CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/21 Paper 2 (Outline Study 21), 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 May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

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]**

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

(a) Why did France go to war in 1792? [10]

The key issue is to explain why France went to war in 1792. There is certainly quite a debate on this, but the key reasons are seen as a mix of political inexperience on the part of key players amongst the 'revolutionaries' and a desire to make a name for themselves. The Declaration at Pillnitz and the activities of the émigrés naturally heightened the tension. There was a perceived threat of an invasion by the Prussians and the Austrians. The role of the King and the Court, encouraging an aggressive approach to foreign affairs for their own ends, is also seen as important. The main reason is aggression by the French.

(b) How successfully did Napoleon govern France between 1799 and 1804? [20]

The key issue here is the degree of success that Napoleon attained while he controlled France's domestic affairs in this period. Reflection on what might be seen as 'success' in this context is important and the focus should be on what happened inside France and not on the military exploits elsewhere. The impact of the Continental System would of course be relevant. Factors which might be considered are his ability to bring law, order and political stability to France, the end of the era of the 'coups' and constitutional experimentation. Factors such as the Concordat, the Civil Code and his administrative work with the Prefects, etc. might be considered. Comment on his authoritarianism, the degree of censorship and his treatment of the former royalists is acceptable. The best will have a definition of 'successful government' in mind and develop a balanced argument each way on the issue. The fact that so much of his internal work survived, which indicates how much his rule was respected, is an obvious factor to mention.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Account for the rise of the middle classes in this period [10]

The key issue here is the identification of factors which led to a major growth of the middle class. There was a substantial amount of wealth being created and a good part of that went into the hands of the middle class. Social mobility enabled former 'lower class' members to rise 'upwards' as there was a demand for men with skills and the ability to manage others. There are many examples, like Wedgwood and Brindley, of men who came from poor backgrounds rising through the ranks because of their skills, enterprise and initiative. There was also a growth in demand for the services of middle class occupations such as bankers, lawyers, managers and surveyors. Enclosing an area required lawyers, bankers, architects and surveyors, and a substantial part of England was enclosed in less than 30 years. Factories needed architects, engineers, bankers and lawyers. They wanted education for their children and their wives wanted shops and doctors.

(b) To what extent were changes in agriculture the main cause of industrialisation? Refer to any <u>two</u> countries in your answer. [20]

The key issue here is in analysing the link between the major agricultural changes which happened in the 18th century in the UK, and somewhat later in France and Germany, and the subsequent industrialisation. It could be argued that there was a major difference between the UK, where there was a much more obvious link, and France and Germany where the pressure for industrialisation was 'top down' and agricultural changes did not necessarily precede industrial changes.

Clearly there is a case 'for' in that it led to surplus food being available to feed an industrial workforce. It generated a great deal of surplus capital which was looking for an investment outlet and it led to an improvement in the standard of living in terms of diet which led to a growing population which could service factories but also created internal demand. The example of applying scientific methods to production was noted in industry and it was also seen how entrepreneurship in agriculture led to great profits. It also led to a stimulus for banking and communication which aided industry. On the other hand, it could be argued that there were already huge markets available abroad as well as ample raw materials. There were many entrepreneurs who could raise capital by other means. Political and financial stability were also key factors as were (especially in the UK) the absence of regulation, unions as well as the tradition of laisser faire and free trade.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

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

(a) Why was the Triple Alliance formed? [10]

The key issue here is to explain why the three countries (Germany and Austria and then Italy) which made up the Alliance chose to ally with each other. There was a genuine concern over the aggressive potential of France and Russia. Initially Germany felt that it would deter Russia and force it to seek better relations with Germany. The Germans also felt that it might restrain Austria in the Balkans and limit the chances of a conflict there. Also Germany felt it would bring stability to central and Eastern Europe. The Austrians felt it would gain support for their potentially declining Empire and liked the idea of a degree of unity for the Germanic peoples, while at the same time getting support against the Russians who also had Balkan ambitions. The Franco-Russian deal, although they did not know the full terms of it, also reinforced the motives. The Italians had more cynical motives; they wanted support for their territorial ambitions in North Africa and the Balkans and had their own particular interests as the primary reason.

