

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/22

Paper 2 (Outline Study 22), 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.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

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 2015	9389	22

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

(a) Account for the fall of Robespierre and the Jacobins. [10]

The key issue is to examine and explain the reasons for the fall of Robespierre and the Jacobins. There are a variety of factors which should be considered (but there is no need to go into the many historical controversies which surround this topic). The Terror was obviously a major factor – it could be seen as anarchy in power. There was a costly war in the background adding to the tension. Extremism and instability were the order of the day and a reaction was bound to come. The Committee of Public Safety was not trusted by many and with a background of constant social upheaval and the ever present sans culottes causing the usual middle class concerns, there was a search for stability. The price of bread was also a factor and the dechristianisation process worried many. The government was regularly split and the whole direction of the Revolution was being challenged.

(b) To what extent was Louis XVI responsible for his own downfall? [20]

The key issue here is an analysis of the extent to which Louis can be personally blamed for his own downfall. There is a strong case 'for' as his failure to compromise and recognise the huge forces that were unleashed in 1789. His flexible attitude towards constitutionalism and his inconsistency through the years which led to his death were obviously major factors. He engendered mistrust, and his flights and the 'declaration' were also key factors. Requesting foreign support was dreadful politics and in the end it could be seen that he gave no alternative to the republicans, even though many were fairly reluctant ones. Leadership was never a strong point of his. On the other hand, there was little chance of any political consensus in France at the time and the demand for change was too strong. The Ancien Régime had been around for too long and was too inflexible, and he could be seen as a victim of that. The socio-economic structure was too embedded to be changed without violence. Poor harvests and the war created further tensions which were also contributory factors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Why did the development of steam power speed up the Industrial Revolution? [10]

The key issue here is to identify and then explain the ways in which the development of steam power speeded up the Industrial Revolution. There are a variety of factors which could be considered such as the way in which it actually made mass production possible as well as the stimulus that steam power gave to related factors like coal production and the development of metallurgy. Steam power's ability to generate huge amounts of energy to power factories actually made the factory possible as well as enabling the use of much more unskilled, and cheaper, labour. Production was now possible in areas where there were limited or no sources of energy and now coal could be moved in easily to power the steam engines. This of course provided a stimulus to not only coal production, but also transportation and capital investment.

(b) Assess the effects of the Industrial Revolution on the working class. Refer to any two countries in your answer. [20]

The key issue here is the impact that industrialisation had on the working class, both agricultural and industrial. There is a good case to be made each way in terms of advantages and disadvantages, but it can vary between different countries. Reference should be made to more than one and there should not just be generalisations. There were general gains; in many cases, a weekly wage replaced an erratic income dependent on the weather and the price of bread. An employer had a vested interest in keeping an employee content. Real wages rose throughout the period and a substantial population increase indicated that the standard of living was improving for all.

With increasing social mobility and a growing demand for skills and 'middle class' occupations, there was the chance to rise through the ranks which was not possible before, especially in France and German. The 'droit de seigneur' had gone while, on the other hand, many who had owned and farmed at least some land, or had been the self-employed handloom weaver, now were reduced in status to wage labourers and were often dependent on income for wives and children for survival. Working and living conditions could be appalling, unions and the franchise banned and they could be laid off with no support in times of low demand.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

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

(a) Why did Britain form the Triple Entente with France and Russia by 1907? [10]

The key issue here is to explain the reasons behind the formation of the Triple Entente. There were differing motives for each country, as well as general ones such as the fear of Germany and the fact that ‘they are doing it’ and the need for security. France was determined to get revenge for 1870 and needed allies. It also wished to expand in North Africa and elsewhere and needed support from other imperial powers. Poincaré was convinced in 1911 that there might be a war between Russia and Germany and saw it as a chance to get Alsace Lorraine back. There were other factors such as the popular press in the UK and France as well as commercial and imperial rivalry, and the arms race helped cement it. Although Balfour in the early stages feared Russia more than the Germans, Grey was later to do much to bring the French closer to the UK and the visit of Edward VII helped. The French enthusiasm for Russia was straightforward in strategic terms, but it took time for Britain to be satisfied that Russia was less of a threat than Germany. Commercial and imperial rivalry was a factor, of course.

