance with Hitler's Germany as the best way of restoring Italian power and maintaining his own control over Italy.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that Italian pride had been severely hit by the Paris peace settlement. Italy had entered WWI on the understanding of territorial acquisitions which did not materialise. Mussolini exploited Italian nationalism to gain power and, inevitably, used propaganda to maintain it. By taking Fiume (1923) for example, Mussolini was highlighting the difference between his government and the weaknesses of the previous one. However, there was more substance to Mussolini's foreign policy than mere propaganda. Part of the reason for the Corfu incident, for example, was Mussolini's desire to gain control of a strategically placed island which would have helped Italy to challenge British control of the Mediterranean. Mussolini's diplomatic approach to foreign policy between 1923 and 1934 was based on his desire to ensure Italy's security. As the only fascist nation, Italy was in danger of becoming isolated and, therefore, vulnerable. He successfully avoided this by establishing friendly relations with Britain, France, the USSR, Greece, Hungary and Albania. At Locarno, Mussolini achieved the acceptance by other

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9389	21

European powers that Italy was a major power in its own right. By opposing Hitler's attempts to take control of Austria in 1934, Mussolini not only protected Italy's borders but also gained the respect of Britain and France, both of which saw alliance with Italy as vital in their attempts to control Hitler's Germany. Mussolini was subsequently able to exploit this – his invasion of Abyssinia went largely unopposed by the League of Nations because Britain and France needed Italy as an ally. Mussolini's close alliance with Hitler after 1934, together with his more overtly aggressive foreign policy, was designed to enhance Italy's prestige. Mussolini saw this alliance as offering the best chance of enabling him to restore Italy as a leading European power.

12 China and Japan, c.1919–1945

(a) Why did the Chinese Communist Party undertake the Long March in 1934? [10]

In essence, the Long March was about the survival of the Chinese Communist Party. Although the CCP had declared the Soviet Republic of China in 1931, in reality it controlled only a very small area, its army consisting of ill-equipped and poorly-trained peasants. Nevertheless, the CCP posed a threat to KMT's control of China, and Chiang had carried out five 'extermination campaigns' against it between 1930 and 1934. Mao's base in Kiangsi province was surrounded by KMT forces. He realised that, in order to survive, he had to escape and seek a safer powerbase elsewhere. The Long March was, therefore, intended to allow the CCP to gain a safer base in Shensi province, an area which had not yet fallen under the control of the KMT. Here, Mao was able to rebuild his depleted army and continue to fight against the KMT and, subsequently, Japanese invaders. Mao was able to make propaganda use of the Long March, while the respect which marchers showed for peasant property gained the CCP increasing support.

(b) 'The Japanese takeover of Manchuria in 1931 was due to political rather than economic reasons.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the take-over of Manchuria was initiated by the Kwantung army, against the wishes of the democratically elected government of Japan. The government had become increasingly unpopular; democracy was a relatively new concept in Japan and it quickly became evident that politicians were corrupt and open to bribery. Secret military groups had developed with the aim of ending parliamentary politics and establishing a military dictatorship; these were increasingly popular with the Japanese people. The agreements which Japan had signed at the Washington Naval Conference were unpopular, and army officers were dismayed by the government's determination to press ahead with cuts to the army and navy. Public opinion was ultra-nationalistic, believing that Japan should increase its military strength and exploit the weaknesses of China. There was, therefore, widespread public support for the actions of the Kwantung army.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that, to a large extent, the growth of ultra-nationalistic sentiment in Japan was the product of economic problems, and many people saw the take-over of Manchuria as a solution to the economic depression which was affecting Japan. The Chinese were trying to reduce Japanese influence over trade and business in Manchuria, and this would have been a serious blow to a Japanese economy which was already suffering. As a small resource-poor island nation, Japan needed new supplies of raw materials to ensure its own self-sufficiency. Manchuria, rich in iron ore and coal deposits, was a prize asset. With China distracted by terrible floods and the civil war between the KMT and the CCP, while Europe and the USA were busy dealing with their own economic problems, this seemed the perfect time to take control of Manchuria, thereby solving Japan's economic problems.