(b) 'Russia should take the blame for the outbreak of World War I.' How far do you agree? [20]

The key issue here is the extent to which Russia should be held responsible for the outbreak of the war in 1914. There is a case to be made, and certainly one advocated by some historians. The alliance with France was obviously a serious factor and its terms, both known and secret, did nothing to ease the tension. The Tsar's belligerence and determination to overcome the humiliation of 1905 was a strong factor as was his own ineptitude which must also be seen as a key element in the drift towards war. To say that he was out of his depth is an understatement. The Russian support for Serbia was a central element as well and Russia was well known to have imperial ambitions in the Balkans and elsewhere. The decision to mobilise was rash to say the least, and common sense would have led to a realisation of what it might lead to. Obviously there is a powerful case to be made against. There was a variety of other long term causes, and good cases could be made against Germany, Austria, France and the UK as well. What is looked for is balance and reflection on the degree of responsibility that Russia, and other countries and factors, should be given.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why did the Tsar survive the 1905 Revolution in Russia? [10]

The key issue is the reasons why the regime survived the 1905 revolution. There are a variety of factors to consider. Gapon was initially quite loyal to the regime. The use of force by the Tsar was, in the short term, effective and he had the support of the greater proportion of the military – above all the Cossacks. There was disorganisation and a serious lack of unity amongst his very diverse opponents and many of those would disagree fundamentally about the way forward. Geographically protest was scattered, from Potemkin and the Black Sea fleet to strikes in industrial centres. There were few committee revolutionaries involved. Witte's work helped – in some respects – and a mixture of brutal pacification and apparent concessions, particularly the constitutional ones, also made a difference.

(b) 'Lenin's leadership was the main reason for Bolshevik success in October 1917.' How far do you agree? [20]

The key issue here is the reasons for Bolshevik success in 1917. There is a fairly powerful case against the assertion. The impact of the war was divisive and military support had drained away from the Provisional Government as it had from the Tsar. The main failings of Kerensky and the PG, the Kornilov affair, the continuation of the war and the arming of the Soviets are examples of this. Few wished a return to Tsardom with memories of autocracy and Rasputin still strong. There was a disastrous economic background with high inflation and real hunger. The Soviets had become powerful forces, central government had effectively broken down and there was anarchy in the countryside. Trotsky proved to be critical in the seizure and there were massive problems facing any rivals. Lenin of course provided much. He had built up the party and was prepared to think radically. His slogans were perfect for the time, his timing was good, his use of the press impressive and in the end he was prepared to step forward and take the steps necessary.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

Section B: American Option

The History of the USA, 1840–1941

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

(a) Why did the USA develop close relations with Japan in the second half of the nineteenth century? [10]

Japan began to open up to US influence from 1853–54 and the visits of Commander Perry and his four black ships. Over the next half century, the USA developed closer relations with Japan for two main reasons: economics and politics. The economics was that of trade expansion between the two countries. In 1858 the two countries signed the Treaty of Amity and Commerce (aka the Harris Convention) which provided the USA with legal rights in Japan as well as additional ports through which to trade with Japan. Slowly, trade grew over the next forty years. The politics was that of the USA's desire to gain and maintain influence in the western Pacific. This had something of the concept of manifest destiny applied to sea instead of land.

The big prize was China but that was subject to a great deal of attention from European great powers, especially Britain and France. Better relations with Japan would give the USA some kind of counter-balance to European predominance on the Asian mainland. As Japan modernised so she turned to various Western powers to model her development. The USA was a major influence over Japanese educational and agrarian reforms. Relations were never all that close, however, even by the 1890s. In 1894 Japan and China went to war but the USA played little part in the diplomacy surrounding the war. In 1902 Japan chose as its military ally among the great powers not the USA but the UK.

(b) How far did the USA uphold the Versailles Settlement in the 1920s? [20]

The main terms of the Versailles settlement can be considered under several headings: territorial, mainly concerning eastern and central Europe; the mandate system; the military limitations on Germany; reparations; the League of Nations. The USA rejected the League and thus refused to sign the Versailles Treaty; a bilateral treaty was eventually signed in August 1921.

The terms of the treaty which caused the greatest disputes in the 1920s concerned reparations. In 1921 the total reparations bill was fixed at $33bn, which was unrealistically high. In 1923 France and Belgium sent troops into the Ruhr to try and enforce their interpretation of the Versailles reparations settlement. By the 1920s, the USA was the world's leading industrial power as well as the leading creditor nation and so her economic and financial policies were of the greatest significance to the reparations issue.