(b) To what extent was the arms race the most important cause of World War I? [20]

The key issue here is the relative importance of the arms race, when compared to other factors, as a cause of the war. Identification of a range of ‘other factors’ is expected, such as the alliance system, imperial rivalry and commercial rivalry, as well as more general forces such as nationalism. There should be a balanced discussion comparing the arms race with a range of other factors. There is a case to be made for it. In the cases of both Russia and Germany, the ‘race’ put into the hands of two volatile and incompetent men the ability to wage destructive war. The Schlieffen plan and its implications were a direct result of the arms race and the fears about the speed of mobilisation. The development of the army in Austria-Hungary, although a strong unifying force, gave the Emperor, together with the ‘blank cheque’, the confidence to take on the Serbs.

The naval race between Britain and Germany was a major cause of tension, and was also a strong influencing factor in the Anglo-French military conversations which were to have serious implications in 1914. The Italians joined in and it fuelled their own ambitions in the Balkans and elsewhere which were to add to the tension.

It could be argued that it did not cause the war, but if nations did not have armies and navies, then there would be no war?

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why did the Tsar abdicate in 1917?

[10]

The key issue is the factors which led up to the abdication and their relative importance. There were the many personal failings, and he was faced with insurmountable problems. He was faced with an ultimatum by the generals and had little choice. He had clearly failed and he knew it. The army's loyalty had dissipated; there was obvious military failure. He felt that his brother would replace him and keep the regime going, while he could retire to be the country gentleman he should have been. The alternative was anarchy and he realised that he had no other option. The growth of radical opposition and economic breakdown were also factors, but the extent to which they impinged on the Tsar's thinking is arguable.

(b) To what extent were the reforms of Witte and Stolypin successful?

[20]

The key issue is the extent to which the work of the two men benefitted Russia. Reflection on what 'success' might imply is looked for, as their work had varying impacts on different groups in society as was, as for the nation as a whole. Witte, of course, was the great 'railway' man and also a key factor behind administrative changes such as the Council of Ministers and the Fundamental Laws. He must take responsibility for the Dumas and the early stages of the concessions post-1905.

Stolypin, of course, was very different with very clear views and remarkable honesty. However, his ruthlessness, 'neckties' and Field Court Martials made the regime few friends and many enemies. His interference with elections angered many and his ability to alienate minorities was damaging. However, he did talk to the peasants and really aimed to create a prosperous peasantry and clear up the mess left by the abolition of serfdom. He did increase social tension, yet both agricultural and industrial output went up and he did appear to have some solutions to some of Russia's major problems.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

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 was the concept of Manifest Destiny so influential in nineteenth-century America?** [10]

The concept was first articulated in 1845, when a journalist, John O’Sullivan, asserted America’s ‘manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our multiplying millions’. In other words, it was obvious that the USA was destined to take control of the greater part, if not all, of North America. At a time when the USA controlled only part of the region, the concept became an important justification for the westward expansion which followed rapidly in the late 1840s. Not all Americans accepted the doctrine; Lincoln did not. However, enough opinion formers and politicians of the mid-19th century did agree sufficiently to use the concept which thereafter became a key element of US political vocabulary. In the later 19th century, some applied the concept to the expansion of American power in the Americas and even across the Pacific. By that time, the phrase conveyed a sense of moral purpose which was not evident in O’Sullivan’s thinking.

- (b) **‘The expansion of US naval power was the most important factor shaping the USA’s relations with Europe in the years from 1901 to 1922.’ How far do you agree?** [20]

In 1901, Theodore Roosevelt became US President. He was very keen to expand the US navy in order that the USA could uphold its interests in an era of imperial rivalry. The US fleet expanded threefold between 1898 and 1913, moving it from fifth to third behind Britain and Germany, racing each other for naval supremacy. The great symbol of American naval expansion was the circumnavigation of the globe by ‘the Great White Fleet’ in 1907–09. This expansion concerned American interests in the Pacific following the war with Spain in 1898 and more immediately the Russo-Japanese war of 1904–05.