The reparations issue became entangled with the question of inter-allied war debts. Britain and France wanted to link the two; the USA did not. Its attitude showed how little the USA upheld Versailles, at least in the early 1920s. By the mid-1920s, however, there was a slightly greater willingness to become involved in the complex finances of Europe, as shown by the 1924 Dawes Plan for reparation payments. The international conference which was required to authorise the Dawes Plan was the first post-war conference concerning Versailles attended by the US government. Thereafter, the USA remained involved in the finances of Europe, culminating in the Young Plan of 1929. It remained uninvolved in the other aspects of the treaty, however. While approving of the Locarno treaty of 1925, the USA took no part in negotiating its terms.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did President Lincoln introduce a naval blockade of Southern ports at the start of the Civil War? [10]

The blockade covered all Southern ports from Chesapeake Bay on the east coast to the Rio Grande. Lincoln's decision was part of his military strategy while also having useful political consequences. The blockade was seen as part of the Anaconda strategy proposed by the Union military leader, Winfield Scott, which aimed to strangle the South into submission. The military reason for the blockade was to stop other states which might want to trade with the South, either buying its raw cotton or providing important military material to an essentially agrarian society. The seceding states controlled a large amount of territory and given the small size of the Northern armies, it was difficult to see the South being defeated on land. In political terms, the blockade showed the determination of Lincoln to defeat secession in war rather than reach a political compromise. The reality of the blockade and its effectiveness are not relevant to this question.

(b) How far did President Johnson continue the Reconstruction policies of President Lincoln? [20]

In the year before his assassination in April 1865, Lincoln had begun to develop policies to address the consequences of the end of the war. Three major initiatives were developed during his presidency: the 10% Plan [December 1863], whereby rebel states could return to the USA if (a) 10% of voters took an oath of future loyalty and (b) the state amended its constitution to include the abolition of slavery; the Thirteenth Amendment [January 1865], which abolished slavery; the Freedmen's Bureau [March 1865], to help freed black slaves and white refugees – though the Bureau was more Congress's doing and it was set up for one year only. In addition, just before his death, Lincoln stated publicly that some black males could be given the vote.

The 10% Plan was opposed in Congress, which approved the Wade-Davis bill for a minimum of 50% taking the oath. Lincoln vetoed the bill. The 10% Plan was applied to Louisiana. Johnson, a Southern Democrat from Tennessee, a border state, believed in states' rights, as a result of which many states introduced Black Codes to uphold the rights of whites. In May 1865 he issued his terms for an amnesty, which gave no percentage for those taking the oath and accepting emancipation. However, the most propertied had to apply individually for a pardon, implying they were to be excluded; most, however, were pardoned. In December 1865 he declared Reconstruction was complete, which alienated Congress. In January 1866 Johnson vetoed both a bill to extend the life of the Freedmen's Bureau and the Civil Rights Act introducing black suffrage. These actions further alienated Congress which consequently introduced the 14th Amendment ensuring equality for all Americans. In general, Johnson thought he was continuing Lincoln's policies while radicals in Congress, who had fallen out with Lincoln, became even more hostile to Johnson.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

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

(a) Account for the 'Red Scare' in the USA in 1919–20. [10]

The Red Scare of 1919–20 was a result of industrial and political unrest resulting from three interrelated factors: the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 in Russia; the end of the First World War in 1918–19; the existence of various revolutionary left wing groups in the USA. This caused many Americans to become alarmed, which in turn enabled the federal government to take action against the left wing groups. The Bolshevik Revolution raised the fear that Communism was about to replace capitalism, especially given the existence of Communist movements in the USA. The end of the war and the subsequent demobilisation caused economic and industrial unrest which seemed to support the danger of a collapse of capitalism. Strikes became commonplace; even the police in Boston went on strike. The revolutionary left wing groups such as the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW or Wobblies) as well as anarchists grew in support and activism. Thus the federal government took action, passing the Espionage Act in 1917 and the Sedition Act in 1918. Actions taken thereafter to contain the dangers threatened by the Red Scare are not strictly relevant.

(b) How far did the working class benefit from industrialisation in the late nineteenth century? [20]

The question implies a focus on the working class, skilled and unskilled, employed to work in factories rather than those working on the land or in service industries. Between 1870 and 1900, the population of the USA almost doubled in size. At approximately the same time, American production increased fivefold, mainly in the industrial sector. That increase in goods produced was not equally shared. While the expansion of US industry provided employment opportunities for the industrial working class – at least in times of economic growth, such as the 1880s – often it did not provide higher living standards. This discrepancy helps to explain the widespread labour unrest of the time, as workers tried to organise themselves to improve their wages and working conditions. The laissez faire policies of most governments of the time and their support of businessmen meant that the industrial working class gained little benefit from industrialisation, especially in the short term.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

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

(a) Why did President Hoover struggle to deal with the impact of the Great Crash? [10]

The Great Crash of October 1929 occurred within the first year of Hoover's presidency. He struggled to deal with the downturn in the US economy because of the severity of the downturn and the miscalculations he made. Downturns had occurred before; there was quite a severe one in 1920–21, after the First World War. The economy had recovered from such setbacks. In 1929–30 Hoover had expected much the same to happen. In fact, the Crash was initially welcomed by some as a necessary correction to the excesses of the Roaring Twenties. Too many people had borrowed too much money in the 1920s and it was believed that some kind of economic contraction was an inevitable consequence. Hoover was affected by such beliefs. Not that he did nothing; he relied on traditional, limited means of trying to help the various states undertake their own efforts. He was opposed to the more radical solution of federal government taking direct action to address the consequences of the Great Crash. Some federal policies, not always with Hoover's approval, such as the Smoot-Hawley tariff, arguably made things worse. It took FDR's willingness to break with conventional wisdom that helped lift the USA out of the depression which the crash had led to – and even then his policies were not always the success that they were often claimed to be.

(b) In 1932, Franklin Roosevelt was described as 'a cautious politician'. How far did Roosevelt's domestic policies in the 1930s support this view? [20]

The quote, from Walter Lippmann, a leading journalist of the era, challenges the usual view that Roosevelt was a radical reformer, someone who paid little regard either to the conventional thinking of the time or to traditional power blocs, such as bankers, capitalists and Southern Democrats. There are examples to support this interpretation, held at the time by left wing critics such as Huey Long. FDR's policies did little to help African Americans because he could not afford to antagonise the powerful Southern Democrats in Congress. FDR did little to reduce the inequalities which many saw as a root cause of America's social and economic problems. The National Recovery Administration [NRA] was based on the wartime War Industries Board. Though in 1933–37, FDR abandoned the goal of a balanced budget in preference for deficit financing, in 1937–38 he returned to a balanced budget, thus causing what became known as 'the Roosevelt recession'.

On the other hand, there is also plenty of evidence that FDR was excessively incautious. His court-packing plan to reform the Supreme Court was the most radical of a series of political and economic initiatives taken by the president. The Social Security Act could hardly be described as excessively cautious and neither could both the Wagner Act which established collective bargaining rights for labour unions and the establishment of a minimum wage.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did war break out between Japan and Russia in 1904? [10]

For economic and strategic reasons, both Russia and Japan were keen to exploit the weakness of China. In 1894, Japan overran Korea, Manchuria and parts of China itself. This led to the Shimonoseki Treaty (1895), by which Japan gained Formosa and Port Arthur. Russia, wanting control of Port Arthur to ensure a warm water port from which to expand its interests in the Far East, resented this. With the support of France and Germany, which also had vested interests in the area, Russia instigated the Triple Intervention, forcing Japan to give Port Arthur to the Russians. This caused resentment and the desire for revenge in Japan. In 1902, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was signed. Like Japan, Britain was concerned that its own interests were being threatened by Russian expansion in Manchuria. Japan now felt strong enough the confront Russia. Japan agreed to recognise Russian rights in Manchuria in exchange for Japanese rights in Korea. The Russians refused to negotiate with a people they considered racially and militarily inferior, and invaded Korea. The Japanese response was rapid, dramatic and devastating.

(b) 'The rival alliances and ententes developed by the Great Powers of Europe were the main cause of World War I.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that the alliances caused uncertainty, fear and tension in Europe, largely because of the secret nature of their terms. There was an 'arms race' between the two rival alliances, leading to the existence of two well armed camps. Just as French leaders were convinced that the Triple Alliance was an attempt to isolate and encircle France, so German leaders were convinced that the Triple Entente was an attempt to encircle and threaten Germany. These tensions led European countries to develop aggressive plans to be used in the event of war (e.g. Schlieffen Plan). As a result of the alliances, France helped Russia to increase its military strength and speed of mobilisation. Austria-Hungary would not have gone to war with Serbia without the certain knowledge that it would be supported by Germany. The opposing sides in WWI largely mirrored the two alliances.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that other factors were more significant. For example, commercial and imperial rivalry, Germany's more aggressive foreign policy under Kaiser Wilhelm, the naval arms race between Britain and Germany, the disintegration of empires (e.g. Habsburg Empire), the growth of nationalism, rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary over the Balkans. Moreover, the alliances were based on vague treaties of friendship which did not compel countries to support each other in war; e.g. France did not assist Russia when it was losing its war against Japan; Italy, though a member of the Triple Alliance, entered WWI in 1915 *against* Germany. Between 1907 and 1914, the alliances actually helped to maintain peace, preventing incidents escalating into war. For example, in 1911 Britain's threat that she would support France over the issue of Morocco led Germany to back down. Although Germany supported Austria-Hungary in its war against Serbia in 1914, it had not done so in 1913. None of the European powers went to war in 1914 as a direct result of their alliance commitments – they did so to protect their own vested interests.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did the 'successor states' face problems during the 1920s? [10]