To everyone’s surprise, Japan had defeated Russia. In 1902, Japan signed a peacetime military alliance with Britain, the world’s leading naval power, a combination which could work against US interests in the Pacific. Britain was the European great power most affected by US naval expansion. However, the growth of the German navy was a greater threat to British interests. Once the USA joined the First World War, its navy played a major role in helping the Allies by shipping two million US soldiers to France.

Following the war, fears of a new naval race resulted in the Washington Agreements of 1922. For domestic and financial reasons, all three naval powers in the Pacific – USA, UK and Japan – were prepared to limit their construction of battleships. As part of the deal, the Anglo-Japanese alliance was ended, thereby achieving an important goal of US foreign policy. The expansion of the US navy in the first two decades of the twentieth century had affected the USA’s relations with Europe less than might have been expected, perhaps because that power was focused on the Pacific and Caribbean more than the Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did Southern states introduce ‘black codes’ in 1865–66? [10]

In 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery, thus ending the law of master over slave. The plantation owners needed state laws to replace their own rule. Hence states introduced black codes to regulate the behaviour of freedmen – and to maintain the traditional economy of the South. As a strong believer in state rights, President Andrew Johnson was prepared to allow the defeated Confederate states considerable autonomy in deciding on a new legal framework to replace that based on slavery. Thus from late 1865 all Southern states introduced laws which became known as Black Codes. Examples included the need for every ex-slave to have an annual contract specifying the work they would undertake. In some states, freedmen breaking this contract could be punished by whipping and sold for one year’s compulsory labour. Apprenticeship laws allowed the imposition of unpaid labour on the children of ex-slaves. Most states passed laws against vagrancy, which was usually interpreted very broadly. These codes caused much hostility in the North and helped bring about the Radical Reconstruction associated with the 1866 Civil Rights Act and the 14th Amendment, fully ratified in 1868.

(b) ‘Life was harsh for everyone in the South during the Civil War.’ How far do you agree? [20]

The Confederacy faced one major problem which is often overlooked: the conditions experienced by civilians in the South. The South’s living standards had been high, if only for whites, before the war because its economy benefitted from the cotton trade. The naval blockade, increasingly effective and added to the self-imposed sanctions against exports of raw cotton, isolated the South. Thus living standards fell, especially as resources had to be diverted to fighting the war.

To make matters worse, the Confederacy had to replace the US dollar with its own currency, the so-called ‘greyback’. This was a paper currency without any resources backing it to ensure its value. Thus inflation became a fact of life in the South; some estimate that prices rose by 9000% during the war. And as Northern forces advanced, especially controlling the Mississippi, so hardships worsened. In April 1863, there were bread riots in the Confederate capital, Richmond.

Even if material conditions were getting steadily worse, there was little evidence of a collapse in resistance to ‘Northern aggression’. White Southern women did what they could to oppose the occupying forces from the North, as in New Orleans where hostility in 1862 was so great that the Union general in the city had to issue an edict stating that any such woman should be regarded as ‘a woman of the city plying her avocation’. General Sherman’s march to the sea across Georgia and South Carolina inflicted great hardships on the civilians of these states. Without doubt, life was harsh in the South during the civil war and it became much harsher as the war progressed. How harsh depended on who you were – male or female, white or black, free or slave, adult or child – and where you lived.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

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

(a) Why did the USA maintain a high tariff policy in the 1870s and 1880s? [10]

There were two reasons for the introduction of tariffs: firstly, to provide revenue for federal government in an era without income tax and when states levied indirect taxes; secondly, to protect infant US industries against foreign competition, especially from the UK. The first had been the main reason for quite low-level tariffs before the civil war. The Republicans had raised tariffs during the war in order to offset higher taxes being imposed on US businesses. After the war, the taxes were reduced or removed, as initially in the later 1860s were tariffs. Then, in 1873 came the onset of an economic depression. Tariffs were raised to protect certain industries which were suffering from the depression, especially the woollen and iron and steel industries. Politics played its part in maintaining and increasing tariffs in the 1870s and 1880s: the Republicans, the party of the industrial North, were in power and they looked after their supporters. Protection had become the main reason for tariffs, though they also allowed the federal government budget to stay in surplus.

(b) How radical were the political and constitutional reforms of the Progressive Era? [20]

The political reforms occurred mainly at state level, which meant not all states were included: initiatives and referendums and recall elections. The constitutional reforms were four amendments, 16 to 19, passed in the space of just seven years: federal income tax – direct elections of the US Senate – prohibition of the sale of alcohol – votes for women. Most reforms aimed to democratise the US system of government. A federal income tax also had a populist dimension in that it would enable the reduction of tariffs, which were a tax on ordinary people. Prohibition was the odd one out, having an ambitious moral goal. Radical can be defined as fundamental change in contrast to more limited, piecemeal change. Each of these reforms needs to be assessed in terms of the extent to which they changed the foundations and nature of US democracy.

The political reforms at state level had the more specific intention of introducing direct democracy alongside the continuing forms of representative democracy in order to weaken the undemocratic features of the latter. Evaluation will vary both with the reform and with the perspective of the viewer. Leaving prohibition to one side, a left-wing progressive analysis of the others would emphasise how little long-lasting political change resulted while a right-wing, conservative position might take the opposite view. For all reforms, there is a contrast to be made between the aims of their supporters and the reality of their implementation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

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

(a) Why did the Roosevelt Presidency begin with ‘100 Days’ of action? [10]

By March 1933, four months after he was elected, Roosevelt was inaugurated as president. During this interregnum, the financial and economic crises facing the USA, already some three years in duration, had worsened. Roosevelt decided that once he became president he needed to take radical action to address the situation. Hence he closed all banks for four days. By the end of the 100 days, Congress had passed fifteen major bills to address urgent social and economic problems, a degree of legislative activity never matched before or since. As well as objective external factors which required urgent action, there were also political reasons for acting so quickly. His election gave Roosevelt a store of popularity which he could use to overcome the obstacles to effective government presented by the US constitution and especially the separation of powers. In later years, Roosevelt became more cautious when faced with Congressional opposition. In his first few weeks in office, he was strong enough to take the drastic action which he believed the dire situation of the USA required.

(b) ‘Roosevelt’s electoral success was based more on personality than policy.’ How far do you agree? [20]

This question requires candidates to consider the reasons why FDR won an unprecedented three peacetime election victories. On one side of the debate are FDR’s policies, labelled as the New Deal and often divided into First and Second New Deals. On the other there is FDR’s personality, which can cover elements such as his skills as a speaker and his ability to relate to the US public as well as fellow politicians and policy-makers. His personality allowed him to attract into government a wide range of individuals, from his ‘Brains Trust’ to his ‘Black Cabinet’. They helped create the policies, many improvised, some contradictory, which were seen necessary to tackle the great problem of the Great Depression. The evidence of FDR’s special qualities is most commonly linked with his use of the new medium of radio via his ‘fireside chats’. These he used to explain his policies in ways which gained him public support. The policies themselves were often radical and controversial and thus unlikely to gain him a great deal of support, at least initially. As the 1930s progressed, his policies gained support from a range of social groups – ethnic minorities, organised labour and the white South – which did help him win the elections of 1936 and 1940.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did Britain end its policy of ‘splendid isolation’ after 1900? [10]

The policy of ‘splendid isolation’ involved keeping out of European affairs and concentrating on the development of Britain’s own Empire. Peace on the continent had enabled Britain to develop its overseas possessions largely unchallenged. As an island nation with massive naval supremacy, Britain felt secure. The policy was ended because:

- Germany’s more aggressive foreign policy under Kaiser Wilhelm alarmed Britain
- the massive increase in the size and power of the German navy caused panic in Britain. While German naval forces were concentrated in the North Sea, Britain’s were widely dispersed across the world in defence of its Empire
- the negative reaction of the other main European powers to Britain’s involvement in the Boer Wars led to insecurity
- the formation of the Triple Alliance and the Dual Entente left Britain isolated
- Britain’s interests in the Far East seemed to be under threat, especially from Russia.

In order to address these problems, Britain formed an Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1902 and, in 1904, agreed to the Entente Cordiale with France.