The 'successor states' emerged as a result of the break-up of the great European empires, their existence confirmed by the Paris peace settlement. They suffered from similar problems as a result of the following:

- The multi-national nature of their populations, for example:
  - Yugoslavia consisted of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Magyars, Germans, Albanians, Romanians and Macedonians, leading to religious and ethnic disputes
  - of Poland's population of 27 million, fewer than 18 million were Poles and more than 1 million were German-speakers
  - Czechoslovakia contained Czechs, Slovaks, Russians, Magyars, Poles, Jews and over 3 million German-speakers
  - Austria and Hungary lost around two-thirds of their populations as a result of WWI and the Paris peace settlement
- Minority groups existed in all of the successor states, leading to political instability (e.g. German-speakers in Austria wanting union with Germany)
- Political instability: with the exception of Czechoslovakia, none of the successor states was able to sustain democratic forms of government (e.g. in 1929, the King of Yugoslavia banned all political parties and became a dictator; in Poland there were 14 political parties, leading to weak and unstable government until Pilsudski's military coup created a dictatorship in 1926)
- Economic difficulties: both Austria and Hungary had lost much of their industrial land. They became increasingly reliant on foreign loans
- Border disputes were inevitable (e.g. Yugoslavia had disputes with Greece, Bulgaria with Italy; Poland with Germany, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania and Russia).

(b) 'The USA remained actively involved in international affairs throughout the 1920s.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that, despite its isolationist policy, the USA did play an active role in international affairs in the 1920s. For example, the USA played a leading role in the Washington Conferences (1921–22), helped to find solutions to the problem of German reparation payments (Dawes Plan 1924 and Young Plan 1929), helped to form the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 and was involved in the World Disarmament Conference (1932–33). The USA was prepared to become involved when its own interests were at stake. For example, the USA insisted that European nations repay their war debts and they could only do this if Germany kept up with its reparations. The Washington Conferences were designed to allay American fears of Japan's expansion in the Far East.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the USA maintained an isolationist policy throughout. The USA refused to ratify the Paris peace settlement and did not join the League of Nations. The USA took no part in the Genoa Conference of 1922 or the Locarno meetings of 1925. The Kellogg-Briand Pact committed the USA to nothing. The USA kept out of European affairs, showing no interest in the Spanish Civil War, for example. The USA took no action in the face of Italy's invasion of Abyssinia. Even the Japanese invasion of Manchuria seemed to generate little response from the USA.

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did the German occupation of the Rhineland in March 1936 meet no resistance? [10]

Hitler's Germany entered the Rhineland in defiance of both the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno agreements. Knowing that his army was not yet ready to fight a major war, Hitler realised that this was a gamble. Even moderate resistance would have forced an embarrassing withdrawal. France, in particular, would feel threatened by the German occupation of the Rhineland and might be expected to take action against it. In reality, although Britain and France protested vigorously, no action was taken against Germany.

Hitler had already split potential opposition to his aggressive foreign policy. He realised that the Stresa Front (an agreement between Britain, France and Italy in April 1935 to resist any further changes to the Treaty of Versailles) was weak and had exploited these weaknesses. In signing the Anglo-German naval agreement of June 1935, Britain had effectively, and without consulting either France or Italy, condoned Hitler's breaking of the Treaty of Versailles by increasing Germany's military capabilities. By 1936, Mussolini's Italy was adopting its own aggressive foreign policy and was allying itself more with Germany than with Britain and France. France did not feel able to confront Germany alone. With public opinion heavily anti-war, neither Britain nor France were prepared to risk a major war against Germany. Appeasement seemed a safer option. Moreover, Hitler claimed that he was merely righting the wrongs of the Treaty of Versailles and offered to sign a peace treaty which would last for 25 years.

(b) To what extent did Mussolini pursue a consistent foreign policy in the period from 1922 to 1939? [20]

In support of the view that Mussolini pursued a consistent foreign policy, it could be argued that his primary aim remained constant – to make Italy '*great, respected and feared'*. He claimed that *'The 20th century will be a century of Italian power'.* Italy's territorial claims had been ignored at the Paris peace settlement. Most Italians saw this as humiliating and a reflection of its government's weakness. Mussolini encouraged ultra-nationalism by talking of the Mediterranean as '*mare nostra*' and seeking a glorious foreign policy. He adopted an aggressive foreign policy whenever circumstances allowed, for example:

- taking Fiume in 1923 in complete contrast to the weakness shown by the previous government over the D'Annunzio incident
- ignoring the League of Nations in forcing Greece to pay compensation over the Corfu incident
- successful invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, in contrast to failure in 1896
- forming the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Anti-Comintern Pact
- invasion of Albania in 1939
- forming the Pact of Steel in 1939.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that, prior to the mid-1930s, his main aim was to make Italy secure rather than 'great and feared'. Italy was in no position to challenge the power of other European nations. For much of the period he was more concerned with Italy's security than with its aggrandisement. Fiume and Corfu were little more than propaganda exercises from which Italy gained little (Italy was forced to leave Corfu when Greece paid compensation – Corfu might have provided Italy with a useful naval base with which to challenge British naval supremacy in the Mediterranean). Prior to 1934, Mussolini's foreign policy was based on diplomacy, which gained Italy respect but did not make it great or feared (e.g. forming defensive alliances, successfully opposing Hitler's attempt to take control of Austria in 1934, playing a leading role in the peaceful negotiations at Locarno). It was only

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015

after 1934 that Mussolini adopted a more aggressive approach, seeing closer liaison with Hitler as the way to enhance Italy's power.

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why did the Japanese economy experience difficulties in the period from 1919 to 1931? [10]

WWI had provided a major boost to the Japanese economy – it had provided the Allies with goods and had been able to exploit markets which the European nations could no longer serve. Its exports soared. By 1921, Europe had revived and was able to regain lost markets. This led to massive unemployment and industrial unrest in Japan. A series of good harvests led to rapidly falling prices for rice, which caused hardship to farmers. The agreement made at the Washington Conferences (1921–22) restricted the size of the Japanese navy. This, together with the general fall in trade, hit the shipbuilding industry. As a small country, Japan lacked large supplies of raw materials, making it difficult to adapt and develop new industries. Japan was severely affected by the world economic crisis following the Wall Street Crash. Exports fell as other countries protected their own industries with high tariffs on imports. Many Japanese exports were luxury items (e.g. raw silk), world demand for which fell during the depression. Japan faced massive unemployment and severe poverty.

(b) How successful was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour? [20]

It is firstly necessary to establish what the Japanese were aiming to achieve by attacking Pearl Harbour – this establishes criteria by which to judge how successful the attack was. Denied vital supplies as a result of the USA's economic sanctions, Japan had a stark choice – either reach a diplomatic settlement with the USA or continue seizing raw materials from Southeast Asia. Japan did both, disguising its aggressive intentions behind an apparent willingness to negotiate. Admiral Yamamoto's plan for the attack on Pearl Harbour was to destroy the US Pacific fleet; this, it was believed, would prevent the USA fighting a naval war in the Pacific, leaving Japan free to continue its aggressive foreign policy.

In terms of success, it could be argued that the planned attack remained undetected and had the element of surprise. US losses were significant – 2402 men, 190 aircraft and 8 ships seriously damaged. Japan's victory against Russia in 1904–5 had been secured by the destruction of the Russian fleet in Port Arthur; the Japanese believed that the attack on Pearl Harbour would have the same effect in 1941. Hitler greeted news of the attack with jubilation – with Japan as an ally, he believed Germany would be invincible and immediately declared war on the USA. American prestige had been severely hit and the USA now faced war against two major enemies in Germany and Japan.

However, devastating though it was, the attack failed in its primary objective. A number of US ships, including three aircraft carriers, were at sea at the time of the attack and therefore escaped undamaged. Moreover, the Japanese failed to destroy large supplies of oil which were to prove vital in supplying the USA's subsequent war effort. American public opinion, previously heavily committed to isolationism and opposed to involvement in WWII despite the protestations of its president, now sought revenge. Japan was taking on a very powerful enemy indeed

© Cambridge International Examinations 2015