(b) To what extent was Germany responsible for the outbreak of World War I? [20]

In suggesting that Germany was responsible, it could be argued that the more aggressive foreign policy adopted by Kaiser Wilhelm caused alarm in Europe. The formation of the Triple Alliance appeared to be a direct threat to both France and Russia, which, despite their political differences, formed their own alliance. Concerned by the rapid development of the German navy, Britain joined with France and Russia to avoid becoming isolated and insecure. As early as 1904, Germany had developed the Schlieffen Plan to be deployed in the event of war. When Germany put this plan into operation in 1914, it brought France and Britain into the war. Austria-Hungary would not have attacked Serbia without the certain knowledge that it had German support.

In challenging Germany’s culpability, it could be argued that the Triple Alliance was essentially defensive in character, reflecting German concerns that it might be attacked by both France and Russia. Kaiser Wilhelm viewed the Triple Entente as a conspiracy to surround and threaten Germany. Germany was not the only country to have developed a plan of action in the event of war, and the Schlieffen Plan was designed as a way of managing war on two fronts. The main causes of the war were nationalism, the collapse of the great empires and rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans. As late as 1913, Germany urged Austria-Hungary not to attack Serbia for fear of Russian involvement. Russia, determined to keep its warm water access through the Dardanelles, was the first country to mobilise following Austria-Hungary’s attack in Serbia in 1914. This forced Germany, under the terms of its alliance commitments, to declare war on Russia and, because of the Schlieffen Plan, also on France.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

- (a) Why, in 1919, did the USA, Britain and France disagree about how best to treat the defeated Germany? [10]

Wilson (USA) wanted '*peace without victory*', a lenient peace based on his Fourteen Points. He believed that imposing a harsh treaty on Germany would cause resentment, making future conflict more likely. He saw himself as a mediator between rival European nations, whose greed and selfishness had led to the war in the first place. In reality, Wilson lacked genuine understanding of the complex problems facing Europe in 1919.

Clemenceau (France) wanted to impose a harsh treaty on Germany. His aim was to ruin Germany both economically and militarily. This was in revenge for the devastation which France had suffered at the hands of German aggression, both in 1914–18 and, indeed, in 1871. He was determined to ensure that Germany could never again threaten France. His determination to inflict a harsh punishment on Germany earned him the nickname 'The Tiger'.

Lloyd George (Britain) faced a political dilemma. It was clearly in Britain's economic interests for Germany, a major consumer of British exports, to be allowed to recover quickly. However, British public opinion was heavily anti-German, and Lloyd George had just won an election on the promise that he would '*make Germany pay*'. Therefore, he wanted a treaty which would be harsh, but which would allow the German economy to prosper again as quickly as possible.

- (b) To what extent did relations between France and Germany improve in the period from 1919 to 1933? [20]

France had been disappointed by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, believing that they had left Germany strong enough to recover and to become a threat to French security again in the future. Unlike Britain, which believed that a resurgent Germany was essential for its own economic well-being, France was determined to keep Germany as weak as possible for as long as possible. In particular, France insisted that Germany pay reparations in full. When Germany defaulted, France occupied the Ruhr, one of Germany's most important industrial regions – a clear threat to peace. Tensions were only reduced by the Dawes Plan (1924), as a result of which France withdrew from the Ruhr.

Franco-German relations did seem to improve as a result of the Locarno Treaties (1925), aided by the good working relationship which developed between Aristede Briand and Gustav Stresemann (Foreign Ministers of France and Germany). Indeed, France's new willingness to compromise on the reparations issue was revealed by its acceptance of the Young Plan (1929). However, France remained deeply concerned about its security and continued to develop alliances against any future German attack (e.g. with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia). As the German economy began to revive, France became increasingly alarmed and adopted a tougher attitude towards its relations with Germany in the early 1930s. The World Disarmament Conference (1932–33) clearly revealed these tensions, with Germany complaining that it alone had disarmed in line with the requirements of the Paris peace settlement.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why were the Republicans defeated in the Spanish Civil War? [10]

The Republicans lacked unity, the various left-wing groups all having their own, often contradictory, aims. Unlike the well trained professional soldiers under Franco's command, they were simply armed workers lacking in military organisation and discipline. The League of Nations gave no direct support to the constitutionally elected government of Spain, establishing the Non-Interference policy. This denied the Republicans support from Britain and France, while Italy and Germany broke their agreement to the policy by supplying Franco. The only external support which the Republicans gained was from volunteers of the International Brigades, and these were untrained and ill-equipped. Conversely, Franco had managed to maintain unity between the various right-wing groups which made up the Nationalists (army, church, monarchists, Falangists). Gaining the assistance of Italy and Germany (and, to a lesser extent, Portugal) had provided Franco with troops, planes and tanks.

(b) How far had Mussolini met his foreign policy aims by 1939? [20]

It is firstly necessary to establish what Mussolini's foreign policy aims were. His primary aim was 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.

Evidence to suggest he was successful might include:

- 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
- gaining the respect of other nations at the Locarno Treaties, allowing Italy to be accepted as a major power
- forming alliances to ensure Italy's security
- successfully opposing Hitler's plans to take Austria in 1934
- 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.

Evidence to suggest he was not successful might include the following:

- his aims were largely propaganda to encourage ultra-nationalism
- 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 largely based on diplomacy. This gained Italy respect, but did not make it great or feared
- after 1934, Mussolini moved closer to Hitler, but his overseas successes were largely for domestic propaganda only (e.g. Abyssinia and Albania).

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9389	22

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why did the May the Fourth Movement occur? [10]

The Movement aimed to end China's humiliation at the hands of foreigners and warlords. Chinese hopes of regaining territories in Shantung Province from Germany were thwarted in 1919 when the Paris peace settlement recognised Japanese rights in the Province. Chinese warlords had agreed to this in exchange for financial help for their own territorial ambitions. The Movement argued that China had become a fragmented country, dominated by warlords who were more concerned with extending their own political power than in defending national interests. This was seen as the cause of China's weakness in the face of intruding foreigners. The Movement marked an upsurge in Chinese nationalism, but it also rejected traditional Chinese culture, values and traditions, which were seen as a fundamental cause of China's weakness. It called for modernisation and political reform, in the form of industrial development and a democratic form of government.

(b) 'The Kuomintang's failure to establish effective government throughout China during the 1930s was caused by poor leadership.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that the KMT's early successes (e.g. Northern March) had been dependent on widespread support. Peasants, factory workers, shopkeepers, merchants and businessmen had all been attracted by the Three Principles (nationalism, democracy and land reform). The KMT army relied heavily on support from Soviet Russia which came as a result of the KMT's close links with the CCP. This widespread support was undermined by Chiang Kai-shek's decision to end collaboration between the KMT and the CCP after 1927. It soon became clear that his priority was nationalism and that he had little time for social or political reform. His government proved to be inefficient and corrupt, favouring businessmen, bankers, industrialists and landowners. It made little attempt to attract popular support.

As a result, the CCP's popularity grew at the expense of the KMT. Chiang's KMT forces were unable to prevent the Long March achieving its objective and the establishment of a CCP stronghold in Shensi Province. Faced with Japanese aggression after 1931, Chiang adopted a policy of non-resistance, preferring to concentrate on defeating the CCP. This policy was not universally popular within the KMT and, indeed, Chiang was taken prisoner by some of his own troops in 1936 and forced to renew partnership with the CCP. Mao was able to depict the CCP as the true defenders of Chinese nationalism.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that it would have been impossible to maintain the widespread support which KMT enjoyed in the 1920s once power had been obtained – it had little in common except the desire to reunite China. The son of a wealthy landowner, steeped in Chinese culture and traditions, Chiang would inevitably favour the wealthier elements in society, to whom the CCP posed a major threat. Chiang had led the KMT army to Peking by 1928, establishing a government – no mean achievement. His government faced numerous problems, such as the continuing power of warlords, the growing menace of the CCP and the threat of Japanese invasion. The Long March established Mao as leader of the CCP, which appealed to a larger section of the Chinese population. Chiang realised that, still weak and divided with no navy, China could not win a war against Japan, which explains why he adopted a policy of non-resistance.